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ABSTRACT

Since Napoleon’s invasion of Egypt, Western nations such as France, Britain, and the United States have displayed Egyptian antiquities as an exotic spectacle, creating the image of ancient Egypt that is known today. Orientalist attitudes shaped exhibitions and museum displays that portrayed ancient Egypt as a place of gilded, strange trinkets, while monuments such as obelisks were taken as trophies and mummies were treated as objects rather than human remains. Even the field of Egyptology emerged outside of Egypt from the creation of Western scholars who thought that they not only understood Egypt on a deeper level than the Egyptians themselves but also assumed that they could preserve the antiquities better.

The discovery of the tomb of Tutankhamun offered a chance to rethink this Orientalist image. However, from the first newspaper headlines in the 1920s to the first traveling exhibitions of some of the artifacts, the tomb of King Tut continued to be presented in Orientalist terms. While Egyptology became more sensitive and thoughtful about ancient Egypt, the general public continued to see ancient Egypt as a land of exotic, strange objects and odd burial practices.

These issues were most apparent in the Tutankhamun traveling exhibition that showed in a handful of major museums in the United States. The tours began to bring large public audiences into the museum scene that had once was seen as something that only appealed to an elite crowd of enthusiasts. These tours set new standards for the treatment of the Egyptian antiquities as well as the limiting view of an Egypt to a tiny span of interesting or glamorous years as opposed to its actual long three-thousand-year history. The methods of displaying Egypt under the aesthetic approach, seemed to have been the successful model for an Egyptian exhibit, but also set standards that later exhibitions struggled to achieve.
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INTRODUCTION

The spectacle and curiosity that ancient Egypt became in the West included appropriated obelisks, mummies, and other ancient artifacts. For Western scholars and those who came to Egypt starting in the eighteenth century, these items were more than just pretty things; they were resources about a vanished civilization. For the general public, however, Egypt was the exotic “other,” a place of glittering, unusual trinkets. While scholars struggled to piece together a chronology and history based on their understandings of artifacts and texts, the general public flocked to displays that showcased what was gaudy or strange.

The spectacle of Egypt was what stood out for the crowd. Before the discovery of Tutankhamun in 1922, smaller museums displayed Egyptian artifacts in ways like those of major exhibitions of the World Fairs. People continued with their fascination of the beautiful and different objects, yet there was little to no interest in the lives of the people who produced those works of art. The lack of interest in the humanity of the ancient mummies almost justified, for Western excavators, the right to claim ownership of the antiquities.

The nearly intact tomb of Tutankhamun seemed to offer a chance to move beyond the showy and the creepy and tell a more detailed story about the life in ancient Egypt, at least the life of a pharaoh. The discovery also opened the doors of Egyptology and archaeology to a wider audience. To expand upon and take advantage of such a popular, exciting and mostly positive story after the fearful chaos of World War I, publications such as the National Geographic, began to fill the void with the news in Egypt. It was in this magazine that the first images of a golden mask of the boy-king made their colorful debut. The constant media attention brought
Tutankhamun’s name to more than just a selective bunch of scholars and antiquarians who cared about this archaeological find. Ordinary audiences fell in love with the young pharaoh even before they caught a glimpse of his golden treasures. This focus, in turn, brought ancient Egypt and its artifacts in a new and positive light but still within the dehumanizing realm of the spectacle.

From the time of his tomb’s discovery until the time his treasures left on a first-time tour in the sixties, Tutankhamun’s image was limited, however, to as many glimpses of artifacts newspaper journalists could get. Then Tutankhamun’s treasures left Egypt for the first time in the 1961 and traveled abroad, going to the United States and other countries. The treasures repeated their journey in the next decade. Although the exhibition in the 1960s had immense success and fulfilled its purpose, the ultimate success from the Treasures of Tutankhamun from 1972 to 1981 reached blockbuster status and changed the American museum forever.

From the moment Tutankhamun left the United States in the late seventies to his belongings’ return nearly thirty years later to the States, museum displays on ancient Egypt in America struggled to adapt. Because the blockbuster from the seventies set the standards for the display of Egyptian antiquities so high, it almost became too hard to compete. There were some instances where Egyptian exhibits centered around the comparison to the Treasures of Tutankhamun show’s success, even when it had nothing to do with the young king.

Treasures appealed to the aesthetics and beauty of the artifacts, thus creating a new expectation of how ancient Egypt was and is supposed to be presented. When the spectacle and the glinting of the gold from the widely used imagery of the famous death mask was removed from the recent displays of Tutankhamun, what was left was simply a boy and his kin. For
Egyptologists, there was a chance to present a more detailed story based on scholarship and study.

However, the general public did not always appreciate this different and historical approach. Getting away from the spectacle was hard. Seeing the ancient Egyptians as more than their treasures has been an issue that museums, to this day, are trying to fight. The emphasis on the daily life of the commoners is a popular method to get away from purely showcasing the nobility of Egypt. Although without exotic golden artifacts to present, it has proven challenging to get the larger public to appreciate how this ancient civilization had an expansive life outside of the common focus and themes of death, tombs and the afterlife.
For almost 3,000 years, Egypt was the source of intrigue and fascination for those in the West. Egyptomania, the extreme fascination with all aspects of Egypt, dated back to the ancient Greeks following Alexander the Great’s conquest of Egypt. As historian Robert Brier has noted, “…to the Egyptians, the Greeks were newcomers … When Greek historian Herodotus visited Egypt in 450 B.C., the pyramids were already 2,000 years old.” Greek scholars traveled to Alexandria’s great library, where Egypt was a source of wisdom, and a place, to the outside world, filled with mystical power.

The antiquity and mystery of Egypt captured Greek interest and it was the aspects of death and the afterlife that did it for the Romans. Because Egypt was one of Rome’s many provinces, Egyptian lands were given to Roman veterans in compensation for the lack of land available in Rome due to quick Roman expansions to their empire. The adaptation to Egyptian customs was not high on the list of priorities for the veterans, but the Egyptian beliefs surrounding immortality was effective. The beliefs continued even after the downfall of ancient

---

1 Ronald H. Fritze, *Egyptomania: A History of Fascination, Obsession and Fantasy* (London: Reaktion Books, 2016), 10. According to historian Ronald Fritze, “Egyptomania could give the impression of being concerned with a form of mental illness. Some people who go to extremes with their interest in Egypt (are given the name ‘Egyptopath.’) Nevertheless, when all is said and done, ‘Egyptomania’ is not a pejorative term. The phenomenon of Egyptomania also goes under alternative names. One of these is ‘Egyptophilia,’ a synonym for Egyptomania that gets rid of the potentially derogatory term ‘mania.’ Other terms include ‘Egyptian Revival,’ ‘Egyptianizing,’ and ‘Nile Style,’ but these terms are limited to discussions of the works of art, architecture and interior design that utilize Egyptian motifs.”


3 Ibid.

Egyptian civilization. This is part of what shaped the European interest in Egyptian religious views of death and the afterlife, a theme that surrounds the image of the ancient Egyptians to this day. In either case, the ancient land was viewed as a different entity from the West, both as an exotic land and a place filled with curiosities.

The Greeks’ and Romans’ picking and choosing of the aspects of Egypt to claim as their own began a domino effect for how the West saw as the proper treatment for Egypt. It set the stage for what historian Edward Said has deemed Orientalism. Orientalism and the Orient, to Said, “was almost a European invention, and had been since antiquity a place of romance, exotic beings, haunting memories and landscapes, remarkable experiences.” From his book, Said says:

Orientalism is never far from what Denys Hay has called the idea of Europe, a collective notion identifying “us” Europeans as against all “those” non-Europeans, and indeed it can be argued that the major component in European culture is precisely what made that culture hegemonic both in and outside Europe: the idea of European identification as a superior one in comparison with all the non-European peoples and cultures. There is, in addition, the hegemony of European ideas about the Orient, themselves reiterating European superiority over Oriental backwardness usually overriding the possibility that a more independent, or more skeptical, thinker might have had different views on the matter.

Edward Said, born in Jerusalem in 1935 and raised in Cairo, graduated from Harvard with a Ph.D. in English Literature in 1964. He became the leading voice on the topic of Orientalism, through his book of the same name, published in 1978. Orientalism, for him, was something he witnessed daily, both in his professional and personal domains. While his thesis related to how Europeans saw the Middle East and Asia of the 1800s and 1900s, his concepts

---

5 Brier, 25-26.
7 Ibid, 7.
also fit how Europeans viewed the ancient cultures of the region, including the civilization of ancient Egypt.

Orientalist attitudes and Egyptomania spread using many mediums from art to obelisks and the surrounding curiosity to the transporting of the giant monuments to the later display of mummies. These human bodies did not represent the specially preserved mummies that are showcased in famous museums around the world today. Instead, they were used as an expendable curiosity. Not only were they ground up for use in everyday things such as medicines and artists’ unique paint mixes, but they were also used as decorations, conversation pieces, and tokens meant for bragging rights, instead of being treated with human decency.

Orientalist attitudes towards the antiquities played a major role in how ancient Egypt and in turn, the nineteenth century’s modern Egypt, were perceived, specifically in the displaying of ancient Egypt in museums. The West could quickly excavate and obtain numerous amounts of ancient Egyptian antiquities for the use of their respective museums and personal collections. Within the next century, these attitudes continue within the first years of the discovery of Tutankhamun’s tomb and the death of a notable figure in the discovery uncovers this attitude in the form of the curse, carrying on the idea that Egyptians held mystical power.

With the subsequent deaths of the people closely connected to the discovery of Tutankhamun’s tomb, superstitions, and rumors spread throughout the media. This is an othering narrative that continues to this day. Yiannis Gabriel, a sociologist, explains the separating notion of othering. Othering, Gabriel says, “denies the Other those defining characteristics of the ‘Same,’ reason, dignity, love, pride, heroism, nobility, and ultimately any entitlement to human
rights…it is made rife for exploitation … by denying its essential humanity.”⁹ Both ancient and modern Egyptians had been othered by the West. Egypt was beautiful but only from a certain distance. It was unlike the West, seen as exotic and mysterious; the perfect place to spend a holiday, but not a place to live. The one to expose this exotic territory was Napoleon Bonaparte.

**Descriptions de l’Egypte**

In 1798, Napoleon Bonaparte, French military leader and later emperor, set off to Egypt with over 54,000 soldiers in 400 ships laden with provisions, artillery, and ammunition and a five hundred book reference library. The expedition, connected to the French government’s Scientific and Artistic Commission, had the goal of surveying the sandy landscape, investigating flora and fauna surrounding the Nile and sketching the ancient monuments.¹⁰ With the British close behind, the French navigated and set anchor at Aboukir Bay then marched by foot to the Egyptian city of Alexandria. After the end of the Battle of the Nile in August of 1798 between the French and the British, Napoleon and his army were stranded.¹¹ The defeat did not deter the commission.

---


In June of 1799, they began their work of documenting the land. In total, they mounted three expeditions, and in each of the three, one of Napoleon’s artist-savants, Vivant Denon, continued to discover more about the once lost ancient lands. “Mounted on a donkey, his cardboard box slung over the shoulder, his crayons in a pouch, he was always at the head of the columns, deaf to the rifle shots, unaware of the rain of cannonballs around him.” Denon’s careful sketches and precise depictions of Egypt eventually led the West in a new era of Egyptomania and led to the development of Egyptology as a science.

The members of the Scientific and Artistic Commission were not allowed to return to France until the 1801 British defeat of General Abdullah Jacques Menou. Through this defeat came the signing of the Capitulation of Alexandria. Robert Thomas Wilson’s, History of the British Expedition to Egypt, published in 1803, noted how the French lost the Rosetta Stone among other antiquities. The French requested that “the individuals composing the Institute of Egypt, and the Commission of Arts, shall carry with them all the papers, plans, memoirs, collections of natural history, and all the monuments of art and antiquity, collected by them in Egypt.”

In response, the British answers:

12 “Savant,” Merriam-Webster, accessed December 2017, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/savant. It means “a person of learning, especially: one with detailed knowledge in some specialized field (as of science or literature.)”
15 Jeffry R. Halverson and Nathaniel Greenberg, Islamists of the Maghreb (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, 2018): Chapter 2. Newly converted to Islam, this unpopular French general was left in charge after the assassination of the general Napoleon let take his place so that Napoleon could sneak out of Egypt to head back to France.
The members of the Institute may carry with them all the instruments of arts and science, which they have brought from France; but the Arabian manuscripts, the statues, and other collections which have been made for the French Republic, shall be considered as public property, and subject to the disposal of the generals of the combined army.  

The wording of the stipulation was due to the claim by the French that the artifacts belonged to those who found them. “Belonging to General Friant; [he claimed] that the famous stone (called the gem of antiquity by the French, as being the key to the hieroglyphic language) was his private property, and that the collections of natural history belonged individually to the different artists.” Though they had lost the Rosetta Stone and other artifacts to the British, they were able to keep their valuable sketches, writings and other documentation from their three-year adventure. Their findings became known as the Description de l’Egypte.

Before Napoleon, the actual landscape and images of Egyptian artifacts were only figments of the European imagination, mentioned in passing in the Bible and the texts of the Greeks and Romans. Most Europeans had never seen Egypt and had limited access to Egyptian art and artifacts, except for rare displays like Giovanni Belzoni’s. When descriptions of Egyptian antiquities were published, the European public got to see how the ancient Egyptians lived.

That said, Europeans had a hard time separating the Egypt of the Pharaohs from the Muslim and Coptic Egypt of the nineteenth century. This confusion could be seen, for example in the items produced for everyday use that came to be adorned with colorful portraits of images of their creator's ideas of Egypt. For example, cigar labels began to print images of what the manufactures thought were Egypt and its people; however, they tended to use their artistic license to give Egypt a face. According to Brier, “The labels had…the pyramids, sphinxes, and

17 Ibid.
18 Ibid.
camels, but in the O’San label, the crescent that frames a veiled woman is decidedly Turkish…the Indian rider on the Lord Egypt label probably didn’t seem out of place.”

Exploring Egypt also included exploring its language. Ever since the Rosetta Stone had been discovered by Napoleon’s soldiers in 1799, Europeans were determined to be the first to decipher the ancient Egyptian language. Since knowledge was so important in terms of holding superiority over a nation, those who could decipher the ancient Egyptian language, in a sense, had the power to tell the story of ancient Egypt. Ancient Egypt became as much of a colony of the West as much as the Egypt of the pashas. The figure who made this breakthrough was Jean Francois Champollion.

Champollion had plenty of predecessors who did their share of work in trying to make a breakthrough in translating hieroglyphics to their native tongue. These predecessors were each well respected in their days, and were seen as lovers of Egypt, lovers of language and grammar, and scholars trying to find their place in the competitive world of early Egyptology. Joseph Fourier, former savant to Napoleon, Claude-Marie Abbe Gattel, Silvestre de Sacy, John David Akerblad and many others played their part in the attempt to decode the ancient script. Among these names, it was the Englishman, Thomas Young who should have gotten more of the credit he deserved, especially regarding his place in the history of Egyptology. He came up with the original alphabet but it was expanded and improved by Champollion, thus the latter received the credit.

---

19 Brier, 105-106.
20 Said, 1978, 40. “To have such knowledge of such a thing is to dominate it, to have authority over it.”
22 Hudson Gurney, Memoir of the life of Thomas Young, M.D.F.R.S. Foreign Associate of the Royal Institute of France, etc. etc.: With a Catalogue of His Works and Essays (London: John & Arthur Arch, 1831), 60. He came up
Regardless, it was Europeans, not Egyptians, who translated the hieroglyphics and therefore, made the ancient Egyptian language as much a trophy of imperial conquest as tomb objects. Europeans appointed themselves to important positions of authority within institutions. Institutions such as the Antiquities Service, which exercised control over Egyptian antiquities, were created and headed by the French. Any artifacts or works found during excavations were to go through to the Service first, thus guaranteeing the French’s control over the artifacts initial possession and display.23

On the opposite end of the spectrum of Western access to this authority on antiquities, native Egyptians rarely held such a title during this time, and some things made it even more obvious how uneven the distribution of power was on each side. Native Egyptians themselves were rarely even named. Many well-known Egyptologists, like Wallis Budge, give no name to the important people they worked with in Egypt; they only refer to them as “the natives.” These natives, according to Budge were responsible for finding most of ancient Egypt’s beautiful treasures,24 yet their names have escaped common knowledge as time has passed.

Only when the mention of an important, but distant official, is spoken of, is when the name of the Egyptian is given. Once the Rosetta Stone was studied and deciphered, the mystery of the hieroglyphs had gone, only to be replaced by having more insight of the ancient past. Even then, ancient Egypt seemed foreign, too different from Europe to be considered equals to the Greek and Roman art and history displayed proudly in museums.

The founding of the study of Egyptology occurred during the time in which nations were moving the obelisks out of Egypt. During this time, there was an ongoing conflict with naming a specific Father of Egyptology as well as a developing distaste for the crude and hasty methods that were being used to excavate artifacts during the rapidly ending race for Egypt. The sciences taken from Egyptian studies reinforced a sense of European superiority.25

When Napoleon and his army and artists explored Egypt, the rationalism of the Enlightenment26 was giving way to Romanticism.27 Orientalism and Romanticism seemed to go hand in hand with each other. In contrast to industrializing Europe and America, the Romantics wished to go back to earlier days filled with color and pageantry. Religious pomp was the key to a good, stable society. People from the Romantic period were also quite tired of how populated and industrial their world had become. The yearning of escaping such a lifestyle was prominent.

The “exotic” nature of said regions, advertised as an adventure and a way to escape, was meant both for actual tourists and for the people who could not afford to travel. Exotic lands became the focal point for many Romantic portraits during this time.28 Ancient Egypt became part of the exotic. With the increase of knowledge about the ancient culture, especially after the

---

25 Said, 11-12. Particularly from Britain, France and the United States. Said makes it clear that Britain and France were the power sources behind the western appropriation of ancient Egypt as well as the passing of the mantle, unwillingly, to the United States after WWII due to the shifting of world power. Power and ancient Egypt went hand in hand.

26 History.com Staff, "Enlightenment," History.com, 2009, accessed November 2017, http://www.history.com/topics/enlightenment. Also known as the Age of Reason, “Enlightenment thinkers in Britain, in France and throughout Europe questioned traditional authority and embraced the notion that humanity could be improved through rational change.”

27 The Editors of Encyclopædia Britannica, "Romanticism," Encyclopædia Britannica, November 30, 2016, accessed November 2017, http://www.britannica.com/art/Romanticism. “Romanticism can be seen as a rejection of the precepts of order, calm, harmony, balance, idealization, and rationality...it was also to some extent a reaction against the Enlightenment and against 18th-century rationalism and physical materialism in general. Romanticism emphasized the individual, the subjective, the irrational, the imaginative, the personal, the spontaneous, the emotional, the visionary and the transcendental.”

28 Joanne Schneider, The Age of Romanticism (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2007), 44.
decipherment of the Rosetta Stone, Westerners became entranced with a place that produced numerous monuments and curiosities.

Obelisks and Mummies

In addition to texts, Europeans began to acquire other types of what was considered Egyptian artifacts, including obelisks and mummies. Obelisks,\textsuperscript{29} always erected in pairs, were significant elements for ancient Egyptian temples. According to Professor Thomas Donaldson, they also “must ever be considered as valuable records of the ancient history of the Egyptians, and of the skill of those periods; monumental evidence of their sovereigns and of their warlike exploits.”\textsuperscript{30}

After ancient Egypt’s decline, most of these ancient carved records became obscure, even after Western lands, like England, France, and the United States gained a gifted obelisk of their own. From the moment of their creation in the quarries of Egypt until their unforeseen journeys to the West, the mystery of the obelisks’ meticulously inscribed hieroglyphs along with the massive structure of the monument must have fascinated all who had seen them firsthand in Europe. They were, however, less fascinating to the Egyptians, or at least their leaders such as the main obelisk giver of the era Muhammed Ali.

Ali ruled Egypt in the early 1800s and because of his religious background, the obelisks symbolized ancient Egypt’s older pagan history, and, therefore, had no meaning to him. This

\textsuperscript{29} Thomas L. Donaldson, “On Obelisks: Their Purpose, Proportions, Material, and Position,” in John Henry. Parker, \textit{The Archaeology of Rome. Chapter IV. The Egyptian Obelisks, to which is added a supplement to the first three parts} (Oxford: J. Parker, 1879), 28. “The term, obelisk, is derived from the Greek term \textit{obelos}, which meant ‘a spit,’ a term which the witty epigrammatic Greeks gave them, with the view, like all wits in such cases, to cover with an air of ridicule what they could not controvert by reason.”

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid.
lack of care for the obelisks, in turn, allowed him to easily deal with the European powers by giving Europeans something they craved but for him had little value.  

Although Ali played a big part in the West’s acquisition of the obelisks, even without his help, Europeans may have found some other way to gain access to what they wanted.

The Orientalist ideas held by the empires of England and France encouraged and caused a sense of entitlement for the acquisitions of numerous obelisks into Europe, at least from a Eurocentric point of view. The obelisks were ‘things’ that Europe and North America received. They excited each nation with their beauty, but they were still objects that became theirs in the way that mummies had become theirs to do with as they pleased.

Those objects were modern-day spoils of war. They were the physical embodiment of a Western victory. Not only did Europe and North America acquire such a grand monument, but the arduous journey and successful placement of said obelisk in their respective countries was proof for the West that ancient Egyptian ingenuity could be mastered and overtaken. Rapid and brutal excavations had already begun to take place after the French invasion, gaining such antiquities, like the obelisks, only spurred on the sense of entitlement.

With the success of each placement, memorabilia surrounding the obelisks spread quickly. In France, “soon there were pens in the shape of obelisks, obelisk confections and songs about obelisks.” In England, national pride grew as well as the interest in all things Egyptian. “The Industrial Revolution made the production of items associated with Egypt affordable for

---

31 Brier, 70-71.
32 Brier, 77.
the masses. It had no connection to Egypt except for the name, but who cared? Egypt sold.”

Egypt began to equal to gaining economic wealth.

In New York, after the obelisk was erected, Egyptomania also reigned, and collectibles and memorabilia spread quickly. “Since the obelisk was called ‘Cleopatra’s Needle,’ it was natural that sewing goods stores created cards capitalizing on the obelisk’s fame. The John English Needle Co. produced a beautiful card showing Cleopatra threading a needle that’s an inverted obelisk.” Westerners were fascinated by the obelisks but kept the people who created the monuments at a distance.

The presence of the obelisk in New York City, like in England, also brought on an additional sense of national pride as the United States had few famous key players in the race for Egypt right after the French invasion. As for the American who brought the obelisk from Egypt, Henry Gorringe, the United States showed its pride over him and his achievement. W. M. Evarts, 1881 Secretary of State, boasted about Gorringe:

The circumstances under which the obelisk was presented by the government of Egypt to the city of New York are so familiar that I need merely advert to the brilliant service rendered by Lieutenant-Commander Gorringe, involving the assumption of considerable personal risk on his part... The sentiment of national pride naturally felt in this successful achievement, coupled with the international character of Mr. Gorringe’s service, makes it fitting that some appropriate action should be taken by Congress.”

---

33 Ibid, 100-102.
34 Ibid, 148.
Henry H. Gorringe was the U.S. Navy engineer chosen by Henry Hurlburt, the editor of the New York World, and William H. Vanderbilt, the railroad tycoon, to bring the obelisk from Alexandria, Egypt to New York City's Central Park. From June 12, 1880, to July 20th, Gorringe, and the new American obelisk sailed the long journey from Egypt to New York’s Central Park. People were both able to focus their energies on the heroes who brought “their” obelisks home and make a profit from the hype and spectacle that surrounded obelisk-mania.

The United States has had own history of Egyptomania, including the obelisk of the Washington Monument that was completed in 1885 as part of an “architectural eclecticism with the Egyptian Revival as the key style in American commemorative culture.” Next on the list is the pyramid on American currency, which turned into the “enigmatic symbol of the unfinished pyramid topped by an all-seeing eye sums up the origins of the American dream.” Also, the Egyptian Revival takes place in memorial and funerary architecture from ordinary gravestones to the Liberty Memorial in Kansas City. It even shaped one of the country’s most powerful symbols, the Statue of Liberty. Lady Liberty was originally intended to be an Egyptian woman

36 Ibid, 5. From Vanderbilt to Gorringe Aug 4, 1879: “Dear Sir: I have learned that you have or can procure the facilities to remove to the city of New York the obelisk now standing at Alexandria, in Egypt, known as ‘Cleopatra’s Needle.’ As I desire that this obelisk may be secured for the city of New York, I make you the following proposition: If you will take down and remove said obelisk from its present position to this city, and place it on such site as may be selected with my approval by the Commissioners of Parks, and furnish and construct at your own expense on said site a foundation of mason work and granite base of such form and dimensions as said Commissioners and myself may approve, I will, on the completion of the whole work, pay to you seventy-five thousand dollars.”
meant to guard the Suez Canal, but the plans were repurposed to an American context after the bankruptcy of Egypt in the late nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{40}

Meanwhile, mummies had been excavated, both by professionals and civilians, from medieval times into the nineteenth century, and, before 1881, it was not considered taboo to collect them as any other object. There was a strong enthusiasm for acquiring the mummies. People wanted them, but they did not desire them as anything except as a disposable commodity. The demand for them was high. Thus, civilians in Egypt began to make fake mummies to sell. According to W. Seipel, of the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna, “The production of hundreds of fake mummies became commonplace. One did not even shy away from mummifying the bodies of newly deceased persons and turning them into mummy-medicine.”\textsuperscript{41}

Mummies gained an excited following in the late nineteenth century, but, even before that, they had been gracing the homes, private collections and corporate offices of many during this time. The major difference between the popular obelisk and the common mummy was the fact that mummies were not as rare as the obelisks. Obelisks had press coverage every time a nation acquired one. Newspaper subscribers followed their movement and made heroes of those involved in placing the obelisk. It was indeed a big deal, compared to the finding of a mummy. Scholarship and study reinforced these attitudes of the lack of care of ancient Egyptian corpses, rather than dispelled them.

\textsuperscript{40} Jocelyn Hackforth-Jones and Mary Roberts, \textit{Edges of Empire: Orientalism and Visual Culture} (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 41.
The fact that mummies, in turn, were objectified, and seen closer as an object than human shows that this dehumanization was shared by many during the era of Romanticism. Mummy unwrapping parties became commonplace with only a select few allowed to join. Scientists and doctors hosted these parties for the high members of society that included their scholarly colleagues, their students and mentors, royalty from around the world and curious people from wealthy backgrounds.

The justification for these parties was science, but usually, this was only added to make it seem like the partygoers were not just morbidly curious to see what they could find. If a golden trinket or any other piece of value had been revealed within the body’s wrappings, this was usually taken home with the guest as a souvenir. Disappointment usually followed if no trinkets were found. The morbid curiosity of viewing a several millennia old body during these Victorian times kept audiences from being too disappointed.

Scholars such as Nicholas Daly and Bradley Deane have claimed that mummies played a special role within Britain’s empire outside of their limited role as a curiosity and a spectacle. Mummies “performed the role of the empire; they provided a medium through which British power and influence could be emphasized…British support for the Ottoman Empire in Egypt during the first half of the nineteenth century makes it applicable to the initial mummy craze.” This craze quickly turned even more macabre.
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The ground mummy used for such a paint came from the desecrated mummies from the unwrapping parties.\textsuperscript{46} Though these parties had a profound impact on Victorian society, it went out of style by the beginning of the twentieth century. The last known public unwrapping party, held by archaeology lecturer, Margaret Murry, took place in Manchester, England in 1908. Though the party had an audience of 500, it faced much criticism in the press because such displays were now seen as inhumane.\textsuperscript{47}

Within the range of archaeological enquiry there can scarcely be a subject of greater curiosity or interest than that which relates to the preservation of the remains of mankind of so early a period as were the first inhabitants of Egypt. The practice of embalming the dead is deeply interesting, were it to rest upon antiquity alone; but when it is considered in relation to the history of the human species, and to the condition of the arts and sciences so remote a period, it rises in importance, and it is remarkable that there should not exist in any language, as far as I have been able to ascertain, any work devoted expressly to the treating of this subject in all its branches.\textsuperscript{48}

This quote from Victorian surgeon Thomas J. Pettigrew, doctor of Philosophy and member of the Royal Asiatic Society,\textsuperscript{49} demonstrates the reasoning of someone who turned the unwrapping parties into a popular spectacle. Pettigrew’s flair drew in thousands of curious scholars and nobles by emphasizing the sights and smells of the unwrapping coupled with serving refreshments.\textsuperscript{50} Pettigrew not only unwrapped and analyzed Egyptian mummies, but he also studied mummies from the Canary Islands, ancient Peruvians, and the people of Burma.\textsuperscript{51}

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid.
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Mummies were of great curiosity to the world of the Europeans and North Americans, and they seemed to be just that, simple curiosities. The general treatment of the mummies caused Europeans and Americans to become numb to the humanity of the ancient mummies. Egyptologist Amelia Edwards, who held a chair in Egyptology at the University College in London in the 1870s,\textsuperscript{52} says this about the smuggling of mummies after the 1835 ban on the unauthorized export of Egyptian antiquities:

We soon became quite hardened to such sights, and learned to rummage among dusty sepulchers with no more compunction than would have befitted a gang of professional body-snatchers. These are the experiences upon which one looks back afterwards with wonder, and something like remorse; but so infectious is the universal callousness, and so overmastering is the passion for relic-hunting, that I do not doubt we should do the same things under the same circumstances. Most Egyptian travellers, if questioned, would have to make a similar confession. Shocked at first, they denounce with horror the whole system of sepulchral excavation, legal as well as predatory; acquiring, however, a taste for scarabs and mummy-gods, they soon begin to buy with eagerness the spoils of the dead; finally they forget all their former scruples, and ask no better fortune than to discover and confiscate a tomb for themselves.\textsuperscript{53}

The treasures, as well as the desire for souvenirs, were what caused the lack of shame for the desecration of tombs. The quick acquisition of priceless artifacts clouded many minds back in Edwards’ era. This era emphasized Egypt and its artifacts as nothing more than trinkets, souvenirs, or treasures to be plundered, but since the discovery in 1881, some of those ‘things,’ to the excitement of both the elite and the commoner; now had names.

The Royal Cache of Mummies 1881

\textsuperscript{52} Kember et al., 191.
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Prior to the British occupation of Egypt in 1882, excavation techniques were still quite primitive. However, the late nineteenth century ushered in sweeping changes to the study of ancient Egypt. Decades after the deciphering of the Rosetta Stone, Egyptology received a major boost. Hieroglyphs were easily translated, technologies had advanced, and a new generation of Egyptologists had entered the scene of excavation. Among them was Flinders Petrie who changed Egyptology forever, by standardizing a chronological method for the artifacts, leading to new methods of displaying said artifacts.\(^{54}\) Petrie states,

> The ideas of conservation have not kept pace with the work of discovery. The present system of museums is the most serious bar to the progress of archaeology. The building, which is the mere modern shell, of no interest, and often of no beauty, is the master of the collection, which is restrained and crippled by such conditions that its use is impaired and its growth is stopped...In a museum the collection is the essential; the building is the mere accident of the surroundings of the collection, and it should completely conform to all the requirements.\(^{55}\)

Petrie wanted to make it clear to look beyond the seemingly dull and mundane look of the vessel. The vessel had the potential to hold many wonders that go far beyond what the eye could see, like the function and look of the outside of a museum. Petrie did this when he looked past what seemed to be common earthenware. His use of pottery shards to determine the once unknown chronology of Egyptian artifacts shifted Egyptological scholarship and improved as well as deepened the methods in which museums explained and interpreted their collections.

Being able to understand and appreciate the order of events in ancient Egyptian history allowed methods outside of the aesthetic appeal of Egypt’s validity. Labels with the context of a timeline improved audiences’ understanding of the culture. However, even though the historical
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context became readily available, the most popular approach to viewing Egypt remained as that of a spectacle of ‘treasures.’

Although famous royal tombs had been discovered even early in the nineteenth century, the actual mummy of a famous pharaoh had never been found until the discovery of the cache of royal mummies in 1881. In that year, it was publicly announced that figures such as Amenhotep I, Tuthmose I, II, and III; all from Tutankhamun’s eighteenth dynasty, as well as Ramses I, Seti I and Ramses II from the nineteenth dynasty, were recovered. During this time, mummy-mania began to take a turn. Due to the Bible’s Exodus, the one pharaoh with “the greatest impact was Ramses II; the public was enthralled with Egyptian mummies so it was only a short time until they entered popular culture.”

Though German Egyptologist Emile Brugsch was given credit for the magnificent find, he was not responsible for finding the tomb of the nobility. It was an Egyptian family, the Abd el-Rassul family, that found them first.

The existence of the first royal cache was announced in 1881, although it had been discovered some ten years earlier by the Abd el-Rassul family. The elder brother of the family reassured that he would be immune from punishment, finally provided the authorities with details of the tomb’s location. On their first visit, the officials found an assemblage of funerary artifacts and a cache of over forty royal mummies…Fear that local villagers might seize the treasure prompted the officials to empty the tomb. The contents were cleared within two days and moved to Luxor, but since no record was kept of the location of the mummies and artifacts within the tomb, researchers later found it difficult to identify some of the bodies. Finally, on July 14, 1881, the mummies were transported by river to Cairo and installed in the Boulaq Museum.

---
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Mummies, of course, were not new to the West by this time, but now they had names and a history. Before this discovery, Western museums had a specific reason for acquiring mummies. Egyptologist Beverley Rogers states that “museums during the nineteenth century displayed mummies and mummy pieces as part of larger Egyptian displays. Any city or town museum which valued its reputation and its visitor numbers sought to acquire ancient Egyptian artefacts.”

With the discovery of the Royal Cache, observable changes began with how ancient Egyptian bodies were treated. It seemed that the West saw the potential of an equal rather than an inferior. Rogers continues, “in the 1880s and 1890s better excavation techniques and academic discourses meant that scholars were able to reconstruct a history of daily life in ancient Egypt so that mummies appeared less like museum objects and more like individual human beings.”

This was the tipping point for Egyptology, from a focus on “tombs and treasure” to the creation of a more comprehensive knowledge of the ancient civilization, and was reflected in a new approach to museum displays with material displayed chronologically or in tomb groups, and including more mundane and overlooked things, such as pottery.

Brugsch’s distrust of the Egyptians led him to excavate the magnificent within the span of a week. It was such a rapid process that he did so without documenting the provenance of the artifacts and completed the cleaning of the tomb in near darkness. Although this find could have rivaled the big discovery that Tutankhamun became, the lack of information about the excavation process did a disservice to Egyptological studies from the late 1880s to this day.

---

59 Sullivan, 193-194.
60 Ibid, 203.
Displaying Egypt

London’s British Museum was opened January 15, 1759 and was an example of the “Wunderkammer” or “cabinet of curiosities.” The Wunderkammer:

Included both works of art and objects used in the study of science and natural history [and] predominated in northern Europe...The Wunderkammer model thus lingered longer in both private collections and public art museums in the North, most conspicuously at the British Museum. Eventually, as art and science were recognized as distinct branches of knowledge, institutions came to be devoted to one or the other. Even as private collections were turned into public museums, in most cases their royal or aristocratic founders and patrons continued to exercise ultimate authority over them.63

The British Museum was not intended to educate the general public. Rather it was, “a place for scientists to consult specimens, for antiquarians to study the documents and material remains of the past and for aesthets and artists to contemplate the merits of ancient art.”64 The assumption was that scholars would already know the stories behind the artifacts. The small ancient Egyptian collection consisted of “bronze statues, shabtis, scarabs, a mummy, a stela and small pieces of sculpture.”65

The major donations of Colossal Egyptian statues and larger artifacts, such as the famous statue of the Younger Memnon, which inspired Percy Shelley’s poem Ozymandias, struggled to gain equal ground and respect compared to the art of ancient Greece and Rome. It took from the opening of the museum to the mid-nineteenth century for the appreciation of Egyptian pieces as
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beautiful art. Yet they were still seen as inferior due to the stiffness of the lines and the lack of the grace that the European eye appreciated in the Grecian sculptures.⁶⁶

Egyptian items were barely considered human history. Any artifact about ancient Egypt as well as any cultural item that had an unknown past was placed into the natural history section.⁶⁷ Archaeologist Stephanie Moser states, “Egyptian antiquities were displayed alongside both the natural and artificial…the association of [the] antiquities with the natural curiosities in the 1st exhibition room enhanced their status on weird and wondrous objects.”⁶⁸

Even the display of the objects seemed to reinforce their status of being only marginally interesting compared to the history of Greece and Rome. Egyptian artifacts languished without proper lighting, assembled in a random order of overcrowded artifacts. The drab walls that resembled dingy stone, purposely contrasted with the brightly painted walls and well-lit pedestal raised statues of Greece and Rome.⁶⁹ Not accidentally, these differences made Egypt look less important.

The British Museum’s interpretation of ancient Egypt impacted British crowds who were allowed into the museum. At first, the audience was limited to those who submitted a written application to visit the museum and earned the rare ticket, according to the British Museum’s 1824, *Synopsis of the Contents of the British Museum*. The *Synopsis* states,

> Persons who may wish to see the Museum, are to apply in the ante-room of the house, between the hours of ten and two, where their names, and the number, of the friends they may wish to introduce with them, are inscribed in a book kept for the purpose: upon which, tickets will be delivered to them for the further admission…It is expected that all persons who visit the Museum be decent and orderly in their appearance and behaviour;
the officers being instructed to refuse admission, or to cause to withdraw, any such as shall disregard this caution. No children apparently under ten years of age will be admitted.\textsuperscript{70}

Right away, a clear classism existed between the British Museum’s policies against the British people themselves. That young children, the illiterate and the not so well off were not allowed to explore an institution that could have inspired their future interests shows the priority museums officials had over limiting their target audience. It was assumed only an academic or well to do crowd could appreciate such works of art and historical knowledge.

Over time, the museum’s policies changed by moving away from being an exclusive, scholarly research facility to an open, national institution. In addition, those in charge went from having a grudging, but neglectful, acceptance of Egyptian antiquities to playing a major part in the excavating, collecting and displaying the now respected ancient artifacts.

The Egyptomania and Orientalism stemming from the Western civilization during the nineteenth century, paved the way for how ancient Egypt was exhibited in Western museums from the time of Giovanni Belzoni’s London exhibition in the 1820s to the twenty-first century. According to biographer Stanley Mayes’ book, \textit{The Great Belzoni}, Giovanni Belzoni was an Italian strongman born in 1778 who had the experience of a circus entertainer to quickly turned excavator at the turn of the nineteenth-century.\textsuperscript{71} Mayes writes that Belzoni “discovered six royal

\textsuperscript{70} \textit{Synopsis of the Contents of the British Museum} (London: Printed by G. Woodfall, 1824), 177-178.

tombs in the Valley of the Kings, opened the Second Pyramid, found the lost city of Berenice and by his efforts, secured for the British Museum, a superb collection of Egyptian antiquities.”72

Belzoni’s 1821 London Egyptian exhibit paved the way for future exhibits by using the reconstruction of reality approach. For the exhibit, Mayes says, “the central attraction of Giovanni’s exhibition was to be his model of the Tomb of Seti I…It was not possible to make an exact replica…Belzoni decided to concentrate on two of the most impressive chambers.”73 Intricate models of temples, Abu Simbel and even a pyramid was created by Belzoni for this London exhibit, as well as every part of his collection that he excavated in Egypt over his short years of travel.74

Despite not knowing the intimate details of the ancient culture at the time, this recreation approach worked well for the crowds who did not know what to expect for an Egyptian exhibit outside of the British Museum. According to French scholar Fabrice Grognet, “Generally speaking, this approach tends not to involve a great deal of explanatory material,”75 which would have fit the category of Egypt at this time. This was before William Flinders-Petrie’s chronological timeline of Egypt was accepted in the scholarly world. Thus, this exhibit was a good start in showing context for Egyptian history when not much was known.

Major Egyptian exhibitions geared to the public and got their start and reputation with the opening of the Crystal Palace, or the Great Exhibition, in 1851. Even though France had had multiple fairs before the time of England’s Fair of 1851, perhaps it was due to the international aspect of the affair that England could claim that it was the first. The Crystal Palace was built
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purely “for the purposes of exhibition, of competition, and of encouragement; when he [Prince Albert] proposed that these contributions should consist of four great divisions, namely: raw materials; machinery and mechanical inventions; manufactures, and sculpture and plastic art generally.”76

Chaos was rampant because, although the Great Exhibition at the Crystal Palace was awe-inspiring, there was just way too much to look at all at one time. The “entire” world of approximately 14,000 exhibitors was brought into London and if one were to view all the wonders of the world in such a short period of time, it is understandable that it would be considered an exhausting sight to witness.77 According to historian, physician and medical researcher Alan R. Rushton, the Fair had an impressive audience. “They were peaceful and orderly Englishmen, not rowdy and disruptive like the Continental working class. Prince Albert saw the event as a triumph of peace and internationalism, demonstrating the very best of English society.”78

Again, that the emphasis was placed on the crowd being “orderly Englishmen” as opposed to the “rowdy, disruptive Continental working class,” shows how Europeans also othered even other Europeans, let alone the ancient Egyptians. This divide outside of the museum also shows who was expected as the target audience to see such wonders in a major display, as opposed to just anyone coming in to enjoy the show. Even though the exhibition was meant for the “world,” the lack of inclusion must have put people off to such events.

77 Ibid, xiv.
When the Crystal Palace’s 1851 theatrical display was complete with full scaled Egyptian buildings, it impressed and motivated British crowds to appreciate the potential beauty of Egypt. The British Museum, though, remained stubborn in their traditional display of Egypt as a sideshow. In the 1854 display a few years later in the Crystal Palace, the event continued to display ancient Egypt in a positive light. It became an immersive experience for the British who were so used to the Museum’s stern and stiff portrayal of Egypt. The display “took the form of a large-scale architectural reconstruction of Egyptian monuments…this vision of ancient Egypt appealed to visitors in a way that was profoundly different from viewing relics in an austere museum setting.”

The French, after 1854, maintained their hold on Egyptian antiquities. Frenchman Auguste Mariette was first titled the conservator of Egyptian monuments by the Egyptian ruler, Khedive Ismail Pasha, after showing interest in Egyptology at a young age. He went on to conduct several successful excavations for the Louvre. He sponsored and subsequently founded the Boulaq Museum in Egypt, and became the Director of the newly instated Egyptian Service of Antiquities in 1858.

Since Mariette was the head of the antiquities department, meant to protect the antiquities, he had the right to have the first look at anything newly excavated. Furthermore, he excavated artifacts as he pleased, and he allowed his friends to have a free pass to Egypt to excavate however they wanted. There had been edicts written to protect the ancient Egyptian antiquities and monuments, but under Mariette, they were not enforced.
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Mariette and his colleagues did contribute greatly towards museums in their day and additionally catered to the many growing private collections that developed throughout the nineteenth century. These private collections were, of course, viewed only by the elite members of society, whose status stemmed from either monetary wealth or great wealth of knowledge. These private collections were the precursors of the notable museum exhibits that followed the transitioning of private collections to museums open displays. Egypt thus became accessible to the general public, and exhibitions modeled after displays in the World Fairs, greatly changing the museum and how artifacts would be exhibited.

For French art and visual culture specialist, Katie Hornstein, the Paris’ Exposition of 1855 “was the first European world’s fair to combine an exhibition of industrial products from around the globe with an exhibition of works of art submitted by participating nations.” This exhibit was created with the intention of overshadowing London’s previous exhibit.

France had been the stage for multiple exhibitions and world’s fairs before England’s Fair of 1851. Like the British showcasing of local and international industries, the earlier “nineteenth-century exhibitions of industrial products were held semi-regularly in different locations around Paris,” like the Louvre and Les Invalides between 1801 – 1827.

Although both the French and the British World’s fairs had their critics at the time, they are seen today as extraordinary successes. Crowds gathered, and people came together to share in the arts and cultures from around the world. In these fairs, Egypt had a presence, but it was never
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the main event or the blockbuster that it would be in the next century. The monuments and the spectacle created a visually pleasing experience.

But in the scheme of things, Egypt was but an afterthought in comparison to the many thousands of exhibits spread across the designated areas of the fairs. Although there was much admiration, aesthetically, for ancient Egyptian artifacts, it was not enough to grant enough time, money, or focus on something that was seen as inferior to themselves and their accomplishments.

The Paris International Exposition of 1867 shows a deeper, if flawed understanding of the Egyptians at this time and is certainly a precursor to the Columbian exhibition in the United States. The exposition blended ancient and modern Egypt which gave the audience the sense that ancient Egypt did not decline as a culture and society, but carried on timelessly but in a different form to be experienced and enjoyed today.

North America’s Relationship with Egypt

The United States, at this point, had a very indirect relationship with Egypt. The Europeans had won the race for Egypt with the British having occupancy within the country beginning in 1882. Also in this same year, the most important organization to have been found in favor of the United States’ acquisition of ancient Egyptian artifacts, was the Egypt Exploration Fund, EEF, founded by previously mentioned Egyptologist, Amelia Edwards. The EEF was changed to the Egypt Exploration Society in 1919.
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North Americans had played a major part in the rush for artifacts for their institutions after the EEF became available to them.\textsuperscript{89} As well as partaking in accomplishments towards Egyptology; their contributions were overshadowed due to the limitations that the lack of the discipline of Egyptology in the country gave them as well as the vast achievements from their European counterparts.

If an American was interested in becoming an Egyptologist before the twentieth century, they had to look outside of the country and travel overseas. Many, like George Andrew Reisner and James Henry Breasted, studied in Berlin,\textsuperscript{90} then traveled to Egypt to complete training before bringing their new expertise to their respective museums and universities in the United States. In 1905, Breasted was given the first chair of Egyptology in the country.

Despite a lacking relationship with Egypt, by the twentieth century, the United States not only owned an obelisk, but they also had many other important artifacts and even some famous ancient Egyptian mummies stored within their very own university and museum walls. Because Europe had a head start in the displaying and interpreting of such a beloved ancient civilization, the United States had a lot of catching up to do. Using a European based model, Egyptian displays, to the delight of American crowds, began to appear in the country.

At first, the display of Egyptian objects followed the traditional European \textit{Wunderkammer} approach. The Niagara Falls Museum fell under this category with purpose. The museum collected objects that “made little distinction between the natural and the man-made,

\textsuperscript{89} \textit{Gerry D. Scott, The Past Rediscovered: Everyday Life in Ancient Egypt: A Checklist of the Exhibition, September 29, 1983-September 30, 1984: Peabody Museum of Natural History, Yale University} (New Haven: The Museum, 1983). “This research organization sponsored archaeological excavations in Egypt and oversaw the rapid publication of the results. Money for the fund’s projects was raised by subscription from museums, universities, and individuals. When excavations were concluded at a fund site, the Egyptian Antiquities Service and the fund made an initial division of the recovered material. The fund then distributed its share among its subscribers.”
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including paintings, scientific instruments and exotic artifacts along with animals, rocks, and birds, displaying all of it with an eye toward aesthetics rather than explanation.”

Thomas Barnett was the museum’s English founder who opened Canada’s first museum in 1827. He sent his son to Egypt to acquire a collection outside of his museums’ usual taxidermized animals and insects, “in order to capitalize on the public’s passion for exotic Egypt.” The museum “eventually became the home for five mummies in 1861 and four more acquired during the 1870s after the Great Fire destroyed the Woods Museum in Chicago.”

For the United States, the first major display of Egypt as a spectacle took place in 1893. World’s Fairs continued to make their mark in the last decade of the nineteenth century, but this time, it made its mark in the U.S. The question of where a World Fair should go in such a vast country was heavily debated. There were four choices: New York, Washington D.C., St. Louis, and Chicago. The latter according to the 1893 article from the Chicago Record, “claimed the best facilities and the best financial organization for the enterprise. She wanted to display to the world an American wonder, a city of a million and a quarter of inhabitants and but half a century old…she was successful.”

Many joined in the celebrations of the fair on May 1, 1893. The World’s Columbian Exposition at Chicago covered 633 acres, enough to hold high volume amounts of people traveling from all over the world. From the hundreds of thousands that crowded around to join
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the festivities, notable guests included world leaders, dukes and other members of the nobility from around the world as well as the descendants of Columbus and the general public. At this point, everyone became an equal in the quest for unity at that moment of the opening. Egypt’s role in the Exhibition was this:

Two very valuable Egyptian collections are among the loan exhibits in this Department and a sculptured Assyrian winged bull and winged lion guard either side of the main entrance to the Anthropological Building...There are private houses and stores; an Egyptian theatre, and a mosque. In the marts of the street are to be found oriental wares of every kind, jewels, daggers, wood carvings, embroideries, silks, shawls, bangles, and pipes, and everything else found in the bazaars of the far east...The café, where fragrant Mocha coffee is to be had, is beautifully built in reproduction of a small mosque. Upon the plaza are Egyptians, Arabs, and persons of other nationalities who throng the streets of the wondrous city. Three smaller concessions lie just to the south of the Egyptian village.

Egyptians, though given more depth and multi-dimensional as actual humans, were characterized by the Chicagoans as still seen as exotic, foreign, and the Other. Egypt as an exhibit is lumped in with others that have a similar countenance to the group they were a part of and was among the other curiosities.

Egypt in the St. Louis World Fair did not have the best representation, but the United States’ exhibit creators seemed to place some humanizing qualities with the Egyptians with the requesting of permission from the Egyptian government. It was still a blatant example of the Orientalism that had spread from Europe to the United States in the form of modern Egyptians as being simply a caricature and stereotype. The title of the article in a *Washington Times* column says that “Egypt Would Bar Immoral Dancing.”
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Egypt doesn’t want to have any ‘hootchie-kootchie’ dancers at the St. Louis Exposition, giving exhibitions which are represented to be typical of life in Cairo. A hitch concerning the Egyptian exhibit at the exposition, brought to the attention of the Department of State yesterday by President David R. Francis, has brought to light correspondence showing the attempt the Egyptian government is making to head off immoral exhibitions such as are said to have made the ‘Streets of Cairo’ such a good-paying concession at other expositions...The exposition had assured the Egyptian government it could have supervision of all Egyptian attractions; that nothing might be exhibited which would place Egypt in a bad light.⁹⁸

The Egyptian government knew that only certain pieces of their culture would be chosen for exhibition and that in itself showed the prominent and ongoing issue of a Western culture attempting to interpret and portray a culture that is unlike their own. Ancient Egypt displayed as part of world fairs and expositions mainly functioned as part of the curious and exotic aesthetic portion of the exhibit, similarly to the many other Eastern based exhibitions that were present.

The giant recreations of ancient monuments to the bangles and scarves and scents of the modern Egyptian society were meant to take the general audience outside of reality; as if it were outside of the norm, something strange. Though each fair and expo were successful in their right to have the difficult task of displaying thousands of inventions and art pieces from around the world, ancient Egypt remained obscure.

A continuation of the World’s Columbian Exposition in 1893, the Field Museum, later host to Tutankhamun’s golden treasures, opened its door within the next decade. It went through an array of different names: Columbian Museum of Chicago, Field Columbian Museum and the Field Museum of Natural History. The other locally famous museum in Chicago is The Oriental Institute Museum which “is a world-renowned showcase for the history, art and archaeology of

the ancient Near East.” The Institute has strong foundations for the displaying of ancient Egypt as well as claiming the United States’ first American Egyptologist, mentioned in the next chapter.

In spite of attempts of American Egyptologists to present a more scholarly view of this ancient civilization, the Orientalist view of exotic ancient Egypt remained alive and well in the United States. Cleopatra had been on the big screen since 1899 and was popularized by silent film actress Theda Bara filling the role in 1917. Although the film has not survived, images of her have continued to grace the modern world where she is still, unfortunately, known as being a vamp.

The way that she was portrayed during her lifetime and being typecast in ways similar to her role as Cleopatra (sexy, exotic and mysterious) shows that Orientalist thought about Egypt was still prevalent, though in a subtler form than outright saying that Egypt was the inferior of the west. Cleopatra herself, though there are numerous books, films, and other works about her life, lost her voice in the midst of defeat at the hands of the Romans. Her portrayal of being wanton and sly, among other words trying to negate her character, was all hearsay. The ancient Egyptian monarchy was defeated and the propaganda against her Otherness, despite being from a Macedonian bloodline, and was a strong queen, was used against her by the Western victors.

When *The Mummy* premiered in 1932, it was a hit. The gist of the movie was this: a tomb was found in the early twenties, a mummy that came with a curse was let loose in the world, and
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the mummy was reanimated with the purpose of finding his ancient lover, Anck-es-en-Amon. In the end, he was met with failure only to be vanquished by the gods of his past.\footnote{Stephen Krensky, \textit{The Mummy} (Minneapolis: Lerner Publications, 2007), 36-38.}

Perhaps the mummy’s curse just happened to be more popular. Of course, to be fair, it was indeed all about knowledge. The less that is known about a certain subject, the less there is to work with. Tutankhamun was an unknown to the general public before his tomb’s discovery, so there would have been no reason to see him portrayed in any form of popular media before 1922, unlike Cleopatra.

Stories about ancient Egypt, whether in film, plays, or literature and song had almost always had a sense of romanticism tied into the story. Any exceptions usually featured Biblically based stories featuring Egypt. These tended to either portray Egypt in an oppressive light or a sheltering and nurturing light. It was either the setting for the oppression of the Israelites or the first safe home for Jesus, to escape from the deadly edict of Herod. It is strange to think that if Cleopatra herself had lived just twenty-four more years, she would have been the Egyptian ruler during the time that Jesus went to Egypt.

The romance of Egypt not only included the whirlwind tales of Antony and Cleopatra but in the years before the mummy curse surrounded the finding of Tutankhamun's tomb, mummies, when seen as actual people from the past, had been romanticized. According to Egyptologist Bob Brier, "the mummies in tunes were not the grisly fiends that would later be created for the movies. In song lyrics, they were usually female and objects of romance… My Egyptian Mummy (1913) laments the same concept of love lost over many years."
Brier concludes that “Cleopatra was another natural topic for Egypt-themed pieces of music, and she was almost always associated with romance.”\textsuperscript{101} There were other ancient Egyptian figures who had gained international fame including Nefertiti, whose famous bust became a worldwide symbol for the sophistication of Egyptian art. Another was Ramses II, the purported pharaoh during the Jewish Exodus.

The Exodus story itself helped revive an interest in things Egyptian. It was after the years of WWII had ended and three years before the epic and romantic film, \textit{The Ten Commandments} (1956) came out that Egypt, in 1953, had gained its true independence from Britain. It was also during the decade of the 1950s that the United States as a country entered into a direct relationship with Egypt and one of the key ambassadors in this relationship proved to be a long dead pharaoh who Americans came to know as “King Tut.”

\textsuperscript{101} Brier, 158-159.
From the very beginning, Tutankhamun had been an elusive being. Despite being a pharaoh and a part of a famous royal and “heretic” family, before the early 20th century, his name carried little weight, even within the scholarly world. Small hints of his existence appeared to excavators in the Valley of the Kings that led to his eventual discovery after the end of the First World War, in 1922. The immediate media coverage spread rapidly across the Atlantic, and the discovery of his tomb opened Egyptology and archaeology to a public who might have never, by themselves, ventured into such a realm.

An American friend and colleague of Howard Carter's by the name of Theodore M. Davis had spent the years right in the first decade of the 1900s excavating in the Valley of the Kings; a popular excavation site. His goal, after a glimpse of the young king’s name was found on a cup in 1906, was to find Tutankhamun. The year after, in 1907, more clues about the mysterious name appeared stamped on various vases as well as a piece of cloth in the vicinity of the vases that was from the same era of his reign.

In 1909, however, “Davis concluded, ‘I fear the Valley is now exhausted,’” after having thought he found the right but empty tomb. Of course, this was not true. By 1914, Davis left the Valley and Howard Carter, along with sponsor and amateur Egyptologist, George Edward Herbert, 5th Earl of Carnarvon, took over his mantle. Only pausing during the First World War, Carter and Carnarvon worked tirelessly afterward to find the mysterious Tutankhamun. Although Carter had taken part in finding the famous Hatshepsut a decade earlier,

---

102 The Royal Cache of mummies from 1881 was discovered 3 miles away from the Valley of the Kings, in Deir el-Bahari.
104 Brier, 164.
Tutankhamun’s name was haunting him; he knew his tomb had not been found as Davis had previously assumed.105

After five years of dismal results, Lord Carnarvon was ready to end the excavation efforts. Despite this, Carter remained persistent and confident, to the point that he offered his own money for one last season to find the missing king. Not long after the agreement was agreed upon, on November 5, 1922, Howard Carter hurried to cable his fellow Englishman. He proclaimed “At last have made wonderful discovery in Valley; a magnificent tomb with seals intact, re-covered same for your arrival; congratulations.”106

Carter’s Issues: 1922 – 1932

A sealed outer door was carefully opened, then a way was cleared down some sixteen steps and along a passage of about twenty-five feet. A door to the chambers was found to be sealed as the outer door had been and, as on the outer door, there were traces of re-closing. With difficulty, an entrance was effected and when at last the excavators managed to squeeze their way in an extraordinary sight met their eyes, one that they could scarcely credit. First, they saw three magnificent statues, all gilt, with exquisite carving and the heads of Typhon, Hathor, and a lion. On these rested beds beautifully carved, gilt and inlaid with ivory and semi-precious stones and also innumerable boxes of exquisite workmanship.107

From the time of the tomb’s discovery to the time that he finished processing his findings, Carter got more attention than he bargained for. He must have felt every single year in the decade unto which he processed every bit of artifact that he could find, as opposed to

105 Hawass, 62-63.
Brugsch’s rapid methods four decades earlier. Even from within the first two months, he had received criticism from the public as to why it took him so long to clear the tomb.

Carter, with the backing of Lord Carnarvon, was determined to do things right. He had been searching for Tutankhamun for over a decade, and now that he had found him, he would leave no corner of the tomb undocumented nor would he leave anything behind or seen as unimportant. His growing audience outside of the tomb would just have to wait.

Since the tomb’s discovery, as Carter said, journalists had watched the archaeologists. For every sudden movement or change, an article was written; even if nothing had been publicly accomplished for the day. Journalists kept track of the events surrounding the tomb and articles were published almost daily, but most certainly on a weekly basis. Even when the season officially wrapped up for the Egyptologists to continue in the fall, semimonthly articles were put out to publicize the happenings of the tomb. Carter felt his quiet world as an archaeologist became a little too open to the public for his liking.

Archaeology under the limelight is a new and rather bewildering experience for most of us. In the past we have gone about our business happily enough, intensely interest in it ourselves, but not expecting other folk to be more than tepidly polite about it, and now all of a sudden, we find the world takes an interest in us, an interest so intense and so avid for details that special correspondents at large salaries have to be sent to interview us, report our every movement, and hide round corners to surprise a secret out of us.108

Carter, though bewildered about being in the sudden spotlight, could understand why this discovery was so important to people outside of the norm. He mentions, in his book, The Discovery of the Tomb of Tutankhamen, that people yearned for a different type of news story;

that THIS story was one out of the usual press coverages and people grasped on to it. Another reason was the idea that buried treasure existed out in the world.  

Such a buried treasure had the potential to be found, perhaps by anyone. Howard Carter was from a working-class family who delved into archaeology after working as an artist and draughtsman for years before heading to Egypt to draw. If an ‘amateur’ like Carter with no professional and education training for Egyptology could discovery something as fantastic as Tutankhamun, anyone could have that chance as well.

The weekly updates that occurred after the discovery was like a reality show or a soap opera, in which people could not help themselves to knowing every little thing they could find out about Tutankhamun and his treasures. It was a progression from how people were kept up to date via newspaper when an obelisk was being transported to their respective countries, but certainly on an even grander scale. The Western press was fascinated and kept an eye out on the goings on of Egypt and what felt like the newly crowned king.

During the last few weeks before the treasures were taken to the museum, Carter had peace, but the treasures became the subject of rumors of a curse that had caused Lord Carnarvon’s demise, four months after the tomb’s discovery. Although Carter thought the idea of a cursed tomb was ridiculous, it began to scare people away from visiting the tomb which had cause it to impede excavations. Relic collectors even began to sell off the artifacts in their possession to free themselves of any curse of the mummy that might have come their way.

Not only had such a vast ancient Egyptian treasure captured the attention of the world, but it was also acknowledged that the Egyptians could claim sentiments of nationalism for a  

\[\text{Ibid.}\]
country that was not normally afforded such a feeling. Egypt, earlier in the same year of the
discovery of the tomb in 1922, had claimed independence against Britain.\footnote{Guy Arnold, \textit{Wars in the Third World since 1945} (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), 6.} Thus, the Egyptian
government decided to take matters into their own hands and take back the power that they had
lost while under British rule, especially in power lost in the dealings of their antiquities.

Under a new law, if American or British excavators discovered any artifact from their
season, the only way it could enter their museums was if it was a gift from the Egyptian
government. The West did look fondly on such a potential loss of power. According to the \textit{New
York Times}, “this law would mean that the American museums would simply be working to
enrich the Cairo museum, which is absurd.”\footnote{“Tutankhamun Tomb is Barred to Press,” \textit{The New York Times}, December 29, 1922, accessed August 2017.} Herbert E. Winlock, an American archaeologist
and of the Metropolitan Museum, agreed, declaring “that the passage of this law will end all
excavation work in Egypt…all of the foreign expeditions in the Valley [were] supported by
public subscription…subscribers expect to receive their reward in the exhibition of at least a
portion of objects reclaimed in museums in America and England.”\footnote{“Scores Egypt’s Plan to Hold Antiquities,” \textit{The Chicago Tribune Co.}, December 26, 1922, accessed August 2017.}

The Americans and the British were furious over the thought that the results of all of their
investments should remain within Egypt. They had their museums to look after, and anything
excavated in Egypt only to remain in the country would result in time and money lost, for the
respective western museums at least. This law would not be properly enabled then, as the British
still had an unofficial holding on Egyptian lands.

The tomb was eventually found to have been plundered in antiquity, after the questioning
of whether it was untouched. Assuming the tomb was untouched, none of the artifacts would
have been awarded towards the excavators and all the years of searching for Tutankhamun would
have been for naught. Carter won this round of issues that occurred for him in the earlier days, that the findings of the tomb were meant to belong to all and was meant to give everyone from around the globe watching the scenes unfold in Egypt a say in the discovery. 113

Because of the timing of the finding of the tomb in 1922, the same year Egypt declared independence, and with the hold that Britain assumed it had over Egypt, negative sentiments were abounding throughout Egypt against Lord Carnarvon and the Western excavators. Journalists against the Earl of Carnarvon were full of jealous fury about the exclusive arrangement he had with London’s *The Times*, and they were forced to present their findings of the discovery as an outside source. The Earl had agreed on this arrangement to limit the stories about the tomb and chosen *The Times* to keep media information consistent. 114 Anti-Western sentiments amongst the Egyptians surrounding the finding of the tomb sprang up right from the beginning.

It was not only “wealthy young Egyptian agitators,” 115 it was the Egyptian government who were concerned with the proper ownership of Tutankhamun’s tomb. Perhaps Davis, as an American, who had first found the boy-king’s name could claim ownership. Perhaps it was the British Carter and Earl of Carnarvon who thought they had a touch of the claim. “In order to annoy and defy England, the anti-British party at Cairo is even attempting to build up a navy…in

---

the hope of startling and overawing the British.”116 This statement was according to Chicago’s Oriental Institute founder, James Henry Breasted, America’s first official Egyptologist.117

Support from Lord Carnarvon and Carter’s friends, colleagues and even strangers from around the world protected them from such sentiments. Lord Carnarvon intended to distribute the findings among those he promised equally, and Carter was more interested in getting work done properly. His time, initially, had been spent courting the press and any tourist and official who came to see the new tomb.

After living under British occupation, the Egyptians declared themselves independent and gained autonomy, not only themselves but of their ancient artifacts. The finding of the nearly perfectly intact tomb of the ancient teenaged-king by British excavators, aided by the Americans, brought these questions into the open. Questions of ownership sprang forth, and tensions were high. After Tutankhamun’s belongings were removed from their original resting place, a select few of them were immediately displayed in the Egyptian museum in Boulaq, a district in Cairo.

While the artifacts rested in the Egyptian Museum, Egyptian poet al-Shawqiyyat proclaimed, according to historian Elliott Colla, that the newly discovered king was a strong figurehead for Egyptian independence. The poem says “Tutankhamen has established Egypt’s representative body, fortified its convocation, and he conferred the promise [of self-government] to this happy generation. Tutankhamen has returned his authority to our sons!”118 Before the

116 Ibid.
West turned Tutankhamun into King Tut, the young king meant something completely different for the Egyptian people.

**Tutankhamun's Display in the Egyptian Museum**

After having just completed a journey of five hundred miles...at the time, it was thought that it would not be possible to exhibit any of the objects for six months. But the objects had responded so well to the treatment and had been so little affected by the voyage that there was little doubt that some of the treasures could go immediately on view. A little less than a week later, six showcases had been built and the first objects from the tomb were placed on public view. Thousands of visitors responded with the utmost enthusiasm. Among the first glittering treasures were the King’s mannequin, the golden Nekhbet shrine, the painted casket, the King’s ‘wishing cup’ and the magnificent golden throne depicting the handsome young King together with his adoring Queen (Ankhesenamun).\(^{119}\)

In the reflection of the newly discovered artifacts’ display, museum professional Thomas Hoving was suggesting a shift in how they could be brought to the public. Until this time, museum exhibits on Egypt were in-house operations. Museum staff created exhibits based on what was in the museum’s collection. Most of those collections included mummies, artwork, and other artifacts that had been taken out of Egypt by collectors or official excavations. What Hoving was describing was a large-scale traveling exhibition made up of artifacts that went out to the public and would eventually return home to Egypt.

The Egyptian Museum’s exhibit in Boulaq however, did not seem to follow a specific narrative. In return to the hall of curiosities model, whatever seemed fit and able was put out for an audiences’ viewing pleasure. The boy-king and his belongings stayed in Egypt for the next

---

three or so decades. Western audiences, scholarly and popular had been left out of seeing Tut’s life unless they visited the treasures in Egypt. For everyone else, publications such as *National Geographic* helped their subscribers get their fix.

*National Geographic* had a long but distant relationship with Egypt. When Egypt was first mentioned, the main topic of interest was the excavations that took place at the beginning of the 20th century. Initially, there was little to say about the country, until the famous 1922 discovery of the intact tomb of Tutankhamun. A *National Geographic* correspondent, Maynard Owen Williams, was sent to Egypt in 1923 to witness the official opening of the tomb along with the presence of the Belgian Queen Elisabeth of Bavaria.

Although the magazine was founded in 1888, the widely known pictorial covers did not take shape until the late fifties. The first-ever image of Tutankhamun took place in October 1963, amid the first Tut tour to the States. It took place on the magazine’s “Great 75th Anniversary Issue.” Even then, the golden death mask was a secondary image, made smaller in the bottom right side of the cover, to a person climbing towards the U.S. flag on Mt. Everest. This was the issue that made French photographer and Egyptologist Christiane Desroches-Noblecourt famous for bringing the golden imagery of King Tut to the foreground.

---

Taking Tutankhamun’s Treasures out of Egypt / The Aswan Dam

The Aswan Dam had been a contentious issue among Egypt, Britain, the United States and the USSR in the mid-1950s. The 1.3 billion dollar\textsuperscript{124} project of constructing a dam to ensure the stability of Egypt’s food source created tension for many reasons. One of these reasons was financial aid. The Suez Canal provided funds for the Egyptian government, but it was not enough to cover such an extensive project.

The United States and Britain had initially offered financial support for the dam. This support shifted following the distrust of Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser’s neutrality during the Cold War as well as Nasser’s call for military aid in the midst of conflict with Israel. The New York Times’ cold attitude towards Egypt’s leader exemplifies this distrust.

To make himself mighty he has mortgaged Egypt’s economic future to get, not bread for his people, but arms in the hope of becoming the leader of a pan-Arab empire that would stretch from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf and would wipe out Israel. These arms purchases, added to unwise and uneconomic industrial investments, have already so strained the Egyptian economy as to make it incapable of raising the domestic capital required to complete the Aswan Dam.\textsuperscript{125}

The Soviet Union ended up investing $100,000,000\textsuperscript{126} in the project and construction began in 1960. Another set of problems arose because despite the positive effects of the dam, with the control of the Nile’s inundation and the gain of electricity throughout Egypt,\textsuperscript{127} the preservation of the ancient monuments that would have been destroyed by flooding.

Preservation of the monuments became a major priority, not only for the Egyptian government but one that was prioritized across various countries in the U.N. Though French

\textsuperscript{125} Ibid.
Egyptologist and U.N. member Christiane Desroches-Noblecourt was part of the first plan in April 1956 to campaign for the funds to protect and relocate the ancient monuments, like Abu Simbel, conflicts with the Suez Canal hindered going forward. Three years later, a meeting between Dr. Tharwat Okasha, Egyptian Cultural Minister, and UNESCO’s assistant Director-General Rene Maheu, changed the outlook of the campaign for aid.

One day after the fateful Maheu – Okasha meeting, Okasha learned that UNESCO’s director – general, Vittorio Veronese, had agreed to put the proposal to save the temples in front of the executive board. Okasha then went on to secure Nasser’s approval, which he did in January 1959.128 The UNESCO appeal brought a new wave of scholars…the organization used the campaign as an educational tool, creating the Tutankhamun Treasures exhibit to tour major donor countries from 1961 to 1966.129

Okasha, along with American Anthropologist Dr. Froelich Rainey, organized the sixties tour. Rainey recalls:

To build up support in the United States for the Nubian campaign to save the monuments, it occurred to me that a loan of objects from the tomb of Tutankhamen in the Cairo Museum, to travel in the United States, could create a general public interest that would bear upon government appropriation of funds. At that time I was the president of the American Association of Museums and as such believed that I could arrange for it in Cairo even though no such exhibition had ever gone abroad from the museum there…it could make all the difference in launching the salvage campaign.130

Rainey does not give a specific reason for choosing Tutankhamun. In fact, he admits that he severely underestimated the name of the boy-king; to the point that he did not think that Tutankhamun’s artifacts would garner enough attention from the general public. He laments, “I

---

did not think that the name of Tutankhamen would still be so famous and that the number of objects was not sufficient to justify admission charges. I have never been more wrong.”

He regretted that almost instantly as he saw, after the opening in the National Gallery, lines of people wrapped around the city of Philadelphia, waiting to see Tutankhamun’s treasures.

With international negotiations underway to save the ancient monuments, Tutankhamun’s ancient treasures left Egypt for the first time, in 1961. The Kennedy White House received great public relations when the treasures visited Washington D.C. Photographers captured Mrs. John F. Kennedy staring with gleeful wonder at an exhibit opening at the National Gallery, the ancient Egyptian artifacts of a golden bracelet with the eye of Horus, an alabaster vase, and a wooden figure is shown underneath her.

The United States will be asked to give $21,000,000 more to help preserve the treasures of the Nile River Valley in Egypt. This was disclosed today shortly after Mrs. John F. Kennedy had officially opened an exhibit of thirty-four priceless objects found in the tomb of King Tut-ankh-Amen, the eighteenth dynasty Pharaoh. He was buried in Thebes in 1344 B.C. The exhibit has been placed on a foundation in the marble rotunda of the National Gallery of Art. This is the first time the 3,300-year-old treasures have been shown outside of Egypt. Officials of the United Arab Republic joined Mrs. Kennedy in the official opening and pleaded for further United States help in preserving temples in the Nubian area, which is to be flooded by construction of the High Dam near Aswan.

The purpose of this exhibit, as well as the imagery of Mrs. Jackie Kennedy, boosted the popularity of people helping support the preservation of ancient monuments.

Meanwhile, Tutankhamun got an even bigger boost of popularity, and the reason was due in part, to French Egyptologist, Christiane Desroches-Noblecourt who published a work about his reign which included photos in color, of his treasures. This work took the newly famous

---
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pharaoh’s fame to new heights. Dutch historian, Kees Van der Speck has noted, “the 1963 rebirth of Tutankhamun is now credited with generating the public interest that underpinned the success of the worldwide Tutankhamun exhibitions of the 1960s, 1970s and early 1980s.”

These sentiments culminated in a novel concept: have Tut and his artifacts not given as a gift to a specific museum, but rather, have them go on tour. This tour would allowed a larger public to see Carter’s finds but also for the Egyptian government to maintain ownership over said artifacts. It is at the British Museum where American directors, curators, and designers were handed a grand example of the beginning of the great Egyptian spectacle that Tutankhamun became.

The British Museum

In 1972, the British Museum hosted fifty pieces from the tomb that had been discovered fifty years earlier. Due to the Aswan Dam project and the devastation that could have destroyed ancient buildings and monuments, the revenue from the British Museum display of the Treasures came to almost 700,000 pounds. The money went to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) campaign and thus, saving the ancient temples.

The British Museum’s website on the Treasures of Tutankhamun exhibit explains how the monuments were saved. The website states, “A coffer-dam was built around Philae island and once the water had been pumped out, the buildings were dismantled and reassembled

---


nearby; 37,363 blocks of stone were moved, and the temples reopened in 1980.”\textsuperscript{135} This was an impressive feat for nations across the world to come together so quickly after WWII and in the midst of the Cold War.

The exhibit was opened in the presence of Queen Elizabeth II on March 30, 1972, and ended its nine months show on December 30 of the same year. The exhibit designers were Margaret Hall and the planner and Keeper of Egyptian Antiquities and I.E.S Edwards, who realized their Western views on Egypt and their antiquities had been skewed throughout the years. Edwards reminisced:

I used to think at one time that perhaps we had a special claim to have the exhibition, because the tomb had been discovered by a British archaeologist, but Magdi Wahba soon disillusioned me. He said that was not the way the average Egyptian viewed it. The British had been allowed to excavate in what had always been promised to be one of the richest sites in Egypt. They had made this marvelous discovery thanks to the generosity of the Egyptians in allowing them to excavate there, a sufficient reward in itself.\textsuperscript{136}

The decision to install new display cases to showcase each object individually, like the golden death mask and small gilded shrine among the other 48 objects, gave the British audience a chance to view each artifact completely. Due to popular demand, the museum extended the treasures’ stay to a nine-month period, which led to over 1.64 million visitors experiencing the splendor of Egypt.\textsuperscript{137} This was quite the difference from the British Museum’s last century of Egyptian display.

Tut comes to America

Ever since the Egyptians had dispatched fifty magnificent pieces from King Tut’s tomb material to the British Museum in 1972, in honor of the fiftieth anniversary of its discovery, every ambitious American museum director had made a play for the exhibition. I had given it a try at luncheon with the president of the Organization of Antiquities, Gamal Mokhtar, way back in 1968 and had failed. I knew that Carter Brown had approached Egyptian officials many times through his powerful diplomatic contacts…But the man who pulled off ‘Tut’ was Richard M. Nixon.  

From the successful British Museum display, the treasures made their way to the Soviet Union. After the fifty-piece collection made its impact in Moscow, St. Petersburg and Kiev from 1973 – 1975, it was the United States’ turn for their tour. Official negotiations were needed in order to bring the treasures back. The person to make this happen was President Richard Nixon.

Before the Second World War, England and other European countries seemed to have the upper hand when it came to having a relationship with Egypt. American Egyptologists were on the rise in the 1930s. After the war, it seemed like the time had come for the United States to take England’s place, not only with the increased status of a world power but as having a presence in Egypt itself. Negotiations and diplomacy were needed to make this a reality.

The Egypt of the mid-1970s had been through; presidential assassinations and war. Egypt had been trapped between multiple countries trying to maintain power over it for multiple centuries and had come out of bankruptcy within the last one hundred years. It needed time to heal, emotionally and financially. A grand tour based around an unknown pharaoh would have been the perfect way to give Egypt a new and shiny platform. A platform that would show every place Tut touched that Egypt was more than a place of conflict.

Richard Nixon had been the surprising key to it all. Nixon had made a political arrangement with Egyptian President Anwar Sadat to “improve [Egypt’s] image in America. Nixon suggested bringing “King Tut” – then touring the Soviet Union – to this country.”\textsuperscript{139} The U.S. president could have never expected that such a deal would have any long-lasting effect on the country yet the effects turned out to be one of the greatest achievements for the push for the cultural arts.

This visit might have taken place in a last-ditch effort to save his falling reputation and loss of trust from the American people. From the time of the opening of the tour, Egyptian Egyptologist Zahi Hawass says, “President Nixon was expected to attend, but Henry Kissinger came instead. When Jimmy Carter became the U.S. president, his daughter, Amy, came to see the exhibit.”\textsuperscript{140} Two months after Nixon’s visit to Egypt, he resigned from his position as president.


Now the real work began on determining how many artifacts there were to choose from, what needed to be exhibited, and how they would be displayed. The person to take on this

challenge was Thomas Hoving. Thomas P. F. Hoving was born in 1935 and grew up in Manhattan to a wealthy family. His interest in art history led him to be chosen as the Metropolitan Museum of Art’s youngest director at age 35 in 1967. His time as director lasted a decade and within that decade, he, along with his extraordinarily similar archrival, J. Carter Brown of the National Gallery, created the major shift in museums across the country, opening it to a general and broader audience.

Even during personal frustrations with the museum, he knew he had to make the final days of the tour spectacular and memorable. Hoving, along with Met curator, Christine Lilyquist and then State Department Deputy Ambassador for Cultural Affairs, Peter Solmsen, thus traveled to Egypt to decide on the matter. When they arrived at the Cairo Museum the team was overwhelmed. Hoving recalls:

Nothing could have prepared me for the combination of splendor and degradation in this museological gem. The objects from Neolithic and Roman periods were universally stunning. The way there were displayed was disgraceful. The galleries were squalid, the vitrines had cracked glass, the guards, all in black felt uniforms, seemed comatose. Many of the most beautiful statues were splotched with yellow paint because no one had used drop cloths in a recent painting of the walls and ceilings. The thread-bare rugs in some galleries had a pattern of dark-brown stains—the guards chewed and spat tobacco…

When it came time to choose the treasures, Hoving’s approach was markedly different from that of Christine Lilyquist. He ignored her potential historical and archaeological approach in selecting the fifty-five artifacts to display. Keeping the now famous solid gold mask at the

---
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forefront of his mind, he, like many other exhibitors who had exhibited ancient Egypt in museums since the 1800s, had chosen the aesthetic approach. Hoving recalled the process:

When I walked up the stairs and into the Tutankhamun galleries, I experienced aesthetic overload. We remained there all day. I didn’t bring any expertise to the Tut galleries; I selected what looked great. Simple as that. Christine Lilyquist tried to point out what was important or not from the Egyptological point of view, but I didn’t listen. I know what I wanted. And the choice rather surprised Lilyquist and the Egyptian curator. They expected I’d pick the larger objects – the huge gilded bed or the royal chariot. But I recognized that the finest Tut things were the more intimate objects. Besides, I realized that with six cities,\(^{144}\) I needed pieces that would fit into a domestic aircraft. In addition, since the galleries in the American museums were bound to be crowded, with the visitors inching along, the works had better be small, needing concentration to be appreciated.\(^{145}\)

The aesthetic approach, highlighted the pieces that had the most visually stunning elements, maintained the form of the earlier *Wunderkammer*. The show that Hoving planned would be comparable to Belzoni’s show from the last century, what with the most beautiful tomb artifacts highlighted and with the use of the tomb recreation. When the West first displayed ancient Egypt, the aesthetic approach was supposedly the best and only way to get the most out of exhibiting Egypt since many aspects of the culture, at the time, were unknown.

As museum scholar Bettina Messias Carbonell has noted, the aesthetic approach “aims to display ethnographic objects as a visual artistic experience [and] such presentations of objects [are] accompanied by only minimal explanations.”\(^{146}\) Therefore, the golden mask, as an artistic

---

\(^{144}\) At the time of planning, the Treasures exhibit was meant to stop at six American cities. After what was meant to be the final stop at the Met, in New York, due to popular demand, the exhibit made its way for an approximately 3-and-a-half-month-long tour (June 11, 1979 – September 30, 1979) to the M. H. de Young Memorial Museum in San Francisco, California.

\(^{145}\) Hoving, *Making the Mummies Dance*, 404.

experience became a highlight for the audience, rather than something that could be glossed over and skipped.\textsuperscript{147}

“Art museums,” says author Virginia P. White, “formerly as silent and dreary as mausoleums, became as lively as the marketplace and so crowded that special showings had to be scheduled to ensure supporting patrons a look at new exhibitions.”\textsuperscript{148} She claims that after WWII, the war opened the United States to the outside world and the arts became more appreciated as the love of new and different cultures entered the country. The image and format of the American museum had changed forever.

Hoving’s use of his artistic approach also stood in contrast to the more detailed scholarly interpretations that the field of professional Egyptologists had come to favor. By the 1970s, museums had worked to shed the old cabinet of curiosities stigma and present themselves as serious institutions that interpreted objects and events. With walls of text, photographs and the artifacts, the trend in museum practice were to give as detailed and scholarly a narrative as school groups and visitors could endure.

\textit{As Interpreting Our Heritage} author and National Park Conservator Freeman Tilden has noted, proper interpretation of an object was “an educational activity which aims to reveal meanings and relationships through the use of original objects, by firsthand experience, or by illustrative media, rather than simply to communicate factual information.”\textsuperscript{149} Interpretation had to go beyond simple labels. Photographs from the discovery, of both the artifacts and the excavators, were placed as an important part of the display of the items, as they gave the audience more of a context behind the treasures.

\textsuperscript{147} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{149} Freeman Tilden, \textit{Interpreting Our Heritage (Chapel Hill books)} (University of North Carolina Press, 1977), 30.
This was the trend for a wide range of museums, including those that presented archaeology. If this had been the model for Tut, the archaeological approach would have given more context to the artifacts of the 70s tour as well a chronological order to the display. The chronology of the treasures themselves was mixed up within the exhibit due to the decision to display the artifacts according to the timeline Howard Carter first saw them. The recreation of the tomb seems to have had a lasting effect on those who had never stepped foot inside of a museum.

Had Lilyquist had more of a say, there might have been a significant difference in the impact that the exhibit made. The exhibition could have gone different ways depending on the artifacts that were chosen. Instead of the “boy-king’s solid gold funeral mask, a gilded wood figure of the goddess Selket, lamps, jars, jewelry, furniture, and other objects for the afterlife,” the exhibit could have taken an entirely different turn with specific other artifacts. This could have highlighted the archaeological interest in recreating the past.

The exhibit could have consisted of the entirety his 100+ walking sticks which in turn could have turned into a show surrounding the disability of ancient Egypt. It could have been featured entirely of all of his belongings as a child (as opposed to the few items exhibited that were from his childhood) which could have turned into life as a royal child or teenager in ancient Egypt. The possibilities were endless, but it was the spectacle of gilded items that prevailed. Tutankhamun was buried with over 5,000 belongings, yet the narrative of King Tut was based on a mere fifty-five of them.

---

This simpler approach worked and the exhibit earned multi-millions of dollars in revenue for both the exhibit and each city that the Treasures visited. The exhibit contributed to the unknown factor of impacting and inspiring a cultural revolution throughout the United States. Hoving, as well as J. Carter Brown, had purposefully set up the exhibit to cater to a broader audience and replace the stuffy image of the museum, even though they were both a part of an elite background themselves.

Although a minor pharaoh in life, Tutankhamun played an enormous role in giving his people humanity through this exhibit. The exhibit had the chance to have the Egyptians tell their story after so many years of appropriation from outsiders. Hoving negotiated with Gamal Mokhtar, Egypt’s longtime diplomat and public official of national cultural policy: My last offer was one hundred percent of the profits on all sales in the shops throughout the runoff the show and twenty-five percent of the profits from the mail-order catalog with the proviso that the Met would have exclusive, world rights to the reproductions and jewelry we were working on after the exhibition, in perpetuity. I insisted that no one else, no commercial or museum enterprise, could reproduce the same things as we...Mokhtar balked. It wasn’t a bribe he wanted. He was begging me to assure him, for political reasons, a higher profit than the British or the Russians had given.

With the upcoming Treasures of Tutankhamun, Egyptians took a role in displaying their country’s history. The Egyptian government had more of a say with the artifacts than ever before. After Hoving returned to Egypt after the less than satisfactory first impression of the museum and his choosing of the fifty-five artifacts he wanted to exhibit had been completed, he decided it was not enough. He said, “The show had everything—gorgeous objects, all looking

---
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as if they had been made the day before, and the stupendous gold mask—but the show lacked humanity in a way I couldn’t quite define.”154

After much negotiation and compromising between J. Carter Brown, director of the National Gallery, and Thomas Hoving; it was decided that Brown would open the exhibit and Hoving would close it. But first, they needed financial help.

After seeing a copy of the budget from the British Museum’s 1972 Tut show, Hoving and Brown began to fret. The insurance costs alone were staggering, not to mention the additional staff and logistical support required. Help appeared on the insurance front when Congress passed the Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Act, in December 1975, to help cover insurance costs related to hosting international exhibitions. “Treasures of Tutankhamun” became the first international art exhibition indemnified under the new law.155

Thus, the show, now adequately financed, was ready to go forward. According to an original Met pamphlet from the Treasures exhibit, this was “an exhibition (that) was made possible by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, matching grants from Exxon Corporation and the Robert Wood Johnson Jr. Charitable Trust.”156

The chosen museums struggled with how to interpret the collection. Some had no experience with the handling and collection of ancient artifacts. Even for those museums with more experience with handling such objects, it was nerve-wracking indeed, for everyone involved, especially for artifacts as old as Tutankhamun’s.

154 Hoving, Making the Mummies Dance, 410.
156 Mark Leithauser, Treasures of Tutankhamun at the Metropolitan Museum of Art (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1978).
The exhibit was arranged and displayed in the same way for every one of the seven museums, which made it easier for museum administrators to navigate the exhibit. “The installation sequence in this exhibition follows the order in which the objects were excavated.”\textsuperscript{157} For artifacts that did not necessarily have a timeline, this seemed to be the best way to put the treasures in some kind of context.

In each location, the format was the same, based in part on the structure of the original tomb itself. Visitors entered through an orientation room, three Antechamber rooms, a Transition Gallery, and a final antechamber to visit the golden mask in the Burial Chamber. After the Burial Chamber was the Treasury and from there was the final room for display, the Treasury/Annex. To finish off the exhibit and to head towards the exit was the Sales Area, where there were plenty of souvenirs to purchase to fulfill the upcoming Tut-mania that spread across the country.

The National Gallery of Art

Conceived in 1928, the Gallery officially opened on March 18, 1941 and it had trouble distinguishing itself from the older Smithsonian Museum that also had a museum dedicated to art. Eventually, it separated from the Institution and “pursued its own independent course,”\textsuperscript{158} away from just the “science and history, rather than art”\textsuperscript{159} as a priority, like the Smithsonian. American art, in the forms of watercolors, prints, drawings, and painting continued to pour into the gallery throughout the forties and fifties.

\textsuperscript{159}Ibid.
This museum had its share of great and successful exhibits, especially with the lending of the Mona Lisa by the French government in 1963. The first touch of ancient arts to enter the building was with the "Exhibit of Archaeological Finds of the People’s Republic of China" in 1974. With this experience on handling delicate artifacts, the museum was ready to deal with the golden treasures of Tutankhamun entering the museum starting November 17, 1976, and finishing with an attendance of over 835,000 visitors on March 15, 1977.160

Although director John Carter Brown and Hoving were the masterminds behind the exhibit, they certainly had help. Colleagues and museum administrators, both local and nationwide contributed their time with the technical side of exhibit design, with the Gallery’s William J. Williams and Oriental Institute’s David P. Silverman creating the text.161 Silverman has the unique position of maintaining his position throughout the recent Tut exhibit, *The Golden King and the Great Pharaohs.*

The Field Museum

The second museum that *Treasures* went to was very familiar with ancient artifacts. Acting as a continuation of the World’s Columbian Exposition in 1893, the Field Museum opened its doors within the next decade of the expo. It went through an array of different names: Columbian Museum of Chicago, Field Columbian Museum and the Field Museum of Natural History.

When Tutankhamun’s belongings visited the museum for the first time in 1962, it was called the Chicago Natural History Museum. From June 15 – July 15, the purpose of the exhibit from the 60s, as was mentioned earlier, was to preserve ancient monuments from floodwaters from the new Aswan Dam. With a shorter period for displaying Tutankhamun’s treasures, the traveling exhibit, aptly titled *Tutankhamun Treasures*, also had a different selection of artifacts for the display.

From the more than 2,000 exquisite objects found in the tomb, the 31 pieces selected for the traveling exhibit are of particular interest because of their close association with the mummified body of the boy-king. Among them are his favorite hunting dagger and sheath of embossed gold, found in the mummy wrappings; a richly decorated miniature coffin, inlaid with carnelian and lapis lazuli—one of four that held the ruler’s internal organs; the ceremonial crook and flail, fashioned of gold and blue glass, which were the symbols of his power; jewelry taken from the body; the young king’s walking stick, embellished with a portrait figure in solid gold; and many vases, chests, and statuettes of deities that would have significance in the Pharaoh’s life beyond the grave.162

During both displays in the 60s and 70s of the treasures, the Chicago museum also exhibited part of their own Egyptian collection alongside Tutankhamun’s. If people decided to go back to the museum and saw glimpses of the permanent collection, they could remember when the whirlwind tour came to their state. It would be a fond memory for the audience, whether they were a native Chicagoan or tourist alike.

From April 15, 1977, to August 15 of the same year, 1.35 million people saw the glittering golden mask of the boy-king in Chicago. To cover the financial aspect of the Chicago exhibit as well as help from the NEH and Exxon, “all costs of installation of the exhibit in Chicago are being paid for by the participating institutions: Field Museum and the University of

Chicago.” Even during the popular May 1977 debut of cultural classic *Star Wars*, people continued to line up and show enthusiasm for the Egyptian treasures of Tut.

New Orleans Museum of Art

With strengths and expertise in French and American art, the New Orleans Museum of Art (NOMA) opened its doors on December 16, 1911, and it became a top cultural center for the South. From entrepreneur and art donor Samuel Kress’ 1931 gift of *Madonna and Child* to pieces from the Louvre to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase, the treasures from an ancient boy-king must have been quite the culture shock. Despite having no prior experience with any ancient cultural artifacts of this level, this southern museum was up to the challenge of holding Tut’s treasures.

In a 2010 interview, John Bullard, the Director of the NOMA during the 70s exhibit recalls the reasoning behind New Orleans gaining the tour.

Verna Landrieu was head of the local bicentennial commission, so she got Mayor Moon Landrieu to go to Washington, D.C. to see the Egyptian ambassador and we had our congressional delegation going to see him as well. They did want a specific geographic distribution—Washington, New York, Chicago, Seattle, Los Angeles—and then they wanted somewhere in the south. I was somewhat skeptical this would happen; surely it
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165 History.com Staff, “Louisiana Purchase,” History.com, 2009, accessed November 2017, http://www.history.com/topics/louisiana-purchase. “With the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, the United States purchased approximately 828 million square miles of territory from France...What was known as Louisiana Territory stretched from the Mississippi River in the east to the Rocky Mountains in the west and from the Gulf of Mexico in the south to the Canadian border in the north. Par or all of 15 states were eventually created from the land deal, which is considered one of the most important achievements of Thomas Jefferson’s presidency.”
would go to Houston or Dallas or Atlanta, where they had a bigger resident population. We made a good case, we talked about the two great delta cities in the world, and the Mississippi and the Nile, and they selected us.  

The exhibit’s New Orleans phase ran from September 15, 1977, to January 15, 1978, and "when the doors closed, 870,594 people had seen the show and spent $75 million in town. The museum saw Tut off with a jazz funeral." Despite Bullard’s nightmares about the exhibit, New Orleans fell in love with Treasures. It was so successful that NOMA had “stopped offering memberships, which included access to the exhibition, after subscriptions climbed from 3,000 to 12,000.”

The Los Angeles County Museum of Art

With its strengths in Asian, Latin American and pre-Columbian art, the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (LACMA) became an important cultural figure for the Western part of the United States in 1965, branching off from the Los Angeles Museum of History, Science, and Art. The Treasures of Tutankhamun made its appearance from February 15, 1978, to June 15, 1978. Henry J. Seldis, Times art critic, praised Tut’s treasures and claimed that “there is hardly an object here that would not cause the most experienced viewer to observe it in awe and wonder.”
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Kenneth Donahue, the Director of the museum, had “expected [the exhibit] to attract some 1.3 million visitors.”\textsuperscript{172} Donahue’s prediction was close. “The exhibit draws 1.25 million visitors – a LACMA record that has yet to be broken.”\textsuperscript{173} To put this figure into perspective, according to a 2011 attendance survey of the top-rated international museums, “The Los Angeles County Museum of Art ranked No. 53 on the list, with 914,356 visitors.”\textsuperscript{174} Less than a million visitors are the impressive norm for the museum within a year, yet \textit{Treasures} was able to entice the crowds within a four-month period.

Seattle Art Museum

Founded in 1933, Asian art, mainly Japanese, Korean, Chinese and Indian, were the highlights of the Seattle Art Museum (SAM). Visits from the family of Van Gogh and a successful World's Fair in 1962, as well as a visit from Andy Warhol in 1976, brought the museum an excellent reputation throughout the country.\textsuperscript{175}

Representing the American Northwest, the highly anticipated \textit{Treasures of Tutankhamun} exhibit arrived at this museum on July 15, 1978, and ended its four-month tour on November 15\textsuperscript{th}. It “forever alters the museum’s profile, bringing increases to staff and new emphasis on exhibitions and publications. The [four]-month show attracts nearly 1.3 million visitors, [it’s] popularity and financial success fuel the plans and preparations for a permanent downtown

\textsuperscript{173} Clark, “LACMA’s 50 Years.”
facility.” Seattle crowds were given a preview of what was to come for the atmosphere of the exhibit in California’s *The Press Democrat* newspaper.

You enter the building into a large area wherein you get a thorough orientation. Then you walk through turnstiles into a long, dimly-lighted passageway which takes you into the Antechamber, the Burial Chamber, Treasury and the Annex. On the walls in the various chambers are quotes from Carter’s journals which explain the significance of what you are seeing. In the background soft Egyptian music – rather eerie and lonely flutes and chants – sets the mood of silence and solitude.

Willis Woods was the director of the Seattle Art Museum. About the increase in memberships from 6,000 members to 25,000 due to the exhibit, Woods has said that the museum’s goal was to keep most of those members with their current program. He mentions that the blockbuster “was a chance to reach out to the community. [SAM] has been a very quiet museum for many years.”

Despite the heavy reliance on tourists rather than Seattle locals, the museum exceeded expectations. Spreading even further from the museum, “hotels and restaurants along the way have done everything possible to cash in on the Tut-treat. There were wine bottles with the king’s name in hieroglyphics on the label, and pharaoh’s fish on the menu.” The next stop for Tut-mania and the *Treasures* was the Met in New York City.
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The Metropolitan Museum of Art

The last officially planned\textsuperscript{182} stop for the \emph{Treasures} traveling exhibit for the United States happened from December 15, 1978, to April 15, 1979. The Metropolitan Museum was unique in that it was one of the museums to have the closest ties with the actual discovery of the tomb in 1922. There was a group of staff from the Met that was in the midst of their excavations when Howard Carter made the grand discovery.

These excavations were part of the 14 seasons of their Egyptian Expedition team that spanned intermittently from the years of 1906 – 1935. Established in 1906 was the Department of Egyptian Art that was created for the copious amounts of new artifacts the excavators would bring back from Egypt.\textsuperscript{183}

Besides the results of the excavations in sculpture, bronzes, pottery, etc., which will be shipped to the Museum for exhibition in the galleries, along with earlier acquisitions of these kinds, there are other important results from the work done in Egypt which put upon the excavators on behalf of the Museum, an obligation which can be met only through publications, to take into account with scientific accuracy the condition of the objects when found, their surroundings, and all of the matters connected with their original meaning and purpose. This constitutes, indeed, the Museum’s contribution to the history of Egypt…through its archaeology.\textsuperscript{184}

From the start of the museum’s Egyptian department, they made sure to give proper context to the ancient artifacts, with a chronological order as well as treating the Egyptian exhibits before Tutankhamun, with a historical respect. Because they displayed the entire collection of Egyptian artifacts, they probably ran into the same issue as the British Museum.

\textsuperscript{182} San Francisco’s de Young Museum was not meant to be a part of the roster, but after the museum’s personal negotiations, it was added to the touring list.
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with a visual of overcrowding. To present the collection, “Major objects were installed in the main rooms, while archaeological finds and pieces of more specialized interest were arranged in tight order on the shelves of secondary study galleries – ‘open storage.’”\textsuperscript{185} Smaller objects, like beads, were separated in a different system to create less of a visual clutter.\textsuperscript{186}

The Met’s Thomas Hoving formulated this exhibit to bring the museum to a world outside of the elite and wanted the flashiest and most dramatic display possible. The determination he had to make the display a success as well as the reasoning behind choosing the fifty-five items, remained both a source of the exhibits’ power and a challenge for later attempts to interpret Egyptian antiquities. The specific way he decided on the artifacts goes back to the time of the West’s re-discovery of Egypt as well as reasons why this traditional formula will most likely remain for the display of Egypt.

\textbf{De Young Museum}

Quite a few studies fail to mention this last museum, most likely because the exhibit was never meant to end up here. As Peter Solmssen, the State Department deputy ambassador for cultural affairs, recalled, after he and Hoving visited Cairo to negotiate the exhibit, there were only meant to be six cities, and one of them had to be Los Angeles.\textsuperscript{187} Solmssen said that the


\textsuperscript{186} Ibid.

Gallery, the Met and LA were “already spoken for and my objective was to have as many people of the American public see the show as possible, so we had to spread it out geographically.”\textsuperscript{188}

Since one of the cities was already in California, there was nothing else he could do, so the city asked for Solmsen’s blessing to take over personal renegotiations on San Francisco’s part. He agreed. “A delegation headed by arts patrons Cyril Magnin, Walter Newman and Fine Arts Museums director Ian White flew to Cairo to plead The City’s case. The San Franciscans had several things to offer. Money… [and a] promise to return the frieze to Cairo.”\textsuperscript{189} After President Sadat approved of the plan, it was the de Young Museum’s time to shine.

Established on March 24, 1895, the M. H. de Young Museum, developed after de Young was inspired by the Columbian Exposition. Although the museum did not collect ancient Egyptian art, it had developed a reputation for housing multiple displays. According to the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco website, the museum has “presented 17 [Egyptian] exhibits since 1975.”\textsuperscript{190}

With the museum’s emphasis on African, American and Oceanic art,\textsuperscript{191} the museum was comfortable with the idea of hosting ancient artifacts. Many pieces from their permanent collection included Mesoamerican and Andean art that ranges from 200 B.C. to the mid-1550s, African art from the 1200s and Oceanic art from the late 1800s.\textsuperscript{192} Perhaps this is why Dr. Zahi Hawass thirty or so years later would trust that another set of Tutankhamun's belongings would be safe within the museum's walls.
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By the time the *Treasures of Tutankhamun* left the de Young museum, it had moved on to Canada in the final months of 1979 and finished its tour with West Germany from February 16, 1980, to July 19, 1981. 1.27 million visitors left with positive impressions and memories about the ancient 3,000-year-old civilization and the museum could boast that the final show in San Francisco brought in 1.25 million viewers, a record.

“The resulting exhibition triggered a frenzy of excitement across the United States, with sold-out tickets, long lines, and overcrowded galleries, and it smashed attendance records for a temporary museum show.” From 1976 and 1979, the cities that Tutankhamun’s artifacts touched saw the likes of more than a million people within its museum’s walls. This exhibit was a happy accident that eventually changed how museums ran the business behind the scenes. Nixon’s administration could have never expected such a successful and altering impact on American culture and society.

**New Beginnings**

The *National Geographic* had helped this Egyptomania along after the cover’s mini-feature of the golden mask in the early sixties. After the mask was featured, the magazine had continued to place Egypt on their covers three more times from 1965 – 1970 until one of the most popular covers that the magazine created entered the homes of millions. This cover was the March 1977 issue, displaying a close up of the solid gold death mask, front, and center. The glam
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of the shiny gold mask made quite the impression for people who thus decided to head towards the Treasures tour that, at the time, had been taking place.

What is quite unique about the popularity of the mask is the fact that it is, indeed, a death mask. It was attached to the over 3,300-year-old mummified body of the now celebrated king and was meant to be forever hidden and sealed in a tomb, due to the death of the king. Yet, despite its true meaning as an ornament to the teen’s death, it somehow became one of the most recognizable faces of ancient Egypt.

People to this day have this fascination about viewing mummies, and unless the mummies are up to Seti I’s preserved standards, they can be typically quite unsettling. By contrast, people did not fear the mast, probably because not only does it not look like something that is associated with death, but it is extraordinarily beautiful in all its solid gold and precious gemstone glory. Had it looked like the ghoulish death masks of other burials and cultures, people would most likely not attribute such a visage towards an entire civilization.

Tutankhamun himself may have had a brief rule when he was alive; he may have even been considered a king of insignificance, especially compared to his predecessor, Akhenaten. Even back when he was discovered, and his popularity sprung up from out of nowhere, people recognized this. According to the New York Times in 1923, “Tut-ankh-Amen, himself, unfortunately, is only a shadowy figure, one of three kings whose united reigns barely covered eight years. He may have reigned two, or at most four, years.”196

Over three thousand years later, however, he was needed again, in death more than in life. His reputation as a pharaoh of Egypt, along with his belongings improved the shaky public

relations that were in between the United States and Egypt. Although his dynasty ended soon after his death, his legacy lived on even after the fact. His mummy has never actually left Egypt for the traveling exhibit. In fact, it remains in the original tomb he was found in to this day.

For audiences who were so intent on viewing a mummy on display, the lack of mummy was not a problem. Even with this fact, his presence was felt by those who witnessed the spectacle of the blockbuster exhibit of the 1970s. By the time the United States got used to such a presence in the country and the hosting of his valuable things, it was time for him to go back home and a new era to begin. Tut-mania and the void of his presence left its mark on the country.

CHAPTER 3

THE AFTERMATH OF TUTANKHAMUN’S TREASURES

There are symptoms. Black around the eyes. A craving for hippos, lion’s feet, turquoise and bangs. Egyptian fever is spreading faster than Asian flu, and by the time the Treasures of Tutankhamen exhibit arrives at the Metropolitan Museum in December 1978, the fever will no doubt have reached epidemic proportions. Susceptibility to the Egyptian bug has been passed along to us from the Romans, Napoleon and our 1920’s antecedents, who lost all-natural immunity when Howard Carter and Lord Carnavon(sic)
unearthed King Tut’s tomb in 1922. While there is, so far, no known cure, symptomatic relief is available. It’s called possession therapy. Instead of taking an aspirin for this fever, you take an amulet, mount it on a pedestal, display it prominently and inhale the aura. Unfortunately for some people, the medicine can be addictive.197

After Tutankhamen’s treasures left the United States in the late seventies, the museum community yearned for the spectacular nature of the blockbuster that it had just witnessed. Sales were up at a rapid pace, and people were interested in the museum world, many of them for the very first time in their lives. Thus, with the onset of the influx of memberships, museums’ collections needed to be improved.

The exhibiting and the acquiring of collections outside of the museum’s norm changed forever. People craved a specific type of exhibit and museums responded to those demands. It was a very immersive exhibit, quite forward looked in its day very similar to what is needed in exhibits today in the museum. People have a requirement to becoming more involved in exhibits to increase visitors and interest in the museum.

By the time the Treasures of Tutankhamun came to the Metropolitan Museum in 1979, Thomas Hoving, one of the masterminds behind the blockbuster exhibit, had already professionally moved on from his position as director.198 However, his choice of the exhibit’s 55 artifacts became his legacy as they helped shape not only how modern American museums

198 Randy Kennedy, "Thomas Hoving, Remaker of the Met, Dies at 78," The New York Times, December 10, 2009, accessed October 26, 2017, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/12/11/arts/design/11hoving.html. According to this obituary in the New York Times, he stepped down from his position as director in 1977 “with the intention of becoming the head of a new branch of the Annenberg School of Communications, to have been established within the Met for the purpose of making fine art more accessible through television and films. But the plan fell apart...From 1978 to 1984 Mr. Hoving was an arts correspondent for ABC’s 20/20 and from 1981 to 1991 he edited Connoisseur magazine.”
displayed ancient Egypt after the 1970s, but also the cultural revolution that took place in Tutankhamun’s stead.

*Treasures* was an extraordinary financial success both for every museum the exhibit visited as well as the city it took place in. The most important results from the tour outside of the monetary numbers and figures were the audience reaction to the blockbuster. Despite the four decades that have passed, there remain many stories from those who remember going to the museum when they were younger and seeing the glimmering artifacts for the first time. For many, it left a deep and lasting impression, and for quite some people, it even inspired and determined the career paths of many.

Tutankhamun’s artifacts have continued to travel after the hit exhibit of the 70s also with great success and publicity to back it. For the museums outside of the *Treasures* tour, ancient Egypt’s display and interpretation of Egypt began to show signs of change. Although the vast majority continued to highlight the funerary practices of the Egyptians, some have attempted to discuss the lives of the ancient Egyptians, not just their traditions involving death and the afterlife.

**The Blockbuster and Egyptomania after Treasures**

When Tutankhamun’s belongings traveled outside of Egypt for the first time in the 1960s and had the financial success accompany it, it was proof that the boy-king was a great representative of Egypt, meant to bring countries together when there was once terrible strife. *Treasures* became a blockbuster that succeeded in reaching an even larger audience. This was an
audience who were willing to wait in line, come rain or shine, or freezing temperatures, for multiple hours on end.

The four months stay in each city as well as the publicity surrounding the traveling exhibit appealed to the general public at the time. This exhibit could bring everyone together, regardless of background. That something so spectacular that it pulled in people from popular culture icons like Elizabeth Taylor and Andy Warhol to thousands of school children suggested that museums could open up to a new world of visitors. The museum’s space became welcome to all.

Tut’s exhibit sparked a renewed wave of Egyptomania. By the time Tutankhamun was found, Egypt had already had a presence in show business. Egyptian art and designs showed up in jewelry, clothing, furniture and even games that were present in many households throughout the United States. It continued even further within popular culture from comedian Steve Martin’s satirical Saturday Night Live song “King Tut” to “Walk Like an Egyptian,” by The Bangles. Egyptomania was portrayed in the architecture of the country.

Revivals of Egyptian forms have enjoyed a remarkably long life: in 1981, for example, the Nile Valley style in dress was promoted by leading fashion designers…The graphic designer, Theodore Menten, produced a number of stencil-patterns based on Ancient Egyptian painted decorations for use in interior décor, and many artists and craftsmen incorporated Egyptianisms in fashion, jewellery, fabrics, needle-work, wallpapers, and objets d’art during the 1980s and early 1990s. The inspiration lies in Antiquity…including the scholarly, stark, and severe Rosicrucian Temple at San Jose; a much-mutilated electric sub-station and tramway station at San Diego, now a garage; the Egyptian Court Apartments also in San Diego…(elsewhere) Memphis now possesses the Great American Pyramid, 88 metres high, inaugurated in 1991, and Las Vegas obtained another huge pyramid, the Luxor Hotel-Casino, which opened in 1993: at the entrance is a huge sphinx and obelisk, and inside the décor is Egyptianising.

From the World Fairs to the current exhibiting of ancient Egypt in museums, Egypt had always been present. Architecture as well was part of how exhibitors portrayed Egypt, and grand stages and sets were built to show off what was known about the ancient world. Exhibitors had had to rely on the “exotic,” like Little Egypt’s representation of Egypt, to sell the beloved ancient civilization. In the twentieth century, figures like Cleopatra helped popularize the grandeur of life along the Nile. Now, a minor pharaoh helped launched not only a new wave of Egyptomania but created a cultural impact.

A Change in Law

The spectacle of the Egyptian blockbuster exhibit became a challenge for American museums in the early 1980s, however, due to the shift of collection policies. The result was a law crafted in response to such an excessive collecting of artifacts. During the new regime after the 1981 assassination of President Sadat, the Egyptian government’s views regarding Egyptian antiquities thus grew stricter, and a new law was put in place a couple of years later in 1983. This law:

Enacted one of the most restrictive patrimony laws which declares all antiquities discovered after the enactment of the statute to be the property of the Egyptian state. The law provides for all antiquities privately owned to 1983 to be registered and recorded, and makes private ownership or possession of antiquities found after 1983 illegal. An antiquity is defined to be ‘every building or object that is a product of the Egyptian civilization or any further civilization. It is also a product of art, science or religion on Egyptian soil from the pre-historic era up to 100 years before present time. An antiquity also covers an item with a historical, archaeological or artistic value that has contributed to the Egyptian civilization or was created in Egypt for any other civilization. It also
covers anything produced in Egypt or bearing any relation to Egypt’s history. All human remains are considered as antiquities.  

Old ordinances of the nineteenth century were meant to protect antiquities and failed due to the many exceptions that were given. The secretive smuggling of artifacts by tourists of the 1800s and early 1900s and the distrust by the West of the museums in the East. The laws of the 1920s right at the time of the discovery of Tut’s tomb highlighted these issues. Now, the law of 1983 took things more seriously.

The law began to limit what collectors could purchase, especially if a seller bought an artifact that had been unknowingly (and knowingly at times) stolen from Egypt after 1983. Buying artifacts became a risky business, especially if the provenance of the item in question had an equally questionable background. Those who were guilty faced prison time and a heavy fine.

Museums could not collect new materials like they once did. In the first decade of the twenty-first century, the United States and Egypt came together again. The newer attempt by Dr. Zahi Hawass, Egyptologist and then, the Minister of Antiquities, to bring Tutankhamun’s
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belongings back to the states for the mutual benefit of the two countries was called *Tutankhamun and the Golden Age of the Pharaohs*.\textsuperscript{203}

For the 2005 tour, the *National Geographic* website explains that the Museum of Ancient Art in Basel, Switzerland, developed the entire exhibit.\textsuperscript{204} Although the spectacle was still there, the approach was muted compared to the 1970s blockbuster. Due to demand, “additional agreements were brokered with the Egyptian government allowing the exhibition to travel to Germany and the U.S.”\textsuperscript{205} For the U.S. portion of the exhibit, there was “an agreement between National Geographic, Arts and Exhibitions International, Anschutz Entertainment Group LIVE, and the Egyptian Supreme Council of Antiquities.”\textsuperscript{206}

The mask, as well as many of the original treasures, were too fragile to travel. They were to remain in Egypt and be put on display in Egyptian museums after the final international tour. Instead, this exhibition took a more scholarly bend, trying to put Tut in the context of the larger dynasty that included the “heretic” pharaoh Akhenaten and the rest of the dynasty.

From Basel, Switzerland, and then went to the U.S. and on to the U.K. After this interlude, it then made its way back to the U.S. before heading home to Egypt. While a few of the seven locations from the original tour were on the route, there were some new participants as well. When Tut returned to a site of the original tour, the contrast between the new and old illustrates what changes had or had not taken place in the museum community regarding how
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they displayed and interpreted ancient Egypt. *Tutankhamun’s Treasures* of the sixties was not the blockbuster exhibit that the seventies *Treasures of Tutankhamun* had become, nor did the new display live up to the standards of *Treasures*.

**The National Gallery of Art**

The National Gallery of Art had launched the big Egyptian exhibitions in 1961 and during the Tut tour of the 1970s., the museum had not displayed ancient Egypt again until *The Quest for Immortality: Treasures of Ancient Egypt*. The show ran from June 30 to October 14, 2002. The exhibit:

Presents the largest collection of objects ever to leave Egypt for a single North American exhibition. Highlighting masterpieces from the Egyptian Museum in Cairo, the Luxor Museum, and other collections in Egypt, the exhibition includes several works that have not been on display in public before and many that have never been shown outside Egypt.207

This exhibit was meant to overshadow the revenue of the Tut exhibit as well as spur interest in traveling to Egypt. Although the actual results of the exhibit are hard to find, it still failed to compare to the *Treasures*’ display. The exhibit did not focus on a specific person and their journey to the afterlife but several contemporaries of the boy-king. Tutankhamun’s name surrounded the advertisements of *The Quest for Immortality*.

Its numerous artifacts overpowered the Tut exhibit due to the doubling of the number of artifacts exhibited. It was expected to pull people in to visit but did not have the same impact from the 70s. According to the National Gallery of Art website, an approximation of 430,772 people showed up to *The Quest for Immortality* while *Treasures* brought in 835,924. Tut, was assumed to have been the sole ruler of the show as opposed to sharing the stage with others from the 18th dynasty. Although the National Gallery currently has no ancient Egyptian collection in their museum, the Gallery gives teachers access to DVDs to Ancient Egyptian and Greek Art.

This art museum has been used to the idea of bringing in big name works of art since its opening in 1941. With works like the Mona Lisa and Vincent van Gogh’s self-portrait gracing the walls of the Gallery, along with other contemporary paintings, ancient Egypt, as well as other ancient civilizations, would seem out of place as a permanent display. For the next museum, ancient Egypt would fit right in.

**The Field Museum**

A key site for the 1970s tour, the Field Museum was again a host for King Tut. *Tutankhamun and the Golden Age of the Pharaohs* stayed at the Field Museum from May 26, 2006, to January 1st of the following year.

---

Visitors to the new exhibition—twice the size of the original 1977 exhibition—will view stunning artifacts that portray the splendors of life and death in the 18th Dynasty. See nearly 130 dazzling Egyptian treasures from the tombs of Tut and his royal relatives, many of which have never before traveled outside Egypt!\(^{211}\)

With the museum’s vast collection of ancient Egyptian artifacts, along with a complete recreation of a three-story mastaba accompanied by “one of the largest collection of mummies found in any U.S. museum,”\(^{212}\) it is easy to see why Egypt would trust the museum to take care of Tutankhamun’s belongings. However, the audience response to the new exhibit was disappointing. One example is from a comment from a blog review from the new Tut show. The commenter, Padma, says,

As a child in Chicago, I went to the original Tut exhibit at the Field Museum. It is a wonderful memory. When my son came home from school and asked if I wanted to chaperone a school field trip to this new version, I jumped at the chance thinking it would be like what I recalled from the Field Museum years ago. Definitely not. Quite disappointing.\(^{213}\)

The Field Museum was the only U.S. museum that Treasures visited that was a natural history museum instead of an art museum. The placement of ancient Egypt became an issue in the earlier years of the display and interpretation of the ancient culture. From being placed within a natural history and scientific section to then being positioned within the realms of art and history; Egypt’s placement seemed to be uncertain.


New Orleans Museum of Art

Like the National Gallery, perhaps ancient Egypt would have seemed out of place for a museum that’s primary focus from their current collection is “the development of Western Civilization from the pre-Christian era to the present.” Although the museum does not currently hold any ancient Egyptian antiquities, according to their collection’s description, they are open to “exhibit, interpret and preserve works of art from ancient to modern times.” In their website’s antiquities selection of their collection menu remains a single a Greek vase from 530 B.C.

Also like the Gallery, the exhibit, *The Quest for Immortality: Treasures of Ancient Egypt* visited the museum as well. Because the New Orleans Museum of Art “ranks among the top 25 percent of the nation’s largest and most significant museums, and is the premier art museum in the Gulf South region,” it made for the perfect place to be inclusive for a new audience.

The Louisiana museum’s membership increased after the *Treasures* tour; from 4,000 to an impressive 10,000. According to the museum administrator at the time; Barbara H. Neiwender, “the massive exhibition required so much work, that the museum added 127 new employees and about 1,000 volunteers to handle the workload.”
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supported the exhibit but they added 75 million dollars to the city’s economy.\textsuperscript{221} This exhibit set new standards for how the museum was run from the time Tut left to today. According to John Bullard, the museum director during the \textit{Treasures} display:

In a normal year before Tut, we would have had maybe 100,000 visitors. In the four months of Tut, we had 900,000 visitors – it was a transforming experience for the museum. It made the politicians and businessmen realize that a big exhibition could generate as much money as a Super Bowl (which took place in New Orleans right after Tut left), over a longer period of time, and with upscale visitors.\textsuperscript{222}

The museum became more than an institution meant for education, it became one of great promotion and entertainment.

\textbf{Los Angeles County Museum of Art}

The Los Angeles County Museum of Art (LACMA), after the original Tut tour, expanded upon their ancient Egyptian collection from their usual Asian, Latin American and pre-Columbian art. After \textit{Treasures} went back to Egypt in the early 80s, it was the first American museum to host the \textit{Tutankhamun and the Golden Age of the Pharaohs}. The exhibit ran from 2004 to 2011. Landing in LACMA from June 16 – November 15, 2005, the exhibit was based on 50 of Tut’s belongings and 70 funerary items from the same dynasty from which Tutankhamun belonged.

\textsuperscript{221} Cannato et al., ”King Tut: A Classic Blockbuster.”
An estimated 937,613 people viewed the eighteenth dynasty’s noble belongings in 2005. Of those people to pass through the exhibit, perhaps many of them would have remembered the event that happened 27 years earlier. Here is an anonymous testimonial that combined personal experiences from the 1978 and 2005 Tutankhamun exhibits:

I remember standing in line with my mother at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, for three hours, waiting to see the ‘King Tut’ exhibit. (It was only the year before, 1977, that I’d stood in line with my brother for four hours waiting to see Star Wars at Grauman’s Chinese Theatre in Hollywood.) The spectacle of this exhibit of a World’s treasure identified something greater to me than any textbook at that time had ever expressed to me. I was only 9 years old, but even then, I felt that it was disrespectful to reduce King Tutankhamun to a nickname. Sadly, I returned to LACMA in 2005 for Tutankhamun and the Golden Age of the Pharaohs Exhibition. As the museum itself was in transition, I felt it was one of the poorest exhibitions I’d ever witnessed. There is still so much more to this young King. We should still be talking about him.

This western art museum’s goal was to become the west coast version of the Met, but since the Met had a century’s worth advantage over the LACMA’s own 1965 opening, they collected what they could to catch up. Although the collection’s timeline was meant to stay within the region of the 13th century to current times, the Egyptian collection has grown under the watchful eye of the Los Angeles museum’s curator of ancient and Islamic art, Nancy Thomas.

The Metropolitan Museum

The museum currently is known to have one of the greatest collections of ancient Egypt outside of Egypt itself. Throughout thirty-nine rooms, almost every part of the Met Museum’s Egyptian collection is displayed. This not only emphasizing ancient Egypt religious beliefs and history but including the daily life of the ancients as well.

*Tutankhamun and the Golden Age of the Pharaohs*, was meant to make its way to the Metropolitan Museum. The museum’s refusal to break policy by charging for a separate and special admission for the Tut show, however, meant that the *Golden Age* exhibit never went there. Instead, the exhibit carried on at the Discovery Times Square Exposition, now closed, less than three miles away, from 2010 to 2011. Though the attendance numbers have been unavailable, it has been projected that at least a million people have paid homage to the boy-king in New York City for the exhibit.

For the people of New York City, like newspaper contributor Joseph Sitarz, who remember the original *Treasures* exhibit, the memories left a great impression:
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I was fortunate to be one of those more than 8 million people to see the exhibit. I went to the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City sometime between Dec. 15, 1978, and April 15, 1979, to see it. I was in high school at the time. I don’t remember how I happened to come to have a ticket for the exhibit, but I did. Even though I had my admission in hand, there was a line to get in to see the exhibit – long lines...Besides the line, I do remember my first glimpse of the burial mask. It was amazing. It was bright and clean. The mask was made of gold with other items, such as blue glass for the stripes, and feldspar, dark blue faience, carnelian, colored glass, quartz, obsidian and lapis lazuli. Boy, did that thing shine. The burial mask is what most people remember about the show.230

After the famous boy-king’s treasures departed from the Metropolitan Museum, the city itself was over 111 million dollars richer. Not only did the exhibit impact the economy, but it also influenced and changed the views on what a museum could do for the public. Instead of the select few being the main targeted audience, the museum was now open to anyone willing to go and visit one.

The Metropolitan Museum of Art has continued to be trusted with the exhibition and display of ancient Egypt. With recent exhibitions like Ancient Egypt Transformed: The Middle Kingdom231 and The Art of Medicine in Ancient Egypt,232 the famous art museum has proved that ancient Egypt can exist in museums out of the sphere of Tutankhamun. Trust, for a museum is very important. If people do not feel like such an institution is trustworthy, there would be no need to visit such a place. That the Metropolitan Museum continued to uphold their policies in
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the face of losing Tutankhamun, shows that the relationship between museum and audience has become one of a mutual respect.

Seattle Art Museum

Because the museum was the last place the treasures would visit before going back to Egypt to be permanently displayed, directors hoped that the exhibit would be a guaranteed blockbuster, which, in the end, was correct. Although the Seattle Art Museum has collected ancient Egyptian art before the major Tutankhamun exhibit of the 70s, the tour was the first time the ancient culture had been displayed in an exhibit.

The museum has an intense focus on Asian art, and after the Treasures exhibit left the city, Egypt found its place more comfortably among the Ancient Mediterranean Art collection. The success also brought the museum’s membership program up to almost 15,000 subscriptions by the time Tut’s treasures left the city. According to SAM’s website:

Treasures of Tutankhamun, shown at the Flag Pavilion at Seattle Center, forever alters the museum’s profile, bringing increases to staff and new emphases on exhibitions and publications…The exhibition’s popularity and financial success fuel the plans and preparations for a permanent downtown facility.

Tutankhamun: The Golden King and the Great Pharaohs, along with approximately 50 items from the boy-king’s tomb accompanied by the other fifty or so pieces from other ancient nobility’s tombs, opened in May 2012 and ran into January of the next year. The first part of the

---


display was set up to showcase more than Tutankhamun’s belongings with leading figures’ statues and funerary goods in the ancient world before the teenaged-king’s time. It was meant to be a humanizing factor in the lifetime of the eighteenth dynasty’s rulers.

The second part of the exhibit became the main event as Tut’s treasures took the spotlight. These items, according to Seattle Times writer, Madeline McKenzie included, “dazzling masks and beguiling, lively shabti statuettes of people to serve him in the afterlife.” As the article McKenzie wrote noted, “There’s something to intrigue any visitor: amazingly preserved ornate jewelry, beautiful ceremonial items and Tut’s bed and sandals for homey comfort through eternity.”

After the Tutankhamun: The Golden King and the Great Pharaohs exhibition left Seattle on January 6, 2013, it went back to Egypt, where Tutankhamun’s belongings will never leave again. The subtle risk of never seeing the artifacts again had always been the motivator for many to see his treasures while traveling in the United States. Now, due to the fragility of the objects, they will stay in Egypt, and all 5,000+ items found in Tutankhamun’s tomb will be displayed all together in Egypt’s Grand Egyptian Museum (GEM), starting in early 2018.

---
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“One-third of these artifacts have been featured previously at the Egyptian Museum in Tahrir, Cairo - but the GEM plans to showcase them in an incredibly realistic manner that enables visitors to experience the inside of the tomb.”\(^{240}\) This is the archaeological approach that had been missing since his discovery. Audiences will get to see the full context of the tomb and see who the mysterious boy-king was, not only as a young ruler but as a young person living in the ancient world.

The Return to London: The British Museum and the O2

Changing course from the last time Tutankhamun’s items visited, this time, England was one of the last places the 18\(^{th}\) dynasty’s rulers’ belongings stayed before taking another quick US detour, due to demand; to finally going back home to Egypt in 2011. *Tutankhamun and the Golden Age of the Pharaohs, November 15, 2007 – August 30, 2008,\(^{241}\)* was the headline show after 35 years away from Britain. To help draw attention to the issue surrounding the need for a new exhibit, Dr. Hawass said, “tourism is the main destroyer of monuments, severe action is needed.”\(^{242}\)

The purpose of the show was to raise money towards the conservation of ancient Egyptian antiquities and their monuments. Although the British Museum had the chance to host the exhibit, the timing would have clashed with an already planned Chinese exhibit, according to the Museum.\(^{243}\) Dr. Hawass mentions, “I wanted it to come to the museum. But they do not have

\(^{240}\) Ibid.
\(^{241}\) Ibid.
\(^{243}\) Ibid.
enough space. If you put it there, people will not see it beautifully." The exhibit went to the O2 instead, where it had been criticized for being an entertainment venue rather than an appropriate place to showcase such ancient artifacts.

Jonathon Jones, a journalist for *The Guardian*, and visitor of the Tut exhibit in Egypt’s Cairo Museum was one of the many disappointed reviewers of the O2 Tutankhamun exhibit. To sum up his feelings, he generally stated that he did not like how distracting the music, architecture, films, lighting, etc., of the display. He laments, “you prepare to enter the dark rooms containing the actual shiny treasures of King Tut, [but] you need to readjust your expectations: everything in this version of his treasury is quite small. It is not an overwhelming assembly; it’s more like a bijoux selection.”

While Jones admitted to the general beauty of Egyptian art, he felt the location of this exhibit cheapened the experience, as well as the objects that were chosen for the display. The lack of the death mask was brought up one of the main complaints about the newer exhibit. The subjects advertised for the event included: “Egypt before Tutankhamun, Traditional beliefs, death, burial and the afterlife, religious revolution, the boy king, Tutankhamun, King of Egypt, causing his name to live, the science of Tutankhamun, the tomb, Howard Carter Gallery and daily life.” The exhibit’s subjects, as mentioned by Jones, had introductory films to cover them.

Another disappointed reviewer was one who was part of the actual set up of the tour from the early seventies in London. Philip Tavener was the “Marketing Director of *Times*  

244 Ibid.  
246 Ibid.  
Newspapers who were partners with the British Museum in sponsoring the event.”

His memories of the 1972 exhibit far outweighed his experience at the O2.

It is in the lower level galleries, dedicated to the discovery of the tomb and the artefacts buried with Tutankhamun that doubts creep in. For me there was a feeling of anti-climax…Similarly beautiful is the tiny gold coffinette inlaid with glass and semi-precious stones…and is displayed alone – in a showcase spotlit against a black background. This seems to be intended as the star of the show and is used in much of the supporting advertising. However, some visitors have commented on their disappointment in it – not because it lacks beauty – but because the adverts led them to believe that they would see the great golden death mask of Tutankhamun, not a 10cm high statuette.

Even if the golden mask had been placed amid the rest of the artifacts, the disappointment surrounding the design of the exhibit as well as the lack of focus on the boy-king himself would not have done the 1970s British Museum exhibit any justice. Taverner laments, “we had to listen to a series of speeches by the organisers … Much seemed to be said about the money they hoped to raise, little was said about Tutankhamun or the exhibition itself.”

Perhaps the tour would have had an element of surprise if they did not include Tutankhamun’s name in the headlining title. If the tour was advertised as being of the era of Akhenaten, then all of a sudden, fifty of those treasures happened to feature Tut, perhaps audiences would not have gone into the exhibition with high expectations.

Although the British Museum initially had a limited view and a biased start with exhibiting and interpreting ancient Egypt, it now thrives on teaching younger audiences the importance of the ancient artifacts, such as, the Rosetta Stone.

---
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From being put on the backburner and being relegated as the inferior to graceful Western art, the image of ancient Egypt now fills the British Museum’s website and inspires the British youth with an openness to learning more about ancient civilizations. The British that remembers the Tutankhamun exhibit from 1972 were certainly inspired when they were children back in the day. Many of the memories include the setup of the tomb-like recreation and how dark and atmospheric the rooms were.²⁵¹

The Challenge Continues

The Tut exhibit from the 1970s went spectacularly well, to the point of setting the standards too high. The exhibit was a best-case scenario for all of the museums and cities it touched, so when it came time to exhibit ancient Egypt after the fact, it became too difficult to get away from the image of Tutankhamun. The reason for this is perhaps because this exhibit was meant to show off the beauty and spectacle of Egypt. It was not simply a show and tell presentation. It was an immersive experience. Hoving understood that the people who might go to the exhibit may have never been to a museum before, so what he did was make sure that a great first impression was had by all.

Exhibits after Treasures, specifically Ramses the Great and The Quest to Immortality, though impressive in their own right, invoked the name of the boy-king to bring interest to the displays. As the advertisement for Quest for Immortality says, “More than 100 priceless artifacts, representing 2,000 plus years of history and a dozen kings, make this touring show twice as large

as the Tutankhamun “King Tut” exhibit which caused a stir nationwide in the 1970s.”252 Instead of attempting to create something entirely new so it could stand alone as a blockbuster event, however, advertisers relied on the success of the popular 70s tour, even when it had nothing to do with the teenaged-king.

When the more recent Tutankhamun exhibits came back from Egypt and into the United States after 2005, the excitement caused by the idea of a “once in a life-time” chance to see the treasures fell flat. Because of the high costs of a ticket as well as the lack of the famous gold death mask, it was an unfortunate disappointment to the many who traveled to see the exhibit. For an exhibition based around Tutankhamun, more than half of the artifacts were from people he would never have met. Many who remembered the 70s exhibit remarked that newer display could never live up to what they remembered as a child.

Before Tutankhamun reigned in North America, ancient Egyptian displays in the United States still depended on collections that had been acquired from Egypt or Europe. Then in the 1970s, millions of people across the country flocked to King Tutankhamun and his shiny treasures. People began to trust this refreshed institution as an educational source outside of schools. Museum workers now knew how to handle vast crowds and how much work goes into planning such spectacular events as well as specific ways to display ancient Egypt.

More recent attempts to display Egypt are looking to the virtual world. Some museums and websites are now taking to interpreting Egypt virtually. Popular sites such as Touregypt.net and institutions such as the Walters Art Museum and the Egyptian Museum are among many.

While this allows smaller museums to present Egypt to the public, it is not the attraction that Tut had been.

Museum websites allowed potential visitors to view tours online and it also allows them to take control of their own experience of the museum. Every museum has a website, and when it comes to the ancient Egyptian exhibits, the boast of focusing on the daily life of the Egyptians is what is meant to draw one in. The daily life focus is due to the constant themes of the life and death of the ancient Egyptian elite, which was a society that did not include the vast majority of Egypt’s population.

Becoming inclusive has become important regarding the exhibition of ancient Egypt. This is one of the challenges of the blockbuster; people steadily tire of repeatedly seeing the same famous artists and their works, therefore, a change of pace was needed. In addition, after Tut, it was hard to turn the public’s love of things Egyptian into exhibits that drew visitors and revenue. A second tour did not have the same energy that the original one did. It was hard to turn a collection of mummy cases and canopic jars into another blockbuster attraction without the glitter and pomp of the Treasures tour. Stricter antiquities laws have made it almost impossible to acquire new artifacts to put on display. In retrospect, the ultimate victim of the curse of King Tut’s tomb may well have been the blockbuster Egyptian museum exhibition.
Conclusion

Western powers, specifically, from the French, British and American governments, over the Egyptian antiquities played a significant role in how the civilization is viewed today. From the time of Belzoni’s extravagant exhibit to the British Museum’s initial misgivings in their displays of Egypt, Egypt and its artifacts had the option of either becoming the dusty sideshow in one gallery or an art or natural history museum, or becoming the showstopper spectacle that drew crowds to see exotic and gilden objects.

Western institutions during this time were trapped within the stuffy and selective image of a museum for the few, but with the discovery of a teenaged-king and his treasures, this had
more of an effect at making Egypt accessible than the French invasion in 1798. After Howard Carter’s discovery of the tomb in 1922, people from a wide range of backgrounds connected with the story of Tutankhamun, or at least to his possessions. He added to the mystery of an already mysterious ancient culture and his burial items gave Western audiences proof that Egypt was a land filled with buried treasure. At this time, his riches could have been used to tell a more intimate story of ancient Egypt, but instead, the beauty and shine of the gold are what won crowds’ affections.

Due to the immense success of the blockbuster tour of the seventies, to this day, a dramatic, golden and theatrical show is expected when it comes to Egypt’s display in museums, at least in Tut’s name. When the glamour is gone, and the audience does not get what they predicted for a Tutankhamun exhibit, it becomes a negative factor for visitors. More than two centuries have passed since Napoleon’s savants made Egypt available to the rest of the world, yet displaying ancient Egypt has not had much change.

Under the traditional aesthetic approach with an emphasis on the spectacle, Egyptian artifacts have shown to be appreciated more deeply by the general public, especially when the audience knows what to expect. Tutankhamun, from the time of his tomb’s discovery to this day, has played the role of a great and powerful diplomat. Though he did not have much time in his life to be the great pharaoh that Ramses II was in the dynasty after Tutankhamun’s death, he has done Egypt proudly in his afterlife.

The main complaint of the newer Tut shows was the lack of the golden death mask. Tutankhamun’s image became the face of the modern imagination of ancient Egypt, and when that comforting visual was removed, people felt like the experience of the tour was cheapened. Despite the presence of multiple artifacts that were thousands of years old and could be
considered quite beautiful, the objects were generally disregarded and seen as almost unimportant. The spectacle that was created of the boy-king, while it has the power to pull people in to see even the *replicas* of Tutankhamun’s treasures, has continued to limit who the ancient Egyptians were.

Ancient Egyptian civilization has the span of over 3,000 years. Yet the most famous image of the ancient culture has been restricted to the period of less than twenty of those years. The Western influence over Egyptian antiquities is what eventually led to Tutankhamun not only becoming the star of Egypt, but it also chose what part of ancient Egyptian history was more important and most interesting.

For example, in 1939, a discovery was made by French archaeologist Pierre Montet in the Egyptian city, San el-Hagar, also known as Tanis. Montet “unearthed a royal tomb complex that included three intact and undisturbed burial chambers…[with] treasures such as golden masks, coffins of silver, and elaborate sarcophagi. Other precious items included bracelets, necklaces, pendants,”253 etc.

Like Tutankhamun’s tomb, it was untouched. Unlike Tut, it was utterly ignored. This dismissal of the discovery was due to the onset of World War II. According to Egyptology professor, Salima Ikram, “had the Second World War not intervened, the royal burials of Tanis would have been as well, if not better, known than the tomb of Tutankhamun.”254 Because the West’s attention was elsewhere, the Tanis find was deemed unimportant and unimpressive.
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Ikram continues, “though the objects reside in Cairo’s Egyptian Museum, they draw far fewer visitors than their more famous counterparts.”

There are a few possible follow-ups for this study. While this was the Western perspective and interpretation of ancient Egypt, it would be enlightening to see Egyptomania and its effects from the Eastern perspective, specifically from the modern Egyptians from each era following the Western invasion of Egypt in the late 1700s. Dr. Zahi Hawass has said that Egypt never really went through such an Egyptian obsession, that Egyptians were rather blasé about the fads.

It would also be enlightening to see how other Western civilizations, separate from Britain, France and the United States, experienced Egyptomania and if it impacted cultural events. Italy, Germany and other European countries dealt closely with Egypt during the race for Egypt; how has it impacted their society? The presence of Egypt in North American society is so closely tied to the ancient civilization that it has become part of what is “our” history. It is taught in American curriculums as if it is part of our direct past, even though, for the most part, Americans typically do not share ties with Egyptian ancestry.

Egyptian antiquities are among the most popular exhibits to this day and they share the title of popularity with those of the dinosaurs. It could be due to the age of the artifacts, yet, there are also other treasures that share the same age bracket. The idea of “Egypt” is something that Westerners either love or they find at least some aspect of its history fascinating, but maybe not to the point of searching universities to train in Egyptology.
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The lack of the Egyptian voice throughout the West’s point of view in the race for Egypt was what personally stood out through the research of this paper. A shocking number of famous Egyptologists, when Egyptology started to become a more institutionalized study, spoke about the Egyptian diggers like they were children and were inferior, even though they were responsible for discovering Egypt’s treasures.

The writers of *National Geographic*, within the first few decades of the founding of the magazine, made it a point of proudly showcasing their Orientalist thinking when it came to people that were different than their target audience in the United States. Even Howard Carter, who seemed to love genuinely “Tutankhamun,” treated the boy-king’s mummy as if it was an obstacle for the treasures on the mummy that he wanted. Carter used many brutal and invasive tactics that was typical for his time-period to get to the treasures that he wanted.

First, the innermost coffin was left out in the sun to roast, in the hope that the heat would melt down the resins. Next, at Carter’s suggestion, an anatomist named Douglas Derry poured hot paraffin onto the mummy’s wrappings. Later, they pried the body out and yanked various limbs apart, and used a knife to slice the burial mask away from Tut’s head. Carter later reassembled the mummy as best he could (minus the mask and jewelry), and placed it in a wooden tray lined with sand, where it would remain.258

It was basically an unadvertised unwrapping party. Carter, when he first entered the tomb, had felt a connection and empathized with the sense of mourning for the young king. He said that he could feel the very human feelings in the room from losing the boy so young and unexpectedly. Yet, when he dealt with the king’s actual body, it became an object that was only in the way of more important and spectacular things. This was the unfortunate problem. Excavators and the general public may have had a genuine love for Egypt and its antiquities, yet

---

the most neglected aspect of the love of all things Egyptian was the lack of respect and
acknowledgment of the actual *people* who created these “wonderful things.”
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