

Human Zoos: the Greatest Exotic Shows in the West

PASCAL BLANCHARD, NICOLAS BANCEL,
GILLES BOËTSCH, ÉRIC DEROO
AND SANDRINE LEMAIRE

To see is to know.¹

The 'human zoo' is exceptional in combining the functions of exhibition, performance, education and domination. Its study crosses disciplinary boundaries, drawing on the fields of history, anthropology and sociology, and it is as much a factor in the sociology of mass cultures as it is part of colonial history.² In embarking on the study of this phenomenon it is important to consider from the outset how it fits into a wider history of such practices. Linked, as it appears to be, to different types of display and areas of knowledge, the exhibition of 'exotic' humans can be said to number among the practices which contribute to the production of knowledge.³

This type of exhibition made its first real appearance as the result of a conjunction of political, social and economic factors in the nineteenth century, a period well known for its interest in distant lands, the discovery of the unknown, and the strange. This taste for far-off places, for exoticism, for the Other is, therefore, essential to our understanding of the links which can be established between 'human zoos' and earlier phenomena, such as the chambers of marvels which appeared in the great courts of Europe at the end of the sixteenth century,⁴ the cabinets of curiosities which succeeded them and multiplied throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, bringing together entirely random groups of rare and strange objects drawn from the animal, vegetable, mineral and human worlds, or, again, menageries, zoological gardens and circuses.

In this long line of predecessors, the cabinets of curiosities are particularly important. First, such attractions, which were as diverse in their form as in the objects they contained, flourished throughout Europe from the end of the Renaissance. Second, it was these eclectic collections (containing juxtapositions of the most unlikely objects brought

together by an all-consuming curiosity) that first motivated their owners to seek to understand their contents and to create systems of classification and hierarchies, making them the precursors of the museum.⁵ Last, their compulsive attraction to the marvellous and their fascination with the curious provide us with part of the explanation for the emergence of human zoos, and for their success.

Early menageries – those collections of a variety of animals which were initially reserved for the enjoyment of Western aristocrats – also contribute to our understanding of those exhibitions of humans which were staged in zoological gardens. With the French Revolution, an upheaval occurred in the history of these menageries, which spread throughout Europe. In France itself, the animals from the Royal Menagerie at Versailles were transferred to the Jardin des Plantes in Paris, with the intention of furthering popular education and breaking with princely privilege. In the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, London and other major cities in Europe gradually followed suit, opening zoos to the public. Such zoos were free, or charged a small entrance fee.

Another contributing factor to the growth of zoological gardens in cities was the urban development resulting from the first Industrial Revolution. These urban zoos became sites for combinations of collections that would not occur in the natural world; instead, they ordered Nature in accordance with the conceptions of eighteenth-century natural science. This recourse to a reconstructed nature corresponded to a deep social need brought about by the uprooting of millions of country people who came to work in the cities. Zoological gardens thus responded to a nostalgia (for nature), but also to the need to create an 'elsewhere' that could serve as the unlikely image of a lost paradise, a Noah's ark revisited by the Enlightenment, in which increasingly varied species of animal were to be found side by side, displayed in exotic settings. These were more the result of a desire to express the prodigality of nature than of any concern to recreate the natural environments of the animals on show. The animal zoo was thus a space both of curiosity and of fantasy, allowing the imagination free rein. It provided a divided and labelled space to which the public could come to contemplate advances in the knowledge of nature and the domestication of various species. And it was precisely at this juncture between exoticism and knowledge, between fantasy and rationality, that the human zoo appeared.

While the different zoological spaces were made available to scientists so that they could study or familiarize themselves with strange and wild beasts (and also confirm or disprove existing theories of the organization of life), they were soon opened to the public for purposes of

entertainment and education (Blunt 1976; Baratay and Hardouin-Fugier 1998; Baratay 1999; 2002).⁶ Now that the vegetable and animal worlds were becoming better known to scientists and the public, there was an increasing interest in the diversity of human morphology, stimulated by discoveries of new countries and colonial conquests. But human morphology needed to fit into current explanatory models of the world, and nineteenth-century physical anthropologists attempted to explain this diversity in scientific terms. Humans became a central topic of study, at first using skeletons or cultural artefacts; later moving on to reconstructed, desiccated or mummified bodies; and, finally through the use of 'live specimens'. These 'specimens' were first studied in their 'natural' environment, before being 'transported' and exhibited in the West.

In North America (where there were two local types of 'exotic' population: the African-American descendants of slaves and the Native Americans) the pattern was not the same. Here, towards the middle of the nineteenth century, the spectacle of 'elsewhere' was to be encountered in travelling circuses. These followed the European tradition of showing animals at fairs, but they did not retain the scientific and educational purposes of such shows. It was in these circuses that 'ethnic shows' and 'freak shows' would meet and cross-fertilize, producing the first popular manifestation of a systematic representation of human difference (if we exclude European cabinets of curiosities and a small number of shows for the benefit of the nobility). The similarity between ethnic shows and 'freak' shows demonstrates, moreover, the underlying connection between visual pleasure in exoticism and/or strangeness, and the (at least superficial) aim of acquiring knowledge through exhibition.

The reference point for such practices remains Phineas Taylor Barnum (who gave the anthropozoological model its name) and his enterprises, but we should also remember Buffalo Bill's Wild West show, which extended its influence across the world (Brown 1976). Of North American extraction, these 'professionals of the strange' were to organize worldwide tours and would travel to the greatest European cities, developing a new concept in mass culture. Their method was to exhibit the most 'savage' or 'outlandish' beings, hybrids of the human and the animal, who fascinated a still relatively naive public. The Wild West show transformed this model by integrating it into the technological progress of the industrial world and the concept of American nationhood, setting up an opposition between 'modern' America and 'Indian savagery'.

On both sides of the Atlantic, almost simultaneously, but in surroundings which were distinct and specific to each culture, there emerged

the basic principles of a modern type of ethnographic exhibition that carried an identical message concerning exotic peoples.

The Genesis of Human Zoos

Of course, the Other has always been exhibited, shown and staged. Already, in Ancient Egypt, black 'dwarves' from the Sudanese territories were exhibited, just as, during the Roman Empire, conquered 'Barbarians' and 'Savages' were paraded through the streets of Rome in order to reinforce the message of Roman superiority and hegemony over the rest of the world. Later, during centuries of discovery and conquest, travellers and explorers brought living or dead human 'specimens' to the courts of the European monarchs. The strange, the different and the monstrous have thus long been objects of a lively curiosity.

The first 'exotic specimens' to be presented in the great courts of Europe were treated in quite different ways, repeating the varied pattern of the cabinets of curiosities which were so fashionable at that time. (These had begun with the Tradescants' collection, known as the Ark, which had been created in the early seventeenth century and would later form the core of the Ashmolean Museum collection in Oxford.) Among those on show were the Tupi Indians brought to Europe by Hernán Cortés and presented to the King of France in 1550; the 'savages' collected by Duke Wilhelm V of Bavaria in about 1580, who were displayed alongside an astonishing range of 'dwarves' and 'cripples'; the Tahitian brought back to France by Bougainville in 1769 (see Boëtsch and Ardagna in this volume; see also Bambridge 2002: 151–53);⁷ and a 'troupe of Africans' who were established near Frankfurt in 1784 by Frederick II of Hesse-Cassel, in order to observe both their habits and their morphology (the bodies of some of their number were studied by Samuel Thomas Sömmering, see Blanckaert 2002: 229).⁸ These cases illustrate a pattern that was slowly but inexorably being established in the West, along with the development of a passion for difference and exoticism.

The arts and the sciences were fully engaged in the study of humanity. Indeed, artists (such as Charles Le Brun) complained at the difficulty of gaining access to samples of all the full range of human forms which populated the earth and, in particular, to different 'racial' types. Their aim was to understand the relationship between the body and the soul. In the eyes of scholars and artists of the time, Europeans had the 'highest' type of facial structure, providing proof of their own genius compared with the abilities of other peoples (Baridon and Guédron 1999). But such hypotheses required confirmation through comparative study,

creating a need for reference collections. The naturalist Johann Friedrich Blumenbach was the most conscious of the importance of forming an anthropological collection containing a large number of 'specimens'. His collection contained portraits of individuals from 'various races' and, in pride of place, 82 skulls. In France, museum professors rushed to form their own anthropological collections. Georges Cuvier, Etienne-Antoine Serres and, later, Jean Louis Armand de Quatrefages built one of the most famous such collections in the world (Quatrefages 1867).⁹ The discovery of the Other by means of these collections of human skeletons became standard practice in the scientific world at a time when scholars were seeking to establish and understand human hierarchies.

To achieve this end, scientists needed anthropological and ethnographic collections, but they also needed to be able to see, touch, measure and study living humans. There were only two possible solutions to this problem: either it was necessary to 'go into the field' – which meant long, arduous and costly expeditions, available only to those with substantial means; or the objects of study had to be brought to the scientists. The desire at the beginning of the nineteenth century to 'collect' and 'display' the various 'races' was strengthened by this situation, as is demonstrated by an early project for an ethnographic park, recorded by the French architect Edme Verniquet in 1802, 'where each man would be dressed according to the traditions of his country, and placed in a setting appropriate to his way of life' (Verniquet 1802: 23; see also Baratay 2002: 36–37).¹⁰ Elsewhere, an ethnological museum of the 'Scandinavian peoples' was created in Sweden in a similar vein, and various projects to form 'human collections' (whether living or not) were set in motion in Europe and the United States in the first half of the century. Although none of these enjoyed the success of the American Museum founded by P. T. Barnum in 1841 in New York, the process had nevertheless begun.

The North American model was central to this development. In New York, the American Museum, founded by Barnum in 1841 in the heart of Manhattan, became the most popular show in the country (Harris 1973; Lindfors 1983a). 'Freaks' were the lynchpin of the show (Garland-Thomson 1996). Barnum's invention was to stage his 'monsters' in an entertainment area, while simultaneously showing a programme of 'scientific' lectures, magical tricks, dancing and theatrical reconstructions. It was a new type of urban spectacle¹¹ and it would be taken up very quickly by the travelling circuses which were beginning to tour the whole of the United States and Europe. In 1884, Barnum created the Grand Congress of Nations, a sort of ideological culmination of these

early commercial exhibitions, presenting 'strange and savage tribes' on a national scale. In it, he presented the American showman R.A. Cunningham's Australian Aborigines,¹² 'ferocious Zulus', Sioux Indians, a 'savage Muslim' 'Nubian', and several other 'exotic specimens'.

In Europe, a similar process had begun in the early years of the nineteenth century with the exhibition in London and Paris of the Hottentot Venus (1810–15), whose body would become an object of scientific study.¹³ London rapidly became the capital of these 'exotic shows' (see Durbach in this volume; see also Altick 1978), with exhibitions of 'Indians' (Native Americans) (1817),¹⁴ Lapps (Sami) (1822), Eskimos (Inuit) (1824), Fuegians (1829), Guyanese (1839), Bushmen (1847), and also several groups of Zulus, including in the major exhibition of 1859, which inaugurated a 'grand tour' through Europe (Lindfors 1999a: 205).¹⁵ This tour fascinated Charles Dickens to such a degree that he later produced a pamphlet in which he argued against the myth of the 'good savage'.

It was during the nineteenth century that the paradigms for a normalization of the natural world developed in both the Old and New Worlds. In these, the world's visible phenomena were transformed into a combination of popular spectacle, science lesson (with the emergence of learned societies),¹⁶ and explicit demonstration of the well-foundedness of existing colonial hierarchies and racial distinctions. Although society was progressively moving away from the age of slavery, through abolition, it was entering the age of empire, and the world order was divided into exhibited peoples on the one hand and spectators at the exhibition on the other. At the 1851 Great Exhibition in London (the first of its kind) the pavilions devoted to the Middle and Far East surprised the visitors by the quality of their artistic production. By contrast, the Egyptian pavilion was set apart from the technological progress of European industry. In addition to the antiquities on show, which were already familiar to Europeans, this pavilion caused a sensation with its imitation of a Cairo street, filled with traders, and with its own mosque, shops, dancers and cafés. This formula would be repeated at every subsequent universal exhibition. In Paris, Chicago, San Francisco, Berlin and Milan, the conventional exoticism of this Cairo street would draw hundreds of thousands of visitors (Aimone and Olmo 1993), and would stimulate a taste for exotic reconstructions which would persist throughout the period of great Western exhibitions.

A Changing Pattern

By the middle of the nineteenth century the pattern of shows was still a piecemeal affair (even though the Zulu tour of 1859 hinted at a new model to come) and had not yet developed into a fully fledged 'industry', with its own codes and professionals, playing an integral role in major colonial displays. The shows still staged essentially ludic displays of strength, strangeness, curiosity or cruelty. However, in the second half of the century a pattern emerged which led to the full development of the model of the human zoos as human exhibitions of 'exotics' with a certain racial element (from 'ethnic shows' to 'negro villages'), which were either independent or formed part of larger performances, such as the universal and colonial exhibitions.

The first troupe of this type was shown by Carl Hagenbeck in Hamburg in 1874, the year of Barnum's arrival in Europe. This date therefore acted as a watershed in the development of human exhibitions. Hagenbeck's troupe was composed of a family of six Lapps (Sami), accompanied by about thirty reindeer. As a result of the success of this exhibition, Hagenbeck exported his shows from Germany (not least to the Jardin d'Acclimatation in Paris, in 1877),¹⁷ professionalizing them under the title of 'anthropozoological exhibitions'.¹⁸ Almost simultaneously, in Philadelphia in 1876, Charles Rau of the Smithsonian Institution proposed a number of exhibitions of the same kind for the Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition, in order to demonstrate the 'extremely low level of our distant ancestors' and to facilitate the measurement of the degree of evolution of Western societies compared with 'primitive societies' (see Rydell 1984).

Alongside the German 'king of the zoos' and American Barnums, many impresarios would gradually establish themselves and develop their own companies (including those who were themselves from colonial backgrounds, such as John Tevi or J. C. Nayo Bruce).¹⁹ From this time, the formula of the human zoo spread rapidly, becoming an historically significant pattern in just over a decade. The great novelty of these moments of scientific excitement, when compared with the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth, was that travellers' tales and engravings were no longer enough to satisfy the public. Instead, a form of display was created which combined science with theatre and was staged in both private and public spaces, where men who were *different* were put on show.

This brought about a decisive transformation in the status of alterity, of *Otherness*, which became rationalized and *rationalizable* by means

of a racial typology established (or in the process of being established) through science. The yardstick of this typology remained Western man and, in particular, Caucasian man, in whom the French naturalist Georges-Louis Leclerc, Comte de Buffon, perceived and admired a physical harmony. But the 'science of the races' would be overtaken in turn by Progress and the interests of international strategy. Accordingly, Japan, as an emerging modern power, would be included in the dominant model from the World's Columbian Exposition of 1893 in Chicago onwards.²⁰ To exhibit the Other became a visible and simple sign of modernity and greatness. Conversely, Russia refused to allow its citizens to feature in the shows, believing that this would diminish their status. The scientific rationalization of alterity produced a racial hierarchy at that time, which was then transposed and vulgarized in ethnic shows, bringing together a combination of features drawn from imaginary constructs of exoticism and the 'savage' (Courcelles 1997; Bensa 2006).²¹

The display of exotic peoples also suggested that they were inferior in status to the Europeans and therefore colonizable, even though there were doubts among some scholars concerning the state of 'backwardness' of some of them. One French anthropologist, Abel Hovelacque, explored the question of those peoples who represented 'the last (or the first) stages on the human ladder' (Hovelacque 1882: ii). In his work, he made reference to Australians, Veddas, Bushmen and the Botocudo of Brazil, whose material culture was, in his view, close to that of beasts: 'Is it not clear, is it not obvious that the most sophisticated dwellings of the Australian, the Bushman, or the Andamanite, are hardly superior in architectural form and comfort to the nests of anthropoids?' (1882: 266).

The appearance and the very rapid spread of human zoos has close links with other contemporary phenomena, for example, the quest for identity associated with the construction of nation-states, which affected the societies of the Old World; the affirmation of 'American specificity' following the end of the War of Independence; and the concept of Meiji modernity in Japan from 1878. These ethnocentric visions were constructed on the many fears that resulted from the combination of staggering advances in science and sudden social shifts. The new paradigm overturned all reference points: concepts of space were changed by the break between town and country and the development of transport networks; concepts of time were altered by the unprecedented speed of travel, the conquest of colonial spaces, and the acceleration of the rhythm of labour in the cities; concepts of society

were changed by the emergence of the industrial working classes and the decay of communal and, sometimes, family ties; while concepts of culture shifted as local country traditions were replaced by a newly created political transcendence which lay at the heart of the creation of nation-states. These transformations, which occurred in the course of just two generations, were of a hitherto unexperienced brutality. Scientific positivism and faith in progress can be understood only against the backdrop of the profound anthropological concerns which permeated the social fabric, undoing the collective psyche and obscuring the future from view. Human zoos were part of a larger attempt to provide reassurance concerning identity.

In the case of the United States, which was both imperial and colonial in character, with a significant Afro-American minority and its own 'savages' in the form of Native Americans, it was necessary to define the essential form of the identity of the nation and its peoples, while confirming a racial model based in many respects on eugenics. In Japan we find a dual approach. First, it was important to establish a Japanese racial model (in which the Japanese were essentially superior), in contrast to the 'backward peoples' of the surrounding countries. Second, those peoples who were 'potentially' colonizable by the new elite groups in power were put on display, in particular, those whose countries were geographically close to Japan (Koreans, Taiwanese, Okinawans and Chinese).

The First National Industrial Exposition in Japan was held in Tokyo in 1877, but it was after the war with China of 1894-95 that exhibitions became more frequent, and 'colonial' exhibits appeared. Accordingly, the Okazaki (Kyoto) exhibition of 1895 included a pavilion of 'foreign colonial specimens' and also, for the first time, a pavilion representing Taiwan. This was only a year after the Chicago exhibition, where the Japanese pavilion had had such an impact on its visitors, influencing international opinion. This pattern was confirmed in 1903 at the Fifth National Industrial Exposition in Osaka, where the Japanese public first encountered an exhibition of colonial 'natives' and 'exotic' peoples in the Anthropological pavilion. The pavilion was supervised by the Tokyo Anthropological Society and linked to the Taiwan Pavilion and the Specimens Pavilion.²² In it, the public could encounter Chinese, Ainus, Taiwanese, Okinawans, Koreans, Malays, Indians, a Javanese, a Turk and even a man from Zanzibar.

In Europe, the great powers supported their colonial choices through their exhibitions. Britain showed its links with India; France did the same with Algeria, Indochina and sub-Saharan Africa; Holland with

the Dutch Indies; and, later, Belgium with the Congo; Germany with Togo and Cameroon; Italy with north-east Africa; and Portugal with east Africa. Meanwhile, Europe sought to reinforce its world hegemony by declaring its mastery over other 'races', whose destiny involved a simple choice: to be brought under colonial rule or to disappear. Each of the great centres of Western imperialism exploited this chance to 'exhibit difference' in order to reinforce its self-justificatory arguments concerning its policies overseas.

A Strange Strangeness ...

As the nineteenth century progressed, displays of difference were rationalized and commercialized. Circuses, fairs, exhibitions and carnivals prospered throughout the Western world, particularly in America, bringing greater pleasure to the crowds and greater profits to their organizers. This popular craze for *monstrosity* cannot be separated from the distancing of various forms of alterity, and of this Guillermo Farini was without doubt a master (Peacock 1995; and the same author in this volume). First known as a tightrope walker and as the inventor of the 'human cannon', he later reinvented himself as an exhibitor of the monstrous and the exotic. In 1879 in London, for example, he exhibited a troupe of Zulu warriors, before going on to specialize in the exhibition of Bushmen whom he had himself sought out in the Kalahari Desert. Changing course again, he directed a touring troupe of blackface minstrels (white performers in black make-up), who travelled throughout the English-speaking world, including South Africa. His personal evolution (from the circus to ethnic shows and then to the minstrel shows) encapsulates the development of the genre at the turn of the century.

The concept of the 'monster' changed with the appearance of the ethnic shows (Twitchell 1990). The exhibition of the monstrous had, of course, been a form of popular culture since the sixteenth century at least, but it developed renewed vigour in the first half of the nineteenth century, as we have emphasized.²³ The arrival of the ethnic shows thus extended the characteristics of radical Otherness, which shifted from 'physical monsters' (Hevey 1992: 53) to 'exotics'.

In a dialectic process, the distancing of the 'abnormal' at the end of the eighteenth century was accompanied by its greater visibility in the form of the 'monster' (Truzzi 1979; McNamara 1974). Siamese twins,²⁴ the Last of the Aztecs,²⁵ the two 'savages of Borneo',²⁶ the 'cannibal warrior of Dahomey',²⁷ and troupes of 'Albino Africans' acted as links

between the world of 'Freaks' and that of 'Ethnics'. These attractions were staged by Barnum²⁸ and by other impresarios in decors which were usually inspired by 'savage societies', with appropriate costumes and scenery (Barnum 1872; Saxon 1980; Reiss 2001),²⁹ opening up new spaces for the ordering of the world.

Although the formalized Otherness of the ethnic shows could be seen as an anthropological necessity, it also gave rise to stereotypes. This extension and redefinition of radical Otherness was cumulative in nature. We should note that ethnic shows, as new spaces for the display of difference, were the most recent products of a lengthy process, which began in the eighteenth century, in which madmen and those with disabilities were subjected to exclusion and incarceration (Foucault 1961). This segregation profoundly changed the face of rural and urban societies, where such figures had previously occupied a minority, but nevertheless legitimate, position as intermediaries for the supernatural. The disappearance of the 'abnormal' from the heart of social structures made it all the more imperative that a new form of Otherness should be displayed. Otherness was not simply a state, it was the alien element which resisted assimilation and made it possible to construct social, cultural and physical identities.

Thus, towards the middle of the nineteenth century, the exhibition of a 'cannibal from Oceania' in London or the 'monkey-woman' at Luna Park in Paris produced as many, if not more, thrills as (or than) the 'trunk-man', the 'Lilliputian' or the 'pig-woman', for it suggested that a whole people shared these physical, cultural and mental characteristics. The ethnic shows moved away from the display of exceptions or mistakes of nature; instead, they showed the extraordinary norms of the worlds surrounding the West, worlds which it would soon be necessary to dominate, colonize and change.

The colonial project was part of this urge towards uniformity, setting out to remodel the world in the West's *own image*, to make the 'savage' disappear, as the 'cripple' or the 'degenerate' had already done. This was a project based on Western reason and fed by the utopia of scientific transparency, which denied the need for the presence of the Other as testimony to what we are through what we are not.

Today it is hard to imagine the pull exerted by the theatricalization of fairground attractions in the visual culture of the second half of the nineteenth century. Despite the fact that, as Gilles Boëtsch suggests in this volume, it is hard to know the response of the vast majority of visitors to these exhibitions since they left no record of their reactions, only that of their presence there, three indicators are nevertheless avail-

able: the impressive (and profitable) sales of postcards of the exhibited peoples at the sites of the shows; the invariably large number of articles in the national and local press about such displays; and the consistently high number of visitors to all types of venue, be it a makeshift stage for a travelling troupe, a theatre or an official exhibition site.

A Contribution to Mass Culture

Such quantifiable information underlines the popularity of these shows,³⁰ including those in small towns,³¹ and the financial benefits they brought to their many promoters are obvious. It tells us that profits rose steadily until the beginning of the First World War, and that the growing number of troupes and universal or international exhibitions from the 1880s generated a tenfold increase in the opportunities for the public to see the 'exotics'.

There remains, however, the complex issue of what this same public thought of the shows, given the lack of documentary evidence on the subject. It would appear that very few visitors or writers were critical of these exhibitions at the time. There were, nevertheless, a few exceptions in France (intellectuals and colonials), the United States (some religious groups), and Britain (anti-slavery groups). For example, Louis-Joseph Barot, a prolific French writer on sub-Saharan Africa and French colonial activities, who would later become Mayor of Angers, denounced 'ethnographic exhibitions' for treating the presentation of Africans as a masquerade. In his view, such exhibitions were nothing but 'gross caricatures', where 'specimens of the human race were presented alongside performing dogs and anatomical museums' (Bergougniou, Clignet and David 2001). And he concluded, in 1902, that 'Blacks should not be judged by the specimens which can be seen in the Dahomean and Senegalese villages that are touted from one town to the next in Europe'.

With regard to the opinions held by the general public, we can glean a range of reactions from newspaper articles (while recognizing the limitations of the use of such sources) that appear to form the background to public perceptions of these shows (as several contributions to this volume demonstrate). First, opposition to this sort of exhibition appears to have been the exception and, when it did occur, it was in special circumstances, such as the exhibition of men or women who were clearly sick, or their deaths as the result of the harsh conditions in which they were displayed. Most writers accepted the exhibitions and they show a nuanced range of responses, from open disdain to sincere admiration, in the vast majority of visitors.³²

Although these exhibitions may appear shocking today in their conception and in their execution, they largely embodied the ideas of the day. Any analysis of the negative aspects of the attitudes they express towards the Other should take account of this. On a practical level, there are many suggestions that exhibited peoples were on occasion treated with cruelty. We thus encounter the use of cages (extremely rare); the use of wire fences (these were more common, and were intended to separate and protect visitors and those on show); the death of performers; the dramatic conditions in which some troupes lived; suicides while on tour, or on the performers' return to their native lands, along with significant trauma;³³ accommodation on the site of the exhibition itself, or in stockyards;³⁴ groups captured by force³⁵ and transported against their will (these were isolated cases, which ceased with the new century);³⁶ recruitment through a single agent under a one-sided group contract; studies carried out on living or dead bodies at the exhibitions;³⁷ the presence of children or publicly reported births in the ethnographic shows; and women deliberately stripped of their clothing in the travelling villages. Although the deaths in Tervuren in 1897, in Paris in 1892 (among the Kaliña), and in Barcelona in 1896, are proven facts, along with the smallpox outbreak in Chicago in 1893 and the dramatic tales of the Hottentot Venus (Coleman 1964; Strother 1999), Ota Benga,³⁸ and the pygmies presented at the Italian court in 1883 (Puccini 1999), these examples should not lead us to attribute the deaths involved only to the rigours they describe.

Very soon, though, two factors intervened to change the conditions under which 'performers' were engaged. First, the organizers recognized that, even more than deaths, sick people were bad for the financial health of their businesses. They led to damaging publicity surrounding the show and created distrust (and sometimes rebellion) among those on show, not to mention public concern (over infection) and compassionate impulses. A system of self-regulation developed to protect the major capital asset of these shows: the exhibited peoples. We can see this in Hagenbeck's response to the death of a whole troupe of Eskimos (Inuit) and many Fuegians. He was subsequently careful to vaccinate his 'performers' and to publicize the vaccination of the participants in the 'negro villages' he sent on tour in France, immediately on their arrival in each town. This public vaccination was intended to demonstrate the good conditions in which the participants were kept, but also to reassure the spectators concerning their health and, in particular, that they were not carrying any infectious diseases.

The second factor which improved conditions was the growing practice

among the organizers, when faced with discontented performers, of recruiting whole families with children for their troupes (the presence of family members was believed to inhibit rebellion and desertion). A secondary effect of this was to make the shows more attractive to the spectators. Last, there was an increase in legislation by some colonial authorities against the recruitment of 'savages' (in the Belgian Congo in 1897, the German colonies in 1910, and the French Empire in 1931) and specific bodies were set up elsewhere to oversee the organization of such exhibitions (in the United States in 1893 and in France in 1906).

The troupes rapidly became professional and, from the 1880s, contracts were entered into with the recruiters, the performers often being represented by a third party. The use of contracts suggests a new perception of shared interests and of the relationships between the organizers and participants. While such relationships remained unequal and exploitative, we nevertheless see some troupes demanding, in addition to their contractual wages, special 'exhibition conditions' (refusing to perform in bad weather; striking in order to obtain a pay rise in Switzerland; calling for supervisory care of the animals on rest days; and demanding the payment of bonuses for all additional performances). Legal differences could lead to the formal prosecution of an impresario.

Economic interests were thus shared, albeit unequally. From now on, the troupes would, with good grace, travel from place to place playing the various roles assigned to them (cannibals here, native warriors there, or burlesque savages on a music-hall stage), illustrating the fantasies and projections constructed around the concept of the 'savage' by the Western imagination of the day. Some troupes remained on tour for a number of years and 'village chieftains' (Mamdou Seck, for example) directed dozens of villages in turn, crossing the Atlantic and travelling from one country to the next, communicating the skills they acquired to their descendants. The title of 'native performer' was, at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, applied to a profession which employed 2,000–3,000 individuals a year on average in the dozen or so countries concerned.

It can be seen that a real economic system developed, involving recruiters in Africa, Asia, Oceania and South America, transporters, negotiating agents who entered into discussions with officials in towns and cities, and exhibition organizers, over the provision of troupes, each with its 'native' village headman and its 'performers' (with their families), and local businesses, which constructed the villages. 'Placed alongside all kinds of objects and products, colonial natives quickly

became a standard part of world fairs, for the education and entertainment of Western citizens', writes Raymond Corbey in this volume. In the end, 20,000–25,000 performers from every part of the world were exhibited in the West in this way, over a period spanning just over half a century.

The similarity between exhibition models and schemata for the perception of the 'exotic' in operation throughout the northern hemisphere demonstrates a process of cultural transference and homogenization in the West. The contributions to this volume show that the creation of an imaginary construct of the Other based on difference not only accompanied but sometimes preceded the great movement of colonization by the European powers, as well as Japanese and American imperialism. We can propose that exhibitions of the exotic were not, therefore, a consequence of imperialism, but, rather, one of the cultural conditions which made it possible by demonstrating the inferiority of many human groups and thereby legitimizing their future submission.

Indeed, on reading the chapters which follow, it will be noticed that from the nineteenth century onwards, the wild animals with some claim to exoticism³⁹ and the small number of inhabitants of distant lands offered for the entertainment of Western elites were replaced by 'specimens' – representatives of a race (or a people), in a group or family, mostly displayed in an original frame or setting. This practice was widespread in nearly a dozen countries in Asia, Europe and the United States, and involved another twenty or so countries in a more marginal way, as the pioneering research of Bernth Lindfors⁴⁰ and Raymond Corbey⁴¹ has shown, and the studies in this volume amply confirm. There is nothing anecdotal about this practice, then. It is part of the development of mass culture constructed around the expansion of different modes of communication, including periodicals, expositions and specifically human exhibitions. At the turn of the century, ethnological exhibitions constituted a key stage in the construction of an imaginary Other based on a vision which brought exoticism and racism together and, from the outset, was confirmed almost universally by scholars and anthropologists (Brace 1982), allowing it unprecedented exemplary value.

From the middle of the nineteenth century, the vast majority of Europeans, Japanese and Americans had their first visual contact with exotic peoples (who would soon mostly be of colonial origin) through the wire fences and other measures which kept them apart from the 'savages'. The 'savage', who had been a mythical figure until that time, appeared in the flesh before the fascinated or fearful eyes of Westerners,

reaching the height of his glory, in various guises, throughout the entire northern hemisphere, from Tokyo to Hamburg, from Zürich to Paris, and from London to Chicago.

Between Science and Spectacle

The status of the Other within these exhibitions also gradually changed. At first reified as a 'savage', the 'exotic' figure was gradually 'tamed' during the period of colonial conquest and then 'civilized', in order to demonstrate the achievements of the colonial 'civilizing mission'. By contrast, those races who, in the contemporary view, were embarked on an irrevocable decline continued to be portrayed as 'savages', in anticipation of their disappearance when confronted with a civilization destined to act as guide to the whole of humanity. In the nineteenth century, the West was attempting to make sense of the world, while in the twentieth century it more obviously constructed it according to its own models, beliefs and interests. Against this backdrop, human zoos adapted themselves to the views of the time, the political context and the expectations of their visitors.

Scientists were, at first, essential to the legitimization of ethnic shows. Following the visits of certain French scientists to the Jardin d'Acclimatation in Paris, the Paris Exposition Universelle of 1878 gave them greater international exposure and provided them with a voice in the press: 'It will be an honour for our country to demonstrate that France is the chief home of the "science of mankind"' (Martin 1878: 8). Objects from the Stone Age, the Neolithic period and the Bronze Age were displayed. Alongside these relics of man's past and evidence of his evolution (Bordier 1878c), visitors could also encounter 'Foreigners of distinction, a native Prince from Java, Spahis, Turks, etc. These included living examples of distant races' (Mortillet 1878: 221). The exhibition was constructed along the same lines as those in the zoological gardens, where 'exotic races' were, by definition, interesting to see.

Indeed, since the innovative work of Linnaeus and Buffon in the eighteenth century, human beings had become proper objects of scientific investigation and anthropologists had begun to examine both objects and bodies (Blanckaert, Ducros and Hublin 1989). In the second half of the nineteenth century, the principle problem for scientists who were no longer content with travellers' narratives, ethnographic objects or skulls was how to gain access to living subjects. Human zoos thus arrived at a moment in the history of science when anthropology was in need of proofs, and were transformed from commercial fairground

phenomena to objects of scientific study. A shift occurred from display to investigation, and from entertainment to education, which was facilitated by the interest of some anthropologists, and this situation lasted until the early years of the twentieth century.

These anthropologists did not remain idle when presented with the fertile grounds for study provided by such exhibitions, and turned them (in Paris at least) into extensions of their own laboratories. This practice became common in Paris from 1877⁴² and in 1883, Ernest Chantre took it elsewhere, taking advantage of the arrival in Lyon of five Zulus to undertake anthropometric measurements of his subjects (Chantre 1884). In 1895, the director of the Sudanese exhibition on the Champ de Mars invited the members of the Société d'Anthropologie de Paris to come and view the several hundred 'negroes' it contained (SAP 1895: 479). Paradoxically, the majority of 'races' presented and studied in the Paris Jardin d'Acclimatation were not from the French Empire. At that time, rarity was valued, especially in the search for the missing link, which was the essential element in evolutionist thinking of the period.

Quite quickly, however, most anthropologists stepped back from their association with such displays, especially with regard to their commercial aspects (Copans and Jamin 1978).⁴³ This occurred between 1885 and 1890 in Western Europe⁴⁴ and some time later in Japan⁴⁵ and the United States.⁴⁶ Anthropologists also complained that the 'specimens' on show were lacking in 'authenticity'⁴⁷ a criticism made, in particular, by Paul Nicole about the Fuegians (*Bulletin de la Société d'Anthropologie*, 1880) and by the French anthropologist Léonce Manouvrier in 1882. Concerns were thus focused on the 'quality' of the 'specimens' shown. Gilles Boëtsch comments, accordingly, on the debates which raged among the members of the Société d'Anthropologie de Paris on the ethnographic exhibitions held from 1882–83. Its members refused in 1886 to visit the Ceylon (Sri Lanka) exhibition, not for any moral reasons, but because they considered it to more closely resemble a circus than an ethnographic exhibition. He concludes that 'in less than twenty years (from 1880 to 1900), anthropologists constructed a view of the world and a way of thinking about mankind which drove the chief mechanisms underlying colonial culture' (2003). It is for this reason that the Anthropology pavilion in the 1889 Paris Exposition Universelle took on a new significance in the minds of scholars.

In 1889, the vision the anthropologists wanted to promote was no longer one which demonstrated men's achievements in the field of technology, as had been the case in 1878. Instead, as Georges Berger cites in his account of the exhibition's themes: 'The retrospective exhibition

of labour [...] should re-trace [...] the different stages of the genius of Man' (Girard de Rialle 1890: 289). We can infer from this that anthropologists wanted to situate their work within the field of modernity, even if some, such as Deniker and Laloy, continued to take measurements of '145 individuals from a wide range of races' (1891: 257), despite the fact that they had no clearly defined scientific goals.

These 'scholarly' preoccupations met with those of nation-states which needed to justify their conquests. Racial difference was a key argument frequently used in official colonial discourse. In the years between 1880 and 1910, an active link developed between the aims of the old colonial powers and the United States (in continuing the War of Independence and in completing the pacification of the West) on the one hand, and the requirements of the human sciences and the interests of private promoters on the other.

As Henry de Valigny emphasized in *La Nature*, writing on a visiting troupe at the 1889 exhibition: 'never in their lives had natural men been more squeezed, manipulated and examined, and I shall long remember the intense curiosity with which one of the most eminent scientists in Vienna helped himself to each native who came within his reach, manipulating their skulls as though he wanted to crush them' (1889). The anthropologists involved (we should remember that they were not in any way the shows' organizers)⁴⁸ supported and validated such shows until 1885–90 in France (Osborne 1994) and Britain, and for some time after in Japan, Italy, Portugal, the United States and Germany, despite the disapproval of some of their number for the policy of colonial expansion.⁴⁹ The twentieth century was beginning, and although the criticisms of scholars were increasingly loud, it was too late for them to have the least effect on the growth of such exhibitions. Moreover, as we have seen, Paul Topinard was still expressing satisfaction at the interest taken by the general public in 'savages' who, he anticipated, would soon disappear.

Although differentialist models cannot be laid at the door of the physical anthropologists of the late-nineteenth century alone (Affergan 1987; 1991) (they had been circulating since the beginning of the century through travel narratives, descriptions by geographical societies, and popular literature, and were already well entrenched in the popular psyche), there can be no doubt that physical anthropology would establish the differentialist concept in the field of science. Hierarchies, both biological and cultural, were at this time combined with a range of anthropometric experimental techniques which provided racial discourse with a new regime of truth, just at the time when anthropological exhibitions were becoming common.

For the physical anthropologists, cultural phenomena were the direct consequences of biology. Accordingly, in a sociological work by Charles Letourneau, we find that the opening pages contain a list of the human 'races' and observations on their geographical distribution (1880b). In his explanatory model of the difference between the human races, intellectual and artistic capabilities, political organization and technical progress are linked to the particular physiology and morphology of each race. He thus suggests that 'only the white races have completely abandoned primitive savagery, at least at the level of society as a whole. Race is thus more influential than environment in sociological development' (1880b: 25).

In this context, the exhibition of the Other served to establish him or her as part of a logical order (that of reason and rationality), and objectivized him or her within a hierarchy (first as a deviant, degenerate or madman, and later as a representative of the 'inferior races', a 'primitive' or 'savage'), while setting him or her against the subjective world of popular representations of the Other, and elsewhere, creating a theoretical system of connections between learned discourse and the most recurrent stereotypes. Here was the reason why it was essential to exhibit the Other. To do so was to acknowledge that she or he had individual status and interest, but at the same time it legitimized, proved and stabilized supposed facts, effectively demonstrating an immeasurable difference.⁵⁰ In the first part of the nineteenth century, physical deformities, non-normative bodily or mental states, unusual or 'exotic' physical characteristics, signs of flexibility, strength or skill, and, in addition, social practices considered strange, such as cannibalism, formed the essential elements for display. Difference (because it crystallized both attraction and repulsion) was now an object of curiosity.

Human zoos are thus situated between popular representations of alterity and such scientific discourse (Blanckaert 2002). They provided a vulgarization of the hierarchical pattern, which, in the early years, was actively supported by anthropologists (in particular in Paris, London, Rome, Berlin, Vienna and the United States), while playing on the established tropes of exoticism and savagery. As a result, human zoos pandered to curiosity and aesthetic sensibilities, inducing surprise in the visitor while illustrating the hierarchy of races.⁵¹

The founding narrative structure of the human zoo, before forms of display became more complex, did not really need to be spelled out; the staging spoke for itself and communicated the underlying principle of difference more efficiently than words. Scientific interest, the contemporary colonial situation and political will were not alone sufficient to

bring in the public, as was demonstrated by the failure (in terms of visitor numbers) of the Bella Coola exhibition in Germany, the Kalmyks in France, the Eskimos (Inuit) in Great Britain and the Egyptian caravans in the United States, none of which were considered by the general public to be sufficiently exotic, sensational or original.

From the 1890s, human zoos entered into a period of intensive spectacularization. Exhibitions had to be renewed constantly, new troupes had to be found, scenery had to be transformed, narratives had to be created (for example, the widespread staging of religious ceremonies, or the birth of children to members of the troupes). Ethnic shows, and 'negro villages' were increasingly billed as attractions, on a par with those of the fairground, at international exhibitions and world fairs, ceasing to be presented as strictly zoological exhibits. Although we can outline these underlying characteristics, we should not confine our interest to the ancestry of the human zoos alone. As the contributions to this volume demonstrate, the exhibition of the Other cannot be reduced to a simple demonstration of the hierarchy of races. It is part of a far more complex process.

It is a fact that some exhibitions led to fascination, even reverence and admiration. Many shows at the end of the nineteenth century laid great emphasis on the beauty of the bodies on display and their eroticism (see Bancel and Sirost 2002), on the admirable nature of the cultural artefacts on show, or on the physical skills of those exhibited (Bal 1996). There was thus a shift in the status of the Other, who changed little by little from an exotic object of curiosity into an exotic body which allowed the projection of Western fantasies (demonstrated by the immediate attraction of early cinema to such subjects).⁵² The Other provoked desire (Gidley 1992). In this attraction towards the body of the Other, the 'savage' body was staged in such a way that it was eroticized, displayed naked or semi-naked, and made to move in 'ritual dances' in a way which escaped all the canons of Western movement. In order to understand why audiences were drawn towards bodies which were first exoticized and then eroticized (a major factor in bringing in the crowds) we need to remember that a physical norm had developed in nineteenth-century Western societies.

Although the Other was described as unreceptive to progress, lacking the necessary mental ability, he or she was possessed of a body which could be seductive in its strength, resistance, and sensitivity to musical rhythms. The armed forces would consider the exotic body to be a type that was well adapted to physical activity and, therefore, to combat. 'Exotic' women already had an established reputation for

being beautiful and sensuous (Yee 2000). As a result, the body of the 'savage' appeared to have greater freedom than those of its audiences, thereby provoking desire in the visitor. Likewise, sexual transgressions attributed to 'savages' (such as polygamy, excessive sexual appetites, and incest), while reinforcing the divide between them and us, also implied a less constrained sexuality, acting as a source for fantasies throughout the century (Le Breton 2001; McClintock 1994). We should therefore distinguish between overtly stigmatizing shows with strong racial connotations and those that were part of a logic of civilizing colonialism, not to mention other, more ambivalent approaches, which mixed the objectification of 'race' with forms of 'recognition' of difference that had no pejorative force.

The Nature of 'Human Zoos'

We should remember that those human zoos which played on the trope of the exotic, and 'negro villages', in particular, appeared in Western Europe alongside faux Breton, Alpine, Flemish, Sicilian, Japanese (Hotta-Lister 1999), Irish, Alsatian, Swiss (Minder 2002), Scottish and Corsican villages. This pattern was born of a complex set of attitudes, in which we find the combination of an interest in ethnographic conservation (Clifford 1986) and a promotion of 'the land' and 'regional heritage', which also stemmed from a devaluation of regional cultures (when compared with the advances of urban modernity promoted by the dominant mid-century Positivist ideology) in favour of national identities.

Despite this context, there are, in our view, several essential differences between such exhibitions and the type of exhibition which grew up around 'exotic' villages. First, the human zoo was characterized by the explicit exploitation of racial difference. For the first decade of such shows, the exotic individual on display was seen as him- or herself, to a certain extent, without resort to a guiding narrative or staging (other than the scenery, which was supposed to recreate his or her environment). Here, the central focus was the representation of physical difference (Hartog 2001). Second, the initial scientific endorsement of the human zoos (founded on a biological racial hierarchy) was absent from the presentation of the 'regional villages'. This suggests that 'human zoos' were a new way of performing Otherness, with their own specific type of radical alterity.

The staging of 'minority cultures' in Europe demonstrates the sense of security of the unifying nation-states, sufficiently confident in their hegemonic power to be able to display their marginal populations as

testimonies of the past, the last symbols of the ancient world. In a way, the 'exotic village' (in addition to its increasing conformity to colonial ideology) clearly demonstrates that the quality of strangeness was, in these final years of the nineteenth century, slipping away from provincial and European spaces and moving beyond Europe to more distant colonial spaces. This move anticipated a process of normalization which had yet to occur, projecting a colonizing and unificatory ideal into the future.

While it is thus necessary to make a distinction between anthropo-zoological exhibitions (De l'Estoile 2007), colonial pavilions at world fairs, travelling fairground and circus shows, and 'exotic villages', in terms of form and content, these different phenomena are nevertheless linked by their ultimate effect, whether explicit or implicit, which was to demonstrate the superiority of the white race and/or of Western civilization. We should therefore think of the broad range of such exhibitions within the context of such ends (along with admiration for some civilizations and reverence for the aesthetic beauty of some peoples), while remembering their function as creators of myths and fantasies based on archetypes of Western culture, going beyond their hegemonic role (De l'Estoile 2007). In this last case, the 'savage' was not just a menacing, limited, childlike, or animal figure, he or she also functioned as the irrepressible element in a desire to go beyond the rigidity and bodily constraints generated by the emergence of modernity (see Bancel and Sirost 2002), the metaphor for lost innocence, or for an Elsewhere which was the counterpart to the invasive rationality of the last years of the nineteenth century.

It is also important, faced with the diversity of forms taken by our definition of 'human zoos', to emphasize the chronological limits of the phenomenon. In the first edition of this book, we wrote with regard to this topic that human zoos, in their historical and etymological sense, occurred only in a precise period, from the early nineteenth century to the 1930s, if we accept a broad definition of their nature, thereby opening the debate on the concept of human zoos itself. It must be said that the problem of the categorization of human zoos was not fully resolved in that first edition and, moreover, the opening up of deliberately broad historical perspectives on the topic, which linked human zoos to the present day, may have led to confusion, despite our precautionary remarks in the Introduction. It is therefore necessary to continue here our attempt to provide a definition of the concept.

The issues of chronological limits and of the categorization itself led to debates and objections from the June 2001 French conference. Scholars

criticized the breadth of the category (Merle and Sibeud 2003; in this particular case with an unfortunate lack of epistemological awareness), but also the link with the 'fact of colonialism' (Liauzu 2004). Others proposed that the official colonial exhibitions of the interwar years should be excluded from the category, as they were more 'humanist' in character (De L'Estoile 2007; Blanckaert 2002; Bergougniou et al. 2001). But Robert Rydell had already largely dealt with these points at the conference, as had many other participants, criticizing the 'recent tendencies in scholarship to treat world's fairs as theatre settings with performers who entertained crowds' (see Rydell in this volume), with no further attempt to discover their meanings and ideological implications (it should be made clear that this tendency is confined to a few researchers in France and Germany). The form of the human exhibition of 'exotics', which included ethnographic shows, 'negro villages' and theatrical performances within the specified time frame, seems to us to constitute a genuine historical pattern. But it is, of course, hard to establish the limits of the phenomenon with absolute certainty, given that the human exhibition of 'exotics' is effectively more a pattern and a process than it is a category in the strict sense.

Even the term 'human zoo', inspired by Hagenbeck's formula of the 'anthropozoological exhibition', seemed to some to be too 'strong' (even though it is really only rewriting a term of the period) or applicable only in a narrow sense to purely 'zoological' exhibitions. On the contrary, as we wrote in 2002, 'to place a man, with the intention that he should be seen, in a specific reconstructed space, not because of what he "does" (an artisan, for example), but because of what he "is" (seen through the prism of a real or imagined difference) is in our view the most precise definition of the human zoos' (Blanchard 2002: 419). We understand this concept to express a separation, 'a relationship of induced distance and exteriority, materialized through a physical spatial device (bars, fence, barrier, screen)' (2002: 419), which leads us to 'construct an invisible but tangible boundary between "them" and "us"' (2002: 420). In the context of this broad definition, the specification of the 'exoticism' of the exhibited peoples and the precise time frame seem to us to be powerful enough tools to delineate the pattern of human zoos.⁵³

In a recent study Benoît De l'Estoile (2007) sets out a reasoned argument which questions whether a single concept (that of human zoos) should include the different forms of exhibition, describing a process which extended from the most racist of exhibitions to those which manifested respect in their reconstructions of other cultures (exemplified by the French Colonial Exposition of 1931 in Paris).⁵⁴ His

critique is indicative of an ongoing debate among a small number of scholars, which, because it is still in progress, we feel it is appropriate to address. Without denying that exhibitions took different forms (as we have remarked here already), we believe that the concept of human zoos does not imply any sense of particular degrees of racism (or humanism), which varied from one exhibition to the next. Instead, it represents a common process and similar devices. This is why, indeed, in the mosaic of human zoos, we encounter the juxtaposition of strongly racialized displays, and of exhibitions which were more ethnographic in character, sometimes allowing a degree of admiration for the civilization of those on show.

This process is in any case well documented in this volume by Boëtsch and Ardagna, who show that the move towards a 'more official image of the colonies' which euphemized 'types', or more specifically 'races', was in evidence in France from the 1906 Marseille Exposition Coloniale onwards, and would emerge fully at the 1931 exhibition, as Lebovics demonstrates here in this volume (see also Lemaire 2002a). This does not alter the fact that in all their complex manifestations, human zoos led to the redefinition of the status of the Other, instituting a boundary between two different humanities (Blanchard, Blanchoin, Bancel et al. 1996).

Amusement, Information, Education

The spectacle of 'racial' diversity in the form of ethnographic scenes was constructed around three distinct functions: to amuse, to inform and to educate, appearing in different configurations in the various types of exhibition. The same troupe could pass from the zoological gardens to a 'native village' at a world fair, or from a colonial reconstruction to a circus act. Boundaries were unclear, genres were mixed, and interests varied. For the purposes of analysis, though, we need to separate the tangled threads of this narrative. For, at the beginning of the twentieth century, a visit to the zoological gardens, to the circus or to a 'negro village', was not just a chance to witness the diversity of humanity, it was an opportunity for the visitor to understand not only the Other's place in the world, but also his own (Barthe and Coutancier 1995).

Visitors to the exhibitions had little sophistication. They shared a general idea of a European physiological norm and were influenced by the new industrial and colonial culture. They were encouraged to interpret what they saw as a demonstration of the progress of humanity

from savagery to civilization. The integration of savagery into the entertainment world had opened up new horizons.⁵⁵ Exhibitions were no longer passive, as they had been in the zoological gardens, but became active (Bogdan 1988). The entertainment value of the 'savage' was increased by activities considered to be primitive in nature, such as dance, music, games and traditional physical pursuits, in which the body of the 'savage' was the key element. This body was presented as the reflection of a universe far removed from the technical progress of the West and close to nature, where man's survival depended on his physical prowess.

Although Otherness is itself an ancient concept, that of exoticism is more recent. The latter belongs to a European conceptual framework, which was expressed through waves of public interest in particular countries or peoples. Persia, China and the Ottoman Empire were in vogue in the seventeenth century, and were considered to be mysterious and fascinating. Well before the bodies of foreign peoples were put on show, their metalwork, clothing, fabrics and drugs⁵⁶ were at first objects of curiosity, then became sought-after luxury goods and were appropriated by the arts. The colonial period gradually constructed a different kind of Other, which was less strange and more everyday in nature, since it had to form part of a colonial and racial hierarchy dominated by the white peoples. This construct became fully integrated into Western thought, permeating the popular imagery of the period and being perceived as a legitimate object of scientific study.

The anatomical criteria for the definition of different human categories were the same in physical anthropology and the figurative arts, both of which were based on appearances. Morphological analysis allowed the appearance of the human body to be broken down into a certain number of visible characteristics. In order to succeed in this observational undertaking, intended to determine the biological characteristics of each human type, physical anthropologists created a scientific classification system in which chromatic scales were utilized to categorize the colours of the skin and eyes, and measuring apparatus, tape measures and slide callipers were employed for the measurement of the body.

A major change in the gaze occurred with the emergence and establishment of the photographic medium, which was soon transferred to the cinematograph. The photographic image satisfied a need to capture, inventory, reproduce, study and distribute the 'true' forms of people and objects that haunted the minds of the curious, which were already filled with the nineteenth-century concepts of universalism and rationalism. Half scientist and half artist (the status of the former was still not fully

established), the enlightened amateur would, through photography, photogravure and, later, the cinematograph, provide the dominant Western discourse with an extraordinary tool. Practitioners addressed an unsophisticated public, employing an iconographic style which could be immediately understood. Purporting to be expressions of the truth, available for rapid distribution in a variety of forms, photographs and, later, films, would provide a definitive validation of a particular representation of the world, complete with its human hierarchy, its scenographic devices, and its moral dramaturgy. These mechanisms, which were successfully tried out at world fairs (in particular by the Lumière brothers in France in 1896), thereafter became an important source for all modes of discourse, communication and identity.

Gradually, comparative anatomy and research in the natural sciences reduced the role played by fantasy in the Western understanding of the world and the bodies of others. But in order to be aware of the diversity of mankind and to portray it, a line still had to be drawn between the human and the animal worlds. Here, those who were considered to be at the limits of humanity would continue to cause problems in classification for scientists whose understanding of anthropology was founded on the European body.

In the field of artistic representation, this led to problems in the construction of normative human figures which were supposed to illustrate the typical morphology of each 'race', given that human groups could be expected to be as susceptible as individuals to changes in their environment or in social practice. For artists, the representation of the human body was expected to correspond to established canons, leading to a problem in portraying Otherness of whatever type, be it deformed, monstrous or savage. Indeed, within the context of an aesthetic where the body illustrated the work of the gods or of God, art could only be derived from perfection, and the canons were consequently composed of representations of perfection, leaving no place for alternative forms.

The common interest of the artist and the natural scientist in the human body had led them to follow parallel paths, at least until the beginning of the nineteenth century, which saw a rationalization of knowledge and a shift from qualitative approaches to quantitative methodologies in the field of science. From this time on, anthropology held itself apart, adopting a classificatory approach founded on a typological paradigm. Measurement did not, as it does today, allow the analysis of the spectrum of human biological diversity, but instead demonstrated the processes of degeneration (of hybridization) compared with 'pure types'.

In this environment, colonized peoples became worthy of a second

look, for they could not remain for too long in the category of the 'savage' or the 'barbarous', given that this would have been a denial of the core principles of the colonial mission (August 1979). They gradually became the subjects of colonial empires, turning into 'the natives'. But, by focusing too closely on the colonial act in its strictest sense, some researchers (in France in particular) have neglected the fact that a *colonial culture* grew up in the home countries that fixed the status of 'races' and 'natives' and popularized this discourse through the visual image.⁵⁷ As Lebovics remarks in this volume: 'Living as we do in the postcolonial period, we tend to underestimate the sometimes Herculean efforts of the imperial propagandists to gain the support of the people for the conquest and administration of an empire and to make them accept their destiny as an imperial race.'

Understanding a Process

One of the major goals of our approach, it will have been understood, is to be able to question the representation of the Other through time and to understand the different forms which illustrate the concept of human zoos through their close relationship with racializing and/or eugenicist discourses, with arguments for colonization, and the creation of national identities. This approach also opens up a fresh spectrum of analysis through the study of new materials, enabling us better to redefine and understand the colonial space.

To allow the reader a cumulative understanding of this process, we have organized this volume on chronological-thematic lines into three major sections. We start the first part with an introduction of the particular characteristics of our core concept, which are to be looked for in a wide range of cultural forms (see Garland-Thomson), particularly in shows containing 'freaks' in circuses and fairs (see Bogdan and Corbey),⁵⁸ but also in the history of the importation to the royal courts of Europe of 'exotics', which merged with the frame of the animal zoo to become human zoos. Three events (two in Europe and one in the United States) appear to have served as turning points in this process: the exhibition of the Hottentot Venus between 1810 and 1815 in Britain and France (see Boëtsch and Blanchard);⁵⁹ the encounter between Barnum and Joice Heth in 1837, with the model that was subsequently established in the United States (see Reiss); and the professionalization of the phenomenon by Carl Hagenbeck in the early 1870s in Hamburg (see Thode-Arora).

The models for the exhibitions were not constructed on identical

lines, nor did they precisely coincide chronologically. They were affected by local expectations, by the type of peoples who were displayed (although black Africans made up more than half the troupes or individuals on show), and by the spaces in which they were presented to the public (reconstructed villages, travelling troupes, exhibition pavilions, circuses). This is demonstrated by the contributions collected in the second part of this volume. In this vast panorama, we encounter formal adaptations of the model of the human zoo, which responded to local requirements and contexts. These include Buffalo Bill's Indians in his Wild West show (see Maddra in this volume; see also Moses 1996); the shows held in Germany in the last part of the nineteenth century (see Ames in this volume); exhibitions which were regularly held in particular locations, such as the Paris Jardin d'Acclimatation, which organized more than thirty exhibitions from 1877–78 onwards (see Schneider in this volume);⁶⁰ those which took place in Zürich and Basel;⁶¹ the ethnic shows at White City in London (see MacKenzie in this volume);⁶² and, of course, the dozens of troupes and villages which Hagenbeck sent out throughout Europe and the United States from 1874 until midway between the two world wars (see Thode-Arora in this volume).

There were also performances in a different style. The exhibitions of Aborigines, Kanaks or Dahomeans throughout Europe; the exhibitions of Onas in the Netherlands (see Mason in this volume) and Kaliñas in France (Collomb 1992; 1995); anthropological inventions such as Dr Kahn's Niam-Niams (see Lindfors in this volume); or the position occupied by Indian (or Sinhalese) troupes and populations in the West (Assayag 1999), all responded to the expectations of particular audiences.⁶³ Beyond these different models, the specific characteristics of each nation-state also affected the evolution of the process. The spread of different models was accompanied by variations in the staging of the Other and of the exotic in all fields of popular culture. From photography to cinema (see Edwards and Deroo in this volume),⁶⁴ from postcards to museums, the range of media in which they appeared goes far beyond the simple exhibition, affecting all cultural spaces at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

In the third and final part of this volume, we have looked more closely at national identities and their relationships with local identities and exhibition models. Faced with a wide range of forms, it is not possible to infer a progression of types from the end of the nineteenth century to the current day, but some more recent hybrid forms suggest the persistence of the racial model, each adapted to its particular context. Most of the European exhibitions (more than three-quarters of the shows took

place on the continent of Europe) were based in four countries: Switzerland; Britain (see MacKenzie and Servan-Schrieber in this volume);⁶⁵ France (see Lebovics, Boëtsch and Blanchard, Blanchard, Bancel and Lemaire, and Schneider);⁶⁶ and Germany (see Thode-Arora and Ames).⁶⁷ Outside Europe, Japan (see Nanta) and the United States⁶⁸ (see Maddra, Emin, Rydell, Delsahut and Arnoldi) experienced comparable shows but for shorter periods (until the First World War in the United States, and until the Second World War in Imperial Japan).

Finally, a last group of countries which were more peripherally concerned with human zoos are presented, in particular Belgium (see Jacquemin), Spain (see Moyano), and Italy (see Abbattista and Labanca).⁶⁹ Elsewhere, only the occasional touring troupe would visit (perhaps while on a grand tour of Europe), and there were just a few local world fairs. Examples here are the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Poland, Portugal, Russia, countries of northern Europe, Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, Canada, India, Algeria (in 1930), South Africa (in 1936) and even what used to be French Indochina (Hanoi in 1901) and Upper Volta (now Burkina Faso) in 1934.

National Developments and Variants

With the fashion for colonial exhibitions and travelling 'negro villages' (including those in the United States, see Rydell 1999) the 'savage' was gradually transformed into a 'native', under the spectators' gaze. In Europe, these exhibitions were dreamed up in order to glorify the achievements and projects of the colonial powers, particularly those of France (Bancel, Blanchard and Lemaire 2000), Italy (see Abbattista and Labanca in this volume; see also Labanca 1992; Palma 1999); Britain (MacKenzie 1984); and Belgium (Jacquemin 1985; 1991). In the case of the Koreans exhibited in Japan and the Filipinos exhibited in the United States, the same process was in evidence. Although the lifestyle, clothes, dances and artisanal techniques were ambivalent in their function (both recognizing certain cultural aspects of the colonized nations, and still associating them with the burden of their archaic nature in comparison with Western modernity), skin colour (or racial differences) remained the emblematic sign of difference. In the nuanced palette of colours which determined the races, the gradation ran from the darkest to the lightest of skins. The blacker the individual, (or the blacker he or she was perceived to be), the more limited or non-existent his or her capacity for development was judged to be.

The spectacularization of the Other was far from homogeneous,

varying according to period and place. In France, there was a noticeable shift in the presentation of colonized peoples at the 1922 Exposition Nationale Coloniale in Marseille, where racial stigmatization was largely glossed over in favour of a paean to the 'civilizing mission'. This continued in 1925 at the Paris Exposition Internationale des Arts Décoratifs, and at the 1931 Exposition Coloniale Internationale in Vincennes, outside Paris, becoming even more pronounced at the Salon de la France d'Outre-mer in Paris in 1935, and reaching its height at the 1937 Paris Exposition Internationale des Arts et Techniques dans la Vie Moderne. By 1940, 'native exhibitions' would completely disappear, to be replaced by a purely economic focus.

In addition to France, which specialized in universal or international exhibitions (1855, 1867, 1878, 1900, 1925 and 1937) and vast colonial exhibitions and salons (1894, 1895, 1901-2, 1906 (2), 1907, 1909, 1911, 1914, 1922, 1923, 1924, 1927, 1930, 1931, 1935 and 1940), not to mention its travelling 'negro villages', Germany and Switzerland also became specialists in ethnic events, while Britain developed a hybrid genre between the universal and the ethnic. As John MacKenzie suggests in this volume, the British 'great exhibitions' gradually became dominated by the theme of Empire, building on their combination of 'entertainment, education, and trade fair on a spectacular scale'. As well as the exhibitions organized in Britain itself (for example those of 1886, 1888, 1901, 1907 and 1938 in Glasgow,⁷⁰ and, in London, the 1899 Greater Britain Exhibition, the 1908 Franco-British Exhibition,⁷¹ the 1909 Imperial International Exhibition, the 1911 Coronation Exhibition, the 1914 Anglo-American Exhibition, and the 1924-25 British Empire Exhibitions at Wembley, which had 25 million visitors), this type of event was staged throughout the British Empire: in New Zealand (on three occasions); in Jamaica (1891); in Australia and Tasmania (1879, 1888, 1891, 1894, 1897); South Africa (1877, 1936); and India (1883, 1910).

For the British Empire, the most important development occurred between the Colonial and Indian Exhibition of 1886 and the Greater Britain Exhibition of 1899 in London. At the latter, the central feature (created by the master of the genre, Imre Kiraľfy) was the *Kafir Kraal*, which portrayed 'savage' South Africa tamed by the white man. It was so successful that it was repeated in Paris in the following year at the *Porte Maillot* under the title of 'Savage Africa'. In 1911, visitors to the Festival of Empire Exhibition at the Crystal Palace in London experienced another significant innovation: being conducted on a complete tour of the Dominions and having the chance to view the riches, landscape and peoples of each colony. After the First World War, the British Empire

Exhibitions of 1924-25 at Wembley marked a change in the character of colonial exhibitions. As in France, the following decade saw ethnic villages gradually relegated to the background, disappearing in the face of an imperial pageant which highlighted the economic progress and power of the British Empire.

In the United States, the process was more complex, although we can locate the change in the exhibition of the 'exotic' (albeit with many caveats) at the Panama-Pacific International Exhibition, San Francisco, of 1915 (Benedict 1983). The staging of minorities, like that of 'exotic' peoples, gained a new quality after this time, before gradually fading away as modernity became the central theme of the great American exhibitions. It was, above all, in the world of theatre, the circus and also the cinema that the invisible boundary between 'them' and 'us' continued to exist. 'Egyptian pavilions' and 'Red-Skin shows' were still to be encountered, but the dreams and spectacle of the Hollywood invitation to travel to foreign lands now dominated the minds of audiences.

Where Japan was concerned, colonial and ethnographic pavilions became common in exhibitions from 1914 until the Second World War (see Nanta in this volume). At the Tokyo-Taisho exhibition in 1914 there were pavilions from Taiwan, Karafuto (Sakhalin Island), Manchuria and Korea (as well as an 'enhancement' pavilion). These were the regions which were shortly to become part of the Japanese Empire. At the 1922 exhibition, the new Nanyo (South Sea) and Siberian pavilions also contained ethnographic features.

In these different geographical areas, the 'ethnic village' was the chief vehicle for the display of 'exotics', being the easiest form to include in both official exhibitions and local shows. From the Paris Exposition Universelle of 1878 onwards, there were calls for indigenous peoples to be included as part of the entertainment in colonial pavilions, and we can note that there were also plans to create ethnographic reconstructions on this occasion.⁷² But at this time the link between private operators such as Hagenbeck and the public organizers of such exhibitions had not yet been forged.

It was in 1883, when East Indian peoples were presented at the Amsterdam International Coloniale en Uitvoerhandel Tentoonstelling, and again in 1886, at the Indian and Colonial Exhibition in Britain (with over five million visitors), that the first villages began to appear in official imperial displays. In France, the first formal villages appeared at the 1889 Paris Exposition Universelle on the Champ de Mars, in particular the Kanak village (Bullard and Dauphiné 2002) and the Javanese village with its troupe of dancers (Labrousse 2002: 171-72).⁷³ Four years later

in the United States at the 1893 Chicago World's Fair, the same type of village was to be found (Bergouniou, Clignet and David 2001; Gilbert 1993; Rydell 1993; Scott 1991).⁷⁴ Last, in Lyon the following year (1894) an organized and structured Indochinese village was placed opposite an apparently archaic and savage 'negro village' with its 'one hundred and ten natives' (Bancel, Bencharif and Blanchard 2007).

In a single decade, the village model was not only rolled out to official exhibitions across the world but also appeared in most of the major cities of Europe (not to mention the United States) under the aegis of thirty or so private impresarios, most of whom were German, French and Swiss. The pattern was thus established and ethnic villages were to be found everywhere in the universal, national, and colonial exhibitions which followed, a fact which suggests that their surroundings were interchangeable. Why? No doubt because at this time these shows were already an international product, shared by the American and European publics. No doubt, too, because this formula was an effective one and responded to codes which had already been tried and tested in the private sector. Such villages offered a developed form of a world in miniature, which could now be visited without having to leave one's home town. These exhibitions had drawn closer to home, visiting small provincial towns on the heels of the circuses and small travelling troupes which, in the preceding decade, had prepared the ground for them, feeding the popular hunger for the exotic.

All of Europe and North America was affected by this pattern. The first to witness it were the cities of Basel, Berlin,⁷⁵ Hamburg, Zürich, Anvers, Paris, Brussels, Lyon, Dresden, Frankfurt, Marseille, Strasbourg, London, and Turin, which alone saw several hundred 'negro villages' or 'exotic' troupes presented as 'villages' (both individually and at exhibitions). We can also cite European and American towns and cities which hosted major shows, such as Barcelona, Budapest, Dublin, Düsseldorf, Ghent, St Petersburg,⁷⁶ Lyon, Freiburg, Geneva, Glasgow, Gothenburg, Vienna, Hanover, Cologne, Lausanne, Leipzig, Liège, Milan, Brest, Munich, Oslo, Moscow, Warsaw, Naples, Copenhagen, Palermo, Prague, Rotterdam, Stockholm, Chicago, Brussels, Bordeaux, Rouen, St Louis,⁷⁷ San Francisco, and Buffalo (Leary and Shones 1998). We should add to this number the Japanese world fairs, and those organized in the British Empire such as the Empire Exhibition of 1936 in Johannesburg,⁷⁸ where ethnic villages were constructed.

Visitors came to these villages not only to learn but also to gaze at and to 'encounter' the Other. For, as the *New York Times* wrote on a Senegalese village which appeared at the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo

in 1901, nothing had previously been seen which gave off such an impression of brutal savagery. In the villages, a touch of exoticism, the odd example of native crafts for the tourist, and a few rags to support the message of an ongoing civilizing mission were the essential elements of the programme, along with, of course, regular attractions and entertainments. They functioned along roughly similar lines: dances and processions with a musical accompaniment; picturesque costumes and interchangeable names for the troupes; reconstructed battles; close association with animals in an exotic setting; cultural or cult attractions; crafts designed as souvenirs, or reproductions of schools, in which children attempted to learn the alphabet. The attractions ranged from children diving into a pool to retrieve coins and the preparation of meals by the women, to 'village births'. They adapted equally to different places, cultures, current events and popular demand. Thus, following a practice which had been common among the travelling exhibitions, the same troupe could, for example, be 'from Dahomea' in France and 'from Togo' in Germany.

This was a euphemized form of the anthropozoological exhibition, which followed new codes. But essentially, despite the claims of some scholars (De L'Estoile 2007), there was no break with the earlier period, and the ethnic villages (especially those at exhibitions) continued to have an undeniably ideological function, namely to demonstrate who was already *civilized* and who still needed to become so. Of course, visitors could sometimes talk with those on show, craftsmen could explain their work, 'natives' could leave with their medals, or visit the local town (the visit being itself an attraction advertised by the press), but this did not serve to break down barriers, it only reduced the degree of distance between observers and exhibits. We also see an attenuation of the racializing elements, with interest being extended to cultural artefacts (objects, architecture, clothing and so on) and to productions which increasingly created a narrative. This accounts for the fact that, in most of the souvenir books and other official guides for exhibitions, these villages were classed among the attractions, sending a clear signal as to how they should be received (and perceived) by visitors.⁷⁹ The First World War seems to have acted as a turning point in the evolution of ethnic shows, as much in the United States and Japan as in Europe, although we should remember that ethnic exhibitions continued beyond this time in the context of circus performance, with little change in the forms they took.⁸⁰ With the increase in prominence of soldiers from the colonies (in France, Britain), minority groups from the United States, and contract workers from countries such as China, the discourse of the

Other took on new forms and exploited new media. Everywhere, exhibitions were adapting to national contexts (Benedict 1991).

The Demise of Human Zoos

In the event, exhibitions of all types, whether international, colonial or national, were used as a vehicle by every state to show off its social (and sometimes 'racial' or eugenicist) projects (Çelik and Kinney 1990), to impose its own view of the world, and to legitimize its overseas projects or the practice of racial segregation. In the United States, analysis of the practice reveals significant differences from elsewhere (Sears 1997), linked to the presence of 'ethnic minorities' within the home country. It is indisputable that the American nation was constructed on successive forms of exhibition, from 'freak shows' to eugenics,⁸¹ and from ethnic shows to racial segregation, in a series of stages which together make up the American model of the exhibition of the Other and which were based on the status of minorities in American society. In Japan, as in France, Britain, Belgium and Italy, the link between the potential for colonization and the designation of peoples as 'appropriate for colonization', or already colonized, is clear. In the case of France and Britain, it is possible to follow the colonial situation (the phases of colonial conquests and events between 1880 and 1910) through the exhibited peoples.⁸² Thus, in different but concomitant ways, human zoos were created in particular contexts, feeding the construction of national identities.

In order to reach the widest possible audience, human zoos were now organized everywhere and relied on a wide range of publicity devices, including posters, photographs, postcards, films, advertising leaflets, reports in the national press, and articles and reports in scientific journals. The tens of thousands of postcards produced demonstrate the degree to which these shows were promoted through the media, but they also anticipated their decline, while cinema sealed the fate of the live shows. As the shows developed national characteristics, they were thus also undergoing a profound shift in medium. From 'living spectacles' (exhibitions) they were transformed into 'living images' (the cinema), passing through the intermediate forms of the diorama and ethnographic sculpture. From the imported Other (the exhibited person) they moved to the duplicated Other (fixed images). This represented both a change in scale and the emergence of a new dimension of Otherness (Baudrillard 1987).

From the early 1930s we see a gradual and steady decline in human

zoos, with some variation from country to country. For example, in 1934 (*Exposição Colonial Portuguesa*) and 1940 (*Exposição do Mundo Português*; see Léonard 1999), Portugal somewhat belatedly organized the visit of several 'native' troupes intended to support its colonial operations and to raise public awareness. Likewise, Italy, engaged in a wave of conquests in Ethiopia, maintained the presence of 'African villages' at its great exhibitions, the last of these being the East African village at the Naples exhibition of 1940. In Germany, (with the *Deutsche Africa-Schau*; see Forgey 1994) and in Switzerland (see Minder in this volume), where there was still a public for traditional ethnographical exhibitions, human zoos continued, but with reduced frequency.

But the time of great colonial exhibitions had passed and in Britain and France the display of 'native populations' was relegated to the background. In France, for example, a decision was made (imposed by Lyautey)⁸³ to exclude all exhibitions of an 'ethnic' character from the Paris 1931 *Exposition Coloniale Internationale*. These included the 'negresses with lip plates', Indochinese rickshaw boys (in response to a direct request from the League for Human Rights) and 'Kanak Cannibals'⁸⁴ (Hodeir and Pierre 1991; Blanchard and Lemaire, 2003). Their exclusion was intended to act as a gesture which would emphasize 'colonial humanity'. However, for the 2,000 'natives' at the Paris exhibition, of whom a large number were soldiers, while it can be said that the 'conditions of presentation had changed' as De L'Estoile underlines (2007: 61), it was nevertheless the case that they were still actors in a staged display, performing in a colonial show created by 'white' producers. Effectively, as Lebovics writes in this volume, this exhibition was like all other colonial exhibitions in that it remained a human zoo, in which the strange beasts of the colonies (and France) were on display.

Although the presentation changed, replacing racial inferiority with the quaint habits of 'native' cultures, the general aim of the demonstration was still to glorify the 'civilizing mission'.⁸⁵ It is indisputable, though, that Lyautey also wished to pay homage to indigenous cultures,⁸⁶ without, of course, questioning in any way the legitimacy of colonial rule. The Vincennes international exhibition thus presented many facets: it was propagandist; it presented other cultures as quaint; it was educational (thousands of photographs, hundreds of films, and a multitude of ethnographic objects were on display in the various pavilions); but it was also admiring of certain other cultures.

Some scientists (such as Henri Vallois), not placated by the presence of pirogues on the lakes, were still nostalgic for the old-style 'negro villages', regretting their absence and bemoaning the fact that the

organizing committee would not allow scientists to study the 'natives', thereby preventing the continuation of the 'fine studies by Deniker and Laloy relating to those displayed in the 1889 exhibition' (Vallois 1932).⁸⁷ A report on the plans for the pavilions of Togo and Cameroon by André Bonamy in 1929 had already warned that 'exhibitions' would be forbidden at the 1931 Exposition, so as to provide a more 'modern' message concerning the French colonial endeavour and to emphasize France's civilizing influence. The concept of modernity was set in opposition to the vulgarity which was now considered to accompany the culture of the gaze generated by such shows.

It is clear to us, here, that we have a mixture of genres, blending scientific activity with the independent private tour (along the lines of a travelling circus) and official reconstruction. The days of the old ethnic shows were over. De L'Estoile comments in this respect that from 1931 'the negro village was seen as outmoded', suggesting that this exhibition 'marked a shift in the presentation of the colonized'. He argues that the performer had now been transformed into an 'artist' who had a particular role to play in the exhibition. The 'static display' of natives had disappeared (if it really ever existed), and performers 'were presented in active roles which emphasized their artistic abilities'. He concludes that this evolution demonstrates the fact that the ethos here was no longer that 'of the zoo', but rather that 'of the music and folk festival' (2007).

It is nevertheless necessary, in our view, to introduce a degree of nuance to the analysis of these changes. We cannot simply describe the 1931 exhibition as a 'music festival', interpreting it as an epistemological break with the human zoos. Instead, we must ask what it shared with these, and recognize that every era adopted different forms of such exhibitions. Indeed, as Lebovics remarks in this volume, we should probably view this exhibition as 'an imperialist ceremony of self-validation and the initiation of French visitors into the new society of spectacle'. It was therefore necessary to bring new life to the genre, and to emphasize, above all, that 'native peoples' were, thanks to France, on the road to 'colonial progress'. As Lebovics concludes, the organizers 'wished to see the reproductions of the Bois de Vincennes become a reality for the peoples of the Empire, and one which was centred on France.'

The homage to other cultures thus needs to be understood not only within the context of an unspoken intention to achieve political domination (legitimated by the intrinsic superiority of Western civilization), sealed by an inevitable 'common future' with France (see Lebovics in this volume). The change from the naturalizing archaism of the first

human zoos to a more modern presentation was, in the final analysis, a way of demonstrating 'the benefits of colonial modernization' to the visitor in visible form, transforming the passive 'savage' into an 'artisan' at work (in the exhibition and, by extension, in the colony). This tendency was already present in the Marseille exhibition of 1922, and reached its height in France at the 1931 Exposition. The 'savage' could no longer be displayed; he needed to have disappeared under the influence of Western civilization, for the primitive peoples of earlier times had become both 'good Christians', under the influence of the missionaries, and 'good soldiers', who would demonstrate their valour in war, as they had during the colonial conquests (Deroo and Champeaux 2006). Women who had once been displayed in 'primitive' nakedness were now clothed and imbued with the moral values of Western society (Boëtsch and Savarese 1999). The two powerful lobbies involved in this process (the Church and the Army) expected colonized peoples to be treated with dignity, thereby becoming valuable economic assets. The presentation proposed by the organizers was influenced by these factors.

As a result, although we should rid ourselves of the idea of a radical shift in the perception of the 'native', we can note a change in the objectives of colonial propaganda which now set out to demonstrate that that the 'native' was on the road to civilization (see Lemaire 2002b), proof of which was provided by the military and religious organizations associated with colonial policy. The new mode of presentation in 1931 was now in line with these objectives and the desired image of a 'Pax Colonial'. The new 'humanism' which can be detected in this transformation cannot be dissociated from the process of colonial domination which, in this particular case, perpetuated the exhibition of the Other in accordance with the new pattern constructed by the colonizers for their relationship with colonized peoples.

In effect, six years later, in 1937, the presence of 'exotics' in Paris at the international exhibition made it resemble a 'village of craftsmen'⁸⁸ accompanied by a theatrical troupe more closely than an ethnic show (Lusenbrink 2002: 260–61), but this process is more properly part of a shift in the colonial relationship than it is the affirmation of a form of 'colonial humanism' supported by the French colonial authorities. Between the two exhibitions, the sidelining of human zoos by French exhibitions seems to have been completed. As Lemaire suggests: 'natives, who had previously symbolized the trophies of colonization in the period of conquest, had now become the trophies of civilization, displayed as visual proof of the rightness of activities in the colonies. It is true that they remained "inferior", but they were tamed, domesticated

and moving towards progress' (Lemaire 2002b: 278).

To reinforce the message that these were 'new times', there were displays on colonial projects and the development of indigenous peoples under the colonial mission (demonstrating progress in conversions to Christianity and in education), but the role of these peoples in the accomplishment of the mission was also shown. This role was, of course, modest (represented by crafts, dances, and enrolment in the army), but was also a moving one, testifying to their enthusiastic participation in the establishment of their own domination.

The Legacy of the Gaze

The final manifestation of this process was Expo 58, the great Belgian Universal and International Exposition of 1958. Here, on the eve of the end of empire, 'native' performers were called on for the last time to participate in the general presentation of a colonial power. As we have seen, it was from the 1930s that the general public became tired of human zoos and that the latter found themselves increasingly out of step with social needs. In particular, the failure of Hagenbeck's two final shows in Germany (a troupe of Kanaks who came from France in 1931, and a troupe of Tcherkess riders in 1932) marked the sad ending of a story which had included more than seventy ethnic shows (see Thode-Arora in this volume).⁸⁹ The last ethnographic tours in Europe appear to have failed to attract the large numbers of visitors of the previous generation, whether in Basel (Switzerland), Stockholm (Sweden), Cologne (Germany – with a troupe of 'Sara Kaba negresses with lip-plates') or Milan (Italy).

In the United States, the same situation prevailed. The model established at the World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago, in 1893 (see Rydell in this volume) had changed and was no longer effective. In the 1893 Great White City of Chicago, everyone had been allocated his or her place in the world. The villages and exotic pavilions had occupied the centre of the exhibition space in a layout that underlined the metaphor of civilizing progress on the march. Thus, alongside a variety of attractions from Hagenbeck's menagerie, and sixty or so Dahomeans (both male and female) who had symbolized the defeat of Darkest Africa by the colonizing West, had been found the Sioux chieftains who had been defeated in 1890 at Wounded Knee (see Preston Blier in this volume; see also Rydell 1993).

That world of display had disappeared. Now, domination was presented in a more subtle fashion. The Other was no longer a 'still-savage' defeated figure, but a 'pacified native', enthusiastically rushing forward

under the leadership of his or her benefactor to follow the path traced out for him towards 'progress'. This was the figure who appeared, as we have emphasized, at the Paris Exposition Internationale in 1937, at the Johannesburg Empire Exhibition of 1936, at the Naples exhibition of 1940, at the Glasgow Empire Exhibition of 1938,⁹⁰ and at the Deutsche Kolonial Ausstellung in 1939, now that the brutal tone of ethnic exhibitions was no longer appropriate for the demonstration of activities overseas. Ethnic shows had now become part of the heritage of both Western societies and ex-colonies: their day was past.⁹¹

A history of human zoos cannot, however, ignore how aspects of this phenomenon have continued in our culture, even to the present day (Blanchard and Bancel 1998b; Bancel 2007). It would certainly be simplistic to propose a continuous line from ethnic shows to modern forms of the display and perception of the Other (Moussa 2002). It is, nevertheless, still possible to propose that there are thematic threads in the representation of the Other which extend across the century (Alloula 1986; Blanchard 2002). As a consequence, all contemporary representations of the Other (in the cinema, live performances, advertising, the tourism industry,⁹² sport, media images, ethnographic exhibitions⁹³ and museums of world culture) should be subjected to a long-term empirical analysis (Gosden and Knowles 2001) which, alone, can allow us to understand their ancestry and their transformations (Mason 1998).

The lack of interest (in colonial history, in the history of mass cultures, and the history of stereotypes) accorded not only to the mass phenomenon of human zoos (nevertheless one of the cultural conditions necessary for the growth of empire) but also to their influence, is still surprising. It would appear that the relationships between communities in Western societies need to be (re)considered as a diachronic process, and any such study should include these exhibitions, which constituted a fundamental stage of the process at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Boëtsch and Villain-Gandossi 2001). The stereotypes which created images of the Other until the time of decolonization made a significant contribution to the construction of the collective imagination and legitimized colonial practice in the eyes of the public.

Human zoos raise questions concerning spectacle and the creation of popular culture, but they also raise questions about a form of racist thought which spread across the globe (from Tokyo to Hamburg, from London to Chicago) in just three generations. This fact calls for the analysis of the building blocks of the construction of societies themselves or, put another way, the archetypes that contribute to a collective imagination that defines us, thereby allowing us to recognize and position

ourselves in the world. Human zoos are, in the final analysis, the crystallization of a shifting barrier between the 'civilized' and the 'savage', between the 'modern' and the 'archaic', and these distinctions are still very much in force.

Notes

- 1 Motto of the Anthropology pavilion, World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago, 1893.
- 2 This research has followed a programme which began in 2000 and involves a number of academic research groups in Europe and America. It led to a first international conference at the University of Marseille 2 in June 2001 under the aegis of Research Group 2322 (Anthropology of the Representation of the Body) of the CNRS (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique) and the research team at ACHAC (Association Connaissance de l'Histoire de l'Afrique Contemporaine).
- 3 This volume represents a shift in focus compared with the original French edition, the revised French paperback edition and the Italian edition (Bancel, Blanchard, Boëtsch et al. 2002, 2004 and 2003 respectively). In it, we have set out to refocus the analysis on the historical development of human zoos and as a consequence, we present here only half of the original contributions (21 articles out of 47). Equally, in order to take account of our own continuing thoughts on the topic and recent work in the field, we have included 11 new contributions, which provide a broader view of the different geographical spaces and types of exhibition and of their implications for the host nations. Ultimately, the 31 contributions published here, organized into three clear sections, allow a better understanding of the phenomenon of human zoos in all its complexity and specificity, providing a new perspective for readers.
- 4 See Falguières (2003) on this subject.
- 5 See Impey and MacGregor (2001 [1985]), and Martin and Moncond'Huy (2004).
- 6 As the director of the Marseille Jardin d'Acclimatation remarked in 1861, such zoos were 'made for the spectators, not the animals' (Siépi 1937: 7; Baratay 2002: 32).
- 7 A similar story occurred in Britain in 1774. Another Tahitian called Omai remained there for two years and was presented to King George III and to the University of Cambridge.
- 8 Some of this group died of cold, others of tuberculosis, while others committed suicide.
- 9 In 1854, the Muséum national d'histoire naturelle collection contained 865 skulls. The largest known collection of the time was that of the American polygenist Samuel Morton, which contained over 1,000 items (Meigs 1857). By 1867, though, the French collection contained more than 1,500 skulls.
- 10 At about this time, the Chinaman, Tchong-A-Sam, was brought to Europe and was studied by many learned societies.
- 11 See Bogdan in this volume.
- 12 See by Poignant in this volume.

- 13 See Fauvelle-Aymar 2002b, and Boëtsch and Blanchard in this volume.
- 14 It is claimed that members of the Cherokee tribe were exhibited in London as early as 1762 (Fox 1989).
- 15 See also Lindfors in this volume. The 2005 film by the French film director Régis Warnier, *Man to Man*, is a semi-fictionalization of this 1859 visit.
- 16 In 1800, the first learned anthropological 'society' was created in France. It was called the Société des Observateurs de l'Homme [Society of the Observers of Mankind]. However, it disappeared in 1803 as a result of lack of activity. In 1829, Dr W. F. Edwards published *The Physiological Characters of the Races of Mankind*, which viewed its subject matter from a historical perspective and was very influential in scientific circles. This work led to the creation of the Société d'Ethnographie in 1839, which was also the result of contacts with English scientists (a Society for the Protection of Aborigines had been founded in London in the previous year). The French society disappeared in 1848 after having contributed to the abolition of slavery in France.
- 17 See Coutancier and Barthe 2002, and Schneider in this volume.
- 18 See Thode-Arora in this volume.
- 19 There was, at that time, an autobiography by John Tevi. Tevi was one of the most noteworthy troupe directors, becoming a specialist in this area after having himself been exhibited and having participated in the major international exhibitions, Buffalo Bill's Wild West show, and Pawnee Bill's Wild West and Great Far East show. His book was published as *A Tour Around the World and the Adventures of Dahomey Village*. On this publication, see Rydell in this volume. Nayo Bruce, who was originally from Togo, directed a travelling troupe for more than twenty years, changing its name and its acts from country to country and according to fashion. He died in 1919.
- 20 At the Chicago Exposition, Japan was considered to be on a par with the Western powers and its pavilion was allocated the same exhibition area as those of France, England, Belgium, Austria and the United States. The pavilion contained, moreover, an anthropology section and an Ainu village.
- 21 In 1995, an initial investigation of the display of the Other and the creation of racial and colonial imaginary constructs was proposed within the framework of an international conference entitled 'Scenes and Types', organized in Marseille by the ACHAC research group. The papers given there are to be found in ACHAC (1996).
- 22 More than four million visitors attended the Osaka exhibition.
- 23 David Lynch's film *Elephant Man* provides a relatively realistic illustration of this.
- 24 The mythology of Siamese twins was one of the major attractions in 'freak shows', from the Chinese twins exhibited by Barnum in New York, onwards (Monestier 2007). Later, the fate of Chang and Heng, brothers from Thailand, who arrived in Boston in 1829, symbolizes the encounter between the worlds of spectacle and science. Indeed, Professor John Warren of the Harvard Medical School provided funding for this show and the tour of Europe which followed it in 1830. In 1835 the brothers joined Barnum and then, becoming their own managers, remained on show in the United States until 1869.
- 25 These were not, in fact, 'Aztecs', but were mentally handicapped.
- 26 These two brothers actually hailed from Ohio. They appeared in various shows

from 1852 to 1905.

- 27 This was an Afro-American called Henry Moss. He was on show in Philadelphia and noted for his dappled skin.
- 28 Barnum showed an Afro-American known as Vitiligo, who was an albino and was also microcephalic. He presented him as the 'missing link' between men and apes.
- 29 See also Reiss in this volume.
- 30 Hagenbeck himself, in his autobiography, was surprised at the high visitor numbers and wrote of their 'enormous impact', remembering that in Berlin, in one day, close to 93,000 people attended one of these exhibitions, necessitating 'mounted police and foot patrols' (1951: 78; see Deroo in this volume). Likewise, just under one million paying and free visitors were recorded in the annual report of the Paris Jardin d'Acclimatation in 1883. Later, the 1900 Paris Exposition Universelle would be attended by a little under 50 million visitors; the 1931 Paris Exposition coloniale internationale would sell more than 30 million tickets; and the British Empire Exhibition of 1924-1925 at Wembley in London would receive nearly 25 million visitors.
- 31 For example, the French towns of Nancy in 1909 (2.5 million paying visitors), Roubaix in 1911 (1.7 million visitors), and Reims in 1903 (300,000 paying visitors and an estimated 100,000 'guests'). These towns achieved greater visitor numbers for these 'negro villages' than on any previous public occasion.
- 32 A major limitation in this research concerns the reaction of the exhibited peoples themselves. Sources are patchy and, most important, produced at second-hand. We cannot assume, as some researchers hope to (see Bergougniou, Clignet and David 2001) that purported interviews of the time with the participants are reliable evidence. Orally transmitted memories, by contrast, are an important source in estimating the effects of these exhibitions. The Kanak remarks of 1931, collected by Joël Dauphiné and Didier Daeninckx (for his novel), demonstrate this clearly. The oral memories collected by Gérard Collomb on the display of the Kaliña are equally interesting, in that they show the handing down of memories across several generations: 'They were shut up so that the Whites could see them. Nobody had the right to leave. Each day, the Whites would gather to watch them' (Maliana's statement, cited in Collomb 1992: 129). But these few statements are insufficient to allow a systematic cataloguing of the reactions of either the public or the exhibited peoples.
- 33 An opposing view was adopted by some anthropologists (themselves revealing the attitudes of the day), who claimed that exhibited peoples became 'civilized' during the exhibitions. In 1881, Paul Nicole wrote on this topic in the *Bulletin de la Société d'Anthropologie*, commenting that initially 'savage' Zulus returned 'crafty and cunning' to their own countries (*Bulletin de la Société d'Anthropologie* 1881: 775).
- 34 Robert Rydell reminds us that this occurred at the Pan-American Exposition, Buffalo, New York in 1901, where 'natives' were housed in an animal stockyard until the construction of their villages could be completed and they could be moved in. See Rydell in this volume.
- 35 Aboriginal Australians, pygmies and Hottentots in particular.
- 36 For example, the Fuegians and Galibi Indians presented at the Paris Jardin d'Acclimatation.

- 37 Parisian and London anthropologists complained at the difficulties in dissecting those participants who died 'during their performance', while in St Louis in 1904, the American anthropologist Ales Hrdlicka removed the brains of a number of Filipinos (Rydell 1984: 164).
- 38 Ota Benga was a Congolese pygmy who was displayed at the 1904 Louisiana Purchase Exposition in St Louis, Missouri, and was persuaded to remain in the United States by various Protestant groups and missions. He was 'lodged' for a time at the Bronx zoo in the orang-utang cage and later committed suicide in 1916 (Blume 1999: 197-201).
- 39 The failure of the Basel zoo (before it specialized in the exhibition of humans and, more particularly, 'exotic' peoples), whose collection in the final years of the nineteenth century focused on European animals, reminds us that the visitors of the time were interested in 'exotic' species, and the public wanted 'strange savage wild beasts, very different from European species, so that they could escape their everyday environment and dream of distant lands' (Baratay 2002: 33).
- 40 In his innovative work, Lindfors, a specialist in African literature, brought together numerous writings on the exhibition of Africans in the West, most of which were published under the aegis of the African Studies Association (Lindfors 1999a). An article by Lindfors on Dr Kahn's famous Niam-Niams is reproduced in this volume.
- 41 Corbey's original article, 'Ethnographic Showcases, 1870-1930', which appeared in *Cultural Anthropology* in 1993, has been revised for this volume. This article was, for the editors of this book, the real starting-point for research on human zoos, beginning in Marseille with the ACHAC research group and continuing in collaboration with the CNRS research group GDR 2322 from 1999 (see above, n. 2).
- 42 A glance at the scientific journals of the day, such as *La Nature*, *Revue d'anthropologie*, *Le Journal illustré*, *La Science illustrée*, and the *Bulletin de la Société d'Anthropologie*, is sufficient to identify the major contemporary names in the field of anthropology, associated with reports on various troupes who were on show in the capital (more than eighty articles appeared in the period to 1909 in French scientific reviews on the Jardin d'Acclimatation exhibitions alone). See Boëtsch and Ardagna in this volume.
- 43 The members of the Société d'Anthropologie de Paris very quickly made the distinction between 'good anthropological attractions' and the others, as Bordier writes in the society's bulletin of 1877: 'The superiority of these scientific exhibitions compared with those which are just Barnum shows [is] what is sought here, neither a standard staging, nor the false local colour of armchair travellers, but the pure and naked truth' (Bordier 1877a).
- 44 In Germany, for example, the combination of spectacle and science reached its height in 1889. In that year, the Munich Ethnographic Exhibition was held. This was a sort of human gallery on a world scale, where the mummified body of the 'gorilla woman', Juliana Pastana, was displayed among other 'exotic peoples'. She was born in Mexico in 1832 and was thought by some to represent the missing link.
- 45 In Japan, the Tokyo Anthropological Society was not formed until 1884, but it played a major part in the ethnographic exhibitions subsequently staged in the archipelago (Nanta 2001).

- 46 The initiating moment in the United States remains, explicitly, the World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago, of 1893.
- 47 'While the anthropologists of the time often went to great lengths to collect their specimens, less attention was devoted to the documenting of the source and previous location of the specimens, whether through negligence or because the clandestine nature of some of their collecting methods prevented such information from being available' (Langaney 2002: 376).
- 48 In a review of the original French version of this book, entitled 'Spectacles ethniques et culture de masse au temps des colonies', in *Revue d'histoire et des sciences humaines*, 7, (2002), pp. 223–32, the French historian of science, Claude Blanckaert, suggests that the book is no more than a series of articles which are 'tedious simple repetitions, page after page on the "staging" of the "Other"'. He suggests that the book 'claims to set out the logic of exclusion which was carefully orchestrated by the anthropologists of the end of the nineteenth century'. Beyond the reductive nature of this criticism concerning the richness of the contents of the volume, it misunderstands something which is explained in almost all the contributions. In fact, anthropologists did not 'orchestrate' such exhibitions, they validated them, initially in a spirit of opportunism, chiefly out of interest in the 'specimens' displayed, and in the anticipation that such shows would make the general public, as political decision-makers, more aware of scientific research.
- 49 Here, again, Blanckaert's review, which suggests that many anthropologists were not in favour of colonization (believing that each 'race' should live in its own healthy environment), does not seem justified to us, as the author purports not to understand that the opinion of these scientists and the nuances of their individual judgement actually have little importance. What was essential for the world of entertainment was that they should support the principle of racial hierarchy which governed these shows, a principle that was endlessly repeated by the theorists and practitioners of colonial expansion.
- 50 The Other and his or her body, by escaping from Western norms, became a cultural construct. As Singleton comments: 'the pig, which we think we can objectively classify as an animal, is, in the ontology of some Papuans, grouped with humanity; whereas some Papuans, whom we think we can objectively classify as humans, are, in the ontology of the Asmats (other Papuans), grouped with edible foodstuffs' (Singleton 2004: 9).
- 51 Hilke Thode-Arora provides an excellent explanation of the initial pattern of these exhibitions, recalling the three main criteria for the selection of a group, namely strangeness, particular characteristics, and picturesque customs. See Thode-Arora in this volume.
- 52 See Blanchard and Deroo's 52-minute television documentary *Zoos humains*, broadcast by ARTE in December 2002, which contains archive film footage. The film received an award at the Festival du Film Ethnographique de Paris, organized by the Musée de l'Homme in 2003.
- 53 This is demonstrated by the behaviour of the Cossacks in Paris and of the Japanese in London in 1908, who insisted on being presented in a different way, not as 'savages' who were part of another sort of humanity.
- 54 See also De l'Estoile (2003), where he is far less critical of this pattern of ethnographic and colonial exhibitions.

- 55 It was, in its own way, the grand European tour of the Egyptian Pasha's three giraffes in 1827–28 which began this process, firmly embedding the 'exotic' in Western performance.
- 56 See Pierre de Taillac's recent work on this subject (2007).
- 57 An example of this attitude is to be found in an unpublished paper by Isabelle Merle and Emmanuelle Sibeud (2003). According to these scholars, this research topic ultimately boils down to a 'predilection for questions of presentation', which distracts from real research on colonization and is mere 'guilt-ridden soul-searching!' Human zoos are, in their view, a 'deliciously fascinating ghost story', which has hardly any impact on the history of the colonial fact, a sort of 'epistemological chauvinism [sic]' whose sole aim is to focus the analysis of our colonial past on relationships of 'domination'. These are somewhat surprising arguments if their authors wish to say that the historical topic 'human zoos' is simply not worth studying, because it ascribes guilt and distracts from the real history of colonization. Is this position not itself purely and simply chauvinistic? It appears to us that the cultural productions linked to imperialism (images, exhibitions, literature, the general press, and so on) are worthy of analysis. The West legitimated the 'right to colonize' through these cultural productions, and the creation of colonial culture which occurred in the cities demands a thorough analysis if we are to understand the 'colonial fact'. The violence of the attacks on the Human Zoos research programme in this text is a fair representation of the conservatism of some scholars of the 'colonial fact' on these matters.
- 58 See also Bogdan (1988) and Corbey (1993), which is an earlier version of Part 1, Chapter 6, in this volume.
- 59 See also Fauvelle-Aymar (2002b); Badou (2000a); and Lindfors (1983a).
- 60 See also Gala (1980). Some scholars have assumed, somewhat hastily, and on the basis of a single study (Osborne 1994), that the exhibitions at the Paris Jardin d'Acclimatation were commercial failures, and have drawn rapid conclusions concerning their lack of impact in France. Although there were no significant financial returns for the Jardin in the first two years, this was only because this new activity was in its infancy and required considerable capital expenditure (in bringing the foreign troupes over from Germany). After this, for nearly 60 years, troupes appeared regularly at the Jardin and this supplementary activity allowed it to balance its (annual) budgets, to renew its facilities, to repay its debts, and to rebuild following the collapse brought about by the 1870 Franco-Prussian war (Gala 1980). With regard to the year 1883, with four or so troupes on the annual programme and a more than positive review, the director, Geoffroy Sainte-Hilaire, was able to report to his administrative board that 'the operations were profitable from a purely financial standpoint as well as a scientific one'. This reference is easy to consult, as it is to be found in the chapter by Schneider in this volume. For the original source, see Saint-Hilaire (1871).
- 61 Although Switzerland had no colonies, it nevertheless acted as a major centre for ethnographic exhibitions, both at various regular sites where dozens of troupes appeared, and in the context of official national exhibitions (Debrunner 1979; Brändle 1992; 1995; 2002; Staehelin 1993). Work in Switzerland on the whole process of display is still patchy. See Minder in this volume. See also Brändle (2002); Arlettaz and Barilier (1991); and El-Wakil and Vaisse (2000).
- 62 See also Shyllon (1977).

- 63 The success of the Dahomeans was phenomenal, as is underlined by Preston Blier in this volume. In particular, their exhibition in Paris in 1893 received more than two and a half million visitors. See Preston Blier and Poignant in this volume. See also Bullard and Dauphiné (2002) and Bullard (1997; 2000).
- 64 See also Banta and Hinsley (1986).
- 65 The permanent exhibition 'Empire and Us' at the British Empire and Commonwealth Museum in Bristol covers the colonial period, international exhibitions and colonialist propaganda, ending with postcolonialism and immigration. A mural sums up this progression, emphasizing that our imperial heritage lives on in our multicultural society (in addition to the chapters in this volume, see also Walthew 1981; Woodham 1989; and Hoffenberg 2001).
- 66 See also, among the many works on this subject: Lusebrinck 1995; Leprun 1987; Lemaire 2002b; and Ruscio 2002. See the General Bibliography for further works.
- 67 See also Eissenberger 1996 and earlier works in the General Bibliography.
- 68 See also Bigham 2000. We should make it clear that many of the 'exotic' exhibitions in the United States were organized for profit by the International Anthropological Exhibit Company.
- 69 See also Delgado, Lozano and Chiarelli 2002 on Spain and Italy. Human zoos took a specific form in Italy (combining with missionary discourse) and therefore continued for longer than elsewhere in Europe, being linked to Mussolini's conquests in Ethiopia and their associated propaganda (1934-40). Nevertheless, as Chiarelli (in Delgado, Lozano and Chiarelli 2002) emphasizes, almost all the colonial international exhibitions in Italy included ethnic villages, in particular those held in Turin in 1884, where Nubians and Ethiopians were on show, and in Palermo in 1894 and Turin in 1928, where Abyssinians were displayed. In Naples in 1940 it was the turn of a Somali village (as it had been in 1934 and 1935), while 'African villages' were on show in Genoa in 1892 and 1913, and in Rome in 1931. Last, at the Turin exhibition of 1898, the whole of humanity was on display, with Indians, Chinese, Libyans, Nubians, Brazilians, Eritreans, Ethiopians and Bolivians (see Castelli 1998; and Labanca 1992).
- 70 The 1938 Empire Exhibition in Glasgow, despite the decline in interest in colonial exhibitions, nevertheless attracted 12 million visitors.
- 71 On the Franco-British Exhibition of 1908 in London, see Greenhalgh 1985.
- 72 Blanckaert (2005) writes that from the 1867 Exposition Universelle in Paris many French scientists, including Armand de Quatrefages, were keen for there to be a presentation of specimens from 'living races on earth'. The plan was apparently blocked by the French Empress, who found the idea morally unacceptable (Chinese participants were nevertheless on show at the Chinese pavilion). In 1878, the explorer Joseph Bonnat proposed the exhibition of a troupe of Africans, but this proposal was not retained by the organizers of the exhibition, a fact lamented by the reporters of the *Petit journal*, the first French newspaper, on 30 July 1878. By contrast, at the same exhibition, Algerian soldiers greeted the public in the Algerian pavilion.
- 73 The *Pall Mall Gazette* described this exhibition as 'colonies of savages' which the 'French' were trying to 'civilize'. At this time, the 'Hairy Man of Burma' was the major attraction in the Paris café-théâtres.
- 74 Beyond the significant impact of the 1893 Chicago World's Fair, it should be

- noted that the ethnographic collections presented there formed the basis of the Field Museum, which would go on to develop ethnographic studies and would, in 1937, create a permanent gallery of the 'races of humanity' (Arnoldi 1997).
- 75 The height of German colonialism was without doubt to be found at the Berlin *Gewerbe-Ausstellung* of 1896, where 'specimens' from throughout the German Empire were on show in their 'natural surroundings'.
- 76 In Chapter 13, Preston Blier reminds us of the familiarities which occurred between the audiences and the Amazons in St Petersburg and Hamburg.
- 77 See Delsahut and Corbey in this volume. The 1904 Louisiana Purchase Exposition was organized in St Louis, Missouri, to coincide with the Olympic Games. During the exhibition, which was among those with the greatest number of native exhibits, visitors could watch Igorots from the Philippines eating dog meat and African pygmies simulating beheadings (see Corbey's chapter in this volume).
- 78 At the 1936 Johannesburg Empire Exhibition there was a village encampment of Bushmen, which 600,000 people visited. Its primary aim was to justify the plan to create a reserve for the 'prehistoric' populations of the Kalahari.
- 79 For various studies of cases specific to France, we recommend a series of works containing a significant corpus of images, in particular *Le Paris Noir* (2001), *Le Paris arabe* (2003), *Le Paris Asie* (2004), *Marseille porte Sud* (2005), *Sud-Ouest porte des outre-mers* (2006), *Lyon capitale des outre-mers* (2007) and *Frontière d'Empire* (2008).
- 80 We can cite the example of Klikko, a young Khoisan, who was on show in Europe and Cuba. He was the star of the Wild Dancing Bushman show in 1913, before joining Barnum and Bailey's company. He died, a half-crazy alcoholic, in New York in 1940 (Parsons 1988). Another example is provided by Joseph Lee, the Afro-American who played the 'African Savage' from Dahomea and became a genuine star in the United States.
- 81 Between 1910 and 1935, the link between eugenics and the exhibition of 'monsters' or 'exotics' was an enduring feature of the activities carried out in the United States by the Eugenics Record Office (ERO). The activities of this body were intended to contribute to the definition of the 'necessary homogeneity' of the American nation (see Emin in this volume; see also Wiebe 1967, and Haller 1984). After a period of research between 1910 and 1920, national campaigns in favour of eugenics gave value to white identity, denouncing the dangers of miscegenation and the black presence (with, for example, the film *The Black Stork* of 1917), along with the risks of degeneracy linked to the transmission of mental illnesses. Conference series, exhibitions, films, databases and studies on migrant populations or 'healthy families' followed. Countless photographs were displayed from the ERO's photographic collections of 'exotics' in circuses or shows, not least those at Coney Island, just a few minutes away from the ERO. From 1935, the influence of the American eugenicists declined for a number of reasons: lack of income; few concrete results which could be brought before the public and federal authorities; an ambiguity in their relationship with the politics of migration, which had been established on a national level; and an increasingly clear link between their discourse and Nazi eugenicist theories which dominated the international stage.
- 82 For example, the Dahomeans were exhibited in many exhibitions and shows between 1891 and 1894, following Behanzin's defeat (a troupe was sent to the

- Chicago World's Fair in 1893 after appearing at the Casino de Paris). A group of Madagascans were exhibited after the conquest of their island, and Tuaregs toured Paris and elsewhere following the fall of Timbuctoo in 1894.
- 83 Marshall Lyautey, who had been Resident-General in Morocco, was appointed by the French government in 1928 as general commissioner for the Paris Colonial Exposition planned for 1931.
- 84 De l'Estoile (2007) suggests that the Kanaks were brought to Paris privately in 1931, with the original intention of participating in the exhibition. In fact, as Dauphiné (1998) has amply demonstrated, the manner of their arrival was quite complex. They were recruited by a society of ex-colonials, with the agreement of the colonial authorities in Nouvelle-Calédonie. It was later, following the dramatic circumstances of their exhibition in Germany (where part of the troupe had been sent), that the authorities acted to forbid the recruitment of the natives of Nouvelle-Calédonie (circular of 27 July 1931). This decision followed the statement made by the Minister in charge of colonial affairs, Paul Reynaud, who denounced exhibitions of 'inferior human types', and called on the administration to refuse to respond favourably to what he described as the promoters of 'unhealthy curiosity' (Hale 2002: 317). In Paris, the Kanaks were presented at a show (with an explanatory brochure) in the Bois de Boulogne, which had the unequivocal title: 'Cannibalism'. Nevertheless, from September 1931, they would attend the exhibition in Vincennes every afternoon, on special occasions and for evening shows, in order to represent their island in various performances (Bullard and Dauphiné 2002: 125). These performers had, in short, interchangeable roles: in the morning they were 'cannibalistic savages' in the Bois de Boulogne; in the afternoon they were the 'picturesque representatives' of Nouvelle-Calédonie in the Bois de Vincennes.
- 85 See, on this topic, the retrospective exhibition which was held in Paris from December 2006 to February 2007 in the Bois de Vincennes, by the City of Paris in collaboration with the ACHAC research group. Information on this project, including the 30 two-faced totems created for it, is to be found on www.achac.com
- 86 Lyautey was a singular figure in the colonial army world. He had always been in favour of the preservation of the cultures of colonized nations (at a time when many foretold their disappearance) and set up a very modern form of indirect rule in Morocco which, in many ways, anticipated the changes in colonial strategy which would be introduced during the 1950s (except in Algeria and Indochina). See Rivet 1988.
- 87 Vallois was also extremely critical of the presentation of the Kanak dances, lamenting their lack of authenticity, and of the general tendency to make indigenous cultures appear quaint in the publicity material for the exhibition.
- 88 The small number of artisans from Senegal was even criticized by *Le Pèriscope Africain*, which expressed its regret that this display bore no relationship with the economic realities of the country, nor with the real work of local jewelers and shoemakers. The *Paris-Dakar* newspaper compared this new style (in August 1937) to that of the past: 'No obscene dances, no English missionaries in the pot. No cannibals behind bars, no death dances, no negro king seated on his throne of skulls' (quoted in Lusenbrink 2002: 265).
- 89 As Thode-Arora remarks in this volume, Hagenbeck's shows had tentatively

- started up again in the 1920s, but had never regained their earlier complexity and success.
- 90 The Highland village, Indian temple and Zulu village on show there represented a more 'artisanal' form of display than the Wembley villages, which, only 15 years earlier, had continued to present the savagery and authenticity of imperial populations. But the most significant difference between the two exhibitions was one of scale. At Wembley, ethnic shows and villages were the central features of the presentation, while in Glasgow they had become merely peripheral attractions (see MacKenzie in this volume).
- 91 We note that a recent special number of the French publication *Sciences humaines* (November 2002) has as its title: 'L'abécédaire des sciences humaines: d'Aborigène à Zoos humains' [The ABC of the Human Sciences: from Aborigine to (Human) Zoo].
- 92 See Deroo and Lemaire 2006, and Bancel 2006.
- 93 See Barlet and Blanchard 2005.