

**‘Films that are applauded all over the world’
Questioning Chaplin’s Popularity in Weimar Germany**

Joseph Garncarz

Abstract

Statements on Chaplin’s popularity in Weimar Germany are usually based on textual sources, such as articles by intellectuals or promotional materials. This article questions Chaplin’s popularity with audiences in Weimar Germany using contemporary film revenues and surveys on the popularity of films and stars. These primary sources demonstrate a group-specific preference for Chaplin-films. The social groups that formed Chaplin’s core audience in Germany were urban workers and intellectuals, but not the audience at large.

Key words

Chaplin - Popularity - Germany

Shortly after the German premiere of Chaplin's films in the early 1920s the discourse on his popularity was already established as well.¹ Chaplin was regarded as the universal star. A Ufa publicity brochure of April 1923 begins: 'If it is film's task to create works that are applauded all over the world, then without any doubt Charlie Chaplin has solved this task completely. Today, there is no country on earth in which Chaplin-films are not being shown on screens in endless reruns. [...] Chaplin is a reason to go to the cinema for millions and millions of people.'²

When statements on Chaplin's popularity in the Weimar period are made today, they are usually based on textual sources. These include publicity materials (such as the brochure quoted above), cinema advertisements (e.g. 'Indescribable cheers storm through our theatre every day'³) and film reviews (e.g. 'The significant work met with the enthusiastic reception it deserved'⁴) [Fig. 1]. These also include articles by intellectuals such as Siegfried Kracauer, Walter Benjamin, Kurt Tucholsky, Béla Balázs and Willy Haas, who celebrated Chaplin as a genius who was able to transcend national borders and unite mankind.⁵ Photos of his one-week visit in Berlin in March 1931 – a promotion tour for *City Lights* (1931, German title *Lichter der Großstadt*) – show large crowds, which seems to support the assumption of Chaplin's extraordinary popularity with the German audience.⁶

The aim of this article is to re-examine such claims using sources that reflect the preferences of the audience at large. A striking example for common misconceptions is the erroneous recollection of Hans Feld, film critic for the trade paper *Film-Kurier*, in connection with the German premiere of *The Gold Rush* (1925, German title *Goldrausch*) on 23 February 1926 in Berlin's Capitol. In an interview with Chaplin-Biographer David Robinson, Feld describes the audience's enthusiastic reaction to the 'dance of the rolls': 'The manager of the theatre, with admirable presence of mind, rushed up to the projection box and instructed the projectionist to roll the film back and play the scene again. The orchestra picked up their cue and the reprise was greeted with even more tumultuous applause.'⁷ But the reprise was actually a promotional ploy, and the repetition of the scene was already integrated into the film print, as the contemporary daily press explained: "'This scene is shown dacapo", an intertitle prepared on grounds of the international success [of the scene] reads'.⁸ Thus, the belief in Chaplin's universal popularity, i.e. one transcending national, class, age and gender differences needs to be examined

more closely. The example I will discuss in this article is Chaplin's reception by the German audience of the Weimar Republic, i.e. between 1919 and 1933. 9

Assessing Chaplin's Popularity

Chaplin had been making films from 1914 onwards, but his films were not shown in Germany before the 1920s.¹⁰ During WWI, foreign films had practically no chance to appear on the German market, because an import ban was introduced on 25 February 1916; it remained in force even after the war had ended, so that US films were not available on the German market again before 1921.¹¹ Thus, Chaplin's short films were not shown in Germany until many years after their production, whereas from the mid 1920s onwards his new feature length films were shown soon after their US premiere in Germany as well.

Between 1921 and 1923, Ufa had secured the rights for thirty-five of Chaplin's short films, twenty-one one act films and fourteen two act films,¹² which were combined for different programs. For example, around 1923 in Berlin's Ufa-Palast am Zoo, the following program of two one act and two two act films was shown: *Those Love Pangs* (1914, German title *Chaplin im Kino*), *The Masquerader* (1914, German title *Chaplin im Glashaus*), *Easy Street* (1917, German title *Chaplin als Stütze der öffentlichen Ordnung*) and *Behind the Screen* (1916, German title *Chaplin bei Anna Boleyn*).¹³ On 16 November 1923, the first feature film of Chaplin's premiered in Germany, in Berlin, namely *The Kid* (1921, no German title). On 23 February 1926, *The Gold Rush* premiered in Berlin's Capitol; it was followed there in the same year by *A Woman of Paris* (1923, German title *Die Nächte einer schönen Frau*). On 7 February 1928, *The Circus* (1928, German title *Zirkus*) premiered in the same cinema. In the 1929/30 season, three programs of older shorts were shown. In 1929 two programs that were arranged around the films *Charlie Chaplin's Burlesque on Carmen* (1916, no German title) and *The Pilgrim* (1923, German title *Der Pilger*).¹⁴ 1930 a program was shown containing *Pay Day* (1922, German title *Lohntag*), *Sunnyside* (1919, German title *Auf dem Lande/Charlie als Hirtenknabe*) and *A Day's Pleasure* (1919, German title *Vergnügte Stunden*). On 26 March 1931, *City Lights* had its German premiere in Berlin's Ufa-Palast am Zoo – the last Chaplin-film shown in Germany before United Artists withdrew from the German market because of the Nazi regime¹⁵ and because German

censors banned Chaplin's films because the Nazis considered him a Jew.¹⁶ Therefore, *The Gold Rush* was banned on 3 January 1935.⁷¹

Of the thirty-five short films, for which Ufa owned the German rights, two thirds were not passed by German censors for persons under the age of eighteen ('Jugendverbot');¹⁸ children under the age of six were not allowed to attend cinemas at all.¹⁹ The films prohibited for children included *The Rink* (1917, German title *Chaplin läuft Rollschuh*) and *Easy Street* (1917). The feature films *The Gold Rush*, *The Circus* and *City Lights* were passed for film goers under eighteen years of age, but some of them only after an objection was filed and/or under the obligation of cuts.²⁰ Therefore, Chaplin's films could reach young German audiences of the Weimar period only within limits.

So how popular *were* Chaplin's films with the German audience of the Weimar period? The best sources for audience demand are box-office figures or surveys on the popularity of films and stars. Four different contemporary sources, which were created for different purposes and use different methods, are extant: the national film hit lists, the national star hit lists, as well as local data on two large German cities, Berlin and Cologne. The national film hit lists were compiled by trade papers, on the basis of interviews with cinema owners. The national star hit lists were compiled by fan magazines on the basis of reader surveys. The study on Cologne is a doctoral dissertation; it is based on interviews of cinema owners. The study on Berlin was done by the US embassy; it is a report to the US film industry and government on the reception of US films in Germany. The data comprises different time periods: the national film hit lists are available from the season 1925-26 to the season 1931-32, the star hit lists from 1923 to 1926, the Cologne study did its research on the year 1926 and the Berlin study on the years 1931 to 1938. There are at least two facts that speak for the validity of this data. Firstly, in all four studies the samples used were very large, even by today's standards. Secondly, all four studies concur in their results, even though they were done for different purposes and use different methods. Thus, on this basis, a coherent and convincing interpretation can be formed.

The national film hit lists from 1925-26 to 1931-32 can be found in the trade paper *Film-Kurier*. From 1929 onwards, this trade paper represented the interests of cinema owners that were members of the 'Reichsverband Deutscher Lichtspieltheaterbesitzer' (the German organisation of cinema owners). The lists are based on surveys of cinema owners, who reported the five most

successful films of the current season. Over the years, more and more cinema owners participated, the number rose from 330 to 1400, equivalent to 9.4 per cent and 27.6 per cent of the Weimar cinemas.²¹ The participating cinemas are representative for Germany concerning size and geographical location. Each film received one point for each nomination, the points were summed by the editorial department, and the films were ranked according to the number of nominations; a minimum of fourteen and a maximum of fifty-nine nominated films per season were published.

The Circus reached rank 7 in the 1927-28 season and rank 32 in the next, i.e. it was a great success with the German audience. However, no other Chaplin film reached a place in the charts at all. For example, *The Gold Rush* was not among the fifty most popular films of the 1926-27 season (in 1926, a total of 487 films were shown in German cinemas). Neither was *City Lights* among the forty-six most popular films of the 1931-32 season (in 1931, a total of 278 films were shown in Germany).

That Chaplin's films were not very popular with German audiences of the Weimar period is actually not very surprising, because this is the case with US films and star comedians in general. For example, Harold Lloyd's films were the most successful of those by US comedians between 1922 and 1927 in the US,²² but in Germany none of his films reached the charts. Between 1925 and 1930, 40 per cent of the films *shown* in Germany were US productions (of a total of 2748 films), but only 19.4 per cent of the most *popular* films were US productions (of 221 films published in the charts). German films were the most successful by far: with an almost equal share of releases of 43.4 per cent they were able to achieve a 67.5 per cent share of the most popular films.³₂

Furthermore, a closer look at the audience of Chaplin's films with the help of the local studies on Berlin and Cologne is very revealing, especially the one on Cologne, because it allows explanations of urban German film goers' film preferences based on their social class. Theodor Geiger describes five social strata, based on an analysis of the general census data from the year 1925: the capitalists, the old middle class (farmers, self-employed persons), the new middle class (civil servants, free-lancers, white collar employees, academics), the proletariat (unskilled wage workers, lower office employees), and 'proletaroids' (day labourers) - a class that belongs to the proletariat in economic terms but shares the mentality of the middle classes.²⁴ The capitalists

made up around 1 per cent of the population, the new and the old middle class 18 per cent each, the proletariat 51 per cent, and the ‘proletaroids’ 13 per cent. Therefore, in socio-economic terms around one third of the population belonged to the middle class (the old and the new middle class), whereas two thirds belonged to the working class (the proletariat and the ‘proletaroids’). However, in terms of their mentalities the middle class and the working class were nearly equal in size, and this boundary was permeable. It is the mentality of audiences and not their socio-economic status that plays a crucial role for their film preferences.

The first known study of film preferences in a German city during the Weimar period is Irmalotte Guttman’s doctoral dissertation in economics on Cologne in 1926.⁵² In that year Cologne had a population of 700000 citizens, making it the third-largest German city, following Berlin with 4 Million and Hamburg with 1 Million. The study is based on standardized interviews with 27 of Cologne’s cinema owners, of a total of 32, i.e. a sample size of 84 per cent. Guttman included questions on the most popular films as well as stars. She categorized Cologne’s cinemas on the basis of their socio-geographic location and their ticket prices into three different markets: 1) first-run cinemas and similar high-class cinemas 2) the cinemas of the middle classes, civil servants and senior citizens 3) the cinemas of the working classes of every political orientation.²⁶ These three markets had approximately the same size: five first-run cinemas with a total of 6550 seats, eighteen working class cinemas with 5805 seats and 9 middle class cinemas with 5570 seats.

The study reveals that *The Gold Rush* had limited appeal in Cologne. It was unusually popular in the Schauburg, opened in 1922, a first-run cinema in the city centre (Breitestraße 90) with 1800 seats: ‘The film was the greatest financial success of the year. It ran for twelve [actually thirteen²⁷] days and was always sold out in spite of good weather.’²⁸ In four proletarian cinemas situated in the outskirts of the city (with 200 to 400 seats and an average ticket price of 50 Pfg) the film was also received ‘very well’. Guttman sums up: ‘In five cinemas [the first-run cinema and the four proletarian cinemas], which together have 3228 seats, the film *The Gold Rush* was reported as having been very good business.’²⁹ The owners of the middle-class cinemas did not mention *The Gold Rush*, i.e. the film was not popular there or was not shown at all.⁰³

The second known study of film preferences in a German city during the Weimar period pertains to Germany’s capital, Berlin. It contains film ranking lists for the years 1931 to 1938,

which are based on runs in premiere-cinemas; they were first published in the 'German Film Notes' of the US commercial attaché.³¹ *City Lights* reached rank 10 in the hit list of 1931. No other Chaplin-film appears in the lists, but this is not surprising, because the next Chaplin-film, *Modern Times* (1936, German title *Moderne Zeiten*) was not finished before United Artists withdrew from the German market and the Nazi censorship bureau banned Chaplin-films in 1935.

Thus, just like *The Gold Rush*, *City Lights* was also popular in first-run cinemas in large German cities. These cinemas were frequented by middle class patrons who were interested in film as art. A review of the German premiere of *The Circus* on 7 February 1928 in the Capitol, a first-run cinema in Berlin, notes: 'even on the balcony people of distinction: diplomats, authors, actors, people from the film business'.³² The first-run cinemas demanded markedly higher ticket prices than other cinemas; for example, at Schauburg in Cologne, a ticket for *The Gold Rush* cost 1.80 Marks on average, and even 2.53 Marks at the premiere. Thus, the average ticket price was three to five times and the price for a premiere ticket four to six times higher than the average ticket price at one of Cologne's working class cinemas at the time.³³ Furthermore, publicity explicitly addressed an audience of cineasts. Three days before the premiere of *The Gold Rush* a large-scale campaign was begun which continued for sixteen days and which included a large, expensive advertisement in the Cologne daily press almost every day.³⁴ The first advertisement, 'What New York, London and Paris say about Charlie Chaplin in *The Gold Rush*', compiled twenty-two enthusiastic reviews by film critics from the international daily press.³⁵ The following day, the advertisement contained a facsimile of a telegram from Max Reinhardt, 'Europe's greatest theatre director'³⁶, to Chaplin: 'I place your art next to the highest of all art.'³⁷ [Fig. 2] Again and again, Chaplin was presented as a 'great artist'³⁸ and *The Gold Rush* as his 'masterpiece'³⁹ [Fig. 3].

Furthermore, surveys on actors are also very significant. From 1923 to 1926, the fan magazines *Neue Illustrierte Filmwoche* and *Deutsche Filmwoche* compiled and published ranking lists of favourite male and female film stars, based on surveys of 12000 to 15000 readers. The top ten stars received 80 per cent of the votes.⁴⁰ When *The Gold Rush* was shown in German cinemas in 1926, Chaplin was not very popular as an actor with the general German audience. In the survey published on 7 March 1926, he received only approximately 100 of a total of 14590

votes, i.e. less than 1 per cent. Fifteen male stars reached a rank in the list. Willy Fritsch was number one with 1672 votes. Jackie Coogan is number ten with 330 votes.⁴¹ Before 1926, with thirty-five of his shorts and the feature film *The Kid* shown in Germany, Chaplin did not appear in any of the lists – but Jackie ‘The Kid’ Coogan did (number eleven in 1923 and 1924), which made him the most popular US star in Germany at the time.⁴² In Cologne working class cinemas Chaplin was a popular star in 1926. In Guttman’s dissertation, two owners of cinemas located in the outskirts of Cologne in proletarian neighbourhoods, which each had 200 seats and charged only 50 Pfg. on average, reported that Chaplin was a favourite of their audiences.⁴³ By contrast, none of the owners of middle-class cinemas named Chaplin.

Thus, in Weimar Germany, Chaplin’s films were most successful in the large high-class cinemas as well as the small working class cinemas of large cities, such as Berlin and Cologne. A film could only become a major hit at the time if it was popular with audiences at large, i.e. appealed to workers and/or the middle classes. The support of one of these major audience segments was already enough to make a film a hit; but few of Chaplin’s films were successful, which means that both groups were divided. Chaplin did not appeal to the majority of the middle classes, only the cineasts and intellectuals were an exception. The working class was divided in mentality, as Geiger showed; thus, the part that identified with middle-class mentality probably also identified less with Chaplin. The social groups that formed Chaplin’s core audience, namely intellectuals and workers, typically lived in large cities. The fact that Chaplin’s films, except for *The Circus*, were not major hits must mean that they were not popular in smaller cities, towns and rural areas, because the majority of Germany’s audience of the Weimar period was based there: 26.8 per cent of the German population lived in large cities, 13.7 per cent in mid-sized cities and 59.5 per cent in small towns and rural communities.⁴⁴

The class- and group specific preference for Chaplin-films is surely not exclusive to Weimar Germany. This trend continues in Germany after WWII: On their re-release in 1972-73 Chaplin’s films, especially *Modern Times* (rank 7 in 1972) and *The Great Dictator* (rank 9 in 1973), became major hits with the German audience for the first time,⁴⁵ but again they were more favourably received in large cities than in smaller cities and towns.⁴⁶ Furthermore, the class- and group-specific preference for Chaplin’s films is probably not exclusive to Germany, but can also be found in countries that are comparable in urbanisation and social stratification. An indication is United Artist’s complaint that *The Gold Rush* ‘proved to be a flop in all the small cities’ in the US.⁴⁷

Explaining Chaplin's Popularity

How may the class- and group-specific preferences for Chaplin's films be explained, and how does the exception of the film *The Circus*, which was popular with the German audience at large, fit in? The class- and group-specific film preferences mean that Chaplin's films and his film persona were regarded as class-specific and were thus favoured by the majority of the working class but not by the majority of the middle classes. Class- and group-specific values and mentalities of audience segments explain their film preferences.

Chaplin developed a simple and coherent screen persona: an outsider and a loser, who never gives up in the face of injustice and has the moral right on his side. His costume signifies his low social status: his clothes are fine, but worn, and the shoes and pants are much too large for him, obviously handed down from a corpulent rich man. In his feature films of the 1920s and 1930s, Chaplin usually plays 'the tramp', a penniless man of the street who is out of work and fights for survival. In *The Gold Rush*, he is a poor, starving gold digger, who wanders about snow-covered Alaska and against all odds finds gold and his love in the end – however, in the European silent version, which was shown in Germany in 1926, he is disappointed in love.⁸⁴ In *The Circus* he plays a tramp, who becomes a circus artist against his will and has to renounce the woman of his dreams. In *City Lights* he is a city tramp, who helps the woman he admires climb the social ladder, but then cannot win her because of his low social status. Thus, urban workers, who regarded themselves as losers in society, could identify with the persona and situations Chaplin created.

By contrast, Chaplin personifies the opposite of what was important to the middle classes of Weimar Germany. They considered themselves as the better part of society and therefore felt entitled to be its leaders. This status-mindedness was expressed in strategies of social distinction, including codes of language, clothes and behaviour. Furthermore, important goals were financial and professional success, ownership of means of production as well as accumulation of private property and wealth. Among the middle classes, however, were specific groups, which did admire Chaplin: many of the highly educated as well as the leftist intelligentsia, for whom Chaplin was an idol of their political convictions. Chaplin-films could be regarded by cineasts, who were interested in film as art, as an oeuvre, because like painters, musicians and authors he

had complete control over his films and personally fulfilled every main function of film making, including producer, director, screen writer and actor. Almost all contemporary texts on Chaplin were written by members of *this* group; thus, it is not surprising that today we have the impression of a general enthusiasm for Chaplin in Weimar Germany.

But how can the exception to the rule, the broad appeal of *The Circus* be explained? The national success of this film was not due to Chaplin, but largely independent of Chaplin or rather even in spite of Chaplin. Its success is due to the fact that it fit into the vogue of circus films at the time. Examples are *Zirkus Pat und Patachon* (rank 8 in 1925-26; rank 39 in 1926-27), *Was ist los im Zirkus Beely?* (rank 14 in 1926-27), *Die Zirkusprinzessin* (rank 42 1928-29; rank 36 1929-30) and *Grock* (rank 38 in 1930-31; rank 19 in 1931-32). Circus films are set in the world of professional circus artists, and the circus is the setting for usually dramatic stories of love, passion and destiny. Chaplin's film *The Circus* was the most successful circus film between 1925 and 1932; the reason for this must be that it was appealing to both the audience of circus films and the Chaplin-audience.

To conclude, almost all contemporary texts on Chaplin were written by a specific social group, namely Bourgeois intellectuals, that is not representative for the audience at large. Discourse analyses that were based only on such sources came to false conclusions regarding Chaplin's popularity. Only a sociological analysis with a broader perspective and which adds quantitative data allows us to understand such texts as well as promotional material. This method might not only revise our impression for Weimar Germany: If similar data is extant or could be compiled for other countries, we might re-examine the hypothesis of Chaplin's universal popularity for other countries as well. Furthermore, this method might generate equally surprising results for other stars and films, and thus help to complete and revise our knowledge of film history in general.

Translation by Annemone Ligensa

Captions:

Fig. 1:

‘Indescribable cheers storm through our theatre every day’

Kölner-Stadt-Anzeiger, 10 March 1926

Fig. 2:

‘I place your art next to the highest of all art.’ (Max Reinhardt)

Kölner-Stadt-Anzeiger, 24 February 1926

Fig. 3:

‘The great artist in his masterpiece’

Kölner-Stadt-Anzeiger, 6 March 1926

Institutional address:

PD Dr. Joseph Garncarz

University of Siegen

SFB/FK 615 “Medienumbrüche”

57068 Siegen

<http://www.fk615.uni-siegen.de/neu/de/index.php>

E-mail: Garncarz@aol.com

Phone: 0049-271-7404946

I would like to thank Peter Krämer and Annemone Ligensa for their stimulating comments on my article.

2 Paul Reno, ‘Charlie Chaplin’, *Ufa-Blätter: Programm-Zeitschrift der Theater des Ufa-Konzerns: Charlie Chaplin* (Deutsches Filminstitut, Frankfurt am Main (hereafter DIF), no date, no page numbers [April 1923]. All contemporary quotations from German texts were translated.

3 ‘Goldrausch’, *Kölner-Stadt-Anzeiger*, 10 March 1926.

- 4Ernst Blass, 'Chaplins *Golddrausch*', no source (DIF).
- 5Sabine Hake, 'Chaplin Reception in Weimar Germany', *New German Critique*, no. 51 (1990), 87-111; Klaus Kreimeier (ed.), *Zeitgenosse Chaplin* (Berlin, Oberbaumverlag, 1978); Thomas J. Saunders, *Hollywood in Berlin: American Cinema and Weimar Germany* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1994).
- 6Wolfgang Gersch, *Chaplin in Berlin: Illustrierte Miniatur nach Berliner Zeitungen von 1931* (Berlin, Parthas, 1999).
- 7David Robinson, *Chaplin: His Life and Art* (London, Paladin, 1986), p. 359.
- 8goL, 'Chaplins Schuh: *Golddrausch* im Capitol', no source (DIF).
- 9See on Weimar cinema: Joseph Garnarcz, 'Art and Industry: German Cinema of the 1920s', in Lee Grieveson and Peter Krämer (eds.), *The Silent Cinema Reader* (London and New York, Routledge, 2004), pp. 389-400.
- 10Based on the Siegen research project's film supply database of 46 000 films shown on German screens between 1895 and 1920. See Joseph Garnarcz and Michael Ross, "Die Siegener Datenbanken zum frühen Kino in Deutschland", *KINtop* 14/15 (2006), pp. 151-63. From 1921 onwards, I consulted: Herbert Holba, *Illustrierter Film-Kurier 1919-1944* (Neu-Ulm, Verlag des Dokumentationszentrums ACTION, 1977); *Jahrbuch der Filmindustrie* (Berlin, Lichtbild-Bühne, 1922-1933); *Deutscher Reichsanzeiger und Preußischer Staatsanzeiger* (Berlin, Kessel, 1871-1945).
- 11Wolfgang Mühl-Benninghaus, *Vom Augusterlebnis zur Ufa-Gründung: Der deutsche Film im 1. Weltkrieg* (Berlin: Avinus, 2004), pp. 150-58.
- 12Program 'Vier Chaplin-Filme', Ufa-Palast am Zoo (Garnarcz archive, no date). Cf. also: Thomas J. Saunders, 'Von der Dafco zu Damra: Spekulation mit amerikanischen Filmen', in Hans-Michael Bock and Michael Töteberg (eds.), *Das Ufa-Buch* (Frankfurt am Main, Zweitausendeins, 1992), pp. 70-1.
- 13Program 'Ufa: Das Programm der Ufa-Theater', 13 April to 19 April 1923 (DIF).
- 14The program of the Berlin cinema Universum (DIF) shows that *The Pilgrim* was combined with *The Idle Class* (1921, German title *Die feinen Leute*).
- 15Markus Spieker, *Hollywood unterm Hakenkreuz: Der amerikanische Spielfilm im Dritten Reich* (Trier, WVT, 1999), p. 91.
- 16Ibid., p. 164.
- 17DIF, 'Schreiben der Filmoberprüfstelle', no. 7578, 7 January 1935.
- 18Joseph Garnarcz: 'Censorship', in: Thomas Elsaesser (ed.), *The BFI Companion to German Cinema* (London, BFI, 1999), pp. 47-50.
- 19Heinrich Stern (ed.), *Lichtspielgesetz vom 12. Mai 1920 (Filmzensurgesetz) nebst Ausführungsbestimmungen vom 16. Juni 1920* (Berlin, Spaeth & Linde, 1920), § 3.
- 20DIF, 'Schreiben der Filmoberprüfstelle', no. 948.25, 9 January 1926.
- 21Alexander Jason, *Handbuch des Films 1935/36* (Berlin, Hoppenstedt & Co, 1935), p. 134: in 1925 there were 3734 and in 1931 there were 5071 cinemas in Germany.
- 22Richard Koszarski, *An Evening's Entertainment: The Age of the Silent Feature Picture, 1915-1928* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, University of California Press, 1994), p. 33.
- 23Data on film supply can be found in: Alexander Jason, *Handbuch des Films 1935/36*, pp. 109-10. Data on film demand can be found in: *Film-Kurier*, no. 129, 2 June 1930.
- 24Theodor Geiger, *Die soziale Schichtung des deutschen Volkes* (Stuttgart, Enke, 1932).

- 25Irmalotte Guttman, *Über die Nachfrage auf dem Filmmarkt in Deutschland* (Berlin, Wolffsohn, 1928).
- 26Ibid., p. 13.
- 27My correction based on the cinema's ads in the *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger*.
- 28Guttman, *Über die Nachfrage*, p. 13.
- 29Ibid., p. 33.
- 30Ibid., p. 38.
- 31Spieker, *Hollywood unterm Hakenkreuz*, pp. 339-41. The original source is: National Archives, Record Group 151, Commercial Attaché Reports Relating to Germany. The missing months were added by Markus Spieker based on other sources, namely Alexander Jason, *Handbuch des Films 1935/36*, pp. 309-12 as well as cinema ads in *Berliner Tageblatt* and *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*.
- 32Leo Hirsch: 'Charlie Chaplins Zirkus', 8 February 1928, no source (DIF).
- 33*Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger*, 25 February 1926.
- 34Ibid., 23 February 1926 to 10 March 1926 (every day except 28 February 1926, 1 and 2 March 1926).
- 35Ibid., 23 February 1926.
- 36Ibid., 24 February 1926/26 February 1926.
- 37Ibid.
- 38'Goldrausch', *Kölner-Stadt-Anzeiger*, 5 March-6 March 1926.
- 39Ibid.
- 40*Neue Illustrierte Filmwoche* (No. 23, 1924); *Deutsche Filmwoche* (No. 19, 1925; No. 19, 1926; No. 11, 1927). Stars who received less than 100 votes were not included in the list. See also: Joseph Garncarz: 'Top ten stars, 1923-1926', in Thomas Elsaesser (ed.), *The BFI Companion to German Cinema* (London, BFI, 1999), p. 228.
- 41*Deutsche Filmwoche*, 7 May 1926.
- 42See Joseph Garncarz: 'Warum gab es im Stummfilmkino keine deutschen Kinderstars?', *KINtop*, no. 7 (1998), pp. 99-111.
- 43Guttman, *Über die Nachfrage*, p. 30.
- 44Statistisches Bundesamt Wiesbaden (ed.), *Bevölkerung und Wirtschaft 1872-1972* (Stuttgart and Mainz, Kohlhammer, 1972), p. 94.
- 45Joseph Garncarz, 'Hollywood in Germany: The role of American films in Germany, 1925-1990', in David W. Ellwood and Rob Kroes (eds.), *Hollywood in Europe* (Amsterdam, VU University Press, 1994), p. 130; see Peter Krämer's contribution to Chaplin's *The Great Dictator* after WWII in Germany.
- 46'Echo der Filme im Querschnitt', *Film-Echo*, no. 72, 22 December 1972, p. 30.
- 47Robinson: *Chaplin*, p. 358.
- 48Joseph Garncarz, *Filmfassungen: Eine Theorie signifikanter Filmvariation* (Frankfurt am Main, Bern, New York, Paris, Peter Lang, 1992), pp. 58-65.