

## SPECIAL REPORTS.

---

REPORT ON THE ORGANIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION  
COMMISSIONS AND JURIES, WITH ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO  
THE VIENNA UNIVERSAL EXHIBITION OF 1873.

BY THOMAS C. ARCHER.

---

From the commencement of international exhibitions nothing has been more apparent than the necessity for well-organized commissions and juries, and success has always been in accordance with the careful and judicious selection of the chief persons to perform the functions of those two branches of the management.

The commissions here referred to are those which are instituted by the nations in whose territories the exhibitions are held, for the purpose of making the general arrangements, providing the necessary accommodations, and framing such regulations as will give confidence to the other nations of the world, that, in accepting their invitations to exhibit, their interests will be fairly studied and amply protected.

Another kind of commission has also been found to be essential to the success of any exhibition, and its constitution is also of great, if not vital, importance; namely, the national commissions, or commissions appointed by the various exhibiting nations, the functions of which are, to take such steps in their individual countries, as will make known to their countrymen who are interested, all the advantages likely to accrue to those who agree to exhibit; to make the exhibitors acquainted with all the rules and regulations of the exhibition; to secure the safe transport of the exhibits; to adjust the space allotted, and to keep, generally, a watchful care over the interests of their countrymen in all that relates to the exhibition wherever it may be held. Regarding these two

forms of commission as a combination to effect one main object, we may designate the former as the Local Administrative and Executive, and the latter as the Foreign Departmental, Commission.

First, then, in order is the Local Administrative and Executive Commission, appointed by the government of the nation in whose territories the exhibition is to be held. Very much depends upon the wise selection of those who are to constitute this important body, for it is necessary to inspire all nations with confidence in their administration. Each nation will, of course, have its own opinions upon this point, but it would be absurdly presumptuous to attempt to lay down any general rules for the selection of this, the most important body connected with an international exhibition; there are, however, one or two points which experience has demonstrated as indisputable facts, which cannot be ignored without great risk of failure. The first of these is that there must be one irresponsible head, a Director-General, whose decision on all disputed points must be final. The necessity for this will at once be seen, when it is borne in mind that an international exhibition is an event which, when complete, only lasts for, as a rule, six months, and, at the utmost stretch, can only be allowed about three months for previous arrangement, during which innumerable unforeseen difficulties arise. If these difficulties are left open to discussions arising from diversity of opinion, many of them would never be settled at all, and the exhibition would represent chaos, instead of nice order and arrangement. Hence it is necessary that the power to give a prompt decision should be vested in one head.

Secondly, a carefully selected but not too numerous body of coadjutors should be chosen to help and support the chief commissioner. Of these, some should be selected for their ability to act as councillors, upon whom the chief can rely for advice and assistance in all cases of difficulty; whilst to others departmental work should be allotted. The Vienna Imperial Royal Commission was fortunate in possessing the first of these requirements; and no better Director-General could have been found on the continent of Europe than His Excellency Baron Schwartz-Senborn; for not only is he a man of great administrative powers and broad views, but he had been

thoroughly trained to exhibition life. In the London Exhibition of 1862, the nation which turned that event to the greatest commercial advantage, and which, in all respects, managed the affairs of its exhibitors best, was Austria; and those results were entirely due to the unwearying activity and admirable arrangement of the baron, then Chevalier Schwartz; and well is his genial co-operation and perfect disinterestedness remembered by those who, like the writer, had the satisfaction of working with him on that and other occasions. With his councillors, however, he had difficulties, although on the whole that part of the arrangement worked tolerably well, perhaps even better than was supposed; for, though the public tongue indulged itself in assertions of disagreements, etc., the public eye did not penetrate into its chambers, nor did the public ear hear its discussions. In the third portion of his commission Baron Schwartz was lamentably weak; he had no efficient staff of aids, to whom the separate departments could be safely allotted, and hence arose confusion, and most irritating annoyance to the exhibitors, which was increased and intensified by the efforts to carry out a complicated and impracticable classification. Everywhere amongst the officers of the commission who were intrusted with the departmental arrangements, under the Director-General, there was an almost oriental spirit of procrastination, and a want of knowledge of the value of time, which seriously impeded the completion of the exhibition, and this inertness, added to the utter inability of the railway companies to do the work they had undertaken, at one time threatened to make the exhibition a complete failure. The various national commissions, however, saved it by taking matters into their own hands, and carrying out the arrangements of their own sections as they thought best.

From this a good lesson ought to be learned and acted upon in all future international exhibitions; namely, not to hamper the foreign commissioners with restrictions which cannot be complied with, and which can only result in a petty warfare and an ignominious abandonment, one by one, of all the disputed points, after the sacrifice of much precious time and temper in the discussion. Every nation will, if left alone, do its best to make its exhibits appear as effective as pos-

sible, and, provided the general arrangements are not too complicated and unwieldy, a few general directions to each foreign commission will secure as much harmony as can be hoped for in an undertaking so vast as an international exhibition must necessarily be. It is one thing to sit down with pen, ink and paper, and with leisure for reflection, and plan the arrangement and classification of either a museum or an exhibition; it is another, to bring together all the varied products of man's industry, associated with all the peculiar wishes and opinions of the producers, and in a very short space of time so arrange them that they shall not only be in some sort of order, but what, after all, will always be the chief consideration, placed so as to exhibit the individual articles in the most effective manner. It follows, therefore, that the more simple the code of regulations, and the less they interfere with the individual action of the foreign commissioners, — who, as a rule, are earnest and well skilled in their work, — the better for the general management. There never has been, at any of the European great international exhibitions, any proper bureau for information to exhibitors; and yet how much trouble might be saved, and how greatly business might have been facilitated! Suppose, for instance, such a department had been fully, instead of very partially, organized in the Vienna Exhibition, and it had consisted of twelve intelligent men of each of the following nationalities, — French, German, and English, — and there had been four officers placed most conveniently for the exhibitors in different parts of the exhibition or grounds, the functions of these officials being simply to receive inquiries on forms, and to transmit them to the proper authorities and see that answers were obtained in due course and transmitted to the inquirers; these officers, aided by a dozen messengers, could have saved enormous trouble, time, and personal annoyance; their proper performance of their duties would have acted like a good lubricating oil, and would have made the great machine work much more smoothly than it did.

There is another point of great importance in which the Austrian Commission signally failed. It was in regulating the daily admissions of the vast army of exhibitors and attendants necessary to carry on the business of the Exhibi-

tion. It is said that no less than fifteen thousand persons had free admission daily as exhibitors, exhibitors' assistants, foreign commissioners, their officers and attendants, the employés of the general direction, consisting of clerks, attendants, police, military, firemen and keepers of the roads and gardens, besides a host of other people connected with the restaurants and other matters. No general rule could be hit upon for the management of this host, and the executive seemed to think that the best way to protect itself from imposition was to keep perpetually changing the passes, and giving all the trouble possible, so as to prevent its being worth the while of any trickster to try and circumvent them; but this was legislating for a few vagabonds, and giving endless annoyance to thousands of anxious, hard-working and honest people. Had a certain number of wicket-gates been allotted for the entrance of the holders of free passes, and picked men placed at them, in a week or two they would have become familiar with the people who had a right to pass, and no real difficulty would have been felt. So irritating was the Austrian process, that upon several occasions it was with difficulty that a general strike amongst exhibitors and their assistants was prevented. About twenty-five nations were represented in the Vienna Exposition; and as many wicket-gates, with three attendants allotted to each, two to be in regular attendance and one to relieve the others for meals and rest, would have made the administration sufficiently secure, and would have saved money, trouble and inconvenience to a considerable extent. For nearly as many gates were open to *free passes*, and even a greater number of people were employed, besides the useless staff whose whole occupation was printing and changing admission tickets continually; but there was no system, and consequently expense and trouble were incurred without any other result than extreme dissatisfaction. Mistakes of this kind, which affected the general management, multiplied of course in all the smaller branches of the arrangement and originated innumerable difficulties and disappointments which greatly militated against the realization of that satisfaction which it ought to have been the general aim of the administration to produce. The want of reliable departmental officers forced the

Director-General to attempt to do too much personally. Instead of being only the administrator, he tried to manage the executive also, and it was too much for him, as it ever must be for a single individual upon such occasions. The consequence was, that much was ill done, and much not done at all. The proper plan would have been to have allotted distinct duties to each of his executive staff, and to have seen that those duties were honestly and faithfully performed.

The executive staff should be divided into sections, and each should report daily to the Director-General the work it has transacted, calling attention to all points of difficulty which may have arisen, and stating how such difficulties have been surmounted. This would enable the Director-General to correct mistakes before too late, or to approve, and thus guide his officers in their future operations.

Assuming the building to be complete or ready for the allotment of space, the following committees, besides others suggested by local circumstances, should be organized :—

*First.* The Committee of Installation, with whom the distribution of space rests,—a difficult and arduous duty, requiring great tact and management in order that conflicting interests may be harmonized and the amenities of the Exhibition preserved. A well organized Installation Committee would never have consented to that huge and ugly trophy of stone bottles, supposed to have contained Curacoa, which disfigured the grand gallery of the Vienna Exhibition in the Dutch department, and many other not much less obnoxious things. The Installation Committee, besides distributing space to foreign commissions and to home exhibitors, have a still more arduous duty in seeing that such space is not occupied so as to injure the general effects.

*Second.* A Railway Committee, whose duty it is to see that the goods delivered into the Exhibition are in good order and are instantly passed on to their proper department. The absence of such a committee in the Vienna arrangements, ought to act as a caution on all future occasions, for nothing more imperilled the success of that Exhibition. A Railway Committee requires a large staff of attendants, some of whom should be practically acquainted with the management of depots for goods, and all should be active, well-chosen men.

*Third.* A Committee whose duty it should be to issue passes to exhibitors, assistants and workmen, and regulate generally the ticket and free-pass department.

*Fourth.* The Catalogue Committee, whose duty it is to collate the forms as soon as received, classify them and get them into the printer's hands without delay. If a concession of the printing and sale of the general catalogue is accorded to any one, care should be taken not to include in it foreign catalogues, unless under some especial proviso which protects the interests of foreign commissions and encourages them to print their own special catalogues, which are always the most valuable portions of the literature of any International Exhibition. The French Imperial Commission in 1867 so mismanaged this matter as to create lawsuits and suppress to a large extent this valuable source of information. The Catalogue Committee should also undertake the printing of forms and other documents required by the other departments. Without some efficient supervision much waste of time and extravagant expenditure is sure to occur in the printing of useless and inconvenient forms, and even in the wasteful production of well digested forms.

*Fifth.* A Committee to regulate the police, the fire-brigade and the attendants and cleaners, is of course necessary, and its functions are second to none in importance.

*Sixth.* The gardens, roads and grounds generally should have a separate Committee, upon which both men of taste and practical experience should be placed.

*Eighth.* An Engineering Committee should undertake the arrangement of boiler-houses and other matters connected with the Machinery Department.

*Tenth.* A Fine Art Committee is necessary to regulate the disposition of art objects with a view to secure the best and most effective placing of them; this may be a sub-committee of the Installation Committee; or, if not, the two ought to act in unison, especially with regard to *trophies*, which, rightly placed and tastefully designed, add much to the beauty and interest of the exhibition, but otherwise, often disfigure it most seriously.

*Eleventh.* The refreshment establishments and the musical entertainments should be under a Committee or Committees,

and on no account ought a control over the charges to be relinquished. This cannot however be fairly retained unless the concessions to sell are made in a liberal spirit. For well-regulated refreshment rooms with moderate charges are great aids to the success of an exhibition.

*Twelfth.* A Committee is necessary to organize and arrange the International Juries, and besides scientific knowledge, the gentlemen composing it, or at least some of them, should be good linguists, and amongst them, or the jurors for the country holding the exhibition, must be selected reporters who will, by careful reports, give an enduring value to the exhibition.

*Thirteenth.* A competent Finance Committee is a matter of course.

The organization of the Foreign Commissions rests entirely with the countries from whence they come, and it is only left to the country holding the exhibition to aid them in every possible way. Nothing that could be said under this head can be of any use to America, where the duties of hospitality are universally understood and practised.

The next important points are the jury question, and the awards; the latter especially, for we have just seen how with the best intentions badly carried out the worst results may be realized. In the Vienna Exhibition regulations, we were told that there were to be five prize-medals: 1st, one for Progress, 2d for Merit, 3d for Good Taste, 4th for Co-operators, and, apart from this series, one for Fine Art, whether in painting, sculpture, or decorative art. Besides these there were two Diplomas,—a Diploma of Honor, the highest prize which could be awarded, and a Diploma of Honorable Mention, the lowest prize which could be awarded. Moreover, it was communicated to the juries that the first four-mentioned prizes were to be valued in the order in which they are given above, that is to say: 1st, Progress; 2d, Merit; 3d, Good Taste, and 4th, Coöperation. Hardly had the work of the juries commenced before the question arose, Can two medals be given to one person; for instance, Progress and Good Taste, Merit and Good Taste, or Good Taste and Coöperation? These were very natural questions, to



which an affirmative answer would also seem a natural reply, but the answer was in the negative. This caused much excitement, and even a threat on the part of some juries to throw up their work; for they did not care to identify themselves with a process of self-stultification. Perhaps this may not appear a necessary consequence; I will, therefore, give an example:—

Take, for instance, two manufacturers of Porcelain, one nearly at the top of his profession; and it is at once obvious that he deserves a high reward, which the jury may consider does not amount to the highest; that is, the Diploma of Honor; they, therefore, give him the Medal for Progress. Now, it must be evident to all that in such an art as his, he cannot have made progress without being a meritorious worker, and a man of good taste; but if he is only to receive the Medal for Progress, the two latter and equally important qualities are left out of sight, whilst the general public will be more likely to think highly of the third class medal for Good Taste than of the first, with the indefinite idea of *progress* attached to it. After much discussion the Council of Presidents of Juries, a deliberative body which held a position between the General Direction and the Juries, decided in favor of the jurors' view, that one or more medals should be awarded where deserved, and that another absurd regulation, that only one Diploma of Honor, in any group, should be given to one nationality, should be rescinded. There was a tacit understanding that this was accepted by the Council of General Direction; but after all the labors of the jury based on this understanding were concluded, and the juries themselves dispersed, their decisions were altered and the old idea reverted to. Therefore, practically, the published lists of prizes do not give the true opinions of the jurors and experts.

Anything more mischievous can hardly be imagined, and already many unprincipled people are taking advantage of it. Thus advertisements appear intimating that the advertiser is the only one in his class who received the medal for "Good Taste"; the public are not aware that this is the lowest prize in the form of a medal. Then others are telling the world by advertisements, circulars, and other means of deceiving, that they received the Diploma, but do not say it is merely

"Honorable Mention," and not of "Honor." All the world would understand 1st, 2d, 3d and 4th prizes, and if with each prize-medal were given a certificate stating the grounds upon which it was given, there would not be much room for mistake or imposture.

It has been mentioned that the Council of General Direction modified the awards of the juries after they had been given in, and had been passed by the Council of Presidents. This is a mistake which ought never to be repeated. The jurors are selected by the various nations exhibiting, and, as a rule, in all past exhibitions, the selection has been unassailable. Men have generally been chosen who were specially qualified for the task, and their decision should be final; for if they, as experts, could not give correct awards, it is quite certain a small knot of men without any of their qualifications cannot do so. Moreover, after a large body of qualified men have given their decisions in good faith, and after full discussion and great expenditure of labor and time, it is most disheartening to find them altered, or set aside, by another body which has asked them to act, and which itself is absolutely incompetent to give more correct opinions; and any changes they make are sure, rightly or wrongly, to be attributed to underhand influences and intrigues.

Much has been said and written, pro and con, upon the desirability of having juries in international, or other exhibitions; and in the London Annual International Exhibitions, committees of selection have been substituted for them. These committees act previous to the arrangement of the exhibition, and from the objects sent select those which they consider worthy to be admitted. The admission then becomes the test of excellence, and no other prize is given than the certificate of admission. The jury system, doubtless, has its faults, but they are small compared with those of this system. Whatever the juries do is open to criticism, for they work where all the world can go and judge also. So that there is every reason why they should, as they always are, be anxious to give a just and sensible decision. In the case of the committees of selection no one knows who has been rejected, or whether the best have been chosen. The writer has worked both on juries and committees of selec-

tion, and has acquired some respect for the working of the former, but none for the latter; he is also of opinion that public opinion agrees with his own, for he has been quite unable to ascertain that even a shadow of value is attached to the certificates of admission. It is of considerable importance that the local and foreign commissions should exercise a power of selection over the exhibits, for which space is claimed from them, so that the real purposes and interests of the exhibition be not perverted to the advertisement of common and uninteresting materials. As a rule, this need only be suggested to the various Commissions, for their national pride is ordinarily sufficient to keep them from lowering the character of their nations in the eyes of the world by introducing exhibits discreditable to the general collection.

On the whole, the jury regulations carried out at the Vienna Exhibition were good, but they acted badly in very many cases, owing to the mischievous system of control over their decisions, and the very indefinite nature of the prizes.

The number of the jurors was, according to Rule V., regulated by the number of exhibitors in each group; no fairer plan can be devised, but the method of carrying it out had one objection. The regulation as it stood was as follows:—

For every	10 to 100 exhibitors,	.	.	.	one juror.
“	101 to 200	“	.	.	two jurors.
“	201 to 300	“	.	.	three jurors.
“	301 to 400	“	.	.	four jurors.

And so on.

Now, the fault in this arrangement is in the first line, for, as a rule, there are the fewest exhibitors of the most important things. Take, for instance, the case of Great Britain in the Vienna Exhibition: In Group 1, stone-ware, porcelain and glass, she had but thirty-six exhibitors, but amongst them there were the Mintons, the Royal Worcester Works, Messrs. Copeland, Wedgwood, Pillatt, Green and others, who are quite unsurpassed in their productions; but by this law, they and their immense interests were only represented by one juror; whilst *France* had three; *Germany*, three; *Japan*, two; *Austria* and *Hungary*, seven, and so on. Now, as it

happened, the exhibitors all through the Exhibition were of two kinds,—those who manufactured the goods they exhibited, and those who only dealt in the goods they displayed. The latter were excluded from receiving prizes, but their numbers counted in the allotment of jurors. The evil of this arrangement must be apparent at a glance. The remedy seems to be, either to exclude all but actual manufacturers from the summation upon which the allotment is made, or to admit traders to the competition for prizes. There are many reasons why the latter should be adopted; subject, however, to stringent regulations. One reason is, that if the promoters of international exhibitions were to depend solely upon manufacturers, they could not get up an attractive and successful exhibition. Enough experience has been obtained to assure us that this is a fact. Such being the case, it is a hardship that those who contribute so much to the success of the undertaking, should be precluded from a participation in its rewards. Had the medal for good taste at Vienna been reserved for such exhibitors, it would have given great satisfaction, and relieved the jurors of a painful duty in passing by those whose good taste in the selection of the best goods so greatly benefited the general effect of the Exhibition, and was a quality in itself well entitled to recognition.

In the seventh article of the Vienna regulations, it was provided that "the director-general may appoint delegates, who will be authorized to participate in the transactions of the jury, and will have a deliberative voice." This is not a good or a fair regulation, unless it is limited to one delegate, because it leaves it in the hands of the director-general to swamp the decision of the juries whenever so inclined; and the personal experiences of the writer lead him to believe that it is a dangerous rule. It is quite right and advisable that the chief executive officer should, if he thinks proper, be present, either personally or by deputy, at all the deliberations of the juries; but beyond seeing that they are carried on in a spirit of fairness and in accord with the regulations, he ought to have no power to interfere.

Another, and a similar mistake, exists in Rule VIII., which permits the Commissioners of Foreign States to participate in and have a voice in the deliberations of the juries. This

gives to small states, whose commissioners have but little to do, the power of having an additional juror, who can go to any jury and give his vote for any purpose he may think proper; whilst another and more important commissioner, from having great occupation, can never exercise this function. This is one evil only, but another must be very apparent: no man can be an expert in all the classes of a great exhibition; therefore it is wrong to give any one the right to act where he is otherwise incompetent.

The fewer the classes or groups into which an exhibition is divided, the greater will be the necessity for forming sectional juries, and this necessitates a more liberal representation than that pointed out above, in Rule V., where, in order to remedy some of the defects noticed, and especially the one most prominent, it should be arranged that twenty-five exhibitors should entitle a nation to one juror; fifty to two jurors; and one hundred to three jurors; after that, one per hundred would be sufficient.

The operations of the Vienna juries began on the 16th of June: that is to say, six weeks after the ceremonial of the opening took place. It was laid down as a *sine qua non* (Rule XIX.) that they were to terminate on the last day of July. Practically, they only finished a day or two before the announcement of the prizes, on the 18th of August. Experience has shown that the sooner the labors of the juries are begun and finished, the better, because, to the exhibitors who have been so fortunate as to obtain the prizes, it is of the greatest importance that they shall have the longest time possible to benefit by the publicity which the Exhibition gives. Therefore the jury work ought not to begin later than one month after the opening day, and should not be allowed to exceed six weeks' time.

Whatever prizes are offered in an International Exhibition, their relative values ought to be strictly defined and adhered to. This certainly was not the case at the Vienna Exhibition. An attempt was made to define them in Rule XXII., and the juries gave their awards accordingly, and where an exhibitor showed progress and good taste they awarded him the two medals, and thus in the same way for meritorious work combined with good taste, they gave the medal for Merit and

Good Taste; but these double awards were nearly all disallowed by the supreme direction; and when the absurdity of the position thus created became apparent, then it was gazetted that all the medals had equal value. Thus, to a very large extent, the work of the juries was superseded, and that which remained was made ridiculous in the extreme; for what could be more absurd than to give to two exhibitors of first and third class merit prizes of equal value? These mistakes mostly arose from a desire to have entire control over everything connected with the Exhibition, even to the deliberations of the jury, or judges as they would be more properly called; and from want of firmness to adhere, against pressure, to even the good points in the regulations. They caused great dissatisfaction, and we may fairly hope that they will be corrected in any future exhibition.

THOMAS C. ARCHER, F.R.S.E., F.S.A.S., F.B.S.E.,

*Director of the Edinburgh Museum of Science and Art, President of the Royal Scottish Society of Arts, Corresponding Member of the Ministry of Crown Domains, Russia, &c., &c.*