Hitting the Trail

Live Displays of Native American, Filipino, and Japanese People at the Portland World’s Fair

TODAY THE GUILD’S LAKE AREA of Northwest Portland is an industrial district, the lake itself long ago filled with gravel. Yet just over a hundred years ago, a collection of amusement concessions occupied the lake’s shores and presented visitors from the city and beyond with an opportunity to participate in active lessons about the nation’s westward expansion. Primarily racial in content, these lessons were disseminated through a number of live-display concessions that featured performances from various groups considered to be non-white. After the concessions closed and the site began its physical transformation, visitors continued to exercise the skills of racial assessment that they had rehearsed during their time by the lake. This practice of racial interpretation allowed individuals and groups to rank both foreign and domestic non-white peoples on a hierarchical scale of progress and civilization, thereby affecting popular understandings of expansion and exclusion.

Between June 1 and October 15, 1905, over one and a half million visits were paid to the Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition in Portland, Oregon. Strolling from the main exposition palaces to the large U.S. Government Building on a peninsula in Guild’s Lake, most visitors passed through the fair’s amusement concession strip, known as the Trail in homage to the explorers in whose names the city celebrated. Along the colorful and at times chaotic strip, visitors had the opportunity to encounter exotic food, souvenirs, and even people — for a small additional fee. One could inspect the home of conquered Native Americans, meet new imperial subjects from the Philippines, and assess the Japanese as both immigrants and increasingly powerful trading partners. Owned and choreographed by professional showmen, the live-display concessions were selected by the fair’s organizational team. Those fair officials — composed of the city’s civic and business elite — were concerned with turning a profit, establishing commercial relationships, and promoting a narrative of American progress and supremacy on both national and international stages. Bound together in their demonstrations of non-whiteness, the live-display concessions instructed visitors about the racial groups and patterns that had coalesced on America’s Pacific Coast at the turn of the twentieth century. Featuring people of color from both home and abroad, the Trail was a unique site for the perpetuation and rehearsal of a multilayered and hierarchical racial world view.
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This image shows visitors on the Trail, the amusement concession strip at the 1905 world’s fair. The Trail was often crowded and noisy, with amusements staying open long into the night. Unlike the uniform architecture of the grand palaces elsewhere in the fair, Trail concessions adopted a range of styles, contributing to the impression of a varied and, at times, foreign space.
This promotional image of the 1905 Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition held in Portland, Oregon, shows the scale and layout of the exposition. The Trail is located in the middle of the left image, along the lake’s edge and feeding into the Bridge of Nations that crossed Guild’s Lake.
The Native American, Filipino, and Japanese concessions visualized and dramatized concepts of race, marking each group in particular ways for the visiting public. The supposedly authentic, yet highly choreographed, representations of appearances, behaviors, and practices were infused with racial meanings that echoed existing stereotypes and were bolstered by popular Social Darwinism and the emergent discipline of anthropology. As a distinct yet integrated space within the fair grounds, the Trail interacted with overarching narratives of American progress and white supremacy. Exhibitions in the main fair grounds professed the nation’s development and ascendancy, supporting those claims with new scientific explanations and classifications. The Trail concessions’ displays of foreign culture offered a stark form of comparison to the exhibitions of art and industry in the main grounds.

The main fair grounds were manicured, uniform, and expansive; the Trail was chaotic, varied, and crowded. Performers on the Trail wore colorful costumes, resided in specially built quarters, and participated in sensational ceremonies. Guidebooks, journals, and newspapers declared that certain habits, traits, and preferences were typical of the race and cited those features as evidence of inferiority to Euro-Americans. With claims that the Native Americans’ “doom” had long been “written upon their brows,” the assertion that dog was a “tribal dish” of the Philippine Igorots, and the paternalistic description of Japanese peoples as “little brown men,” the Portland fair encouraged visitors to regard these populations as racially substandard, and therefore incompatible with idealized versions of the nation’s future racial composition. Despite obvious differences in the representations of the three groups, which reflected their varied roles in the processes of American expansion, there were also commonalities, ensuring that a repetitive and hierarchical message of racial inferiority permeated the concession strip. Human displays — from the freak show to the tourism industry and to the world’s fair concession strip — have shaped our understandings of human difference and societal norms. Rich scholarship on live human display in its many forms has been developed significantly in the past two decades, and putting a spotlight on the Trail offers a comparative assessment of the racialization of non-white peoples at the relatively understudied world’s fair in Portland.

Building on the wave of scholarship inspired by Robert Rydell’s work on the hegemonic function of world’s fairs, this article applies Joe Feagin’s concept of an overarching world view that structures understandings of race — which he has termed the “white racial frame” — to argue that the live-display concessions were important cultural arenas for the perpetuation and rehearsal of racism. While racial stereotypes about the three groups had been advanced elsewhere, the world’s fair site consolidated those narratives, creating the opportunity for a protracted and comparative inspection of the groups on the Trail. The world’s fair, as an intermediary between official and popular narratives, legitimated the white racial frame by presenting it in a trustworthy and legible format. As a physical site, the fair brought the three groups together under narratives of progress and expansion, encouraging visitors to make racialized and hierarchical judgments, with white America consistently emerging on top. The live-display form disseminated the white racial frame in a highly choreographed yet supposedly authentic setting, and allowed individual fairgoers to practice using a framework of racial thoughts and actions in a specially designated space. This “tool kit,” as identified by Feagin, functioned to shape understandings and interpretations of racial encounters both inside and beyond the fair grounds. Occurring at a time and place that represented an important juncture between the continental expansion that characterized the nineteenth century and the overseas expansion that dominated the turn of the twentieth, the 1905 world’s fair helped visitors conceive of the racial consequences of the nation’s Pacific future.
The lengthy official title of the celebration — the Lewis & Clark Centennial & American Pacific Exposition & Oriental Fair — pointed to the effects of expansion on the national and regional racial order. "Lewis and Clark Centennial" represented the nation’s completed expansion, which had claimed the continent west of the Mississippi River for America at the expense of Native American peoples. "American Pacific Exposition" signaled the importance of imperial and maritime interests in the Pacific, including the recent annexation of Hawaii, the occupation of eastern Samoa, and the colonization of the Philippine islands. Similarly, "Oriental Fair" indicated the established trade and immigration ties between West Coast cities and Asian nations as well as the belief that a “re-awakening Asia” offered great commercial promise. Taken as a whole, the title made clear that the nation’s eyes were on the Pacific Coast and that various populations had become linked in their significance for the nation and the region’s future. This article builds on the historiography of the imperial function of turn-of-the-century world’s fairs, by drawing on studies of American imperialism that have established the need for foreign and domestic race relations to be considered together.

Recent scholarship has pointed to the significance of the West Coast world’s fairs in promoting the nation’s imperial future and has analyzed the concession strips as important sites at which fair organizers worked to popularize the processes of expansion. A 2010 special issue of the Pacific Northwest Quarterly, for example, examined how racial and imperial notions were shaped and challenged at the 1909 Seattle world’s fair across several articles, although that issue did not employ a single, consistent analytical framework of race. Considering the three groups in conjunction demonstrates how individual displays worked together to constitute a racial tool kit that could be used to cement a multilayered view of white supremacy.

The Portland world’s fair was an ephemeral event, yet the urge to document, regulate, remember, and share the exposition experience has left historians with a rich and varied — albeit widely dispersed — archive. Promotional and commemorative materials such as guidebooks, programs, posters, and exposition journals provide textual and visual representations of the live concessions, reveal the didactic intent of the exposition management, and demonstrate the legacy of the event beyond its spatial and temporal limits. Yet by their very nature, these sources can be problematic, obscuring organizational modifications and shortcomings behind the bluster of their aggrandizing tone. Official documents, such as concession contracts and correspondence, often suggest the behind-the-scenes expectations, aims, and desires of exposition managers. Photographs, by no means an unmediated window onto the live concessions, are nevertheless vital in conveying details about the visual aspects of the performances. Newspapers provide local context, yet official sources show that fair employees would often prepare articles for the press with the sole intention of idealizing the exposition.

The endlessly engaging and well-documented historical site of the world’s fair offers numerous avenues of study, but the complicated sources force researchers to look with a critical eye. In comparison to the larger and better known world’s fairs of the period — such as the 1893 Chicago and 1904 St. Louis expositions — there are far fewer sources relating to Portland’s event in general world’s fair collections. This uneven representation in the larger archives perhaps accounts for the tendency of scholars to consider the Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition as a marginal story in the world’s fair chronicle, and thus why historians have not examined the Trail as frequently or in as much depth as other concession strips, such as the St. Louis Pike. Nevertheless, some historians have turned to the substantial exposition
the “strange myths and weird, religious rites, the wild, mournful melodies, and many curious customs of these primitive and to us incomprehensible people,” which were “still an unexplained riddle crying to us for solution.”\(^{23}\) As representatives of the nation and the region’s past, Native Americans were useful symbols of the celebratory narrative of American progress and white supremacy. At the turn of the twentieth century, Native Americans occupied a unique position within American society. While thousands had become American citizens in exchange for land under the Dawes Act, thousands more lived on reservations, most of which were located in the Western states.\(^{24}\) At the fair, entrepreneurs and exposition officials used Native American performers to dramatize a justification and blueprint for overseas expansion.

While the Native American concession at Portland also functioned as a model for the framing of less-familiar non-white populations, it primarily served as an opportunity to assess the nation’s indigenous peoples in close quarters. Live displays of Native Americans were not new, having appeared in the popular form of the Wild West Show from the 1880s, and at world’s fairs since the 1893 Chicago exposition.\(^{25}\) Almost 5,000 indigenous people lived in Oregon in 1900, and the fair took place fewer than thirty years after a number of violent Indian wars.\(^{26}\) Yet for one contributor to the fair’s official journal, the “problem of the Red Man” was the “most disconcerting mystery” to face the nation. She lamented that “after four centuries’ embarrassing acquaintance with him, we look into his stolid, unrevealing face and know that his inner life is still a sealed book to us.”\(^{27}\) In attempting to pry open that sealed book, the live concession presented a legible narrative about Native American life.

Although planning for the fair had begun many years in advance, events and exhibits were constantly subject to change, and fair organizers continued to solicit for interesting concessions once the fair had opened. It was often unclear what exhibits existed, for how long, where they were located, who owned them, and what they contained. The gulf between promotional and commemorative texts is often vast, yet in the pursuit of documentary evidence, it is important not to disregard these earlier plans and anticipations, which reveal much about the intentions and desires of the fair’s organizational team. The fair’s Director of Concessions and Admissions, John Wakefield, wrote to the Director of Exhibits, Henry Dosch, to set forth his plan for a large, live display of Native Americans:

I am of the opinion that if some competent, energetic, faithful, party would take up a concession privilege for a showing of Indians of various tribes, their Tribal manners, habits and customs, doing this by an installation of perhaps one or two families from each of the various Tribes, that the ensemble would be attractive to Exposition patrons, of interest to all concerned, of value to the Exploitation Division and of profit to the holder of the concession privilege.\(^{28}\)

The “strange myths and weird, religious rites, the wild, mournful melodies, and many curious customs of these primitive and to us incomprehensible people,” which were “still an unexplained riddle crying to us for solution.”\(^{23}\) As representatives of the nation and the region’s past, Native Americans were useful symbols of the celebratory narrative of American progress and white supremacy. At the turn of the twentieth century, Native Americans occupied a unique position within American society. While thousands had become American citizens in exchange for land under the Dawes Act, thousands more lived on reservations, most of which were located in the Western states.\(^{24}\) At the fair, entrepreneurs and exposition officials used Native American performers to dramatize a justification and blueprint for overseas expansion.

While the Native American concession at Portland also functioned as a model for the framing of less-familiar non-white populations, it primarily served as an opportunity to assess the nation’s indigenous peoples in close quarters. Live displays of Native Americans were not new, having appeared in the popular form of the Wild West Show from the 1880s, and at world’s fairs since the 1893 Chicago exposition.\(^{25}\) Almost 5,000 indigenous people lived in Oregon in 1900, and the fair took place fewer than thirty years after a number of violent Indian wars.\(^{26}\) Yet for one contributor to the fair’s official journal, the “problem of the Red Man” was the “most disconcerting mystery” to face the nation. She lamented that “after four centuries’ embarrassing acquaintance with him, we look into his stolid, unrevealing face and know that his inner life is still a sealed book to us.”\(^{27}\) In attempting to pry open that sealed book, the live concession presented a legible narrative about Native American life. 

Although planning for the fair had begun many years in advance, events and exhibits were constantly subject to change, and fair organizers continued to solicit for interesting concessions once the fair had opened. It was often unclear what exhibits existed, for how long, where they were located, who owned them, and what they contained. The gulf between promotional and commemorative texts is often vast, yet in the pursuit of documentary evidence, it is important not to disregard these earlier plans and anticipations, which reveal much about the intentions and desires of the fair’s organizational team. The fair’s Director of Concessions and Admissions, John Wakefield, wrote to the Director of Exhibits, Henry Dosch, to set forth his plan for a large, live display of Native Americans:

I am of the opinion that if some competent, energetic, faithful, party would take up a concession privilege for a showing of Indians of various tribes, their Tribal manners, habits and customs, doing this by an installation of perhaps one or two families from each of the various Tribes, that the ensemble would be attractive to Exposition patrons, of interest to all concerned, of value to the Exploitation Division and of profit to the holder of the concession privilege.\(^{28}\)
This internal correspondence shows the fair management’s understanding of the appropriate form and function of the live concession. Wakefield hoped that a private concessionaire would come forward with a display, and he was certain that the vaguely defined “manners, habits and customs” of the performers would reveal their “Indian” and “Tribal” characteristics. Along with the assertion that family groups should be included, Wakefield betrayed his subscription to the colonial notion that an indigenous individual’s authentic state was visible in everyday life and that inner meaning could be revealed through visual observation. This conviction explains the popularity of the live concession form and rationalizes Wakefield’s claim that such a display would be attractive, interesting, valuable, and profitable.

In the end, Native American performers and exhibits appeared in numerous locations and forms throughout the fair. Musical performances, athletic competitions, craft booths, statues, and photographs depicted Native Americans as unusual and bound to tradition, while a government exhibit sought to demonstrate their progress away from that tradition under the wardship of the state. On the Trail, Native Americans appeared in a concession variously referred to as the Indian Temple, Indian Collection, and Indian Village. Although Wakefield’s desire for a display of families was met — with men, women, and children occupying the site — his ambition to host various tribes was not. For the most part, sources indicate that the performers were Nez Perce, although some refer to the Umatilla nation, both of which are native to the Columbia Plateau region of the Pacific Northwest.

This local showing of the indigenous population anchored the narrative of white supremacy in long-held, domestic race relations, establishing a base for the multilayered racial world view that permeated the Trail as a whole.

Like many world’s fair concessions, the Native American display on the Trail began several months after the gates had opened. An article in the Oregon Sunday Journal announced the group’s arrival with the headline, "Held Trail Against White Men, Now Make Portland Holiday." The group’s clothing and tepee met visitor expectations of authentic Native life and represented a stark contrast to the grand palaces and exhibits of progress elsewhere in the fair. To the left of the tepee, a modern structure is visible, further emphasizing the performers’ incongruity with contemporary society.

On page 135 of the Western World’s Fair, Official Daily Program, this detailed map of the Trail shows the “Indian Collection” at the bottom right corner. The Japanese village is located on the left of the main strip. Although the program was printed just two days before the fair was due to close, the map appears to be an earlier, outdated edition. It does not include the Igorot Village, which opened in September. Such changes and inconsistencies make it impossible to rely on maps in isolation.
“Held Trail Against White Men, Now Make Portland Holiday.” Evoking the history of the Oregon Trail, the headline framed Native Americans as antithetical to white pioneers. The article stated:

An Indian village at the exposition will be open for public inspection within a few days. Its inhabitants are from the Caldwell reservation and number about 25. The Indians live in their native tepees and are commanded by the successor of Chief Joseph of the Nez Perces tribe. The present chief is an interesting old veteran. He wears the scalplocks of Crows and Blackfeet, acquired in active warfare, and a buckskin coat which he declares in solemn broken English has been worn by the chiefs of his tribe for the past 100 years. Four of the Indians were warriors in Chief Joseph’s campaign against the United States 30 years ago.8

This brief news item emphasized the supposed inferiority of the Native Americans in several ways. That the performers would be travelling from the confines of a reservation to a site open for inspection established their subordinate status in relation to the visiting public. Tying the chief and other performers to past events and people firmly fixed them — and by extension, all indigenous peoples — as primitive representatives of the past, therefore denying them a role in contemporary society.9 The allusions to violence and war framed the group as hostile, although the reference to Crow and Blackfeet scalps suggested that aggression was not directed at whites. The new chief’s “broken English” indicated that he was unable to assimilate, and thus to function in the present. Finally, the practice of displaying defeated warriors visualized the narrative of American progress as victorious and inevitable, helping to reconcile the violent elements of expansion with the founding principles of a democratic republic.10

A photograph of the concession accompanied the article, depicting a group of men, women, and children dressed elaborately in war bonnets and beaded robes, in front of a tepee. These visual markers signified the group’s difference and helped to make their inferior status legible and apparent. Tepees and war bonnets were ubiquitous in visual representations of indigenous peoples, regardless of nation, throughout the twentieth century. Such forms of dress and dwelling created an accessible symbol of the group’s difference and helped to make their inferior status legible and apparent. Tying the chief and other performers to past events and people firmly fixed them — and by extension, all indigenous peoples — as primitive representatives of the past, therefore denying them a role in contemporary society.9 The allusions to violence and war framed the group as hostile, although the reference to Crow and Blackfeet scalps suggested that aggression was not directed at whites. The new chief’s “broken English” indicated that he was unable to assimilate, and thus to function in the present. Finally, the practice of displaying defeated warriors visualized the narrative of American progress as victorious and inevitable, helping to reconcile the violent elements of expansion with the founding principles of a democratic republic.10

Beyond the physical encounter on the Trail, various texts and ephemera helped structure visitor experiences and facilitate a repetitive rehearsal of white supremacy. Postcards depicted indigenous peoples in static, stereotypical forms, which validated and bolstered similar depictions elsewhere on the Trail and acted as a visual reminder of the lessons learned at the fair.2 One particularly colorful postcard featured a Native American man elaborately clothed, with the mocking caption “Chief ‘Afraid of Eagle’” underneath. A souvenir by the Astoria Chamber of Commerce inserted Native Americans into the story of American progress, equating them with animals. Referring to the Lewis and Clark Expedition, the text described how the men had “crossed a country full of savages, previously unknown to civilized people” and offered a heavily qualified acknowledgement of the role of the “poor Indian woman,” Sacagawea.4 Celebrating the progress of the past century, the souvenir declared that “buffalo and Indians are nearly extinct” and that another “race of people” now occupied the country, developing its resources and replacing its “wigwams” with schools and churches.5 This dying-race narrative — which was widely employed by both ethnologists and promoters of Western tourism — justified invasive studies and exploitative displays by suggesting that there was an urgent scientific need to document Native American communities. The discourse of extinction rationalized the violence of conquest by suggesting that savagery was self-extinguishing in the face of inevitable progress.6 This ambiguous marrying of scientific and popular narratives was common at the world’s fair and played an important role in the live displays of other non-white peoples.

The Native American village on the Trail condensed various stereotypes, images, and emotions about the nation’s indigenous population, framing
the performers as primitive, warlike, unusual, and yet defeated and vanishing trophies of the nation’s racial past. This decontemporizing tactic of representation fixed the indigenous population’s inferior position within the racial order. By perpetuating the long-held belief that Native Americans did not encounter civilization until the arrival of Europeans, the indigenous population was framed as dependent on the benevolence of the superior white race. This notion of dependence had long shaped local and federal policy, and would continue to do so throughout the twentieth century. In 1906, the Burke Act introduced a measurement of competence before individual land allotments would be issued, and despite the passage of the 1924 Indian Citizenship Act, many western states restricted the extension of the franchise from Native Americans, frequently citing their supposed lack of civilization. The fair’s references to past conflicts — whether depicting Native Americans as aggressive or afraid — contributed to the encoding of U.S.–Native American relations through symbolic narratives, including notions of the frontier, the savage, and the inevitability of American progress. These supposedly self-evident categories and ideas transformed a history of violence into a narrative of American innocence that could further be adapted as expansion moved overseas. That Native Americans had been defeated, and could now be observed and consumed as colorful, beaded figures, impressed upon fairgoers that expansion abroad was a similarly inevitable task that would not disrupt the racial order at home.

WARDS OF THE GOVERNMENT

The Philippine islands became a part of the burgeoning American empire at the close of the 1898 Spanish–American War. As fighting occurred between American soldiers and Filipino revolutionaries — officially ceasing in 1902, yet continuing in remote areas for over a decade — Filipinos became American nationals. This abnormal political status allowed free passage into American borders without subjection to the nation’s immigration laws but prevented naturalized citizenship on racial grounds. Although large-scale Filipino immigration to the United States would not begin until the 1920s, the islands’ Pacific location and the established patterns of Asian immigration to the West Coast brought the group within the purview of a simultaneously regional and global racial world view. Concerns about those unknown populations were expressed in a popular handbook to the new empire, which stated:

The United States of America, after more than a century of continental growth and development, has, upon the threshold of the Twentieth Century, taken a new and radical step forward in its national career, having added to its dominions a large number of tropical islands, situated on the opposite sides of the earth, and inhabited by peoples strikingly distinct from those of the great republic of the West. The question, What shall we do with them? is one which necessarily arises, but which only time and experience can answer. . . . A period of watching and waiting is what wisdom dictates.

The live concessions at American world’s fairs became an ideal tool of assessment during this period of watching and waiting. Racial narratives about the Philippines bounced back and forth between popular and official sites, with military and ethnographic classifications permeating exposition concessions at Omaha in 1898 and St. Louis in 1904. The division of the Philippine population into distinct races and tribes — which supposedly varied in language, custom, and levels of civilization — created a hierarchical scale that justified the imperial argument that the colony was provisionally incapable of full autonomy. This notion of distinct tribes was familiar to American audiences, as one popular text noted that the “wild tribes of the Luzon highlands correspond to our various tribes of Sioux, Apaches, Crows, Chippewas, etc.,” differing only in language and “minor customs.” This correlation between non-white populations at home and abroad contributed to the multilayered racial world view that permeated the Trail.

The Portland exposition management hoped to replicate the hugely successful, large-scale exhibition of Filipinos one year earlier at St. Louis, which had featured several hundred Philippine performers in a series of
In a letter to the St. Louis Philippine exhibit board, Director-General Harvey W. Scott claimed that the fair management were “very anxious to have a fine exhibit from the Philippines,” as the Pacific Coast “takes a great interest in everything pertaining to the Philippines and I am sure a good representation from the islands would prove a great mutual benefit.” Emphasizing the regional significance of hosting a Philippine display in Portland, Scott expressed the expectations of the fair’s potential visitors. The terms of a contract with the International Anthropological Exhibit Company, dated November 1904, stipulated that the concessionaires should bring no fewer than 150 Filipinos who were “distinctively representative of their respective tribes” and would offer a “true” representation of their “homes, surroundings, conditions, occupations and habits of life.” Despite the exposition management’s best efforts, this contract and several others were not fulfilled — a problem compounded by Secretary of War William Howard Taft, who considered a ban on privately operated displays of Filipinos. For several months, it seemed that the Pacific Coast fair would not play host to any Philippine representatives. While Portland’s press attempted to save face — dismissing the Philippine population as “Little, Naked, Dirty Cannibals” and claiming that “Their Absence Will Not Be Noted So Far as Management Is Concerned” — behind the scenes, exposition president Henry Goode appealed directly to Taft, expressing his concerns that the fair would lose faith with its visitors. Six weeks before the fair was due to close, a Philippine concession finally opened on the Trail.

Despite the fair management’s plan to have representatives from the various Philippine tribes, in the end, it was only possible to secure a small exhibit of performers from the Igorot group, who — according to the Philippine Commission — were near the bottom of the hierarchy and were part of the islands’ “wild or non-Christian population.” The Igorot Village immediately became one of the most popular exhibits at the exposition. The fair’s official journal offered a detailed assessment of the concession, stating:

Among the more than one hundred tribes of the Philippine Islands the Igorrote is one of the most conspicuous and easily the most interesting, because of his strange customs and method of life. So little known is he, that today he would be as great a curiosity in the City of Manila as in Portland. The Igorroto are of Malay origin, of a superb bronze color, with long straight hair, and remarkable physiques… The men wear only a breech-clout, called ‘G-string,’ and a picturesque little hat. . . . The Igorroto is a pagan, a barbarian in culture, and agriculturist from necessity.

Much like descriptions of the Native American village, the text firmly established the inferiority of the Igorot performers. By claiming that the Philippine representatives were both interesting and little known, the journal positioned

the concession as a source of entertainment and authority of racial knowledge. The focus on the group’s appearance, with descriptions of skin color and dress, made their supposedly inherent racial differences legible and identifiable. Elements of their religion, culture, and society were dismissed as primitive and uncivilized, and thus incompatible with contemporary America.

Like the Native American representatives, the Igorot performers were framed as violent and warlike. A daily program claimed that there was “constant warfare between the neighboring tribes” in the Philippines and that the practice of “head-hunting [was] not only a means of self-defense,” but also a favored “pastime.” Obscuring the contemporary warfare involving American soldiers, this framework contained notions of Philippine violence, expressing it in sensational stories of internal fighting and of the Igorot performers’ supposed proclivity for slaughtering and eating dogs. Ceremonial dog feasts were a popular feature of the Igorot Village, ensuring, alongside
the program’s assertion that “All Igorottes eat dog,” that the behavior was framed as a peculiar and singular racial trait. Despite the fair’s connection to the Corps of Discovery, evidence that the fair’s eponymous heroes had indulged in dog meat during their travels was willfully ignored. Instead, the dog feast at the Igorot Village became a fascinating spectacle of racial difference. In one striking image from the fair, a large number of male visitors gathered around two young Filipino boys as they prepared the ceremonial dog feast, scrambling to see the spectacle.

Although the fair management had failed to secure a large exhibit of Filipinos that could represent the various tribes, the Igorot Village could still function as a “study of contrasts” through its location on the Trail. A newspaper article stated that “five races of men” had gathered at the Filipino concession, including the “Indian brave, the Chinese merchant, the well-behaved negro, besides our own people, attracted by the little brown man.” Texts frequently compared the unfamiliar, foreign figures from the Philippines with the more recognizable, homegrown Native Americans. One journalist stated that the Igorot performers “look as intelligent as the average Indian. Their skin is of a rich, bronze color, a little darker than that of the Indian.” Not only were the Philippine performers’ appearances subject to comparison, but so too were their behaviors. In an anecdote similar to that of the Native Americans on a motorized boat, the Oregon Daily Journal published a satirical report about a group of Igorot performers scaling the village fence in order to steal a ride on the hot air balloon concession. The group’s encounter with modernity — and the “wonder” it inspired — was roundly mocked. The article emphasized the Filipinos’ inferior position in the fair’s narrative of progress. They “chattered excitedly on the marvels accomplished by the white brother,” their voices reduced to an awe-struck admiration of the “house that flies.”

Comparisons and connections between Filipinos and Native Americans were not just present in supporting texts but were also evident in the fair’s physical structures. Both displays took the form of enclosed and architecturally styled native villages. The similarity of form, yet difference in architecture and content, made the direct comparison of the two villages a simple process that visitors could rehearse as they walked along the Trail. The comparison was further evident when one incensed visitor wrote to the fair’s Secretary and Director of Exploitation, Henry Reed, to complain about the treatment of dogs by the “barbarious Iggorotes now holding high carnage” at the exposition:

Supposing some of our Oregon-bred Indians were to come to Portland and make a raid on dogs; how long would your chief of police permit them to live out of jail? Why, our Indians are not permitted to drink North End booze. Yet the officials of the Fair, hire these savages to come here and drag dogs around their sty by the neck.

The visitor’s comments demonstrate a relative view of two populations — one domestic, one foreign — bound in their non-whiteness. Structuring his encounter with the Philippine dog feast through prior understanding of local Native Americans, the visitor used the racial tool kit that encouraged comparative observations and interpretations.

While perceptions of Native Americans provided a useful model for the racialization of the Philippine performers, this comparison could function only to a limited extent. If Native Americans represented the nation and
the region’s completed colonial past, Filipinos typified concerns and hopes about the imperial future. The dying-race narrative could successfully frame Native Americans as temporally irrelevant in contemporary American society, but it could not apply to framing a population that had only recently been drawn into America’s social and political orbit — and that continued to put up a fierce resistance to the process of colonization. The Igorot Village at Portland contributed to a globalized vision of white supremacy that drew on and extended existing domestic racial hierarchies.

Although the live Filipino concession at Portland only featured Igorot performers, this singular representation in itself evoked the existence of other, supposedly more developed tribes, and therefore the Igorots’ potential for limited progress under American tutelage. The framing of the Igorot performers — with their violence directed internally or at canines, their awe at the white man’s progress, and their very presence on the Trail — established a narrative of Philippine dependence on American civilization. The Igorot performers on the Trail were said to be “from Uncle Sam’s island domain” and were “wards of the government.” Although they were framed as “barbarians,” textual materials informed visitors that “scientists say they are susceptible of a high state of development” and that the arrival of U.S. soldiers had put a stop to the “barbaric custom” of headhunting.

While the Native American village featured dying trophies of America’s completed continental march, the Igorot Village contained living representatives of a new march toward supremacy in the Pacific.

**CREATURES FROM A FAIRY BOOK**

As the nation looked west for emerging markets, Japan came to represent an interesting connection between foreign and domestic race relations and between the processes of expansion and exclusion. Emerging as a modern empire in its own right, Japan challenged America’s power in the Pacific, disrupting hierarchical narratives of white supremacy. As a particularly vis-
Positioned next to each other in the Oregon Journal Souvenir View Book of the Late Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition, the images of Filipino and Native American villages can be easily compared. The groups’ posed stances in front of an architecturally specific backdrop are similar, yet their costumes are clearly different.

In line with other Trail concessions, Fair Japan marked the performers’ appearances and behaviors as different, and exhibited those features as evidence of their racial characteristics. The concession’s showcase of dancers and tea servers trivialized Japanese industries of these nations by “actual operating, working exhibits by the natives themselves, clad in their native costumes, living in their own houses, showing their modes of life, work and play.” Dosch’s plan for a working exhibit of the various Asian nations did not come to pass, and the appearances, behaviors, and traits of Japanese performers at the fair became the focus of the exhibit on the Trail.

The contract for the Japanese village, an agreement between the exposition and Yumeto Kushibiki of St. Louis, set out the fair’s desire for a “true and representative picture of the Japanese life, manners and customs.” Although private companies and individuals owned the Trail concessions, the terms of the contract bound those owners to a certain vision of the display, set forth by the exposition management. Unlike the contract for the Philippine display, a further clause was included:

The concessionaire agrees that he will not employ in connection with the concession herein contemplated any person, or give any entertainment, or produce any feature of Japan that would in any way cast ridicule either upon the inhabitants or institutions of said country; but that on the contrary this concession shall be so constructed and operated as to faithfully represent the Japanese people in a dignified and proper manner.

The inclusion of such a clause was important. Poor treatment of Asian exhibitors at the 1904 St. Louis exposition had alienated the Japanese government, causing the withdrawal of official involvement at Portland. Instead, private exhibitors— including merchants and businessmen from the region’s Japanese community— stepped in to install displays of Japanese industry in the Oriental Exhibits Building and to organize the Japanese concession on the Trail. Having been drawn into the sphere of American expansion under different terms from the Philippines, Japan afforded this more cautious treatment. Not only had Japan shocked the world in its triumph over Russia’s navy at the Battle of Tsushima just days before the Portland fair had opened, but it was also an important commercial partner in “America’s future market” in the Pacific and a valuable economic tie for port cities on the West Coast in particular.

Despite the contract’s cautionary clause and the recognition of Japan’s commercial value, the concession on the Trail— known as Fair Japan — succumbed to similar racial narratives as its neighboring displays. Guidebooks and promotional texts consistently described Fair Japan as “attractive and entertaining,” deeming it “one of the principal sights of the Trail.” Featuring demonstrations of rug making, a stand selling tea and rice cakes, a theatre, garden, and bazaar, the exhibit also featured geishas, who would “flutter about like creatures from out a fairy book.” In line with other Trail concessions, Fair Japan marked the performers’ appearances and behaviors as different, and exhibited those features as evidence of their racial characteristics. The concession’s showcase of dancers and tea servers trivialized Japanese
culture, while the rug-making demonstrations — like craft exhibits in the Native American village — framed the performers as primitive representatives of antiquity, obscuring the nation’s rapid industrialization. 

The curved arch of the concession’s entrance, covered with carved dragons, alerted visitors that they were about to enter a transplanted representation of a foreign land. Yet Oregon was not entirely unfamiliar with Japanese people, and the fair’s concession was not the only place to witness Japanese culture in the region. Between 1899 and 1910, Japanese residents represented the second largest group among the state’s foreign-born immigrants, and the largest group in Washington. Although the actual number of Japanese residents was small, their distinctive appearance as well as language and religious practices were especially visible to Oregon’s largely white population. On August 31, the fair hosted Japan Day, which saw an estimated 4,200 representatives of the “new world power” in attendance. Stating that the “little brown men turned out in force,” the Morning Oregonian alluded to a large Asian population that represented not only a valuable overseas market but also a budding industrial and military competitor and a significant source of immigration. On the Trail, however, such demographic issues were obscured, and the Japanese performers were cast as distant, benign foreigners.

Although there were commonalities between the framing of the Japanese performers and the other groups on the Trail, there were also significant differences. The costumes worn by the members of Fair Japan functioned as visual markers of difference but were far more substantial than the Filipinos’ scant dress and more subdued than the Native Americans’ colorful beads and war bonnets. Women wore long kimonos with their hair pinned back neatly, and men wore trousers, tunics, and caps. For visitors, the costumes on the Trail offered a simple and comparable means of assessing the three groups. In colonial relationships, clothing — which is visible, tangible, and reproducible — acts as a signifier of authenticity, regardless of the colonizer’s role in constructing the components of what is deemed authentic. That the clothing on the Trail was simply one component of a highly choreographed performance likely did not matter to most visitors; costume signified the relative civilization and progress of the peoples on display. The framework of war and violence that permeated the Native American and Filipino villages was also absent from Fair Japan — a notable omission considering that nation’s recent engagement with Russia. Instead, notions of beauty and peacefulness suffused the visual elements of the concession, and even its name suggested that visitors would encounter an enchanted, peaceable people.

Although these differences facilitated a more positive assessment of the Japanese performers, they were nevertheless suffused with the same overarching narratives of American progress and supremacy, and thus helped to bolster the white racial frame. In a speech aimed at eliciting Congressional funding for the exposition, the U.S. Representative from Oregon, Binger Hermann emphasized the importance of America’s engagement with the nations in the Pacific. Claiming that the more America introduced its “modern improvements” and “western ideas” to the East, the greater the demand would be for American products, Hermann pointed to the social, political, and commercial “progress” that had been made in Japan since it had begun its “commingling with the western nations.” Although recognizing Japan’s success, Hermann attributed the change to the involvement of the West, thus depicting Japan as dependent and ultimately inferior to Euro-American powers. Echoing narratives of the white man’s burden, which suffused the
Philippine concession, the framework identified Japanese success as a signifier of American supremacy.43 With this added mitigation, acknowledgements of Japanese progress would not run the risk of suggesting that the nation could achieve racial parity with white America. On the Trail, Japan’s inferior position within the racial order was visualized through the presence of an American flag at the entrance to the concession. The American flag had not been planted in Japan as it had in the Philippines, but its appearance on the Trail evoked similar ideas of empire, power, and dominance.

As in the other Trail concessions, textual and visual representations of Fair Japan paid close attention to the performers’ bodies. The dramatization of Japan’s supposed inferiority was embodied within the framing of the geisha. Seemingly always on hand to serve visitors tea and rice cakes, the “Golden-skinned geisha girls” visualized a narrative of submission, femininity, and passivity.44 Nineteenth-century European colonizers frequently declared the “feminine penetrability” of the ‘Orient’ in order to isolate the East from notions of Western progress, therefore justifying Western intervention.45 The body of the geisha functioned to obscure Japan’s recent military successes, negate concerns that America’s Pacific supremacy was under threat, and perpetuate the idea that the East was open to commercial exploitation. Framing the Japanese performers as submissive also had consequences elsewhere on the Trail. If the conquered Native Americans represented a blueprint for expansion into the Philippines, the passive and semi-civilized Japanese performers could function as a model of development in Asia, and thus act as proof that American intervention would also uplift Filipinos.46

Although fair managers could not secure representatives from the supposedly more civilized tribes from the Philippines, Fair Japan could stand in to promote America’s narrative of Western involvement in the Pacific region. When organizers were still hopeful of recruiting members of the Philippine Scouts for the fair, they noted that members of that U.S. Army-run battalion were “trim, orderly and soldier-like in appearance, though noticeably small in stature, like the Japanese,” and could therefore illustrate the work accomplished on the islands.47 This description of the Scouts attributed their success to American military order — thus emphasizing their dependence on their superiors — and drew comparisons with the Japanese to show their inherent potential and limitation for progress. This comparative framework in some ways foreshadowed the “Model Minority” image that framed some Asian American groups from the 1960s, heralding their success at assimilating into American society.48 The Scouts’ small bodies mitigated the potentially alarming consequences of a militarized Philippine unit, instead evoking the supposed beauty and inertia of the partially civilized, yet still inferior, Japanese body.

The Portland world’s fair occurred immediately before a shift in U.S.-Japanese relations, and the relatively positive framing of the Japanese performers on the Trail marked an end to a largely benign image of the nation and its people. William Nimmo has identified the final months of 1905 as a turning point in American public opinion toward the nation. As the United States began to interpret Japan’s military endeavors as an attempt to dominate the Pacific, opposition to Japanese immigration increased.49 In a 1907–1908 Gentlemen’s Agreement, Japan agreed to stop issuing passports for those destined for the continental United States, and the United States promised to prevent further mistreatment of Japanese residents on American soil. Japan’s ascendency in the region warranted such diplomacy, yet nativist sentiments abounded on the West Coast and were expressed through racialized fears of military invasion and demographic competition. Kristofer Allerfeldt has claimed that Oregon was particularly polarized on
the issue of Japanese immigration, with the business community — which had been so instrumental in funding and organizing the fair — fighting against discriminatory legislation in fear of losing Japanese trade. Although Fair Japan had depicted the nation and its people as semi-civilized, passive “creatures,” the broader lessons of the racial toolkit permitted individuals to compare and contrast and to accept and reject particular elements of the white racial frame, using it to structure constantly changing racial encounters and relations. Above all, the frame prized whiteness, ensuring that non-white groups could only ever move up or down along a limited number of rungs on the racial hierarchical scale.

HITTING THE TRAIL

Before the exposition opened its gates, one newspaper article declared:

Hitting the Trail will be to journey in many lands, jumping from a Japanese tea garden to the Foolish House of Coney Island fame, thence to the Orient, with its turrets and booths, purposely made a dingy white so that the sightseer may half believe for a moment when he steps inside that he has really seen the East. He will have seen it in effect. He will have felt the weird influence of the Orient. But ten steps beyond he can go into the nearer Orient, Japan, or into a “Wild West” show or what he will. Everything will be there, and he can take his choice.

Visitors at Portland had the opportunity to inspect non-white populations for a prolonged period and to make direct comparisons among the features of each native village. They could see conquered Native Americans in a crude tepee and meet former warriors who had been defeated by the advance of white civilization. The aging natives stood for the nation’s past and demonstrated what the superior white race had achieved. Just steps along the Trail, visitors could see the newest race to be subjugated by the might of American military. The Filipinos represented the future of American foreign policy, and their supposedly savage and incapable form embodied both their need for American tutelage and their potential for improvement under it. If fairgoers wanted proof that Western involvement in Asia could lead to such improvement, they could pay a visit to Fair Japan and be greeted by the pleasant and passive geishas. Hitting the Trail was indeed a journey into many lands, but it also visualized the progress of the American nation from its indigenous past to its imperial future and plotted the position of various non-white races in relation to its own achievements.

It is impossible to know to what extent visitors on the Trail accepted particular images and narratives surrounding the performers; visitor-authored sources rarely include detailed responses to the concessions. Pauline McClay’s account of the Portland fair featured a brief mention of the Trail, which she regarded as a “great place,” and she noted the “Indian Village” in a far from comprehensive list of concessions. Yet this relative absence in itself indicates that the Trail did not subvert the visitors’ world view, but instead reflected and supported accepted ideas about race and difference.

As the concessions on the Trail staged a hierarchical display of difference, they simultaneously facilitated a temporary collectivity of sameness among the white visitors. The Morning Oregonian described the Trail as a “great leveler” and “common meeting ground,” where people cared little for the “outward manifestations of caste.” Here the “millionaire” and the “Valley farmer” could be found “hobnobbing gracefully.” As visitors hit the Trail, they participated in an entertaining rehearsal of white supremacy that would continue to influence their thoughts and actions long after the fair gates had closed.

The live concessions on the Trail dramatized the appearances, behaviors, and practices of the performers and framed those features as self-evident signifiers of race. While these specific characteristics functioned as legible, identifiable indicators of the performers’ supposed inferiority, those details ultimately mattered less than the dissemination of a broader lesson about how to observe and rank non-white groups. The language of difference was less consistent, and less important, than the certainty that difference existed. The racial tool kit, which was in constant use on the Trail, taught visitors to recognize and assess features such as clothing and behavior as evidence of inherent racial traits, and thus a valid basis for arguments in favor of expansion and exclusion. The rehearsal and adaptation of this framework at the various...
concessions on the Trail facilitated the endless revision and application of the tool kit, even if those features changed. The tool kit could share and shape narratives, compare and contrast features, and give structure and meaning through repetition and ranking. Although the Igorot Village was only open for six weeks, and featured just one of the Philippine tribes, its relation to the Native American and Japanese concessions situated the village within a larger framework of racial difference. The similarities in language and imagery among the three concessions, as well as the differences and obvious omissions, strengthened the overarching message of the Igorot performers’ inferiority. Rather than providing an object and definitive lesson on a particular nation or populace, the concessions worked together to create a site at which white supremacy could be exercised in its various and changeable forms. The Trail provided a distinct physical space that facilitated easy comparison among non-white groups and that was shaped by the larger narratives of the world’s fair, which transformed specific features and lessons into moral stories of American progress and achievement.

The inherent flexibility of the white racial frame also permitted and subsumed moments of apparent contradiction. The very presence of Native Americans at successive world’s fairs — in themselves modern and commercial spaces — disrupted the notion that they were a dying race with no role in contemporary society. For Filipinos, this paid journey to the metropole involved hardships, but also offered opportunities for participation in a wage economy. Fair Japan presented a narrative that would be largely disregarded by Americans on the West Coast as relations between the two nations shifted toward the end of 1905. Despite the best efforts of the local business elite, anti-Asian sentiment grew. These alternative narratives and acts of resistance did not undo or undermine the lesson of white supremacy but, instead, demonstrated the breadth of its applicability.

As different racial groups and patterns coalesced on the West Coast, American citizens needed a multilayered and flexible racial world view that moved beyond the binary, black/white, slave/slaveholder structure. Multiple narratives, images, and stereotypes could be contained within the concessions because they signified an indisputable difference between white Americans on the one hand, and foreign and domestic non-white populations on the other. Regardless of the content of the performance, the “almost-but-not-quiteness,” and indeed not-whiteness, of the subordinate remained. Broad in its reach across racial groups and beyond borders, the designation of ‘non-whiteness’ simultaneously emphasized racial difference while obscuring the details, ensuring that the classification could flexibly be applied to any group considered as a barrier to the nation’s progress. Although the Portland fair did not succeed in transforming the Pacific Ocean into an American lake, it contributed to the development of an imagined region termed the “American Pacific,” that would be of increasing importance throughout the twentieth century. Creating a spectacle of the American Pacific in miniature on the shores of Guild’s Lake allowed those who hit the Trail to participate in an entertaining rehearsal of the future terms of white supremacy.
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