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Introduction

Perche tutti questi viaggi intorno al mondo sono un po come un grande film mai girato.\(^1\)
---Gian Luca Farinelli, Direttore, Cineteca di Bologna, on Chaplin’s travel narratives

Charlie Chaplin, one of the first Hollywood stars to experience unparalleled fame and celebrity, presents an interesting example of the new (for the 1920s) practice of promoting one’s work through a world publicity tour. Chaplin’s two world tours (1921 and 1931-2) had a great effect on his later creative life in terms of helping him to develop a social consciousness that found its way into his films. However, as I argue in this project, at the time of each tour, this lofty consideration became secondary to the promotional needs demanded by the release of the risky films each followed—*The Kid* and *City Lights*—and the damage to Chaplin’s reputation caused by his divorces from Mildred Harris and Lita Grey and his problems with the Internal Revenue Service. It’s at this point that the travel narrative comes to the rescue, for following each tour, Chaplin released a “promotional” travel book: *My Trip Abroad* (1922)\(^2\) and “A Comedian Sees the World” (1933-4)\(^3\) respectively.

I argue that the genre of the travel narrative proves to be the perfect promotional tool for Chaplin because it works in tandem with the audience’s accumulated knowledge

---

1 “Because all his trips around the world are just like an unmade film.” (Translation courtesy of Cecilia Cenciarelli, Cineteca di Bologna)
2 *MTA* was published in February 1922 by Harper and Brothers Publishers. The book then came to be serialized additionally in *Movie Weekly, Screenland*, and 29 newspapers around the country (mostly second-string papers, such as the *Chicago News*, and the *New York Evening World*), as well as being translated into 12 other languages within ten years of its initial publication.
3 “A Comedian Sees the World,” in its published form, comprises five parts which appeared starting with the September, 1933 issue of *Woman’s Home Companion* (Crowell Publishing, Springfield, Ohio) and ending with the January, 1934 issue. The managing editor for this series was Willa Roberts. From the primary documents housed at Association Chaplin in Paris, it can be ascertained that this series was largely Chaplin’s own and as such it is perhaps the first instance of his own writing to appear in print, except for the “economic policy” which he released to the papers on June 27, 1933—a document which also resulted from the 1931-2 trip.
about the Little Tramp persona—that he often enters the film on a road and leaves the
same way, that he usually carries all his belongings with him and that he must rely on his
adaptability to strange environments and strange people in order to survive from day to
day. In other words, these narratives are effective because, in his films, the Little Tramp
character connoted the “everyman” tourist in his dress, demeanor, and movement. Thus
the creation of this new persona of Chaplin-as-tourist in the narratives effectively linked
the two (public and filmic), thereby overcoming some of the public dissension created by
the media’s negative portrayal of Chaplin’s personal life and behavior at the time. It was
up to the narrator of each narrative (ostensibly Chaplin), then, to conflate his public
persona with his filmic one in order to allow him to convert the text into a promotional
vehicle. This dissertation will examine the way each narrative achieves this conflation
and employs other promotional rhetorical strategies that work in conjunction with it. In
the process of this analysis, the project will also propose a tradition of the travel-
narrative-as-promotional-vehicle to be found through a consideration of the poetic
tavelogues of Lord Byron, Charles Dickens’s *American Notes* (1842) and Gertrude
Stein’s *Everybody’s Autobiography* (1935), a tradition that helps to position Chaplin’s
narratives historically and generically.

In addition to these goals, the project makes three unique assertions that demonstrate
its significance. First, Chaplin’s travel narratives stand at the juncture between the
sociological phenomena of literary celebrity and the tourist attraction, showing
correlations between accepted theories of each phenomenon. Second, these narratives
exhibit certain stylistic elements of literary modernism, such as use of the sentence
fragment, unattributed dialogue and the present tense. Finally, as texts exhibiting some
modernist innovation, Chaplin’s narratives add a dimension to current discussions of modernist marketing strategies in that, like the implicit strategies of James Joyce and other high modernists, the narratives did not overtly present themselves as publicity products, but sought instead to project a rhetoric of authenticity that would have been the objective of any travel narrative or memoir.

An important assertion of this dissertation is that Chaplin’s travel narratives are positioned at the intersection between celebrity scholarship and the study of tourist behavior—two areas of vibrant ethnographic inquiry. In order to make this assertion, the project employs the ethnographic work of Joshua Gamson in *Claims to Fame: Celebrity in Contemporary America* and Dean MacCannell in *The Tourist*. My close examination of Gamson’s theory of the celebrity encounter game and MacCannell’s theory of the tourist-attraction encounter, allowed me to bring these two theories into a dialogue with each other. Gamson’s celebrity encounter game has three stages: 1) identification of the star, 2) excitement in occupying the same space as the star, and 3) documentation of the encounter through photos or other trophies, such as autographs or bits of hair and clothing (139). Gamson suggests that there must be an element of community or camaraderie in the second stage of the game for it to have the appropriate impact, a requirement that lends the game the aura of ritual as well. McCannell’s theory of sightseer behavior in regards to the tourist attraction encounter, then, can be seen to follow similar steps, including the ritual aspect. In this theory, the tourist first recognizes the sight and then must link his or her markers (guidebook, photo, map, plaque on the sight itself, etc.) to it and to the markers of others in the group (the ritual element of this encounter). The tourist’s encounter with the tourist attraction ends, like that of the
celebrity, with some documentation of the encounter, usually accomplished by taking a photograph or buying a postcard, but in times past it might have meant inscribing one’s name and date on the attraction itself or taking a physical part of it as a memento (135-7).

The close correlation of these two theories adds an important dimension to this project, for it becomes clear throughout the tradition of the travel-narrative-as-publicity-vehicle that the literary celebrity and the tourist attraction become united in the person of the author on tour or on a lecture circuit. Also, since both theories examine the phenomenon from the perspective of the fan or the tourist only, the literary celebrity travel narrative becomes the first example of an account written from the perspective of the celebrity/tourist attraction him or herself, a circumstance which allows for the first multi-dimensional consideration of Gamson and MacCannell’s widely-accepted ethnographic theories.

As a celebrity, Chaplin’s public persona was collaboratively constructed by multiple entities and voices—including the media and personal acquaintances, as well as his own publicity machine—many of which conflicted with or contradicted each other. My archival work for this project, for example, showed that the first travel narrative, \textit{MTA},\footnote{I will refer to \textit{My Trip Abroad} as \textit{MTA} hereafter.} was ghostwritten.\footnote{Although the contract for \textit{MTA} lists as its second point that the “author is sole author and proprietor of said work,” the author being listed as Charles Chaplin, Louis Monta Bell is listed as due to receive 1.5% of Chaplin’s 10% of the profits in the fifth point of the contract “for services rendered by him in connection with the writing of such work.” Correspondence between P. C. Eastment of McClure Newspaper Syndicate dated October 19, 1921 suggests the details of the financial deal regarding the serialization of \textit{MTA} (which was to pre-date the publication by Harpers & Bros.). It should be noted that Chaplin’s press agent at the time was involved: “In accordance with our conversation with you and your representative Mr. Carlyle Robinson, it is agreed that you will furnish material for a story of your trip abroad, to be written over your signature to us. [...] This story is to consist of approximately 50,000 to 60,000 words and is to be prepared by a thoroughly trained newspaper man and submitted to you and your representative for revision and approval before published in the newspapers.” A later letter, also from Eastment dated February 16, 1922.} Due to the conflicts and contradictions created by media narratives
with the public persona Chaplin wished to promote, an understanding of his perceived public persona and of the personal context surrounding the two overseas tours help to explain his need to utilize new publicity venues such as the travel narrative. As mentioned above, Chaplin’s trips to Europe followed the completion of a film that marked significant risk on his part, as well as a period of some personal scandal publicized in the press. When Chaplin left for London in September 1921, he had recently completed his first feature comedy, *The Kid*. As Charles Maland points out, it immediately followed two relative failures, *Sunnyside* (1919) and *A Day’s Pleasure* (1919) (55). Articles began to appear in the press at this time, such as “Is the Charlie Chaplin Vogue Passing?” (*Theatre* October 1919) in which the author objects to “styling Charles Chaplin a great artist when he’s nothing of the sort” (Farmer 249). *The Kid* was risky because, not only was it six reels long (comedies appeared only as “shorts” of approximately 25 minutes total at this time), but also it juxtaposed scenes of comedy with those of pathos in a bold new way. In addition, Chaplin was just recovering from his first divorce scandal; his divorce from actress Mildred Harris became final in August of that year. Despite Maland’s suggestions that the press treated Chaplin with gentleness reveals some information on the way Bell may have gotten involved. Eastment writes “I have no doubt that you are finding Mr. Bell both very delightful and very useful to you and I feel pleased for your mutual sakes that our little business deal brought you together.” More important, though, is an unpublished typescript found late in my research. It was a typescript dated May 24, 1960 and titled “Monta Bell”–a typescript found amongst Chaplin’s draft and manuscript material for *My Autobiography*. Chaplin’s first line of this typescript serves as his admission in print of Bell’s role. It reads “Monta Bell, the newspaper man who ghost wrote my book *My Trip Abroad.*” This evidence clearly shows that Chaplin did not write the book. Not surprisingly, there are no drafts of any kind for this work in the archives.


7 Actually, this strategy was one Chaplin used to great effect in such films as *The Bank* (1915) and *The Vagabond* (1916). What was new about it was Chaplin’s foregrounding it in the opening credits (“A comedy with a smile—and perhaps a tear.”) and then his making the juxtapositions more explicit throughout the film.
(44) in their handling of the divorce, The Des Moines Sunday Register (Des Moines, Iowa) devoted two full pages of their Sunday magazine to Mildred Harris’s court testimony during the proceedings that cast Chaplin as an insensitive husband.\(^8\)

Copyrighted by the International Features Service, the article would have appeared in newspapers throughout America’s heartland, thereby presenting a figure of scandal, Chaplin-the-man, in contradiction to his beloved film persona.

His 1931-2 trip was propelled by much the same set of conditions. City Lights, the film he released just before his departure, despite its synchronized sound track,\(^9\) was essentially a silent film. By 1931, sound technology had been in place in the film business more than five years.\(^{10}\) Proof of the risk involved here for Chaplin is evidenced by the fact that he was compelled to secure venues for showing the film himself in both Hollywood and New York. He contributed significantly to the completion of the Los Angeles Theatre on Broadway in Los Angeles, California in order to show his film there. And in New York, he rented the Cohan Theatre against the advice of his associates.

Again, in his personal life, Chaplin had recently undergone two scandals in 1927—the long and tortuous divorce suit of his second wife, Lita Grey, and his owing of back taxes to the Internal Revenue Service. Whatever unflattering revelations about Chaplin the press had provided during the Chaplin-Harris divorce, the Chaplin-Grey divorce made

---

8 Harris’s testimony included Chaplin’s mistreatment of her on their first Christmas together when Harris had just been released from the hospital after treatment for a nervous condition. Chaplin failed to come home on Christmas Eve, after he had told her “he would be home and have dinner with me and help me trim the Christmas tree” (“What Charlie” n.pag.). When he did arrive home in the early hours of the morning, he woke Harris up to castigate her for buying so many presents. On Christmas day, he arose very late and continued to yell at her for her overindulgence, stating that “he did not believe in such things” (“What Charlie” n. pag.). Such pronouncements must have seemed sacrilegious to working class Americans.

9 A synchronized sound track in 1931 is an orchestral track composed and performed to match the action and emotions portrayed onscreen.

10 The first film to utilize sound technology was, of course, Al Jolson’s The Jazz Singer (1927).
them pale in comparison. After the publication of Lita Grey’s divorce complaint in a small brochure-sized document sold on street corners like any scandal sheet, the public began to choose sides. Most scholars agree that the public was divided on the issue along the lines of education level and economic status—at least in the United States. In favor of Chaplin were his colleagues in the arts and academia (including many members of the press); against him were the women’s clubs and moralizing middle America. In Europe, there seems to have been no such divide, for the public generally refused to judge Chaplin’s art on the basis of this particular human frailty. In an essay entitled “Hands Off Love” printed in *transition* in September 1927, a group of thirty-one European artists and intellectuals, including Louis Aragon, André Breton, Marcel Duhamel, Max Ernst, Man Ray and others conveyed their views of Chaplin’s situation to the public, turning him into a cause célèbre:

A Dog’s Life. That is at the very moment the life of a man whose genius won’t win him his case; of one on whom everyone’s back will be turned, who will be ruined with impunity, from whom all of his means of expression will be taken, who is being demoralized in the most outrageous fashion, for the benefit of a miserable, spiteful little bourgeoisie, and for the sake of the grandest public hypocrisy possible to imagine. A dog’s life. Genius is nothing to the law when matrimony is at stake, the blessed

---

11 The document numbered 23 pages and was printed on cheap pulp paper. It was released to the public on January 12, 1927, just two days after the complaint was filed in Los Angeles. Among its more revealing claims is item 3 under part V: “defendant solicited, urged and demanded that plaintiff submit to, perform and commit such acts and things for the gratification of defendant’s said abnormal, unnatural, perverted and degenerate sexual desires, as to be too revolting, indecent and immoral to set forth in detail in this complaint” (4).

state of matrimony. And anyway as we know, genius is never anything to the law, never. (10)

The American government chose this inconvenient moment (January 20th to be precise) to sue Chaplin for back taxes, seizing and sealing all of his assets, including the studio (Maland 97). By 1931, despite the predictions listed in the essay cited above, public rancor had largely been shelved, but the specter of its ability to arise at any moment must have added to the tense atmosphere that surrounded the production of City Lights.

Because both the release of The Kid in 1921 and the release of City Lights in 1931 were tentative junctures in Chaplin’s career that might make or break him professionally, they demanded strong and innovative promotional texts.

One of the models that Chaplin and his ghostwriter used to construct this new promotional vehicle was the “between-the-wars” travel narrative. In order for this new sort of promotional text to be effective, it must first be convincing as such a narrative by attending to some of the parameters of the genre. In the next few paragraphs, I will briefly discuss how Chaplin’s MTA and “CSTW”13 work with and/or against the conventions for the travel narrative genre, outlined by Paul Fussell in Abroad: British Literary Traveling Between the Wars (1980). As this discussion will show, Chaplin’s travel narratives do attend to a majority of these accepted parameters and, over and above this attribute, exhibit what Fussell would label “modern” elements in terms of style. Since the term “modern” can be used to modify creative products from the Renaissance to the present, I would prefer to term these stylistic choices “modernist.” In addition, the ghostwritten MTA will serve here and throughout my analysis of the texts as a template.

13 I refer to “A Comedian Sees the World” hereafter as “CSTW.”
Being a purchased publicity text, *MTA* was undeniably created to promote Chaplin and/or his film persona, the Little Tramp. Therefore, I can assume that the ghostwriter of *MTA* chose the rhetorical strategies he employs with this publicity agenda in mind. Knowing this, then, I can compare *MTA*, the publicity product, to “CSTW,” Chaplin’s own composition, and better determine the ways in which the second narrative conforms to or diverges from this model.

It is interesting to note that while the first ghostwritten narrative (*MTA*) is mostly a search for self in a homecoming situation, the second (“CSTW”) is more concerned with economic and social analysis and critique. In this respect, “CSTW,” can be aligned with such diverse works as Charles Dickens’s 1842 *American Notes*, Aldous Huxley’s 1934 *Beyond Mexique Bay*, and George Orwell’s 1937 *Down and Out in Paris and London*. While I cannot prove that Chaplin read *American Notes* specifically, the connections between the two works are worth discussing briefly, if only because Chaplin has been linked, since the 1920s, to Dickens by many writers and critics and, in fact, often welcomed the connections himself and worked to prolong and emphasize them.\(^{14}\)

\(^{14}\) Chaplin himself probably fostered his being compared to Dickens, because he makes much of the fact that *Oliver Twist* was the first book he read as a boy (an untruth, since he was illiterate until he reached his mid-20s). However, his connection to Dickens is an early one; he began mimicking music hall performer Bransby Williams’s characterizations of Dickens figures at the age of 8 and continued to return to these impersonations as part of his routine for Casey’s Court Circus, circa 1907. A comparison of Chaplin’s and Williams’s portrayals of Fagin, as shown below, are hauntingly similar. Film scholar Neil Sinyard superficially compared them with regard to their similar economic status during childhood, similar experience with child labor and degenerate parentage, and similar self-made-man tendencies—in his *Filming Literature: The Art of Screen Adaptation* (1986). But it was Chaplin himself who continued to make the connections throughout his life. Having been invited to give the “Immortal Memory” speech at the Dickens birthday celebration in London in June 1955, still touting Dickens as the catalyst for his boyhood love of literature, he by this time was able to admit that this “love” was engendered by his own performance interpreting these characters on the music hall stage. (See Chaplin’s speech published in *The Dickensian*, Volume LI, Part 3, No. 315, pages 112-14). And, finally, Chaplin’s biographer David Robinson prolonged the mythical alliance after the death of both men when he wrote that in the last year or two of his life, Chaplin “read and re-read his favourite Dickens novel, *Oliver Twist*” (628).
Several points of connection can be located between Charles Dickens’s *American Notes* and Chaplin’s “A Comedian Sees the World.” *American Notes* was essentially a social and economic study of America by Charles Dickens, who at the moment of his departure from English soil, wholeheartedly believed that America was the model for a utopian society he hoped to someday see come to England. Within a week of his arrival, however, he had completely changed his mind and wrote his travel narrative in order to expose America’s ills and degradation to the rest of the world (but mostly to his fellow Englishmen). Of course, Chaplin had no such purpose in mind for his narrative. Nevertheless, the connection lays mostly in the types of “sights”—hospitals, prisons, schools, etc—each chose as interesting locations that afforded some tangible information about the state of social and economic affairs. I have always thought Chaplin’s “penchant for prisons” as one news article calls it, an interesting idiosyncrasy, but an offhand scribbling on the typescript for “CSTW” caused me to look for more concrete connections between Chaplin’s obsession and Dickens. At the beginning of the page describing his visit to the Old Bailey and Wandsworth Gaol in London, Chaplin scribbled

---

Chaplin as Fagin (fn. 14)  
Williams as Fagin (fn. 14)
“Charles Dickens” in the margin. Just this simple notation seems to suggest that Chaplin was connecting this penchant in his mind with Charles Dickens, who also visited prisons with regularity, including Newgate in London, Sing-Sing in Ossining, New York and the Eastern Penitentiary in Philadelphia. Perhaps Chaplin took a cue from Dickens about the importance of social critique and his duty (Chaplin’s as well as Dickens’s) as a celebrity to engage in it.

The between-the-wars travel narrative (a possible model for Chaplin and his ghostwriter, as I noted above) claims many more parameters than social consciousness, however. Some of the rhetorical strategies Fussell enumerates include a use of hyperbole, trivia or gossip, humor and irony. Of the strategies Fussell mentions, Chaplin employs trivia sparingly, as in his description of anomalies like the Japanese tea ceremony discussed later. Hyperbole is all but absent; nothing is the “most” beautiful, the “greatest” spectacle, the “grandest” anything. Not surprisingly, a mixture of humor and irony is the strategy he employs most often. In keeping with the self-deprecative humor of the Little Tramp persona, Chaplin makes fun of himself in situations as diverse as his afternoon with H. G. Wells (in MTA) and his meeting with King Albert of the Belgians (in “CSTW”). The second of these, his meeting with the Belgian king, Chaplin later incorporates into The Great Dictator, in the scene between Hynkel and Napaloni that takes place in Hynkel’s office. It employs some of the big-versus-little humor emphasized in Chaplin’s silents, especially the films in which he plays opposite Eric Campbell (The Immigrant, The Adventurer, etc.).

---

15 See my analysis of this episode in Chapter 2.
In terms of point of view, one strategy Fussell mentions is the use of the subjective narrator. This feature renders the work more democratic and more aligned to autobiography. The narrator confesses to his or her reader—lets him or her in on the secrets of the journey, so to speak. The subjective narrator can better reveal personal recollections of the places and people encountered and can also reflect feelings or sensations associated with each place or person. For both *MTA* and “CSTW,” the narrator uses a subjective voice rather than a traditional objective one.

Another feature common to the travel narrative is the description of some anomaly encountered on the journey. Usually this anomalous place, person or event is described in contrast to the traveler/tourist’s own experience or culture. Fussell argues that collecting anomalies is a uniquely British trait. The Brit seems to possess “a supreme confidence that [he or she] knows what is ‘normal’ and can gauge an anomaly by its distance from the socially expected” (170). Chaplin and his ghostwriter, too, engage in this practice. The ghostwriter’s account of Chaplin’s first visit to Berlin in *MTA* contains many impressions of anomalies, such as “The different style of architecture here is interesting. Factories are being built everywhere. Surely this isn’t conquered territory. I do not see much livestock in the fields. This seems strange” (114). In “CSTW,” anomalies, such as his account of the Berlin Police Museum included in early drafts, Chaplin decided were too offensive for his audience and, so, he excised the episode for his final version. Then there were sights reported to have the aura of the anomaly that turned out to be disappointments. Chaplin reveals these fakes, as in the case of the German cross-dressing club which offered much less shock value than had been reported: “I must say I was very disappointed. It was a most feeble entertainment and very self-
conscious of its naughtiness” (II:17). The most traditional sorts of anomalies Chaplin reports in “CSTW.” These include his experiences in Southeast Asia, a region he travels to for the first time on this tour. Nearly everything about Bali is anomalous to Chaplin, from the bare-breasted women to the kris dances and gamelan performances. Japan, though, is anomalous as much for the evidence Chaplin sees of its westernization as for its Kabuki-za theatre and tea ceremony: “Should you ask me offhand my opinion of Japan, I should say it is a nation of inconsistencies. A simple illustration is a man attired in a kimono wearing a derby hat” (V: 86).

Several narrative elements are also commonly employed in the travel narrative. Often, travel narratives, usually organized chronologically, begin with a movement from personal crisis to nostalgia to embarkation. Chaplin follows this formula very closely. At the onset of the *MTA*, Chaplin’s crisis is expressed in the three words with which he chooses to open the work: “A steak-and-kidney pie, influenza, and a cablegram” (1). With the choice of these three words, Chaplin has effectively related his increasingly alienated state to his readers, for each is a symbol of alienation inherent in modern life. The steak-and-kidney pie signals Chaplin’s expatrial residence in America in that his desire for it heightens his growing feelings of homesickness for England. Influenza is a symbol not only of World War I, but the sickness engulfing the modern world following the war that took a great many lives as well. Finally, the cablegram is a symbol of modern technology, an innovation in communication that was designed to make the world smaller in some sense, but which could not help but emphasize the distance between persons, due to its physical reality of disjointed words and phrases on a small page. It was these three items, supposedly, which first set Chaplin on his journey. He
relates selective information about his particular personal crisis in “CSTW” as well:

“The disillusion of love, fame, and fortune left me somewhat apathetic. There seemed nothing to turn to outside my work, and that, after twenty years, was becoming irksome. I needed emotional stimulus” (I: 7).

“Nostalgia,” the second element of the formula, begins then in the next paragraph. Chaplin outlines his desire “to live in my youth again, to capture the moods and sensations of childhood” (I: 7) and then clarifies this desire first through a series of impressions of his childhood memories and then through relating a lengthy anecdote about his relationship with Hetty Kelly. After convincing caricaturist Ralph Barton to join him, embarkation occurs several hundred words later (I: 9). In the earlier work, *MTA*, nostalgia is embodied in the steak-and-kidney pie itself. The wave of nostalgia which floods Chaplin at Montague Glass’s dinner party where he eats the pie actually precedes and even exacerbates the crisis itself. Embarkation in this narrative also differs from the prescribed formula in that it is dramatically delayed. Chaplin’s ghostwriter chooses to have the reader travel with Chaplin over the American continent to the East coast, experiencing his celebrity with him then along the way. Embarkation doesn’t happen until page 20.

Fussell suggests that the body of the modernist travel narrative is composed mostly of a search for self (the interior journey) (70). In *MTA*, this formula is strictly adhered to and, in fact, almost seems to be the point of the whole book. In the episode in which Chaplin first encounters his cousin Aubrey, for instance, the reader sees him trying out different behaviors in order to acclimatize himself to this “new” person—searching for who he is or who he wants to appear to be:
My cousin interests me. He warns me what to talk about. At first I felt a little conscious in his presence. A little sensitive. His personality—how it mixes with my American friends. I sense that I am shocking him with my American points of view.

He has not seen me in ten years. I know that I am altered. I sort of want to pose before him a little. I want to shock him; no, not exactly shock him, but surprise him. I find myself deliberately posing and just for him. I want to be different, and I want him to know that I am a different person.

(45)

While Chaplin’s continual flashbacks to his childhood would suggest that he might be trying to work something out on this journey, “CSTW,” however, does not really give evidence of this. Chaplin is more troubled by the economic and social condition of the world around him and so, he focuses on these conditions as he encounters them and then his own particular analysis of or proposals concerning these conditions. In the end, he does suggest that he has come to a sort of personal epiphany on the journey: “It [Europe] animates me with a desire for accomplishment—not in the old way but in something new; perhaps in another field of endeavor” (V:86). This epiphany may suggest definitively the end to Chaplin’s journey, both personal and physical. In this capacity it works as the final narrative element of the travel narrative: the ritual of the return. Fussell argues that this final stage of the journey “tends to be [a moment] of heightened ritual or magic” (208). Evelyn Waugh in *Labels* accomplishes the ritualistic aspect of the return by tossing his champagne glass overboard: “This gesture, partly, I suppose, because it was of its own moment, spontaneous and made quite alone, in the dark, has become oddly
important to me, and bound up with the turgid, indefinite feelings of homecoming” (177). A similar “magicness” for Chaplin could be evidenced by the aformentioned epiphany from “CSTW,” or even through his welcome back into America by the reporters waiting for him in Seattle. Ironically, Chaplin’s final line suggests that America is indeed home, an admission he rarely makes so clearly: “Nevertheless I am glad to be back in America. I’m glad to be home in Hollywood. Somehow I feel that in America lies the hope of the whole world. For whatever takes place in the transition of this epoch-making time, America will be equal to it” (V:86).

In the ghostwritten MTA, however, the ritual of the return is enacted in a tour of Sing-Sing prison in Ossining, New York back on the North American continent. This hall of imprisonment in a beautiful landscape becomes the sort of liminal zone in which the “magic” Fussell speaks of is most at home. In the strictest sense, though, the narrative overextends the bounds of the actual overseas journey and follows Chaplin all the way home on the train. His reflections there more effectively bring the trip to a close: “And going over it all, it has been so worth while and the job ahead of me looks worth while” (155).

As I have tried to show in this discussion, Chaplin’s ghostwriter in MTA and then Chaplin himself in “CSTW” had significant knowledge of the parameters of the travel narrative genre to use them convincingly and expertly. These travel narratives, though, must be deemed popular works. Although they cannot be ranked with the achievements of high modernist writers, they do display certain stylistic strategies that are comparable to ones recognized as such. In fact, the idea of Chaplin as a modernist artist, at least in terms of film, is not new. As Minnie Maddern Fiske related in a 1915 article in Harper’s
Weekly, “cultured, artistic people” were beginning to take notice of him—a trend that never ceased during Chaplin’s lifetime. It is the intellectuals of Weimar and of Paris who can be credited with first making this connection. Despite the fact that Chaplin brought his films to Germany for the first time in 1921 during the very trip about which MTA was written, Ivan Goll had already introduced the German and French intelligentsia to Chaplin through his cinema-poem Die Chaplinade in 1920. Sabine Hake returns to the Chaplin/modernism connection in recent scholarship by reminding us that Goll praised “Chaplin as the embodiment of modernity, revel[ed] in his attacks on bourgeois values, and speculat[ed] on his importance as a figure of reconciliation between art and technology [. . .]” (89). Michael North continues this discussion by attributing Chaplin’s filmic modernism to the mechanical jerkiness of his movements (170), a sentiment that seems to echo the memories of Gertrude Stein in Everyone’s Autobiography when Chaplin at a Beverly Hills dinner party explained to her that “he had known the silent films and in that they could do something that the theatre had not done they could change the rhythm” (qtd. in Sitney 160) and of T. S. Eliot in a 1923 issue of The Criterion in which he remarks that “the egregious merit of Chaplin is that he has escaped in his own way from the realism of the cinema and invented a rhythm” (306). North explains further:

In bringing a rhythm back into realism, he stalls or syncopates or reverses the seemingly natural order of things, disrupting that powerful sense of the given that always attaches to the purely visual. In particular, the repetitiousness of his movements, or of certain props [. . .] makes the whole process of copying, without which movies are unimaginable,
visible, and in so doing it highlights the inherent instability of every object and person in a film. (171)

As North suggests, the jerkiness of Chaplin’s movements on screen are akin to the fragmented, impressionistic nature of modernist texts and, I would suggest, cubist painting. The unique aspect of Chaplin’s art is that he accomplishes this rhythm without sound. The audience sees his jerky gait and his cane tapping the pavement and is able to feel the reverberations without hearing them.

Many of the stylistic choices in *MTA* seem to reflect the pervasive modernist theme of the work, namely alienation, isolation and estrangement. While the fragmented sentences and one-sentence-long paragraphs of the narrative can easily be dismissed as evidence of the ghostwriter’s (a journalist’s) lack of literary prowess, a more useful rationale for their existence in the text is their apt promotion of the alienation characteristic of modern human life which the Little Tramp persona experienced in abundance. A typical example of this staccato text occurs on page seven:

Crowds. Reporters. Photographers. And Douglas Fairbanks. Good old Doug. He did his best, but Doug has never had a picture yet where he had to buck news photographers. They snapped me in every posture anatomically possible. Two of them battled with my carcass in argument over my facing east or west.

Neither won. But I lost. My body couldn’t be split. But my clothes could and were. (7)

Chaplin himself uses this stylistic choice in “CSTW,” although it is not as prominent in this text as in the ghostwritten *MTA*. Because the instances of fragmented sentences
are minimal, their inclusion seems designed to achieve a certain effect. In Part I, for instance, a paragraph containing such fragments gives the effect of a flood of nostalgic impressions, almost in the style of stream-of-consciousness narration:

High factory walls that depressed me, houses that frightened me, bridges that saddened me. I want to capture some of the hurt and joy again. To see the orphan asylum where, as a child of five, I lived two long years. Those cold bleak days in the playground! I want to see the drill hall where on rainy days we were sheltered, sniveling around half-heated water pipes; the large dining-room with its long tables and forms; the smell of sawdust and butter as we entered the kitchen. (I.7)

He creates his fragments in three ways in this short paragraph. In the first sentence, he separates phrases by commas, the third and fourth “sentences” he forms into sentence fragments, and then in the final sentence, he separates impressions with semi-colons.

Chaplin’s ghostwriter also utilizes an unattributed-dialogue technique in MTA. The alienation exacerbated by celebrity is effectively transmitted to the reader through this stylistic choice that he utilizes when encountering the ever-present press. Interestingly, the ghostwriter includes Chaplin’s own speech in this dialogue:

“What do you do with your old mustaches?”

“Throw them away.”

“What do you do with your old canes?”

“Throw them away.”

“What do you do with your old shoes?”

“Throw them away” (4-5)
Every encounter with the press is treated in the same manner. Chaplin’s use of this technique in his own narrative, “CSTW,” is similar to that for MTA, perhaps suggesting that he did use this earlier ghostwritten book as a sort of model for his own. This encounter with the press as related near the end of Part I, almost echoes the one above:

“Did you find the Prime Minister interesting?”
“Yes.”
“Did you discuss politics?”
“No.”
“Did you do your funny walk for him?”
Smile.
“Are you going to put it in a funny picture?”
Another smile. (I:87)

Robert Byron in his travel narrative The Road to Oxiana (1937) also uses this technique, one which Paul Fussell, in his introduction to the 1982 edition, claims is evidence that this book has “much in common with such other masterpieces in the modern mode of rhetorical discontinuity as The Waste Land, The Cantos, Ulysses—even David Jones’s In Parenthesis” (xi). One example of such a dialogue is introduced only by “In the door stood the Charcoal Burners” (118). Byron continues:

“YOU? er--Hullo.”
“I’m sorry I’ve finished the whisky.”
“Not at all.”
“On account of my health.”
“We heard you were ill.” “Do you find it cold in Afghanistan?”
“The rain has inconvenienced us.”

“But you like the buildings, I hope.”

“Oh, charming.” (118-9)

Regardless of the specificity of each author’s usage, the intention is the same; unattributed dialogue used in this manner suggests both isolation and alienation of the subject experiencing it.

The final stylistic choice I will discuss is the singular use of the present tense in both MTA and “CSTW.” Since MTA concerns remembered events and people, some form of past tense would be the most likely choice for Chaplin’s recounting. However, he chooses specific remembered moments, like the evening he spends at Max Eastman’s house in New York and makes the acquaintance of a furloughed prisoner who is about to be reincarcerated, to switch to the present. This evening is a rare moment in the work for Chaplin in that he is represented, for once, as feeling integrated—accepted by the other guests as one of them. The ghostwriter explains this in the paragraph before the tense switch: “We all played, danced, and acted. No one asked me to walk funny, no one asked me to twirl a cane. [. . .] You were a creature of the present, not a production of the past, not a promise of the future. You were accepted as is [. . .]” (16). With this declaration of his being “a creature of the present” the “memory” becomes an event simultaneous with the writing of the text when Chaplin’s ghostwriter chooses to put it in present tense: “George asks me about my trip, but he does not interview” (16).

Chaplin himself uses the same sort of tense switching in “CSTW.” Again, as a travel memoir, convention dictates that the work should be in the past tense. Chaplin, the narrator, however, intervenes at points in the text, giving the impression to the reader that
he is writing the work as it happens and that the reader, therefore, joins Chaplin in his experiences—at least some of them. Arriving in England (now in 1931), Chaplin relates

We were to land in Southampton, but I discovered Sir Malcolm Campbell was getting off there and thinking that the celebrated should divide the celebrating, we decided to get off at Plymouth and leave Southampton to Sir Malcolm.

It is seven in the morning when we arrive, but there are friends to greet us. After the preliminary interview with the press, we are safely installed in a private carriage on our way to London. Several journalists are on the train, some wanting special interviews, but I have to decline. (I:10)

Robert Byron also uses present tense in *The Road to Oxiana*, although selectively. A work that can best be described by the word “montage,” some of the pieces of Byron’s literary puzzle are diary entries in which he utilizes present tense. In one such entry labeled “Teheran, January 17th,” Byron relates, “On hearing I have been to Afghanistan, the educated Persian draws a deep breath as though to restrain himself, expresses a polite interest in Afghan welfare, and enquires with feline suavity whether I found any railways, hospitals, or schools in the country”(126). As I have tried to show, certain stylistic strategies that are widely accepted as characteristic of literary modernism appear in Charlie Chaplin’s travel narratives, much as Fussell has argued they appear in Robert Byron’s *The Road to Oxiana*.

Due to the seemingly modernist elements of Chaplin’s narratives, a consideration of his marketing strategies should provide some insight into marketing strategies for modernist works in general. Foundational to this discussion is scholarship like Andreas
Huyssen’s *After the Great Divide* that works to perpetuate the idea that modernist authors’ relationship to a popular audience and culture can be termed “an anxiety of contamination” (vii)—that modernist “high art” was somehow diametrically opposed to “low culture.”¹⁶ Work on modernist authorship after the early 1990s mostly follows the line of thinking Paul Delaney espouses in his chapter “Paying for Modernism.” He argues convincingly that despite the fact that modernist literature was funded by patronage, the author still must contend with the more pedestrian requirements of the business, such as reproduction and circulation. He suggests, in fact, that exclusiveness does not conflict with commodification; it may even be the highest form of it. Patronage allowed the young modernist writers to survive while they labored at forms too esoteric for the commercial literary culture. Yet the projects they undertook, in subsidized obscurity, were grandiose in scale and in breadth of cultural reference; their implicit aim was to progress from their avant-garde coteries into the public sphere of the great capitals. (149)

Delaney argues further that the dynamics of marketing modernist works—selling them in small numbers repeatedly to different target areas—proved to attract buyers first by a “rhetoric of scarcity” (155) that then allowed the work to be issued later as an unlimited edition for the mass market.

---

¹⁶ Renato Poggioli in “The Artist in the Modern World” (from *The Sociology of Art and Literature*, edited by Milton C. Albrecht, James H. Barnett, and Mason Griff, 1970) argues that this opposition was the avant-garde model: “Avant-garde art, as a minority culture, must attack and deny the majority culture to which it is opposed” (670). Terry Eagleton in “Capitalism, Modernism and Postmodernism” (from *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader*, edited by David Lodge, 1988) proposes a similar argument when he defines modernism as, “among other things a strategy whereby the work of art resists commodification, holds out by the skin of its teeth against those social forces which would degrade it to an exchangeable object” (392).
The high modernist writer wished to be obscure and difficult. “Obscure” and “difficult” seem to be terms which lead away from any notion of a desire for mass production or mass dissemination, but essay collections such as Kevin J. H. Dettmar and Stephen Watt’s *Marketing Modernisms: Self-Promotion, Canonization, Rereading* and Ian Willison, Warwick Gould and Warren Chernaik’s *Modernist Writers and the Marketplace* clearly show that these modernists were, in fact, engaging in such strategies, even if they might be considered more subtle or subversive (and financially less effective) than those used by the Victorian and Edwardian writers with whom they wished to break.

Charlie Chaplin enters this discussion as more a filmic modernist than a literary one, but even so, his position between these two creative endeavors suggests that the case of his travel-narrative promotional vehicles will add an interesting dimension to this discussion—that, like some high modernist authors, even mass market professionals like Chaplin utilized subtle strategies of self-promotion not immediately discernible as such to great effect. Chaplin’s affinity for the business side of film can be surmised from an anecdote included in his autobiography about his early business inclinations: “There was a strong element of the merchant in me. I was continuously preoccupied with business schemes. I would look at empty shops, speculating as to what profitable businesses I could make of them, ranging from fish and chips to grocery shops” (60). It’s not surprising, then, that Chaplin was in Europe on each tour to promote his newest film—*The Kid* (1921) and *City Lights* (1931) respectively. *MTA* reveals the fact that Chaplin carried his films into Germany for the first time on this trip and that he also attended the first of many premieres of his work. My analysis of the business correspondence during
this time demonstrates that the second tour’s venues were chosen with the intention of staging premieres of *City Lights* in the chosen city that then would be enhanced by a personal appearance of Chaplin himself. Letters to Chaplin and his representative at the United Artists’ New York office, Arthur Kelly, from Chaplin’s European United Artists representative, Boris Evelinoff, written and sent the same day (December 12, 1935) promise that “ce ne sera pas difficile de reconstruire la grande popularité et l’enthousiasme autour de gênie de notre grand Patron “Charlie,” “—the same publicity as Chaplin had during the 1931-2 tour on what Evelinoff calls “un voyage de propagande en faveur de Charlie.” Chaplin managed to get in a little rest and relaxation on the beaches of the French Riviera and the slopes of St. Moritz, but it is clear that these occasions are beside the point. Both the 1921 and 1931-2 tours were clearly arranged for promotional reasons.

In addition, these “mercenary” motivations can be extended to the books as well. I have examined both contracts for the books and it appears that each proved a very lucrative venture on its own. *MTA* had several printings here in the States and was then translated and published in twelve foreign countries on into the 1930s, with each edition bearing new photos of whatever Chaplin movie happened to be out at the time of its release. The contract for *MTA* guaranteed more than $15,000 for Chaplin and earned him much more than that; the contract for “A Comedian Sees the World” paid $50,000. With these financial considerations in mind then, Chaplin’s expertise in promoting his

---

17 “it is not difficult to reconstruct the great popularity and enthusiasm around the genius of our great patron “Charlie” (translation mine).
own work is clearly shown to have a type of expertise unimagined by the literary modernists.

However, despite his well-developed business acumen, Chaplin’s travel narratives bear the same sort of abstruse marketing strategies as those of the high modernists. In one such strategy, modernist authors exploited the little magazines. Mark S. Morrisson argues that the little magazines, for some modernists, “seemed to open up the possibility of oppositional space, even of counterpublicity and counterpublics” (9). In other words, the market accessed by the little magazines, in being a counterpublic, worked well with the mythos of the high modernist artist. Censorship eventually played a role in this mythmaking as well, allowing James Joyce “to create a myth of himself as a martyr to his art” (Wexler xvi). In another strategy, Joyce and T. S. Eliot used photographs—a photo spread for Joyce and cover and other sorts of photo portraits for Eliot—in popular magazines like Time to further disseminate this mythology, albeit in an implicit way. The subtle strategy of Chaplin’s narratives—a strategy that results in promotional genius—lies in their projection of a rhetoric of authenticity which is the same as that of a genuine travel narrative at the same time as they succeed as promotional vehicles.

I wish to conclude this introduction with a brief description of the dissertation’s individual chapters. The project is comprised of an introduction, five chapters and a brief coda. In Chapter 1, I delineate a tradition for the travel narrative/publicity text for the literary celebrity, beginning with Lord Byron, then examining Charles Dickens’ American Notes and, finally, Gertrude Stein’s Everybody’s Autobiography. Like Chaplin’s two narratives, each of these writers promotes a new persona in his or her travel narrative. In order to judge the effectiveness of each narrative as a publicity
vehicle, I examine rhetorical evidence of the sociological phenomenon of the literary
celebrity/tourist attraction in each text—evidence that, I suggest, affords the narrative a
rhetoric of authenticity which makes it an effective publicity text. For this analysis, I
employ the ethnographic work of Joshua Gamson in *Claims to Fame: Celebrity in
Contemporary America* and Dean MacCannell in *The Tourist*.

Chapters 2 through 5 closely examine the particular effectiveness of Chaplin’s travel
narratives in their role as publicity vehicles. In Chapters 2 and 3, I examine the persona
Chaplin projects in the narratives and the way it works rhetorically to conflate his well-
known filmic persona, the Little Tramp with his public persona. More specifically in
Chapter 2, I investigate the way in which the visual rhetoric of the Little Tramp on film is
translated verbally into the text of the travel narrative, thereby working to conflate
Chaplin’s public and filmic personae. Using Frances Dauer’s theory from his essay “The
Nature of Fictional Characters and the Referential Fallacy” as a foundation, I develop a
comprehensive theory of Chaplin’s visual rhetorical strategies that elucidates a
correlation between these strategies and the verbal ones he employs in the travel
narratives. I base this theory on three categories of anomalies: behavioral, relational and
situational. An anomaly, in this discussion, is simply a deviation from the usual or the
accepted. This complex theory allows me to organize at least a small portion of
Chaplin’s visual rhetorical strategies from film into a scheme that I can then apply to the
written texts of the travel narratives. This theory allows me to move back and forth in the
chapter, then, between each visual strategy and its correlate in each of the written
narratives to demonstrate clearly how a conflation between Chaplin’s filmic persona, the
Little Tramp, and his public one was achieved, with the effect of creating in each a successful promotional vehicle.

Chapter 3 examines the dynamics of creating a tourist persona for Chaplin in the travel narratives that assists the conflation achieved by the rhetorical strategies examined in Chapter 2. In Chapter 3, I first discuss the traveler/tourist dichotomy as worked out by scholars and argue that the Little Tramp persona is most easily aligned with the tourist side of this dichotomy. With this distinction, it then becomes necessary for Chaplin to create a tourist persona in the texts and I suggest that one way his success in achieving this can be measured is by using MacCannell’s theory of the tourist-attraction encounter. I examine Chaplin’s two travel narratives for evidence that he engages in and demonstrates tourist behavior in them according to this sociological theory. I am able to show that Chaplin, like MacCannell’s sightseers, follows the entire ritualistic procedure of encountering a tourist attraction--including recognizing the sight, comparing his marker to those of other tourists and then documenting the encounter. In other tourist episodes in the narratives, I discuss Chaplin’s use of markers (books, postcards, guides, memory) to mediate his experience of a particular site and I categorize these markers into historical, personal, and cultural ones to facilitate this discussion. Finally, I discuss Chaplin’s use of the word “tourist” in the narrative, focusing on specific incidents in which he not only uses the word to label himself or his own behavior, but also as a way of distancing himself from the pejorative connotations of the word—a behavior that is shared with many tourists and therefore one which adds another important dimension to his tourist persona in the narratives.
In Chapter 4, I investigate the rhetoric of authenticity which Chaplin’s travel narratives exhibit, using the theoretical apparatus for this discussion which I set up to examine Byron, Dickens and Stein’s narratives in Chapter 1. In order to get at this language of authenticity in Chaplin’s narratives, I examine the elements of Richard Dyer’s rhetoric of authenticity for promotional texts—that each must exhibit lack of pre-meditation, lack of privacy and lack of control (“A Star” 137)—first in My Trip Abroad and then in “A Comedian Sees the World.” I show that Chaplin and his ghostwriter use fragmented sentence structure and the present tense in order to simulate an unpremeditatedness in the narratives. The narratives reveal private information, another of Dyer’s signposts of authenticity, through digression and a collage-like construction. Also, Chaplin’s narratives can be shown to demonstrate a lack of control through their accurate depiction of the celebrity-encounter game/tourist-attraction encounter in the text. In addition to these signposts of authenticity, the narrator in MTA and “CSTW” attempts to forge a close companionate relationship with his reader with many of these techniques, thereby making the reader more invested in the experiences the narratives relate than might usually be the case.

In Chapter 5, I consider the visual elements of Chaplin’s two travel narratives—photographs and illustrations—and the ways in which they function in this discussion of the travel narrative as promotional text. Susan Sontag, for instance, notes that “whatever the camera records is a disclosure—whether it is imperceptible, fleeting parts of movement, an order that natural vision is incapable of perceiving or a “heightened reality” (Moholy-Nagy’s phrase), or simply the elliptical way of seeing” (121). The idea that the photograph is a sort of disclosure, coupled with the belief that it is also a
miniature slice of the real (Sontag 4) (i.e., the camera never lies), allows it to play an important role as authenticator of other texts, such as written travel narratives, which must be somewhat suspect due to the inescapable ambiguity of language. It seems reasonable then, that the photographs and illustrations Chaplin and his publicity machine chose to include in both narratives played an important role in their success as promotional vehicles, for, as Roland Barthes asserts, “the structure of the photograph is not an isolated structure; it is in communication with at least one other structure, namely the text—title, caption or article—accompanying [it]” (16). The travel narratives I discuss for Byron, Dickens and Stein do not employ photographs or illustrations in them, although both Dickens and Stein used photos and photographic portraits to keep their images before the public. Therefore, I extend my discussion in this chapter to other modernist writers, such as James Joyce and T. S. Eliot in particular, both of who are known to have utilized the photograph successfully in their marketing strategies, in order to compare them with those of Chaplin in the travel narratives.

Charlie Chaplin’s travel narratives can be considered cultural artifacts as much as they are works of travel literature. While they conform in interesting ways to the known parameters of the travel narrative as set down to us by scholars like Paul Fussell, they also pertinently enter conversations about the phenomena of celebrity, the tourist attraction, and the multi-textual construction of persona. Most importantly, as artifacts of the film industry and as products of a great filmic modernist, Charlie Chaplin, the narratives have much to offer in terms of new discussions about marketing modernist art in general. The course of Chaplin’s popularity has moved up and down with the times and with the changing tastes of his audience. Still, his film work has achieved a place in
history of equal status to the great artists of literature such as James Joyce and T. S. Eliot. Part of that success can only be due to a clever marketing scheme, one that still continues to this day. Although the fact hasn’t garnered attention until this study, in some small way, Chaplin’s travel narratives played their part in this scenario very well. Gian Luca Farinelli, the director of the Cinteca di Bologna, recently noted (the original is my epigraph to this chapter) that the travel narratives really were films in print, with Chaplin in the starring role. This, in essence, is exactly the impression they project and therefore, why they work so well.
Chapter 1
Before and After: The Promotional Travel Books of Charles Dickens and Gertrude Stein

The man of letters puts himself on the market, in as much as he is a flâneur, to sell himself.

--Walter Benjamin, “Paris, Capital of the Nineteenth Century”

In the mid-nineteenth century, “celebrity” was first used as a term meaning a “famous person” as opposed to “having the quality of being famous.”18 This transformation would seem to suggest a linguistic need at the time for a noun to bring focus to the person affected more than to the phenomenon of celebrity itself. It seems reasonable then that it was at this point that the “star system,” an organized means by which a famous person is transformed into a commodity, began to appear both in Europe and America, due in part to achievements in communications like the telegraph, the rotary press, the photograph and, most importantly, advancements in advertising (Gamson 19-20) which facilitated and expedited the dissemination of the work, exploits, art and image of these chosen individuals. Authors were at the forefront of these advancements; therefore, in the 1850s there emerged “a new cult of literary personality which made the public eager to see as well as read their favourite authors” (Collins lii). Although certainly not the first literary celebrity, Charles Dickens is notable in this discussion for the fact that he seemed to possess a certain marketing genius. After piloting his innovation of serial publication with much success in Pickwick Papers (1837), he helped to advance the mania surrounding the celebrity authors, first through his visit to America in 1842 and later through performing on a lecture circuit, both at home and abroad. Mark Twain, Oscar

18 The OED dates the first such usage as 1849.
Wilde and Gertrude Stein are all students of Dickens in this respect, for all utilized the lecture circuit strategy to their advantage as public individuals and as marketing strategies. However, only Stein emulated Dickens further by using the travel narrative itself as a promotional vehicle. Dickens and Stein each wrote a travel narrative in conjunction with or shortly following a journey taken for largely mercenary reasons. For Dickens, it was *American Notes* (1842) and for Stein, *Everybody’s Autobiography* (1935). In this chapter, I will first discuss the amorphous genre of the travel narrative and the ways in which it works particularly well when employed as a promotional text. I will follow this discussion with an investigation of authenticity, a characteristic of equal importance to travel narrative, to memoir and to promotional texts. In this investigation I will show how theoretical work (most of it ethnographic) in each of these areas can be brought into a conversation with important outcomes for this dissertation. I then begin my analysis of celebrity authors and their travel narratives with Lord Byron and his position as combined literary celebrity and traveling persona, for although he predates the “new cult of literary personality” which arose around 1850, he is important as an instigator of the movement. I will then examine the narratives positioned both before and after Chaplin’s (Dickens’s and Stein’s) in order to assert that the genre is especially effective as a vehicle for persona promotion—as a marketing strategy—because of the particular rhetoric of authenticity it demands, coupled with a phenomenon unique to the juxtaposition of travel and celebrity: the transmogrification of the celebrity into the tourist attraction.

---

19 While Dickens insisted he was touring America because it had long been his desire to do so, his frequent speeches promoting international copyright legislation suggest that he hoped to put an end to his financial losses to American publishers as well (Meckier 39-41). Stein’s tour of America was organized according to lectures for which she was paid (Reaves 21).
John Cawelti distinguishes clearly between literary fame and literary celebrity when he argues that “the test of artistic fame is that one’s words or images remain in the minds of men; the test of celebrity is being followed everywhere by a photographer […] The object of celebrity is the person; the object of fame is some accomplishment, action or creative work” (164). In this statement, Cawelti purposely separates the artist as celebrity from his work. However, in the examples discussed here of the celebrity author and his or her particular travel book, the author’s celebrity and work are imbricated to the point of indiscernability. The celebrated author writes about his or her celebrity in the travel narrative and projects a public persona in the narrative promoting that celebrity and the work as well. In this sense the celebrity works; the celebrity becomes the work; the work is celebrated. This occurs in the travel narrative over the genre of autobiography because of a system of rhetorical authenticity unique to the form. Joe Moran points out that “the symbiotic relationship between promotion and self-promotion in the public construction of authors like Twain makes any attempt to distinguish between the ‘public’ author and the ‘private’ self a deeply problematic exercise” (23). The travel narrative, used as promotional vehicle in the case of Charles Dickens and Gertrude Stein, then, takes advantage of this symbiotic relationship in each case by promoting a particular public persona, different from the ones employed in other works. In the case of Dickens, the persona in American Notes has been noted to be counter to the “author-as-friend” persona affectionately termed “Boz,” which was characteristic of Dickens’s works in the

20 Other scholars on celebrity authors include Joe Moran, who, in Star Authors, refers to authors as ambiguous figures, “since they tend to straddle the divide between the restricted and extended subfields of cultural production [per Pierre Bourdieu] […]. As cultural signifiers they often contain elements of the idea of the charismatic, uniquely inspired creative artist associated with the autonomization of the cultural field, but they also gain legitimacy from the notion of celebrity as supported by broad popularity and success in the marketplace”(7).
years before 1842. And for Gertrude Stein, the persona of *Everybody’s Autobiography*—a book which I will argue should be classified as travel memoir rather than autobiography—works very hard to play off of the one projected in *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*, a persona more accessible to her mass readership (known by scholars as “the Good Stein”) and so, one more profitable for her.

Because I will limit this discussion to these select works of travel literature, how then does this particular genre lend itself to a self-promotional agenda? As Barbara Korte argues, travel writing is considered a hybrid literary form. Not only does it fuse “various modes of presentation: in very different proportions, narration is intermingled with description, exposition and even prescription. [...] Crossovers with the essay, the letter, reportage, the sketch, anecdote or treatise are frequent, and occasionally an account will even contain sections of poetry” (10). Most important in this *omnium-gatherum* known as travel writing is its autobiographical element. As Korte also suggests, the travel account participates in what Philippe Lejeune has termed “the autobiographical pact”—in which the author’s name on the title page affirms that “the author, the narrator, and the protagonist” are one person (qtd. in Glass 7). With this additional characteristic common between the two genres, the demarcations between them become still more blurred.

Questions of authenticity are important to autobiography, to travel literature and to celebrity promotion. Strategies in projecting authenticity in each of these genres, while taken on by different scholars, are strikingly similar. A foundational theory on the subject of authenticity in celebrity promotion is presented by Richard Dyer in *Stars*. Dyer argues first of all that because film stars exist out in the world outside of the film, they seem more real than fictional characters in literature. This existence outside of the
film serves “to disguise the fact that they are just as much produced images, constructed personalities as ‘characters’ are. Thus the value embodied by a star is as it were harder to reject as ‘impossible’ or ‘false,’ because the star’s existence guarantees the existence of the value he or she embodies” (22). This phenomenon applies to the celebrity author as well, especially one who “performs” in person for the public in some manner—through public readings and lectures, for instance. This sort of celebrity, be he or she a writer or a film star, is intertextually constructed; he or she is built through an imbrication of advertisements, gossip columns, newspaper articles and interviews, criticism and critique, photography and even film. Therefore, if the travel narrative is to function as a promotional vehicle, the celebrity author must effectively combat the alternative narratives of his or her life presented in the media with a strong persona in the narrative, one that takes its strength from an expert employment of a rhetoric of authenticity. Authenticity in celebrity promotional texts, then, is promoted through the use of signposts “that indicate lack of control, lack of premeditation and privacy” (“A Star” 137)—all of which are achieved rhetorically or stylistically. Each of these signposts relies for its efficacy on the assumption that “truth” lies behind or beneath the surface impressions that confront the public—a notion that is echoed in Dean MacCannell’s re-interpretation of Erving Goffman’s framework analysis in *The Tourist*. Like celebrities, tourist attractions are dependent on their projection of an aura of authenticity. Using Goffman’s original

---

21 Alternative narratives, as I discuss in Chapter 4, are newspaper articles, episodes from personal memoirs (published or unpublished), fan magazine articles, or newsreels that present scenarios found in Chaplin’s narratives from a different perspective. These alternative narratives act as referents to the episodes in Chaplin’s books that they retell. In other words, there is the possibly that the reader can go to these referents to check Chaplin’s narrative against their alternative version.
front-back dichotomy,\textsuperscript{22} “tourist settings can be arranged in a continuum starting from front and ending at the back, reproducing the natural trajectory of an individual’s entry into a social situation” (101). Therefore, like Goffman’s social situations, the back region, “closed to audiences and outsiders, allows concealment of props and activities that might discredit the performance out front. In other words, sustaining a firm sense of social reality requires some mystification” (McCannell 93). I mention this correlation here, because, in the case of literary celebrities who chose public performance as part of their interaction with audiences, they often became tourist attractions/sights themselves. This additional layer of signification provided an important opportunity for these celebrities in terms of authenticity.

Gamson argues that the celebrity-encounter game is composed of three stages: 1) identification of the star, 2) excitement in occupying the same space as the star (in real life), and 3) documentation of the encounter through photos or other trophies (139). Gamson clarifies his second stage in this theory as being a community experience: “There is a camaraderie born of waiting together and of focusing on the same event and of being identified together as spectators” (134). This additional information is important when trying to correlate Gamson’s theory with MacCannell’s. MacCannell asserts that the encounter of the tourist attraction is best explained by the ritualistic performance of the tourist undergoing this encounter (135). A similar recognition of the sight occurs initially, but then the tourist—in the company of others—must link his or her marker or markers to the sight itself and to the markers of others, in what he describes as “a little

\textsuperscript{22} In Erving Goffman’s analysis of the structural division of social establishments found in The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life, the front is where hosts, guests, customers and the like meet while the back is where employees, etc., work, relax or prepare for the performance out front.
flurry of activity” (136), i.e., “excitement.” MacCannell argues that “an authentic touristic experience involves not merely connecting a marker to a sight, but a participation in a collective ritual, in connecting one’s own marker to a sight already marked by others” (137). The “marker” in this theory—a guidebook, photo, postcard, map, plaque, etc.—correlates to the trophy of Gamson’s theory. In each case, tangible evidence of the celebrity/attraction/sight is a requirement of the experience. In addition, the celebrity author’s travel narrative is the only instance in which the celebrity author/tourist attraction can relate the experience of the celebrity encounter/tourist attraction recognition from its own perspective. The subjectivity of the attraction can be expressed for the first time.  

Unlike other authors who present an authentic persona only through written work, the celebrity authors in this study could construct a narrative of authenticity both in print and in person, becoming intertextual constructions much as is the case for a film star like Chaplin. Lord Byron is the progenitor of the convergence between authorial celebrity and travel, although *Childe Harold* employs a different sort of rhetoric of authenticity than the promotional texts of Dickens, Chaplin, and Stein.

It was the publication of *Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage* on March 10, 1812 which effectively launched Byron’s career in the direction of the poetic travelogue, as *Childe Harold* has come to be known, and it is this text and the persona Byron creates within it that effectively combats earlier “bad press” regarding works such as *Hours of Idleness*.

---

23 In his fragment “The Temple” (1919), E. M. Forster personifies Indian temples generally and even allows one to speak the line “‘I am a temple no longer. No man, not even a god, has visited me for a thousand million years’” (226-7), but this is the limit of the attraction’s subjectivity and most of the work is related by a third-person omniscient narrator.

and English Bards and Scotch Reviewers. A review published in The Quarterly Review in March 1812, noted the “happy accident” that Byron had found travel as a theme for his poetry (Ellis 180), or, more importantly, the first-person solitary male wanderer as his poetic persona. Samuel C. Chew suggests that the success of this theme and narrative device is due to the fact that for twenty years, “Englishmen, unless they were fulfilling a military or diplomatic function, had been shut off from the Continent by the almost uninterrupted succession of wars. This lack of opportunity for travel made attractive a poem that dealt with wanderings in foreign lands” (9). Through Childe Harold and other poetic travelogues, Byron’s public persona became conflated with the fictional heroic ones of his poems. Allan Massie, in fact, argues that Childe Harold is “Byron dressed up for show. He told his mother that he had acquired ‘a most superb uniform as a court dress, indispensable for travelling,’ and it is as if he wore that uniform to write Childe Harold” (31). An alternative reading of the poem arrives at a similar conclusion: Stephen Cheeke asserts that from the beginning of Byron’s life as a writer, “the place, or more specifically, the ‘spot’ which stands for the essence of the place, simultaneously speaks for itself and for Byron, so that geo-history and self-identity are interchangeable, or assumed to be so” (22), an assertion which again shows the wisdom in Byron’s choice of the poetic travelogue as a preferred genre. Byron employs a rhetoric of authenticity in works like Childe Harold, then, through the first-hand experience behind the lines of the poem, an aspect which is, for instance, highlighted by the opening sentence of the poem’s preface: “The following poem was written, for the most part, amidst the scenes which it attempts to describe” (4). Childe Harold developed from an actual two-year journey which was mostly without a plan or consistent itinerary, an element of the real-life
journey that becomes an organizational principal for the poem and, in one reading of the poem, for the growth of the poet’s mind (McGann *Fiery Dust* 40). Cheeke suggests that “as we read the wanderings of Harold, a sense of the author Lord Byron emerges, a powerful individual shaping his materials to the strong contours of his own masculine self” (40). If the poem has no particular plan, much as the journey preceding it had no plan, then, Cheeke asserts, it must be considered to have a destination—Byron’s own mind or personality (40). Byron effectively utilizes the travel book--the poetic travelogue--as a vehicle for promoting his preferred public persona, but without employing, as does Chaplin, Dickens and Stein, a rhetoric of authenticity which addresses his celebrity status directly.

Byron’s poetic travelogues achieved a lasting success because of his influence on the tourist industry and his status as tourist attraction himself. James Buzard argues that the “histrionic theatrical tenor of Byron’s public persona” (117) made it especially appealing to wannabe anti-tourists. Since the persona was “a grand subjectivity making travel into an opportunity for self-staging” (128), Byron helped to transform the Continent “into a great theatre for traveler’s acts of cultural self-dramatization” (117). His anti-touristic behavior thereby became conventional touristic experience. Old, oft-visited touristic sights took on new auras with the addition of the tourist’s dramatic act of reading Byron’s poems at the point of sight recognition in what can be referred to as Byronophilic methodology. This recognition coupled with the experience of the performance of reading lent the sight authenticity; the touristic sight was no longer an

---

25 While it might be interesting to use “site/sight” in this discussion, thereby linking a tourist location with the act of seeing that location, I find that travel literature scholarship uses the term “sight” to mean both the location and experience of seeing a tourist attraction and so, therefore, I have opted to use this term exclusively.
authentic experience without this performance, because “Byron offered a means of imagining and dramatizing their separation from the crowd of common tourists through emulation of him” (121). The phenomenon occurred both during Byron’s life, thereby making him a touristic sight in and of himself, and shortly after it, until about mid-nineteenth century. Prior to and acting as a catalyst to his sacralization as a tourist attraction (MacCannell’s terminology), came noteworthy Byron sightings, achieved

26. The affiliation with travel of poems such as Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage, “Prisoner of Chillon,” and Don Juan and their use as sight enhancements or “markers” as MacCannell terms them, resulted in changes in the works themselves, as well as in Byron’s public persona. John Murray’s guidebooks effectively reinvented Byron and his work due to extensive excerpting in which Murray deleted much of the political and socially conscious tenor of the works (Buzard 125-7). In the 1838 guide to Switzerland, for example, Byron’s “Prisoner of Chillon” appears there in mutated form (he quotes first from stanza VI, keeping the first eleven lines unchanged except for the question marks at the end of line five, then moving to stanza II for the remaining lines which correspond to lines 2 through 9 of the original poem), one which eliminates any sense of pathos or suffering on the part of the political prisoner who is the protagonist of the poem—elements of Byron’s politically and socially conscious persona which he promoted during his lifetime:

Lake Leman lies by Chillon’s walls;
A thousand feet in depth below
Its massy waters meet and flow;
Thus much the fathom-line was sent
From Chillon’s snow-white battlement (?),
Which round about the wave entralls:
A double dungeon-wall and wave
Have made—and like a living grave.
Below the surface of the lake
The dark vault lies wherein we lay.
We heard it ripple night and day.
In Chillon’s dungeons deep and old
There are seven columns massy and grey,
Dim with a dull, imprison’d ray,
A sunbeam which hath lost its way,
And through the crevice and the cleft
Of the thick wall is fallen and left,
Creeping o’er the floor so damp,
Like a marsh’s meteor lamp. (148)

As Buzard relates, “this reconstructed Byron pervades Murray’s guidebooks, well suited to the brief and disconnected emotive-aesthetic responses which tourists sought to display” (127), so much so, in fact that with the success and popularity of these guides, the persona projected by them (of Byron) became the accepted one—not just for Byron, but for all Englishman.

27. Allan Massie in Byron’s Travels (1988) reports that Byron was often inundated with admirers from England, most of whom he wanted to avoid. He once postponed going to Rome because he heard it was “‘pestilent with English—a parcel of staring boobies’—in Switzerland they had even trained telescopes on the Villa Diodati [Byron’s residence there]” (102).
through brief encounters. In John Galt’s *Life of Lord Byron* (1830), we find one such instance of a typical Byron sighting in a Gibraltar military garrison library:

A young man came in and seated himself opposite me at the table. Something in his appearance attracted my attention. […] His physiognomy was prepossessing and intelligent, but ever and anon his brows lowered and gathered; a habit, as I then thought, with a degree of affectation in it, probably assumed for picturesque effect and energetic expression […]. (quoted in Fiona MacCarthy 97)

Thus, Byron’s traveling persona and position as literary celebrity work together to make him an important precursor for the personalities and travel narratives I consider in this discussion, even though Dickens seems to publicly reject for himself any affiliation with Byronophilic methodology, as suggested in a recollection from *Pictures of Italy* in which he encountered a Bolognese waiter who was

a man of one idea in connection with the English; and the subject of his harmless monomania, was Lord Byron. […] He knew all about him, he said. In proof of it, he connected him with every possible topic, from the Monte Pulciano wine at dinner, (which was grown on an estate he owned,) to the big bed itself, which was the very model of his. (324-5)

Dickens’ sarcastic tone in relating this experience gives evidence of a change in the minds of mid-nineteenth century British tourists, from one of emulation to one of revulsion and mockery for this method, for the Victorians suspected that such popular
emulation was leading away from difference and towards conformity. While Dickens is highlighting in this anecdote a general change in the popular mindset towards Byron-impelled travel, an examination of his travel narrative *American Notes* will demonstrate a different sort of change, one in Dickens’s public persona.

A critic in the *North American Review* explained that “no one thinks first of Mr. Dickens as a writer. He is at once, through his books, a friend” (“Charles Dickens” 671). As a young and up-and-coming writer, Charles Dickens had worked hard to achieve this affinity with his readers. His innovation of publishing serial installments of his work seemed to bolster this relationship. As Kathleen Tillotson observes, “serial publication […] induced a close relation between author and reader […]. The prolonging of this intercommunication over eighteen months or more enforced the effect of contact; there was a sense of long familiar association” (qtd. in Deane 33). However, Mary Poovey argues that this “personal” relationship was, in fact, complicated by the act of serialization and the parameters imposed by the process:

> Because of the absolute standardization of the form—the fact that each serial part had to contain exactly thirty-two pages, which had to be produced according to an inflexible schedule and internal form—the writer was constructed not as an individual, much less a “genius,” but as just one instance of labor, an interchangeable part subject to replacement in case of failure or to repair in case of defect. (104)

---

28 Emulation or imitation is dangerous to the Victorian traveler because of the perjoration of the term “tourist.” Any traveler who conforms to the methods or modes of other travelers is not seeking individuality in experience but, instead, acting like any other tourist. Charles Dickens, a self-respecting Victorian, would not have wanted to be considered a tourist in any sense of the term. See my extensive discussion of the traveler/tourist dichotomy in Chapter 3.
However, the paradox of serialization’s effect on the authorial persona worked to provide a solution to the “contradiction between the two images of writer—the “genius” and the cog of the capitalist machine—at the same time that it assured the writer a constructive and relatively lucrative social role” (106). Poovey suggests that Dickens’s own personal success in solving the contradiction was due to his ability “to recognize what is characteristically English in his readers” (109). Dickens exhibits this characteristic only after his first American visit in 1842, when he discovers his own “bedrock Englishness” (Meckier 1) for the first time, an Englishness he introduces to his audience in *American Notes*. Englishness for Dickens came to be anything not American and included such characteristics as “good sportsmanship,” “reticence and modesty,” and personal fastidiousness (Meckier 15). Poovey, however, suggests instead that Dickens “understands and represents (‘comprehends’) the ‘national character,’” (109) and, being popular for this characteristic, plays an important role in defining English character for his trusting readers. Quoting a reviewer of Dickens’s *David Copperfield* writing in *Fraser’s Magazine* in 1850, Poovey defines English character according to this particular reviewer’s portrayal of Boz and men like Boz, who “‘are the true humanizers, and therefore the true pacificators, of the world. They sweep away the prejudices of class and caste, and disclose the common ground of humanity which lies beneath factitious, social and national systems’” (qtd. in Poovey 109). For Poovey, it is this collective humanity—a uniquely English characteristic, at least in the minds of the English—which Dickens’s persona projects and which thereby confirms his particular Englishness to readers.

*American Notes* has, at different times, been called Dickens’s “Dunkirk” (Nisbet 204), “a public relations nightmare” (Epstein 144), “a job of professional work, done under the
pressure of time and money and the need to be entertaining” (Patrick McCarthy 70), and “the book that inflamed two nations” (Moss 80). The book was reworked from letters sent home to England from Dickens’s 1842 five-month American visit to John Forster and William Macready (Meckier 1). Unlike his novels, it was not serialized, but released as a book for which current publishers Chapman and Hall had advanced money for Dickens’s travel expenses. The book reached New York on November 6, 1842—a Sunday—and two pirate editions appeared the very next day. And, despite the comments of scholars, The New World reported selling 24,000 copies in the first twenty-four hours and the New York Herald 50,000 copies in two days (Meckier 53). These factors help to make the story of *American Notes* a complicated one.

Dickens came to America a young man of thirty, carrying with him visions of a utopian nation that he constructed from reading the accounts of Alexis de Toqueville in *Democracy in America* (1830), Harriet Martineau in *Society in America* (1837) and Frances Trollope in *Domestic Manners of the Americans* (1832). Believing as he did then in the ameliorative capabilities of society—especially American society, Dickens was all the more nonplussed by the America he experienced. Slavery, the discussion of which Dickens devotes an entire chapter placed strategically at the end of the book, penal servitude and general poverty, squalor and lack of decorum were but a few of the maladies Dickens critiques in his travel narrative. Outside of the narrative, but influencing it as much or more as these social issues was Dickens’s ill treatment by the

---

29 Jerome Meckier in *Innocent Abroad: Charles Dickens’s American Engagements* (1990) argues that “regardless of *Chuzzlewit’s* plummeting sales (due in part to its author’s overexposure) and despite a depression in the book trade, the idea of an 1843-44 decline in Dickens’s reputation as a result of *American Notes* and a novel’s American episodes must be dismissed as a popular myth. It has been nurtured by eminent critics who, coincidentally, are also American” (59).
press when he made the mistake of promoting international copyright law at several
dinners given in his honor. Lionized by the media upon his arrival, he became “a
contemptible Cockney,” a “penny-a-line loafer” and “no gentleman” in an editorial by
James Gordon Bennett of the New York Herald, seemingly overnight (Moss 40).

After just a few days of this treatment, Dickens underwent both an epiphany and a
crisis. As Meckier points out, “instead of supplying an alternative social system, the New
World was a detour that rerouted Dickens permanently; obliged to say goodbye to exalted
sentiments and romantic dreams, he began expanding and coordinating the stringent
social criticisms already mounting in his first five novels” (2-3). With this illumination,
Dickens found his Britishness; Americans and America in no way lived up to the
standards of the British society he had left. Jeremy Tambling suggests this
transformation in his comment that “the dignity assumed for American Notes is another
aspect of that sentimentality that is nostalgia for bourgeois order” (42), or more correctly,
an English bourgeois order. It now became his duty to return to Britain and work to
improve its basic societal ills. American Notes, then, became his first forum for
presenting this new English persona to the public.

In his excellent analysis of Dickens’s American engagements, Meckier outlines the
following “concurrent operations” of American Notes: “1) recording his own
impressions; 2) measuring firsthand experience against books he has read; and 3) actively
seeking situations that test a previous traveler’s conclusions” (77). Promoting a new
authorial persona, one that would displace Boz forever and continue to make his (the new
persona’s) presence felt in Dickens’s work after 1842, did not make Meckier’s list.
However, the notion that American Notes can be considered a promotional vehicle for a
new persona is an important function of Dickens’ text, as I suggest, which works concurrently with Meckier’s delineated operations. Unlike Boz, Dickens in *American Notes* exhibits “extraordinary assurance” and an “air of authority”; he is “self-dramatising, knowingly putting [himself] forward in every scene, almost stunningly confident” (Patrick McCarthy 75). Henry Wadsworth Longfellow noted the voice to be “at times very severe” (qtd. in Longfellow 421). While these characteristics are not “English” as I have defined the term above, they do suggest a new level of seriousness and purposiveness in Dickens’s writing. This seriousness as well as Dickens’s concern for humanity can be seen throughout *American Notes*. Writing of the poverty and destitution of Five Points in New York City, for instance, Dickens’s new persona comments that

this is the place: these narrow ways, diverging to the right and left, and reeking everywhere with dirt and filth. Such lives as are led here, bear the same fruits here as elsewhere. The coarse and bloated faces at the doors, have counterparts at home, and all the wide world over. Debauchery has made the very houses prematurely old. See how the rotten beams are tumbling down, and how the patched and broken windows seem to scowl dimly, like eyes that have been hurt in drunken frays. Many of those pigs live here. Do they ever wonder why their masters walk upright in lieu of going on all-fours? and why they talk instead of grunting? (88-9)

Although Dickens seems to be dehumanizing the poor and debauched specimens he encountered in Five Points by equating them with pigs—with animals lower than man—his revulsion seems to be directed more at their particular circumstances, ones he
suggests are similar to “counterparts at home,” than to the people themselves. In depicting this scene to his English readers, he suggests that both he and they are responsible, that he, in pointing out the impoverished circumstances of the Five Points poor, calls for an end to such scenes at home in England.

Although *American Notes* is revised and polished from what was originally a collection of letters, Dickens still manages to achieve a level of perceived lack of premeditation important to Dyer’s rhetoric of authenticity required for promotional texts. One way he achieves this is through the use of floods of impressions separated by semi-colons. Leaving Harrisburg, Pennsylvania by rail, Dickens relates that it was pretty traveling thus, at a rapid pace along the heights of the mountain in a keen wind, to look down into a valley full of light and softness; catching glimpses, through the tree-tops, of scattered cabins; children running to the doors; dogs bursting out to bark, whom we could see without hearing; terrified pigs scampering homewards; families sitting out in their rude gardens; cows gazing upward with a stupid indifference; men in their shirtsleeves looking on at their unfinished houses, planning out to-morrow’s work; and we riding onward, high above them, like a whirlwind. (153)

This passage suggests through its use of semi-colons, Dickens’s spur-of-the-moment notation of these images in a journalistic fashion. As readers, we experience each image as it passes by—“scattered cabins” and “children running to the doors” and “dogs bursting out to bark.” This sort of journalistic notation becomes a rhetorical strategy for
Dickens, then, which effectively evinces Dyer’s lack of premeditation requirement for promotional texts.

Another strategy he uses to affect an immediacy and unplanned character to the work is his inclusion of odd bits and pieces from other genres and other sources which gives the work the character of a scrapbook. He might relate a memorable conversation like one he witnessed while traveling through Ohio by coach by rendering it as a mini-play within the narrative, even labeling the characters “Straw Hat,” “Brown Hat” and so on (190-1). In his final chapter entitled simply “Slavery,” in which he moves away from the chronological construction of the typical travel narrative to assume his commentator persona in full dress, Dickens pastes lists of slave advertisements one after the other in one section and lists verbatim newspaper reports of cases of demoralized individuals and their abhorrent crimes in another—evidence, Dickens suggests, of the devolution of American society due to the presence and influence of slavery. Many of these strategies are journalistic in nature and as such lend a sense of immediacy and lack of premeditation to the narrative.

Another of Dyer’s elements of a rhetoric of authenticity essential to promotional texts is for the work to exude a sense of privacy or to reveal private information. Dickens achieves this in American Notes through graphic detail, discussing sordid and unclean elements of American society usually unfit for genteel consumption. One example is his description of Negro living conditions in New York:

Pah! They have a charcoal fire within; there is a smell of singeing clothes, or flesh, so close they gather round the brazier; and vapours issue forth that blind and suffocate. […] Where dogs would howl to lie, women, and
men, and boys slink off to sleep, forcing the dislodged rats to move away in quest of better lodgings. (90)

More well-known and oft-quoted passages exhibiting this element discuss the American habit of expectoration or vile and uncouth mannerisms at table. One of many passages describing this American penchant for spitting recounts Dickens’s experience on a canal boat. Remarking on his boat-mates, he notes that either they never sleep at all or they perform the unusual feat of nocturnal expectoration: “All night long, and every night, on this canal, there was a perfect storm and tempest of spitting; and once my coat, being in the very center of the hurricane sustained by five gentlemen, […] I was fain the next morning to lay it on the deck, and rub it down with fair water before it was in condition to be worn again” (148). Table manners, too, were described with appalling frankness: “the gentlemen thrust the broad-bladed knives and the two-pronged forks further down their throats than I ever saw the same weapons go before, except in the hands of a skilful juggler” (146).

Dyer’s final signpost is an exhibition of lack of control (neurosis). This particular signpost can be directly linked with the phenomenon of the celebrity author becoming a tourist attraction, because it is evident in moments of sight recognition (to conflate both Gamson’s and MacCannell’s terminology) that the celebrity author can best be seen to be out of control. The congruence of Gamson and MacCannell’s theories is evident in Dickens’ *American Notes*, thereby lending the narrative a particular level of authentic rhetoric not available to authors who are not targets of such adulation. As I will demonstrate, the elements of the celebrity/tourist-attraction encounter follow the logical order provided in both Gamson’s and MacCannell’s theories: 1) identification of the
celebrity/tourist attraction, 2) excitement at inhabiting the same space as that
celebrity/tourist attraction, and 3) documentation of the event through the collection of a
trophy or trophies.

Dickens relates to the reader in his final chapter, “Concluding Remarks,” that “I have
made no reference to my reception “(252), a comment that suggests there will be no
evidence in the narrative of his position as either a celebrity or tourist attraction.
However, a close examination of the text show that he was not as careful to exclude these
moments as he may have intended. Norrie Epstein relates that “Boz’s jubilant arrival in
America was the Victorian equivalent to the Beatles’ inaugural tour in 1964. Having
read pirated editions of his novels, Americans were suffering from an acute case of
Bozmania, and Dickens’ tour was surrounded by hype unprecedented in American
history” (144). Letters home suggest that this sort of uncontrolled adulation, with
hysterical “crowds that pour in and out” of his lodgings, “people that line the streets,” and
cheering for him in the theatre (qtd. in Epstein 144) were all novelties that Dickens had
not experienced in England and as such, soon became annoyances (“a traveler is bound
[…] to resent the near approach of a class of strangers, who, at home, would keep aloof”
(Dickens 250)) and further reason for his outcry against such vulgarities in American
Notes. A newspaper in Philadelphia reported an incident of “documentation” when a
particular opportunist barber was found to be selling locks of the author’s hair as
souvenirs: “Go it, Boz, don’t be selfish, give the ladies a lock of your hair, and when it is
all gone, rub your bald pate with Balm of Columbia […]” (qtd. in Wilkins 160). Media-
generated narratives such as this one for Dickens alter the efficacy of the promotional
power of the travel narrative. However, suggestions of the existence of the phenomenon of celebrity author/tourist attraction used as a rhetorical strategy to evidence a lack of control on the part of the author is also important. Dickens’s *American Notes* benefits from this strategy and, in fact, all three elements of the phenomenon appear in the text.

I will focus on three encounters described in *American Notes* (by the attraction himself) that suggest Dickens’s status as celebrity author/tourist attraction and thereby confirm his employment of a rhetoric of authenticity necessary for self-promotional success. The first is his meeting with a Choctaw chief who approached Dickens on board “The Pike” steamboat traveling from Cincinnati to Louisville. Dickens’ status is suggested by his own italicized phrase within the line, “There chanced to be on board this boat, in addition to the usual dreary crowd of passengers, one Pitchlynn, a chief of the Choctaw tribe of Indians, who *sent in his card* to me, and with whom I had the pleasure of a long conversation” (165). The action on the part of the Choctaw chief in approaching Dickens through his calling card is a clear indication of Dickens’ celebrity status in this episode. “Excitement,” Gamson’s term for the spectator/fan/tourist’s experience of the aura of the celebrity is evidenced by Dickens’s retelling of an incident on a train in Ohio. Although the experiencer of Dickens’s aura may be undergoing what is better described as agitation or irritation rather than excitement, what is achieved by Dickens’s retelling of the event is that 1) this gentleman has clearly passed through the recognition phase and 2) the gentleman has entered (and is experiencing) a stimulation

---

*I will discuss the effect of media-generated narratives on the promotional value Chaplin’s narratives in Chapter 4.*
stage and one he shares with his wife (important for the ritualistic aspect of the stage).

Dickens relates that by overhearing the gentleman’s conversation through the wall of his cabin, he learned he “was unwittingly the occasion of very great uneasiness” (198).

Dickens relates the following details from the conversation:

“Boz is on board still, my dear.” After a considerable pause, he added, complainingly, “Boz keeps himself very close;” which was true enough, for I was not very well, and was lying down, with a book. I thought he had done with me after this, but I was deceived; for a long interval having elapsed, during which I imagine him to have been turning restlessly from side to side, and trying to go to sleep; he broke out again, with “I suppose that Boz will be writing a book by-and-by, and putting all our names in it!” at which imaginary consequence of being on board a boat with Boz, he groaned, and became silent. (199)

The gentleman suggests his recognition of Dickens both by naming him “Boz” and by relating his knowledge that this person (Dickens) is still on board. The gentleman’s irritation is suggested by the tone of the conversation and by the final exclamation in which he predicts his future mention in some Dickensian publication (a prediction which came true), but, interestingly, is further emphasized by Dickens’s own imagination of the scene in which the conversation is taking place—one in which the gentleman turns “restlessly from side to side.” By emphasizing or even exaggerating the excitement stage in this way, Dickens heightens the effect of this rhetorical strategy for the reader. A greater sense of authenticity is thereby achieved.
A final example suggests that recognition and excitement have occurred outside the bounds of the text, for Dickens focuses only on the “documentation” stage of the encounter. His choice in relating this incident works to compound his argument that such behavior must be vulgar, for in this case, the spectator/fan/tourist is a patient of an insane asylum. In Hartford, Connecticut, after touring the asylum in the company of the doctor in charge, “a well-dressed lady, of quiet and composed manners, came up, and proffering a slip of paper and a pen, begged that I would oblige her with an autograph. I complied, and we parted” (76). Dickens’s comment to the doctor at this juncture hints at the frequency of such occurrences: “I think I remember having had a few interviews like that, with ladies out of doors. I hope she is not mad” (76)? Taken together, these three encounters are ample evidence of Dickens’s powers as a celebrity and an attraction. I would argue that the fact that the situation of the celebrity/tourist-attraction encounter is presented in *American Notes* adds a layer of authenticity to the work that makes it a successful promotional text.

As I move this discussion into the twentieth century, then, I have to begin it with Chaplin’s two travel narratives, which I will attend to in subsequent chapters. Being a film star first, Chaplin’s promotional motives and his relationship to the mass market would have been more acceptable than if they were affiliated with the careers of high modernist writers. Gertrude Stein, the final celebrity author I will consider in this chapter, however, as a high-modernist writer, had to deal with the challenge of marketing her work, yet still maintaining an acceptable aura of difficulty and obscurity. As Kevin J. H. Dettmar and Stephen Watt suggest in their introduction to the collection *Marketing Modernisms: Self-Promotion, Canonization, Rereading*, the idea of “marketing
modernisms” seems oxymoronic; typically, “critical accounts of modernism and modernist writing frequently excavate, or are theorized across, a chasm or ‘great divide’ between modernism, however multifoliate its ambitions and productions, and the larger marketplace” (1). Yet, they continue, “advertising is arguably the modern(ist) art form par excellence” (5). Highlighting the paradox Dettmar and Watt create in these statements, Loren Glass, in his study of modernist authorial celebrity, asserts that the “model of the author as a solitary creative genius whose work goes unrecognized by the mainstream collides with the model of the author as part of a corporate publisher’s marketing strategy” (6-7)

Gertrude Stein’s *Everybody’s Autobiography* (1937), a memoir written following Stein and Toklas’s return to America in 1934-5, is also a promotional travel narrative. Although this work may be problematic because it has not been labeled as such, Gerri Reaves’s description of the organization of *Everybody’s Autobiography* sounds like a description consistent with travel memoir, but she fails to make this connection perhaps due to the mass or popular connotations of the genre: “For Stein, the paradigm of America replaces human or religious time, and serves as an achronological organizational concept that permits the overlap and superimposition of various time frames and selves. The chapter titles delineate a journey narrative” (31). Admitting any affiliations the work may have to travel memoir may force another high modernist to “cross the great divide” against her will. But *Everybody’s Autobiography* is an important travel memoir because it is a memoir of a journey made purely for purposes of publicity and as such is as much a memoir of Stein’s experience with celebrity as with the places she visits.

---

31 Stein left America in 1903 and this trip marked her first and last return to the country.
Although Stein had experimented with autobiography before in *The Making of Americans, The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas,* and *Stanzas in Meditation,* she suggests in her introduction to *Everybody’s Autobiography* that she came upon the idea for this particular book from a conversation she had with Dashiell Hammett in California—a conversation that suggests she had never written an autobiography before and was only now considering it for the first time. Stein begins the conversation by suggesting that whereas women authors were the ones writing autobiographies in the nineteenth century, “now in the twentieth century it is the men who do it. The men all write about themselves, they are always themselves as strong or weak or mysterious or passionate or drunk or controlled but always themselves” (5). Hammett responds that men in the twentieth century no longer have any confidence and so “must make themselves [...] more beautiful more intriguing more everything” (5). I would suggest that with this pronouncement by Hammett, Stein became ready to embark on a study of herself no longer protected by the narrative device of Alice B. Toklas. Perhaps suffering from the lack of confidence she experienced after writing *The Autobiography* in 1932 when she found herself creatively blocked for an extended period, Stein both sympathized with the lack of confidence possessed by her fellow male writers and wanted to follow up the success of *The Autobiography* with another strong (even if that meant accessible and popular) work. She reveals her consciousness of the modernist writer’s dilemma regarding audience, popularity, celebrity and financial success in *Everybody’s Autobiography* as well, thereby strengthening my argument for this work as a sort of promotional vehicle:
They [a dinner party of Hollywood film stars] wanted to know how I had succeeded in getting so much publicity, I said by having a small audience, I said if you have a big audience you have no publicity, this did seem to worry them and naturally it would worry them they wanted the publicity and the big audience, and really to have the biggest publicity you have to have a small one, yes all right the biggest publicity comes from the realest poetry and the realest poetry has a small audience not a big one, but it is really exciting and therefore it has the biggest publicity, all right that is it.

(283-4)

In this passage, Stein captures the essence of modernist publicity: the obscure work of the solitary “genius” has cachet because it is obscure and because the artist is inaccessible—a sort of publicity she capitalized upon during this American tour where her lectures were consistently sold out. Loren Glass argues that Stein’s self-fashioning as a genius in her autobiographies can be understood as an attempt to confirm publicity […]. Stein persistently exploited and encouraged the process whereby the obscurity of the literary genius can become the popularity of the celebrity. Indeed EA is centrally engaged with the alchemy whereby the literary resistance to exchange value can generate exchange value. (126-7)

In fact, these are also attributes most prized by the spectator/fan/tourist; the “backstageness” of the modernist writer’s work (and him or herself) is equivalent to the mystery of the “real” person behind the celebrity (any celebrity) and likewise the aura of the touristic sight. I suggest that Stein hoped to exploit this phenomenon in Everybody’s
Autobiography and in so doing, concretize her position as a genius with the American public by exhibiting some of the same existential crises as male writers of her generation with whom she identified. However, her experiments in the more democratic genre of memoir were to cost her an elite status amongst these same modernist male writers, who resented their “portrayals” in The Autobiography (Glass 134).

Up until the 1934-5 tour and the writing of Everybody’s Autobiography after it, Catherine Stimpson argues that Stein embodied a binary opposition between what she terms the “Good Stein” who the public liked and only came into contact with through The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas and the “Bad Stein” who the public hated because of the obscurity of her writing (152). But who is this “Good Stein” and is she the same in Everybody’s Autobiography as she was in The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas which first made her work successful and made her a celebrity in America? Neil Schmitz describes the voice of Everybody’s Autobiography as “troubled and uncertain” when compared to “the magisterial ‘I’” of The Autobiography (86). Stein’s own admission that “You are you because your little dog knows you” (44) would seem to illustrate a point at which some stability lies; on the other hand, “her audience’s responses dictated Stein’s level of confidence or anxiety” (Reaves 24). The unconfident persona of Everybody’s Autobiography falls in line with the unconfident personas of other male writers, as Hammett had suggested. Thinking of the book as a travel memoir for a moment, her strategy becomes one element of the rhetoric of authenticity necessary for the success of such works as outlined by Richard Dyer. Lack of premeditation, a sense of privacy or the private behind the public, and a lack of control must be evident in this work, as it was in Dickens’s American Notes.
Stein affects a lack of premeditation in *Everybody’s Autobiography* by rejecting the organizational apparatus of chronological or religious time. Just in her introduction, for example, Stein moves back and forth, in and around time. She begins with “just today I met Miss Hennessy” and then moves in a stream-of-consciousness fashion to David Edstrom and Dashiell Hammett who she met years earlier in Pasadena, California, finally returning to the immediate present. This small section of the book foreshadows the organization of the remainder. Although, as mentioned earlier, the chapter titles suggest that the narrative will follow along with Stein and Toklas’s journey to America in 1934-5, it is never either so linear or so predictable. Stein’s characteristic writing style also adds to the unpremeditatedness of the work; she admits that “I do not correct, I sometimes cut out a little not very often and not very much but correcting after all what is in your head comes down into your hand and if it has come down it can never come again no not again” (311).

Privacy, the second element of Dyer’s rhetoric of authenticity, is explicitly discussed in the book. Part of Stein’s existential crisis and instability is hashed out over the course of the book (and journey) in an intermittent discussion of the tension between the public and private self. Her visit to Radcliffe, her alma mater, engenders one such discussion:

> When I write I write and when I talk I talk and the two are not one, no not for any one and when they come near being one, then the inside is not inside and the outside is not outside and I like the inside to be inside and the outside to be outside, it makes it more necessary to be one. (264)
She is aware of the dichotomy between the public Stein and the private Stein—aware also that the media plays a role in constructing her public persona. *Everybody’s Autobiography* is both her acceptance of this fact and her attempt to counteract it:

In the old days when they wrote novels they made up the personality of the things they had seen in people and the things that were the people as if they were a dream. But now well now how can you dream about a personality when it is always being created for you by a publicity, how can you believe what you make up when publicity makes them up to be so much realer than you can dream. And so autobiography is written which is in a way a way to say that publicity is right, they are as the public sees them. Well yes. (69)

In this passage, Stein admits that the publicity can be “much realer than you can dream” and that the autobiography, although seemingly a vehicle for revealing the authentic behind the publicized, instead ends up only reinforcing that publicized persona. The autobiography in this sense is only part of the publicity game, not a counteraction to it. However, Stein’s courage in admitting this within the text would seem to be a sort of genuine revelation and as such participates in the rhetoric of authenticity she is effectively using here.

Finally, evidence of a lack of control is much more prevalent in *Everybody’s Autobiography* than it was in *American Notes*. Stein exacerbates a sense of lack of control, not only through the anxiety she expresses in the text in a confessional way, but through her detailed accounting of her reception in America. As celebrity author/tourist attraction, she witnesses her own celebritization in the States and expresses her
discomfort with it. As Reaves relates, “her name in lights in Times Square and her screen image in a newsreel are tangible reminders that she does not completely own herself” (26). Stein narrates that “we saw a sign moving around a building and it said Gertrude Stein has come and that was upsetting” (175). Her recognition of this fabricated marker pointing to Gertrude Stein as attraction she relates to moments when she is recognized on the street:

Anybody saying how do you do to you and knowing your name may be upsetting but on the whole it is natural enough but to suddenly see your name is always upsetting. Of course it has happened to me pretty often and I like it to happen just as often but always it does give me a little shock of recognition and non-recognition. (175)

With this passage, Stein gives evidence of herself as the object of Gamson’s celebrity-encounter game and MacCannell’s tourist-attraction encounter, a phenomenon which lends an additional layer of authenticity to the narrative. Recognition of the celebrity/star has been accomplished. Excitement at encountering the celebrity/sight, experienced in the company of others, is related in one instance in Stein’s account of a party at Bennett Cerf’s house where a young party guest “began to kneel on the floor and kiss the hem of one’s gown” (186). This particular spectator/fan/tourist effectively transforms the ritualistic aspect of the excitement stage into an actual performance. Finally, Stein offers many accounts of providing documentation to these same spectators/fans/tourists. Trophies include photographs and autographs which she provides in abundance: “Everybody speaking to you everybody knowing you, everybody in a hotel or restaurant noticing you everybody asking you to write your name for them” (178). Stein’s
encounters with photographers add an interesting dimension to this phenomenon. Not strictly seeking documentation themselves, the photographers, as part of the media, act as a sort of second-person mode of documentation. The futility of the photographer’s quest to reveal the private person behind the public persona is exemplified in Stein’s account of an experience with one young photographer who was to shoot four or five photographs of her “doing anything” (218). After much discussion and Stein’s rejection of several suggestions about what to do, she relates “well he said what can you do, well I said I can put my hat on and take my hat off and I can put my coat on and I can take it off and I like water I can drink a glass of water all right he said do that so I did that” (219). This account not only gives evidence of completion of the celebrity-encounter game in this text, but also highlights the game itself as an illusion. Promising to guarantee authenticity, the celebrity-encounter game/tourist-attraction encounter as it occurs in Stein’s experience with the photographer is instead shown to be only another contrivance.

In this chapter I have traced a tradition of the travel narrative promotional vehicle. While Byron’s *Childe Harold* is not explicitly a promotional vehicle in just the way Dickens’s *American Notes* or Stein’s *Everybody’s Autobiography* are, his position as the innovator of the poetic travelogue and as writer *cum* tourist attraction establishes his status as the forefather of this tradition. Charles Dickens, the innovator of publishing strategies such as serialization and the inclusion of advertisements in books, has been shown here to take the tradition from Byron and mold it to his own uses, creating a vehicle for the wandering Boz that allows the persona to form anew along with his experiencing of a new landscape and people. In *Everybody’s Autobiography*, Gertrude Stein shows how inextricable the writer and his/her celebrity has become and how
dependent he/she has become upon it. In this travel memoir of her lecture tour of America in the mid-1930s, “Stein tries to account for and intervene in the gradual process […] whereby literary modernism, which had been developed in conscious resistance to commodification and the literary marketplace, itself became a commodity in that marketplace” (Glass 117). Still, even in comparison to these unequivocal masters of their craft, Charlie Chaplin takes the travel narrative-as-promotional-vehicle strategy to new heights, first through the approval and release of the ghostwritten *MTA* and later in his own serialized travel narrative, “CSTW.” Perhaps the visual nature of film and its consequential requirement of visual acuity in the film artist lend themselves to a special expertise on the part of that artist in regards to promotion. As I will show in the following chapters, the intertextual construction of Chaplin’s Little Tramp persona seems especially tailored to exploitation in a travel narrative, just as long as Chaplin is able to affect a conflation between that film persona and his own public one.
Chapter 2

Persona I: The Verbal Construction of the Little Tramp Persona

He understands that the language of the film is not that of words, but of gesture. [. . .] Chaplin realized that another medium required another technique. He has created an independent philosophy of gesture which supercedes speech. His body is talking all the time in an idiom of his own, swift, sensitive, eloquent, and as intelligible to the Egyptian fellaheen as to the eyes of Mayfair.

---A.C. Gardiner, *Portraits and Portents*

As suggested in my introduction, Charlie Chaplin, beginning with his film *Kid Auto Races at Venice* (1914), perfected on film a rhetoric of the body through pantomime that has afforded him a lasting fame and iconicity. As the filmgoer came to know the Little Tramp figure in this and in succeeding films, the persona became firmly embedded in American consciousness, possibly as early as 1915. However, as I have also outlined in the introduction, by 1921 when Chaplin returned to England for the first time since his great filmic success, he was experiencing some of the worst press of his career. His divorce from first-wife Mildred Harris and his failure to serve in World War I were just two of the causes. In addition, he had just completed his first full-length feature film, *The Kid*, in which he combined comedy with pathos in a bold new way. At the time of his second European tour, in 1931-2, Chaplin had come through an ugly divorce to second wife Lita Grey and was about to release another silent film a full five years after the talkies had come to Hollywood. Therefore, in both cases the time was ripe for some reputation rehabilitation and in both cases, a travel narrative was successfully enlisted to

---

32 Charles Maland in *Chaplin and American Culture* argues that “thanks to the national bout with ‘Chaplinitis,’ a Chaplin star image, combining the persona created in the films with the man who created it, was firmly anchored in the United States by the end of 1915” (14). While Maland hints in this passage at the sort of convergence between public and filmic persona, he goes on to reinforce the differences, with the man “humble and unassuming, yet imbued with greatness” and the persona as “crude and mischievous” (14).
assist this rehabilitation. In addition, after the demise of silent comedian Roscoe “Fatty” Arbuckle in a rape/murder scandal in San Francisco while Chaplin was making the first of these tours, Hollywood’s reputation needed as much or more refurbishment. As reviewer Fritz Tidden from *Moving Picture World* of March 25, 1922 states, “exhibitors should do all in their power to promote Chaplin’s book [MTA]. Everything of this kind helps the industry” (n.pag.).

The media’s persistent attempts to portray the “real” Chaplin in an unflattering light demanded that he construct himself verbally in a way that would suggest a continuity between Chaplin and the Little Tramp persona that would reinforce or even duplicate the physical rhetoric he had mastered on film and, therefore, eclipse his tarnished reputation. Chaplin’s two travel books, *MTA* and “CSTW,” the foci of this study, effectively demonstrate a skillful verbal conflation of these two personae. In this chapter, then, I will juxtapose evidence of Chaplin’s visual rhetoric as manifested in the Little Tramp persona with excerpts from the travel books to show how Charlie Chaplin (or his publicity machine) was able to compose the Little Tramp in words in an attempt to mitigate his often-problematic public persona.

Thomas Burke creates a useful analogy which seems to illustrate a strict division between Chaplin the man and the Little Tramp persona of silent film--lines written just after he met with Chaplin for the second time, during Chaplin’s second world tour in 1931-2: “*Charlie* indeed is no more Charles, and no more fuses with him, than the figure of Punch fuses with the man who manipulates the stick that gives it the semblance of life, or than Dickens the writer fused with Dickens the man” (144-5). What is interesting about this analogy is that he contradicts it several pages later in his discussion of the
Little Tramp persona itself. “That is why Charlie—and Charles himself—,” Burke writes, “arouses in almost all women the protective, mothering instinct. Because Charlie is Charles himself at fourteen, and his stuff is the stuff of the London streets and the old music-halls lifted, by personality and genius, into bizarre poetry” (163). This contradiction, then, offers a question which is foundational to my analysis: Did Chaplin’s audience believe that he himself was the Little Tramp persona and of how much importance was this interchangeability for the continued success and longevity of both the film persona and the actor?

It may seem unreasonable to believe that the public could be so naïve or so easily duped. But, in fact, the evidence for this sort of confusion between Chaplin’s public persona and his film persona is relatively easy to find. Wyndham Lewis, for example, writes that “Chaplin” as he calls the Little Tramp persona, thereby never making a distinction between the two, “was always the little-fellow-put-upon—the naïf, child-like individual, bullied by the massive brutes by whom he was surrounded, yet whom he invariably vanquished” (66). Another example of this phenomenon is from a chapter in the 1926 *Portraits and Portents* by A. G. Gardiner in which it quickly becomes clear that he also fails to make a distinction between the two entities. Writing about Chaplin’s public persona, Gardiner introduces a passage he will quote from Chaplin’s 1922 travel narrative *MTA*: “In the articles which he wrote describing his triumphal visit to London in 1921, it is not the public enthusiasm and the meetings with the celebrities that occupy him so much as his wanderings in the haunts of his boyhood in Kennington, and the human documents that he discovers” (227). Then, in a passage immediately following his lengthy quotation from *MTA* itself, it becomes obvious that Gardiner can no longer be
writing just about Chaplin the man—the supposed author of MTA whom he just mentioned; it is obviously the Little Tramp persona that has become the subject of this passage:

He comes into the great, big, bullying world like a visitor out of fairy land, a small, shuffling figure, grotesque yet wistful, a man yet a child, a simpleton who outwits the cunning, moving through an atmosphere of the wildest farce, yet touching everything with just that suggestion of emotion and seriousness that keeps the balance true. He is in the world but not of it, and the sense of his aloofness and loneliness is emphasized by the queer automatic actions that suggest a spritelike intelligence informing a mechanical doll. (228-9)

I have quoted this passage at length because Gardiner uses the text of MTA to illustrate his confusion regarding Chaplin’s public and filmic persona—intentionally or not. This seems to point to the particular success of MTA in promoting the connection between public and filmic personae so important to the narrative’s success as a promotional vehicle.

Another example important to ascertaining the continuing strength and frequency of the phenomenon of confusing the personae during the time just prior to the publication of “CSTW” is an article by P. W. Wilson in The New York Times dated January 10, 1932 (Chaplin was still abroad on his second tour) and entitled “Ten Men Who Stand as Symbols.” Chaplin, whose photo for the article is of him waving to the crowds at a London train station (not dressed as the Little Tramp at all), is still confused with his filmic persona in the article when Wilson writes that the Little Tramp was “the highbrow
who happens to be a hobo, the duke who was only born a dustman, the utterly genteel
who is utterly shabby” (SM12). This passage suggests to Charles Maland that “the
author seemed to blend Chaplin and Charlie: Chaplin himself was something of a
dustman turned duke in his private life, and the description also relates to oppositions in
Charlie’s [The Little Tramp’s] character” (132).

Finally, St. John Ervine writing in *Vanity Fair* in 1921, also fails to discern a
difference between public and filmic personae here, but his description as cited below
begins to attend to the sort of visual rhetoric A. C. Gardiner alludes to in the opening
epigraph:

Mr. Chaplin is the small boy realizing his ambitions. He has fierce fights
with big men, and always wins them. When he meets a policeman,
instantly he reveals the small boy’s heart. Observe the sudden look of
dismay that comes over Mr. Chaplin’s face as he turns quickly and finds a
policeman at his elbow. It is not the dismay of a criminal, but the dismay
of the child in contact with authority. There is a little twitch of
nervousness, followed by a disarming smile and a futile effort to appear
unconcerned and detached. You can almost hear the small boy’s heart
thumping as he tries to pretend that he had nothing whatever to do with the
unfortunate affair now engaging the policeman’s attention. And then
comes the triumph when authority is humbled and defeated. The
policeman dives towards the terrified small boy—and misses him, for Mr.
Chaplin, fulfilling the small boy’s secret desire to be a proficient acrobat
and to flout authority, leaps through the policeman’s distent legs and
gallops up the street with the humiliated bobby vainly following. (84)

Ervine has done a very good job here of capturing the pantomime—the visual rhetorical
strategies, for that is what pantomime really is—in words. Ervine attends to the nuances
of gesture and expression that make up the language of the silent screen that Gardiner
argues is Chaplin’s gift. In Ervine’s discussion, the Little Tramp’s trait of challenging
authority follows a procedure. The Little Tramp’s challenge or resistance to authority
begins with 1) dismay, then moves to 2) a twitch of nervousness, to 3) the flash of a
disarming smile, to 4) an effort to appear unconcerned and detached. Finally, when the
authority figure reacts, the Little Tramp’s next move is to 5) leap between the man’s legs
with agility and 6) gallop to freedom.

Ervine’s description above illustrates one method of translating into written words the
sort of visual rhetorical strategies the Little Tramp persona utilizes on film. Ervine’s
careful and very detailed description fits into a more general schema of visual rhetorical
strategies of the Little Tramp Francis W. Dauer offers in his essay “The Nature of
Fictional Characters and the Referential Fallacy.” He uses the Little Tramp as his model
for the larger argument suggested by the title. As he explains, “At the broadest level, the
humor of Chaplin’s films is principally achieved through dazzling sequences of
incongruities” (33)—one rhetorical strategy for which there are counterparts in Chaplin’s
travel narratives. The problem, he argues, with this sort of comedy is maintaining the
continuous humor. Chaplin does it, he suggests, by relying “on a series of reversible metamorphoses” (34)—a second visual rhetorical strategy.33

Dauer’s theory, however, only speaks to a small portion of the intricate web of visual rhetorical strategies Chaplin utilizes in his films. In order to better analyze the correlation between these visual strategies and the verbal ones contained in the travel narratives, I have devised a theory that incorporates Dauer’s two strategies into a larger scheme. I have organized this theory into three categories of anomaly (a deviation from the usual or accepted) that I am labeling 1) behavioral anomaly, 2) relational anomaly, and 3) situational anomaly. Each of these categories then contains two or more strategies Chaplin commonly used in his silent films.34 The first category, behavioral anomaly, which I define as a deviation from usual actions or reactions of an individual to external or internal stimuli, contains two strategies: a) exaggerated emotion revelation, and b) reversible metamorphosis (one of Dauer’s two strategies). Exaggerated emotion revelation is the visible evidence exhibited by expressions, gestures and body movements of the Little Tramp and his fellow characters that betray emotion above the level accepted as a norm for someone of the indicated class, gender and age. Reversible metamorphosis, the other subcategory, is the seamless movement of the Little Tramp back and forth between roles. While this metamorphosis takes many forms in the films, the Little Tramp

33 Dauer’s formula for this strategy is as follows: “Given a person of type X and the incongruous action or situation F, with the continuation of actions or situations like F, the X-type person and the incongruity tend to vanish. Thus in the absence of a significant time lapse, to create further humorous incongruities a new persona X* has to emerge, thus allowing X* to be incongruously juxtaposed with a new feature F*. But this in turn creates the problem of how the identity of X and X* is to be attained so that the integrity of character can be maintained” (34).

34 Chaplin made 76 silent films, the last one being Modern Times in 1936.
usually moves out of his role as a homeless transient into that of a high society dandy or *bon vivant*.

In the second category, relational anomaly, I have included two strategies: a) extreme protagonist/antagonist opposition and b) blatant protagonist/authority figure conflict. Relational anomalies are deviations from logical or natural associations between two or more people. While the two subcategories, extreme protagonist/antagonist opposition and blatant protagonist/authority figure conflict, may have some overlap and may seem to depend on similar relationships between characters, I have chosen to make a distinction between the first which can be accomplished visually solely through size, shape or costuming of individual characters and the second which introduces an element of behavioral opposition in addition to any physical opposition which is apparent. This second category, blatant protagonist/authority figure conflict, highlights the Little Tramp’s non-conformist, anti-authoritarian attributes. It is not just anomalous, therefore, that the Little Tramp is extremely small and petit in relation to his large and portly antagonist, but it is perhaps more anomalous that despite this size difference, he does not hesitate to confront his opponent with an audacity unequal to his physical dimensions.

Finally, in the third category, situational anomaly, I have included two strategies: a) incongruous juxtaposition (from Dauer’s theory) and b) geographic disorientation. Situational anomalies are deviations from the usual ways in which the Little Tramp is positioned in his surroundings. The first subcategory, incongruous juxtaposition, is the placing of two things—people, objects, places, events—in an unlikely position next to each other. Place the Little Tramp, for instance, next to a seated statue and he’ll employ it as a comfy recliner or hand him a feather duster and he’ll make a bird out of it, placing
it gingerly, then, back home into its birdcage. The second subcategory, geographic disorientation, labels those elements of the film narrative that show the Little Tramp as an outsider or stranger in each of his films. He enters each film knowing no one and having no familiarity with his current location—a situation that was not only unacceptable in society, but one that might engender great empathy and compassion from the audience. Using this theory of anomalies, then, I will show how Chaplin employs them in the travel narratives in order to conflate his public and filmic personae.

In terms of behavioral anomaly, exaggerated emotion revelation again refers to the Little Tramp’s predilection for making his emotions visible to the audience through a skillful combination of gesture and expression. These emotions run the gamut from ecstasy to deep melancholy. It’s important to note here that this predilection was standard for the Little Tramp persona before the risky 1921 feature film *The Kid* in which Chaplin emphasized the close relationship between pathos and comedy for the first time. In the short film *The Vagabond* (1916), for example, The Little Tramp becomes visibly distraught when the young girl he has rescued from the gypsies begins to show a preference for a fair-haired stranger over himself. In the final scene in which the girl leaves with this new suitor and her mother, the Little Tramp tugs on his forelock and stamps around, trying to shrug off this bit of bad luck much as he has successfully done in other films. However, this time he is unable to recover with his usual resilience and betrays the fact quite clearly through facial expression. Similarly, the “abduction” scene in *The Kid* in which the orphan Jackie is taken away from his adopted father, the Little Tramp, by the orphan asylum officials shows both the boy and the Little Tramp weeping unashamedly throughout the scene (see Figure 1). It’s not so much the fact that these...
tragic incidents result in a melancholy Little Tramp as the fact that every emotion is clearly portrayed by this persona, as evidenced in this photo by the Little Tramp’s glazed eyes filled with tears, the creased brow and overall look of sorrow in response to the crying boy he embraces. This exhibition of emotions is a trait that runs counter to the traditional behavioral norm for a male character or persona. In addition, this strategy gives the persona a childlike quality; it seems to us that this behavior would be acceptable in a child, but not in a grown man.

Figure 1.35 Chaplin and Jackie Coogan in *The Kid*

As expected, this strategy shows up frequently in *MTA*. The first instance of its utilization occurs at Max Eastman’s house in New York, before Chaplin has even left the country. Eastman has invited a man called only “George” to the affair, a prisoner on

35 Photos used as figures in this dissertation are from my own collection unless noted otherwise.
some sort of furlough from prison. Chaplin’s brief interlude with the man that night is too emotionally overpowering for both of them it seems:

We talk of George’s future. Not of his past nor of his offense. Can’t he escape? I try to make him think logically toward regaining his freedom. I want to pledge my help. He doesn’t understand, or pretends not to. He has not lost anything. Bars cannot imprison his spirit.

I beg him to give himself and his life a better chance.

He smiles.

“Don’t bother about me, Charlie. You have your work. Go on making the world laugh. Yours is a great task and a splendid one. Don’t bother about me.”

We are silent. I am choked up. I feel a sort of pent-up helplessness. I want relief. It comes.

The tears roll down my cheeks and George embraces me.

There are tears in both our eyes. (17)

Such explicitly emotional scenes are so prevalent in this narrative that even the reviewers of the time took notice. A reviewer from the Cleveland Press writes on March 10, 1922 that “few novels published recently contain as much real emotion and such thoughtful, sensitive observation as Charles Chaplin’s account of his trip to Europe” (“Charlie Chaplin’s My Trip Abroad” n.pag.). And again, in Tracy Hammond Lewis’s “Charlie Chaplin Introspects” published in the New York Telegraph on February 24, 1922: “There are few books which have been published lately that afford a more intimate acquaintanceship with their author than ‘My Trip Abroad’ (Harper & Bros.), by Charlie
Chaplin. Every thought and emotion experienced by him on his tour of Europe for a ‘vacation’ is set forth with the utmost faithfulness [. . .]” (n.pag.)

Chaplin utilizes the strategy of displaying unabashed emotion in his own writing in “CSTW,” thereby creating again an important link back to the Little Tramp persona for his public self. Arriving back in his hometown of London after more than 10 years, Chaplin sneaks out of the Carlton Hotel and takes a taxi back to his old neighborhood:

The morning is bright and promising. As I pass each familiar spot I get a thrill. Dear old London. It is still the same. Here it is eight o’clock in the morning and I find myself all emotional weeping on street corners. (I: 10)

Later, in Kennington Park, Chaplin relates a memory, also deeply emotional:

As I stand in Kennington Park a woman is sitting on a bench and a little child runs lambent about the grass before her.

I see myself playing like that little child. I was about five at the time. A woman is sitting on that very same bench. My mother.

I remember there was something hopeless about that day. I never understood the situation. I had been playing in the Children’s Gymnasium and decided to return and surprise her. As I approached quietly from behind, I became aware that she was softly weeping. I was so shocked that I ran to her side and wept also. It was hours before she could pacify me. (I: 10)

This final version of this passage becomes more interesting when the first draft is examined. The first draft of this passage, handwritten, is also deeply emotional, but fails to evoke the same image:
As I stand in Kennington Park a woman is sitting on a bench. A child is playing lambent on the grass before her. I see myself and my mother sitting in that same park I could not have been more than five at the time but I remember there was something hopeless about that day. I never quite understood the situation. I had been playing in the children’s park gymnasium having tired of the swing I decided to surprise my mother who was seated on one of the park benches. As I approached quietly behind her I discovered she was weeping. This so shocked me that I crept away and cried myself. (Chaplin “CSTW” ms.)

Chaplin’s final line here in which he “crept away and cried myself” works to break the spell of this pathetic moment in the narrative. David Robinson, Chaplin’s biographer, often emphasizes the fact that Chaplin would not include action in his films that was in anyway illogical (Chaplin: His Life 197). “Crept away and cried myself” would suggest a certain unattractive or anti-social quality in Chaplin as a child that would be counter to the image of the Little Tramp on film. On the other hand, “It was hours before she could pacify me” creates an image of an important bond between mother and child that is consistent with the Little Tramp, especially as we see him in the The Kid. We see here a bond through pain and suffering as well as through kinship.

Another strategy within behavior anomaly, reversible metamorphoses (from Dauer) describes the Little Tramp’s uncanny ability to move back and forth easily between two very divergent roles—escaped convict and parson in The Pilgrim for instance. Living as Chaplin did in real life on the border between his childhood in poverty and his adulthood in great wealth, it is also easy to see Chaplin metamorphosing back and forth between the
two social stations throughout the narratives. Thomas Burke provides his perception of Chaplin’s real-life situation that might have engendered such a strategy:

It is not easy to visualize this eager Cockney, of workaday tastes, as a rich man surrounded by Japanese cooks, Japanese valets, Japanese house-men, chauffeurs, secretaries and managers; or to remember that he is the employer of a small host. He has none of the assurance of the rich man and none of the arrogance of the young director of a prosperous and expanding business. (141)

In his study *Silent Clowns*, Walter Kerr makes much of the Little Tramp’s metamorphoses in the chapter “Chaplin: An Outline Becomes a Character.” He relates the intricacies of the strategy and Chaplin’s particular mastery of it on film in his discussion of the Little Tramp in the 1915 film *The Police*. The Little Tramp, having just been released from jail, breaks into a young woman’s house and is eventually confronted by the police who have taken so much time in responding to Edna’s (the young woman’s) distress call, that the Little Tramp and she have had time to begin a sort of relationship and she decides to introduce him to them as her husband. As Kerr relates, it is at this point that a virtual miracle takes place. With no transition at all, Charlie becomes Edna’s husband. Affable, outgoing, utterly at home, digging his hands into his pockets and flexing his knees as though he were “master of his own domain and ready to get out the humidor, he is all bourgeois bonhomie, the host par excellence, eager to show his guests about and have them back soon again” (84). Chaplin, the director, Kerr argues, “made no effort whatever to do what other filmmakers were doing and what was easily possible: to bring the two figures together in a single frame through double exposure. He merely cuts
back and forth between them. The only thing that interests him, obviously, is the opportunity to be two entirely different men at the same time” (85).

The Little Tramp persona uses this strategy by moving back and forth between roles, ostensibly for purposes of comedy. Figures 2, 3, and 4 display some of the physical manifestations of these metamorphoses on film—the Little Tramp as jailbird in Figure 2, the Little Tramp as parson in Figure 3 and the Little Tramp as man of wealth in Figure 4. Figure 5 presents the Little Tramp in his usual and well-known costume that illustrates that the metamorphoses he undergoes on film are made explicit by his costuming and also his comportment in each new role. In fact, Ervine’s careful description above of the Little Tramp’s visual rhetoric can be classified as an example of this metamorphosis. In it, the Little Tramp is described as morphing first into a child and later into an acrobat in order to outsmart and escape the authority figure of the policeman. However, in the written text of the travel narratives, Chaplin must achieve a similar sense of metamorphosis only through his audience’s ability to infer.
Figure 2. Chaplin in *The Pilgrim*

Figure 3. Chaplin in *The Pilgrim*
Figure 4. Chaplin in *One A.M.*

Figure 5. Chaplin in Costume as the Little Tramp
Chaplin’s visit to the Garrick Club in London, which the ghost-writer relates in the text of *MTA*, a venue in which he meets up with what he terms “the immortals,” J. M. Barrie, Gerald DuMaurier and other literati, demonstrates an instance that is made more Little-Tramp-like through a use of what Dauer calls reversible metamorphoses employed here as a rhetorical strategy. He is portrayed as vacillating throughout the evening between feelings of acceptance and utter rejection, moving back and forth between “the indigent Cockney lad” and “world-famous wealthy film star.” At one point, listening to the storytelling of one “ruddy gentleman,” Chaplin reports that

> Everyone is laughing at his chatter, but nothing seems to be penetrating my stupidity, though I am carrying with me a wide mechanical grin, which I broaden and narrow with the nuances of the table laughing. I feel utterly out of the picture, that I don’t belong, that there must be something significant in the badinage that is bandied about the board. (87)

The ghost-writer for this text is successful in that the reader understands Chaplin’s movement back and forth between roles, even to the point of “trying on” words, such as “nuances” and “badinage” which would have been unfamiliar to a man with only two years of public school education.

His experiences with H. G. Wells are plagued with the same sense of insecurity brought about by the need for constant metamorphosis. Even in an informal autograph-signing session, he is portrayed as analyzing the simple difference between his sweeping signature and Wells’ “small, hardly discernible style” as not just a difference in writing style but as a symbol of the large gap between them: “I feel as though I had started to
sing aloud before a group of grand-opera stars” (98). Still, he finds himself posing for Wells, having dressed especially for the occasion:

I try to explain my dress. Tell him that it is my other self, a reaction from the everyday Chaplin. I have always desired to look natty and I have spurts of primness. Everything about me and my work is so sensational that I must get reaction. My dress is part of it. (101)

Likewise in “CSTW,” while in London, Chaplin describes metamorphosing between several roles as he walks about the city in what seems to be his own sort of sightseeing strategy:

I have the soul of a tourist, for I love to visit the spots where the deed took place. I try to get an empathy, a feeling into things. I imagine myself as Charles the First coming through that window to be beheaded—where he might have looked. Then as a spectator, placing myself in a position where the citizens must have stood that day. (I: 80)

In this passage, Chaplin is first a tourist, then Charles the First, and finally a spectator at the beheading. While certainly these two passages demonstrate Chaplin’s effective use in “CSTW” of the metamorphosis strategy as suggested by Dauer, they also demonstrate a sort of embellishment of this strategy in that Chaplin no longer limits himself to representations of physical manifestations of these strategies, for these examples give evidence that they have entered the realm of the cerebral as well.

In the category of relational anomaly, I have broken down extreme protagonist/antagonist opposition into the variations of social, that accomplished through

36 Chaplin and the Little Tramp as tourist/traveler will be discussed more fully in Chapter 3.
costuming and actor deportment, and physical, that accomplished through extreme divergence in size or body type. The Little Tramp persona has often been described by scholars as indicating “brave but ineffectual pretensions to the dignity of the petit bourgeoisie” (Robinson Chaplin: His Life 115). He sports the accoutrements of wealth, but they are mismatched, old and worn. Still he tries hard to present a semblance of gentility—brushing the dirt off his trousers with a whiskbroom in The Tramp (1915) or doffing his ragged derby to everything from a society dowager to a hen that has just provided him a much-needed egg. Despite the energy he spends in this charade, however, the Little Tramp is down and out and so, one of the visual strategies Chaplin uses to amplify this fact and the persona’s particular struggles in this skin is to create an obvious visual opposition between the protagonist (the Little Tramp) and his antagonist (s) in terms of social class. In The Idle Class (1921), the most obvious antagonist to the Little Tramp is Edna’s father, played by Mack Swain, who is clearly one of the idle rich. We see him on the golf course in appropriate golf wear and then at a fancy dress ball all dressed up as a Scottish lord. Although Chaplin plays two different roles in the film, his characterization of the Little Tramp continues in the well-known mismatched costume—one clearly at odds with the antagonist and others of the wealthy class with whom he interacts. This strategy often works as a catalyst for one of the behavior anomalies recently discussed: reversible metamorphosis. Often it is directly due to the fact that there is such a divergence between the social status of the Little Tramp and his antagonist that he is moved to metamorphose into another role.

Chaplin also creates a clear divergence between the Little Tramp and his particular protagonist in terms of size. In the Essanay and Mutual film periods (1915 and 1916-17
respectively) Chaplin worked with a fairly stable stock company of actors. Because he was short (5’ 6½”) and slight of build, he always made sure to engage a tall and stocky foil to play against. In the 1916 Mutual film *Easy Street*, for instance, the Little Tramp, being especially destitute, decides to take a job as a policeman. Little does he know when he accepts the position that his particular beat is ruled by a menacing giant (Eric Campbell). In this instance, the Little Tramp and the giant are members of the same social class, so Chaplin chooses to create a stark divergence between them through a clear size difference (see Figure 6). Campbell is about 6’4” and weighs some 300 pounds. This easily discernible difference in size impacts the initial irony of the Little Tramp, a persona also known for his anti-authoritarian behavior, having taken a job that requires him to enforce the law and make order out of chaos.

![Figure 6. Chaplin in *Easy Street*](image)

This was usually Bud Jamison in the Essanay period and Eric Campbell in the Mutual.
Both of these strategies of extreme protagonist/antagonist opposition work visually to reinforce important characteristics of the Little Tramp persona that quickly came to be recognized: 1) his small, childlike stature and 2) his low class. While Chaplin utilized these strategies separately on many occasions, his use of an extremely large-sized man or woman of high class (thereby using both strategies together) worked to make both protagonist (the Little Tramp) and antagonist nearly allegorical figures. The more Chaplin’s films came to be aligned with the Italian commedia dell’arte in the minds of his public, the more important this tendency towards allegory would become. Therefore, to be an effective promotional vehicle for the Little Tramp, MTA would need to exhibit some verbal rhetorical strategy which could be correlated to the one just discussed. In fact, Chaplin’s ghostwriter for MTA recognized the importance of using this strategy in the narrative, but only through social divergence, not physical.

As I have already discussed, Chaplin’s rise from a childhood in poverty to extreme wealth as an adult greatly influenced his film work. Monta Bell, as the ghostwriter of MTA, has done an excellent job of exploiting Chaplin’s tentativeness in regards to social status, or at least the audience’s expectation of such a tentativeness. One such instance occurs on board the S. S. Olympic when Chaplin goes to tea:

The tea room suggests and invites social intercourse. Somehow there are barriers and conventionalities that one cannot break, for all the vaunted “freedom of shipboard.” I feel it’s a sort of awkward situation. How is it possible to meet people on the same footing? I hear of it, I read of it, but somehow I cannot meet people myself and stay myself.
I immediately shift any blame from myself and decide that the first-class passengers are all snobs. I resolve to try the second-class or the third-class. Somehow I can’t meet these people. I get irritable and decide deliberately to seek the other classes of passengers and the boat crew. (26)

This clear distinction Bell creates between his narrator Chaplin and the upper class passengers seems to reinforce a similar opposition Chaplin often creates between the Little Tramp persona and his particular antagonist in the films. The scenes with J. M. Barrie and H. G. Wells recounted above are two other instances in MTA of Bell’s employment of this strategy and, as I suggest above, each of those leads to Chaplin’s supposed attempt to metamorphose back and forth between cockney lad and man of great wealth.

Chaplin, through his own writing in “CSTW,” however, effectively reconnects with an old strategy, that of highlighting his small physical size in comparison to a much larger antagonist. While in Paris, Chaplin was summoned to an audience with the King of Belgium who was in town for a visit. After a long wait to be admitted, Chaplin relates that

His Majesty pointed to a chair and commanded me to be seated, at the same time drawing one up for himself. The King is an extremely tall man with a benevolent face and quiet manner. His imposing height accentuates his royal dignity.

Unfortunately my seat was extremely low and the King, drawing his chair—a high one—in close proximity to mine, added greatly to the
contrast of our heights. My nose was somewhere up to His Majesty’s knee when we were finally seated. (II: 108).

Chaplin, in this passage, utilizes the strategy of obvious size divergence and in that the “antagonist” is a king, has used it in conjunction with his strategy of clear social class opposition as well. While his conversation with the king is similar to that of the naïve narrator of MTA (“With my voice becoming weaker and my confidence gradually ebbing away, I continued [. . .]”; “I saw His Majesty looking strangely at me. I smiled somewhat sickly” (II: 108).), clearly Chaplin in “CSTW” has elected to utilize this distinct opposition in a different way. The unconfident narrator of MTA plays a lesser role and in his place is a man who, ten years later, has become more comfortable with his wealth. In this narrative, instead of approaching his social antagonists with a wavering confidence, Chaplin uses a slightly different strategy, one I have labeled blatant protagonist/authority figure conflict—one also frequently employed in the films. Starting with Chaplin’s earliest appearances on film, the Little Tramp exhibits a sort of reckless pluck or assiduity that seems incomprehensible for a person of his size and status. The Little Tramp is certainly the underdog in his films, but despite this fact, he always bests his adversaries to the benefit of himself and those to which he is allied, however briefly. Figure 7, from the 1915 Essanay film Shanghaied, illustrates this characteristic of brash courage that is one for which the persona is most known and admired. Because of this fact, MTA falls short of its mark in not utilizing it. “CSTW,” on the other hand makes it an underlying theme. For Chaplin in “CSTW” it is no longer important to highlight the great divergence in social status of himself versus the company he keeps on the tour (all from the higher levels of society). Important here is strict divergence in political and
social philosophy, one that characterizes him as confrontational in nearly every setting. Episodes of the narrative show him confronting figures as wide-ranging as millionaire Frank J. Gould, Lloyd George, Albert Einstein, Winston Churchill, Lady Astor, and even the British Royals. Even Ghandi became an adversary of sorts. A meeting between Chaplin and Ghandi, staged by Ghandi’s pressmen, occurred in October 1931 in London. The two had never met before and Ghandi had never even seen a Chaplin film. Chaplin begins his narration of the event with a typical moment of reflexivity: “How on earth do you get into these situations? I thought. Here you are, a harmless actor on a vacation, striving to have a good time, and you get into this predicament. What do you know about India, politics, cabbages and kings, and what do you want to know about them anyway” (IV: 23)? Quickly, however, Chaplin launches into his now-familiar (for “CSTW”) tirade:

“I was just telling a young lady that I couldn’t quite agree with all your principles. I should like to know why you’re opposed to machinery. After all, it’s the natural outcome of man’s genius and is part of his evolutionary progress. It is here to free him from the bondage of slavery, to help him to leisure and a higher culture. I grant that machinery with only the consideration of profit has thrown men out of work and created a great deal of misery, but to use it as a service to humanity, that consideration transcending everything else, should be a help and benefit to mankind.” (IV: 23)
However, he did not confine his revelation of injustice to his interactions with these lofty individuals. A situation at the only hotel in Bali at the time provided another such opportunity:

How nice to be away from civilization, relieved of stiff shirt fronts and starched collars. I had made up my mind to go around native-like with just a loose shirt, a pair of trousers and sandals. You can imagine my disgust when I found a notice posted in the room which read that all guests must be fully dressed when entering the dining-room. I was most indignant. Nevertheless I dined deliberately without changing my clothes or shaving. (V: 21)
In the typescript of notes for “CSTW” written by Chaplin’s half-brother, Sydney Chaplin, he describes that, in Bali, “The Dutch officials remain formally dressed in spite of the heat. But hear that you dislike formality (sic)” and so, keeping this in mind, removed their coats at dinner (Chaplin Untitled ts.). (Charlie) Chaplin has clearly skewed the information provided by Syd’s notes in order to characterize himself in this episode as non-conformist and confrontational, thereby creating another important link back to his filmic persona for readers.

In the third category of anomaly, situational anomaly, Dauer’s incongruous juxtaposition is included as the first of these strategies. In another passage from St. John Ervine’s article cited above, he demonstrates that Chaplin’s audience understood this theory of incongruous juxtapositions. He suggests that “a film in which he [the Little Tramp] figures will be full of totally unexpected incidents” (40). He goes on to describe one such incongruous juxtaposition from Chaplin’s 1915 Essanay film entitled The 
Champion, in which

he engages in a prizefight with a famous bruise. In eluding the pugilist’s blows, he hurls himself against the ropes of the ring and then occurs one of those unexpected inventions which are remarkably comic. He suddenly does the sort of tight-wire walk along the lower rope, while holding on with both hands to the upper one, which every boy in the world has done some time or other on seeing a wirefence or rails where such a performance is possible. (40)

Still photographs from Chaplin’s films also provide evidence of his use of visual incongruities. Figure 8 shows the Little Tramp from the 1936 silent film Modern Times...
happily entertaining a police officer in a jail cell masquerading as a cheerful parlor. The juxtaposition in this photograph of the jail cell, the prisoner and the warden in comfortable repose and homey objects such as the flowered bedspread, the bowl of fruit, and brightly patterned lampshade, among other items, is incongruous.

Figure 8. Chaplin in *Modern Times*

Chaplin, in his own writing for “CSTW” displays the same predilection for incongruity and inconsistency. In Nice, France, Frank J. Gould’s wife has arranged a lunch for Chaplin at the Municipal Casino where “some of the most famous names in art and literature will be present—Maeterlinck, Marchand, Domergue and many others. There was something incongruous about the lunch and these illustrious gentlemen and the background of the casino” (III: 102). Later, in Japan, he witnesses “a man attired in a
kimono wearing a derby hat” (V: 86), an inconsistency, as he terms it, and one that makes a comment on the impact of the westernization of Asia in which he himself may have played a small role.

The use of such incongruous juxtapositions, then, as Dauer explains them, and as a particular visual rhetorical strategy of the Little Tramp persona, can also be found in the written texts. One such instance from MTA is described as part of Chaplin’s experience upon the S. S. Olympic’s arrival in Southampton where he was to be met by the mayor of that city. In this episode, the great pantomimist is thrust into a situation in which he is expected to both write a speech and then give it to the mayor and a large crowd of admirers. The ghostwriter demonstrates this incongruous situation when he has Chaplin relate in first person, “it is their game, this speechmaking, and I know I shall appear a hopeless dub with my reply” (40). After a fitful night of writing, rewriting and practicing in front of a mirror in his cabin, Chaplin is portrayed as waking up late for his appointment with the mayor and forgetting his “script” in the process. In response to the outcome of this episode, Chaplin is made to relate that “I believed that I had created some new gestures never before attempted on platform, or in pulpit, but I was lost without my copy” (40). The juxtaposition in this scene of the “speechless” pantomimist with his task of writing a speech in preparation for an oral performance, combined with his forgetting the document with the speech on it and then his reliance in the end on his facility with gesture seems to provide a verbal example of Dauer’s first visual rhetorical strategy.

If anything, Chaplin’s second travel narrative, “A Comedian Sees the World,” provides more concrete examples than MTA of his use of this strategy. One example is Chaplin’s experience at a boar hunt in Normandy. At this event, he was the guest of the
Duke of Westminster. Many of the elements of this particular story present incongruous juxtaposition. The first of these is provided by Chaplin’s inexperience and lack of ability with horses: “My greatest concern was whether I could stay on the horse. The more I thought of this, the less I liked the animal. I could never understand man’s sentimental attachment to the beast. I’d remember every accident I’d ever had with him” (III: 15). Chaplin, an unskilled horseman, placed in juxtaposition with a horse must result, then, in a comedic situation similar to one the Little Tramp might find himself in. This introduction to his particular unfittedness to the task at hand is followed by the story of the way the boar hunt played out, beginning with his problems with the horse, of course, supposedly a quiet old nag named Flossie: “At that moment Flossie suddenly reared up on her hind legs, cavorted and pranced around, then sidled towards me as though desiring to sweep me off the road. But I was too quick for her. I was behind one of the cars in a jiffy” (III: 16). This behavior on the part of the horse caused the Duke to request a different one for Chaplin, but his control of this horse is also problematic. He is never the master of these animals, only the mastered. But this is not the only incongruous situation he relates in regards to the boar hunt. Another is a situation caused partially by being an inexperienced rider—inappropriate dress. Chaplin tells the reader that he’s only been able to acquire two of the required dress items for the hunt, riding breeches and boots. Therefore, he is forced to borrow the other parts of the huntsman costume and emphasizes the fact that the owners of the items differ greatly from himself in body type. From the duke, a man six feet three inches tall, he borrows a helmet and waistcoat. From Sem, the renowned French caricaturist, and a man only five feet tall (nearly 6 inches shorter than Chaplin’s own diminutive stature) he borrows the red jacket (III: 15-16). So,
because of the incongruity of the juxtaposed items of clothing, Chaplin creates a verbal image that directly correlates to one of the Little Tramp persona. In fact, this particular episode creates an even more direct link to a characteristic of the Little Tramp which is perhaps the most well-known and recognized, the hodge-podge costume. As Chaplin explains in his autobiography, “I wanted everything a contradiction: the pants baggy, the coat tight, the hat small and the shoes large” (144)—an accurate verbal description in itself of this visual rhetorical strategy manifested by the Little Tramp persona (see Figure 5). Interestingly, there is almost a one-to-one correspondence between this description and the costume that emerged from the situation of the boar hunt.

The final strategy I’ve included in the category situational anomaly is geographic disorientation. The Little Tramp is usually unfamiliar with where he is as each film begins. He has little contextual information at his disposal. Also, when the film ends, the Little Tramp watches a world with which he has become intimate, if only for a short time, travel away. In *The Circus* (1928), for instance, the Little Tramp enters the world of the bigtop by accident, experiences both success and failure there, and then watches the circus wagons leave him behind in the final scene (see Figure 9). This strategy helps to establish the Little Tramp persona as a traveling figure—a wanderer and even a tourist.38 Travel in some sense demands the placement of oneself in unfamiliar situations, situations for which the traveler has little context or background. As travel narratives, both *MTA* and “CSTW” can be expected then to utilize this sort of strategy.

38 See Chapter 3
Although Chaplin is traveling to two cities he has spent time in before, London and Paris, and only one in which he has not—Berlin—MTA includes several episodes in which Chaplin finds himself in unfamiliar circumstances. Upon first entering England, Chaplin declares “I am in another world. Southampton, though I have been there before, is absolutely strange to me. There is nothing familiar. I feel as though I am in a foreign country” (43). Later, in Berlin for the first time, it is not the place so much that is strange, but the fact that he himself is not known there that creates an unfamiliar feeling: “A different atmosphere here. It seems hard for me to relax and get the normal reaction to meeting people. They don’t know me here. I have never been heard of” (115). This second example comes at unfamiliarity from a different angle, one that is interesting to
consider. Here, he is isolated and estranged, not because he doesn’t “know” but because he isn’t “known.”

While “CSTW” shows Chaplin in venues throughout Europe that were essentially new to him, his travels into Southeast Asia provide the most widespread use of this strategy. “Ceylon,” Chaplin writes, “was the realization of all my exotic dreams” (IV: 42). Kandy was full of strange sights and exotic perfumes for him. Bali, too, little visited by Westerners at the time, provided some of Chaplin’s most reflexive moments: “How different this port looks from those of civilized countries; no chimney stacks to mar the horizon, no begrimed docks nursing rusty ships, no iron foundries, stock yards or tanneries. Only a small wood wharf, a few picturesque boats and houses with red-tiled roofs” (V: 21). And after viewing a ceremonial dance, “how different, I thought, from anything I’d ever seen. How far removed I felt from the rest of the world. Europe and America seemed unreal—as though they’d never existed” (V: 21). This second example, too, seems to approach the problem from a different perspective. Here, through his prolonged isolation in a place new to him, he feels the old familiar life and places becoming strange as this new place becomes familiar. The reflexivity provided by the travel narrative genre allows for this verbal working-out of the problem. In both travel narratives, there is evidence that the genre itself provides a depth and breadth to the strategy of unfamiliar setting not feasible for film (this reflexive capability). However, the repetition and amplification of this strategy of the films in the travel narratives works once again to reinforce a link between the Little Tramp persona and the public Chaplin.

The persona Chaplin projects in his two travel narratives is all important to the ability of those narratives to conflate his ailing public persona with his beloved filmic one, the
Little Tramp. As I’ve tried to show in this chapter, one important task of the narratives in this mission is to create verbal correlations to Chaplin’s visual rhetoric on screen. As I will show in the next chapter, another task of the narratives is their ability to project a Chaplin-as-tourist persona, one capable of being readily semiotically linked to the Little Tramp in the minds of the audience. Both of these aspects of persona work in concert to achieve the necessary conflation. Each of these techniques works well because of their subtlety, a trait Max Eastman relates as being important to Chaplin’s success as a film artist: “Chaplin’s acting was mainly distinguished from that of his colleagues by what, to my mind at least, is the subtlest and most mature of all values, power in reserve. He loves to not quite do something, letting his audience feel the more exquisitely what it would be if he did it” (209). Chaplin and his ghostwriter don’t slap the reader in the face with these strategies; they work because the reader, probably very familiar with Chaplin’s film work at the time, is able to grasp the connections—the correlations—simply because of his or her accumulated knowledge.
Chapter 3

Persona II: The Chaplin-As-Tourist Persona

I have the soul of a tourist, for I love to visit the spots where the deed took place. I try to get an empathy, a feeling into things. I imagine myself as Charles the First coming through that window to be beheaded—where he might have looked. Then as a spectator, placing myself in a position where the citizens must have stood that day.

(“Comedian Sees the World” I: 80)

As I discussed in the preceding chapter, Chaplin’s travel narratives work to conflate his public persona with his filmic one, the Little Tramp, through a creation of verbal correlations in those narratives to Chaplin’s particular visual artistry on film. As I will show in this chapter, the strategy operates in conjunction with the travel book persona who advertises himself at many points as a tourist. The Chaplin-as-tourist persona aids the effectiveness of the narratives by building upon the audience’s historical perception of the Little Tramp as a transient traveling figure, a perception that gives the genre of travel narrative more believability as a vehicle for him. With the audience’s reception of the Little Tramp as transient traveling figure in mind then, I will outline the scholarship on the traveler/tourist dichotomy—a sociological distinction which separates the elite traveler from the democratic tourist—and demonstrate the ways in which MTA and “CSTW” project the Chaplin narrating these works on the side of the Little Tramp’s democratic tourist in this dichotomy, despite his personal wealth and affluence at the time. In the process of this discussion (and as I achieved for the travel narratives of Dickens and Stein), I will begin to forge important links between fan behavior and tourist behavior, links that will culminate in an analysis of the phenomenon of Chaplin as celebrity/tourist attraction in Chapter 4.
Foundational to this discussion is the fact that the Little Tramp persona is a walking persona—a traveling persona. In describing the travel atmosphere of the between-the-wars period, Fussell asserts that “sacred to this generation is the image not just of the traveler but of the wanderer, the vagabond, or even Chaplin’s cinema tramp, all skilled in the techniques of shrewd evasion and makeshift appropriate to the age’s open road” (57), an assertion which perhaps suggests that the Little Tramp was even an icon of travel during this time. In Chaplin’s films, he is often shown entering the film on a road and then leaving it the same way.\(^{39}\) He has no history or context, and the personal relationships he forms with other characters in film after film are ephemeral. He is certainly not an elite traveler and perhaps does not really have an affection for this occupation; perhaps he does it out of necessity. As a tramp, traveling is what he does—what he must do. Still, the Little Tramp’s audience looks on his tramp-like characteristics not as signs of failure, but as endearing ones, as suggested by the postcard shown in Figure 10. In this postcard, the tramp/hobo’s iconic handkerchief tied over a stick (which Chaplin does use in some of his films\(^{40}\)) has metamorphosed into a tourist’s suitcase. Because the case appears to be adorned with travel stickers and shows significant wear, the Little Tramp figure is promoted in the card as being a seasoned tourist. Also, because the card is a Belgian one written in French and advertising a Belgian tourist location, Littoral, the Little Tramp figure upon it is represented as a citizen of the world (in fact, a moniker Chaplin used to claim for himself). The card’s imagery supports the idea that Chaplin’s audience may view the Little Tramp as a figure

\(^{39}\) Consider such films as *The Tramp* (1915), *The Circus* (1928), and the ending of *Modern Times* (1936).

\(^{40}\) Chaplin used the handkerchief-on-a-stick prop in such films as *The Tramp* (1915) and *Modern Times* (1936).
of respect because, like this audience, he enjoys traveling around and seeing the sights. In fact, the collection of postcards the Little Tramp carries with him suggests that he is mediating his experience of the sights or documenting his experience of the sights with markers much like any of MacCannell’s tourists. While the Little Tramp is pictured in this card as wearing his usual mismatched and worn-out costume, it is the only evidence presented that might align him with the downtrodden tramp, a figure, in American culture at least, who has historically been understood to be violent, lazy, morally-degraded and even mentally unstable. John D. Seelye suggests that it was the advent of the characterization of the tramp as a figure of comedy which altered his perception in the minds of the American public from this negative image, for “the clown is an abstraction, a caricature (the tragic hero is an ideal, a ‘king’), whose antics have only a symbolic relationship to the ordeals of a real tramp” (536).
The German toy pictured in Figure 11 also presents the Little Tramp as a traveling figure, literally a globetrotter in this case, which reaffirms both his world-wide appeal and his everyman quality. Here again, the Little Tramp carries a tourist’s suitcase instead of the hobo’s kerchief-on-a-stick. The globe is the largest element of the toy and as such becomes the focal point, but the viewer’s eye soon travels from this point up to the disproportionate figure of the Little Tramp standing on top of it. The Little Tramp figure’s large size in comparison to the geography depicted on the globe suggests either
his metaphorical domination of the world or his ease in encountering any part of it in the act of travel itself.

Figure 11. German Chaplin and Globe Toy

Because of the reception of the Little Tramp persona as a transient traveling figure suggested by these artifacts, he must have been easily aligned to the figure of the tourist in the traveler/tourist dichotomy, thereby remaining consistent with his “everyman” proletarian status. The traveler/tourist dichotomy is pervasive in scholarship on travel and travelers, including the study of travel literature and of the behavior of people away from home (both sociological and ethnographic studies). Scholars such as Paul Fussell and Daniel J. Boorstin argue the most fervently for the dichotomy because it is clear from
their work that each possesses a bias for the traveler and against the tourist. Each agrees that the term “tourist,” and therefore the dichotomy itself began with Thomas Cook’s first package tour taken in 1845 from London to Caernarvon that made travel possible for the lower and middle classes. As Boorstin explains, “sophisticated Englishman objected. They said that Cook was depriving travelers of initiative and adventure and cluttering the continental landscape with the Philistine middle classes” (88). In fact, class issues are at the heart of the division, although this point is hidden in the rhetoric that describes the differing features of the two terms. While the “traveler” was of the elite class, he is described instead as “working at something” (Boorstin 85)—a seemingly more proletarian agenda and one that would hardly suggest aristocracy. Rather than a figure of leisure, this traveler was “active; he went strenuously in search of people, of adventure, or experience” (Boorstin 85). As Paul Fussell argues, before the advent of the tourist, “travel was conceived to be like study, and its fruits were considered to be the adornment of the mind and the formation of judgment” (39).

The tourist, on the other hand, is distinguished from his loftier counterpart, not overtly by class, but by his lack of purpose and unsavory character. Jonathan Culler relates that tourists are seen as “the lowest of the low. […] Animal imagery seems their inevitable lot: they are said to move in droves, herds, swarms or flocks; they are mindless and docile as sheep but as annoying as a plague of insects when they descend upon a spot they have ‘discovered’” (153). In a February 1865 article in Blackwood’s Magazine, a British consul in Italy is already using this imagery to project his particular disgust of tourists:

The Cities of Italy were now deluged with droves of these creatures, for they never separate, and you see them forty in number pouring along a
street with their director—now in front, now at the rear, circling round them like a sheepdog—and really the process is as like herding as may be.

I have already met three flocks, and anything so uncouth I never saw before, the men, mostly elderly, dreary, sad-looking; the women, somewhat younger, travel-tossed, but intensely lively, wide-awake, and facetious. (qtd. in Boorstin 88).

Unlike the active traveler, then, the tourist is “passive; he expects interesting things to happen to him. […] He expects everything to be done to him and for him (Boorstin 85).

Along with this attribute (passivity), tourists are castigated because they seem to prefer the inauthentic to the authentic, often spending more time in the gift shop buying the replica than appreciating the original. For the tourist to be satisfied with a sight, it must first be certified. This is achieved only through markers—the guidebook, the informational plaque, the postcard—such that the experience of the tourist attraction is perpetually mediated by other texts (i.e., these same markers). Heather Henderson argues that “the value of a scene, landscape, or monument lies not so much in its own intrinsic qualities as in the pleasure of seeing for ourselves what someone else has seen and described before us. The observer’s relationship to the scene is indirect, filtered through the literary representation by which he first came to know it” (232). Jonathan Culler suggests that this creates a paradox; “the dilemma of authenticity is that to be experienced as authentic [the sight] must be marked as authentic, but when it is marked as authentic it is mediated, a sign of itself, and hence lacks the authenticity of what is truly unspoiled,

---

44 See my discussion of Dean McCannell’s definition of the marker in Chapter 1.
untouched by mediating cultural codes” (164). Finally, Buzard argues that tourists are also blamed for being

the unwitting harbingers of unwelcome modernization, the insidious agents of transformative power. While they passed “superficially” through districts they little knew nor long remembered, they nonetheless profoundly altered those districts by virtue of their numbers, their dissemination of cliché responses, and their patronage of new, obtrusive institutions—like hotels, railway lines, and “macadamized” roads—which irrevocably altered the landscape. (28)

In the final accounting, it’s difficult to find any advocates for the tourist in this discussion. Still, one of the interesting things about the dichotomy is that the traveler in his purist form only existed in his own mind, because being the first to see something or to experience something was and is all relative. White western travelers claiming to be the first to glide down the Amazon or the Nile may have in reality followed tens of thousands of natives having achieved the same goal (without even seeing it as a goal). So, while the tourist is a degraded figure, all who travel are tourists to some degree, albeit tourists who try to remove themselves from that label as forcefully as possible.

Important also is the fact that tourism itself, especially for Americans, Chaplin’s major audience, was rising steadily, even into the Depression era. Michael Berkowitz in “A ‘New Deal’ for Leisure: Making Mass Tourism during the Great Depression” notes that “in 1915, those few tourists fortunate to have the time and money for a vacation had spent approximately 500 million dollars on domestic travel-related activity. By the eve of World War II, tourism ranked as one of the largest industries in the nation—as large as
the automobile, petroleum, and lumber industries combined and 50 percent larger than iron and steel production” (205-6). Being a tourist, then, is a role more and more lower and middle class Americans could relate to through their own experience.

The task of Chaplin’s travel narratives, then, is to work in accordance with this assumption that everyone is a tourist—even a Chaplin having tea with Winston Churchill or dinner with the Prince of Wales (encounters that no democratic tourist would ever experience). In these experiences, Chaplin has described himself in retrospect not as a “snob,” but as a “tourist, sight-seeing” (My Autobiography 271); his tentativeness and lack of confidence in many of these situations also attests to this as well. But perhaps more important is the way in which Chaplin’s experiences in these situations works in conjunction with expected behavior for the Little Tramp. Situations in which Chaplin “morphs” into an affluent, richly dressed gentleman who handles himself well (if a little tentatively) in aristocratic society would be just another example of reversible metamorphosis as Chaplin used it in films such as The Count and City Lights. In these films, the Little Tramp temporarily becomes an affluent gentleman experiencing very similar social situations. Chaplin’s audience, already keyed into this strategy, realizes that the metamorphosis is only temporary and that they only have to wait for the moment when he will either change back or assume another role for a time. Chaplin’s audience seems to have also accepted the Little Tramp as a tourist, as evidenced by another

---

45 See my discussion of this rhetorical strategy in Chapter 2. 46 As Michael North points out in Reading 1922: A Return to the Scene of the Modern, the press from time to time in Chaplin’s career made an issue of a supposed division between Charles, the wealthy movie mogul and Charlie, the downtrodden Little Tramp (165-8). Due to Chaplin’s use of the reversible metamorphoses strategy in his films, however, such coverage did little to foster the doubt and lack of confidence in Chaplin that the press may have wanted.
postcard shown in Figure 12 in which he is shown gazing at the Mannekin Pis in Brussels, Belgium like any other sightseer:

![Image of a postcard showing a man gazing at the Mannekin Pis]

Figure 12. Belgian Postcard Chaplin and Mannekin Pis

Chaplin’s travel narratives function as successful promotional tools by presenting Chaplin convincingly in this persona of tourist. The narratives achieve this first by demonstrating verbally that Chaplin was engaging in MacCannell’s theory of the tourist-attraction encounter on his tour. As I will demonstrate below, passages exist in both *MTA* and “CSTW” that show Chaplin engaging in every step of the process in regards to a tourist attraction. Second, even when all the steps of MacCannell’s theory are not present, Chaplin clearly demonstrates that his experience is mediated by texts outside of
the sight itself, a relationship that MacCannell terms “marker involvement.” These markers fall into three main categories: 1) historical, 2) personal, and 3) cultural. Finally, although he does his best to avoid it as any tourist would, Chaplin overtly names himself a tourist in both narratives, despite the word’s negative connotations. Each of these verbal elements of the travel narratives work to depict Chaplin as a tourist and in so doing, strengthen the visual/verbal correlations by conflating his public and filmic personae. In addition, my analysis of these narratives allows me to move beyond MacCannell’s work by considering Chaplin first as a celebrity tourist and then in Chapter 4 as a celebrity/tourist attraction, thereby demonstrating that Chaplin’s travel narratives stand at the juncture between the sociological phenomena of literary celebrity and the tourist attraction.

Reiterating my discussion of MacCannell’s theory in Chapter 1 for the purposes of this one, I assert that the encounter of the tourist attraction is best explained by the ritualistic performance of the tourist in the presence of the tourist attraction (135). MacCannell argues that “an authentic touristic experience involves not merely connecting a marker to a sight--a guidebook, photo, postcard, map, plaque, etc., i.e., any text that mediates the tourist’s experience of the sight--but a participation in a collective ritual, in connecting one’s own marker to a sight already marked by others” (137).

47 Hartmut Berghoff and Barbara Korte in “Britain and the Making of Modern Tourism: An Interdisciplinary Approach (The Making of Modern Tourism: The Cultural History of the British Experience, 1600-2000, eds. Hartmut Berghoff et al., Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave, 2002) echo MacCannell’s theory of marker involvement in this essay, stating that “indeed, for most tourists, travel experience crucially entails a mediation through texts and images. They produce texts (postcards) and their own photographs. They usually have a Baedeker and perhaps other travel literature in their luggage; above all, they have images in their minds with which they confront the countries traveled” (6).
Chaplin’s travel narratives project a tourist persona first by recounting episodes that allow the reader to follow Chaplin experiencing sights much like tourists in MacCannell’s theory of the tourist attraction encounter. Albeit as much a homecoming memoir as a travel narrative, Chaplin’s ghostwritten *MTA* announces Chaplin’s status as a tourist. Sneaking out of the Ritz-Carlton by himself, Chaplin takes a taxi across the Thames to the neighborhoods just beyond the Westminster Bridge. The text or “marker” which mediates this experience is Chaplin’s memory of the place. It allows him to recognize landmarks, both places and people, and notice how they have changed or remained the same. The reader sees this as Chaplin crosses over the Thames, remarking

I am passing Westminster Bridge again. I see it better. Things are more familiar. On the other side is the new London County Council Building. They have been building it for years. They started building it before I left.

The Westminster Road has become very dilapidated, but perhaps it is because I am riding in an automobile. I used to travel across it another way. It doesn’t seem so long ago, either. (53)

In this passage, Chaplin’s ghostwriter records Chaplin’s recognition of the bridge, but also his impressions of it. The bridge is not especially important in and of itself as a sight or a landmark for Chaplin; instead, it is important because of the way in which the text of his memory mediates it. Without this marker, the sight would be meaningless.

As in MacCannell’s theory, each moment of sight recognition is marked by a moment of excitement in which the tourist compares his markers to those of his companions in the experience. In *MTA* and as I will show for “CSTW,” this ritualistic aspect of the experience is always carried out between the narrator (Chaplin ostensibly)
and the reader, a great feature of the books which lends them a particular and convincing sense of intimacy, much like Chaplin’s films. Chaplin’s ghostwriter achieves this by employing present tense, as if the encounter of the sight or sights is happening concurrently with the reading of the narrative. Also, the ghostwriter uses exclamation points to indicate Chaplin’s excitement in identifying the sight—an excitement he then shares with the reader, thereby satisfying the ritualistic aspect of MacCannell’s theory. One such instance occurs just as Chaplin’s taxi makes its way over into Kennington from the bridge. Chaplin clearly demonstrates his recognition of an important landmark for him: “My God! Look! Under the bridge! There’s the old blind man. I stop the driver and drive back. We pull up outside the Canterbury” (53). Mediated by Chaplin’s memory of this individual, the encounter becomes not just a typical touristic one, but one which causes Chaplin to make a tragic symbol of the old man:

There he is, the same old figure, the same old blind man I used to see as a child of five, with the same old earmuffs, with his back against the wall and the same stream of greasy water trickling down the stone behind his back.

---

48 Dan Kamin notes how Chaplin creates this intimacy in *Charlie Chaplin’s One-Man Show*, “Chaplin rarely plays a scene without glancing at the camera. In some instances, his eyes are not focused on the camera lens, but his face is presented to the audience, in effect inviting them to look into his eyes and increasing their vicarious participation in his emotions, […] [allowing them to] engage in a continuous one-to-one ‘dialogue’ with [him]” (9). Travel writers began to create a similar intimacy with their readers with Alexander Kinglake’s *Eothen* (1844). In *The Crescent and the Cross* (1845), Kingslake’s friend, Eliot Warburton purposely wrote as though he were having “a sort of imaginary conversation with the reader,” even addressing him at the end of the book with the words: “Reader!—you have been my only fellow-traveller through many lands; wherever I have wandered you have been; whatever I have learned you have known” (qtd. in Henderson 241).
The same old clothes, a bit greener with age, and the irregular bush of
whiskers colored almost in a rainbow array, but with a dirty gray
predominant.

What a symbol from which to count the years that I had been away. A
little more green to his clothes. A bit more gray in his matted beard. (53-4)

Finally, Chaplin is shown to document the walk in a way atypical for MacCannell’s
theory, but just as inherently meaningful for Chaplin himself, by stopping in at a
neighborhood pub to order a drink, an attempt to engage in a communal experience there.
In this final episode of his long walk/ride through Kennington, Chaplin attempts to
document the experience through this act of consumption:

We pull up at the Horns for a drink. The same Horns. Used to adjoin
the saloon bar. It has changed. Its arrangement is different. I do not
recognize the keeper. I feel very much the foreigner now; do not know
what to order. I am out of place. […]

“What can I do for you, sir?” […]

“Ah, give me a ginger beer.” I find myself becoming a little bit
affected. I refuse to understand the money—the shillings and the pence.
It is thoroughly explained to me as each piece is counted out to me. I go
over each one separately and then leave it all on the table. […]

Suddenly a white funk comes over me and I rush out and into the taxi
again. (61)
The attempt to document the experience in this instance seems to negatively color the entire Kennington tour. Henderson suggests that “in travel literature, the narrator moves in a climate of expectation—engendered, usually, by other literature—but the potential for disappointment is so great that it becomes virtually a convention of the genre itself” (235). In fact, it works in conjunction with Chaplin’s other failures and misconnections in the narrative which function as foreshadowing, like Chaplin’s experience arriving in Southampton in which he finds out abruptly that his childhood sweetheart has recently died in the flu epidemic. For this narrative, like many travel narratives, is also a narrative of a search for self; Chaplin is portrayed as having returned to England in order to reconcile his English heritage with his newly acquired American-ness and this mission proves a failure, a fact we only discover at the beginning of the second narrative, “CSTW” (“My first trip to England was a disappointment” (I.7)).

In this second narrative, Chaplin again effectively projects a tourist persona; again, several scenes conform to the steps of MacCannell’s theory of the tourist’s encounter of the sight in at least one episode. Early in Part I of “CSTW,” Chaplin the narrator assumes the role of the tourist in his verbally guided tour of Kennington. Here again, he mediates the experience with the “text” of his memory. Chaplin guides the “tour” first by taking us back in time through the Kennington neighborhood of his youth where we encounter together “the artificial limbs’ shop, the depressing wax foot that demonstrated a fallen arch and the horrible colored lithographs of the human anatomy exposing a labyrinth of nerves like the design of some coral undersea growth” (I: 80). Soon, we round the corner and discover West Square of the past and of the present as well:
As I walk around West Square, I come upon a stationer’s shop where they sell toys, sweets and tobacco. The store has an odor that awakens memories. It smells Christmasy. In the window I see a Noah’s ark with painted wooden animals. I can’t resist it. I go in and buy it just to get a whiff of the paint and the feel of the excelsior that’s packed inside. (I: 86)

A recognition of the sight occurs: “West Square!” (I.86). In the passage above, Chaplin, after recognizing the sight, experiences the “flurry of activity”—a sort of frisson—in the flash of involuntary memory which occurs, a moment which excites all his senses. As in MTA, he creates a special bond with his reader here by using present tense; it is the reader with who Chaplin compares markers. Finally, his purchase of the Noah’s ark consecrates the sightseeing act because it works to document it for him; the toy is something tangible, an additional marker, that he takes away with him in order to effectively recall the experience at any time. This passage suggests, then, that Chaplin can participate (has participated) in the work of the tourist. He has played the role successfully.

Chaplin and his ghostwriter frequently use markers that further align the narrative voice with a tourist persona. For the purposes of this discussion, I have categorized these markers into three types: historical, personal, and cultural. In one instance, Chaplin’s ghostwriter in MTA does not reveal the particular historical texts or markers that mediate Chaplin’s experience of the area behind the Strand Theater in London. Perhaps even Chaplin’s companion, Edward Knobloch, provided them. Still it is apparent from his narration that Chaplin’s touristic experience is influenced by some historical narrative:

[The] beautiful gardens and courts [suggest] palaces and armor and the days when knights were bold. These houses were the homes of private
people during the reign of King Charles and even farther back. They
abound in secret passages and tunnels leading up to the royal palace.
There is an air about them that is aped and copied, but it is not hard to
distinguish the real from the imitation. History is written in every stone;
not the history of the battlefield that is laid bare for the historians, but that
more intimate history, that of the drawing-room, where, after all, the real
ashes of empires were sifted. (66-7)

In the next few lines, he tells us in detail how this historical narrative has personally
effected his recognition and appreciation of these sights: “I drift along with the sight and
am carried back a hundred years, two hundred, a thousand. I seem to see the ghosts of
King Charles and others of old England with the tombstones epitaphed in Old English
and dating back even to the eleventh century” (68). Chaplin effectively presents himself
as a tourist in this passage, one who uses an historical narrative as his guide.

Similar episodes are related in “CSTW.” As he walks through London at different
points in the narrative, the reader sees Chaplin step back in time due to the historical texts
informing these walks which he wishes to share. In one episode, as he is approaching
Grosvenor Square, which he calls “the world of affluence,” Chaplin not only steps into a
different level of society, but a different era, here the Victorian one:

I can imagine four-in-hands with prancing thoroughbreds foaming at the
mouth and proud flunkeys opening carriage doors, a Lord Palmerston or a
Disraeli making a call. I see gentlemen of quality with black stock ties
and fawn silk hats meticulously placed to bring out the elegance of their
sideburns, and demure ladies with bustles and proud puffed sleeves and ivory-handled parasols, airing their poodle dogs in a morning stroll. (I.80)

The historical narrative Chaplin uses to mediate his experience of Grosvenor Square permits him to see only the social accoutrements of Victorian England such as the “black stock ties” and “proud puffed sleeves.” Historical figures such as Lord Palmerston and Disraeli enter the picture, but they fail to bring a plot along with them; they appear to Chaplin only as *tableau vivant* figures. Still, like MacCannell’s tourist, Chaplin is unable to view the scene without this historical narrative. He sees only what this particular narrative permits him to see.

I have already presented evidence of Chaplin and his ghostwriter’s use of a personal narrative to color the representation of his tourist experiences in both *MTA* and “CSTW,” and so I move in this next section into a discussion of cultural texts as mediators of Chaplin’s tourist experience. For this category, though, we are given specific information about the particular texts Chaplin employs in each case. Again, beginning with *MTA*, Chaplin’s ghostwriter relates a very unique experience for Chaplin himself as it would be for any tourist. One of the “names” Chaplin arranges to meet during his visit is author Thomas Burke, a man who is mostly unknown now, but at the time of Chaplin’s visit and on into the 1930s was immensely popular for his lurid and suspenseful tales arising out of the transient dockside neighborhood of Limehouse in London, populated by a mixture of Chinese, Indian, and other immigrants, where Burke grew up. In the episode with Burke, he is to lead Chaplin on a tour of the Limehouse district, beginning at about midnight and walking well into the early-morning hours. Ostensibly, Burke is the guide of this particular tour, but, as Chaplin relates, the true guidebook for the tour is Burke’s
wildly popular collection of short stories, *Limehouse Nights* (1917). Chaplin explains his realization of Burke’s particular *modus operandi*:

> He is silent and we merely walk.
>
> And then I awaken. I see his purpose. I can do my own story—he is merely lending me the tools. And what tools they are! I feel that I have served an ample apprenticeship in their use, through merely reading his stories. I am fortified.
>
> It is so easy now. He has given me the stories before. Now he is telling them over in pictures. The very shadows take on life and romance. The skulking, strutting, mincing, hurrying forms that pass us and fade out into the night are now becoming characters. The curtain has risen on “Limehouse Nights,” dramatized with the original cast. (92)

*Limehouse Nights,* or at least, Chaplin’s knowledge of the stories and their characters, act as cultural markers for the walk which totally obliterate the reality of what Chaplin really sees there. His perception of the immigrant residents he sees going about their business vanish under the stories’ influence, as in the case of a “little lady” Chaplin spies whose cheap cotton clothes are cut with Parisian cunning, and as we cross and pass her we discern beauty, enhanced many fold by youth and vitality, but hardened with premature knowledge. I can’t help but think of little Gracie Goodnight, the little lady who resented the touch of a “Chink,” so much so that she filled the fire extinguishers in his place with oil, and when he was trapped in the blazing building, calmly, and with a baby
smile upon her face, poured the contents of the extinguisher over him and his furniture. (93)

Using Burke’s collection of stories as his marker for this tour not only limits his perception of the immigrant residents he encounters, but also provides him with an excuse for retaining the stories’ bias against their alterity, suggested by the use of words such as “Chink.”

By the time Chaplin reaches Bali with his brother in March of 1932, as related in “CSTW,” he seems to have relegated the book as marker to a more respectable position, that of trip instigator. Chaplin tells his reader that

We were in the Mediterranean nearing Port Said when my brother brought me a book on travel.

‘Here is an interesting article on Bali,’ he said and added: ‘There are two young American boys on the boat who are going there.’

During the day, I browsed the book and after reading a chapter I was sold. (V.21)

While Chaplin doesn’t name the book in this passage, a letter from his brother Syd to R. J. Minney written at the time, lists the books they had in their possession and The Last Paradise (1930) by Hickson Powell was included in this list.49 The version of this book published in London, which is the version Syd most likely would have had since he was living in Europe at the time of the tour, is supplemented with bawdy illustrations by Alexander King and National Geographic-type photos by Andre Roosevelt which, most

---

49 Further evidence that Chaplin read this particular book, or at least the first chapter of it, is contained in the fact that he nearly plagiarized a passage of his narrative word-for-word from the first chapter of this book—the episode in which Chaplin and his brother come upon their first bare-breasted maiden.
noticeably, concern themselves with bare-breasted young women more than any other sort of Balinese individual. In other words, the Bali presented in this book would seem to be the homeland of soft porn. Its not surprising that the western tourists traveling to Bali on Chaplin’s boat and most of the westerners he encountered on the island were men.\textsuperscript{50} Despite this information, Chaplin’s descriptions of his experience in Bali mostly show his ability—being now a more seasoned reader of tourist attractions and landmarks—to move outside the bounds of the particular marker he has chosen and think for himself—formulate his own unmediated perceptions:

As we traveled, the country became progressively beautiful. Green rice shoots were growing in silver-mirrored fields, and wide green steps terraced down the mountainside. We passed through villages with beautifully built walls and imposing entrances along the roadsides. They were like the enclosures of some fine old estate. They looked like the remnant of some western influence. But no. They were the walls that surrounded the native compounds and built to keep out evil spirits. They were paradoxical—these magnificent walls and the primitive buildings they surrounded. (V. 21)

In this chapter, the reader sees Chaplin working against the power of mediating texts to see things for what they really are, not “the enclosures of some fine old estate,” but walls “built to keep out evil spirits.” Although not as particularly culturally/ethnically perceptive as would be expected today, Chaplin’s concluding comments for this episode

\textsuperscript{50} Two exceptions are a pesky lady journalist (un-named) whom Syd refers to in his typewritten notes of the trip and caricaturist Al Hirschfeld’s wife.
in Bali shows his attempt to at least move outside of what he knows to better understand the sights and culture he experiences there:

    How different, I thought, from anything I’d ever seen. How far removed I felt from the rest of the world. Europe and America seemed unreal—as though they’d never existed.

    Although I was in Bali only a few hours, it seemed I had always lived there. […]

    How easy man falls into his natural state. What does a career, a civilization matter in this natural way of living? From these facile people one gleans the true meaning of life—to work and play—play being as important as work to man’s existence. That’s why they’re happy. The whole time I was on the island I rarely saw a sad face. (V.22)

Although Buzard suggests that “the tourist appears unable or unwilling to cast off the traces of modernity which at home is all too much with us, changing to domestic habit and amenities which destroy the foreignness of foreign places one they are introduced to them” (8), Chaplin by this point in his second world tour (only two months from home), has matured in his ability and desire to perceive sights as well as just recognize them. It’s clear from this passage that he has tried to enter into the spirit of the place as he has come to understand it for himself. He’s moved beyond both the simple, “this is Bali!” sort of

51 Unfortunately, Chaplin in his what seems to be a marker-unrestricted analysis of his experience on Bali, is instead influenced by some sort of western Darwinist imperialist narrative, an influence best described by Patrick Brantlinger in The Rule of Darkness: British Literature and Imperialism, 1830-1914 (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1988): “Evolutionary thought seems almost calculated to legitimize imperialism. The theory that man evolved through distinct social stages—from savagery to barbarism to civilization—led to a self-congratulatory anthropology that actively promoted belief in the inferiority, indeed the bestiality, of the African,” (186) here Balinese. In the case of the travel writer, “seeing ‘Them’ as a primitive ‘Us’ enables travelers to overlook ‘Them’ as distinctively and legitimately ‘Other’” (Henderson 234).
recognition and the “this is the home of bare-breasted maidens” sort of mediated experience, to understand the seasonal lifestyle of the Balinese that demanded for intense periods of working, followed by long periods of recreation and play. Chaplin’s moving beyond markers to try and arrive at his own analysis is a strategy that works subtly to gain even greater approval of all those average tourists in his audience who wish to deny this pejorative moniker, for as Culler explains, “ferocious denigration of tourists is in part an attempt to convince oneself that one is not a tourist. The desire to distinguish between tourists and real travelers is a part of tourism—integral to it rather than outside it or beyond it” (156).

A more obvious way in which he achieves a Chaplin-as-tourist persona than the ones just discussed is by overtly naming himself a tourist in both books. Upon first inspection, though, it appears as if Chaplin is reticent to place this label on himself, a situation that is consistent with the episodes described earlier in which he strategically distances himself from tourist behavior just a bit. The ghostwriter for MTA, at least, finally uses the term in reference to Chaplin’s position at the hands of Thomas Burke on their tour of Limehouse (“Shortly after his wife comes in [Thomas] Burke and I leave, I feeling very much the tourist in the hands of the supercity guide” (90).), but then spends some time later in the episode developing a caveat:

What a guide [Burke] is! He is not showing me Main Street, not the obvious, not even the sight-seer’s landmarks, but in this rambling, I am getting the heart, the soul, the feeling. I feel that he has gauged me

---

52 Several hand-written manuscripts of scripts with a Bali-oriented storyline exist in the Chaplin archives that deal with this aspect of Balinese life in particular.
quickly—that he knows I love feelings rather than details, that he is unconsciously flattering to my subtlety, after two miles through black, through lovely shadows. (94)

Again, the ghostwriter tries to separate Chaplin from the average sightseer and so, from the pejoration of “tourist” by indicating that he goes beyond simply recognizing sights (“landmarks,” as he terms them) and tries to get “the heart, the soul, the feeling.” In *MTA*, like all tourists, Chaplin is presented as being loathe to overtly admit he is one.

Chaplin seems to emulate his ghostwriter’s tactic, then, in “CSTW” in the citation I have used as an epigraph to this chapter, in which he fails to admit that he is a tourist, but only possesses the “soul of a tourist.” In the very next line of the passage, he again tries to develop a subtle caveat, claiming that he tries “to get an empathy, a feeling into things”—in other words, he tries to move beyond simple recognition to perception and understanding, tasks the tourist does not perform. However, in the next line, the reader sees that this empathy he claims to possess is created only through the mediation of his markers, here an historical narrative or narratives of some sort: “I imagine myself as Charles the First coming through that window to be beheaded—where he might have looked. Then as a spectator, placing myself in a position where the citizens must have stood that day” (I: 80). Admittedly, few readers would see this subtle strategy and would focus instead on the word “tourist,”—even discarding in most cases the “soul of” portion, but Chaplin’s attempt to mitigate the negativity of the word when he chooses to use it here, shows his continual attention and deference to the audience he hopes to reach.

Late in “CSTW,” though, Chaplin finally uses the word, but not without qualification. The last episode and venue of his tour is Japan and it is only in a sort of final analysis of
the tour as a whole that he makes the admission. Referring to himself, Chaplin states that “the tourist’s opinions of countries he visits are usually in error, especially a celebrity’s, who sees things through a glamour of excitement” (V.86). Although this passage is a sort of overt denunciation of the tourist and especially the celebrity tourist (and works to link the two terms as well), Chaplin hits upon MacCannell’s main assertion about tourist behavior in the process. The celebrity tourist—perhaps the worst of all tourists, Chaplin suggests—“sees things through a glamour of excitement.” In other words, all tourists see or experience sights through the markers they carry along with them, but the celebrity’s particular marker, “the glamour of excitement” provides a view that is especially distorted. This recognition of himself as occupying a special place as a celebrity tourist both highlights the breadth of his understanding of the role and highlights a connection between celebrity and tourism that continues to dominate this study.

In his next sentences, as if realizing the tourist’s greatest fault, he tries to suggest that recognition of the sight (the tourist’s only real capability according to scholars) and perception of the sight are not separate from, but akin to each other: “Yet, invariably, the first question the press will ask you on your arrival is what you think of their country. Nevertheless external impressions are related to the soul of things” (V.86). Then in the next two short paragraphs, he demonstrates what he sees as his particular ability to get at “the soul of things” by offering this analysis:

Should you ask me offhand my opinion of Japan, I should say it is a nation of inconsistencies. A simple illustration is a man attired in a kimono wearing a derby hat, also the adoption of western dress at the cost of their own silk industry.
Even their art has been undermined by western influence. The beautiful school of some of the old masters—Harunobu, Hokusai, Uramaro, Hiroshige—is entirely neglected and in place of it are hybrid entrepreneurs whose work is neither Japanese nor European. (V.86)

Although Chaplin has plainly called himself a tourist at the beginning of this passage, he is still hedging or trying to minimize the impact of that particular word by demonstrating capabilities that seem to exceed those of the average tourist. The paradox is, though, that such hedging behavior makes him even more convincing as just that—a tourist—the very persona Chaplin’s travel narratives should project in order to succeed as promotional vehicles.
Chapter 4

Chaplin’s Language of Authenticity

Authenticity is both a quality necessary to the star phenomenon to make it work, and also the quality that guarantees the authenticity of the other particular values a star embodies (such as girl-next-door-ness, etc.). It is this effect of authenticating authenticity that gives the star charisma.

---Richard Dyer, “A Star is Born and the Construction of Authenticity”

Paul Fussell argues that “travel books are a sub-species of memoir in which the autobiographical narrative arises from the speaker’s encounter with distant or unfamiliar data, and in which the narrative—unlike that in a novel or romance—claims literal validity by constant reference to actuality” (203). Such an actuality might include the hotel the writer stays in, the train he must take from point to point, or the eccentric people seated at the table next to him in the hofbräuhaus. A celebrity such as Chaplin (or Dickens or Stein) has an additional level of “literal validity” at his disposal for his particular travel books because of the constant barrage of alternative narratives of his experiences appearing in the press which act as factually-based referents. A reader from any level of society could easily pick up a newspaper or another celebrity memoir or autobiography and check Chaplin’s facts against the description of the same experience in these referents. Therefore, in the case of the celebrity travel narrative, engendering authenticity is a requirement. By authentic, here, I mean believable, based in fact, and/or non-fictional. For the celebrity travel narrative to be a successful promotional vehicle, the reader must believe in it as a sort of historical account. In the case of Chaplin’s narratives, the reader must believe that his encounters and experiences happened as they are recorded in the text. Otherwise, the reader will never accept his apparent Little-Tramp-ness in these same encounters and experiences.
In this chapter, I will analyze Chaplin’s narratives for their rhetorical strategies in establishing this authenticity. As I did for Charles Dickens’s *American Notes* and Gertrude Stein’s *Everybody’s Autobiography* in Chapter 1, I will use Richard Dyer’s theory that suggests that authenticity in celebrity promotional texts is promoted through the use of signposts that indicate lack of premeditation, privacy, and lack of control (“*A Star*” 137). Dyer defines each of these signposts through his discussion of the Judy Garland film *A Star is Born* (1956). For instance, Dyer identifies his signpost, lack of premeditation, with any sort of improvisation. In the scene in which Garland sings *The Man That Got Away*, gestures such as the opening “doo doo” of the song and “the raised eyebrow on the final piano phrase followed by a satisfied laugh” (“*A Star*” 138-9) seem to come from Garland’s immediate experience with the music—i.e., these gestures and movements are unplanned. Another of Dyer’s signposts, “privacy,” is apparent when private information is revealed. Again, in the same scene from *A Star is Born*, Garland and the band seem not to know that they are being observed in their rehearsal of the song. As Dyer remarks, “the dark lighting and the close grouping that the moving camera continually reframes both connote intimacy, not public performance” (“*A Star*” 139). Finally, to illustrate “lack of control,” Dyer calls attention to Garland’s redundant gestures and facial expressions as evidence of neurosis in the scene. Dyer remarks that “she brushes a lock of hair off her forehead after bringing her hand to her throat on the words, ‘No more that all time thrill’; but her hair is cropped, there is no lock on it; it is redundant as a practical gesture, but indecipherable as an expressive one, except as a gesture that can be taken to ‘betray’ neurosis” (“*A Star*” 138). I will examine Chaplin’s two travel narratives for these signposts in the same order outlined here. In addition, and
unlike my procedure for Dickens and Stein, I will briefly examine the role of referents in promoting authenticity in Chaplin’s narratives and celebrity author travel narratives as a whole.

The first of Dyer’s requirements, a perceived lack of premeditation, is achieved in Chaplin’s two travel narratives through the use of two specific strategies: sentence fragments and the present tense. I have already briefly discussed these elements in order to show the narratives’ modernist attributes. My discussion here will illustrate that these strategies, in addition, achieve a sense of lack of premeditation that affords the narratives another important dimension of authenticity. Finally, I place these particular strategies in this category because they play an important role in promoting immediacy in the narratives, but this is not their only role. As I will explain in the discussion that follows, sentence fragments and the present tense are also important strategies for establishing an intimate relationship between Chaplin and his reader—a relationship in which the reader believes that private information and experiences are revealed. In this capacity, the strategies could be included in the second category of “privacy” as well.

Much as Dickens achieved a perceived unpremeditatedness in his American Notes by listing impressions of sights, people and events in his narrative through the use of either commas or semi-colons, Chaplin and his ghostwriter consistently use the sentence fragment to achieve the same goal. Short, choppy or fragmented sentences may suggest lack of writing prowess, but they also suggest a sense of immediacy, as if the lack of writing talent might simply be due to the hurriedness with which words and sentences are laid down on the page. A letter from MTA’s ghostwriter, Monta Bell, to Chaplin written in November 1921 suggests that at least this cog in Chaplin’s publicity machine was
aware of the need for immediacy and for getting the narrative as a whole released to the public before too much time went by: “I will wire you immediately upon receipt of any information as I believe it imperative that the book be published at once if there is to be any real sales. An ordinary book by you would go well at any time, but this one concerning a recent trip is more or less in the nature of news and it soon gets stale.”

Perhaps due to this sense of urgency, MTA uses the fragmented sentence liberally, especially to create an atmosphere for moments of excitement and anxiety, as in the episode in which Chaplin nears Waterloo Station by train—his first return to the area in ten years:

The recognition of these localities! There is a lump rising in my throat from somewhere. It is something inexplicable. They are there, thank God!

If I could only be alone with it all. With it as it is, and with it as I would people it with ghosts of yesterday. I wish these people weren’t in the compartment. I am afraid of my emotions.

The dear old cut. We are getting into it now. Here we are. There are all conceivable kinds of noises, whistles, etc. Crowds, throngs lined up on the platforms. (46)

---

53 MTA was released to the public less than five months after Chaplin returned from his tour in October 1921.

54 While I have tried to appeal in this paragraph to those readers who insist that Dickens’s verbal unpremeditatedness is crafted and Bell’s the result of rushed production, there may be no evidence to support this argument. Monta Bell was an experienced journalist at the time of ghostwriting MTA (he was editor-in-chief of The Washington Herald). In fact, if composition time is any indication, it is interesting to note that Dickens, arriving back in England in June of 1842 would have taken approximately five months to complete American Notes by the time it appeared in November of that year (Meckier 5, 9, 53) and Bell also completed MTA in five months (Chaplin’s tour ended in October 1921 and the book appeared in February 1922). In any event, a discussion of writing skill is beyond the scope of this dissertation.
The fragments, combined with short sentences—most of which employ a form of “to be” as their main verb—give this passage and the narrative as a whole a conversational quality. The illusion created is that Chaplin is talking directly to the reader. This conversational quality works in harmony with a use of present tense to create an intimate relationship between Chaplin and his readers such as has been a common device of the travel narrative since the publication of Alexander Kinglake’s *Eothen* in 1844.

“CSTW” uses the sentence fragment as well, but in a more controlled and strategic fashion. Chaplin indicates in several passages in “CSTW” that he spent time thinking about the craft of writing. It’s clear from these short passages that he is attempting to make “CSTW” a work of literature in some sense—perhaps a work of literary journalism or literary non-fiction. Because of this fact, Chaplin is more overt in “CSTW” about his use of strategies of writing such as the sentence fragment, in one case even foregrounding his use of this technique with the word “kaleidoscopically.” Chaplin explains to the reader that

I should like to have stayed longer in Rome as there was so much to see there, but one needs leisure for this. I was in a continual rush of excitement and expectation which can better be described kaleidoscopically:

---

55 In the course of telling an anecdote about the writer, Frank Harris, Chaplin’s makes one such indication of his thoughts about writing:

“You should write,” was Frank’s comment after I finished my story.
I was flattered by his remark, especially coming from one I admired so much. He little realized what an insidious seed he had planted in the soil of my literary desire.
“You’re touching a vulnerable spot that’s everybody’s weakness,” I said. I’d like to write, but grammar would cramp my style.
“Grammar nonsense,” said Frank. “Who has the authority to say what’s grammatically correct? Colloquialisms come into usage and are accepted. Ambiguity is the only fault in a sentence.” (III.119)
Arrive at midnight. The streets deserted. Impressed with lights of the Tiber. Receive warm welcome from friends and the press. At the hotel a message—arrangements can be made to meet Mussolini. After cold supper I take a long walk. Rome falls short of my imagination.

Retire at four in the morning. Up again at eleven. Expect news from Mussolini. In the meantime, visit St. Peter’s, the Roman Forum and Museum. Back to hotel. No news from Mussolini. Out again sightseeing. Return to hotel. (VI.42)

Again, in this passage as in MTA, lists of impressions represented by the employment of sentence fragments and short simple sentences provide a sense of hurriedness—of the right now—to the narrative. In this example from “CSTW,” however, the effect achieved is not one in which the reader believes Chaplin is talking to him or her, but that the reader has been given access to hurried jottings in Chaplin’s diary or journal. In this sense, they create the impression of revealing the private behind the public façade as well.

I have already tried to establish Chaplin’s use of the present tense in both MTA and “CSTW” as a marker of modernist style in the works. The employment of present tense also allows the narratives to be perceived by the reader as unpremeditated texts. When Chaplin and his ghostwriter write in the present tense, the effect is the impression that the event or episode being described is happening contemporaneously with the writing of the narrative. This strategy suggests an attempt to establish a familiar or intimate bond between the narrator and the reader who, in effect, become companions on the journey. Alexander Kinglake employed the present tense with similar success in Eothen (1844):
As long as you are journeying in the interior of the Desert you have no particular point to make for as your resting place. The endless sands yield nothing but small stunted shrubs; even these fail after the first two or three days, and from that time on you pass over broad plains—you pass over newly reared hills—you pass through valleys dug out by the last week’s storm, and the hills and the valleys are sand, sand, sand, still sand, and only sand, and sand, and sand again. (172)

Barbara Korte explains that Kinglake “takes (narrative) time to present time in his journey that was spent without any particular ‘use,’ without looking at sights and without any particular events, but which, for the traveler, nevertheless represented a personal experience” (101). For her, the merit of such passages “is the opportunity to share the experience with the traveler, even in its temporality” (101).

While Kinglake is often cited as being the first to develop this strategy in his *Eothen*, it is really Henry Fielding in *Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon* (1755) who first entertains the idea of the narrator of the travel book as being a sort of companion to the reader. Describing the demands on the travel writer, Fielding suggests that “all his pains in collecting knowledge, all his judgment in selecting, and all his art in communicating it, will not suffice, unless he can make himself, in some degree, an agreeable as well as an instructive companion” (124). In fact, it seems as if this rhetorical device in Kinglake’s *Eothen* is only a byproduct of his preface that he addresses directly to his friend Eliot Warburton, Kinglake’s chosen companion for the journey he ends up taking alone. Still, Warburton, in his own travel book published a year later (*The Crescent and the Cross*) adopts the device, relating
I have not (intentionally) followed in the footsteps, or used the thoughts of any author; but I confess to have borrowed freely, in other respects, from as many as seemed suited to my purpose. I have pursued no settled plan of writing or classification, but have spoken of each matter as it seemed to suggest itself in the course of a sort of imaginary conversation with the reader. (xiii)

In this passage, Warburton demonstrates his ability to move beyond simply addressing an actual friend in the book to addressing his larger potential audience as friends, ostensibly treating them as traveling companions in the process.

Chaplin’s ghostwriter achieves this sort of bond between the traveler and reader of *MTA*. He uses present tense to promote this relationship, but in the passage below, also achieves a sense of movement in time with Chaplin’s movement on the train to the station. The reader is moved along with Chaplin in this passage, seeing the sights framed by the windows of the train right along with him:

London! There are familiar buildings. This is thrilling. The same buildings. They have not altered. I expected that England would be altered. It isn’t. It’s the same. The same as I left it, in spite of the war. I see no change, not even in the manner of the people.

There’s Dalton Potteries! And look, there’s the Queen’s Head! Public house that my cousin used to own. I point it out to him decidedly, but he reminds me that he has a much better place now. Now we are coming into the cut. Can it be true? I can see two or three familiar stores. This train is going too fast. I want more time with these discoveries. (46)
At one point in this passage, Chaplin even mentions to the reader that the train is going too fast, as if to account for his fragmented narration and the speed with which he describes and reflects upon important landmarks that come briefly into view. The use of present tense allows the reader to feel as if he or she is sharing Chaplin’s cabin, sitting with he and Aubrey and hearing first-hand Chaplin’s comments as familiar places and people pass by.

Chaplin’s use of the present tense in “CSTW” achieves a similar effect but without the conversational rhythm of *MTA*. In the passage below, Chaplin guides the reader through Vienna of 1931 effectively without the fragmented sentences and frequent exclamation points:

- Vienna is sad. One feels the spirit of gayety has left it. It is a city of yesterdays. As we pass through the wide avenues and broad cobblestone streets, I count many café bars as they are called. People buy their cup of coffee and sit for hours in these places, doing their corresponding and negotiating their business. It is an address for many people—where one can meet.

- I meander through the city. Were I addicted to *cacoethes scribendi* I should go into pages of rhetorical rapture extolling the beauties of Vienna. Therefore I shall spare you all too suffering readers any conscious pleonasm on my part.

- I find myself on a bridge over the Danube River. I can understand the charm of Vienna. It must have been wonderful before the war. I seem to be walking along an endless avenue with shops and beer gardens. (II.102)
The pace of this walk through Vienna is much slower than Chaplin’s ride to Waterloo station cited from *MTA* above. However, it is clear that Chaplin hopes to achieve the same sense of camaraderie with his audience, whom he refers to in this passage as “you all too suffering readers.”

Chaplin’s interest in creating an intimate bond with the reader is evident, again, when he overtly addresses him or her by name or through the second-person pronoun. In Part IV of the series, Chaplin diverts from an anecdote about a frightening night he spent in Blackburn in northern England to address his audience in this way:

> Nobody’s consistent in life. Many of us take a stand on principles and make resolutions, but they are colored by moods and desires. Time and circumstances change them. That’s why we seldom live up to our philosophy. I think it was Walt Whitman who said, “If I contradict myself, well, I contradict myself.”

> In the beginning of this manuscript I stated that I was tired of love and people. I should have said I’m tired of myself especially now when writing this book. However, dear readers, you are partly responsible for this. You should not encourage a movie actor to take himself “literaturely.” (IV. 36)

In this passage, Chaplin’s intimation to his audience is that they are not just companions but collaborators and are as responsible for his written text as he is himself. The subjectivity of the narrator both creates an opportunity for Chaplin’s revelation of this confessional information and, at the same time, creates an intimate bond between himself and his readers—one which, in this instance at least, allows him to take the relationship
beyond Kinglake and Warburton’s efforts (the reader as traveling companion) to one in which the reader is not just following along passively but actively responsible with Chaplin in determining the final written product.

Dyer lists “privacy”—private information—as the second signpost a publicity text must evince in order to be considered authentic. The use of digression and a collage-like construction of the narratives are strategies that work towards this goal. I have chosen “digression” to refer only to Chaplin and his ghostwriter’s particular strategy, because it connotes a lesser degree of attention to form. The strategy is an important travel narrative convention, especially for the between-the-wars narratives. It works to entertain the reader and thereby create an intimate bond with that same reader. It also works to reveal information—seemingly intimate information in some cases—which provides the narrative another important dimension of perceived authenticity.

Chaplin and his ghostwriter utilized this device in both *MTA* and “CSTW,” but in very different ways. In *MTA*, digression occurs as an offshoot of sightseeing. As Chaplin passes by landmarks important to his London childhood, personal anecdotes and remembrances enter the text of the narrative. In one instance, he has hired a taxi to drive him over into the south side of London:

> I jump into the automobile again and we drive along past Christ Church. There’s Baxter Hall, where we used to see magic-lantern slides for a penny. The forerunner of the movie of to-day. I see significance in

---

56 The term “digression” is my own. Paul Fussell refers to diversions from the main course of the travel narrative as formal essays woven into the text. Osbert Sitwell coined a new term for this element—discursion—explaining that a discursion “is an attempt […] to find a new name for a particular kind of essay, that unites in the stream of travel […] many very personal random reflections and sentiments” (qtd. in Fussell 204).
everything around me. You could get a cup of coffee and a piece of cake
there and see the crucifixion of Christ all at the same time.

We are passing the police station. A drear place to youth. Kennington
Road is more intimate. It has grown beautiful in its decay. There is
something fascinating about it. (55)

In this passage, Chaplin’s digressions are made brief and clearly made to seem
engendered by his gaze out the taxi window as he passes important landmarks. In other
passages, these remembrances are more fleshed out, sometimes growing to several pages
in length. One of the most prominent of these digressions is doubly important because
Chaplin himself returns to it in “CSTW.” This is the story of his first love—an
unrequited one—involving a young music hall dancer named Hetty Kelly. As in the
passage above, the digression is a side effect of viewing an important landmark, here
Kennington Gate:

Kennington Gate. That has its memories. Sad, sweet, rapidly recurring
memories.

‘Twas here, my first appointment with Hetty (Sonny’s sister). […]

I get out and stand there for a few moments at Kennington Gate. My taxi
driver thinks I’m mad. But I am forgetting taxi drivers. I am seeing a lad
of nineteen, dressed to the pink, with fluttering heart, waiting, waiting for
the moment of the day when he and happiness walked along the road. The
road is so alluring now. It beckons for another walk, and as I hear a street
car approaching I turn eagerly, for the moment almost expecting to see the
same trim Hetty step off, smiling. (60-1)
This page-and-a-half-long digression provides an excellent example of the way in which this strategy can work to subtly create the impression of revealing the real (the private) behind the façade of the public persona. In this passage, the ghostwriter has Chaplin reveal a very poignant and emotional episode from his childhood, one the reader would not find in any other venue. Interestingly, Chaplin himself returns to this childhood episode in “CSTW” within its first few paragraphs. In this second narrative, he expands the digression to twice its previous length, using it as both a link to the first narrative and as an explanation of why the first European trip in 1921 was a failure. Beginning the anecdote “It is necessary to digress” (I.8), he reveals his method as well as his childhood angst:

In those days life was lonely. My social precincts were limited. I yearned for more than my environment could give me. Those were melancholy days without romance or beauty until one August night something happened.

We were playing a suburban theater. I was standing in the wings waiting my turn to go on. A troupe of girls was dancing. One of them slipped and the rest smiled. One especially, a brunette with big brown laughing eyes. She turned to the wings and caught my gaze. Never had I beheld such beauty. (I.8)

Unlike his ghostwriter’s recounting of this relationship in MTA, Chaplin embellishes the events with greater physical and emotional detail. He seems to tell the whole story of his relationship with Hetty Kelly from beginning to end, revealing more to his reader in the process.
My examination of the drafts of “CSTW” shows that the strategy of digression, one used to create intimacy with the reader, Chaplin expanded on in his revisions. In the first handwritten draft, Chaplin used the strategy of digression in his first walk upon reaching London through his old Kennington neighborhood. In this digression, he recalls an emotional moment between his mother and himself that resulted in his hatred of city parks. By the second draft, either Chaplin or his editor must have decided to expand specifically on this digression strategy and an unusual method was developed for achieving this expansion. Subsequent drafts include lengthy digressions by having them work as stories Chaplin tells when visiting the many important names he encounters throughout the tour—people such as the Morrells, Lytton Strachey and Aldous Huxley during one afternoon, Winston Churchill on several occasions, Ramsay MacDonald one weekend, and Albert Einstein and his family one evening. This method of including long digressions works well because it is subtle; such digressions don’t seem to be as tangential to the event Chaplin is describing because they pose as the actual anecdotes and stories he told during that same event. The result is that the reader not only receives seemingly private information through the digression itself, but also believes him or herself to be privy to the telling of these stories at the same moment in time that they were shared with Chaplin’s lofty company. While the strategy of digression works well to reveal the private behind the public—a goal important for promoting the texts’ authenticity—Chaplin’s particular method enlarges upon this strategy by promoting a “reader-as-traveling-companion” situation as well.

57 My assumption that these anecdotes only pose as the actual stories Chaplin told at these events is based solely on the fact that they were additions to the original drafts. They could indeed have been the stories Chaplin told on those occasions, if he, in fact, told stories at all. More important to my analysis is the how they function in the narrative—as revelations of seemingly private information.
Digressions in “CSTW” are not restricted to childhood and other personal memories. Chaplin uses the strategy to reveal his political and social consciousness as well. In the aforementioned evening with Einstein and his family, Chaplin’s digression (added in a subsequent draft from a typescript entitled “Depression #1”) is presented in the travel narrative simply as a conversation between Einstein and Chaplin about the economic situation in Europe and the problem of the gold standard:

“Only the other day I was speaking to a prominent business man who said England never thought she could pay her national debt after the Battle of Waterloo because of the lack of trade. But steam came along and started new industries. Then electricity developed and put men back to work. ‘Depressions come periodically,’ he insisted, ‘but new enterprises crop up like the automobile industry or radio and solve the problem.’”

Professor Einstein listened attentively and I was encouraged to hold forth. […] (II.17).

This passage not only reveals a private conversation to the reader between Chaplin and Albert Einstein, but also reveals Chaplin’s social and economic consciousness. Even though the conversation may be fabricated, the reader is persuaded that he or she is privy to a few moments of Chaplin’s private life and so, is better convinced that the narrative he or she is reading is reliable and authentic.

A travel narrative that is constructed in the manner of a collage can promote a perceived immediacy—that its haphazard construction is strong evidence that it was compiled quickly—and/or it can reveal private information, depending, of course, on the content of the parts of the collage. Collage-like construction is an attribute of the travel
narrative that also has a long history. Returning once again to Kinglake’s *Eothen*, Hogarth notes in his introduction that “more than one critic has seen haphazard arrangement [...] in the book” (xx). Hogarth, instead of seeing this as a fault of the book, chooses to note instead the art involved in the process:

> It is possible, indeed probable, that the book, as we have it, is a mosaic of passages written and rewritten separately, and arranged and rearranged during nine years to produce the most brilliant, compelling and harmonious effect within Kinglake’s power: but, if so it be, all the more honour to the artist for a result in which his art is so concealed by art as in *Eothen*. (xxi)

Collage-like construction in the travel narrative, though, is more than just the construction of a “whole” out of easily discernible parts. It can also give the narrative the appearance and tenor of a scrapbook in which unrelated materials are arranged in a way meaningful to the author. Robert Byron’s *The Road to Oxiana* (1937) is an example of this technique, one Paul Fussell claims Byron was moving toward even in his earlier book, *The Station: Athos, Treasures and Men* (1928). Calling it “potpourri style” instead of collage-like construction, Fussell explains Byron’s process in *The Road to Oxiana*:

> It gathers and arranges the most heterogeneous rhetorical materials, juxtaposing them, like the elements of a collage, without apparent reference to familiar traditional orders. Here we find newspaper clippings, public signs and notices, official forms, letters, “diary entries,” essays on current politics, lyric passages (virtual “odes” in prose), historical and archaeological dissertations, brief travel narratives (usually of comic-
awful delays and disasters), and—the triumph of the book—at least twenty superb comic dialogues, some of them virtually playlets, with stage directions and “musical” scoring. (Introduction x)

W. H. Auden and Louis MacNeice’s *Letters from Iceland* (1937) is another carefully constructed example of the technique. Auden, in Part 1 of his *Letter to Lord Byron*, a poem that threads its way through the narrative, explains his use of the collage technique:

Every exciting letter has enclosures,
And so shall this—a bunch of photographs,
Some out of focus, some with wrong exposures,
Press cuttings, gossip, maps, statistics, graphs;
I don’t intend to do the thing by halves.
I’m going to be very up to date indeed.

It is a collage that you’re going to read. (21)

Marsha Bryant asserts that Auden “revises High Modernist collage” in this narrative (115). Instead of using collage to exclude, Auden uses it as “a necessary and accessible way of representing the external world” (115) to the average reader. In Bryant’s reading, then, Auden is more concerned with writing for the masses than in authenticating his narrative, although his inclusion of artifacts from his journey must accomplish this task as well.

Chaplin and his ghostwriter use the collage technique, albeit not to the same extent as either Byron or Auden and MacNeice. In *MTA*, for example, the ghostwriter includes excerpts from what seem to be actual fan letters delivered to Chaplin’s suite of rooms at
the Ritz Carlton in London. In the chapter entitled “A Memorable Night in London,” the last two pages have letters printed in the text in a smaller print, complete with their initial salutation—a procedure that suggests that these are the actual letters published here verbatim. One example reads:

Dear Charlie,--Have you ever thought of the money to be made in peanuts? I know the peanut industry, but I am not telling any of my business in a letter. If you are interested I becoming a peanut king, then I’m your man. Just address me as Snapper Dodge, above address. (78)

The letters included were probably selected because of their humorous content, but they also allow the reader to experience the illusion of reading Chaplin’s private mail in some sense. Other “personal” texts included within the larger travel narrative MTA include cablegrams, poems and song lyrics. While these artifacts amount to a very small part of the narrative as a whole, they do play an important role in establishing the authenticity of the text by revealing private information.

Chaplin himself continues this practice in “CSTW” and, in fact, seems to copy one of the letters his ghostwriter reveals in MTA very closely in this text. The letter as revealed in MTA is paraphrased by the narrator, rather than printed in its original form. Chaplin relates that “one young soldier sent me four medals he had gotten during the big war. He said that he was sending them because I had never been properly recognized. His part was so small and mine so big, he said, that he wanted me to have his Croix de Guerre, his regimental and other medals” (78). In “CSTW,” Chaplin gives a similar letter more prominence in his text by making it the only personal letter he reveals:
On my return to the hotel I received the following, an anonymous letter which a friend translated for me:

“Dear Sir: Allow me to thank you for all the happiness you have given this sad old world. I have read an announcement that you are to be decorated. During the war I myself was given the Legion of Honor, and now I give it to you, having no further use for it, as I’ve only a little while to live. By the time you receive this I shall probably have passed on. It is my express desire that you keep it as a token of my appreciation for all the good you have done humanity. There is no one more worthy to wear it than yourself.”

I was deeply impressed. (II.106)

The fact that these two very similar letters appear in both travel narratives suggests that their contents allowed them to reveal something to the reader that was especially important to Chaplin’s publicity agenda. Chaplin was often lambasted for being anti-war, but especially for not serving in World War I as a British soldier. By revealing these sorts of “personal” letters, Chaplin and his publicists may have hoped to appease some of that criticism. Presented as authentic personal letters included within the text of a genre of writing perceived as memoir-like and therefore “true” in some sense, these letters worked in two ways: 1) to subtly transmit the message that Chaplin’s work was valued

---

58 In Maland’s *Chaplin and American Culture*, he describes under a subheading “Chaplin the ‘Slacker’?” Chaplin’s reputation problems during World War I having to do with military service. Maland relates that “as a prominent movie star from 1915 on and a young British male eligible for the draft, Chaplin inevitably drew the attention of some citizens. As early as his Keystone days, Chaplin began to be criticized in England for not being in uniform and fighting for his country. In addition to receiving threatening letters, some enclosing white feathers (a symbol of ‘slackers’ during World War I), Chaplin was also the target of occasional public attacks. In an effort to defuse the antagonism he had aroused, Chaplin contributed money to the British cause” (36).
by the average heroic foot-soldier and therefore, possessed a level of importance comparable to serving and 2) to authenticate Chaplin’s travel narratives. The inclusion of Chaplin’s private letters help to provide the narratives authenticity by acting as referents, i.e., they provide tangible evidence that the story Chaplin relates in the text is valid.

This letter isn’t the only insert-material Chaplin incorporates into the narrative of “CSTW.” As in MTA, song lyrics are included also--songs from Chaplin’s boyhood in London. These songs are markers (in MacCannell’s definition of the term) Chaplin brings with him as he walks through his old neighborhood and their words mediate his experience of old landmarks:

Why did I leave my little back room in Bloomsbury,
Where I could live on a pound a week in luxury—
These old songs have their associations and a flood of memories surges through my mind. The streets are deserted and there is a slight mist. The houses are just visible in outline. (I.80)

Acting as markers for him, these lyrics become signposts of a different sort for the reader—signposts of authenticity. By singing these lyrics to the reader in the text of the narrative, Chaplin reveals something about his private life, for favorite songs can offer information about tastes and desires which may not be offered by Chaplin’s narrative alone. Just these two lines suggest regret at the passing of time or the leaving of the familiar. They may suggest a deep-felt homesickness that seems to confirm Chaplin’s constant haunting of his old neighborhood on foot in these narratives. However the reader interprets them, the lyrics seem to offer a glimpse into Chaplin’s personal life that lends authenticity to the narrative.
The final requirement of Dyer’s rhetoric of authenticity for publicity texts is that they promote a perceived lack of control. Once again, Joshua Gamson’s theory of the celebrity-encounter game and Dean MacCannell’s theory of the tourist-attraction encounter can be correlated to allow me to demonstrate a perception of lack of control in Chaplin’s travel narratives by locating evidence of this phenomenon in the texts. To recap, Gamson’s theory demonstrates that the celebrity encounter game is composed of three stages: 1) identification of the star, 2) excitement in occupying the same space as the star (in real life)—a ritualistic component, and 3) documentation of the encounter through photos or other trophies (139). Once again, MacCannell proposes a theory in his *The Tourist* which correlates closely to Gamson’s celebrity-encounter game—the ritualistic performance of the sightseer in the presence of the tourist attraction (135). In this theory of behavior, the tourist recognizes the sight, shares and compares his marker or markers of the sight with others (ritual aspect) and finally, documents the sight through photographs or consumption of replicas or reproductions. Also, as I will show in Chaplin’s travel narratives as I have shown for Dickens and Stein, the celebrity author’s travel narrative is the only instance in which the celebrity author/tourist attraction can relate the experience of the encounter from his or her own perspective.

Chaplin’s arrival back in London in 1921 was celebrated by thousands of admirers. As David Robinson relates, “all London seemed to be in the grip of a Chaplin fever” (*Chaplin: Mirror* 55). A caption to a Wide World rotogravure photo dated September 29, 1921 states that “Chaplin was besieged by a welcoming crowd of many thousands [...]. Crowds estimated at from fifty to a hundred thousand fought to get near him” (n.pag.). Charles Maland notes also that “like his European tour in 1921, Chaplin drew huge
crowds on his 1931 trip whenever his arrival in a new city was made public” (128). Both 
MTA and “CSTW,” then, contain multiple accounts of Chaplin’s experiences as a 
celebrity/tourist attraction, demonstrating his lack of control in these situations in the 
process.

The narrator of MTA (Chaplin, ostensibly), relates one such experience in the episode 
in which Chaplin arrives in Southampton where large crowds wait to see him, hear him 
and take away some sort of trophy from the experience:

There are lots of men, women, and children gathered about. I am 
introduced to the children. I am whirled around into the crowd, and when 
I turn back I can’t quite make out who is the mayor. There seems to be a 
roomful of mayors. Eventually I am dug from behind. I turn. I am 
whirled back by friendly or official assistance. Ah, here is the mayor. […] 
I am shaking hands mechanically with everybody. From all sides 
autograph albums are being shoved under my nose. Carl is warding them 
off, protecting me as much as possible. (41)

In this passage the reader sees a narrative expression of the celebrity-encounter game cum 
tourist-attraction encounter. The crowd has been alerted that this is Charlie Chaplin, the 
physical embodiment of the beloved Little Tramp. He stands recognized before them. 
The whirling about and the overall confusion described in the scene identify the moment 
of excitement the crowd ritualistically experiences while occupying his space and also 
Chaplin’s lack of control in his experience of the situation. Finally, they must document 
the event with handshakes or autographs. In fact, MTA can be considered a record of 
this behavior as the public encountered Chaplin throughout this first tour. Similar
experiences occurred wherever he was recognized, even in America before he has officially started his journey. Chaplin recounts his experience, for example, attending Douglas Fairbanks’ premiere showing of *The Three Musketeers* (1921) in New York City a day or two before Chaplin’s departure for Europe. I include this episode here to show a variation on the documentation requirement of the celebrity-encounter game that I have not uncovered in the other texts analyzed for this project. Recognized as a member of Fairbanks’s and Mary Pickford’s party, Chaplin is pushed, shoved and accidentally punched by a policemen in the crowd’s excitement at this encounter. All that is left of the “game,” as Gamson calls it, is documentation. Chaplin relates:

> I felt a draught. I heard machinery. I looked down. A woman with a pair of scissors was snipping a piece from the seat of my trousers. Another grabbed my tie and almost put an end to my suffering through strangulation. My collar was next. But they only got half of that.
> My shirt was pulled out. The buttons torn from my vest. My feet trampled on. My face scratched. But I still retained the smile, “prop” one though it was. (11)

In this passage, the Chaplin “sightseers” are not satisfied with simple handshakes and autographs. The excitement in this instance has reached a level of frenzy in which violent action against the attraction comes into play. The crowd must document the encounter by forcefully collecting actual pieces of him—of his clothes—in behavior that has morphed from simple documentation to a kind of consumption.
In “CSTW” there are similar episodes recounted. Chaplin, ten years later and ten years more adept at dealing with his status as celebrity/tourist attraction, seems less anxious in these now familiar situations:

London at last! There is an enormous crowd at the station. As I get out I face a battery of fresh cameras. The police are trying to keep the crowds back. They are frenzied with excitement and I am enjoying it all. We are being carried along in the crush and they are all pushing and shoving. But I love it! It feels like an affectionate embrace. (I: 10)

In this episode, the reader recaptures the magnitude of the phenomenon through the reaction of Chaplin’s companions as well: “I turn to look at Ralph [Barton]. There are tears in his eyes. Good heavens! If he starts that I’ll be doing it also” (I: 10). Chaplin’s own reaction is less clear. As celebrity/sight, he still appears disoriented, although the fear expressed in MTA (if it was at all authentic) is absent:

My own emotions are mixed. I have an intense feeling of joy and pity that leaves a vacuum under my ribs. I sit back in the car telling myself that I am in London—telling myself that ten years have intervened since my last visit. But too much is going on within me to fully drink in the realization of it. Things all appear two-dimensional. My impressions are surfaces. I sit back, numbed with excitement. (I: 10)

Chaplin’s use of “two-dimensional,” “impressions are surfaces,” and “numbed with excitement,” for instance, indicate a situation for him outside of the norm and the usual and so, he feels both joyful and pitiful and therefore, not in control of either the situation or his reaction to it.
The extent to which Chaplin was considered a touristic sight is emphasized by an examination of private collections of documentation “trophies.” For this analysis, I have examined a collection compiled by Josephine Percy (see Figure 13), a British woman spending her holiday on the French Riviera during the summer of 1931. Percy’s only narrative of the experience, and therefore, of encountering Chaplin, exists in the form of short captions on the backs of photos in the collection. It is clear even from these brief texts Chaplin’s attractive powers as a touristic sight. The photos document the fact that she comes upon him on the beach at Juan-les-Pins in the same way that a tourist encounters a waterfall in the deep forest. In the first photograph (Figure 14), the viewer sees a small and indistinct figure in the background of the photo—Chaplin lying face-down on a blanket on the sand next to his partner at the time, May Reeves. The three waving figures in the front of the photo are the “forest” in this analogy. With each photo, Percy moves closer and closer to Chaplin, first shooting he and Reeves still in the darkened background but no longer concealed by the “forest” (Figure 15), and then alone, being “identified” (awakened from a nap) by a male leaning down over his blanket (Figure 16). Chaplin’s face has not yet been shown in these photos; a positive “ID” has not taken place. Finally, (for this particular series of shots) several photos show Chaplin sitting upright, smiling his prop smile affably for Percy and her camera (Figures 17 and 18). One photo even documents her documentation of the encounter, as it shows Percy snapping a photo of a posing Chaplin (Figure 19). Other photos demonstrate that Percy continued to seek out and document Chaplin after this initial encounter. She shot four photos of Chaplin clowning on a boat (Figures 20-23), another photo on the beach on a different day (Figure 24), a photo of Chaplin dressed for dinner and walking along the
beach on St. Honorat (Figure 25), and finally, one of Chaplin dressed for dinner and standing on a city street on the Riviera (Figure 26). The final photo is even “notarized” in a way, because it is inscribed with Chaplin’s autograph as well.

Figure 13. Josephine Percy

Figure 14. “C. in the b.g. lying down”
Figure 15. “Charlie and his guardian angel, though a very dark one.”

Figure 16. “Charlie lying down”
Figure 17. Chaplin posing at Juan-les-Pins

Figure 18. “Entitled by C. C. himself, ‘The South Sea Islander.’ He was very amused when he saw it. Posed for me only.”
Figure 19. “A friend took this whilst I was snapping Charlie—is proof that I took the picture.”

Figure 20. “C. tired out”
Figure 21. “Oh, my arms!”

Figure 22. “That wretched arthritis again!”
Figure 23. Chaplin on boat, Juan-les-Pins

Figure 24. “Taking a lesson in the theory of swimming by the invisible stranger, or?”
Figure 25. “On Isle St. Honorat. Those mosquitoes!”

Figure 26. Chaplin on the French Riviera, signed
In addition, many of the photos are inscribed on the reverse with short captions that indicate a certain familiarity with Chaplin. Figure 6 is inscribed with these telling lines: “Entitled by C. C. himself, ‘The South Sea Islander.’ He was very amused when he saw it. Posed for me only.” The verb “to pose” which Percy uses in this caption not only suggests the artifice involved in the composition of this photograph, but, more interestingly, makes an important correlation between the Chaplin in the photo and the physical attitude of an inanimate figure on a stone monument, in a sculpture or painting. Not only is Percy documenting her encounter with Chaplin the celebrity/tourist attraction here by taking a photograph, but also Chaplin himself becomes an inanimate “attraction” through his posing. Percy’s remark “for me only” suggests also that the photo allows her to own a piece of Chaplin in a sense. This particular photograph, a document of a unique moment in time, allows Percy to consume Chaplin in the same way as the fans in New York City who snipped pieces of Chaplin’s clothes.

Percy labels these photos August 1931 and in so doing, reveals that she has captured Chaplin during his final days on the Riviera that summer. The remainder of Percy’s collection suggests that she felt compelled to extend the effects of Chaplin’s aura, however, because she began to collect newspaper articles and photos of Chaplin as he continued his tour of Europe and Asia. The last newspaper photos she collected were of Chaplin in Egypt (he visited Cairo on March 20, 1932). Although these artifacts were never compiled formally, they make up a sort of Chaplin scrapbook. Just as in Chaplin’s travel narratives, the insert-material—the elements of the scrapbook—act as important referents. In Percy’s case, the elements of the scrapbook are referents of her encounters with him and thereby certify them as historical fact. These artifacts also provide
important extra-textual evidence suggesting the lasting power of the aura of the celebrity-as-touristic-sight and the authenticity of Chaplin’s accounts of such encounters in each of his travel narratives.

Finally, travel narratives written by publicly celebrated authors, such as those by Dickens, Stein, and Chaplin share a unique situation that cannot be quantified by Dyer’s tripartite theory. Unlike other travel writers, these celebrity authors had alternative versions of the episodes of their tours (i.e., referents) printed in the media at the time of those tours and in other celebrity memoirs in the years following them. These referents serve as easily-accessible verifiers of the information within the narratives and as such work as extra-textual rhetorical strategies that provide an authenticity not available to other travel narratives. Chaplin, unlike Dickens or Stein, capitalized on this phenomenon by including excerpts of actual articles in “CSTW”—an especially successful strategy because it becomes a case of actually bringing the referent itself into the narrative so that it can do its authentication work immediately, rather than relying on the reader to seek the referent him or herself, outside of the text of the narrative—work that the reader may or may not do. Quoting from an article that covers a day of his visit to St. Moritz, Switzerland in one example, Chaplin is able to brag about his newfound skiing expertise using someone else’s words:

However, dear readers, ‘twas not ever thus, for later I became—but there, modesty forbids, so I shall quote from the newspaper, the *South Wales Argus*:

“People at St. Moritz were electrified to see a small man go tearing down a steep village street at a terrific speed, to pull up suddenly at the door of
his hotel. He was Charles Chaplin, film clown, says Reuter’s correspondent. Perhaps there were painful memories of misadventures with the hotel revolving door that made him stop so sharply. Skiing experts declare that this dash was a very fine achievement. Charlie, in fact, is becoming an adept on skis.” (IV.38)

In this passage, under the pretext of modesty, Chaplin inserts the words of the Reuter’s correspondent into his narrative, thereby claiming their veracity as his own. Hayden White would see such referents as evidence that these celebrity travel narratives can be deemed “historical” and therefore of unquestionable authenticity:

In order to qualify as “historical” an event must be susceptible to at least two narrations of its occurrence. Unless at least two versions of the same set of events can be imagined, there is no reason for the historian to take upon himself the authority of giving the true account of what really happened. The authority of the historical narrative is the authority of reality itself; the historical account endows this reality with form and thereby makes it desirable, imposing upon its processes the formal coherency that only stories possess. (19)

With this added distinction, then, I argue that the celebrity author travel narrative has the capacity to at least give the illusion of being the most “historical” and authentic of travel narratives—a paradoxical assertion indeed, considering the elaborate staging inherent in most publicity schemes.
Chapter 5

Seeing Stars: The Role of the Visual Text in a Promotional Agenda

Photographs are not an argument; they are simply a crude statement of fact addressed to the eye. But the eye is connected with the brain; the brain with the nervous system. That system sends its messages in a flash through every past memory and present feeling. --Virginia Woolf, *Three Guineas*

The evidence I have presented in this investigation so far has been limited to the verbal rhetoric employed in Chaplin’s two travel narratives, but because Chaplin was a film artist and, therefore, primarily a visual one, ignoring the visual elements of the travel narratives would result in an incomplete investigation of the rhetorical artistry of the works, at least in terms of their success as promotional vehicles. Also, a dismissal of the narratives’ visual elements would preclude an important link between them and related strategies of high modernists, such as those of T. S. Eliot and James Joyce. In this chapter, then, I will first discuss aspects of the current theoretical scholarship on the photograph that will inform my analysis. Then I will analyze Joyce and Eliot’s respective uses of the photograph to show that, like Chaplin, they all capitalize on the relationship between what Roland Barthes terms the denotative and connotative levels of meaning in the photograph in order to conflate their public personae with their mythological ones. I will bring Chaplin into this analysis initially through a brief discussion of his use of the publicity portrait in general and then through his use of the photograph and illustration in *MTA* and “CSTW.” In this final section of the chapter, I will analyze a selection of photographs and illustrations from Chaplin’s narratives to elucidate the ways in which these elements confirm and extend: 1) the narratives’ verbal rhetoric of authenticity, 2) Chaplin’s status as a celebrity author/tourist attraction, and 3) the conflation of Chaplin’s public persona with that of the Little Tramp.
Roland Barthes delineates three levels of meaning for the photographic image in his book *Image-Music-Text* that will inform my analysis in this chapter: 1) linguistic, 2) denotative and 3) connotative. The linguistic level Barthes believes to be present for every image—“as title, caption, accompanying press article, film dialogue, comic strip balloon” (38) and attempts to “fix” the floating chain of signifieds of the photographic message by identifying “purely and simply the elements of the scene and the scene itself” (39). Because the relationship the caption has with its photograph is often neither very pure or simple, I will selectively examine the caption (the linguistic message) as it colors the reading of Chaplin’s photographs and illustrations in his two travel narratives. However, because many of the captions for “CSTW” are quotes pulled from the body of the narrative that I have analyzed in previous chapters, my main focus for this chapter will be the denotative and connotative levels of meaning. The denotative message is the one that allows the photograph its semblance of truth-value. Barthes calls this level both the denotative and the literal; it is one in which the relationship of the signifieds to the signifiers is one of “recording”; “the scene is there, captured mechanically, not humanly (the mechanical is here a guarantee of objectivity)” (44). The denotative level of meaning allows the photographs included in Chaplin’s narratives to achieve both the first and second tasks listed above—1) confirm the rhetoric of authenticity in the written text of the narrative and 2) confirm Chaplin’s status as celebrity/tourist attraction. With the power of this level of meaning, the photographs become referents and thereby allow the narratives to seem believable as historical factual accounts. The final level of meaning for Barthes is the connotative or symbolic. This level guarantees not one reading, but infinite readings that vary according to the individual reader. Susan Sontag provides a
clear definition of the connotative message of the photograph, explaining that “any photograph has multiple meanings; indeed, to see something in the form of a photograph is to encounter a potential object of fascination. […] Photographs, which cannot themselves explain anything, are inexhaustible invitations to deduction, speculation, and fantasy” (23). It is this level of meaning, the connotative level, that is the hardest to manipulate for either the model or the photographer. Both Joyce and Eliot used the photograph selectively in their careers as a subtle marketing strategy for their written work; therefore, each relied on the relationship between the denotative message of the photographs, which provided evidence of the author’s physical body, and the connotative message, which worked to project an image of the living author as the embodiment of his better-known mythos. In essence, then, this marketing agenda is very similar to Chaplin’s for both the verbal and visual texts that make up the travel narratives: to conflate his public persona with his better-known and more beloved filmic one.

James Joyce finally subjected himself to the game of publicity through photography in 1939, late in his life and career. Perhaps he felt, as Anthony Burgess suggests, that the realm of the visual was just not a place he would ever feel comfortable:

Joyce was so little of a visual writer that he created characters one can hardly see, though one can hear them vividly enough. None of his main characters are described: they are voices, though not disembodied ones, Leopold and Molly Bloom are, God knows, fleshy enough: Bloom can be weighed and measured, but he discloses no image in any mirror. (7)

Only the dire situation surrounding the publication of *Finnegans Wake* persuaded Joyce to enter this world. Photographer Gisèle Freund suggested to Joyce through a
mutual friend (Louis Gillet) that a photo essay might greatly assist the distribution of his new book. She explains in her photo-autobiography, though, that “he had very definite ideas on how he wanted to be presented to the world press” (117). He appears to have wanted to present himself, first and foremost, as a great author, so he selected settings and poses for himself and his chosen companions that achieved this end. Never looking directly into the camera lens itself, Joyce achieves in Freund’s photos the effect of being caught in the act—a sort of candor that lends the images a sense of authenticity. As Linda Haverty Rugg suggests, candor is not an attribute possessed by a particular photo, but instead it “takes place between the image and its eventual viewer; the image is candid as image toward its viewer, or at least it has the appearance of being so. It is the image that pretends an honesty about what it captured: ‘This is an unposed snippet of reality’” (54). Freund explains Joyce’s agenda in achieving this sort of candor and thereby, an authentic authorial persona—a mythological identity he had helped to create for himself over the preceding years of his career:

He telephoned his friend and personal advisor Eugene Jolas, publisher of the review *transition*, and asked him to come over the next day so that I could take them together, correcting the proofs of the book. He also wanted me to take a series of photographs in Sylvia Beach’s bookshop, Shakespeare and Company, with Adrienne [Monnier]—not for old time’s sake, but for practical purposes. Joyce knew that English and American readers associated him with Sylvia, who had so courageously published *Ulysses* in 1922, while French readers knew that Adrienne had published the book in its French translation. We decided to end the story with
pictures of Joyce at home, surrounded by his wife, son, and grandson—the human side of this great writer [...]. (118)

Although Freund assumes some responsibility for the last venue of the shoot in the final sentence of this passage by using the pronoun “we,” the overall impression she gives is that Joyce had a definite plan for his only publicly disseminated photo-essay. Freund’s photos appeared in both *Time* and *Life* magazine in the spring of 1939.

Maurizia Boscagli and Enda Duffy assert that Joyce’s appearance on the cover of *Time* as what they call “a highly conventional centered subject” (133) is especially problematic for a “great modernist writer and archpriest of high art” who “worked in his writing to disrupt and delegitimize the notion of a concrete and unified modern subject; through bricolage constructions from Molly to Bloom to HCE, he fashioned instead complex models of multiply interpellated and fragmented subject effect” (133). In the second part of their argument, Boscagli and Duffy, agree that Joyce considered the photo-essay “primarily as an advertisement” (146) and therefore “did want to pose as a star” (147) within it. However, they insist that this strategy remained a painful one for Joyce, who “deprived of his voice, [...] merely ‘makes a spectacle’ of himself in order to sell. In the very images that are supposed ‘to tell,’ Joyce is condemned to silence, and confined to the dangerous position of the author turned commodity in a system of exchange” (151). Boscagli and Duffy insist that Joyce’s tentativeness in assuming this position is evident in the photos themselves: “His pictures are both self-revelatory and self-denying, showing the image of a man faking his self, and at the same time jealous of the fiction he has authored. This is signified by the way in which Joyce averts his eyes
from the camera, in an attempt to negate his state as the object of the photographic gaze” (151).

I agree with Boscagli and Duffy that although he has failed to portray himself in these portraits as a decentered modernist subject, Joyce does project an image in line with the image of the cosmopolitan dandified author that had become a widely accepted, sort of mythological persona for him. In the *Time* photo essay cover portrait, for instance, Joyce is pictured in color, allowing the viewer to see not just the texture of the fine plush smoking jacket he wears as he examines the proofs of *Finnegans Wake*, but its rich burgundy-red color. His slender, delicate fingers are bedecked with ornate rings and while the well-groomed hair is now gray and his characteristic stoop more pronounced (Joyce was to die just two years later), the photo provides the viewer the very image his reader conjures up for him today, for his “stylized silhouette—round glasses, spare moustache, sleek hair combed back” (Boscagli and Duffy 157) has become as much of a trademark as his writing style.

T. S. Eliot, on the other hand, embraced the power of his image and its reproduction throughout his career. Again, although the concept of the author as commodity seems counter to high modernist philosophy, Eliot had no reservation about maximizing the power of this strategy for himself. As Nuzhat Bukhari relates, Eliot’s portraits became an occasion for him “to make cameo appearances in publications as diverse as *Vogue*, the *Bookman*, *Harper’s Bazaar*, *Punch*, the *Sunday Times*, *Picture Post*, *Time*, the *Dial*, and *Boston Evening Transcript*, with cultural contexts and audiences that far exceeded purely literary ones” (380). He may have embraced the practice more readily than Joyce, but like him, Eliot was interested in exerting some control over the image he projected.
Photographer Patrick Heron relates Eliot’s “method” as it played out in one sitting in the Faber and Faber office (a preferred venue):

Once, during one of our sittings [...] he volunteered: ‘I am now focusing again on the same chimney pot. But that of course does not guarantee the angle of my head.’ Only a professional model would have had such a conscious awareness of the physical position of his own head. I realized at that moment that Eliot’s genius extended far beyond the sphere of the verbal. Obviously he was as aware of the form in space, which was his own body slanted in that tiny room, as a sculptor might have been. (34)

Bukhari argues that what Eliot reveals in his portraits is, in fact, his own role in creating his image—his visual persona. However, unlike Joyce’s, Eliot’s persona is true to the decentered modernist subject; according to Bukhari, his images “continuously dissolve and re-form, becoming almost a pictorial counterpart to his allusive and protean poetics” (379). Cecil Beaton’s photos of Eliot taken in 1956, “reflect[ ] him both as an eminent critic and imaginative artist” (Bukhari 383), for instance, while George Platt Lynes’s 1947 portraits depict a more profound, magisterial Eliot, one evincing a certain psychological tension (Bukhari 415). The Cecil Beaton photo featured in Bukhari’s essay (380) is the most enigmatic of the photos she includes and therefore perhaps supports her thesis the most forcefully. Beaton aims his camera lens up at Eliot, and due to this odd angle captures the glare of Eliot’s glasses with only the faint image of eyes behind them. The effect is to create a daydreaming, imagining sort of Eliot. The viewer can’t see his eyes and so, they appear to stare at nothing—and possibly everything. His

59 This photo is labeled “T. S. Eliot, Black and White Photographs, Faber & Faber office, 1956, Sothebys.”
familiar slicked-back hair is not as prominent here due to the unusual angle. In other words, he is nearly unrecognizable and as such has assumed a shape unfamiliar to his audience, “a pictorial counterpart to his allusive and protean poetics” (379) as Bukhari suggests. What is most prominent in the photo (only the top half of Eliot’s body is portrayed here) is Eliot’s hands which loom large and out of focus at the center front of the photograph. Their fuzziness suggests movement; these are perhaps hands more comfortable writing or editing rather than resting primly atop the file cabinet, one clasping the wrist of the other. His hands, being so prominent in the photo, become a sort of metonym for the persona he wishes to project.

One of the oldest tools for film celebrity promotion is the formal photographic portrait, usually disseminated in the form of 5” X 7” fan photos sent gratis on request as well as published by the media. This tradition made its way to the publicity departments of Hollywood studios from the stage where cabinet photos and carte-de-visites were the first affordable type of photographs and as such brought photography and the owning/collecting of photographs to the masses. First patented by Disdéri in 1854 in France, CDVs were, as John Tagg relates, “paper prints from glass negatives, mounted on card and produced by use of a special camera with several lenses and a moving plate holder. With such a camera, eight or more images could be taken on one plate and the prints from it cut up to size” (48).
suggests otherwise. Chaplin sat for Edward Steichen twice, once in 1925 and again in
1931—both times for *Vanity Fair* magazine and both times in New York when Chaplin
was in the city to promote a film. Although such sittings were requirements of life as a
film celebrity, Steichen insists that Chaplin exhibited unfamiliarity and lack of ease in his
particular studio, relating that for the 1925 sitting Chaplin was delivered to his studio by
his secretary (probably Carlyle Robinson) and then put himself completely in Steichen’s
hands for the shoot itself:

> When we got in the studio and started to arrange the lights, he froze. I
dismissed my assistants and tried to work alone with him, but nothing
happened. Finally Chaplin said, “You know, I can’t just sit still. I have to
be doing something. Then I’m all right.” […]

Then I started to talk to him about his films, and as I waxed enthusiastic
about *The Gold Rush*, the film he had just released, he loosened up and
became enthusiastic in turn. I called the men in and in a few minutes I had
a half-dozen portraits of Chaplin relaxed and himself, the image of a
dancing faun. (n. pag.)

Steichen offers here an account of a Chaplin who has no particular agenda in terms of
what sort of image he hopes to project in the portraits. Yet, as “himself,” or who
Steichen believes him to be, Chaplin is “the image of a dancing faun”—in other words,
the Little Tramp. In fact, the two portraits from these sessions Steichen published in
*Vanity Fair* achieve a conflation of Chaplin’s public persona with the Little Tramp within
the photo itself more than any of his other formal portraits. The 1925 portrait shown in
Figure 27, for instance, denotes Chaplin in street clothes, but its composition works to
achieve a conflation of his two personae through its connotative message. The cane and hat are not those of the Little Tramp, but Chaplin’s posture in the photo is. The shadow cast by his diminutive figure (made smaller by the large amount of dark background which frames him) looms large and menacing over Chaplin, almost overtaking him. In this shadow the viewer sees the typical posture of the Little Tramp (hand on hip), the outline of the hat (here unidentifiable as to its type) and the curly hair that becomes exaggerated in size and shape by the shadow. The white background becomes a movie screen and Chaplin’s own body reflects the image of his film creation upon it.

Figure 27. *Introducing Mr. Charles Spencer Chaplin* by Edward Steichen
Despite Steichen’s account, it is hard to believe that Chaplin, the master self-promoter, would have had no hand in the final product, especially considering his use of visual elements in the two travel narratives, as I will discuss later in this chapter. Perhaps Steichen’s version reflects only an artist’s territoriality over his own work. Like T. S. Eliot and James Joyce, it is more likely that Chaplin played a large role in shaping the image that emerges from his portraits, in order to “maintain[] a kind of ‘authorship’ of self-image” (Rugg 3). In accordance with Walter Benjamin’s conclusions in “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction,” they seem to understand that “one of the immediate dangers of the infinitely reproducible image is the loss of control over that image when it is released to the public” (Rugg 43).

In fact, Chaplin’s publicity machine used some of these formal photographic portraits in the original edition of *MTA* that was released in the United States in February 1922. In addition, the book contains both press photographs and film stills. There are twenty photos in all, twelve of which are press photographs of Chaplin out of costume, three are portraits (two in costume and one out of costume) and five are film stills that depict Chaplin in costume. My task in this section of the chapter will be to demonstrate the role each type of photograph played in the promotional ambition of the travel narratives.

*MTA* contains one formal portrait of Chaplin out of costume and two in costume as the Little Tramp. The denotative message of Chaplin’s portrait out of costume is that Chaplin exists (existed). Rugg reiterates the denotative message of the photograph in general: “photographs as evidence re-anchor the subject in the physical world, insisting on the verifiable presence of an embodied and solid individual” (2). In this role as
referent, the photographic portrait accomplishes its first task—as confirmation of the authenticity of the written text. This portrait seems to be a counter-text to the written narrative, because the Chaplin depicted in the photo doesn’t look like the film persona. This portrait (Figure 28), positioned opposite page 8, is one taken before Chaplin’s film career, probably in 1910 or shortly thereafter when he worked as a music hall comedian for the Karno Company in London. The linguistic message of the photograph, “As I Look When I Am Serious,” focuses on Chaplin’s dour expression. In this photo his hair is parted in the middle and slicked down on either side, thereby effectively hiding his trademark curls. He is hatless. His “serious” expression also provides a stark contrast to the light-hearted demeanor of the Little Tramp. In fact, this grave expression is further exaggerated by the dark Edwardian necktie he wears that makes him appear almost neckless. The connotative message of the photo, then, might be that this young man takes himself very seriously and that he is not the Little Tramp. Compared to one of the portraits depicting Chaplin in costume (Figure 29), found opposite page 126, the contrast is striking. Here Chaplin wears the trademark Little Tramp costume—derby hat, toothbrush moustache, conspicuously curly hair, ragged clothes (the viewer sees only a small portion of the shirt, vest and jacket). His expression is almost mischievous; his smile is a tentative one.
Figure 28. “As I Look When I Am Serious”

Figure 29. “My Favorite Close-Up”
While press photos of Chaplin out of costume are more numerous than those in costume, the familiar face of the Little Tramp—more familiar than Chaplin’s own—appears frequently enough to be useful to the conflation agenda. The concurrence of portraits of Chaplin both in and out of costume in the same volume, despite the formal portrait’s threat as possible counter-text, in fact, assists the efforts of the written text to rhetorically conflate Chaplin’s public persona with his filmic one. The stark contrast between the public Chaplin and the Little Tramp is one the reader is expecting. He or she has seen the public Chaplin in the papers, in magazines and in newsreels. The formal portrait of the serious young Chaplin assists the conflation achieved in the written narrative because it refers to the image of the public Chaplin, one who, as the written narrative insists, behaves, responds, thinks, acts and moves like the Little Tramp despite his physical contrast. The conflation is assisted not by a one-to-one correlation of the appearance of the public Chaplin with the Little Tramp, but by correspondences in behavior, movement and action between the two, for as I discussed in Chapter 2, a juxtaposition of verbal or visual images of Chaplin in and out of costume only reinforce the strategy of reversible metamorphoses employed in the films. The affluent Chaplin—the one out of costume—works simply as another role or shape into which the Little Tramp has temporarily metamorphosed.

The inclusion of film stills from Chaplin’s recent movies, such as *A Dog’s Life* (1918) and *The Kid* (1921) further this project quite effectively by keeping the image of the Little Tramp constantly within easy access. The cover design (Figure 30), however, is the element that brings these disparate images together on one page. A publicity portrait of Chaplin as the Little Tramp together with his dog from *A Dog’s Life* is featured in the
center position. Just below this image is a facsimile of Chaplin’s famous signature that is embellished with Chaplin’s own caricature of his film persona—a sort of sketched montage of the iconic elements, the shoes, the derby, the cane and the “important” elements of his expression—the eyebrows and moustache. This signature acts as a sort of authentification stamp on the work (it appears again just inside the front cover on the page facing the flyleaf). These central elements are then framed on each side by a section of fabricated filmstrip in which Chaplin can be seen out of costume at various venues on his tour. While it would have been possible to view the “real” Chaplin on film—in newsreels, for instance—the fabricated “film” depicted on MTA’s cover moves the public Chaplin to the Little Tramp’s home—the celluloid—thereby demonstrating yet again the facility with which each persona could move into the place of the other.

Figure 30. *My Trip Abroad* Cover Art
The most frequently used type of photograph in *MTA* is the press photograph. The press photograph is a special case partly because the photographer in most cases is unknown or not commissioned by the artist and, therefore, outside of the control of the subject being photographed. This allows the press photograph to be considered candid by the viewer, a fact that adds to the perceived authenticity of the image. The press photograph, more than the portrait, is evidence of the existence of a living body in a certain time and place. This is its denotative message. The press photographs chosen for *MTA* potentially provide evidence for three aspects of Chaplin’s narrative through their denotative objectivity. First, they act as referents for the actions and events detailed in the text of the narrative. Second, they help to provide evidence of Chaplin’s celebrity status both before and during the tour. And, third, they provide visual evidence of Chaplin as the celebrity author/tourist attraction. I have chosen three press photographs from the narrative to consider in this discussion. Figure 31 is a photograph of Chaplin in Berlin with a group of people at the Palais Heinroth. I have chosen this example because it is noteworthy for depicting Chaplin as a tourist visiting a celebrity/tourist attraction—here, German actress Pola Negri. This photograph provides evidence of Chaplin’s trip to Berlin and his meeting with German film star Pola Negri (thereby fulfilling the first criterion), and also supports his contention in the narrative that “They don’t know me here. I have never been heard of” (115). The photograph is unique because Chaplin is scarcely recognizable in it. Dressed in outerwear, he appears only at the right fringe of the photo with his face in shadow and wearing a somber expression. He is most recognizable, in fact, by the elements of the Little Tramp’s costume he has adopted as part of his public costume—the derby and the cane. Pola Negri (obviously the “star” of
this photo) is featured at the center of the photograph. Chaplin, positioned as he is away from her, is simply the tourist encountering the sight. His depiction as tourist in this photo contributes to the promotional agenda of the narrative, then, by providing visual evidence of Chaplin in this role.

![Figure 31. “I Meet the Beautiful Pola Negri in Berlin”](image)

Other press photos in *MTA* work to provide evidence of Chaplin’s celebrity status. One photo depicts Mutual Studios head John Freuler, Sydney Chaplin and Charlie signing his $670,000 contract in 1916 in New York City. Due to the fact that this event had nothing to do with the tour and occurred more than 5 years previous to it, its presence in the narrative can only be justified by its ability to prove Chaplin’s importance in the film industry, however gratuitous this may seem. Press photos depicting Chaplin in the company of other well-known figures such as H. G. Wells and boxer Georges Carpentier also effectively establish his position as celebrity of merit at least equivalent to theirs.
The press photo’s role in providing evidence of Chaplin as celebrity author/tourist attraction is especially important because it verifies this phenomenon as it is appears rhetorically in the written text, an element which then works to authenticate this text.\(^6\)

Figure 32, for example, shows Chaplin greeting the mayor of Southampton, England. The crowd of people jammed into the frame of the photograph—sightseers in the presence of Chaplin, the tourist attraction—represents Chaplin’s diverse audience, male, female, young and old. A nattily attired Chaplin stands hatless in the center of the photo, clasping the mayor’s hand in welcome. He looks at a seemingly boisterous individual standing just next to the mayor who, being open-mouthed and with hands outstretched, may represent the typical fan/tourist experiencing and sharing his excitement in the presence of others. Just barely visible near the bottom edge of the photo, Chaplin’s left hand (his dominant one) clasps tightly onto his cane—the only vestige of the Little Tramp in sight, but one that subtly evinces the ever-present link between the two. Two other press photographs depict Chaplin in similar situations on his tour. Repetition of such images, of course, enhances the power of any one image to lend credence to its denotative message.

\(^{6}\) See my discussion of the narratives’ rhetoric of authenticity in Chapter 4.
Figure 32. “I Am Welcomed by the Mayor of Southampton, England”

*MTA* had several foreign editions as well, and it is interesting to at least take note of the changes in the photographic texts included in some of them. The British version which came out shortly after the American one in 1922 featured a different formal portrait of Chaplin out of costume and this time, it is placed opposite the title page (the photo in this position in *MTA* is a press photograph of Chaplin waving from the ship). This one was taken in the 1920s, so would be a more up-to-date image of Chaplin, but like the young portrait in *MTA* it also features a serious Chaplin dressed formally in a black bowtie. The caption reads “Charlie as he is to his friends”—a linguistic message that not only refers to the body and viability of the man, but as Rugg suggests, helps to disrupt the division between the public and the private (37). This “private” image could then be compared to the very same headshot of the Little Tramp from *A Dog’s Life* as the one used in *MTA* (here positioned opposite page 96) with presumably the same effect—that despite contrasting appearances, the Chaplin of the narrative is the Chaplin of film.
The overall number of photos is less (only seven) and the film stills are all from Chaplin films that would have been well out of circulation at the time (none are from the current film *The Kid*). Also Chaplin includes a full-page reproduction of his caricature/autograph (featured twice in *MTA*) as a trademark of authenticity. Press photos are limited to ones that were taken on British soil and include familiar British figures such as Wells and Sir Philip Sassoon. The effect is that Chaplin’s social status is authenticated, but his position as celebrity author/tourist attraction is not. While there is no documentation available about why certain photos were included or not included, perhaps the editors decided that since the British had witnessed these scenes of adulation first-hand, there was no need to represent them again in the pages of the travel narrative.

The German and French editions, both published in 1928, have dropped the press photographs altogether and use only film stills (from films released well after the tour, but more contemporary to the release of the translations) and one or two portraits. The result for each of these translations is that there is no photographic evidence of Chaplin as either celebrity or tourist attraction, again perhaps due to the fact that these scenes had already been witnessed (or participated in) by the public there. Therefore, the photos included only work to demonstrate the contrast between the public and filmic personae.

The French edition, entitled *Mes Voyages*, contains the caricature/autograph once again, featured here opposite the title page, one still of Chaplin directing *The Gold Rush*, eleven stills from Chaplin’s film released in 1928, *The Circus*, two formal portraits of Chaplin taken “at home” in his house on Summit Drive in Beverly Hills in 1927, and two other photos depicting Chaplin iconography—one entitled “Les attributs de ‘Charlie’” (Figure 33) which include Chaplin’s derby, cane, floppy shoes and moustache arranged as if he
were wearing them, but without his body and the other a photo just of the floppy shoes. The portraits taken at Chaplin’s Beverly Hills mansion portray the same serious Chaplin as the one used in earlier editions, but here he is shown “at work” reading in one and standing proprietarily against his mantel in the other. Unlike the formal portraits used in earlier editions, the viewer is invited into Chaplin’s private space, his home, and there is depicted not just a serious Chaplin but a wealthy Chaplin--a refined and confident one. The furnishings are in the art nouveaux style with very dark fabrics and rich-looking patterns. Chaplin’s own double-breasted suit seems to be made of the finest material and of the current fashion. One connotative message of these portraits, as I have discussed earlier in this chapter, is that this affluent Chaplin is just another metamorphosis of the Little Tramp, one that he will inhabit only temporarily. In this reading, the public and filmic personae are not so much contrastive, then, as they are supportive to the conflation agenda of the narratives as a whole.

Figure 33. “Les attributs de ‘Charlie’”
The two photographs of the Little Tramp’s “props,” though, need to be considered more carefully. By removing Chaplin’s physical body, even in its guise as the Little Tramp, these photos make the same assertion as the one promoted by Chaplin’s portraits in and out of costume. The physical appearance of Chaplin’s body as a public person and as the Little Tramp is not as important to his audience\(^2\) as his behavior in either guise. The iconic status of his props—the fact that they are used as authenticating referents of the Little Tramp in the pages of Chaplin’s travel narrative—seems to indicate that any body could try them on. Chaplin’s challenge is to prove in the written text of the narrative that the props are his as much as they are the Little Tramp’s—that they fit him like a glove. It is up to the reader to fill the white spaces of this photo with Charlie Chaplin’s body and he/she will only be willing to do that—to be persuaded that the public Chaplin and the Little Tramp are linked—if the narratives achieve this conflation rhetorically as well.

Finally, the German edition, *Hallo, Europa!*, also mostly film stills, includes scenes from *The Gold Rush* (1925), *The Circus* (1928), and even *The Pilgrim* (1923). A formal portrait of Chaplin is also positioned opposite the title page and it is from the same sitting as the ones included in the French edition. The “caption” for this particular photo, though, is simply Chaplin’s autograph (no caricature)—a construction that not only works to authenticate the narrative itself, but the particular portrait it adorns. Like the French edition, the contrast of the formal portraits of Chaplin out of costume with his depiction as The Little Tramp in the film stills serve the agenda of the narrative to

---

\(^{62}\) This assertion is also supported by the large number of Chaplin impersonators who were and are successful in making a living by merely aping the Little Tramp’s behavior, posture, and actions.
conflates the two. The particular cover illustration for this edition also confirms this agenda by arranging the two characterizations (the public and filmic personae) together onto a collage of postcard-like images of European sights (Figure 34). This is the only image used that brings Chaplin, the Little Tramp, and travel/tourism into conversation with each other in this translation, an important achievement. The photos included inside this edition, including this formal portrait and all of the film stills, seem to be the same as a series of postcards released by Ross Verlag publishing (Berlin) at about the same time. The effect for the reader of the narrative might have been akin to that accomplished by the “grangerized” book. A grangerized book (named for Rev. James Granger (1723-76), the first to compile such an edition) is one for which photographic illustrations were collected and attached to the blank pages or parts of pages of a book by the reader, thereby making the composition of the book collaborative. The readers of the German edition of Chaplin’s narrative would not need to attach their own postcards to the book because the images already appeared there, but they might be moved to collect these same images outside of the experience of the book itself, thereby extending and enhancing their engagement with it and, of course, with Chaplin.

---

63 My nearly complete set of these postcards published in the late 1920s and early 1930s (Chaplin’s films were banned in Germany in 1933) is my source for this remark.
64 See Marcia Poynton’s *Hanging the Head: Portraiture and Social Formation in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1993) for information on James Granger and grangerized books, pages 53-78.
While the foreign editions of *MTA* show a considerable amount of variation in their choice of visual texts to include as part of the narrative, the consistency between narratives of juxtaposing images of the public Chaplin with his film persona the Little Tramp perhaps demonstrates the most important function of the photograph in the rhetorical agenda of the book: to inextricably link the two personae together. The success of the travel narrative as a promotional vehicle for Chaplin depended on the photographs working in complement with this agenda.

The visual components of “CSTW” have a commonality with those of *MTA* in that they include press photographs. However, the color illustration transplants the photograph in importance in this narrative. This privileging of illustrations over photographs may be due only to the philosophy and tradition of the *Woman’s Home*
A quick survey of other articles in the five issues in which Chaplin’s series appears shows that almost all of them used color or black and white illustrations exclusively. Due to this stark difference in visual components, my analysis must be modified to accommodate it. As Barthes explains, the drawing must be considered very differently from the photograph, for

the operation of the drawing (the coding) immediately necessitates a certain division between the significant and the insignificant: the drawing does not reproduce everything (often it reproduces very little), without its ceasing, however, to be a strong message. […] In other words, the denotation of the drawing is less pure than that of the photograph, for there is no drawing without style. (43)

The denotative message of the illustration is also less pure because of artist ownership. The Peter Helck illustration for Chaplin’s final installment (January 1934) recently sold at auction as a work of art—one totally separate from the narrative it illustrated, except for its subject matter. This fact demonstrates that the Chaplin company, while it embellished the first page of each installment with its familiar copyright stamp (“Copyright, 1933, by Charles Chaplin Film Corporation”), did not own the rights to the illustrations published as part of that installment and therefore, could not control the content of those illustrations. In some sense, then, the illustrations for “CSTW” become each artist’s personal interpretation of the events and experiences of Chaplin’s tour as related in the narrative, but also his or her interpretation of the Chaplin-as-tourist persona. This is especially important when considering how well most of the illustrations work to further Chaplin’s promotional agenda for the work (despite his approval or disapproval).
The most important illustration of the series is the cover illustration by Welsh for the premiere installment in September 1933 (Figure 35). This brilliantly colored cover begins a message that seems to be communicated consistently by most of the various illustrators for the series—that it was as much the Little Tramp on tour as the public Chaplin. While photographs might allow the viewer to see Chaplin’s expensive cane and derby as important reflections of the Little Tramp in the physical Chaplin, the illustrator can make the conflation more overt and obvious. In this illustration, Chaplin is depicted as the Little Tramp the tourist. He wears the familiar costume, except that it has morphed here into the costume of a sort of Great White Hunter. His shabby suit seems pristine and new and is all white except for his black necktie. His derby has become a white pith helmet and his hands are adorned with gloves. He’s depicted in action; the scarf on his helmet cascades behind him, as does his camera case. The camera case is only one piece of evidence that Chaplin is in tourist mode. Unlike the penniless Little Tramp he appears to be in the films, here he is accompanied by an assistant, a valet of some ethnic origin (he appears in colorful traditional dress, perhaps Turkish—a country Chaplin never visited) who totes Chaplin’s sticker-covered suitcase and golf clubs. Chaplin raises his hat in a characteristic style and looks straight ahead, as if deferring to some unseen acquaintance. The Turk looks down on him from his greater height with an expression of deference and respect. This depiction of an affluent Little Tramp, almost a symbol of aristocracy and imperialism (on the connotative level), may be Welsh’s attempt to reconcile the stark disparity between the public Chaplin’s wealth and social status with

---

65 The Little Tramp only wore gloves in one film, The Jitney Elopement (1915), mainly because Chaplin hated having anything on or near his hands, jewelry included. He probably felt the gloves would limit his hands’ ability to communicate in pantomime.
the Little Tramp’s poverty. In effect, he has created a figure positioned between the two. He looks and carries himself like the Little Tramp but he obviously has the advantages of money and influence. This hybrid figure represents, if nothing else, a unique attempt to conflate the two personae and one that can only help this task of the narrative.

Figure 35. “CSTW” Cover Art, WHC, September 1933

Inside this first installment are three large tri-colored illustrations (blue/black/white or brown/black/white) with the first labeled with a microscopic caption that reads “Drawn from photographs by Shapi.” These illustrations try to capitalize on the denotative
message of the press photograph—that the physical Chaplin was in this place at this time meeting with this person—by representing press photograph scenes realistically. Still, as Barthes warns, the artist selects what he or she will represent. The first photograph reproduced (Figure 36) is of a line of policemen holding back a London crowd. Chaplin does not appear either in this illustration or in the original photograph. While Shapi has been mostly true to that original representation, he chooses this time to add to it by sketching in, just under the policemen’s feet at the far right of the scene, the Little Tramp’s iconic props—the cane, the shoes and the derby. Therefore, while the policemen in the original photograph hold back the crowd in order to protect the body of the public Chaplin, the policemen of the illustration seem to protect only the Little Tramp’s props instead, as if these were the most valuable commodities suggested by the name “Chaplin” printed on the other side of the same page. If the caption, “Drawn from photographs,” is read at all, it must allow the drawings some status as referents for the reader, thereby lending a level of authenticity to the text. The drawing just described, then, asserts Chaplin’s status as a celebrity tourist attraction, an attribute also supported by the two other drawings in this installment, one of Chaplin and Ramsay MacDonald, the British Prime Minister at the time, and the other of Chaplin and Bernard Shaw at the premiere of City Lights in London.
The second installment, which appeared in October 1933, utilizes press photographs in a creative way. The first page of this installment embeds photographs onto gold and silver graphics (see Figure 37). Along the left margin of the page the photographs have been cropped into approximately one by two and a half inch trapezoids onto what looks like either a gold ribbon or an accordion-shaped postcard folder. If a postcard folder, the effect is either that Chaplin has collected these images as documents of his own encounters with celebrities (these could be the trophies taken away from these experiences), making him a sort of tourist, or that they represent a collection of postcards Chaplin’s sightseers can use as markers to mediate their experience of him. Whatever the connotative message, the denotative one—again, that Chaplin was there at this time—
provides a semblance of truth-value to the narrative. All the photos on this page depict Chaplin in the company of some easily recognizable male person (there are no captions), with the largest and most prominent one depicting Chaplin with the Prince of Wales. This large photo may have engendered the one-dimensional stylized crowns that litter the background (with the inclusion of the derby in this group thereby elevating it to the status of the crown). A banner at the top of the page provides the title and author of the narrative and is itself “crowned” by a display of the Little Tramp’s shoes and hat in silhouette with the cane crossing them diagonally in gold and framed by laurel leaves (the sign of the poet). These symbols attempt either to suggest that the Little Tramp is now keeping company with royalty and aristocracy or that the Little Tramp’s battered derby is as much a crown as any of the others depicted (the presence of the laurel leaves may support the latter interpretation). Neither of these connotative messages seem to assist the goals I have uncovered for the narrative, but seem to work instead towards a popular goal of Chaplin’s fellow artists at the time—to help to elevate his status to high artist, rather than low comedian. On the two succeeding pages, however, the images work more to my purpose. Here the photographs are cropped into the shape of circles, surrounded in large blue type by the names of the cities in which each was taken. Each of these round photos represents Chaplin experiencing the frenzy of his audience as it encounters him. In other words, each photo depicts Chaplin the celebrity as tourist attraction.
The third installment that appeared in November 1933 compiles the work of four different illustrators. The full page of illustrations (Figure 38) featured on the second page of the article is especially important because it affirms the rhetorical work of the narrative in the fox-hunt episode in forging correlations between the behavior and actions of the public Chaplin with typical behavior of the Little Tramp. The focal point of the page is a large realistic (almost photographic) drawing of Chaplin in his hodge-podge huntsman’s outfit, drawn by Rodrogin. The illustrator Wallace Morgan, who was later famous for his war illustrations, creates a sort of cartoon of the hunting episode that
moves from the top center of the page down the left margin and then to the right along
the bottom border to its conclusion. The story is told in seven distinct frames. Here the
viewer sees the story of this episode told in cartoon. The focus of the first five frames is
Chaplin’s interactions with the horse and with other riders. In the final two frames,
however, the public Chaplin visually becomes the Little Tramp when he is depicted
hatless with a shock of dark curly hair (the public Chaplin was silver-haired by this point,
and recognizably so). The final frame expands on this assumption when it depicts
Chaplin with his back to the viewer, hands on hips, curly black hair asserting itself, and
feet splayed outwards—all typical attitudes of Chaplin’s film persona. The illustrations
by Rodrogin and Win (separately) on the next page abandon Chaplin’s public persona
altogether and depict Chaplin’s characters (Rodrogin depicts Chaplin’s Karno persona
“The Inebriate” and Win a collection of nine sketches of The Little Tramp in his films).
The emphasis in all of this illustration (and, to me, it almost overwhelms the text here) is
that the narrating subject of “CSTW” is the Little Tramp of the films, that they are the
same person. The assertiveness of this imagery must assist the efforts of the written
narrative, then, to achieve the conflation of these two personae.
The December 1933 installment features illustrations by Robert Gellert on three pages. The first page (title page) of the narrative begins with a banner similar to the one for October in that it depicts the iconic props (hat, cane, and shoes), but here they become Christmas ornaments (even hanging off of a pine bough) and the laurel wreath a Christmas garland (see Figure 39). Gellert creates an interesting effect with his illustrations, all done in blue-green ink. He creates a sort of montage by interweaving postcard-type scenes of recognizable European cities with iconic features of those cities, such as a bullfighter for San Sebastian and a dancing bear for Biarritz. The more solid
blue band (the “road” taking Chaplin from place to place) which links the images is
drawn upon in white with images of transportation and travel, such as a valise, a Pullman
car and a limousine. Gellert chooses to include Chaplin in his illustrations by applying
disembodied Little Tramp heads (culled from film stills) onto each venue. These
illustrations, consistently with the others in the series, promote the conflation of
Chaplin’s public and private personae. They also work to promote the image of the Little
Tramp as tourist. Interestingly, what is missing from Gellert’s message is Chaplin’s
status as a celebrity tourist attraction. By using only the Little Tramp’s head (and face),
Gellert adds further evidence to my assertion that Chaplin’s audience is not swayed so
much by a similarity in looks between the public Chaplin and the Little Tramp, but by a
similarity in behavior, gesture and comportment, because the focus is on the Little
Tramp’s varied facial expressions. The connotative message I discern in this element of
the illustration is that the reader need only recognize this photograph of the Little
Tramp’s characteristic grimace or smirk placed here next to Biarritz and there next to
London to believe both that he was in these places and that Chaplin’s narrative of the trip
is also his (the Little Tramp’s).
The final installment (January 1934) continues the strategy of combining illustration with altered press photographs. The illustrator for this issue is Peter Helck, most famous for his drawings of modes of transportation (especially cars). The title-page illustration depicts a very tiny Chaplin out of costume moving quickly out of the frame of the illustration in a rickshaw pulled by a Ceylonese man in a straw hat. Chaplin’s brother Syd is seated at his side (an attempt at realism). The rest of the illustration is filled with figures of Ceylonese—the working Ceylonese—who abandon their work to give chase. These are the frenzied crowds that the narrative only depicts in Europe, but this illustration argues that Chaplin’s appeal to the common man is worldwide. The only
evidence of the Little Tramp here is Helck’s embellishment of the first letter of the title (“A”) with a derby hat and an Asian artifact depicted in perspective behind it, a subtle artistic touch which, however small, still keeps the conflation agenda before the eyes of the reader. The second page includes only a press photo of Chaplin experiencing the Japanese tea ceremony, cropped into a circle and captioned with a pull quote, “In the sanctity of peace you refresh your troubled mind in liquid jade.” The effect here is to ascertain Chaplin’s presence in Asia and his willingness to participate in and experience the local traditions, no matter where he is, i.e. it depicts Chaplin as tourist.

The third page (Figure 40) is complex and very rich in signification. The rectangular frame at the top left of the page shows two Balinese folk dancers in performance. The public Chaplin is visible in the audience, positioned at the top right corner of the illustration. He stands out amongst the dark-skinned natives because he glows white—his suit is white, his hair is white, and his face is white (again the Great White Hunter/Explorer?). This is made especially noticeable because Helck draws Sydney beside him in more muted tones. Chaplin is depicted in the posture of someone totally engrossed in the performance; his shoulders are hunched forward as if he desires to be as close as possible to the action—the enthusiastic tourist experiencing what he believes is an authentic ethnic performance. At the bottom of this illustration, Helck creates a sort of border of Balinese masks, with the Little Tramp’s head taking its place as the central one. One reading of this part of the illustration is that the Little Tramp’s face (again a disembodied head) is as much a mask as the ceremonial Balinese ones placed beside it. The mask of the Little Tramp’s positioning in the center of the frame (and of the line of
masks) may suggest its dominance over the others, similar to the way the public Chaplin depicted in the illustration dominates the crowd by radiating light.

Figure 40. “CSTW,” *WHC*, January 1934

The large frame of this illustration is embedded into the illustration behind it. Whereas the frame just described is a dark and colorful scene, this background illustration is light—almost a sketch. It shows the public Chaplin arriving back in America. He is a small dapper figure stopping near the end of the gangway to wave to the press and the swarming public. Above him are the porters carrying his large amount
of luggage. Above the porters on the ship’s deck are Chaplin’s shipboard companions, admirers as well, who even after all this time still climb up on the railings or crane their necks in order to catch one final glimpse. This illustration, then, ends the series with an image not only of Chaplin’s celebrity but also of his status as tourist attraction, a position he has occupied consistently throughout the sixteen months of the tour.

While illustrations cannot offer a written text the level of authenticity afforded by photographs, the fact that many of the illustrators used press photographs (although altered) in conjunction with their illustrations may allow these illustrations more truth-value than others not based on press photographs. Besides these photographic elements, the illustrations seem to project the message that the subject on tour was both the physical Chaplin and his film persona in one, thereby assisting this agenda of the written text. And, except for Robert Gellert’s illustrations, the drawings accompanying the series establish, enhance and even exaggerate Chaplin’s status on the tour as both celebrity and tourist attraction.

Chaplin was a visual artist, an artist of film, and as such it would be hard to imagine any creative product of his which tried to stand alone without a visual component. As promotional texts, the travel narratives use whatever means at their disposal to achieve their marketing usefulness for Chaplin and his film creation. Just as the Little Tramp appears in nearly every scene of his films, so, too must he be visually accessible in his written texts. Like Joyce and Eliot, Chaplin and his publicity machine understood the rhetorical usefulness of the visual image and capably employed it.

Visual images of Chaplin as the Little Tramp on film or even in photos have inspired volumes of written commentary, thereby demonstrating a close affinity between these
two types of texts. Even Lucia Joyce, James Joyce’s troubled daughter, begins her short tribute to Chaplin for *Disques Vert* in 1924 with looking at a photograph: “La photo de Charlie est sur ma table. Ses yeux intelligents et tristes me regardent tandis que je cherche à vous exprimer mon admiration pour ce grand et petit comique” (76). The denotative message of the photograph makes Charlie (the Little Tramp) seem alive to her, even allowing him to meet her gaze with his own. Because of the vitality of the Little Tramp created by these images, the public Chaplin must perform the Little Tramp in order to be accepted. As Rugg asserts, as the physical body’s aura increases with the reproduction and dissemination of its images, its audience begins to identify the “presence of humorous entertainment with the presence of the body, and if they were disappointed in that hope, they might begin to suspect that the body before them was a fake, a counterfeit. The image, on the other hand, could not be. [Therefore], it becomes the body’s task to approximate its images” (43). As was the case for Samuel Clemens’s Mark Twain, the physical body of Chaplin must perform or impersonate the Little Tramp in the travel narrative and in the photograph in order to succeed, for the pseudonym (the fictional creation) has become more alive in the minds and hearts of the public—more real—than the man who created him.

---

66 See Appendix B for Lucia Joyce’s complete tribute. I include it because it begins with the photograph, moves to remembrance of the Little Tramp on film and ends with Joyce’s brief encounter with Chaplin on the Champs Élysées during his 1921 tour (she was just fourteen). Most importantly, she begins her quest to meet Chaplin hoping to meet the Little Tramp and finds him, not in Chaplin’s appearance, but in his gestures and attitudes. It appears translated into English here for the first time.

67 “The photo of Charlie is on my table. His intelligent and sad eyes look at me while I search for a way to express my admiration for this great and small comic actor to you.” (translation mine)
Coda

After my arrival in London, [...] I wanted change, new experiences, new faces; I wanted to cash in on this business of being a celebrity. I had just one date, and that was with H. G. Wells. After that, I was freelancing, with the dubious hope of meeting other people.

“I have arranged a dinner for you at the Garrick Club,” said Eddie Knoblock.

“Actors, artists, and authors,” I said jokingly. “But where is this exclusive English set, these country homes and house parties that I’m not invited to?” I wanted that rarer sphere of ducal living. Not that I was a snob, but I was a tourist, sight-seeing.

---Charlie Chaplin, My Autobiography

So begins a franker version of Chaplin’s 1921 tour contained in his autobiography, written when Chaplin was seventy-five. In fact, a comparison of his version of the two tours in this volume shows just how different they are from the versions contained in MTA and “CSTW.” Chaplin explains shortly after the passage cited above that it was only his inauspicious meeting with Sir Philip Sassoon that provided his entrée into the circle of society he wished to experience, another fact never provided by the travel narrative version. As scholars have long argued in consideration of other texts and contexts, what is not stated—what is absent or lacking—can be more telling than what is. Included in Chaplin’s autobiography and not in his travel narratives are elements of his behavior which his audience would have considered un-Little-Tramp-like, such as his frank opinions about celebrated individuals, which make him seem too much a sort of verbal commentator, and his sexual exploits which make him seem successful with women—something the Little Tramp rarely was. Also, his receipt of the Legion d’Honneur medal, his frequent visits with the Prince of Wales, his material acquisitiveness as well as his tireless efforts for charitable causes are all evidence of a level of affluence that would conflict with the Little Tramp’s apparent poverty. In addition, the Europe of the 1930s he experienced was not all a venue of high and
lascivious living but instead is best represented by Chaplin’s final words on the subject: “I saw food rotting, goods piled high while people wandered hungrily about them, millions of unemployed and their services going to waste” (377). This great disparity between the two versions of these tours (from *My Autobiography* and from *MTA* or “CSTW”) supports an unstated promotional agenda for the travel narratives’ version, one that seems to include a deliberate conflation of Chaplin’s public and filmic personae. As I have tried to show in this dissertation, Chaplin’s narratives rely on the audience’s knowledge of the Little Tramp as a traveling persona. Chaplin then exploits this characteristic of the Little Tramp by projecting a tourist persona in the narratives, one that allows him to achieve a conflation with the Little Tramp persona that allows the books to succeed as promotional vehicles.

Chaplin’s first film after he returned from Europe in 1921 was entitled *The Idle Class*. It is essentially a film about the Little Tramp going on vacation, in his own inimitable way, of course. He arrives at the train station in the baggage compartment of the train, totally unruffled, and grabs a ride to the resort by jumping on the spare tire of a passing car. He collects golf balls and golf clubs for his own use by surreptitiously stealing them from unsuspecting golf partners. He even attends a fancy dress ball, in costume (ostensibly) as a tramp. This film suggests not only that Chaplin brought his traveling experiences home with him to use as inspiration, but that he may have wished, in his first film upon his return, to emphasize tourist-like attributes of his film persona by making them overt for the first time. In essence, Chaplin has created in this film an advertisement for his travel narrative that is an advertisement for his film persona, thereby creating a closed circle of signification.
In this dissertation, I have uncovered, through close rhetorical analysis of both written and visual aspects of the travel narratives, the way in which their promotional agenda was accomplished. To this end, Chapters 2 and 3 demonstrated how Chaplin’s persona accomplished a correlation of the Little Tramp’s visual rhetoric in the written text of the narratives and also how Chaplin presented himself as a typical democratic tourist in them. Chapters 4 and 5 further showed how the narratives project an aura of authenticity, rhetorically and visually.

Although Chaplin’s narratives are popular texts and anomalous ones at that, I was surprised in this project to find close correlations to his strategies in Charles Dickens’s *American Notes* and Gertrude Stein’s *Everybody’s Autobiography*. Also surprising was how closely Chaplin’s narratives conform to the generic parameters of the travel narrative and still do their job so well. Most surprising, however, was my realization that ethnographic behavior of the fan for the celebrity and the sightseer for the sight can be so closely correlated, allowing the celebrity author on tour to become the embodiment of the tourist attraction—heretofore considered only an inanimate object.

The living celebrity author as tourist attraction as I have investigated him or her is a more interesting phenomenon when considered in light of the work of Ian Ousby in his chapter from *The Englishman’s England* entitled “Literary Shrines and Literary Pilgrims: The Writer as Tourist Attraction.” Ousby relates the Englishperson’s traditional affinity for associating literature and the literary with landscape and the pilgrim’s journey—a secular tradition probably necessitated by the Reformation’s removal of Catholic shrines, monuments and churches from England. He argues that “the public need for these things
had to find secular equivalents. [...] [It was] the writer [who] could best endure, kept alive by his living book, his achievement at once majestic and familiar to later generations. He proved the ideal hero for a secular culture, the most satisfying object of national pride” (22-23). As Ousby explains, this objectification, as it did for saints and other holies, occurred after death. The celebrity author only became a tourist attraction upon the postmortem establishment of his or her monuments. Writing about Westminster Abbey in *The Sketch Book* (1815), Washington Irving explains the rationale for the tourists’ predilections towards the dead author:

> I passed some time in Poet’s Corner [...]. Notwithstanding the simplicity of these memorials, I have always observed that the visitors to the abbey remained longest about them. [...] They linger about these as about the tombs of friends and companions, for indeed there is something of companionship between the author and the reader. Other men are known to posterity only through the medium of history, which is continually growing faint and obscure: but the intercourse between the author and his fellow-men is ever new, active and immediate. [...] Well may posterity be grateful to his memory, for he has left it an inheritance not of empty names and sounding actions, but whole treasures of wisdom, bright gems of thought, and golden veins of language. (188)

Benefiting from this same “new, active and immediate” relationship with readers, the living author could become a “sacralized sight” (MacCannell’s term) as well, most easily through the lecture or publicity tour, which, in fact, is what the reader finds in Chaplin’s narratives. 1920s British film critic Iris Barry, in a caption to another Steichen
photograph published in *Vogue* in February 1926, expresses just how Chaplin affects his audience and why he engenders such intense feeling in them:

He is the most popular man alive. We all call him by his Christian name, for we regard him as a friend. But he is more than that, he is each one of us. His misfortunes are ours, his disappointments and his quick recoveries. He is the intelligence in us which is beaten down by brute force, the idealist in us who comes up against cruel facts, the poet in us who rises undaunted above them, the prophet in us whom none will listen to, the anarchist in us whom the mechanism of society fails to subdue. He is the pilgrim who fights Giant Despair; the Saint who preaches to the birds when men turn away; the Pierrot who wants the moon or gives his heart to those who neither want it nor deserve it. He is, in fact, a legendary figure comparable to Don Quixote. He is Charlie. (qtd. in Hankins 504)

Such appraisals appearing frequently from all branches of the media suggests that Chaplin’s publicity scheme worked and worked well. The travel narratives these days are all but forgotten. Chaplin’s “whole treasures of wisdom, bright gems of thought, and golden veins of language” (Irving 188) lie in his films which continue to live long after he himself has become an oft-visited monument in a cemetery in Corsier-sur-Vevey, Switzerland.
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Appendix A

Archival Materials

“A Comedian Sees the World ("CSTW") exists in several partial drafts at Association Chaplin. There is a manuscript draft which, when transcribed, reaches only thirteen pages and makes up only a small portion of Part I, up only to the point at which he recounts the dinner at Lady Astor’s. Several pages of this manuscript are written over and over with nearly the same wording, much as the way Chaplin is known to have worked in the medium of film in which he took retake after retake with Virginia Cherrill, at least, being once quoted as saying that she could tell very little difference between each such take (Unknown Chaplin). As Anna Fiaccarini and Cecilia Cenciarelli write in “Chaplin the Author,” “writing is for Chaplin an exercise, a job, feverish craftsmanship: its pleasure lies in the search for perfection, through its rigour and discipline” (22). Even with this very small amount of the whole in manuscript form, though, I can begin to see Chaplin’s initial foci for the series, including rhetorical strategies he would use throughout the work.

Next, a typescript draft that appears to have some integrity (it has numbered pages to page 76 and follows the sequence of the published series fairly closely) exists, also at Association Chaplin. This document would appear to be the studio secretary’s (Catherine Hunter’s) attempt to translate an often difficult-to-read manuscript into typed form. However, more importantly, this draft has evidence of Chaplin’s handwritten deletions and annotations, some written right on the page and others on the back of the preceding
In most cases, he is clear about where such additions should be located in the text, even numbering changes in some places in order to help with clarity.

This draft only deals with the content of what would be Part I, Part II, and about half of Part III. It ends with Chaplin’s first few days spent on the French Riviera, which is essentially June 1931, and it is missing pages 47-53. In addition to this typescript, there is another one—also 76 pages that appears to be a later draft than the one just described. It contains the changes Chaplin demands in his handwriting on the first typescript. Handwritten comments on this draft are in someone’s hand other than Chaplin’s (perhaps Hunter herself) and are confined to questions of spelling, punctuation and getting names, dates, and places correct. In other words, while it may have been useful to have this draft typed out as well, I chose not to spend time with it because the changes were superficial and a carbon copy was made of it as well, so two complete copies of this draft exist in the archives. In addition to this material, I found one typescript page which was on letter-sized paper, unlike the other typescript drafts which are on 8 ½” X 14”, which indicates to me that at least one other typescript draft existed at one time. This seems to be the only surviving page from this manuscript (page 63). It was also filed in with the “economic policy” papers.

Interestingly, even though he would be abroad for another entire year, only half of the series will deal with this period of time (June 1931-June 1932). In addition, the existence of a typescript draft for only this half of the series is consistent with correspondence between Syd Chaplin and Alf Reeves, the Chaplin Studios manager, who noted in a letter dated March 30, 1933 that Miss Roberts, the managing editor of *Women’s Home Companion* and the individual who courted Chaplin’s work for her publication, “whilst
she was laudatory in her comments on the first half of the story, she does not appear quite so pleased with the second half remitted later, and has asked Charlie to make some changes, which, however, he does not feel inclined to do.” However, at Association Chaplin, I was able to locate several pages and partial pages of typescripts that ended up being included at points in the final version of the second half. One of these was a three-page typescript entitled “BALI” which contained what would be the first few paragraphs of Part V of the series. This typescript was filed with a handwritten page which contains the only evidence I found of an outline, or a brainstorm, for the work. Because it’s so unique and may provide some concrete evidence of Chaplin’s composition process, I include a transcription of it here in its entirety:

Bali

Different from other Tropic mixtures

Captan talks of other islands as wilder—Bali moor romantic—Isle of rats—Isle of white people—very few cannibals left—my first reaction—North Bali—South Bali—while progressing moor Natives—my brother nudge me—our quest—the meals of the Hotel the food—Hirshfelt the artistic sales or sho—The House _____ furnished—music that night—I meet Hirshfelt Landsend—what they drew—they describe their ways—the present & the beauty—tea at the ____—the native girls covering—

I found other “pieces” of the second half as well. A two-page typescript filed in with the “economic policy” typescripts entitled “Depression #1” appears in the final version as an addition to the scene in Einstein’s apartment in Berlin in Part III. Another ¾-page typescript entitled “Japan #27” appears in the last few paragraphs of Part V and is
Chaplin’s description of the Japanese tea ceremony for that section. In addition, a short typed paragraph appearing alone on one sheet of paper (untitled) becomes the final paragraph for the series in its published version. And finally, I found a several-paged typescript entitled “Notes for the Final Chapter,” none of which were included in the final version. This proposed final chapter for the series was a an overview of the effects of the economic depression on Europe and Asia and Chaplin’s own suggestions for solving the problems he saw and described.
Appendix B
Lucia Joyce’s Chaplin Tribute

Charlie et Les Gosses.

La photo de Charlie est sur ma table. Ses yeux intelligents et tristes me regardent tandis que je cherche à vous exprimer mon admiration pour ce grand et petit comique.

Peut-être nous semblait-il, au début, un simple fantoche, mais déjà il commençait à s’animer et à se transformer en marionette, puis en polichinelle, et nous avons enfin trouvé notre grande gosse.

Nous l’avions vu jusqu’alors prendre dans ses films des rôles quelconques, banals, comme, par exemple, un baron qui joue au lance-crèmes à des soirées, ou vide en cachette les bouteilles de liqueurs; ou bien court avec une douzaine de gendarmes après lui pour avoir vole une pomme. *The Kid* nous montre ce vulgaire voleur qui devient un ange et un bienfaiteur. Nous sommes transportés avec lui et Jackie au paradis. Quel mélange de grotesque et de sublime! Toujours lui qui revient nous faire éclater de rire au moment où le drame allait nous faire pleurer. *The Kid* ne restera pas seulement un des meilleurs films, mais Charlie a su apporter avec son originalité une consolation à la misère. Comme il appartient à chaque petite noix une écorce, Jackie est le gosse de Charlot comme lui du public.

Quand je le vis pour la première fois, ses “godasses” et sa canne me devinrent si sympathiques que je lui écrivis. Peu de temps après, les journaux annoncèrent son arrivée à Paris. Il fallait le voir à tout prix. Voilà comme je pris un jour les Champs-Élysées avec l’espoir de rencontrer Charlot. Le hazard fut bon. Quel dommage! Il n’avait ni sa canne ni sa drôle demarche. Je ne voulus pas le reconnaître, mais quand il
s’arrêta au Petit Guignol pour regarder le spectacle qui intéressait vivement les enfants, ses gestes et ses attitudes me le démasquèrent enfin. Ces petits qui poussaient des cris de joie aux fantoches, qu’auraient-ils fait s’ils avaient su que le vrai, le vivant, était derrière eux?

Lucia Joyce

Charlie and the Kids.

The photo of Charlie is on my table. His intelligent and sad eyes look at me while I look for a way to express my admiration for the great and small comic to you.

Possibly, he seems to us, at first, a simple puppet, but beyond this, he begins to animate and transform himself like a marionette, then Punch, and at last we have found our great kid.

We have seen him until now take any role in the films, as banal, for example, as a baron who plays with ice cream cones at soirées or empties a hiding place filled with liquor bottles; or runs well with a dozen policemen after him for having stolen an apple. The Kid shows us a vulgar thief who becomes an angel and a benefactor. We are transported with him and Jackie to paradise. What a mixture of the grotesque and the sublime! Always at his return we burst into laughter until the moment when the drama moves us to tears. The Kid doesn’t remain only one of his best films, but Charlie gives to it a consolation to the miserable with his originality. Just as the little nut and its shell belong together, so Jackie is Charlie’s kid as he (Charlie) is the public’s.
His “shoes” and his cane become as pleasant for me as I write of them now as when I saw him for the first time. A little time afterwards, the papers announced his arrival in Paris. I needed to see him at any price. The opportunity arose and I spent a day on the Champs-Élysées with the hope of meeting Charlot. The chance was good. What a shame! He had neither his cane nor his funny walk. I didn’t want to meet him, but when he stopped at the Petit Guignol to look at the show which vigorously interested the children, his gestures and his attitudes finally unmasked him. Those little ones who urge the puppets with cries of joy, what would they have done if they’d known that the true, the living, was behind them?

Lucia Joyce

--Published in *Le Disque Vert*, Nos. 4-5, 1924, pages 76-8