

“FULL-GROWN, LARGE, AND SHAPELY”: PARADES, FREE LABOR, AND CIVIC
MANHOOD AFTER THE CIVIL WAR

Emma Z. Rothberg

A thesis submitted to the faculty at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master in the History Department in the School of Arts and Sciences.

Chapel Hill
2018

Approved by:

W. Fitzhugh Brundage

William Sturkey

Erik Gellman

©2018
Emma Z. Rothberg
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

Emma Z. Rothberg: “Full-Grown, Large and Shapely”: Parades, Free Labor, and Civic Manhood after the Civil War
(Under the direction of W. Fitzhugh Brundage)

This thesis explores three case studies in late nineteenth-century parading—the Baltimore Sesquicentennial Celebration (1880), the Opening of the Brooklyn Bridge (1883), and New York’s Centennial Celebration of Evacuation Day (1883). These three civic ceremonies, ostensibly intended to celebrate places, epochs, and all who lived in them, were in fact elite dominated and privileged monied elites’ ideal manhood, “civic manhood.” “Civic manhood” was based on free labor ideology and voluntary civic engagement and also glorified participation in the marketplace. This thesis addresses these parades as part of broader contestations over manhood after the Civil War. It draws on newspaper accounts of the parades and materials produced by the three parades’ planning committees to show the similarities in conception, organization, and execution of the parades led to civic ceremonies that in fact privileged monied elites’ ideal manhood and claims to authority.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
I. CONCEIVING PARADES.....	16
II. ORGANIZING PARADES.....	24
III. EXECUTING PARADES.....	43
IV. ALTERNATIVES AND REACTIONS TO PARADES.....	58
V. CONCLUSION.....	64
APPENDIX A: CIRCULATION NUMBERS FOR NEWSPAPERS CITED.....	67
APPENDIX B: LIST OF INDUSTRIES.....	70
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	72

INTRODUCTION
“Full Grown, Large, and Shapely”¹

Across the city, residents and visitors waited expectantly. All eyes were trained on the empty street, anticipating the sound of thousands of shoes hitting pavement and the sight of uniformed men. Some looked on from their windows. Some perched on stoops, separated yet still part of the masses of men, women, and children who waited. The rest crowded on the sidewalks, their sheer numbers pressing those in front ever closer to the street. They all awaited the spectacle that newspapers and boosters had promised would be a grand affair—a grand celebration of their city and the age in which they were living.

This scene was played out repeatedly in Baltimore and New York during the late nineteenth century. In October 1880, Baltimore celebrated the sesquicentennial of its founding. According to the *Sesqui-Centennial Journal*, an estimated “seventy-five thousand strangers” were in Baltimore for the celebration’s first day.² *The Baltimore American and Commercial Advertiser*³ headlined their article on day one’s parade as “Twenty-Five

I would like to thank the Department of American Studies at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill for

¹ Quote describing Baltimore and taken from J. Thomas Scharf’s oration delivered on the opening day of the Sesquicentennial. “Oration delivered on Monday, October 11, 1880, the Opening Day of the Grand Celebration of the 150th Anniversary of the Founding of the City of Baltimore by J. Thomas Scharf,” PAM 4122, Special Collections, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, 4-5.

² *Sesqui-centennial Journal*, October 16, 1880, Box 2, MS 1097, Maryland Sesquicentennial Scrapbooks, 1880, Special Collections, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, 1 (hereafter referred to as “*Sesqui-centennial Journal*,” MHS).

³ Hereafter referred to as *The Baltimore American*.

Thousand Men in the Line of March.”⁴ Three years later, New York celebrated the centennial anniversary of Evacuation Day.⁵ The Committee of Arrangements estimated that “over 2,000,000” spectators would be in Manhattan for the festivities and that “between 25,000 to 40,000 men” wanted to participate in the procession.⁶ The Evacuation Day parade, which followed the route George Washington and the Continental Army took downtown to reclaim New York in 1783, was the centerpiece. Since November 25, 1883—the actual day of the anniversary—was a Sunday, the Committee moved the celebration to November 26th. It rained that day, but *The New York Sun* described how spectators “stood ten and twelve rows deep on the sidewalks with upraised umbrellas, like a huge growth of black mushrooms.”⁷ The *New York Tribune* wrote, “the crowds grew and grew from moment to moment, and were obviously composed of country folks and the toilers of the city, to whom a holiday and a great procession are as dear as an apple to a schoolboy.”⁸ Finally, at the sound of sloshing boots on rain-soaked streets, “all of a sudden the promenading [of the spectators] ceased, and the thousands and tens of thousands crystalized into a standing army of spectators with their

⁴ “New Baltimore,” *The Baltimore American*, October 12, 1880, BMS5-1, Baltimore Sesquicentennial Celebration Records, Baltimore City Archives, Baltimore, 1 (hereafter referred to as “New Baltimore,” BCA).

⁵ Evacuation Day marked the day the British evacuated New York at the end of the American Revolution (November 25, 1783) and the city was reclaimed by the Continental Army. For more on the celebration of Evacuation Day see <https://www.nypl.org/blog/2014/11/24/evacuation-day-new-york-holiday>.

⁶ “No More Places in Line” *The New York Times*, November 21, 1883, 5.

⁷ Press Notices of the Celebration, “Report of the Joint Committee on the Centennial Celebration of the Evacuation of New York by the British. Monday, November 26, 1883. With an Historical Introduction by John Austin Stevens, Evacuation of New York by the British, 1773-1883”, XS F128 .47 .J56 1885, Patricia D. Klingenstein Library, New-York Historical Society Museum and Library, New York, 155 (hereafter cited as “Report of the Joint Committee on Evacuation Day,” NYHS).

⁸ “Centennial of Evacuation,” *New York Tribune*, November 27, 1883, 1-2.

faces toward the street.”⁹ While the rain physically dampened the awaiting crowd, “the set faces of the men: the grim look of determination” of those parading, “shone through the mist.”¹⁰

The thousands of people that descended upon Baltimore, New York, and Brooklyn at the end of the nineteenth century did so not only for the visual feast, but also because they understood and recognized the singular importance of these events in American civic life. Newspapers recognized and organizers, civic and political leaders all assigned a level of significance in these events. The *Baltimore Sun* wrote of the Sesquicentennial, “the sense of energy is vital in all our people, and in celebrating Baltimore’s birthday we give the occasion remembrance on account of the renewed consciousness of strength which we naturally derive from the authentic history of the past, assuring us of our perfect competency to grapple with our rival cities in the immediate future.”¹¹ According to *The New York Times*, Evacuation Day “was one of the largest pageants ever seen in the streets of the City” and “there could be no doubt of the quality of the patriotism that animated those who participated in the street procession.”¹² The headline of the *Brooklyn Daily Eagle* upon the opening of the Brooklyn Bridge read: “Glorification! The Two Cities Celebrate the Work that Makes Them One.”¹³ Despite the soaring and unifying rhetoric employed by newspapers and parade organizers, these parades were in fact highly choreographed performances that proposed idealized and

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ “One Hundred and Fifty Years Old,” *The Baltimore Sun*, January 12, 1880, 2.

¹² “After A Hundred Years,” *The New York Times*, November 27, 1883, 2.

¹³ “Glorification! The Two Cities Celebrate the Work that Makes Them One,” *The Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, May 24, 1883, 11-12.

static images of cosmopolitan success. It was an image of success tied to an older, idealized version of masculine identity that negated incipient constructions of that same identity. Contemporaries celebrated the city and through gendered language. A poem written by Wilber Williston Worlock, published in an 1883 Evacuation Day souvenir book, contained the following lines:

The father, son, of her ensuing years,
Bestowing gigantic manhood, commercial strength
Godfather to her wealth, her shipping piers,
Her avenues, mansions, Park of beauty length.¹⁴

Worlock's gendering of metropolitan New York was based in and created out of "commercial strength." In New York on May 27, 1883, Reverend Robert Collyer remarked in a sermon on the opening of the Brooklyn Bridge that "[he] would touch the Bridge... as one of the noblest revelations of the manhood of this New World."¹⁵ In an oration delivered on the opening day of the Baltimore Sesquicentennial on October 11, 1880, the same day as representatives of trades and industries marched through Baltimore's streets, J. Thomas Scharf—a journalist, historiographer, Confederate colonel, and active member of the Maryland Historical Society—said, "Baltimore has come of age, yet some of those here, who now proudly do homage to this hour of its manhood, were witness of its vigorous expansion in youth, of its active struggles in infancy."¹⁶ After asserting Baltimore's achievements in industry, its pride in labor, and the military heroics of its native sons, Scharf ended his

¹⁴ "1783. New York's Historic Century and Evacuation Day Souvenir. 1883." XS E 239.W9 1884, Patricia D. Klingenstein Library, New-York Historical Society Museum and Library, New York.

¹⁵ "Robert Collyer on the Bridge," *New York Tribune*, May 28, 1883, 2.

¹⁶ Baltimore Centennial Record, October 11, 1880, BMS5-1, Baltimore Sesquicentennial Celebration Records, Baltimore City Archives, 1-2. (hereafter referred to as "Baltimore Centennial Record," BCA); "Oration delivered on Monday, October 11, 1880, the Opening Day of the Grand Celebration of the 150th Anniversary of the Founding of the City of Baltimore by J. Thomas Scharf," Maryland Historical Society, 3.

oration by concluding, “Baltimore has come of age—let her prove her manhood by preserving her inheritance pure and clean, an apple of gold in a vessel of silver.”¹⁷ On October 16th, the *Baltimore American* stated, “the vast display of physical strength represented in processions miles in length, of strong men, whether that physical strength is to be utilized in war or labor or commerce or science or art—this is after all the wealth and glory of the city.”¹⁸ This rhetoric elevated the idea of men as courageous, strong producers and intimately linked together military and industrial achievement through masculine, gendered language. It also elevated men as laborers, at least in theory.

Parading has garnered scholarly attention because it constituted a primary medium for individual and collective expression throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth-century United States. Like social media, television, or movies today, parades reflected communities’ cultural pride and social concerns. Rather than dismissing them as innocuous nuisances that merely close down parts of town, historians use parades as a lens through which to examine the historical evolution of power dynamics, identity construction, and commemorative symbolism. Parades were important moments in which imagined communities manifested themselves; parades presented symbols that, in turn, created usable pasts and collective understandings.¹⁹

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 20.

¹⁸ Sesquicentennial Scrapbook 2, Box 3, MS 1097, Maryland Sesquicentennial Scrapbooks, 1880, Special Collections, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, 36 (hereafter referred to as “Sesquicentennial Scrapbook 1 or 2,” MHS).

¹⁹ For scholarship on the role of symbols in identity formation see Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (revised ed., New York, Verso Books, 2006); Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011).

A rich historiography addresses parading culture and public performance of identity in the nineteenth-century United States. However much of the extant scholarship is highly specialized and temporally specific. There is rich scholarship examining parading in the Early Republic and how it helped codify the ideas of the American Revolution.²⁰ Other scholarship focuses on the parading culture surrounding a specific group, such as veterans, laborers, or ethnic groups, or a specific event, such as the commemoration of the Civil War, Emancipation Day, or Decoration Day (later Memorial Day).²¹ Much of this scholarship

²⁰ See David Waldstreicher, *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism, 1776-1820* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997); Susan G. Davis, *Parades and Power: Street Theatre in Nineteenth-Century Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986); Benjamin H. Irvin, *Clothed in Robes of Sovereignty: The Continental Congress and the People Out of Doors* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

²¹ For scholarship on parading culture and race see Kathleen Clark, *Defining Moments: African American Commemoration & Political Culture in the South, 1863-1913* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005); Mitchell A. Kachun, *Festivals of Freedom: Memory and Meaning in African American Emancipation Celebrations, 1808-1915* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003); Alesandra Lorini, *Rituals of Race: American Public Culture and the Search for Racial Democracy* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1999); Shane White, "It Was a Proud Day": African Americas, Festivals, and Parades in the North, 1741-1834," *The Journal of American History* 81 (June 1994): 13-50.

For more on the Grand Army of the Republic and parading see Wallace Evans Davies, *Patriotism on Parade: The Story of Veterans' and Hereditary Organizations in America, 1783-1900* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955); Stuart McConnell, *Glorious Contentment: The Grand Army of the Republic, 1865-1900* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992); Barbara A. Gannon, *The Won Cause: Black and White Comradeship in the Grand Army of the Republic* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2011); Cecilia Elizabeth O'Leary, *To Die For: The Paradox of American Patriotism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999).

For scholarship on Civil War commemoration see David Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001) and *Beyond the Battlefield: Race, Memory, & the American Civil War* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002); Caroline E. Janney, *Remembering the Civil War: Reunion and the Limits of Reconciliation* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2013); W. Fitzhugh Brundage, *The Southern Past: A Clash of Race and Memory* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008).

For scholarship on labor and parading see Timothy J. Minchin, "Together We Shall Be Heard: Exploring the 1981 'Solidarity Day' Mass March" *Labor*, 12, no. 3 (2015): 75-96; Mary P. Ryan, "The American Parade: Representations of the Nineteenth-Century Social Order", ed. Lynn Hunt, *The New Cultural History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989). 143.; Michael Kazin and Steven J. Ross, "America's Labor Day: The Dilemma of a Workers' Celebration" *The Journal of American History*, 78, no. 4 (Mar 1992): 1294-1323; Robert E. Weir, *Beyond Labor's Veil: The Culture of the Knights of Labor* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996).

focuses on the didactic nature of parading and how parades helped create and instill a collective identity amongst participants and observers. Yet, there is a dearth of broader studies on civic parading occurring after the Civil War. Parading culture also represents an underdeveloped area of inquiry within labor history.

Parades, generally speaking, no longer hold the same cultural or civic importance for communities across the United States as did those in earlier periods. Yet parading was still of enduring significance in the late nineteenth century and contemporaries understood its importance. Newspapers devoted significant space to covering parades, cities and locales gave thousands of dollars to mount civic celebrations, and people came out by the tens of thousands to participate and spectate. The cultural work parading did in the early nineteenth century—as displays of power, as commemoration, as expressions of popular politics, as demands for political and social change, or a combination thereof—continued throughout the late nineteenth century. This thesis examines parades as displays of power deployed by a socio-economic class.

One model study this thesis builds on is Mary Ryan’s *Civic Wars: Democracy and Public Life in the American City During the Nineteenth Century*. Ryan skillfully examines the diversity, structure, and issues of inclusion and exclusion in parading culture between the 1820s and the 1870s. Ryan concludes that by the 1870s, the public sphere was marked by “civic wars” that enacted the will of only some people and operated in binaries, particularly along racial and gendered lines.²² Ryan’s research, which does not extend beyond the 1870s, precludes her from recognizing the important developments in late nineteenth-century parading culture or the social and political struggles they reflected. This thesis’s examination

²² Mary P. Ryan, *Civic Wars: Democracy and Public Life in the American City During the Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).

of large-scale parading in the 1880s reveals contingencies and issues Ryan's analysis does not account for, most importantly the interrelated issues of class and manhood.

Attention to the intersection of manhood and parading culture is essential for understanding larger civic, political, and social struggles of the era. The 1880s were a moment of renegotiation over who controlled cities, who controlled urban politics, and who controlled urban commerce. Parades offered conspicuous moments for these renegotiations to take place in public. After the tumult of the 1870s, including the emergence of prominent labor unions and a crippling economic recession, the 1880s were a time when monied elites, political elites, and workingmen all began to reassess the nature and control of the nation's political economy. Parading reflected this reassessment.

Earlier definitions of manhood operated in terms that no longer seemed tenable for many American men after the Civil War. In 1854, Noah Webster's *An American Dictionary of the English Language* defined both "man" and "manhood" in opposition to childhood, thus foregrounding the independence of men against the dependence of children.²³ The two definitions also describe the "qualities of man," which included "courage; bravery; resolution" as well as "the sense of strength, vigor, bravery, virile powers, or magnanimity, as distinguished from the weakness, timidity, or impotence of a boy, or from the narrow-mindedness of low-bred men."²⁴ These definitions of both "man" and "manhood" also emphasized the qualities of soldiers in conjunction with "magnanimity"; this conceptual link

²³ Noah Webster, *An American dictionary of the English Language; containing the whole vocabulary of the first edition in two volumes quarto; the entire corrections and improvements of the second edition in two volumes royal octavo; to which is prefixed an introductory dissertation on the origin, history, and connection, of the languages of western Asia and Europe, with an explanation of the principles on which languages are formed. By Noah Webster...Rev. and enl., by Chauncey A. Goodrich...with pronouncing vocabularies of Scripture, classical, and geographical names*, (Springfield, MA: G. and C. Merriam, 1854), 690-1, <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=nnc2.ark:/13960/t6ww9t108;view=1up;seq=784;size=150>.

²⁴ Ibid.

underscored prevalent ideals of volunteerism and generosity that inherently excluded those without the time, opportunity, or means for either. The references to “virility” underscored the importance for men to have dependents themselves—children and wives. These earlier definitions of manhood also focused on property ownership.²⁵ By this logic, since the Declaration of Independence stated all men were created equal, all men were in principal inherently equal competitors in the marketplace. Economic independence then became more important for the development of free labor ideology.²⁶ Being “self-made”—independently creating one’s own success and supporting one’s family without assistance—became an important cornerstone for definitions of manhood, especially in the postbellum period, when the emergence of the “labor question” gave manhood explicit economic significance.²⁷ All these concepts more intensely linked manhood and authority.²⁸

²⁵ Michael S. Kimmel refers to as, the “Heroic Artisan”—men who were independent and self-reliant. The “Genteel Patriarch” also fit into this mold for, while he did not toil himself, he owned property and his property—including human beings—made him self-reliant. See Michael S. Kimmel, *Manhood in America: A Cultural History* Second ed.(New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 12-13.

²⁶ William E. Forbath writes, “‘Free Labor’ ideology was imbued with the traditional republican conceptions of freedom and of a sound polity inherited from the Revolutionary era. Freedom meant economic independence, ownership of productive property—not as an end in itself primarily, but because such independence was essential to participating freely in the public realm. The propertyless ‘servant’ or ‘hireling’ was an untrustworthy citizen. His property and ‘dependence’ made him vulnerable to coercion, threatening the integrity of his opinions and his ballot. ‘Independence’ in pursuing one’s economic calling and ‘independence’ as a citizen were entwined, then, and a republican polity could not safely co-exist with a large permanent class of propertyless laborers.” Free labor also stressed the idea of “liberty of contract,” in which individuals entered freely into contract with other individuals. See William E. Forbath, “The Ambiguities of Free Labor: Labor and the Law in the Gilded Age,” *Wisconsin Law Review* (1985). 774-5. For more on the development of free labor ideology, see Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party before the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970); Cohen, *The Reconstruction of American Liberalism, 1865-1914*; Heather Cox Richardson, *West from Appomattox: The Reconstruction of America after the Civil War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007).

²⁷ Kimmel, *Manhood in America*, 30-1.; Nancy Cohen, *The Reconstruction of American Liberalism, 1865-1914* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 219.

²⁸ Gail Bederman argues manhood linked together anatomy, identity, and authority and allowed one to stand in for the others. This “*historical, ideological process*” began with white middle class men in the closing decades of the nineteenth century and resulted in “manliness,” which stressed “self-mastery and restraint.” See Gail

The 1880s were thus a period when the question of the content of manhood, and who could lay claim to it, was uncommonly fraught along racial, gendered, and class lines. African Americans, both during and after slavery's legal end, had been widely disparaged as undeserving of and incapable of exercising manhood rights. Nativist groups and xenophobes denigrated and excluded the new immigrant groups that streamed into America's cities in the 1880s by using gendered language to negate their manhood. Michael Kimmel describes how feminizing language was applied to ethnic and racial minorities—especially in Northern, urban cities whose demographics were undergoing dramatic changes.²⁹ For example, Jews were often called effeminate and black men thought of as rapacious and possessing no self-control. With newly emancipated black men gaining the vote and women agitating for it, the innate links between manhood and the vote seemed less certain. Veterans, especially of the Civil War, had to justify claims of dependency without negating their manhood as they fought for pensions.³⁰ As James Marten articulates, veterans felt the “nation's gratitude must take concrete form” and that their military service already proved their manhood and civic commitment. Conversely, many Americans felt veterans' pension demands “violate[d]

Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995), 8-12.

²⁹Kimmel, *Manhood in America*, 63.

³⁰ The fight for pensions for veterans was long and arduous and involved various groups, most notably the GAR and individuals. While fighting for pensions, Civil War veterans needed to contend with nineteenth-century conceptions of manhood as well because of the issues of dependency. For more on pensions for Civil War veterans see James Marten, *Sing Not War: The Lives of Union and Confederate Veterans in Gilded Age America* (Chapel Hill: University of Chapel Hill Press, 2014) and “Not A Veteran in the Poorhouse: Civil War Pensions and Soldiers' Homes” in *Wars within a War: Controversy and Conflict Over the American Civil War*, ed. Gary Gallagher and Joan Waugh (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009); Larry M. Logue, *To Appomattox and Beyond: The Civil War Soldier in War and Peace* (Chicago: I.R. Dee, 1996); Brian Matthew Jordan, *Marching Home: Union Veterans and Their Unending Civil War* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2014); Richard Severo and Lewis Milford, *The Wages of War: When American Soldiers Came Home—From Valley Forge to Vietnam* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1989).

certain assumptions about independence, the role of government, and manhood.”³¹ More and more men found themselves employed by bosses and dependent on wages.³² Rendered dependents through their work and unable to “make” themselves through economic success, workingmen pushed back against inherited definitions of men and manhood.³³ They could not accept the argument made by E.L. Godkin in his July 1867 *North American Review* essay, “The Labor Crisis,” that ““when a man agrees to sell his labor, he agrees by implication to sell his moral and social independence.””³⁴ To accept these terms would have meant surrendering all claims to male privilege and dignity in the postbellum nineteenth-century United States.

All of these challenges to previous definitions of manhood occurred concurrently with monied elites’ attempts to hold onto political and economic power by espousing free labor ideology and constructions of manhood celebrating a degree of economic independence that only the wealthy enjoyed. Manhood rights were also rights of power, both political and

³¹ Marten, *Sing Not War*, 200.

³² After 1850, few workers were spared the effects of an industrializing society. See Herbert G. Gutman, *Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America: Essays in American Working-Class and Social History* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1976), 80. After the Civil War, Americans began abandoning farming *en masse* and flocked to ever-growing industrial centers to work in increasingly large factories. According to census data compiled by historian David Montgomery, in 1870 two-thirds of individuals engaged in the marketplace were “hirelings.” See Leon Fink, *The Long Gilded Age: American Capitalism and the Lessons of a New World Order* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015), 17. According to David Montgomery, “nineteenth-century trade unions... adherents were usually from the ranks of craftsmen.” While “in the two decades following the Civil War, trade-union activists endeavored simultaneously to organize members of their own crafts in defense of their wages and work rules to act as the voice of the working class as a whole in dialogue with bourgeois intellectuals and reformers,” the dialogue was “often acrimonious.” Many amalgamated craft unions, which appeared in the late nineteenth century, excluded workers who were paid by the hour or day as they were seen as disposable. Between 1870 and 1910, the number of manual wage, industrial workers rose 301%. See David Montgomery, *The Fall of the House of Labor: The Workplace, the State, and American Labor Activism, 1865-1925* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 4, 23-4, 51.

³³ In this thesis, workingmen are defined as wage dependent, hired hands generally in unskilled or semi-skilled jobs.

³⁴ Montgomery, *The Fall of the House of Labor*, 19-20.

economic. Laying claim to manhood was important for both maintaining power and dictating who would continue to wield power. Monied elites were not about to willingly surrender this privilege.

This thesis uses case studies of three civic ceremonies in two nineteenth-century cities: Brooklyn and New York—henceforth referred to as metropolitan New York³⁵—and Baltimore to analyze the assertions of an exclusive manhood in parading in the 1880s. Baltimore and metropolitan New York were very different cities in the 1880s. New York and Brooklyn’s combined population was 1,772,892, making it the most populous metropolitan area in the United States. Baltimore’s population of 332,313 made it the nation’s seventh largest.³⁶ Metropolitan New York was a global city, recognized as a commercial center, while Baltimore aspired to attain similar stature. Despite the differences in size and commercial prominence, parading culture in both cities reflected unbounded local pride in success in a quickly industrializing nation.

This thesis draws primarily on newspapers and materials produced by the three parade planning committees. The language with which newspapers described these parades and articulated their purpose served as the main source for the public’s understanding of the celebrations, and in turn, the meaning these celebrations bestowed on manhood. Nineteenth-century newspapers were often highly partisan and focused on civic boosterism. Although these editorial choices admittedly make the newspapers less accurate sources, this thesis does not use their coverage to understand *what* happened but rather to understand how newspapers conveyed these parades’ cultural significance to their readers. The newspapers this thesis

³⁵ Brooklyn and New York remained separate cities until 1898 when they consolidated with Queens, Staten Island, and the rest of the Bronx to form Greater New York.

³⁶ U.S. Bureau of the Census, “Table 11. Population of the 100 Largest Urban Places: 1880,” <https://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0027/tab11.txt>

examines had large circulation numbers and were major papers in metropolitan New York and Baltimore respectively.³⁷ Therefore, their interpretation of these parades and the expressions of manhood in them reached a wide audience.

In outlining the exclusive nature of civic culture in the 1880s, it is necessary to define the central actors in this thesis. They are the northern urban elites—the urban contingent of a larger, national class of monied elites. Urban elites were the main sponsors and organizers of the three parades examined. Urban elites had access to capital, were well connected to political and cultural institutions in the city and beyond, and class conscious.³⁸ They had the resources, time, and access to mount these spectacles, and their desire in doing so was to glorify and support their own interests through constructions of their own, idealized manhood.

Owing to the contested and ambiguous nature of manhood in the 1880s, civic performances of manhood acquired a new level of symbolism and importance at the end of the nineteenth century. Parading in the United States had been, either explicitly or implicitly, a pageant of manhood since the Early Republic because of the nature of parade participation and the proposed purpose of celebrations.³⁹ Parade sponsors and organizers were sometimes unconsciously and at other times consciously working through issues surrounding manhood

³⁷ See Appendix A.

³⁸ Urban elites partly takes its definition from Sven Beckert's definition of the American Bourgeoisie in *The Monied Metropolis: New York City and the Consolidation of the American Bourgeoisie, 1850-1896*. Beckert defines the American Bourgeoisie as prominently including "substantial merchants, industrialists, and bankers, along with rentiers (people who lived off investments they did not manage themselves), real estate speculators, owners of service enterprises, and many professionals. Taken together, this was the entrepreneurial or economic bourgeoisie par excellence. They shared a specific position in New York's social structure in that they owned and invested capital, employed wage workers (or, at the very least, servants), did not work for wages themselves, and did not work manually." See Sven Beckert, *The Monied Metropolis: New York City and the Consolidation of the American Bourgeoisie, 1850-1896* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 7. This group of men and women are referred to as "urban elites" in the remainder of this thesis to distinguish them from those who would be considered "bourgeoisie" by Beckert's definition but did not live in northern, urban locales.

³⁹ See Ryan, "The American Parade: Representations of the Nineteenth-Century Social Order. "; Ryan, *Civic Wars.*; Waldstreicher, *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes*

as they put together civic ceremonies. There were many ways in which parade organizers could have symbolically addressed the ambiguity surrounding manhood in the 1880s, yet urban elites instead adopted a restricted, conservative definition of manhood that they then imposed on the civic parades they organized. Given manhood's longstanding associations with political and public power, it was important for urban elites to showcase men whose presence on the streets reaffirmed their authority. Civic ceremonies, ostensibly intended to celebrate places, epochs, and all who lived in them, were in fact elite dominated and privileged monied elites' definition of ideal manhood. Their ideal manhood, "civic manhood," was one based on free labor ideology and voluntary civic engagement and also glorified participation in the marketplace. This civic manhood was a nineteenth-century phenomenon.

This thesis uses a chronological structure to follow the conception, organization, and execution of the parades studied. The first section, *Conceiving Parades*, details who was involved in proposing the parades and their purported purposes for mounting them. While the section does not directly deal with competing conceptions of manhood in the 1880s, the fact these organizing committees were made up exclusively of men prominent in each city's social, cultural, political, or economic life means that we should think of the parades they organized as functions of their civic power and their self-understanding as elite men. The second section, *Organizing Parades*, analyzes the ways parades were funded and who was invited to participate. Both reveal that the organizers of the parades this thesis discusses formed their structure around elites' idea of civic manhood meant to subordinate challenges to that understanding of manhood. The third section, *Executing Parades*, explores how the parade organizers' underlying ideologies manifested in the parades themselves, and how the press covered the events. The fourth section, *Alternative Forms of and Reactions to Parades*,

details dissenting responses to the three parades this thesis focuses on, as well as the ways non-elite groups used parading to construct and present group identities.

I: CONCEIVING PARADES

Proposals for all three celebrations came from the host city's urban elites. Those involved in their planning were overwhelmingly males with major roles in the cities' commercial and cultural institutions. Initial talks about celebrating the 150th anniversary of the founding of Baltimore came from members of the Maryland Historical Society, whose founders included elite members of Baltimore society with the time and money to dedicate to the collection of "the remnants of the state's history," in early 1880.⁴⁰ Members of the New York Historical Society spearheaded talks in January 1883 for celebrating the centennial of Evacuation Day in November of that same year.⁴¹ Other committees involved in the Evacuation Day parade planning included the Common Council of the City of New York, the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, the New York State Society of the Order of the Cincinnati, the New York Commandery of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, the Department of New York of the Grand Army of the Republic, and the Veterans of the National Guard, State of New York.⁴² Proposals for celebrating the completion and opening of the Brooklyn Bridge in 1883 as a public, civic affair came from the Bridge's Board of Trustees and the Common Council of the City of Brooklyn rather than

⁴⁰ See <http://www.mdhs.org/about/mdhs-history> or *The Baltimore Sun*, January 31, 1844, 2.

⁴¹ "Centennial Celebration of the Evacuation of New York City, Monday, November 26th, 1883, with an Historical Outline and Order of Procession. Compiled by John Brete. *Published under the direction of the Committee of Arrangements*," F128 E 239.B 84 1883, Patricia D. Klingenstein Library, New-York Historical Society Museum and Library, New York, 1.

⁴² "Report of the Joint Committee on Evacuation Day," NYHS.

the laborers who toiled for fourteen years to construct the bridge.⁴³ The planners wanted the opening to not only be a celebration of an engineering marvel but also one which recognized the Bridge's "important bearing upon the material interests of Brooklyn."⁴⁴

The urban elites proposed each of these celebrations to promote a civic pride intimately tied to their city's industrial and cultural contributions to the United States. Both Baltimore and metropolitan New York had increased their industrial output after the Civil War. By 1880, Baltimore was the United States' "leader in canned fruits and vegetables,"⁴⁵ and had taken a leading role in the emerging fertilizer business, as well as railroads, fishing, and farming.⁴⁶ Baltimore was proud of Maryland's historic prominence in the tobacco trade and its German breweries. In comparison, metropolitan New York's industry was more varied. In the 1880s, metropolitan New York was physically growing so rapidly that construction provided ample opportunities for huge numbers of workers.⁴⁷

According to newspaper coverage, the Baltimore Sesquicentennial's organizers wanted the celebration to cement Baltimore's standing as a commercial and industrial center and thus garner economic investment in the city. The organizers likewise wanted to boost Baltimoreans' sense of civic pride and use their expansive roster of parade participants to

⁴³ "Report of the Special Committee of the Common Council of the City of Brooklyn Upon the Celebration of the Opening of the New York and Brooklyn Bridge, 1883," F128 .617. B7 B5, Patricia D. Klingenstein Library, New-York Historical Society Museum and Library, New York, 1,3 (hereafter referred to as "Report of the Special Committee on the Brooklyn Bridge," NYHS).

⁴⁴ "Report of the Special Committee on the Brooklyn Bridge," NYHS, 3.

⁴⁵ "1866 to 1899--Heading Towards Modernity, the History of Baltimore," <https://planning.baltimorecity.gov/sites/default/files/History%20of%20Baltimore.pdf>.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Edwin G. Burrows and Mike Wallace, *Gotham: A History of New York City to 1898* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 1041-58.

generate public interest and investment. The *Sesqui-Centennial Journal* wrote, “the merchants, business men and capitalists who have shown an interest in the celebration, being credible to our city [of Baltimore], will doubtless reap advantages from the trade and money that it will attract.”⁴⁸ Even though metropolitan New York dwarfed Baltimore, the latter city’s leaders compared the two cities directly. The *Baltimore Sun* during the week-long parade celebrating Baltimore’s 150th birthday commented that “now, as the second grain port in rank in the United States, it has been seriously alluded to as ‘the young rival of New York.’”⁴⁹ The *Sesqui-Centennial Journal* wrote that Baltimore was growing so rapidly in industrial, manufacturing, and commercial importance that “even mighty Gotham may have to tremble for her laurels.”⁵⁰ Whether or not Baltimore truly matched metropolitan New York in manufacturing or commercial output or importance is beside the point; of note is that Baltimore sought to directly compare itself to the city that had come to embody the nation’s financial and economic promise. Industrial and commercial capacity made a city—and by extension its men—great.

The organizing committees for the two metropolitan New York parades similarly highlighted commercial interests in their initial proposals. The Special Committee of the Common Council of the City of Brooklyn wrote in their report on the celebration of the opening of the Brooklyn Bridge in May 1883 that,

The successful completion of the great work—the grandest triumph of genius and skill in modern times—and its important bearing upon the material interests of Brooklyn, seemed to properly require our citizens that the actual opening of the

⁴⁸ “The Sesqui-Centennial,” *Sesqui-centennial Journal*, October 11, 1880, BMS5-1, Baltimore City Archives, Baltimore, 3 (hereafter referred to as “Sesqui-centennial Journal,” BCA).

⁴⁹ “The Opening Day, *The Baltimore Sun*, October 12, 1880, 2.

⁵⁰ “Sesqui-centennial Journal,” BCA, 4.

Bridge for public use should be specially commemorated by the City, aside from the ceremonies designed by the Trustees of the Bridge.⁵¹

The “Report of the Joint Committee on the Centennial Celebration of the Evacuation of New York by the British” stated that, “an appropriate celebration of the Centennial Anniversary of the Evacuation of the City of New York by the British troops in 1783, had been for some years contemplated by gentlemen interested in the history of our city” and that, “it was the original intension [sic.] of the Historical Society in urging this celebration to awaken public interest in this important, but hitherto neglected, part of our history.”⁵² Yet this interest was inherently commercial; committee secretary John Austin Stevens wrote to George W. Lane, President of the Chamber of Commerce, on November 1, 1882 asking the Chamber to take part “in the celebration of an event of such interest in the history of the nation and the commerce of the United States.”⁵³ The British evacuation of New York in 1783 was an historical event and one that could have proceeded without explicit celebration of commerce. Yet metropolitan New York’s urban elites imposed a commercial layer onto the parade because of their own interests in declaring economic success.

Mounting parades that celebrated commercial success reflected urban elites’ anxieties about their own status during the 1880s. In the wake of the 1873 economic depression, monied elites’ optimism about the country’s economic future turned into anxiety.⁵⁴ The depression showed that monied elites’ power was fragile and easily lost. In response, monied elites emerged from the depression with full awareness of their station and a separate class

⁵¹ “Report of the Special Committee on the Brooklyn Bridge,” NYHS, 3.

⁵² “Report of the Joint Committee on Evacuation Day,” NYHS, 1.

⁵³ Preliminary Proceedings, “Report of the Joint Committee on Evacuation Day,” NYHS, 32.

⁵⁴ Beckert, *The Monied Metropolis* 218.

identity.⁵⁵ As Sven Beckert writes, their “social life and politics increasingly manifested a new and greater distance” from others, especially workingmen who the urban elites saw as a threat to their power.⁵⁶ This mentality and disquiet meant monied elites advocated for the “self-made man” as the ideal; if they had survived the economic depression, so could others by focusing on freedom of contract and the laws of supply and demand.⁵⁷

One group threatening the ideal of the “self-made man,” who parade organizers hesitated to include, was workingmen. Baltimore and metropolitan New York both had a large, vocal, working class filling the ranks of unskilled manufacturing jobs. Many of these workingmen were ethnic or racial minorities who sensed opportunities to mount challenges to the exclusive claim white men believed they had to manhood. In both Baltimore and metropolitan New York, workingmen engaged in a fight against what they believed was an unfair economic system that benefitted urban elites at their expense. The New York City Draft Riots in July 1863 had manifested labor and ethnic politics; the Union’s adoption of conscription propelled many workingmen, including many who were Irish, in metropolitan New York to begin calling the Civil War “a rich man’s war and a poor man’s fight.”⁵⁸ A decade later in metropolitan New York, parades for an eight-hour day and the 1874 riots in

⁵⁵ Ibid., 5.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Beckert argues the bourgeoisie also “advocate[d] the unquestioned primacy of unregulated markets and, most dramatically, restriction of suffrage rights in municipal elections” and “the center of American society was the right to control and accumulate property without interference, either from the state or the propertyless.” See *ibid.*, 281.

⁵⁸ When the Union Army adopted conscription in a war that now had a stated goal of emancipation, thus creating a new source of labor competition for unskilled jobs, New York’s mostly Irish working class revolted. The draft allowed for substitutes or payment instead of service—both at prohibitive sums for working people. See Burrows and Wallace, *Gotham*, 887-898.

Tompkins Square in Manhattan pitted police against the working poor in violent struggles for control over streets and workplaces.⁵⁹ The mobilization of workers through protests is one explanation for the Tilden Commission's support for higher property qualifications for the right to vote in New York City in 1877.⁶⁰ Similar workingmen's agitation happened in Baltimore. The Great Railroad Strike of 1877, when thousands of railroad workers and their supporters struck due to wage cuts, created disruption in multiple states and caused outbreaks of violence between strikers and the military units mobilized to end it. In Baltimore, roughly 14,000 took to the streets during the strike and destroyed or seized railroad property until confronted by Maryland National Guard units who fired into the rioting crowd.⁶¹

Allowing the trades to parade—to literally have control of the streets—would have been to concede a key part of the urban elites' symbolic power over place.⁶² In the case of the Brooklyn Bridge, the organizers did not invite any laborers who worked on the project to participate. The “Report of the Special Committee Appointed to Confer with the Trustees of the New York and Brooklyn Bridge,” reprinted in a commemorative booklet after the event, acknowledged that while “a suggestion was made that a procession of the citizens and

⁵⁹ For more on the Tompkins Square Riot and the police, see James F. Richardson, *The New York Police: Colonial Times to 1901* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), 195-7.

⁶⁰ The Tilden Commission was a New York State commission called for by Democrat Samuel J. Tilden in 1875 that espoused “taxpayer conservatism” and opposed “the public works programs sought by laboring New Yorkers.” See David Quigley, *Second Founding: New York City, Reconstruction and the Making of American Democracy* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2004), 125, 45, 47, 51-2.

⁶¹ Mintz, S., & McNeil, S. (2016), “The Great Railroad Strike,” Digital History, Retrieved 2017 from http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/disp_textbook.cfm?smtid=2&psid=3189.

⁶² For more on the connections between power and space, see Ryan, *Civic Wars*; Brian Larkin, “The Politics and Poetics of Infrastructure,” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 42 (2013): 327-343; Henri Lefebvre, *The Urban Revolution*, Trans. Robert Bononno (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003); Andy Merrifield, *The New Urban Question* (London: Pluto Press, 2014); Amy S. Greenberg, “Pirates, Patriots, and Public Meetings: Antebellum Expansionism and Urban Culture” *Journal of Urban History* 31, no. 5 (July 2005), DOI: 10.1177/0096144205275570; Sylvia Doughty Fries, *The Urban Ideal in Colonial America* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1977).

tradesmen would be a desirable feature of the municipal celebration” it “was deemed finally unadvisable and was abandoned.”⁶³ No fuller explanation for this exclusion was given according to the meeting minutes. Likewise, the “Final Report of the Committee of Arrangements for Evacuation Day” stated,

It will be observed that the participation of the Trades as a feature of the procession had not been sought for. The expense to these bodies of representation, in the manner usual in civic processions, and in the uncertainty of weather at this usually inclement season, seemed inexpedient.⁶⁴

The Committee did not show the same concern for the “inclement season[’s]” effect on the other contingents of paraders. Trades were singled out. While workers did march as part of Baltimore’s Sesquicentennial celebration, newspapers and organizers marked them as “employees” rather than representatives of a socioeconomic class or a movement.

While parade organizers were wary of including workingmen due to the political and economic challenges they represented, organizers were intent on showcasing institutions and groups that represented their own interests. They especially favored representatives of commercial or cultural institutions, electoral politics, and law and order. Local and national politicians were mainstays at all three parades since urban elites had a vested interest in building relationships with the men who held the reins of power and could make laws concerning commercial interests. The police, voluntary militias, and National Guard regiments were also important participants in all three parades. They were also intimately tied to urban elites’ interests. Veterans of previous American wars were also conspicuous in parades, since the public respect they received made them symbolically essential participants.

⁶³ “Report of the Special Committee on the Brooklyn Bridge,” NYHS, 11.

⁶⁴ Final Report of the Committee of Arrangements, “Report of the Joint Committee on Evacuation Day,” NYHS, 77.

The three parades followed similar programs of events. The Baltimore celebration, which took place from October 11-16, 1880, consisted of multiple days of parading, fireworks, musical performances, orations, and a display of maritime vessels in the port. Each day showcased an element of the image Baltimore's urban elites wanted to promote. Day one included historical tableaux depicting Maryland's history and emphasized "the trades and industrial and mechanical interests." Day two highlighted the Free and Accepted Masons, Knights Templar, and public and private school children. Day three was the "parade of the State, city, and visiting military organizations, city and visiting fire departments, police department, letter carriers and telegraph messenger boys." Days four through six showcased benevolent, temperance, and fraternal societies along with "colored social and benevolent organizations, societies and orders."⁶⁵ The celebration for the Brooklyn Bridge opening included musical performances by the Twenty-Third Regiment Band of the National Guard, speeches from individuals presenting and accepting the Bridge, a parade of dignitaries across the Bridge escorted by the elite New York Seventh Regiment, more orations at the foot of the Bridge, fireworks, and finally a reception at the Brooklyn Academy of Music for President Chester A. Arthur. Evacuation Day's final program consisted of a procession, fireworks, a Water Parade of tugboats and steamboats up the Hudson River, and the dedication of a monument to George Washington on the steps of the Sub-Treasury Building.⁶⁶ All three parades' programs highlighted individuals and institutions whose civic engagement meshed well with urban elites' visions for their cities' future.

⁶⁵ "150th Celebration of the Founding of Baltimore City," "Baltimore Centennial Record," BCA 1-2.

⁶⁶ The Sub-Treasury Building is now Federal Hall, a National Park Service site, across the street from the Stock Exchange on Wall Street in Manhattan. The statue, still standing, marked the spot where Washington took his first oath of office, becoming the first President of the United States.

II: ORGANIZING PARADES

After the organizing committees chose dates and identified appropriate participants, they secured funding for their parades. The three case-study parades all received public and private funding. The public funding further supported elite organizers' claims these parades were people's celebrations that reflected public sentiment and desires. Private funding reaffirmed this sentiment for it suggested the parade's mounting stemmed from public demand. According to the "Report of the Special Committee of the Common Council of the City of Brooklyn Upon the Celebration of the Opening of the New York and Brooklyn Bridge," \$4,647.30 was inserted into the Brooklyn Tax Budget by the Board of Estimates to cover the opening.⁶⁷ For Evacuation Day, \$20,000 came from city government.⁶⁸ For the Baltimore Sesquicentennial, \$10,000 came from the Municipal treasury.⁶⁹

⁶⁷ The \$4,647.30 may not reflect private donations or other sources of funding that contributed to mounting the Brooklyn Bridge opening celebration. Given the other two parades this thesis examined received substantial sums through private contributions, it is assumed that private donations also played a role in funding the Bridge's opening. According to the final program of events listed in the "Report of the Special Committee of the Common Council of the City of Brooklyn Upon the Celebration of the Opening of the New York and Brooklyn Bridge, 1883" there were private events that took place alongside the public events for the Brooklyn Bridge opening, including a reception at Colonel Washington A. Roebling's House and a dinner for the President, Governor of New York, and "other distinguished persons" at Brooklyn's Mayor Low's home. See "Report of the Special Committee on the Brooklyn Bridge," NYHS, 35, 39.

⁶⁸ Final Report of the Committee of Arrangements, "Report of the Joint Committee on Evacuation Day," NYHS, 61.

⁶⁹ "The Stranger's Guide in Baltimore and its Environs. Sketches of Public Buildings, Monuments, Notable Localities, Resorts, Suburban Drives, &c. Showing Strangers where to Go and what to See. With a Description of the Sesqui-Centennial Celebration and of the Oriole Pageant. Yorktown, and how to reach it from Baltimore," PAM 4380, Special Collections, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, 89.

Funding also came from private sources raised through subscription funds set up by the organizers. For the Baltimore Sesquicentennial, some donations came in small dollar amounts from individuals, mostly in increments of \$1-\$3, while others came from urban elites, businesses, and cultural institutions, mostly in the range of \$10-\$25.⁷⁰ The *Baltimore American* commented that,

there is not much of a probability that an appropriation will be made [by?] the [City Council Committee on the Sesquicentennial Celebration] for the celebration. The citizens are manifesting a laudable desire in swelling the contributions, and it is the general belief that the private contributions will reach the sum necessary to meet all the expenditures without any aid from the city treasury.⁷¹

Baltimore's parade organizers were certain the city's more affluent citizens, who could afford to voluntarily contribute and reap subsequent capital from their contribution, would bridge the economic gap. A similar dynamic occurred in metropolitan New York. The Citizens Fund for Evacuation Day helped raise roughly \$14,500 on top of city appropriations.⁷² Donors to the fund included four commercial exchanges, sixteen banks and trust companies, six bankers, ten insurance companies, four express companies, one railroad company, one press (the German paper, *The New York Staats Zeitung*) one club, eighteen hotels, fifty-two business firms, and twenty-seven individuals including William and John Jacob Astor.⁷³ Among the many private donations given to support the Evacuation Day celebration were those from the First National Bank, Liverpool and London and Globe Insurance Company, the Buckingham Hotel, and the New-York Equitable Insurance

⁷⁰ "Subscriptions in the aid of The Celebration of the 150th Anniversary of the Founding of the City of Baltimore," Johns Hopkins Special Collections, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.

⁷¹ "Sesquicentennial Scrapbook 1," MHS, 16-17.

⁷² Final Report of the Committee of Arrangements, "Report of the Joint Committee on Evacuation Day," NYHS, 89.

⁷³ Minutes and Reports, "Report of the Joint Committee on Evacuation Day," NYHS, 99-101.

Company.⁷⁴ In the long list of individual donors, not a single one was female. Evacuation Day was a male event that celebrated male contributions to metropolitan New York. Urban elite men with capital at their disposal provided the bulk of the financial support to celebrate a century of metropolitan New York's freedom from the British. These parades visualized the marriage of wealth and civic power.

With plans and funding in place, the parade organizers then began issuing invitations to both spectators and participants. Politicians—local, state and federal—were of upmost importance as attendees because of the power they exercised and their prominence as civic representatives. The presence of politicians—whether they marched in or viewed the parade from conspicuous positions—was also particularly important given workingmen's calls for government intervention in labor disputes between workers and employers.⁷⁵ Politicians' presence, at the behest of urban elites, unequivocally signaled their alliance with monied interests to organized labor and individual workingmen. Organizers of the Evacuation Day parade sent invitations to politicians representing the thirteen original colonies. Congressmen, members of the President's Cabinet, governors, judges, and mayors and Common Councils of various cities on Long Island, New Jersey, and Brooklyn also participated in the procession. The opening of the Brooklyn Bridge included "the President and his Cabinet, both houses of Congress, the Governors of all the States, [and] Mayors of Eastern cities."⁷⁶

⁷⁴ "Money Coming In Slowly. The Preparations for Celebrating Evacuation Day....," *The New York Times*, November 23, 1883, 5.

⁷⁵ Leon Fink argues, "as far back as the 1870s and continuing through the 1880s, the American labor movement imagined a positive role for government in buttressing workers' power and adjudicating major industrial disputes." In 1883, the Senate commissioned a Committee on the Relations Between Labor and Capital. See Fink, *The Long Gilded Age*, 96.

⁷⁶ "Wedding of the Cities. The Bridge Trustees Prepared for the Celebration....," *The New York World*, May 17, 1883, 8.

Baltimore's Sesquicentennial also prominently included politicians marching or riding in carriages. These parades were in part meant to show urban elites' political as well as civic and commercial power.

Invitations were also issued to individuals. For the Brooklyn Bridge, the list of invited individuals included "prominent citizens" and "each of the Aldermen of New York and Brooklyn [received] five cards" that they had promised "to about one hundred constituents."⁷⁷ Invitations worked similarly to patronage; loyalty earned some constituents a chance to be seen by parade spectators as members of the monied elite. A Brooklyn paper similarly commented,

Ten thousand invitations for the opening [of the Brooklyn Bridge] are being directed to all parts of the world. Every member of the Society of American Engineers will be invited to attend. Distinguished Americans at home and abroad will be invited, and invitations will also be sent to all foreign Ministers at Washington. Five hundred letters a day are received at the bridge office, many of them asking for invitations.⁷⁸

Metropolitan New York's urban elites wanted other monied elites and international representatives of the political order to attend their grand day celebrating scientific and technical achievement. The Brooklyn Bridge was an affair for "distinguished Americans," despite the fact a resolution adopted by Committee who organized the opening stated the "opening of the Bridge [should be] celebrated in a manner consistent with its public nature and purposes, and with ceremonies common to all, without invidious distinction."⁷⁹

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ "The Opening of the Bridge. Mayor Low's Note to His Neighbors and Other Arrangements," May 19, 1883, Brooklyn, N.Y. Newspaper Cuttings, 1877-86, F128K.3 B766 1858*, Patricia D. Klingenstein Library, New-York Historical Society Museum and Library, New York (hereafter referred to as "Brooklyn N.Y. Newspaper Clippings," NYHS).

⁷⁹ "Report of the Special Committee on the Brooklyn Bridge," NYHS, 4.

Other groups invited to participate were the police, militia, and National Guard, units associated with the maintenance of law and order. The law and order these three groups maintained was one defined by urban elites and meant to protect their commercial interests. All three were associated with suppressing organized labor, breaking strikes, protecting strikebreakers, putting down riots, and defending private property.⁸⁰ When the Board of Estimates and Apportionment appropriated \$20,000 for the celebration of Evacuation Day, the Committee of Arrangements used the money to invite various types of military units—veterans, National Guard, and militia units—from New York and the surrounding states.⁸¹ The Committee was willing to use private donations or city appropriated funds to support the inclusion of voluntary militias and National Guard units, just not representatives of trades.

The desire for law and order units in particular to participate in the parades reflects an essential element of the ideas of manhood that preoccupied urban elites—the idea of the “citizen-soldier.” The citizen-soldier idea in the United States dates back to the minutemen during the American Revolution and was championed as a way to avoid the tyranny associated with a standing army.⁸² Citizen-soldiers were also thought to create “manly citizens who loved their community”—men who were more concerned with the common

⁸⁰ For more on the police and strike breaking see Daniel Czitrom, *New York Exposed: The Gilded Age Police Scandal That Launches the Progressive Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016); Sidney L. Haring, *Policing a Class Society: The Experiences of American Cities, 1865-1915* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1983); Richardson, *The New York Police*. For more on voluntary militias and their relationships to workingmen see Robert Reinders, "Militia and Public Order in Nineteenth-Century America " *Journal of American Studies* 11, no. 1 (Apr., 1977). For more on the National Guard and their relationship to workingmen see Jerry Cooper, *The Rise of the National Guard: The Evolution of the American Militia, 1865-1920* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997).

⁸¹ Instructions to the Committee of Arrangements, General Committee of Fifteen, Second Meeting, October 31, 1883, Minutes and Reports, “Report of the Joint Committee on Evacuation Day,” NYHS, 61.

⁸² Claire R. Snyder, *Citizen-Soldiers and Manly Warriors: Military Service and Gender in the Civic Republican Tradition* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1999), 80.

good than their individual goals.⁸³ In this sense, the citizen-soldier served as a powerful political, social, and cultural tool for defining masculine citizens.⁸⁴

The police, many of whom were members of the same socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds as the people they regulated, were not known for their restraint while on patrol. However, as parade participants, policemen marched with military precision and carriage while in uniform, thus promoting elites' civic manhood visually. City's police not only provided crowd control during parades but urban elites also invited them as participants given the relationship between the police and capital. Despite their working-class and Irish ethnic origins, the metropolitan New York police ingratiated themselves with the propertied classes and urban elites as the "main bulwark against organized labor and radical activism."⁸⁵ According to Daniel Czitrom, this alliance was in part a result of the influx of veterans after the Civil War when the police were organized along military lines and were well prepared for their new duties as allies of capital.⁸⁶ The new, highly disciplined and bureaucratic nature of the police made it easier for individual patrolmen and officers to act against their class interests.⁸⁷ The bureaucratic nature of the departments, argues James F. Richardson, also

⁸³ Ibid., 87.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 11.

⁸⁵ Daniel Czitrom, *New York Exposed: The Gilded Age Police Scandal That Launches the Progressive Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 59.

⁸⁶ Czitrom, *New York Exposed*, 30.

⁸⁷ Harring, *Policing a Class Society*, 135.

meant that police were less likely to support labor.⁸⁸ Beginning in 1877, municipal police departments became frequent strikebreakers.⁸⁹

The National Guard, too, served the interests of monied elites. As voluntary units who were intimately tied to monied elites' interests and property, the National Guard (as well as voluntary militias) exemplified the ideal of the citizen-soldier in the 1880s. Time and again, it was the National Guard whom the monied elites called upon to forcibly end strikes. These units' choice of uniforms—crisp, clean, and often more suited to parading than fighting—also exemplified the gentility and monied independence urban elites were keen to promote. They often operated without much, or any, state financial support and thus the quality of their uniforms—purchased by the members themselves—signaled their socio-economic status.⁹⁰ Unlike its modern incarnation, the nineteenth-century Guard could not be federalized and was not associated with the U.S. army. Their funding, training, and size varied from community to community, but many regiments began to petition—and receive—support from state legislatures in the late 1870s.⁹¹ The National Guard was an outlet for men to

⁸⁸ One of the reasons why the police were willing to work on behalf of the urban elites was due to the highly politicized and partisan nature of appointments and promotions. Civil Service reform did not reach the police until 1884, meaning that policemen's "function was to protect and advance the interests of their respective political organizations." Since getting the job, securing a good 'beat,' or receiving a promotion were all based on political pull, the police gravitated towards those who could exert political influence and power—the urban elites. The necessity for money to advance within the police also encouraged monetary collections from both illegal and legitimate businesses, thus putting the police further in the pocket of the urban elites. Finally, policemen did not take up the cause of Labor because their strikes caused more work, in an already excessive work schedule, for policemen. When "salary increases were the results of legislative activity and not collective bargaining," policemen saw no reason to "identify with the problems and aspirations of labor." Many policemen's identities were therefore highly contradictory. See Richardson, *The New York Police*, 172-3, 75, 78-9, 81, 90, 201.

⁸⁹ Haring, *Policing a Class Society*, 111.

⁹⁰ Cooper, *The Rise of the National Guard*, 24.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 65, 86.

demonstrate their soldierly ability without having to serve in the U.S. Army. Effectively a social club or fraternal organization, the nineteenth-century Guard's membership, drawn primarily from white men who represented skilled workers and the upper middle-class, exemplified the elites' preoccupation with citizen-soldiers.⁹²

The links between the urban elites, police, and National Guard garnered the latter two groups invitations. Evacuation Day organizers invited policemen to march as part of the Fifth Division of the parade along with fire departments. The headquarters of Evacuation Committee were at 300 Mulberry Street, the courtroom of the New York Police Department.⁹³ Baltimore's Sesquicentennial celebration organizers invited Maryland National Guard units to parade as part of the "Military and Naval Forces, Fire Department, Police, &c. Procession" on Wednesday, October 13th.⁹⁴ The Twenty-Third Regiment, National Guard and the Third Gatling Battery, National Guard were invited to escort dignitaries across the Brooklyn Bridge at its opening.⁹⁵ Evacuation Day organizers invited regiments of the National Guard from New York, Connecticut, and New Jersey to participate in the parade.

The urban elites were also keen to have voluntary militias participate in the parades. These militias were predominantly made up of men from the urban elite and their sons who used their membership as a vehicle for demonstrating and claiming their manhood.

⁹² Ibid., 72.

⁹³ "Official Programme of the Procession," F128 E. 239.B841 1883, Patricia D. Klingenstein Library, New-York Historical Society Museum and Library, New York (hereafter referred to as "Official Programme Evacuation Day," NYHS).

⁹⁴ Sesqui-Centennial Municipal Executive Committee Pamphlet, PAM 5186, Baltimore Sesquicentennial Souvenirs, Special Collections, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, 11-12.

⁹⁵ "Report of the Special Committee on the Brooklyn Bridge," NYHS, 18-20.

Membership in a militia allowed these elite men to claim status as citizen-soldiers while also linking them directly to the American Revolution, thus making a claim to patriotism as well. These men had the time and the means to *volunteer* for militia service, and thus proclaimed their socio-economic status simultaneously with their patriotism while parading in uniform.⁹⁶ Like the National Guard and police, the volunteer militias also helped protect urban elites' interests and property.⁹⁷ Volunteer militia units invited to participate came from multiple states and not just the host city. Invited to Evacuation Day were the Old Guard and Detachment of Honorable and Ancient Artillery of Boston, the Governor's Foot Guard of Connecticut, the Albany Burgess Corps, the Utica Citizens Corps, the Battalion Providence Light Infantry, the Newport Artillery, the 1st Company Washington Continentals, N.Y., the Continental Guards, School No. 68, the Hibernian Rifles, and the Veteran Guards "(colored)."⁹⁸ The *New York World's* coverage of the Evacuation Day celebration remarked, "of the most notable organizations that will occupy conspicuous positions [is] the Philadelphia City Troop" which "has always been recruited since its formation as the 'Philadelphia Light Horse,' Nov. 17, 1774, from the elite of Philadelphia Society."⁹⁹ To further emphasize the Philadelphia Light Horse's urban elite status, the *World* also noted "the troops will bring their own horses" and "wear Continental uniform," again emphasizing the

⁹⁶ According to Robert Reinders, "volunteer militia often reflected class divisions in ante-bellum America. Many units were staffed and ranked almost exclusively by upper-class elements, men who had the affluence, time, and social prestige to devote to 'soldiering.'" Reinders also argues the volunteer units "elected their own commissioned and non-commissioned officers (over-staffed), chose their uniforms (gaudy), and set conditions of entry (selective)." See Reinders, "Militia and Public Order in Nineteenth-Century America " 87.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 81-2, 87.

⁹⁸ "Official Programme Evacuation Day," NYHS.

⁹⁹ "When the City was Freed..." *The New York World*, November 25, 1883, 7.

links between them and the “minutemen” of the American Revolution.¹⁰⁰ In Baltimore, a letter to Mayor Latrobe from one H. Schloss asked if the Alexandria (VA) Light Infantry could participate in the centennial; Schloss remarked that in “speaking to a great many of our members” they made clear “they would like to go and participate in the Centennial of Baltimore.”¹⁰¹

The celebrated Seventh New York Regiment, which marched in all three celebrations, exemplified the close relationship between citizen-soldiers and urban elites. A part of the Union Army during the Civil War, the regiment was directly associated with and made up of urban elites from Manhattan.¹⁰² In the 1880s, the Seventh was a regiment in New York’s National Guard.¹⁰³ While the regiment became famous for its valor during the Civil War, it was also known for its dandiness. In 1861, young merchants, bankers, professional men, and clerks composed the New York Seventh.¹⁰⁴ When they departed New York for Washington D.C. on April 19, 1861, newspapers noted the Seventh carried white kid gloves in their packs so they could dress the part for the victory balls they thought they would attend.¹⁰⁵ The Seventh was also involved in two major New York workers’ demonstrations—the Draft

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ Letter to Mayor Latrobe, from Jacob Grove, June, 22, 1880, Box 1, Folder 5, MS 1097, Sesquicentennial Correspondence, Special Collections, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore.

¹⁰² For more on the Seventh Regiment’s history and ties to urban elites identity see Chelsea Bruner, “The Seventh Regiment Army Commission and Design: Elite Identity, Aesthetic Patronage and Professional Practice in Gilded Age New York” (PhD diss., City University of New York, 2013).

¹⁰³ Cooper, *The Rise of the National Guard*, 44.

¹⁰⁴ Burrows and Wallace, *Gotham*, 868-9.

¹⁰⁵ Adam Goodheart, “Kid Gloves and Bowie Knives,” April 14, 2011, Disunion, New York Times, https://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/04/14/kid-gloves-and-bowie-knives/?_r=0.

Riots in 1863 and the Tompkins Square riot in 1877.¹⁰⁶ It was no coincidence that a regiment known for its associations with elite New Yorkers and helping end the worst riot in the city's history played such a prominent role in all three parades celebrating industrial progress and commercial interests. The Seventh embodied the power urban elites wielded.

The inclusion of these voluntary, citizen-soldiers was also important because the 1880s also saw a renewed interest in honoring and memorializing soldiers across the United States. Localities and states erected monuments honoring the common soldier. The monuments dotted public parks, community greens, cemeteries, and the courtyards of government buildings.¹⁰⁷ As Kirk Savage wrote about monuments dedicated to the common soldier of the Civil War, the “moral imperatives of citizenship came to be inscribed on the bodies of white soldiers,” both sculpted and human, thus “profoundly reshaping the image of the soldier and the nation in the process.”¹⁰⁸ Publishers eagerly printed veterans' memoirs and the public read them vociferously. Northern communities sought out veterans and Grand Army of the Republic members to march in parades commemorating Independence Day and Decoration Day. To be an ideal citizen, and by extension an ideal man, was to serve the interests of the nation rather than one's self.

¹⁰⁶ Czitrom, *New York Exposed*, 60.

¹⁰⁷ For more on Civil War monuments see Sanford Levinson, *Written in Stone: Public Monuments in Changing Societies* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998); Kirk Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War, and Monument in Nineteenth Century America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997); *The Civil War in Art and Memory*, ed. Kirk Savage (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016); John R. Neff, *Honoring the Civil War Dead: Commemoration and the Problem of Reconciliation* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005); Thomas J. Brown, *The Public Art of Civil War Commemoration: A Brief History with Documents* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2004).

¹⁰⁸ Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves*, 19.

Urban elites were keenly aware of the mass appeal soldiers held in this moment and used it to promote their events. Sesquicentennial organizers were clear that the “illumination of the city and pyrotechnic display [was] in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of Baltimore City, and the 99th anniversary of the surrender of Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown.”¹⁰⁹ While the ninety-ninth anniversary of Yorktown did coincide with the first day of the Sesquicentennial celebration, the organizers’ desire to link the two events speaks to their interest in foregrounding soldiers. Yorktown was neither a Maryland event nor are ninety-ninth anniversaries usually celebrated as important temporal markers, and yet the organizers coopted the event’s significance as an American, volunteer army milestone to promote their own local celebration. Evacuation Day organizers similarly foregrounded citizen-soldiers by highlighting the life of John Van Arsdale in the promotion of the event. Souvenir booklets and newspaper articles told Van Arsdale’s story and emphasized that he “volunteered early” for service in the Revolutionary War, “had shown great spirit in the fight, and was among the last to cease firing,” was “honorably discharged” and lived as “an honest and noble-hearted man” who worked for himself as an independent “packet” driver.¹¹⁰ Van Arsdale was, for the purposes of this ceremony, both a citizen-soldier and an independent businessman, thereby wholly embodying elites’ civic manhood. Urban elites’ use of a symbol with such power and influence over the public was strategic and not a coincidence. Citizen-soldiers and symbols associated with them played important roles in urban elites’

¹⁰⁹ “Baltimore City’s 150th Anniversary Programme,” 1880, 975.26 B197Ag. 1880 R.B., Johns Hopkins Special Collections, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, 2.

¹¹⁰ “‘Evacuation Day,’ 1783, with Recollections of Capt. John Van Arsdale. Of the Veteran Corps of Artillery. By James Riker,” E. 239 .R57, Patricia D. Klingenstein Library, New-York Historical Society Museum and Library, New York , 25, 39, 48, 53.

representations of their own power. During celebrations in the 1880s, they used the militias to physically take over the streets.

Parade organizers included veterans from previous American wars in all three parades, creating visual links between *bona fide* soldiers and men whose service was largely social, based on standing, and capital. The combination of U.S. Army veterans and members of voluntary militia units made them part of the same whole. Newspapers and parade programs listed the units under the same heading, allowing the service and popularity of the veterans to bolster other participants', and through them the urban elites', claims for manhood. Militia units reflexively received the glory afforded to veterans while also disavowing the lingering tension between the supposed democracy of militias and their origins with the elite use and dominance of militias in the 1880s. The visual created by the military divisions of parades was of a single army of citizen-soldiers serving the community; that community, however, was one controlled by elites.

The veterans invited to participate in the celebrations by parade organizers were overwhelmingly members of various veterans' associations. The Grand Army of the Republic (the GAR) played a key role in all three celebrations.¹¹¹ New York's Evacuation Day Committee invited representatives from the Society of the Cincinnati,¹¹² the Sons of the Revolution, the Military Order of the Loyal League, and veterans of the War of 1812 and the

¹¹¹ The Grand Army of the Republic was a Union veterans organization, the GAR was a social outlet, a support group, and a political voice for Union veterans across the United States in the 1880s.

¹¹² Founded in controversy, thought of as un-American because would create a type of hereditary aristocracy, The Society of the Cincinnati represented descendants of officers who fought in the American Revolution and was thus a veterans group mainly of elites or those descended from elites.

Mexican-American War.¹¹³ Similarly, Baltimore showed interest in having veterans' groups as prominent features of the parade. The *Baltimore American* wrote on September 28th that,

invitations were sent yesterday to the Society of the Cincinnati, Grand Army of the Republic and the Society of the Army and Navy of the Confederate States—all of them being non-political organizations...The survivors of the war of 1812 and of the Mexican war had been previously invited to take part in the military celebrations.¹¹⁴

The inclusion of Confederate veterans revealed the importance of veterans, regardless of their previous loyalty, to parade organizers. While the veterans would have come from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds, they paraded as symbols of military power and not as members of their respective classes. They also marched in uniform or uniformed clothing. Thus, their military identity and manhood derived from it—patriotic, orderly, self-made through service, and self-possessed—made invisible any identity that would have linked the veterans to class or ethnicity. Despite veterans' inclusion in parades, there were some who still grumbled about parade organization. Under the heading “Indignant Mexican Veterans,” the *New York World* reported veterans of the Mexican-American War believed they had been “insulted” by their placement towards the back of the military division during the Evacuation Day parade.¹¹⁵ Nonetheless, they still paraded ahead of any representatives of the trades.

Labor unions and workingmen showed awareness of their subordination to commercial and monied elites' interests. Workingmen in Baltimore were concerned about their absence from the week's parades. A letter to F.C. Latrobe of Baltimore, who served on

¹¹³ “Celebration of the Evacuation of the City of New-York by the British. Order of Procession.” SY1883 no. 46, Broadside, Patricia D. Klingenstein Library, New-York Historical Society Museum and Library, New York, (hereafter referred to as “Evacuation Day Order of Procession,” NYHS).

¹¹⁴ “Sesquicentennial Scrapbook 1,” MHS, 24.

¹¹⁵ “Indignant Mexican Veterans,” *The New York World*, November 26, 1883, 8.

the Sesquicentennial's organizing committee, from the employees of factories on Camden Street read,

We the undersigned employees in the extensive Factories situated on Camden St. between Howard and Sharp—do respectfully entreat you to use your influence in having one day's procession of the Sesqui-Centennial week, pass our block, it being impossible for us to obtain leave of absence except on that first day. We represent the following Factories: Pacholder + Bauberger, Cigarette Factory employing 350 hands, Elbrise + Sons, Taylor + Co, E. Wise + Son, Steifel + Juhu, Stief Piano Factory.

After three pages of signatures, a note read that “about 1000 more that did not get time to write there [sic.] names” were also in support of changing the parade route.¹¹⁶ The letter ended with the words, underlined in the original, “do not forget us.”¹¹⁷ Absence from the parade—either as participants or spectators—meant anonymity, cultural impotence as a class, and the inability to define the parade's message concerning manhood.

The organization of all three parades garnered significant popular interest, sometimes in ways its organizers did not want or expect. The organizers of Baltimore's Sesquicentennial celebration hoped that Baltimoreans would get involved in its funding, but the city's residents also voiced their opinions regarding its participants, format, and route. Hundreds of people from in and out of Baltimore wrote letters to Baltimore's mayor and president of the organizing committee F.C. Latrobe, Chairman of the Municipal Executive Committee Francis P. Stevens, and Secretary J. Thomas Scharf. These letters ranged from those pleading to be included in the parade, accepting or denying requests to participate, urging the organizers to change the parade route for personal or commercial reasons, to letters

¹¹⁶ Letter to F.C. Latrobe from employees of factories on Camden St., 1880, Box 1, Series 1, M.S. 139, Sesquicentennial of Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Special Collections, Baltimore.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

concerned with the way the celebration included Black Americans.¹¹⁸ One letter from a young boy to “Mr. Mayor” on September 19th, one month before the parade, spoke of his youthful glee about the prospect of participating in the Sesquicentennial parade:

My papa is all the time talking about the centennial procession next month made me write to you to ask you if you would not let us boys join in the procession I know I can get lots of boys of my playmates and other boys to march in the line I want you to let each boy have a tin horn and a flag we will have [~~our~~] own boy band of music and will make has [sic.] much noise as the big men will, I will head the procession mounted on my little horse please let me know what day I can see you about us marching

your Little Friend
11 years of old
Willie K. Hooper
No. 399 Lanvale Street¹¹⁹

Besides showing the sheer excitement of a young boy, Willie Hooper’s letter to “Mr. Mayor” also speaks to conceptions of manhood prevalent in the 1880s. Writing before the parade took place, Willie’s letter shows that the image of men the parade presented would be of upmost attraction and, potentially, influence. If Willie, or any other young boy, saw a part of the Baltimore Sesquicentennial, he would have associated the units marching in the parade with the idea of civic manhood.

Other letters written by members of the public to the Sesquicentennial’s organizing committee spoke directly to the conflict between workingmen and urban elites’ intentions in the parade. A letter written to F.C. Latrobe from “A Citizen” in Baltimore dated September 30 stated, “a citizen desires to say that in looking over the names of the gentlemen appointed as Aids to the Chief Marshal he does not recognize the names of a Mechanic or Workingman

¹¹⁸ See Sesquicentennial of Baltimore, M.S. 139, Box 1, Series 1, Johns Hopkins Special Collections, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.

¹¹⁹ Letter from Willie K. Hooper to “Mr. Mayor,” September 19, 1880, Box 1, Series 1, Johns Hopkins Special Collections, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.

among them” and recommended appointing the “late President of the 6th Ward Democratic Association.”¹²⁰ A letter described by the *Baltimore American* from a J. Luther Kessler to the organizing committee asked, “why no provision is being made for the workingmen to participate in the celebration.” Mr. Kessler stressed,

that as the election is soon to come off, the votes of the workingmen will be wanted, and unless something is done for them they will not be had. He asks that war committees be appointed to enroll workingmen who do not belong to any organization, and to raise money for them to purchase hats and gloves.¹²¹

Kessler’s letter speaks to the urban elites’ awareness of workingmen as a conscious identity group. Therefore, elites’ unwillingness to acknowledge this class identity in the parade speaks to the ways in which elite parade organizers sought to promote their civic manhood and their authority while dismissing competing constructions. While parade organizers more often excluded than included workingmen, when allowed to participate (as in the case of the Baltimore Sesquicentennial), workingmen were represented as employees of a company rather than as a class of men. Kessler and parade organizers were of the same mind—labor organizations in a parade celebrating place would be a dangerous relinquishing of symbolic power.

Newspapers and individuals also reacted to the disregard of workers in order to elevate commercial interests during the opening of the Brooklyn Bridge. Some newspapers wrote angrily about the toll the Trustees planned to put in place on May 25th, the day after the Bridge’s opening in which no labor unions, tradesmen, or workers participated. The “toll of one cent,” which according to the *New York World* was in the interests of “the ferry companies,” “rich corporations” whose “golden hen” a free Brooklyn Bridge threatened. The

¹²⁰ Letter to F. C. Latrobe from “A Citizen” in Baltimore, September 30, 1880, Box 1, Series 1, Johns Hopkins Special Collections, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.

¹²¹ “Sesquicentennial Scrapbook 1,” MHS, 24.

World continued that the toll would hurt the cities' populations, especially those of "the tenement-house population." The *World* ended the article by arguing that, "the working classes of the city do not enjoy many privileges. Let them at least have free schools, free air, free daylight, and a free bridge."¹²² Similarly, a letter written from by "a Citizen Storekeeper" to the editor of the *Brooklyn Eagle* questioned who would be most affected by Brooklyn's Mayor Seth Low's request that "citizen storekeepers" "close their places of business on the 24th inst. in honor of the bridge":

[W]hy tax the storekeepers with the loss of a day's trade? ...[W]hat advantage will it be to the storekeepers, who are the life of the city, and what advantage will it be to the city? ... Why not ask the landlords to rescind one day's rent and thus make the thing more even? Why not ask the gas companies to furnish gas free that day for the people to illuminate with, and as a slight compliment to the people of Brooklyn (who are called upon to do so much for the privilege of being shut off from the bridge by the existence of invitations that measure nearly six by twelve) why not throw the bridge open to all the people for the following month, and thus please those who could but look at the bridge on opening day? It is not the value of the cent, but the principle of the thing which is involved...it is not too late to amend...¹²³

New York's Mayor Franklin Edson similarly recommended Manhattanites observe May 24th as a holiday and suspend business.¹²⁴ For Evacuation Day, Mayor Edson would again urged businesses to close "in order that all the people of the City of New York may participate in the celebration of this Hundredth Anniversary of the culminating event of the Revolution."¹²⁵

¹²² "Let the Bridge Be Free!", *The New York World*, May 16, 1883, 4.

¹²³ "A Storekeeper's Views. To The Editor of the Brooklyn Eagle," Brooklyn, N.Y. Newspaper Cuttings, 1877-86, F128K.3 B766 1858*, Patricia D. Klingenstein Library, New-York Historical Society Museum and Library, New York (hereafter referred to as "Brooklyn N.Y. Newspaper Clippings," NYHS).

¹²⁴ "A Walk Over the Bridge," *The New York World*, May 20, 1883, 2.

¹²⁵ Final Report of the Committee of Arrangements, "Report of the Joint Committee on Evacuation Day," NYHS, 82.

However, the State Legislature did not declare the day a “legal holiday.”¹²⁶ While these celebrations in metropolitan New York and Baltimore had become commercially oriented affairs, the letter from “a Citizen Storekeeper” (and those from citizens and the employees from Camden Street factories in Baltimore) highlighted a central question of these parades’ nature and intention: for whose commercial benefit and boost was the parade truly meant?

¹²⁶ “Second Meeting held Monday, October 15, 1883,” Folder—Evacuation Day Celebration 1883: Arrangements, Minutes of Meetings, Tickets + Receipts, John Austin Stevens Papers, Patricia D. Klingenstein Library, New-York Historical Society Museum and Library, New York.

III: EXECUTING PARADES

The cities—decorated with bunting, flags, and light—were quiet in the hours before the festivity’s start. Citizens expectantly filed into the streets while others sat at their windows to secure the best view. Thousands of men stood on cross streets, waiting to fill their place in line and begin the procession. Organizers had warned them that order, discipline, and a celebratory atmosphere during the procession were paramount. A “permission slip” for participation in the Procession of History and Industry on the first day of Baltimore’s Sesquicentennial celebration issued by the Executive Board required that “every person participating in this Procession, [must] decorate himself with a Badge.”¹²⁷ A printed, yellow card issued by the Head-Quarters Chief Marshall, City Hall for the Procession of History and Industry from H.D. Loney, Chief of Staff, included the following instructions:

When the column moves you will be careful to preserve an interval of ten paces between the rear of the preceding and right of your section; also, to prevent straggling of any of your men from the column upon any pretense whatever, and to obey all orders delivered by the Chief of your Division or his Aids; to prevent all smoking or drinking of spirits or malt liquors, and exhibition of political or obnoxious designs or legends.¹²⁸

The organizers of Evacuation Day set forth similar requirements for parade participants. The Official Programme of the Procession stated, “no delays are to be made in formation,

¹²⁷ Executive Board Permission Slip, Printed Ephemera, BMS5-1, Baltimore City Archives, Baltimore.

¹²⁸ Yellow Card for Procession of History and Industry, Printed Ephemera, BMS5-1, Baltimore City Archives, Baltimore.

awaiting organizations that may be late, such organizations must take positions in the rear of their division—all organizations not military will march eight abreast with interval of three yards between the sections.”¹²⁹ All parade participants, whether they marched as representatives of trades or representatives of law and order, would carry themselves with a military bearing and abide by a behavioral code dictated by the parade’s elite organizers.

The emphasis on commercial interests and order, as well as the civic manhood parade organizers sought to promote, manifested in the line of march. The formation of the Evacuation Day parade, for instance, included, in the following order, government representatives, military units, civic associations and—languishing at the rear—trade associations.¹³⁰ The First Division included local politicians, representatives of historical societies and exchanges, military units, and governors.¹³¹ The exchanges featured in the First Division all represented urban elite, commercial interests and included the Chamber of Commerce, the Marine Society, the Stock Exchange, the Produce Exchange, the Cotton Exchange, the Maritime Association, the Mining and Petroleum Exchange, the Mercantile Exchange, the Metal Exchange, the Board of Trade and Transportation, and the Real Estate and Traders’ Exchange.¹³² This organization placed commerce on equal footing with the government and the military and visually linked them all as integral to the American democratic experiment.

¹²⁹ “Official Programme Evacuation Day,” NYHS.

¹³⁰ “Evacuation Day Order of Procession,” NYHS.

¹³¹ “Official Programme Evacuation Day,” NYHS.

¹³² “Ready for Evacuation day. Programme of the Procession...,” *New York Tribune*, November 24, 1883, 1.

After their initial hesitance, Evacuation Day organizers allowed three workingmen's associations to participate as part of a division devoted to ethnic organizations. The Sixth Division included representatives of the Irish Confederation. These representatives typically came from benevolent societies supporting metropolitan New York's Irish community, but included in their number were members of the Yorkville & Harlem Bakers' Association, Journeymen Stone Cutters' Association, and Journeymen Tailors' Association. Perhaps most surprisingly, the "Young Men's Progressive Association (colored)" also marched as a part of the Irish Confederation. Given the historical and contemporary animosity between Irish and Black New Yorkers, this organizational choice is exceedingly significant.¹³³ That parade organizers forced Irish and "colored" associations to march together emphasized their disregard for workingmen's associations; the organizational decision layered marginalized racial and ethnic identities onto class identity. Parade organizers undermined ethnic and racial groups' claims to manhood, as well as Irish workers' claims to whiteness and its attendant privileges, by placing them all at the end of the line.¹³⁴

Politicians and representatives of industry and commerce not only planned but also took part in the parades as marchers. During the first day's parade in Baltimore, the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad represented itself with hundreds of workers followed by barouches filled with executives and members of the Baltimore and Ohio's Board.¹³⁵ During the Brooklyn Bridge's opening, the Seventh Regiment and mounted police escorted President

¹³³ "Official Programme Evacuation Day," NYHS.

¹³⁴ As Gail Bederman explains, links between whiteness and male power, while not new at the end of the nineteenth-century, were of increasing rhetorical significance beginning in the 1880s-90s. See Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization*, 5, 22.

¹³⁵ "New Baltimore," BCA, 1.

Chester A. Arthur, New York's Governor Cleveland, and other local government officials (all in carriages) down Fifth Avenue to Union Square and then to City Hall before crossing the Bridge on foot. Later that evening during the reception at the Brooklyn Academy of Music, "the mechanic and the man of wealth, the work girl and her mistress, indiscriminately and without prejudice, paid their respects to the chief magistrates [President Arthur, Governor Cleveland, Presidential Cabinet, and Governor's staff] of the Nation and the State."¹³⁶ As part of Evacuation Day, government representatives as well as representatives of historical societies, the aforementioned exchanges, and "other Social, Political, and Historical Clubs and Associations" marched or rode in carriages as part of the parade.¹³⁷

After moneyed elites and politicians came units representing law and order. According to newspapers, the crowds were particularly enthralled when these men passed them. Whether or not the newspapers exaggerated the extent of the crowd's enthusiasm is not as significant as the fact the newspapers' editors and writers believed dedicating significant column space and laudatory language to the parade's police participants would appeal to their readers. Given the spectating crowd would have consisted of men, women, and children from all socio-economic backgrounds, their enthusiasm towards men who represented urban elites' interests is striking.

If the crowd disapproved of the police's contradictory identity, they did not show it. The police received applause from the crowd. During the Evacuation Day parade in Manhattan, the police marched as part of the Fifth Division with volunteer firemen. Some

¹³⁶ "Report of the Special Committee on the Brooklyn Bridge," NYHS, 11.

¹³⁷ "Evacuation Day Order of Procession," NYHS.

police paraded on foot while others were on horses.¹³⁸ The *New York World* wrote, “there were an unusual proportion of ladies among the Union Square spectators, so the passing of the attractive mounted police squad created quite a stir. These and the firemen earned the greater share of the applause.”¹³⁹ Women, the newspapers implied, were particularly drawn to the police; this editorializing augmented the police’s status as men by accentuating their virility. Since the police were tied to urban elites and their interests, this accentuation extended to the manhood of urban elites as well. The most laudatory account of police parading came from the *Baltimore American*. Describing Day Three of the Sesquicentennial celebration, the newspaper wrote:

The battalion of police was a feature of the procession... Their uniforms were pictures of neatness—frock coat, with the single row of buttons; white gloves and [esapatoon]; and the perfect order held among them gave evidence of the fact that they were finely drilled and well officered body of men. The city, therefore, had every reason to feel justly proud of her force as they marched along with measured tread and perfect alignment.¹⁴⁰

The *Baltimore American* portrayed the police department as a civic institution rather than as a tool of urban elites. By describing their physical uniformity and their dignified bearing, the *Baltimore American* inextricably linked them to the military units that dominated parade routes.

The National Guard received similar approval from the crowd. The *Brooklyn Daily Eagle* commented, “no feature of the [Brooklyn Bridge opening] celebration attracted more popular interest and attention than the parade of the military contingent, made up of the

¹³⁸ “Official Programme Evacuation Day,” NYHS.

¹³⁹ “Under Drenching Rain. Modern Patriots Celebrate Evacuation day with Great Ardor...,” *The New York World*, November 27, 1883, 2.

¹⁴⁰ “Sesquicentennial Scrapbook 2,” MHS, 1.

National Guard and attachments from the United States regular forces, representing the army the navy.”¹⁴¹ As part of the Evacuation Day parade, National Guard regiments from New York, Connecticut, and New Jersey marched as part of the Second Division right in front of the independent military organizations.¹⁴² The Maryland National Guard also marched along with the GAR, Baltimore’s Fire and Police Departments, and “visiting military and firemen” as part of the Sesquicentennial week on Wednesday October 13th.¹⁴³

Newspapers dedicated a significant portion of their print space to describing the voluntary militia units that marched in each parade. The *New York World* remarked that the Philadelphia City Troop, participating in Evacuation Day was “composed of the most fashionable young men in the Quaker City” and “came in also for much applause.”¹⁴⁴ The *Baltimore American* highlighted the presence of multiple militia units from Virginia, including the Light Artillery Blues and the City Guards of Norfolk, the Warren Light Infantry of Front Royal, and the Staunton Artillery.¹⁴⁵ The Seventh Regiment Band conducted a “Brilliant Musical Programme” that the *Baltimore Sun* praised for its “proper phrasing and most intelligent shading.”¹⁴⁶ The musical selections included, “splendid transcriptions of Chopin, Meyerbeer’s Fackeitanz, Wagner’s ‘Invocation from Rienzi,’ [and]

¹⁴¹ “Glorification!,” May 24, 1883, “Brooklyn N.Y. Newspaper Clippings,” NYHS.

¹⁴² “Official Programme Evacuation Day,” NYHS.

¹⁴³ Sesqui-Centennial Municipal Committee Pamphlet, PAM 5186, Baltimore Sesquicentennial Souvenirs, Special Collections, Maryland Historical Society.

¹⁴⁴ Press Notices of the Celebration, “Report of the Joint Committee on Evacuation Day,” NYHS, 180.

¹⁴⁵ “Sesquicentennial Scrapbook 2,” MHS, 3.

¹⁴⁶ “Baltimore City’s Anniversary. Second Week of the Celebration,” *The Baltimore Sun*, October 19, 1880, 1.

Rossini's Overture of William Tell."¹⁴⁷ The Seventh Regiment also took a place of honor in both the opening of the Brooklyn Bridge, as already described, and Evacuation Day. During Evacuation Day, the *New York World* noted, "the Seventh regiment aroused the greatest interest and enthusiasm" from the waiting crowd.¹⁴⁸

Each newspaper paid close attention to these units' uniforms, which could be quite lavish. These costume-like uniforms were in stark contrast to the uniforms worn by soldiers in previous military parades.¹⁴⁹ In 1871, the *New York Times* bemoaned that, "the plain uniforms which were so much in vogue among the real soldiers of eight years ago are gradually giving way, and the old gorgeous play-soldier apparel is gradually coming up again."¹⁵⁰ The shift in uniform the *New York Times* reported also marked a shift from use of a draft army back to a volunteer army and local militias. Citizen-soldiers were not economically dependent on military service and could thereby claim their independence through voluntary, military participation and showy uniforms.

The ornate uniforms of the voluntary militias emphasized their elitism and social purpose.¹⁵¹ The *Baltimore American* noted "the uniform of the Light Artillery was especially

¹⁴⁷ "Baltimore City's Anniversary," *The Baltimore Sun*, 1880, 1.

¹⁴⁸ Press Notices of the Celebration, "Report of the Joint Committee on Evacuation Day," NYHS, 180.

¹⁴⁹ In the Grand Review of the victorious Union Army in Washington, D.C. in May 1865, the parading troops marched in the uniforms they had worn in the camps they just departed; these were the uniforms they had worn in battle, presumably, cleaned of dust and mud. (<http://www.nytimes.com/1865/05/24/news/review-armies-propitious-weather-splendid-spectacle-nearly-hundred-thousand.html>). Fourth of July parades in Manhattan in the 1860s saw units marching in full uniform rather than a fancy, ornamented dress uniform. See July Fourth and Decoration Day coverage from the *New York Times*, *New York Tribune*, *New York Herald*, and *The Brooklyn Daily Eagle*.

¹⁵⁰ "THE GLORIOUS FOURTH...Celebrations by the Germans, Colored Men and Societies," *The New York Times*, July 5, 1871, 1.

¹⁵¹ As Stephen Skowronek argues, "the men who spent their recreational hours in the militia at considerable personal expense were either thoroughly committed to the cause, advancing their careers in local politics, or

noticeable: white, or rather cream colored, frock coats, blue breeches, with red stripes, ‘Busby’ hats (half shakos), with crimson side flat, and gilded shield in front, and white plumes.”¹⁵² The City Guard’s uniforms were “tastefully ornamented, and, notably, [included] bearskin shakos of the utmost altitude.”¹⁵³ The Warren Light Infantry’s uniform included “gray, swallow-tailed coats, with admirable trimmings.”¹⁵⁴ Nowhere did the newspapers comment on signs of wear on the uniforms. *The Army and Navy Journal* described the uniforms of the Twenty-Second Regiment of the New York State National Guard during Evacuation Day as creating a “military looking group of men.”¹⁵⁵ It is significant the *Journal* felt the need to clarify this National Guard unit looked the part but were not fully soldiers, presumably because its audience wanted to distance themselves from those who were not a part of the U.S. Army.

The New York Seventh Regiment’s parade uniforms on Evacuation Day were quite striking given how out of place they were. The *New York World* noted the “Seventh Regiment, 480 strong...was ordered out in summer uniform, consisting of white helmet, gray coat, white-straps, white trousers and polished boots. Every one noticed the boots, because they did look so very black at the end of the white ‘unmentionables.’”¹⁵⁶ That the Regiment

both. In any case, they controlled more than their share of votes on election day.” See Stephen Skowronek, *Building a New American State: The Expansion of National Administrative Capacities, 1877-1920* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 95.

¹⁵² “Sesquicentennial Scrapbook 2,” MHS, 3.

¹⁵³ Ibid.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵⁵ Press Notices of the Celebration, “Report of the Joint Committee on Evacuation Day,” NYHS, 164.

¹⁵⁶ “Tied Together. The Great Bridge Officially Delivered to the Public...,” *The New York World*, May 25, 1883, 2.

was ordered to wear their summer uniforms in November further shows that a gentele image was more important than practicality.

Veterans too distinguished themselves with their clothing. While voluntary militia units used uniforms to reassert elite status, veterans could not make such class claims. Unlike the more homogeneous socio-economic background of militia members, veterans had been parts of democratic armies in which men of many socio-economic backgrounds served. This more democratic army experience was particularly true for Civil War veterans, who made up the bulk of veteran parade participants, for they had served in the first draft army in U.S. history. Their uniforms needed to remind the crowds of their civic service despite the fact many of them had served involuntarily. The GAR paraded in ten subdivisions made up of various posts during Evacuation Day. Also present were the Department Commanders of GAR units and their staffs from New York, Maine, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Delaware, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, Maryland, the District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, the Gulf, and Georgia.¹⁵⁷ *The New York Sun* wrote that the GAR “veterans who followed won cordial admiration. Their gray hair, their old uniforms, their torn battle-flags, their order in tramping through the long line of mud into which Broadway had been transformed provoked constant cheering and hand-clapping.”¹⁵⁸ The “old uniforms” of the veterans stood in stark contrast to the new, “tastefully ornamented” uniforms of the militia units. The “old uniforms” served as a reminder of service already rendered to the common good of the nation.

¹⁵⁷ “Official Programme Evacuation Day,” NYHS.

¹⁵⁸ Press Notices of the Celebration, “Report of the Joint Committee on Evacuation Day,” NYHS, 166.

While workingmen were overwhelmingly absent from the parades as visible members of a class, that did not mean their work was likewise absent. In the case of the Brooklyn Bridge's opening, while the men who built the bridge did not march, the Bridge itself reminded spectators that *someone* had constructed it. In Baltimore, businesses used "displays" to advertise their wares.¹⁵⁹ Drawings and descriptions in newspapers and photographs from the day show the displays as similar to a modern-day parade float. These displays, excluding the driver, did not necessarily have people on them. Displays without people were characteristic of the Ninth Division of the parade, which "was devoted exclusively to industrial displays, and comprised, among other, two of Baltimore's leading industries—the oyster and fruit packing trade and the brewers of Baltimore."¹⁶⁰ The *Baltimore American's* description continued by writing that each industry was "fully represented" by a number of "firms," the emphasis placed on the businesses themselves rather than the men whose work ensured the product's availability.¹⁶¹ The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad also chose to include "a team of four oxen" dragging an "antiquated wagon" under "the guidance of an old darkey of pre-historic appearance" as well as "a lean and lank mule, propelled by a negro female."¹⁶² The inclusion of black caricatures, and in particular a black woman, to the Baltimore and Ohio display emasculated its workers. Trade associations, while given the last spot in line, did participate in Evacuation Day and their presence suggested workingmen's importance to New York's past and future.

¹⁵⁹ See Appendix B for list of all industries that participated in the Baltimore Sesquicentennial.

¹⁶⁰ "Sesquicentennial Scrapbook 1," MHS, 68-79.

¹⁶¹ Ibid.

¹⁶² "New Baltimore," BCA, 1.

When workingmen did participate in the parades, their class identity was subsumed by an institutional identity. While organizers and spectators glorified both soldiers and industry alike, the men who marched as members of law and order units or veterans were not actively contesting the system they served. Workingmen, through their labor organizations, were. Thus when workingmen were allowed to march in significant numbers, which happened in Baltimore's Sesquicentennial, they did not march as representatives of their class or the labor movement. Urban elites visually rendered workingmen as cogs in a machine benefitting the city. They, like the law and order units marching in uniform, served the (elite) city residents' interests and not their own. Baltimore's Sesquicentennial organizers emphasized workingmen's status as disciplined employees. The industrial section of Baltimore's Sesquicentennial's Parade of History and Industry was tantamount to a parade of advertisements for Baltimore companies. The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad's display also included "five thousand men" marching in companies and their inclusion was "indeed a credit to that great corporation;" their identity as workingmen was ignored but their identity as employees was celebrated.¹⁶³

Many workingmen participated in the parade as part of a display representing an individual business. Their identity was inextricably linked to their employer and their contract, a key aspect of free labor ideology, rather than their class. They were "employees," dependents rather than independent agents. The Powhatan Cotton Mills display included "three large wagons, each drawn by six horses" that held "male and female employes [sic.], about 50 men and 54 young ladies. The latter looked very nice in their calico dresses and

¹⁶³ "Sesqui-centennial Journal," MHS, 1.

white caps.”¹⁶⁴ Placing male and female employees together on a parade float, like the Baltimore and Ohio’s use of a “negro female” in their display, visually delegitimized the workingmen’s claims to manhood; if women could have their jobs, what made them men? In describing the display of Henry M’Shane & Co. (a bell and brass foundry), the *Baltimore American* wrote, “three hundred and fifty of the employees of the foundry, in sections of one hundred and fifteen each, each section dressed to represent the national colors.”¹⁶⁵ The paper used the same language when describing High Sisson’s & Sons (marble) display that included “one hundred of the employees.”¹⁶⁶ D.H. Junior & L.V. Miller, “the only manufacturers of plug tobacco as a specialty in Baltimore” also used workers in their display to show off their product: “they had a very large wagon, showing a fully equipped tobacco factory in operation, with fifteen colored hands singing at their work.”¹⁶⁷

Putting workingmen in uniforms and having them march as employees rather than members of a class or movement supported urban elites’ twin goals for the Baltimore Sesquicentennial. Workingmen’s visual status as employees rendered their work as service to city and country, thereby supporting urban elites’ commercial goals for the parade. Workingmen’s uniforms and discipline linked them to soldiers, thereby rendering them as members of a bureaucratic institution that functioned by a command structure in which they were subordinates. Relating black and non-black workers together undercut workingmen’s whiteness and, by extension, their claims to manhood. The workers were presented as the

¹⁶⁴ “Baltimore City’s Jubilee,” *The Baltimore Sun*, October 12, 1880, 5-6.

¹⁶⁵ “Sesquicentennial Scrapbook 1,” MHS, 68-79.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

dependents of their employers, and this status obscured any acknowledgement of incipient conceptions of manhood that expanded it beyond elite, white men.

Despite the exclusion of labor from the parades, speeches given during the celebrations remarked upon “the Labor Question” and discussed the opportunities given workingmen and the debt society owed them. Some speeches presented workingmen’s sacrifices in romanticized, military terms. In Brooklyn, Mayor Low’s said in his address at the opening of the Brooklyn Bridge,

Let us recall with kindness at this hour, the work of those who labored here faithfully unto the death, no less than of the great army of men who have wrought, year in and year out, to execute the great design. Let us give our meed [sic.] of praise to-day to the humblest workman who has here done his duty well, no less than to the great engineer who told him what to do.¹⁶⁸

Mayor Low, like the *Baltimore American* on October 16th, emphasized service as the marker of glory and loyalty. However, the comparison between workingmen and the army also emphasized hierarchy, bureaucracy, and listening to one’s superiors without question. Workingmen were part of a finely tuned machine that they were not to challenge.

Other speakers discussed the progress workingmen had seen. Also at the Brooklyn Bridge opening, Congressman and iron manufacturer Abram S. Hewitt devoted a section of his long speech to “The Labor Question.” He rhetorically asked if “the discoveries of science, the triumphs of art and the progress of civilization, which had made its accomplishment a possibility and a reality, [have] promoted the welfare of mankind, and raised the great mass of the people to a higher plane of life?” He brought up the ancient Egyptian pyramids and compared “the compensation of the labor employed in the building of this Bridge with the

¹⁶⁸ Address of Mayor Low, “Report of the Special Committee on the Brooklyn Bridge,” NYHS, 26-7.

earnings of labor upon works of equal magnitude in ages gone by.”¹⁶⁹ After verbally walking his audience through the math he did to get the average daily salary of a Bridge worker, Hewitt said,

Now, if this work had been done at the time when the Pyramids were built, with the skill, appliances and tools then in use, and if the money available for its execution had been limited to nine million (\$9,000,000) dollars, the laborers employed would have received an average of not more than two cents per day, in money of the same purchasing power as the coin of the present era. In other words, the effect of the discoveries of new methods, tools and laws of force, has been to raise the wages of labor more than an hundred fold, in the interval which has elapsed since the Pyramids were built.¹⁷⁰

Industrialization, he affirmed, had not degraded labor or the laborer, but rather improved his status and his pay. Industrialization was progress. If Hewitt’s comparison of workingmen to Egyptian slave laborers was purposeful, it would again deny workingmen’s manhood by linking them to a labor system that, in its American incarnation, was based in race, theories of racial dependency, and the feminization of its workers. Hewitt continued,

I do not underestimate the hardships borne by the labor of our time... But this comparison proved that through forty centuries these hardships have been steadily diminished... It shows that, notwithstanding the apparent growth of great fortunes, due to an era of unparalleled development, the distribution of the fruits of labor is approaching from age to age to more equitable conditions, and must, at last, reach the plane of absolute justice between man and man.¹⁷¹

Conditions were improving and, therefore, workingmen should continue to let them progress without agitation. Hewitt’s conception of “progression” dismissed labor’s arguments about the unequal and exploitive nature of industry. It is noteworthy that Hewitt, a wealthy manufacturer himself, spoke of the “growth of great fortunes” as a natural part of

¹⁶⁹ “Address of Hon. Abram S. Hewitt,” Opening Ceremonies of the New York and Brooklyn Bridge, May 24, 1883, <https://archive.org/stream/openingceremonie00stra#page/50/mode/2up>, 50-1.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 52.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 53.

“development” rather than individual choices concerning working conditions. For Hewitt, these “fortunes” were natural, not desired or accumulated by any particular class. His use of the passive voice served to separate Hewitt, and others of his socio-economic class who employed similar rhetoric, from their wealth as well as contemporary questions over the ways in which he and others generated that wealth.

IV: ALTERNATIVES AND REACTIONS TO PARADES

There were alternatives to parades whose intent were commercial and meant to showcase urban elites' interests and assertions of civic manhood. According to historian Sean Wilentz, workers in the United States historically paraded and processed to exhibit their pride or protest.¹⁷² By the 1870s and 1880s, parading was a form of identity expression for many groups and organizations. Ethnic groups, particularly the Irish in metropolitan New York, used parading to celebrate their cultural and religious identities.¹⁷³ Black Americans across the North and South paraded in their celebrations of community and readily employed the rhetoric and displays of manhood in their processions.¹⁷⁴ Labor unions too paraded as a means to advocate for their causes and members. The Central Labor Union (CLU) of New York, Brooklyn, and New Jersey, which was formed in January 1882 and consisted of a group of a dozen or so core unions, was an organization that planned workingmen's parades.¹⁷⁵ The CLU included craftsmen, skilled, and unskilled workers.¹⁷⁶ The CLU

¹⁷² Sean Wilentz, *Chants Democratic: New York and Rise of the Working Class, 1788-1850* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004). 372.

¹⁷³ Mary Ryan argues, "by 1876, then, the American parade had apparently become an ethnic festival" but "ethnicity had begun to erode the public and inclusive character of parading" as well before 1876. (Ryan, "The American Parade: Representations of the Nineteenth-Century Social Order " 145.)

¹⁷⁴ See "Pageants of American Racial Democracy: Rituals of Civil Society" in Alessandra Lorini, *Rituals of Race: American Public Culture and the Search for Racial Democracy* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1999).

¹⁷⁵ By 1884, thirty-six separate unions were affiliated with the CLU (Burrows and Wallace, *Gotham*, 1091.)

organized the United States' first Labor Day parade on September 5, 1882. Held in Manhattan, the day incorporated the traditions of artisanal festivals and parades common earlier in the century. Roughly twenty thousand workers, predominantly male, marched in "regalia" carrying banners from City Hall to Union Square, passed a reviewing stand full of "labor dignitaries" and then adjourned to a picnic uptown.¹⁷⁷ Mimicking military parades, workingmen physically took over the streets and proclaimed to their manhood by portraying independent identities separate from their bosses. Workingmen, like monied elites, used parades to advance their cause. Workingmen across a multitude of industries and trades marched or otherwise agitated in support of an eight-hour workday in metropolitan New York in 1850, 1865-1868, 1872, and 1882.¹⁷⁸

Another prominent labor organization of the era, the Knights of Labor (KOL) was also absent from the urban elite-mounted parades.¹⁷⁹ Many KOL members were also members of the CLU.¹⁸⁰ The KOL had a robust parading culture during this same period.¹⁸¹ In June 1885, the Baltimore Knights of District Assembly 41 marched in Baltimore where, at

¹⁷⁶ Among the CLU's demands was an "eight-hour work day, an end to child labor, equal pay for equal work, government-(not bank) issued currency, the abolition of tramp laws, and, quite grandly, an end to 'all class privileges.'" See Burrows and Wallace, *Gotham*, 1091.

¹⁷⁷ Burrows and Wallace, *Gotham*, 1091-2.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 771, 987-8, 89, 1012-13, 98.

¹⁷⁹ Created as a "secret society by Philadelphia garment workers," the Knights of Labor became the first mass membership labor organization; at its peak in 1886, it had 750,000 members. Focusing on the republican prodecerism espoused by Jefferson's idea of the yeoman farmer, the Knights of Labor were open to women and Black Americans but less inviting to immigrant populations. See Kimmel, *Manhood in America*, 73-4.

¹⁸⁰ Burrows and Wallace, *Gotham*, 1091

¹⁸¹ Robert E. Weir, *Beyond Labor's Veil*, 308-9.

the procession's end, speeches attacked the city's capitalists.¹⁸² Over 600 marchers—including men from the KOL, Brotherhood of Carpenters, Monumental Assembly (shoemakers), and numerous other trade unions—participated.¹⁸³ Only five years after the Sesquicentennial, which praised labor without recognizing the laborer, the KOL's June march critiqued the conscious choice the Baltimore Sesquicentennial's elite organizers made to ignore alternatives to their definition of civic manhood and claims to power.

The conflict between urban elites and labor over the purpose and form of these celebrations is also evident from the records on the opening of the Brooklyn Bridge. In planning this ceremony, there was a back and forth between Bridge Trustees, the celebration's organizers and the CLU. The CLU was unhappy with the date of the Brooklyn Bridge's opening because it coincided with Queen Victoria of Great Britain's birthday. The *New York Times* reported,

Messrs. William McCabe, J.B. Ferguson, and William W. Cowen, representing the [CLU] of New-York and Brooklyn, protested against the bridge being opened upon May 24, that being the Queen's birthday. They also demanded the laboring men of the two cities be represented at the opening ceremonies. They argued that the opening of the bridge on the Queen's birthday would be a concession to a growing snobbishness in this country and an insult to American working men.¹⁸⁴

In response to the CLU's requests for a date change, William C. Kingsley (the President of the Board of Trustees of the Brooklyn Bridge) reportedly "did not hold out any hopes that the date of opening would be changed."¹⁸⁵ "Mr. Stranahan," another member of the Board,

¹⁸² Ibid., 305.

¹⁸³ Ibid., 305-6.

¹⁸⁴ "The Opening of the Bridge. City Authorities and Others Conferring With the Bridge Trustees," *The New York Times*, May 4, 1883, 8.

¹⁸⁵ "The Opening of the Bridge." *New York Times*, May 4, 1883, 8.

“added that delegates from the labor unions would be welcomed at the opening ceremonies and be treated with as much attention as any men in the land.”¹⁸⁶ As the Trustees held out no hope for a date change, the CLU “issue[d] a proclamation calling on workingmen to keep away from the Bridge on Thursday, and agreeing to have a procession of all the trade unions in New-York and Brooklyn on the Fourth of July and formally open the Bridge.”¹⁸⁷ The motion also included a request that “authorities...allow the working men to cross the bridge that day without paying the toll.”¹⁸⁸ For the CLU, the opening of an engineering marvel made possible by the labor, and death, of hundreds of workingmen on a date that celebrated a monarch revealed the true intent of the urban elites’ parade—the Brooklyn Bridge’s opening was never intended to be a people’s celebration. While metropolitan New York’s workingmen objected, the GAR acted. The veterans organization, which was increasingly political, quickly secured patronage jobs for “thirteen war veterans as toll collectors, watchmen, brakemen and laborers” from the Bridge’s Board of Trustees.¹⁸⁹

While the Brooklyn Bridge’s Board of Trustees expressed willingness to have labor unions participate in the Bridge’s opening, their actions revealed a different attitude towards them. A *Brooklyn Daily Eagle* article discussing “slnngshots” (most likely a mistype of “slingshots”) found by police the day before the Brooklyn Bridge’s opening in 1883 stated, “it is feared that [agitators from the Labor League] may get up some sort of hostile

¹⁸⁶ Ibid.

¹⁸⁷ “Preparing for the Opening,” *New York Tribune*, May 21, 1883, 2.

¹⁸⁸ “Still Harping Upon The Bridge. Wrathful Working Men and ‘Sons of Liberty’ Ventilate Their Views,” *The New York Times*, May 21, 1883, 12.

¹⁸⁹ “The Bridge Opening. A Card from Mayor Low...” May, 19, 1883, “Brooklyn N.Y. Newspaper Clippings,” NYHS.

demonstration; but the men who are the leaders are being closely watched by detectives in citizens' clothing, and if they start any demonstration they will be quickly silenced in a forcible manner."¹⁹⁰ The *New York Times* gave no indication as to why the detectives pinned the slingshots on labor leaders or why surveillance was necessary. What it does show is the perceived threat of violence initiated by labor unions loomed in the minds of the city's urban elites during the 1880s. Urban elites used the power of the police at their disposal to make sure the rejection from the CLU did not turn into action.

Some New Yorkers reacted to the Bridge's Trustees and opening's organizing committee with threats. When the Bridge Trustees refused to change the date of the bridge opening from Queen Victoria's birthday, the *New York Tribune* wrote,

The great question in every mind is Shall [the bridge] be used to win the good will of our Irish fellow-citizens who have kindly abandoned their native land to take charge of this, or shall it be made the instrument of running a very large sized garden roller over their finer feelings and so outraging them and oppressing them and grinding them down that they will feel compelled by a sense of personal honor and their own self-respect to blow up the whole wretched affair with dynamite? That is the present aspect of the bridge question... it would give offense to a class of patriots who bear absolute sway in these two cities, and who are uncommonly sensitive to insults. They will blow up the bridge—no one can tell what they won't blow up—if this thing is persisted in.¹⁹¹

The *New York World* had similar commentary after one of its writers observed a meeting of about "thirty men and boys" in "a room over a beer soloon [sic.] in Second avenue" on May 20th. The *New York World* reported "an old man named Gallagher, who said he had fought and bled for his country" (without specifying if this meant Ireland or the United States) "complained that he had been stigmatized as wanting to blow up the bridge by a morning

¹⁹⁰ "Glorification! The Two Cities Celebrate the Work that Makes them One," May 24, 1883, "Brooklyn, N.Y. Newspaper Clippings," NYHS.

¹⁹¹ "Change the Date," *New York Tribune*, May 15, 1883, 6.

newspaper. ‘I would not destroy public property...but it’s none of my business if somebody else blows the trustees off the bridge.’¹⁹²

Newspapers understood and editorialized on alternatives to the exclusive, monied elite dominated, and conservative nature of these parades. The *New York World* was the most vociferous in its attacks on the advancement of urban elites’ interests during Evacuation Day. Under the heading “The Lesson of To-Day,” the *New York World* wrote,

Are not too many of our money kings to-day yearning for the shoddy aristocracy which strikes to ape the aristocracy of birth? Do not some mushroom millionaires make themselves ridiculous and scandalize true republicanism by the affectation of European flummeries? Does not the secret and pernicious power of our privileged classes and corporate monopolies corrupt our legislatures, debauch our judiciary and own mortgages on our Presidents?¹⁹³

The next day, November 27th, the *New York World* continued its editorializing under the heading “Liberty Begging,” writing:

What a humiliation is this to the great Republic and the great city which claims the leadership of all the cities of the world in population, wealth, commerce, beauty and ‘manifest destiny!’ Above all, what a stigma on the Money Worshipers of New York, who make a grand parade of their wealth, who ape the vices without the virtues of a foreign aristocracy, and who flaunt their riches in the faces of people who know that they are too often the proceeds of dishonor and dishonesty!¹⁹⁴

To the *World*, Evacuation Day was a superfluous showcase of wealth, merely an occasion for metropolitan New York’s urban elites to flaunt their power and affluence.

¹⁹² “Sunday on the Bridge. Meeting to Protest Against Opening on the Queen’s Birthday. Clergymen Using it to Point Morale in Regard to Right Living,” *The New York World*, May 21, 1883, 2.

¹⁹³ “The Lesson of To-Day,” *The New York World*, November 26, 1883, 4.

¹⁹⁴ “Liberty Begging,” *The New York World*, November 27, 1883, 4.

V: CONCLUSION

The Baltimore Sesquicentennial celebration in October 1880, the opening of the Brooklyn Bridge in May 1883, and the centennial celebration of Evacuation Day in November 1883 were exclusive affairs that showcased a restricted definition of manhood proffered by and benefitting urban elites. Per the instructions given them by each parade's organizing committee, the parade's participants collectively represented independence, gentility, volunteerism, discipline, and respect for authority. In particular, they had to demonstrate a respect for urban elites' authority as the organizers and main financiers of the celebrations. Politicians, commercial entities, and law and order representatives all inherently represented and protected urban elites' interests and were thus prominent elements of all three parades. Veterans, who the public glorified and esteemed, added to urban elites' imposition of civic manhood and claims to authority. Their service to and sacrifice for country made them ideal men and their popularity made the image of veterans influential and didactic for the next generation.

The exclusive and highly militarized nature of these celebrations was not inherent to parade form. Parade organizers could have chosen a much more inclusive format and list of participants. The celebration of Evacuation Day did not inherently warrant a celebration of industrial acumen, commercial interests, or engineering feats, as Baltimore's Sesquicentennial or the Brooklyn Bridge's opening parade did. It was a celebration of a historic moment, the founding of the United States and its democracy, and thus had the

potential to be inclusive. The opening of the Brooklyn Bridge could have easily included all the workingmen who participated in its construction, but instead organizers had urban elites speak on the “Labor Question.” The Baltimore Sesquicentennial’s organizers included workingmen in the first day’s parade of History and Industry because the procession was meant to prove Baltimore’s industrial prowess and bolster the city’s industrialist’s claims to equal prominence with metropolitan New York. The parade’s celebration of Baltimore’s industrial and commercial profitability would likely have fallen flat in the public eye had no workingmen been included.

These three events were important for staging urban elites’ definition of manhood because of their civic nature. Urban elites did not choose to mount exclusively military parades to stage their vision of manhood because they would exclude commerce and industry. Since the ballot no longer measured manhood by the 1880s, parades around electoral politics would also have inherently been more inclusive and thus imperfect events to stage civic manhood. As these three civic parades celebrated both place and epoch, they were the best events through which urban elites could establish their civic manhood—one based on free labor ideology and voluntary civic engagement and also glorified participation in the marketplace—as the ideal form of manhood. These events were purportedly inclusive, people’s celebrations. Staging civic manhood in this setting therefore not only reached a wide audience but also allowed urban elites to say their parade—and its intent, goals, and presentation—reflected the people, their understandings, their desires, and their conceptions of manhood. The consequences of the parades’ exclusivity, elitism, and presentation of a restricted, conservative definition of manhood negated the ambiguities that characterized manhood in the United States in the 1880s. It undermined those challenging the exclusive,

and overwhelmingly unattainable, civic manhood and bolstered the authority of those who defined and claimed to embody its ideals.

The impulse to perform and codify civic manhood into something tangible and visual rather than an abstraction reveals the shaky ground on which conceptions of manhood stood in the 1880s. The impulse to mount and participate in these large-scale parades also reveals the anxieties multiple classes, ethnic groups, and races had about their claims to and holds on power in urban space. Laying claim to and defining manhood meant securing its associated rights and privileges in a world where being white and being a man were the only ways to exert power. The search to reaffirm order in nineteenth-century cities after the Civil War required a translation of manhood into choreographed elements that were to be performed in public space.

APPENDIX A: CIRCULATION NUMBERS FOR NEWSPAPERS CITED

1882 Circulation Numbers for Newspapers Cited

Taken from *Geo. P. Rowell & Co's American Newspaper Directory, Containing Accurate Lists of All the Newspapers in the United States, Territories and the Domain of Canada, Together with a Description of the Towns and Cities in which they are Published. Fourteenth Annual Edition. New York: Geo. P. Rowell & Co., Publishers, 1882.*

Notes from Source:

- “The population is from census of 1880, or from recent estimates by resident publishers or postmasters.” (8)
- “From Publishers of Newspapers who furnish information upon which the report of circulation may be based, *a memorandum is asked of the actual issues for each number of the paper for the preceding three months.* Each publisher sending such a report is desired to make it as definite and exact, as to dates and figures, as he would wish to require from a rival publishers,—were a comparison, based upon the two reports, to be instituted between the two papers.” (8)

Baltimore—listed at population 332,190 in 1882 (pg. 152)

- Baltimore American and Commercial Advertiser—daily and weekly, and Saturdays as *The American*, four pages, subscription, no party affiliation listed established daily 1773, weekly 1850, edited/published by Chas. C. Fulton and managed by Felix Agnus
 - Daily, Sunday, and Weekly—circulation not exceeding 15,000
- Sun—daily except Sunday and weekly, independent, subscription, established daily 1837 and weekly 1838, A.S. Abell & Co. editors and publishers,
 - Daily—circulation between 25,000-50,000
 - Weekly—between 10,000-15,000

Brooklyn—listed at population of 566,689 in 1882 (pg. 248)

- Brooklyn Eagle—democratic, four pages, subscription, daily, established 1840
 - Daily—circulation between 20,000-25,000 (pg. 249)
 - Sunday does not exceed 10,000 subscribers (pg. 249)

New York—listed at population 206,590 in 1882 (pg. 265)

- Times (266)—daily, semi-weekly, and weekly, republican, 8 pages, subscription, established 1851
 - Daily—circulation between 25,000-50,000
 - Sunday—circulation between 50,000-100,000
 - Semi-weekly—circulation between 5,000-10,000
 - Weekly—circulation exceeding 100,000
- Tribune (266)—daily, semi-weekly, and weekly, independent, 8 pages for daily, 16 pages for weekly/semi-weekly, subscription, Editor Whitelaw Reid, established 1841
 - Daily—circulation between 25,000-50,000
 - Semi-weekly—circulation between 5,000-10,000
 - Weekly—circulation exceeds 100,000

- World (266)—daily, semi-weekly, and weekly, democratic, 8 pages, subscription, established 1860
 - Daily—circulation not exceeding 15,000
 - Semi-weekly—circulation between 5,000-10,000
 - Weekly—circulation between 50,000-100,000

1887 Circulation Numbers for Papers Cited

Taken from *American Newspaper Directory, Containing Accurate Lists of All the Newspapers and Periodicals Published in the United States, Territories, Dominion of Canada and Newfoundland, Together with a Description of the Towns and Cities in which they are Published. Nineteenth Year. New York. Geo. P. Rowell & Company, 1887.*

Baltimore—population listed at 425,000 in 1887 (292)

- American (assuming this is the former *American and Commercial Advertiser*)—daily and weekly, daily 4 pages, Saturday/Sunday 8 pages, subscription, daily established 1773, weekly 1850, Chas. C. Fulton & Co. publishers
 - Daily—circulation between 22,500 and 25,000
 - Sunday—circulation between 37,500-50,000
 - Weekly—circulation between 22,500-25,000
- Sun—daily except Sunday and weekly, independent, 4 pages, subscription, established daily 1837 and weekly 1838, A. S. Abell & Co. publishers and editors
 - Daily—circulation between 25,000-37,500
 - Weekly—circulation between 10,000-12,500

Brooklyn—population listed at 750,000 in 1887 (441)

- Eagle (442)—daily except Sunday, one published Sunday, democratic, daily is 6 pages, Sunday is 16 pages, subscription, established 1840
 - Daily—circulation between 20,000-22,500
 - Sunday—circulation between 10,000-12,500

New York—population listed at 1,206,590 in 1887 (463)

- Times (464)—daily, semi-weekly, weekly, independent-republican, daily/semi-weekly/weekly are 8 pages, subscription, established 1851
 - Daily—circulation between 37,500-50,000
 - Semi-weekly—circulation between 4,000-5,000
 - Sundays—circulation between 50,000-75,000
 - Weekly—circulation between 25,000-37,500
- Tribune (464)—daily, semi-weekly, and weekly, republican, daily is 8 pages, semi-weekly/weekly are 16 pages, Whitelaw Reid editor, established 1841
 - Daily—circulation between 37,500-50,000
 - Semi-weekly—circulation between 17,500-20,000
 - Weekly—circulation between 75,000-100,000
 - Sunday—circulation between 50,000-75,000
- World (465)—daily, semi-weekly, and weekly, democratic, 8 pages, Sundays 24 pages, subscription, Joseph Pulitzer editor and publisher, established 1860
 - Daily—circulation exceeding 150,000

- Semi-weekly—circulation between 4,000-5,000
- Weekly—circulation between 50,000-75,000
- Sunday—circulation exceeding 150,000

APPENDIX B: LIST OF INDUSTRIES

The following is a list of all industries that were included in the Procession of History and Industry of the Baltimore Sesquicentennial on Monday, October 11, 1880. Those listed below are types of industries rather than specific businesses. Some of the industries below had more representatives, either individuals or businesses, than others. The individuals who represented each industry may have been workers, bosses, or owners. Some of the industries listed below only had displays rather than representatives.

Taken from “Celebration of the 150th Anniversary of the Founding of Baltimore—
Programme of the Procession of History and Industry (Monday, October 11th, 1880),” Box 2,
MS 1097, Maryland Sesquicentennial Scrapbooks, 1880, Special Collections, Maryland
Historical Society, Baltimore.

- German Singing Societies
- Benevolent Societies (Including some for workers, hospitals, sick relief)
- Flour and feed
- Grocers
- Salt
- Tea
- Patent top manuf.
- Basket and willow ware
- Saw and planing mills
- Furniture manufacturers
- Musical instruments
- Picture frames
- Rustic work
- Barrel makers
- Box factories
- Billiards
- Turners
- Post office
- Schools
- Printers
- Lithographer
- Stationers
- Music dealer
- Bookbinders
- Paperhangers
- Fancy paper
- Goldbeaters
- Plated ware
- Straw goods
- Kid gloves and hair
- Dry goods
- Hosiery
- Hatters
- Gents' furnishing
- Shirts
- Carpets
- Tailors and clothiers
- Shrinkers
- Umbrellas
- Ruffling
- Dyer
- Cotton mills
- Paper-boxes and paper
- Butchers
- Leather
- Pork packers
- Hair factories
- Brushes
- Upholsters
- Lime, hair, and cement
- Paints and oils
- Varnish
- Gutta percha
- Glass
- Soap
- Laundry
- Street lamps
- Oyster and Fruit Packers (LARGE)
- Cider
- Canmakers
- Tin ware
- Water coolers
- Leadwork
- Artificial limbs
- Brewers of Baltimore (LARGE)
- Weiss beer
- Coppersmiths
- Coopers
- Well-diggers
- Mineral water
- Beer bottlers
- Refrigerators
- Liquors
- Dairies
- Ice cream

- Drugs
- Barbers
- Real estate
- Railways
- Blacksmiths
- Iron foundries
- Hardware
- Edge tools
- Lightning rods
- Gas generators
- Machinists
- Boiler makers
- Safe and iron works
- Stoves
- Fire brick
- Galvanized iron
- Diver and stevedore
- Shipsmith
- Elevator
- Steel and iron
- Mantel works
- Marble
- Roofer
- Granite workers
- Agricultural implements
- Acids and fertilizers
- Bell founders
- Theatres
- Ice exchange
- Powder
- Axle grease cheese
- Coal and wood
- Horses
- Hay dealers
- Veterinary surgery
- Coal oil and lamps
- Stoves
- Undertakers
- Paste
- Insect power
- Junk business
- City sprinkler

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Published

Geo. P. Rowell and Co.'s American newspaper directory. New York: Geo. P. Rowell & Co., 1882.

Geo. P. Rowell and Co.'s American newspaper directory. New York: Geo. P. Rowell & Co., 1887.

Newspapers

The Baltimore American and Commercial Advertiser

The Baltimore Sun

The Brooklyn Daily Eagle

The New York Times

The New York Tribune

The New York World

Manuscript Collections

Baltimore Sesquicentennial Celebration Records, Baltimore City Archives, Baltimore.

Brooklyn, N.Y. Newspaper Cuttings, 1877-86, F128K.3 B766 1858*, Patricia D. Klingenstein Library, New-York Historical Society Museum and Library, New York.

Maryland Sesquicentennial Scrapbooks, Special Collections, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore.

“Official Programme of the Procession,” F128 E. 239.B841 1883, Patricia D. Klingenstein Library, New-York Historical Society Museum and Library, New York.

Printed Ephemera, BMS5-1, Baltimore City Archives, Baltimore.

“Report of the Joint Committee on the Centennial Celebration of the Evacuation of New York by the British. Monday, November 26, 1883. With an Historical Introduction by John Austin Stevens, Evacuation of New York by the British, 1773-1883”, XS F128 .47 .J56 1885, Patricia D. Klingenstein Library, New-York Historical Society Museum and Library, New York.

“Report of the Special Committee of the Common Council of the City of Brooklyn Upon the Celebration of the Opening of the New York and Brooklyn Bridge, 1883,” F128 .617. B7 B5, Patricia D. Klingenstein Library, New-York Historical Society Museum and Library, New York.

Sesquicentennial of Baltimore, M.S. 139, Box 1, Series 1, Johns Hopkins Special Collections, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.

“The Sesqui-Centennial,” *Sesqui-centennial Journal*, October 11, 1880, BMS5-1, Baltimore City Archives, Baltimore.

Online Sources

“Address of Hon. Abram S. Hewitt.” Opening Ceremonies of the New York and Brooklyn Bridge, May 24, 1883.
<https://archive.org/stream/openingceremonie00stra#page/50/mode/2up>, 50-1.

Webster, Noah. *An American dictionary of the English Language; containing the whole vocabulary of the first edition in two volumes quarto; the entire corrections and improvements of the second edition in two volumes royal octavo; to which is prefixed an introductory dissertation on the origin, history, and connection, of the languages of western Asia and Europe, with an explanation of the principles on which languages are formed. By Noah Webster...Rev. and enl., by Chauncey A. Goodrich...with pronouncing vocabularies of Scripture, classical, and geographical names.* Springfield, MA: G. and C. Merriam, 1854.
<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=nnc2.ark:/13960/t6ww9t108;view=1up;seq=784;size=150>.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. “Table 11. Population of the 100 Largest Urban Places: 1880.”
<https://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0027/tab11.txt>

Secondary Sources

Published

"1866 to 1899--Heading Towards Modernity, the History of Baltimore."
<https://planning.baltimorecity.gov/sites/default/files/History%20of%20Baltimore.pdf>.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, revised edition. New York, Verso Books, 2006.

Beckert, Sven. *The Monied Metropolis: New York City and the Consolidation of the American Bourgeoisie, 1850-1896*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Bederman, Gail. *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Blight, David. *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001.

———. *Beyond the Battlefield: Race, Memory, & the American Civil War*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002.

Brown, Thomas J. *The Public Art of Civil War Commemoration: A Brief History with Documents*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2004.

Brundage, W. Fitzhugh. *The Southern Past: A Clash of Race and Memory*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008.

de Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011.

Clark, Kathleen. *Defining Moments: African American Commemoration & Political Culture in the South, 1863-1913*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005.

Cohen, Nancy. *The Reconstruction of American Liberalism, 1865-1914*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

Cooper, Jerry. *The Rise of the National Guard: The Evolution of the American Militia, 1865-1920*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.

Czitrom, Daniel. *New York Exposed: The Gilded Age Police Scandal That Launches the Progressive Era*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Davies, Wallace Evans. *Patriotism on Parade: The Story of Veterans' and Hereditary Organizations in America, 1783-1900*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955.

Davis, Susan G. *Parades and Power: Street Theatre in Nineteenth-Century Philadelphia*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986.

Fink, Leon. *The Long Gilded Age: American Capitalism and the Lessons of a New World*. Order Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015.

Forbath, William E. "The Ambiguities of Free Labor: Labor and the Law in the Gilded Age." *Wisconsin Law Review* (1985).

Fries, Sylvia Doughty. *The Urban Ideal in Colonial America*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1977.

Gannon, Barbara A. *The Won Cause: Black and White Comradeship in the Grand Army of the Republic*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2011.

Goodheart, Adam. "Kid Gloves and Bowie Knives." April 14, 2011. Disunion. New York Times. https://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/04/14/kid-gloves-and-bowie-knives/?_r=0.

- Greenberg, Amy S. "Pirates, Patriots, and Public Meetings: Antebellum Expansionism and Urban Culture." *Journal of Urban History* 31, no. 5 (July 2005). DOI: 10.1177/0096144205275570.
- Gutman, Herbert G. *Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America: Essays in American Working-Class and Social History*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1976.
- Harring, Sidney L. *Policing a Class Society: The Experiences of American Cities, 1865-1915*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1983.
- Hobsbawm, Eric and Terence Ranger. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Irvin, Benjamin H. *Clothed in Robes of Sovereignty: The Continental Congress and the People Out of Doors*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Janney, Caroline E. *Remembering the Civil War: Reunion and the Limits of Reconciliation*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2013.
- Jordan, Brian Matthew. *Marching Home: Union Veterans and Their Unending Civil War*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2014.
- Kachun, Mitchell A. *Festivals of Freedom: Memory and Meaning in African American Emancipation Celebrations, 1808-1915*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003.
- Kimmel, Michael S. *Manhood in America: A Cultural History*. Second ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Larkin, Brian. "The Politics and Poetics of Infrastructure." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 42 (2013): 327-343.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Urban Revolution*. Translated by Robert Bononno. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.
- Levinson, Sanford, *Written in Stone: Public Monuments in Changing Societies*. Durham: Duke University Press. 1998.
- Logue, Larry M. *To Appomattox and Beyond: The Civil War Soldier in War and Peace*. Chicago: I.R. Dee, 1996.
- Lorini, Alessandra. *Rituals of Race: American Public Culture and the Search for Racial Democracy*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1999.
- Marten, James. *Sing Not War: The Lives of Union and Confederate Veterans in Gilded Age America*. Chapel Hill: University of Chapel Hill Press, 2014.

- “Not A Veteran in the Poorhouse: Civil War Pensions and Soldiers’ Homes” in *Wars within a War: Controversy and Conflict Over the American Civil War*, edited Gary Gallagher and Joan Waugh. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009.
- McConnell, Stuart. *Glorious Contentment: The Grand Army of the Republic, 1865-1900*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992.
- Merrifield, Andy. *The New Urban Question*. London: Pluto Press, 2014.
- Minchin, Timothy J. “Together We Shall Be Heard: Exploring the 1981 ‘Solidarity Day’ Mass March.” *Labor* 12, no. 3 (2015): 75-96.
- Montgomery, David. *The Fall of the House of Labor: The Workplace, the State, and American Labor Activism, 1865-1925*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Neff, John R. *Honoring the Civil War Dead: Commemoration and the Problem of Reconciliation*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005.
- O’Leary, Cecilia Elizabeth. *To Die For: The Paradox of American Patriotism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Quigley, David. *Second Founding: New York City, Reconstruction and the Making of American Democracy*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2004.
- Reinders, Robert. "Militia and Public Order in Nineteenth-Century America ". *Journal of American Studies* 11, no. 1 (Apr., 1977): 81-101.
- Richardson, James F. *The New York Police: Colonial Times to 1901*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Ross, Steven J. and Michael Kazin. “America’s Labor Day: The Dilemma of a Workers’ Celebration.” *The Journal of American History* 78, no. 4 (Mar 1992): 1294-1323.
- Rotundo, E. Anthony. *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era*. New York: Basic Books, 1993.
- Ryan, Mary P. "The American Parade: Representations of the Nineteenth-Century Social Order." In *The New Cultural History*, edited by Lynn Hunt. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
- *Civic Wars: Democracy and Public Life in the American City During the Nineteenth Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Savage, Kirk. *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War, and Monument in Nineteenth Century America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- *The Civil War in Art and Memory*, edited by Kirk Savage. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016.

- Severo, Richard and Lewis Milford. *The Wages of War: When American Soldiers Came Home—From Valley Forge to Vietnam*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1989.
- Skowronek, Stephen. *Building a New American State: The Expansion of National Administrative Capacities, 1877-1920*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Snyder, Claire R. *Citizen-Soldiers and Manly Warriors: Military Service and Gender in the Civic Republican Tradition*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1999.
- Waldstreicher, David. *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism, 1776-1820*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- Wallace, Mike and Edwin G. Burrows. *Gotham: A History of New York City to 1898*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Weir, Robert E. *Beyond Labor's Veil: The Culture of the Knights of Labor*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996.
- White, Shane. "'It Was a Proud Day': African Americas, Festivals, and Parades in the North, 1741-1834." *The Journal of American History* 81 (June 1994): 13-50.
- Wilentz, Sean. *Chants Democratic: New York and Rise of the Working Class, 1788-1850*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Online

- Mintz, S., & McNeil, S. (2016). "The Great Railroad Strike." *Digital History*. Retrieved 2017 from http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/dispatch_textbook.cfm?smtid=2&psid=3189.

Dissertations

- Bruner, Chelsea. "The Seventh Regiment Army Commission and Design: Elite Identity, Aesthetic Patronage and Professional Practice in Gilded Age New York." PhD diss., City University of New York, 2013.