

Crossing between the Elite and the Popular: Cultural Productions during Turn-of-the-Century America¹⁾

Masako NOTOJI

In designing urban parks, museums, or any other public spaces, one of the most enduring cultural issues in the United States has been whether the particular place should represent the aesthetics and heritage of the educated elite or the everyday life experience and aspirations of ordinary folk. In more recent discussions of American society, however, it has become increasingly problematic to make any meaningful distinction between elite and popular culture, or between high and mass culture. In this paper, I will take a historical perspective on the role of professionals and technology in the process of cultural production during the period between the late 19th and the early 20th century, in an attempt to gain a more nuanced understanding of who controls and consumes America's public spaces and cultural events.

Let us first look at a description of a special landscape in American cultural history. "The beauty of the main [section], the well-planned balance of buildings, water, and open green spaces was a revelation for the 27 million visitors. Not only was [it] dignified and monumental, it was also well-run: there was no poverty and no crime (so the visitors were led to believe), there were state-of-the-art sanitation and transportation systems, and the [security] kept everyone happily in their place. In contrast to the grey urban sprawl and blight of [American] cities, this seemed a utopia."²⁾

Today a large number of Americans might identify this well-manicured and crime-free space as Disneyland or Walt Disney World, which are both billed as "The Happiest Place on Earth." However, the above quote refers not to a popular theme park in California or Florida, but to a world's fair site at the turn of the twentieth century in Chicago — the official White City section of the World's Columbian Exposition of 1893.

To make a spectacular display of America's new role as the vanguard of Western civilization in its quadricentennial celebration of Columbus' first voyage to the "New World," Chicago's Daniel Burnham, with his team of French-trained architects mostly from the East Coast, created an "ideal city" with monumental and neoclassical buildings showcasing America's social and technological progress. Frederick Law Olmstead, by then the nation's foremost landscape artist following his success at New York's Central Park, had turned the desolate swamps around Lake

Michigan into a celestial white “city upon a hill.”

This was indeed a tour de force of comprehensive city planning, and the architectural idiom used to express civic unity, order, and dignity was the Beaux-Arts style, named for the venerable *École des Beaux-Arts* in Paris. While conceptualizing his ambitious plans, Director of Works Daniel Burnham declared that “1893 will be the third great debate in our country’s history,” suggesting that the Chicago fair would be a historical landmark comparable to the American Revolution and the Civil War.³⁾ So much of the country’s talent was assembled for the reincarnation of ancient glory that the fair’s sculptor Augustus St. Gaudens rhapsodized that the design team was “the greatest meeting of artists since the 15th century,” drawing a parallel between their professional vigor and pride and those of Renaissance artists.⁴⁾

In many of the writings on the Chicago fair, contrasting remarks are made about the Midway Plaisance, a mile-long strip of ethnic amusements and paid concessions. Beginning with the Ottomans Arab Wild East Show, the native Dahomey village, through the Chinese Village and Theater, the Moorish Palace, the Hagenbeck Animal Show, and the Japanese Bazaar and continuing to the French Nursery, these international exhibits were roughly arranged to suggest a sliding scale of Darwinian human evolution from the primitive to the civilized. The narrow strip and sidewalks were packed with excited crowds, and the greatest profits were made from the central section, where a gigantic Ferris wheel loomed over the “Streets of Cairo” with mesmerizing exhibits of “oriental” fantasies.

According to many observers of the fair, the White City was an official statement of high culture above any competitive interests, whereas the Midway embodied the chaos of a lowbrow, exotic, and commercial world. For example, cultural historian John Kasson argues that, as a radically different model of democratic urban recreation, the Midway was designed “not according to the civic values of cultural elites but according to the commercial values of entrepreneurs determined to attract a mass audience.”⁵⁾ There is no question that the White City and the Midway each had a dramatically different ambiance and appealed to different classes of visitors. But as cultural historian James Gilbert points out, both sections were imbued with private commercial culture; the White City only had a less apparent intent of providing the best possible setting for the wares of modern industrial civilization, but the commercial purpose was underscored by the architectural costume of the classical exterior.⁶⁾

Another important consideration here is that both the White City and the Midway served as vital vehicles for a growing professional class to gain power and control over America’s cultural productions and public spaces: the former including architects, city planners, and artists, and the latter including not only ambitious impresarios but also professors of academic institutions. The Midway grew out of an idea for a museum-like display of anthropological exhibits, to be super-

vised by the Fair's Department of Ethnology and Archaeology. Although initially headed by Frederic Ward Putnam, a prominent Harvard professor of anthropology, with the assistance of the Smithsonian's G. Browne Goode in categorizing the artifacts, financial concerns soon led to the appointment of young Jewish entrepreneur Sol Bloom as Midway director. The 22-year-old showman without a formal education would soon turn the Midway into a dazzling jumble of exotic villages from around the world.

Having a Harvard anthropologist in charge of the fair's amusement section was later ridiculed by Bloom as making "Albert Einstein manager of the Ringling Brothers and Barnum and Baily Circus."⁷⁾ What is more important, however, is the fact that the scholarly participation and supervision gave the Midway an aura of scientific respectability and, at the same time, helped popularize the emerging academic discipline of anthropology and promote its institutional development. This collaborative relationship between entertainment and anthropology would be replicated in subsequent world fairs throughout the twentieth century.⁸⁾

One of the fascinating aspects in the study of American cultural history is precisely the negotiations and intermixing of the elite and the popular, and how different cultural environments and events reflect the diverse worldviews behind this apparent dualism. For example, Gilbert argues that "Bloom and Burnham represent polar opposites of the Fair, just as the White City and Midway . . ." Bloom believed in none of Putnam's racial theories of Darwinian natural selection, and claimed that "a tall, skinny chap from Arabia with a talent for swallowing swords expressed a culture which to me was on a higher plane than the one demonstrated by a group of earnest Swiss peasants who passed their day making cheese and milk chocolate . . ."⁹⁾ For Burnham, on the other hand, it was more important to maintain the order and noblesse oblige of the white Anglo-Saxon culture than to address the changing dynamics of social and cultural diversity. Why there could have been a kind of attraction between people of such different backgrounds and ideologies may be answered by looking into the sense of belonging to a new class of experts they possibly shared in rapidly industrializing America.

One cannot thus overemphasize the significance of the Chicago fair of 1893 in identifying and placing the new class of professionals at the center stage of civic affairs. Although much of their work was based on private initiative, these reformers of urban America, generally from the middle and upper-middle classes, were concerned about the problems of public neglect and private greed that permeated the cities. They were also motivated by fear of potential violence and disruptions among immigrants and other working-class city dwellers who were becoming increasingly diverse in their ethnic and ideological backgrounds. The social unrest during the Gilded Age, notably the Haymarket Riot of 1886 in Chicago, the Homestead Strike of 1892, and the Pullman Strike of 1894, was a memory still fresh in the minds of many Americans at

the beginning of the new century. It was a natural development that, with the success of the World's Columbian Exposition in convincing the general public of the necessity of civic order and harmony, the City Beautiful movement gained momentum as a social control device designed to remedy the urban ills during an era of great disorder and disharmony.

The first of the full-scale City Beautiful projects was redesigning the monumental core of Washington, DC, to commemorate the centennial of the nation's capital. Still unsure of defining its identity as a unified nation, it was of vital importance for the United States to create a capital which articulated its cultural authority and heritage by reworking the unfinished city plan of Pierre L'Enfant a century earlier. The Senate Park Commission convened many of the celebrated leaders of the Chicago fair, including Daniel Burnham, Charles McKim of the renowned New York firm of McKim, Mead & White, Augustus St. Gaudens as America's most prominent sculptor, and Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., who was achieving his own reputation as a landscape architect. In developing and executing the McMillan Plan of 1901–02, named for Senator James McMillan, these members of the commission would eventually bring in a wholesale change to the appearance of the Washington Mall, bringing it to approximately the state in which we know it today.

Just like Chicago's White City, the Washington plan borrowed the monumental neoclassical style not only to express a sense of cultural parity with Europe but also to evoke the democratic spirit of ancient Greece and the Roman Republic. The team of commissioners toured the great cities of Europe in the summer of 1901 with a Kodak camera in their hands to "see and discuss *together* parks in their relation to public buildings."¹⁰ After Paris, the team visited Rome where they were utterly inspired by "the strength, power, and mastery of imperial Rome," and reveled in the ancient temples and ruins of Hadrian's vast palace complex in Tivoli, a historic town on a hill outside Rome. It is important to note that Burnham and his colleagues were especially captivated by Rome as both the greatest of all urban influences on the planning of Western cities and as a specific model for Washington, at a time when their young republic was emerging as an important world power in the new century and was beginning to view itself as the New Rome.¹¹

In their enthusiasm for national idealism and urban unity, the commissioners even redirected the flow of the Potomac River, relocated a railroad station and its tracks outside the Mall area, and realigned the east-west and north-south axes in order to articulate a sense of geometrical harmony and control, by making sure that they met precisely at right angles.¹² Equally critical for the planners was the establishment of a visible historical continuity with the Founding Fathers, thereby expressing national prestige and governmental legitimacy. The placement of the Lincoln Memorial later in 1922 at the western end of the core served to enclose the monumental Mall. Previously an unpretentious open space for strolling Washington residents, the Mall was thus "recon-

ceived as a new kind of governmental complex, a combined civic and cultural center that is at once a national front lawn and an imperial forum, . . . a sacred enclosure, a temenos for a democracy.”¹³⁾

The Washington Plan was officially presented in January 1902 to a large audience, headed by President and Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt, and members of the Congress. The general public also came to view the large models of the Mall area. The commission’s visions were further conveyed in numerous popular publications, lectures, and interviews. Middle-class Washingtonians largely welcomed the Plan as a source of civic and national pride, but voiced their concern about its enormous cost and excessive formalism. There was also criticism of the Plan’s exclusive, rather than inclusive, concept, “. . . tending to seal off official Washington from the neighboring commercial and residential districts.”¹⁴⁾ There were also voices of strong opposition to the plan of locating the Lincoln Memorial in what then was only a muddy backwater of the Potomac. The Speaker of the House, Representative Joseph Cannon from Illinois expressed his infuriation in telling Secretary of War Elihu Root: “So long as I live, I’ll never let a monument to Abraham Lincoln be erected in that God dammed swamp.”¹⁵⁾

In general, however, the 1901 Plan for Washington gave an inspiring example of how the principles of civic architecture and art experimented with at Chicago’s World Fair could be implemented in an actual city, and in its process succeeded in presenting the public with a focus for civic pride, and “a symbol of the power of the national government.”¹⁶⁾ In the broader historical context, the McMillan Plan influenced subsequent City Beautiful projects in Chicago, Cleveland, San Francisco, Seattle, and other major cities across the country well into the 1930s, and grandiose, Beaux-Arts style capitol domes, court buildings, and libraries are now found in almost every state. But the movement’s goal the of moral uplift and economic progress of all citizens through the beautification of the city center has largely remained unfulfilled. As Boyer pointed out, “socialization through the civic ideal was an unproveable proposition at best, tenuous or nebulous at worst,” and the plight of the urban poor and other social and racial minorities at Washington’s city center is still one of the most serious in American cities.¹⁷⁾

If the lessons of the Chicago fair changed the face of the nation’s official capital, as well as its state capitals, they had as great an impact on America’s unofficial capital of the new mass culture. Only two years after the Columbian Exposition, New York’s Coney Island had its own version of the “Streets of Cairo,” where visitors were allured not only by exotic animals, but also by “Little Egypt” and other dancers from the Middle East. With its half-size Ferris wheel, electric illuminations, and other attractions, Coney Island borrowed freely from the Columbian Exposition to create “a White City for the multitude, a fantastic fair for the common man.”¹⁸⁾

Kasson emphasizes the liberating effect of the amusement park structures: even though they

were constructed out of the same impermanent plaster materials as the White City, Coney Island buildings “achieved monumentality without oppressiveness, grandeur without solemnity. The amusement park threw off all sense of restraint to indulge in an orgy of ebullient forms, bright colors, and sumptuous ornament.”¹⁹⁾ In her comprehensive study of the history of America’s amusement parks, Judith Adams touches on the ideological challenge Coney presented to the concept of cultural authority and respectability of the day: “. . . Coney was an intoxicant that turned all the values of its time upside down, replacing an outmoded Victorian gentility with a mass culture engendered by the machine and industrialization. Coney’s amusement shattered all expectations of normality and paradoxically turned engines of work into joy machines, spectacle, and chaos.”²⁰⁾

Also important to consider here is the role of popular amusements as vehicle of socialization and, in particular, of Americanization during the era of large-scale immigration. Records show that around 1905, working-class families in Manhattan typically made outings to Coney Island once or twice a summer despite their limited budgets for leisure and recreation. For the majority of Americans, an excursion to Coney served as a substitute for foreign travel, but for immigrants and their children Coney Island “provided a means to participate in mainstream American culture on an equal footing. Far more immediately and successfully than agents of the genteel culture, Coney’s amusement parks incorporated immigrants and working-class groups into their forms and values.”²¹⁾

The notion of creating a lavishly decorated stage for the collective experience of the spectacular would eventually be borrowed by the ornate movie theaters of the 1920s. During the period of a fundamental shift in American society from a production-based economy to that of mass consumption, and from the rural to the urban, the amusement park industry reached its golden age, with more than 1,500 facilities across the country in 1920. But with the spread of automobile, radio, and movies, in addition to the economic blows from the Depression, the number dropped to 500 in the mid-1930s, and amusement parks tried to survive by catering primarily to inner city low-income whites and racial minorities after the majority of the white middle-class began to move to the suburbs.

I have thus far discussed the general influence of Chicago’s Midway formula on the emerging outdoor entertainment spaces in Coney Island and other amusement parks. I would now like to examine the subsequent lives of the three key players involved in this much disputed amusement district of the Fair. George Washington Ferris (1859–1896), the inventor of the giant wheel of the Midway, was a civil engineer specializing in railroad bridges. In an open competition to design a monument for the fair that would surpass the Eiffel Tower, built for the Paris International Exposition of 1889, the man who proposed the daring idea of the wheel curiously had a

similar professional background to that of Gustave Eiffel (1832–1923). The Frenchman was also a bridge engineer as well as the builder of the steel interior of New York’s Statue of Liberty. The Ferris Wheel carried one and a half million fairgoers, each paying 50 cents, but Ferris himself could not claim the nearly \$750,000 profit made from his wheel, and spent the last years of his life in litigation. Although he died in obscurity, his wheel as a technological masterpiece remained a focus of research and discussions among a large number of contemporary American civil engineers for over a year after the close of the fair.²²⁾

As the exposition was drawing to a close, Frederic Ward Putnam (1839–1915), who presided over the ethnological displays at the Midway, initiated a move to establish a permanent ethnological institution to house the artifacts collected under his supervision. Late in 1893, what was to become the Field Museum of Natural History was established by Marshall Field, the department store magnate, and other cultural elites of Chicago, but Putnam’s hopes of becoming its first director were unrealized due to different approaches to the planned museum. But he remained active as president of professional organizations, including the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the American Anthropological Association, and continued to contribute his advisory services and scientific authority to subsequent world fairs.

Besides professional expertise, what mediated the boundary between the high and popular cultures in turn-of-the-century America was the advent of new technology. An illuminating example is the relationship between motion pictures and the Middle Eastern belly dance, which was one of the most controversial displays in the entire Midway. The exposure and sensual movements of the female body were seen as a challenge to Victorian notions of morality and propriety. Whether for its notoriety or its fame, scenes of belly dancing became popular subjects for moving pictures in their earliest days, and the Edison staff filmed those exotic dances in addition to a great variety of other subjects in short films to be distributed to kinetoscope parlors in large cities.

Even though only a few of his belly dancing films, including one titled *Fatima’s Coochee-Coochee Dance* (1896), were officially listed in Edison catalogues for fear of police censorship, attitudes on the subjects of sex and violence gradually changed with regard to what was considered acceptable public entertainment. This was partly due to “the powers of photographic mediation [which] took the ‘curse of presence’ off many types of amusements when shown via motion pictures.”²³⁾ Belly dance performers were variously advertised as “ethnic dance artists” or “exotic temptresses,” emphasizing either their anthropological legitimacy or their voyeuristic appeal. More than a hundred years later, researchers of performing arts today see Edison’s dance films as valuable records providing “a brief glimpse of the Middle Eastern professional female solo dance at a point just before its evolution into the internationally recognized stage art”²⁴⁾

The above examples already suggest the fluidity of exchange between the serious and the frivolous, between the respectable and the vulgar, as well as between the elite and the popular in many forms of public display of knowledge and cultural behavior. Crossing between these lines were individual experts and cultural expressions that managed to negotiate through seemingly separate terrains via the mediations of new technologies and professional forte. I will illustrate my point further by discussing an interesting turn in the life of Sol Bloom (1870–1949), the manager of the entire Midway.

With his theater and show business background, and as the person responsible for bringing the Algerian and Tunisian village, which he first encountered at the 1889 Paris Exposition, to the Chicago fair, it is not surprising that Bloom wrote enthusiastically about the Algerian dancers: “As a matter of strict fact, the *danse du ventre* [belly dance], while sensuous and exciting, was a masterpiece of rhythm and beauty; it was choreographic perfection, and it was so recognized by even the most untutored spectators.”²⁵⁾ What is striking is his subsequent success, in the business of music publication and selling Victor Talking Machines, in real estate, and later in national politics, beginning in 1920 when he was elected Representative for New York’s 19th Congressional District. In the US Congress Bloom was in charge of the George Washington Bicentennial (1932) and the US Constitution Sesquicentennial Exposition (1937). He chaired the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in 1938. A strong supporter of Zionism, he was a delegate to the 1945 San Francisco Conference and helped draft the United Nations Charter.²⁶⁾ When he died in 1949, he was succeeded in Congress by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.

Before concluding my discussion, I would like to touch on another showman whose professional career was significantly influenced by Sol Bloom. It is obvious that the concept of reproducing thrilling adventures and exotic villages, developed to such success by Bloom at the Chicago Fair of 1893, became a staple entertainment formula for the future development of theme parks. In particular, the Disney organization owed a debt of inspiration to Bloom all the way from the building of Disneyland (1955) in California to the opening of Epcot Center (1982) in Florida.²⁷⁾

A less direct relationship Walt Disney had with Bloom was that his life too was enhanced by working with the United Nations. In 1957, Walt Disney (1901–1966) was commissioned through the Pepsi-Cola Company to plan an exhibit for the United Nations International Children’s Emergency Fund (UNICEF) for the 1964–65 New York World’s Fair. The result was a nine-minute boat ride, called “It’s A Small World — A Salute to UNICEF,” carrying visitors past such familiar miniature scenes as the Eiffel Tower, a Dutch windmill, and India’s Taj Mahal. The electronically animated children of various nations placed along the winding waterway sang and danced to a theme song in their native languages.

Incidentally, within the context of this paper, Walt Disney should be remembered as a producer of both nostalgia and futuristic visions, keen to employ the latest photographic and sound technology to enhance the effect of illusion in his animated films and theme park attractions. Like Sol Bloom, Disney hardly had any formal schooling, and ventured into the new field of animation when he was only 18. Within a few years, however, he came to realize the limits of his draftsmanship, and concentrated his energies to scenarios and story making. The Great Depression was a boon to Disney, as he was able to recruit a new breed of staff; unlike the more traditional type of self-made cartoonist from New York, “the newcomers were college graduates or graduates of art schools, drawn to the creative ferment of the Disney studio.”²⁸⁾ Disney was also the first person to build an amusement park that required paid admission, but it was based on a concept antithetical to the atmosphere of Coney Island, being inspired instead by European-style pleasure gardens, such as Tivoli Gardens in Copenhagen.

Disney had previously undertaken projects for world fairs in San Francisco and New York in 1939, the US pavilion at the 1958 Brussels fair, and the Moscow fair the following year, but for this New York fair, it was a full-scale involvement. When the request for the UNICEF exhibit arrived, Disney’s team were preparing the attractions for General Electric (The Carousel of Progress), Ford Motor Company (Magic Skyway) and the Illinois State Pavilion entitled “Great Moments with Mr. Lincoln” featuring the electronically reincarnated 16th President. Disney was at the complex crossroads where popular art, national mythmaking, and corporate capitalism met within the ever privatizing trend in America’s public events.

The New York Fair in 1964–65 was also a chapter in the tumultuous history of Disney’s family. When Disney’s team of technicians from California encountered difficulties in securing the full cooperation of New York construction workers in the last phase of the project, Walt Disney mentioned that his own father Elias had been a carpenter at Chicago’s World Fair seventy years before. That is said to have resolved Disney’s labor problems before the opening of the fair.²⁹⁾ Disney’s success at the New York Fair would push him further to a position of leading influence in large-scale cultural production on the national level.

Looking back at the history of world fairs, James Gilbert claims that the two cultures — the elite and the popular — had been separated by unbridgeable gulfs ever since the London Exposition of 1851, but that popular culture gradually “encroached upon the fair until, at Chicago, it established itself as a separate but equal appendage of high culture and science.”³⁰⁾ He further observes that the physical boundaries between the two were gradually erased until, after World War II, with Disneyland in California, the two became indistinguishable. The analysis I have attempted in this paper seems to suggest that a more fluid and porous relationship had actually existed for more than a century. While the tensions between those two cultures continued to

define the physical contours and philosophical tenets of such productions, there has been a more dynamic interplay between what have been labeled as the elite and the popular even from the turn of the twentieth century. As we have seen, what mediate the two are powerful agents of technology, professional developments, corporate capitalism, and the changing values of consumers. It is the combined forces of these various media and the competitions among their stakeholders that determine not only who controls America's cultural productions, but also the possibilities of its democratic culture.

Notes

- 1) An earlier version of this paper was presented at the conference, "Elites and Elitism in American Democracy," held at the American Studies Institute of Seoul National University in November, 2009. I am deeply grateful to the participants for their valuable comments.
- 2) <http://xroads.virginia.edu/~cap/citybeautiful/city.html>
- 3) Earnest Poole, *Giants Gone: Men Who Made Chicago* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1943), p. 184.
- 4) Thomas S. Hines, *Burnham of Chicago: Architect and Planner* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979) p. 90.
- 5) John E. Kasson, *Amusing the Million: Coney Island at the Turn of the Century* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1978) pp. 26–27.
- 6) James Gilbert, *Perfect Cities: Chicago's Utopias of 1893* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991) p. 100.
- 7) Sol Bloom, *The Autobiography of Sol Bloom* (New York: G. P. Putnam's, 1948) p. 106, quoted in Gilbert, p. 87.
- 8) Robert W. Rydell, *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at the American International Expositions, 1876–1916* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1984) pp. 62–64.
- 9) Gilbert, pp. 87–88.
- 10) Quoted in Charles Moore, *Daniel H. Burnham, I* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1921) p. 142.
- 11) Hines, p. 146.
- 12) John W. Reys, *Washington on View: The Nation's Capital since 1790* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991) p. 242.
- 13) Robert A. M. Stern, "A Temenos for Democracy: The Mall in Washington and its Influences" in *The Mall in Washington, 1791–1991* (Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1991) p. 263.
- 14) Thomas S. Hines, "The Imperial Mall: The City Beautiful Movement and the Washington Plan of 1901–02" in *The Mall in Washington, 1791–1991* (Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1991) p. 92.
- 15) Quoted in Hines, *Burnham of Chicago*, p. 155.
- 16) Frederick A. Gutheim, *The Federal Presence: Architecture, Politics, and Symbols in United States Government Building* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1978) p. 43.
- 17) Paul S. Boyer, *Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, 1820–1920* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978), p. 90.
- 18) Kasson, p. 54.
- 19) Kasson, p. 63.
- 20) Judith A. Adams, *The American Amusement Park Industry: A History of Technology and Thrills*

- (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1991), p. 56.
- 21) Kasson, pp. 39–40.
 - 22) John A. Kauwenhoven, “The Eiffel Tower and the Ferris Wheel,” *Arts Magazine*, 54 (1980), p. 171.
 - 23) Charles Musser, *Edison Motion Pictures, 1890–1900 An Annotated Filmography* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1997), pp. 131–32.
 - 24) Venus, “Fatima’s Coochee-Coochee Dance (1896), A Film by Thomas Edison,”
<http://venusbellydance.com/2008/articles/fatima.html>
 - 25) Sol Bloom, *The Autobiography of Sol Bloom* (New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1948) pp. 134–45.
 - 26) Stephen E. Schlesinger, *Act of Creation: The Founding of the United Nations: A Story of Superpowers, Secret Agents, Wartime Allies and Enemies, and Their Quest for a Peaceful World* (Cambridge, MA: Westview, 2004) p. 237.
 - 27) Judith A. Adams, *The American Amusement Park Industry*, p. 29.
 - 28) Bob Thomas, *Walt Disney: An American Original* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974) pp. 63, 115.
 - 29) *Ibid.*, pp. 310–11.
 - 30) Gilbert, pp. 78–80.