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Earlier this month, *Gallup* published an expansive study in response to a simple question: “Is College Worth It?” The study, which surveyed over 30,000 university graduates, created a list of the “Big Six” factors that made for a successful and worthwhile college experience, and led to long-term career and life achievement. According to the study, the top four experiences of successful students are: “(1) a professor who made them excited about learning (2) professors who cared about them as a person (3) a mentor who encouraged them to pursue their goals and dreams. (4) worked on a long-term project.” Although many, many people and experiences have made Barnard “worth it” for me, I have Professor Tiersten to thank for giving me the top four keys to success. Your constant support, your ability to make us laugh, and, most of all, the genuine interest and care you have invested in me over the course of this year means more to me than a million college degrees. I will never be able to fully express my gratitude for your unwavering patience, kind understanding, and thoughtful insight during the thesis-writing process, but I can say that you have taught me to believe in myself, a gift for which I am eternally grateful.

Thank you to Jess Lempit, Elisa Han, Khaya Himmelman, and Andrew Niedt for being the most supportive and understanding friends imaginable, for sharing my love of historical hotties, and for inspiring me with your truly magnificent works of scholarship. I can honestly say that I would not have a thesis without your encouragement, handholding, and late-night commiserating. I am grateful for my academic advisor, Professor Kaye, for giving me the confidence to call myself a “historian,” and for teaching me the beauty of a well-crafted footnote. Thank you for being a constant source of kindness, support, and fascinating stories over the past three years. I also owe Professor Valenze, whose Introduction to European History class inspired me to study history, and the entire Barnard History Department for encouraging curiosity and inspiring passion and camaraderie in your students. I think I have spent more time this year on the fourth floor of Lehman than in my own room, and I would not have wanted it any other way.

Finally, for this thesis and for everything else, thank you to my wonderful family and friends.

The Armistice Dance arranged at the Pump Room on Tuesday evening proved a distinct success. There was a company of about 200, and dancing was enjoyed from 8 to 12.

The 1920s marked a turning point in international social and cultural history. The First World War was over, the armistice was signed, and Britain was ready to move beyond the traumas of war. It was as if the veil cloaking Europe had been lifted, and Britain’s eyes were opened to a new, modern era. The light the war had temporarily extinguished was reignited, and was ready to blaze brighter than ever. Along with countless young British soldiers, the old nineteenth-century way of life had perished during the battles. Instead, a new enthusiasm for progress and rebirth swept the country. With the war in the past, Britain was finally ready to enter the twentieth century.

Directly following the war, celebration and lightheartedness was encouraged throughout Britain. This spirit of celebration provoked by the signing of the Armistice did not, however, dissipate quickly. The image above shows pictures of a dancing ball in Bath, England celebrating
the first anniversary of Armistice Day in November 1919.¹ Celebratory enjoyment of this sort proliferated during the first few years following the war’s end, and gave way to a new culture of amusement. Lightheartedness, victory, and progress became defining symbols of a new, war-free age that came to epitomize the mood of the nation throughout 1920s. This feeling was fueled by a newfound appreciation of life brought on by the mass destruction of war. An overwhelming desire to live in the moment and enjoy life defined the attitude of an entire era. The long-term trend of amusement meant that 1920s British leisure culture grew exponentially during the decade, and was incorporated inexorably into the notion of a new, modern, and fashionable way of life.

The new spirit of celebration created an atmosphere in Britain in which pleasure-seeking enterprise flourished. New “cheap amusements” became widely popular throughout the country. With the expanding urbanization and the growing purchasing power for the lower and middle classes, interwar Britain transformed into a bright landscape where recreation ruled and was enjoyed by members of all classes. This new, modern England was a far cry from the England embodying the industrial work ethic of the mid-nineteenth century. Even for the affluent “leisured” class of the nineteenth century, amusements marked a transition away from private festivities to public, commercial recreation on a mass scale. To some, this transition meant that “good,” conservative, austere British culture had been supplanted by hedonistic frivolity often imported from America. To others, new, affordable amusements meant an opportunity to experience a world of luxury and freedom previously available only to the upper class who had unrestrained time and money to spend. Whereas nineteenth-century leisure and society fostered

an environment of separation based on class, the 1920s indulgence ethos brought a shared popular culture to members of the British public.

This thesis will focus specifically on two amusements, cinema and dance hall, which both emerged as central to the pleasure-seeking culture of the 1920s. Both of these new, cheap entertainments expanded throughout the decade. Leisure enterprises built modern cinemas and *palais de danse* which could accommodate unprecedented crowds of dancers and film enthusiasts. Facilities in picture houses and ballrooms greatly improved from their pre-war standards; improvements which created a luxurious environment for its patrons of modest means. Moreover, both cinema and dance hall began to use display advertising in newsprint, a technique previously reserved for material goods, to sell the experience of modern lightheartedness. Advertising allowed cinemas and *palais* not only to sell the new amusements, but also gave them an opportunity to counter disapproval posed by critics who lamented the newfound dismissal of the Victorian work ethic. With all of these commercial developments, the leisure industry grew into mass entertainment.

My interest in this topic originally grew out of a curiosity about how societies move beyond mass destruction, like the Great War, and how people spend their time in the wake of national tragedy. What is more, I have long been interested in the unifying powers of popular culture, and how popular culture contrasts with the high arts like opera and theater. I see the 1920s as the moment in British leisure history when popular culture like films, dance steps, and the music that accompanied both moving pictures and dances, became, for the first time, ubiquitous. My thesis explores this theme of popular leisure as an equalizing force which allowed amusement enthusiasts from across classes to participate in the same activities.
In the first chapter, I discuss the social, economic, and technological changes to British society that allowed for the proliferation of popular culture. Chapter I also provides a brief history of leisure before the advent of cheap amusements. This chapter shows the ways in which increased urbanization, increased purchasing power for the lower and middle classes, and regulation of working hours all created a society ready for cheap amusements. In Chapter II, I explore the ways in which leisure’s proliferation and accessibility to all classes created a unified popular culture that was identifiable and enjoyable to many different Britons during the 1920s. Chapter III examines the opinions of a large sector of the British public who did not support the spirit of modernity and progress amusement enthusiasts associated with popular leisure. This chapter focuses on the Britons who lamented what they saw as the destruction of the traditional British character, which they defined as hard-working and austere. Although these members of the British public disliked the hedonistic pleasure-seeking that cheap amusements promoted, I argue that these opponents of film and dance prove that cinema and palais de danse had become so relevant in British daily life that even people who did not directly participate in leisure consumption talked about amusements. Finally, in Chapter IV I discuss the ways in which leisure enterprises marketed themselves to the British public. In doing so, advertising teams addressed the critiques presented by leisure’s opponents introduced in Chapter III, and attempted to debunk negative publicity for modern, pleasure-seeking culture.

**Historiography**

This thesis relies almost exclusively on newspapers and periodicals as primary sources. The incredible digitized archive of British publications available through the Columbia
University Libraries has been extremely helpful. In choosing which publications to prioritize, I attempted to use sources that expressed a broad range of opinions, especially emphasizing newspapers and magazines with diverse socioeconomic readership. The Daily Mail is used most frequently, but other primary sources include the Times, The Manchester Guardian, The Observer, and the Sunday Times. From these news outlets, I drew upon articles, letters to the editors, and advertisements. In addition to newsprint, I also used some social surveys and published personal observation.

The secondary sources used in this thesis mainly covered topics in social change, leisure history, and economic developments. I found many general sources on British social and cultural history to be invaluable resources while writing this thesis, but a few stand out as most relevant to cheap amusements’ development in interwar Britain. Allison Jean Abra, whose PhD dissertation “On With the Dance: Nation, Culture, and Popular Dancing in Britain 1918-1945” was an extremely useful source for my thesis, is one of only a handful of historians focusing on British popular dancing and palais de danse. David Fowler, in his book, The First Teenagers: The Lifestyle of Young Wage-earners in Interwar Britain, argues that British leisure culture during the 1920s and early 1930s fostered a sense of identity among young wage earners and constituted the first instance of an identifiable youth culture in Britain. This work was fundamental in both shaping my understanding of the universe in which my thesis is set, and in piquing my interest in the topic. Finally, Gary Cross’s Time and Money: The Making of Consumer Culture and Ross McKibbin’s Classes and Cultures England 1918-1951 were tremendously valuable sources because they make clear the connection between class, society, and leisure upon which this thesis is based.
Chapter I

The Making of a Leisure-Friendly Britain

Mass entertainment, like any other cultural phenomenon, did not appear out of thin air. An ethereal cloud did not burst over London, raining the Charleston and Charlie Chaplin. Visiting a dance hall and going to the cinema, activities that exploded in popularity during the early 1920s, only came to enjoy such profound relevance in British daily life due to a web of social, political, and technological advancements that developed over the late nineteenth century and the first two decades of the twentieth century. Changes in the British economic climate since the second half of the nineteenth century significantly influenced the rise of mass entertainment. Economic factors mingled with the evolving social structure of British society, heralding a new youth demographic which emerged as audiences and consumers of mass entertainment. Additionally, leisure was able to gain popularity due to a combination of urban and technological advancements that changed the entertainment industry's capabilities. Because of the changed social and technological conditions coming out of the First World War, the 1920s marked not only the birth of mass leisure culture in Britain, but also represented a changed interaction between amusements and the British people.

Early Amusements: Nineteenth Century Entertainment and the Historical Origin of Dance Hall and Cinema in England

As compared to nineteenth-century leisure culture, the 1920s marked a tremendous shift in British amusements. The vast majority of enjoyment during the early Victorian period took
place in the home, and was often self made and intermittent.\textsuperscript{2} Although mid-century leisure did exist outside of the home, it was often under the jurisdiction of local organizing, so the availability of common leisure spaces like parks, libraries, baths and museums inevitably varied significantly in different areas of the nation.\textsuperscript{3} Moreover, nineteenth-century leisure differed immensely based on class. The upper class enjoyed pleasurable festivity frequently, but enjoyment often took place inside luxurious private homes, which were equipped with libraries, concert rooms, dining spaces, and even ballrooms.\textsuperscript{4} When the upper class did venture outside the home for leisure, it was often in growing urban cosmopolitan spaces, like London’s West End, which, beginning in the 1820s, underwent an urbanizing gentrification that brought expensive entertainment to the area such as theater and opera, and, later in the century, department stores and upscale hotels.\textsuperscript{5} The working class, in contrast, had very little opportunity for leisure in the mid-nineteenth century. In an 1833 letter to the Chairman of the Manchester Select Committee on Public Walks, Dr. J. P. Kay, a Manchester physician, noted: “The entire labouring population of Manchester is without any season of recreation, and is ignorant of all amusements, excepting that very small portion which frequents the theatre.”\textsuperscript{6} When they did find time for leisure, the working class, especially men, visited pubs and participated in amateur sporting.\textsuperscript{7} Between 1830 and 1870, however, the industrial revolution created a standard of work that was based on discipline and around-the-clock labor, which resulted in a mid-nineteenth century decline in

\textsuperscript{3} Eileen Green, Sandra Hebron, and Diana Woodward, Leisure, What Leisure? (London: Macmillan, 1990), 44.  
\textsuperscript{7} Andrew Davies, Leisure, gender and poverty: Working-class culture in Salford and Manchester, 1900-1939 (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1992), 55.
leisure time for workers.\(^8\) These divides in nineteenth-century amusement accessibility and options created a society in which free time and enjoyment were completely segregated based on class and geography.

Although amusements did exist during the nineteenth century, the new leisure of the 1920s represented a distinct departure from nineteenth-century entertainment culture. Cinema- and dance hall-going were relatively new practices that emerged during the turn of the century and developed over the first two decades of the twentieth century. Cinema came to Britain before dance hall. The first motion picture premiered in London in 1896.\(^9\) Shortly thereafter, London saw the rise of movie houses, film palaces, and the threepenny cinema.\(^10\) Film grew rapidly in popularity between 1906 and 1914, serving mainly a working-class audience and infiltrating the world of variety theatres.\(^11\) By 1914, there were approximately 3,000 cinemas in Great Britain.\(^12\) The onset of war meant many of the established film makers in England turned to patriotic subject matters, either commercially or as official war propaganda.\(^13\) Wartime restrictions made film-making difficult, and air raids affected film studios and early cinemas in London.\(^14\) Furthermore, by 1917, many of the young men who worked in British film industry had gone off to war.\(^15\) Despite setbacks the cinema industry faced during the war, film continued to evolve as an integral part of British culture. In fact, the war itself was seen by many to legitimate the need for cinema in British life, a justification which lasted long after the war's end. As a *Daily Mail*
correspondent noted in 1926, “The kinema played an invaluable part during the war. It brought a
temporary and most beneficial rest from worry to the harassed and anxious civilians, and,
whenever possible, to soldiers, too.”16 The war gave cinema a positive justification, and the
period of celebration that followed the signing of the armistice served as the catalyst for a culture
in which leisure was king. On the eve of the 1920s, the cinema industry was already well
established and was set on a path to continue its growth in popularity throughout the decade.

Dance halls, in contrast, did not exist in their 1920s form in the pre-Great War world. An
entirely new industry needed to be created specifically for popular dancing. Much like the
relaxation justification for cinema that came out of First World War ideology, the dance hall
“craze” originated out of the celebration at the end of the war. “Dances,” organized social
occasions to learn and join in the latest popular dance moves, began cropping up in 1917 and
1918.17 After the armistice, dances were continued in the interest of promoting public fun,
leisure, and celebration.18 The social dancing culture that started in the immediate postwar had a
codifying turning point in 1919, when the Hammersmith Palais de Danse – the first dance hall in
Britain – opened in west London.19 Hammersmith meant that the dancing fad, which started in
the late 1910s, had become popular enough to need its own space. Once the popularity of social
dancing was identified, it was possible for dance to become a widely popular activity over the
course of the 1920s. Indeed, dance culture progressed to a popular phenomenon within the year,
a trend which continued to develop, spread and commercialize throughout the 1920s. Even at the
beginning of 1919, one commentator noted: “It has been said in times gone by that England had

17 Alison Jean Abra, “On With the Dance: Nation, Culture, and Popular Dancing in Britain, 1918-1945” (PhD Diss.,
University of Michigan, 2009), 26.
18 Walvin, Leisure and Society, 130.
19 Abra, “On With the Dance,” 129.
the best dances and the worst dancers! If it is practice that makes perfect, then the Englishman and Englishwoman of to-day should be perfect exponents of this most ancient of the fine arts."\textsuperscript{20}

Dancing, like cinema, clearly already had an “audience” by 1920. It was the coupling of the entertainment world as it stood, however, with the specific social, economic, technological, and urbanization changes that developed over the 1920s that truly allowed mass entertainment to flourish.

\textbf{“Brighter London” in the Interwar Period: Urbanization, Technology, and the Spirit of Modernity}

Dance hall and cinema thrived in large part due to a series of social, economic, and demographic shifts that afforded a large portion of the population access to new forms of leisure. One of the most important factors in the growth of new leisure culture in Britain was growing urbanization and newfound ease of transportation that allowed more and more people to enjoy the amusements of big cities. This was especially true of London. Urbanization grew over the course of the nineteenth century, transforming London into a metropolitan hub at the turn of the twentieth century. By 1901, the population of greater London had reached 6 million inhabitants.\textsuperscript{21} The turn-of-the-century urban population was already known as “The great audience,” a label which indicated the concentrated urban population's potential as a large-scale market for amusements.\textsuperscript{22} By the 1920s, cities were already primed to provide mass leisure audiences because they housed a concentrated population base.


\textsuperscript{21} Jonathan Schneer, \textit{London 1900: The Imperial Metropolis} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 7.

\textsuperscript{22} Briggs, “Mass Entertainment,” 9.
Urban expansion continued into the twentieth century. The interwar period saw its largest urban expansion in the form of suburbanization. Urban built environments saw huge growth, with the developed regions of outer London tripling between 1919 and 1939. This suburban phenomenon had become very evident by the late 1920s. Writing in 1927, historian, biographer, and author, E. Beresford Chancellor, noted:

But to contrast London with any other capital in the world is absurd for one very adequate reason: London has long ceased to be a city and has become a county … You may, by poring over a map, obtain a hazy idea of its immensity; but even then it is difficult to say where in any direction its boundaries are; and with the exception of the officials of the London County Council I doubt if anyone could state with perfect assurance where the City ends and the suburbs begin.

With more families living in and around the cities, leisure industries, particularly cinema and dance hall, had an incentive to focus their efforts on building up amusements in large metropolitan areas. London was not the only major British city that witnessed the influx of popular leisure activity during the 1920s -- Glasgow, Manchester, Newcastle, Birmingham, Liverpool, Cardiff and Edinburgh all became home to major, commercial cinemas and dance halls. This combination of associating new leisure with city centers, coupled with the growth of urban landscapes into suburban regions during the interwar era, gave leisure enterprise the opportunity to cater to a wide, centralized audience that did not exist to the same degree in the prewar world.

Suburban expansion during the interwar period was facilitated by technological and infrastructural advancements in transportation. Transportation change directly influenced audiences' ease of access to picture shows and dances, and was especially helpful in allowing

---

venues to remain open late into the night. Transportation in Britain during the early twentieth century advanced within cities themselves and improved ease of travel from country to city, further expanding the population who could access city-based cinemas and dance halls, if only on a special visit. By the end of the nineteenth century, the railways covered a massive expanse of the country.\textsuperscript{26} Above ground rail was a huge factor allowing for ease of travel, and also influenced the flow of suburbanization, as rail provided easy access from residential neighborhoods into city centers.\textsuperscript{27} Growth in transportation within metropolitan areas also affected leisure's ability to grow as an industry. By the first decade of the twentieth century, London had electrified underground tube stations at Oxford Circus, Piccadilly Circus, Tottenham Court Road, and Leicester Square.\textsuperscript{28} A commentator in 1906 noted the tube's utility in and around the city:

\begin{quote}
Tube railways furnish the urban distribution facilities required, and if extended as surface railways into the suburban districts, as is proposed in the case of the Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway, or linked up with suburban tramways, as in the case of the new railway, provide effectively for suburban collection and terminal diffusion.\textsuperscript{29}
\end{quote}

This observer, like many in the first decades of the twentieth century, saw rail travel as the answer to London's notorious traffic problem, as the above-ground streets were already packed with relatively new but already widespread forms of public transport, such as motorcars, buses, and trams.\textsuperscript{30} Transportation improvements, particularly electrified underground stations, meant

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{26} Bédarida, \textit{A Social History of England}, 212.
\bibitem{28} Walkowitz, \textit{Nights Out}, 19.
\bibitem{29} Anonymous, “Tubes and London Traffic,” \textit{Saturday review of politics, literature, science and art} 102 (December 15 1906), 731.
\bibitem{30} Betts, \textit{The Film Business}, 26.
\end{thebibliography}
suburban dance hall visitors or cinema goers could easily make a full day trip to the city and purchase a picture ticket or go out to dinner before a night at the dance hall.

Transportation expansion also meant that visitors from the British countryside and from abroad could participate in the consumption of urban leisure. Tourism became big business in the 1920s. Writing in 1932 about London in the 1920s, acclaimed screenplay and short story writer, John Collier, and his co-author, Iain Lang, lamented tourism’s invasion of the capital:

The scramble for tourists' money degraded whole areas of London. Reputable shops, forgetting the generations of stubborn chastity and proud modesty that had brought them repute, turned to harlotry, shamelessly importuning the passer by … The city shed part of its dignity and at least half of its charm in its vulgar anxiety to profit by the entertainment of the wealthy visitor from abroad.

Clearly, evolving transportation in and around London and other major cities meant that entertainment could become a source of income directed at a larger audience. Ease of transportation in the 1920s also aided the growth of cinema and dance hall outside of major cities. The interwar period saw a growth in the popularity of seaside holiday, and vacationing became an attainable luxury for a larger sector of the British public. Both cinema and dance hall venues began to crop up in popular holiday destinations, such as Brighton and Blackpool. Tourism, promoted by increased ease of transportation, meant that dance hall and cinema became players as a part of a larger trend towards consumption, spectacle, and sight seeing centered around big cities and popular vacation destinations.

---

33 Bédarida, *A Social History of England,* 208. During the Interwar Period, holidays became possible for the lower-middle and working classes because of bargaining for government regulation on working week hours. Socioeconomic changes during that time also impacted cheap amusement’s ability to grow on a mass scale.
34 Abra, “On With the Dance,” 150.
Urban growth, transportation, and new technologies all contributed to a notion that, by 1920, the world was becoming increasingly modern. This changing spirit, especially in London, where new cosmopolitan urbanization flourished, became the context in which cinema and *palais de danse* thrived.\textsuperscript{35} After the armistice, the atmosphere in London turned away from the strict rule of austerity during the War, whose restrictions spread a blanket of dreariness over the city.\textsuperscript{36} Restrictions on hours of operation for public houses and drinking venues lasted in the immediate postwar years, but began to lift during the early 1920s.\textsuperscript{37} Additionally, the hard-work ethos of Victorian England began to break down, giving way to a modern distinction between work time and leisure time.\textsuperscript{38} Pleasure-seekers began to explore ways to look to a new future for London, one that would be defined by a bright, modern, and forward-looking outlook. The campaign for a Brighter London was spearheaded by the Chelsea Arts Club Ball, whose 1922 theme was, “Brighter London One Hundred Years Hence.”\textsuperscript{39} Of the event, the *Times* reported, “Their programme included, in accordance with the tradition of this ball, five other new numbers, all of them fox-trots. The masquerading was as picturesque as ever. Dancing continued until 5 a.m.”\textsuperscript{40} Clearly, from its inception, the concept of a “bright London” was closely associated with popular leisure and modernity. This shows the inexorable connection between the well-being of the city and the prosperity of amusements during the 1920s. “Brighter London” became a sort of slogan to rally around making the city a better and brighter place to live, and

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{35} Walkowitz, *Nights Out*, 145.
\textsuperscript{36} Collier and Lang, *Just the Other Day*, 22.
\textsuperscript{38} Davies, “Cinema and Broadcasting,” 264.
\end{flushleft}
was adopted as an advertising campaign by many purveyors of entertainment and enjoyment, such from hotels and restaurants to dance halls and cinemas.\textsuperscript{41} The brightness campaign was not just an empty promise. In 1926, British journalist and essayist Stephen Graham noted:

\begin{quote}
Piccadilly Circus is our equivalent of the Great White Way. Electric light wastes there like life itself. It glows, it dazzles, it flares to heaven. All the moths of London come and stare at it; the lights of pleasure and the lights of vice. Something not to be missed by the visitor to London is to drive in an open car up Piccadilly at night— to the Circus.\textsuperscript{42}
\end{quote}

Urbanization, tourism, transportation, and a bright modernity, all served to create a culture which brought about the boom of mass leisure and allowed dance hall and cinema to grow into widely popular and lucrative industries.

\section*{Changing Demographics: Youth, Women, and the Socioeconomic Audience for 1920s Amusements}

Changes to cities, transportation, and infrastructure were not the only external factors that contributed to the ability of the leisure industry to grow on a massive scale. Class shifts and emerging consumer demographics merged with the changing climate in Britain towards a brighter modernity to create an environment which fostered the growth of enterprise surrounding amusements. In contrast to luxury cultural engagements, such as theater and opera that catered to an exclusively elite audience, the new cinema and dance hall offerings sweeping the country during the 1920s marked a period of democratization of leisure activity.\textsuperscript{43} Both cinema and dance hall became examples of “cheap amusements” that provided an alternative entertainment

\textsuperscript{41} Collier and Lang, \textit{Just the Other Day}, 23.
available to a sector of the population that could not afford upscale leisure.\textsuperscript{44} Cinema and dance hall's democratizing capabilities originated from a combination of the emergence and growth of a new, lower middle class, together with wage improvements and increased benefits for the working class. During the 1920s, this lower-class sector began to enjoy some, albeit limited, spare capital and free time to enjoy dance hall and cinema. This audience for amusements developed throughout the interwar period due to a trend in British labor towards a rise in real wages, reduction of overall hours of work, and increased purchasing power.\textsuperscript{45} Although the interwar period experienced an onslaught of unemployment, the average standard of living actually rose because wages of those who were working and the salaries of all levels of the middle classes rose.\textsuperscript{46} The expansion of leisure time and the increase of buying power during the 1920s opened up a space in the market on which the leisure industry capitalized. Dance hall, cinema, and the “mania of the moment” culture provided inexpensive entertainment to those whose budgets and spare time could newly afford it.

The leisure industry was also able to grow out of an ability to appeal to multiple demographics on the socioeconomic scale. The disparity between wealth and poverty was slowly becoming less pronounced. The middle class expanded rapidly just before and during this period. In the mid-nineteenth century, the middle class formed around 16\% of the British population. By 1931, the class had grown to 36\% of the overall population.\textsuperscript{47} The emerging lower middle class

\textsuperscript{46} Bédarida, \textit{A Social History of England}, 178.
\textsuperscript{47} Bédarida, \textit{A Social History of England}, 205.
consisted primarily of tradesmen, small businessmen, shop assistants, and commercial sector workers. Somewhere in between the proletariat and the established upper middle class, the lower middle class served as a perfect audience for new forms of leisure because, as a class, they had a sense of deserving a “better” standard of living, but still had the economic blockage that prevented them from participating in traditional “high” culture amusements. Although the emerging and expanding middle class was vital to the growth of mass culture, it was not the only social sector to enjoy cinema and dance hall. Without the redistribution of social class towards a middle class, entertainment amusements would not have been able to reach the same number of people during the 1920s.

The middle class was not the only expanding demographic that impacted the leisure industry's growth and development during the 1920s. Dance hall, cinema, and the new pleasure-seeking lifestyle that developed around them was, for the most part, enjoyed by young workers. Unmarried youth, many of them moving to urban centers for work, could afford the cheap amusements offered by the cinema and dance hall. Over the course of the interwar period, average income for working individuals, male and female, aged fourteen to twenty-five, increased between 300 and 500 percent. This spending power meant that the 1920s generation had an unprecedented pocket money to put towards new amusements.

Contemporary commentators fully recognized the special new qualities of the 1920s youth. Writing in 1923, the English writer, poet, and philosopher, C. K. Chesterton, remarked, 

---

50 Ross McKibbin, *Classes and Cultures: England 1918-1951* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 391. McKibbin discusses these forms as creating a *democracy* of culture because they were popular among all social classes.
“It is said that every generation is in revolt against the last; but the change between the last two generation is rather unique.” 53 Clearly, the ability of young people to spend money on emerging leisure activities meant a divergence both from spending abilities and habits of their parents' generation. In fact, during the interwar years, young, single people from working class backgrounds experienced a much higher standard of living than the other members of their families. 54 It was not only working class and lower middle class youth, however, that participated in dancing, cinema-going, and other habits of the leisure industry. Affluent young people also became consumers of leisure culture in droves, and the amusement enterprise developed in order to cater to youths of different spending ability. For example, the 1920s saw the emergence of different tiers of cinemas, including the more expensive city center picture houses. 55 This division also existed for dance halls, with upper-middle class youth experiencing the latest dance craze at scheduled dances or charity balls at clubs, hotels, or restaurants, while lower-middle class youth visited dance halls in different neighborhoods. 56 Despite these discrepancies in venue and neighborhood, young people of the 1920s were, for the first time, experiencing the same cultural activity because of their age, not because of their class. This shared experience of popular amusements and a communization of affordable entertainment within the youth environment meant a further democratization of leisure activity. 57 Rich or poor, a British nineteen year old in 1927 likely knew how to foxtrot. With the youth across the socioeconomic gamut participating in 1920s amusements, the leisure industry was able to expand its audience and gain popularity on a widespread scale.

54 Fowler, *The First Teenagers*, 95.
57 McKibbin, *Classes and Cultures*, 391.
Of the youth demographic that made up the vast majority of audiences for dance hall and cinema, young women constituted a large portion and became consumers of the leisure industry. Women’s place in British society had been evolving significantly since the mid-nineteenth century. Between 1850 and 1880, educational reforms meant the creation of secondary schools for girls and the acceptance of women at major universities, including Cambridge and Oxford. The Married Woman’s Property Acts of 1870 and 1882 allowed wives to regain possession of property obtained both before and after marriage. After a long struggle for suffrage, women gained the right to vote in 1918. These social and political gains meant that, by the 1920s, British culture was seeing the breakdown of the Victorian ideal of woman as the guardian of the household. What is more, women’s financial independence was improving. With the rise of industrial capitalism, the number of women in the workplace grew and women’s work, which was previously relegated to the domestic sphere, was given a monetary value. Although this progression marked a significant shift in women’s spending capabilities, it also created a gendered work environment, which compartmentalized “women’s work” from “men’s work” in the public sphere. This meant that women’s participation in certain professions expanded. By 1929, one fourth of all civil service employees were women. The number of women teachers in Britain jumped from 70,000 in 1851 to 172,000 in 1901, and women were well represented in public service and as nurses, dentists, and librarians by the turn of the century. After the

---

outbreak of the First World War, even professions from which women were traditionally excluded, such as law, stock exchange, and politics, hired their first female employees.⁶⁶ All of these social, political, and economic changes allowed women to engage more actively in public life.

Changes in women’s position in society, especially their financial capabilities, greatly influenced their ability to participate in new leisure. Traditionally, leisure referred to time spent away from paid work, a luxury which women did not have on a widespread scale before the mid-nineteenth century.⁶⁷ Even in working-class families, where women had always been much more likely to work for pay than in middle- and upper-class households, men were the prominent consumers of leisure before the 1920s. Working-class women were expected to put the needs of the family before their own, whereas men could always access petty cash to spend on leisure.⁶⁸ Young working women, however, had disposable income to spend on new leisure without the constraints of family life.⁶⁹ In this way, youth was a time when the inequalities of spending power and independence between the sexes were less pronounced.⁷⁰ As increasing numbers of women entered the workforce, their ability to spend money on non-essentials like entertainment grew. By the 1930s, 75% of British cinema-goers were women.⁷¹ Similarly, British popular dancing culture, particularly going to the *palais de danse*, was most closely associated with women.⁷² With their newfound growth in spending capabilities, young, working women were able to grow as the largest demographic for new amusements.

---

Chapter II

“Wherever you look”: The Growth and Democratization of 1920s Leisure

How did one live without typewriters, carbon paper, electric light, gramophones, telephones, wireless, motor cars, paraffin, antiseptics, gas-fires? Yet all these things have come into common use during the last 25 years.

So have the turbine, the oil driven steam-ship, the motor-boat, the kinema. Our existence is dominated and shaped by inventions and devices which were, for all practical purposes, unknown when Queen Victoria died.

Theatres were few and rather costly. The cheap kinema for the million had not yet to come. The motor-coach, which enables town's folk of the most moderate means to enjoy country air and scenery, is very new. The teashop, the huge popular restaurant, the dance-hall are not much older.

—Sir Sidney Low, “Wonderful Years of Progress,” Daily Mail
Atlantic Edition, 10 Jan. 1927

Everywhere anyone looked in 1920s Britain, people were amusing themselves. As Sir Sidney Low, noted British journalist and historian, pointed out in his 1927 article, “Wonderful Years of Progress,” this proliferation of leisure activities was decidedly new, and it marked a major transformation towards a culture obsessed with amusements. The flood of new pleasure-seeking activities was often conceived of by contemporaries as a “craze,” a “boom,” or a “mania” that had captured the attention of the British people. As Low implies, and as many other commentators noted, the leisure “craze” was often taken as a defining element of the modern age. Although the terms “craze” and “mania” were certainly imbued with negative connotations, this chapter focuses on the ways in which the leisure “craze” fostered the spread and success of many cheap amusements, especially cinema and dance hall. This chapter also endeavors to highlight the ways in which cinema and dance hall reached mass cultural relevancy
on a widespread scale. Because cheap amusements were both accessible and identifiable to a substantial portion of the British population during the 1920s, they became mass activities that acted as popular and unifying points of cultural reference.

“Wherever you look”: The Proliferation of Dance Hall and Cinema

Leisure's expanded popularity was a function of the spread and success of cheap amusements. The most important factor of growth for both cinema and dance hall was the simple fact that they were widely available, which meant that Britons looking for enjoyment did not have to search far. The first British *palais de danse*, Hammersmith Palais, opened in London in 1919. Hammersmith’s opening marked a new trend in dancehall size and status that was markedly different from pre-war ballrooms and other public dance spaces.\(^\text{73}\) The novel Hammersmith Palais, measuring 27,000 square feet, was remarkable for the sheer number of dancers and bystanders it could accommodate.\(^\text{74}\) The *Daily Mail’s* original 1919 announcement of Hammersmith’s opening clearly expresses astonishment at the number of people the hall would be able to hold:

Hall for 2,000 Jazzers: What, it is claimed, will be one of the largest dancing halls in the world - a floor area of 27,000 square feet capable of accommodating 1,000 couples at one time - is about to be opened in the Broadway, Brook Green-road, Hammersmith. It will be known as the ‘Palais de Danse.’\(^\text{75}\)

For the first time, dance spaces were able to welcome mass numbers onto their floors, which meant more people had access to popular dancing.

\(^{73}\) McKibbin, *Classes and Cultures*, 393.
\(^{74}\) Abra, “On With the Dance,” 133.
Not only were *palais de danse* able to accommodate more interested pleasure-seekers in the 1920s, but soon major British cities also saw an influx of dancehalls, restaurants, clubs and other spaces with dance floors and dancing hours. Between 1919 and 1926, an estimated 11,000 dancing establishments were erected throughout the country.\(^76\) The availability of dancehalls was noteworthy to contemporary commentators. In 1925 the *Manchester Guardian* reported many British people felt “that they were becoming surrounded by dancing saloons.”\(^77\) In the same vein, Anna Pavlova, the world-famous ballerina, wrote to the *Daily Mail* in 1925, claiming:

“Wherever you look there is a new *Palais de Danse*. Everywhere strange music throbs.”\(^78\)

Clearly, the ubiquity of *palais* became established over the course of the decade, meaning that leisure was easily attainable for those who were interested. By 1929, the *Manchester Guardian* noted: “In London alone there are nearly a hundred hotels, dance halls, schools, clubs, and palais de danse from which to choose when deciding where you are going to spend the evening.”\(^79\) This diversity of options for dancing meant the leisure activity had expanded into a widely available good; it was everywhere.

Cinema, as the older of the two amusements, had a slightly different path of development than *palais de danse*. Whereas the British dancing “craze” did not develop until after the 1919 opening of Hammersmith Palais, cinema was already a well-established amusement with large audiences at the beginning of the 1920s. Cinema’s position as an integral part of British daily life was therefore substantially better established than that of dance hall. According to a study published by the Cinema Commission of Inquiry of the National Council of Public Morals in
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\(^76\) Abra, “On With the Dance,” 134.


\(^78\) Anna Pavlova, “This Dancing Age,” *Daily Mail Atlantic Edition*, 22 Nov. 1925: 4. The title of this subsection is taken from this article.

1917, there were approximately 4,500 cinemas in the British Isles, with 1,075,875,000 attendances over the course of a single year.\(^{80}\) Although cinema already had an established presence in British culture, its prevalence continued to grow during the 1920s age of leisure. In 1911, there were 94 cinema in London, with a total seating capacity of 55,000. By 1931, this number had grown to 258 cinemas with a seating capacity of 344,000.\(^{81}\) What is more, the 1920s saw the rise of the “super-cinema,” spaces which could accommodate much larger audiences than small, pre-war picturehouses.\(^{82}\) In 1922, the *Daily Mail* announced the opening of a “super-kinema” in London, remarking, “should negotiations be completed there will be built a new super-kinema, capable of holding 4,000 people, which, it is claimed, will be without rival in this country.”\(^{83}\) As was the case with *palais de danse*, the growth of cinema during the 1920s was characterized by both an increase in the number of overall cinemas in the country and by a massive expansion in their ability to accommodate larger audiences. Cinemas, like *palais*, became more accessible as their capabilities expanded.

**Leisure’s Expanding Audience**

With the numbers and capacities of British dance hall and cinema expanding the size of audiences, the types of participants also began to grow and diversify. The primary audience for 1920s “cheap” amusements was young urban workers, especially young women. The largest

---

\(^{80}\) The National Council of Public Morals, “The Cinema: its present position and future possibilities,” report taken by the Cinema Commission of Inquiry (London: Williams and Norgate, 1917), xxi. This number reflects total ticket sales, rather than how many individuals attended the cinema in a single year. Although it seems like a preposterously high statistic, David Fowler notes that, by the early 1930s, it was not unusual for young wage earners to visit the cinema three times per week. See Fowler, *The First Teenagers*, 116.

\(^{81}\) Jones, *Workers at Play*, 44.

\(^{82}\) Davies, “Cinema and Broadcasting,” 270.

segment of the dancing- and cinema-going public was made up of ‘flappers,’ a slightly derogatory term applied to young, unmarried, lower middle-class women with time and some money to spare.\textsuperscript{84} The affordable price of cinema and dancehall meant that young working-class women also became dominant consumers of film and dance.\textsuperscript{85} As early as 1919, the \textit{Daily Mail} acknowledged the preponderance of young women in audiences for amusements, noticing that “[t]here is little doubt that the extraordinary popularity of dancing is owing to the need felt by young girls for relaxation and exercise.”\textsuperscript{86} In 1922, the \textit{Manchester Guardian} recapped a study of cinema conducted by the National Union of Societies for Equal Citizenship, which highlighted cinema’s popularity among the working class: “Several things made [cinema] the most popular of indoor entertainments. It was cheap; it provided absorbing interest and distraction to millions of working people.”\textsuperscript{87} Clearly, even in the earliest years of the 1920s entertainment “craze,” young women and the working class in general were most commonly associated with the increasing popularity of cheap amusements.

Although amusements’ main audience was made up of young, working-class women, cinema and popular dancing attracted both young and old, rich and poor audiences. The \textit{Daily Mail} reported instances of elderly people enjoying film. A 1921 death announcement of a 104-year-old man claimed that he “used to spend three afternoons every week at the kinema,”\textsuperscript{88} and an 85-year-old retired Cambridge University lecturer in history wrote in 1923, “I have been engaged in education all my life, and I cannot understand why anyone should object to children going to kinemas. They are my favourite amusement, and always have been since they were first

\textsuperscript{84} Langhamger, \textit{Women’s leisure in England}, 53.
\textsuperscript{85} Langhamger, \textit{Women’s leisure in England}, 58.
invented.” Clearly, cinema appealed to a wider age range than its main audience would suggest. Because of the physical requirements needed to participate in dancing-centered activities, the actual dancing population tended to be more homogeneous than cinema attendees in that they had to be physically able to dance. In spite of this limitation, much of the British public was still exposed to cultural references to popular dances, such as the Fox-Trot and the Charleston, through print culture, radio, music, and film. Both cinema and popular dancing, therefore, were relevant to a larger portion of the population than those who participated directly.

Just as cinema appealed to audiences above the age range of its most notable demographic, both cinemas and dance halls drew visitors from well above their targeted “cheap” financial means. In fact, during the 1920s reports surfaced of royalty enjoying popular leisure activities. The 1920s saw a shift in cinema attendance from the almost entirely working-class audience that frequented pre-war picture houses to a more universal viewership. Under the headline, “King and Queen at a Cinema,” a 1927 Daily Mail article informed: “Large crowds gathered on the pavement to watch the arrival last night of the King and Queen, accompanied by Princess Mary, for the gala performance of the British Navy film comedy, 'The Flag Lieutenant,' at the Marble Arch Pavilion, W., in aid of King George's Fund for Sailors.” Similarly, in 1922 the Times described a charity ball at Hammersmith Palais:

... at the present time the [dance] craze seems to have reached its zenith. The number of private and public dances has grown enormously, and the official seal of approval was set on the public dancing hall when, a little while ago, the Duke of York visited the Hammersmith Palais de Danse on the occasion of a function that had been arranged for charity. Moreover, he joined in the dancing.

---

91 McKibbin, Classes and Cultures, 394.
92 Davies, “Cinema and Broadcasting,” 270.
The symbolic significance of the Prince giving his “official seal of approval” to the *palais* meant that this leisure activity, and the very same dance halls attended by the dancing masses, were fit for a king, or, at least, for a prince. The audiences for both cinema and dance hall, although mainly comprised of young, working class women, grew throughout the 1920s to include varied age ranges and socioeconomic classes.

Both cinema and *palais de danse* clearly drew audiences from a myriad of different backgrounds, but perhaps the most notable feature of the audience for cheap amusements was its sheer scope. With *palais* and cinemas constantly cropping up across the country, these entertainment forms were able to reach huge numbers of audience members and participants. Writing in 1921, Arthur Weigall, noted British cinema critic and journalist, described the distinct audience cinema achieved worldwide as follows:

> It is to be remembered that a popular photo-play is seen by scores of millions of persons throughout the globe: there has never before been such a means of publicity. The newspaper with the largest circulation on earth is a mere mouse in the presence of this mammoth, and the 'best seller' in the book-world is, by comparison, something still smaller. Even *Chu-Chin-Chow*, with the actors growing grey in their roles, cannot touch more than a small part of the vast public which views a successful film shown for the space of no more than three days at any one theatre. ⁹⁵

Clearly, contemporary observers understood the unprecedented audience mass leisure entertainment provided. The newfound scale of audiences meant that many individuals in Britain, and indeed around the globe, were experiencing cheap amusements.

**“The West End for the Many”: The Homogenization of Popular Culture**

---

With the growth of cinema and dancehall audiences, one of the cornerstones of 1920s leisure became its ability to create a relevant cultural reference point across the social classes. For the first time, British patrons from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds were visiting the same *palais* and cinemas. What is more, amusement’s ability to provide inexpensive luxury to classes who had never experienced it before meant that working-class *palais*- and cinema-goers felt that they were being provided the same quality of leisure as the upper class. In this way, cheap amusements allowed a broad range of classes to enjoy the same leisure activities at the same quality standard. The 1920s, therefore, marked a period of homogenization of popular culture.

Many contemporary commentators agreed that the mark of cheap amusement’s success was in its ability to provide high-quality enjoyment at an affordable price. In 1923, the *Manchester Guardian* noted:

There are cheap night clubs, excellently managed and with good food, where thousands can sup, dance, and enjoy cabaret amusements, and restaurants quite as stupendous in glitter and gaiety as the richest party could desire. There are, too, *palais de danse* on a tremendous scale, with beautiful floors and boxes often tenanted by picture-postcard people. Further developments in the way of providing a West End for everyone are being planned by various astute and enterprising people. The kinemas, of course, have contributed their big part to this movement.96

Bringing the “West End” to all meant proliferation of similar interest in “glitter and gaiety.” This phenomenon of extending amusements at a popular level marked a departure from the old tradition of the “leisured” classes and the masses spending their time in markedly different ways. Many contemporary observers commented on the idea that providing luxury at an affordable price created common cultural ground among varied classes. In 1919, the *Daily Mail* reported
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that: “[dancing] is as great a joy to the poor as to the rich. There are no mechanical aids for millionaires only.”"97 In 1924, one Manchester Guardian article described London's approval of all-night dancing licenses for hotel dance halls as a success for those masses “who desired to dance as well as well-to-do people.”"98 With expanded access to the luxury of leisure, cross-class shared experiences and interests became commonplace.

It was in large part the provision of luxury that aided cheap amusement in its ability to act as a vehicle for the homogenization and universalization of popular culture. In 1923, the Manchester Guardian concluded, “The increasing democratization of what used to be called West End life must have been noticed by all observers.”"99 With luxury increasingly becoming an equalizing rather than a dividing force, cinema and popular dancing became common cultural references for its expanded audience of rich and poor, young and old. In 1920, The Observer commented on cinema’s future role as a cultural unifier: “If it elects to use wisely the power it has of appealing equally to high and low, lettered and unlettered, its coming will have been an incalculable gain to society.”"100 Again in 1927, The Observer remarked, “The screen is universal because all men see it with the same eyes.”"101 This universalizing element was also notable for dance hall. According to a 1919 Daily Mail article, the dancing boom was culturally relevant to a wide population of the British public: “Society men and girls dance, business men and girls dance, working girls and men dance, every sort and of girl and boy dance: all have been caught up in the enveloping wave of dancing which is sweeping over this country.”"102 The

homogenization of leisure meant that cinema and dancehall became almost universal cultural icons.

Cinemas and *palais*, therefore, grew to be conceived of as spaces of class mixing, as they were appealing leisure activities not only to the traditional “masses” in the sense of the lower class, but also in the sense that cultural influence was widespread. Writing in 1926, Stephen Graham, British journalist, travel-writer, and essayist, described the newness of this phenomenon in his visit to an East London dance space as follows: “Once upon a time it used to be thought much 'finer,' by which was meant much rougher. Now with its dancing license, its music, and its mixed crowds, a man might take his wife in if he and she were good 'mixers' and not too self-conscious.”103 Dance halls became newly acknowledged spaces where the formerly “rough” met the formerly “well-to-do.” Although this example hints at the lingering differentiation between classes that remained within the dancing culture, it is also evident that classes were experiencing the same amusements, and that the evolution of the dance hall and dance licenses for other spaces provided the same popular culture dance opportunities to working populations.
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103 Graham, *London Night*, 177. Graham refers to mixing not only from a class standpoint but also very explicitly from a racial standpoint. Both dance hall and cinema carried huge racial implications, colonial influence, cultural appropriation, and represented both racial “mixing” but also racial exclusion. Although this thesis focuses on the rise of leisure as a democratizing force from a socioeconomic standpoint, the limitations of this project mean that I cannot do justice the the question of racial and colonial influences on interwar leisure, a topic which deserves significant analysis. For more on the influence race and colonialism on twentieth century leisure see Schneer, *London 1900*; Abra, “On With the Dance,”; Walkowitz, *Nights Out*; Abra, “Dancing in the English style: professionalisation, public preference and the evolution of popular dancing in Britain in the 1920s” in Brett Bebber *Leisure and cultural conflict in twentieth-century Britain*; Nott, *Music for the People*; Malnig, ed. *Ballroom, Boogie, Shimmy, Sham, Shake: A social and Popular Dance Reader*. This list of sources is not even close to exhaustive on the subject of race, dance hall, and cinema, not to mention the entire historiography devoted to the racial appropriation of jazz music and dance styles, which is closely related to the popularity of the British *palais de danse*. 
“Signs of our time”: Leisure’s Fashion in a Modern Age

As going to the cinema and the *palais* became accessible and popular activities, and as their democratization meant that dances and films were recognizable cultural references across the classes, it became clear to many that leisure play was a defining element of a new, modern world. The democratized nature of entertainment was an integral factor of the transformation.

Writing in 1933, the noted British author and playwright, J.B Priestley, observed:

> Notice how the very modern things, like the films and wireless and sixpenny stores, are absolutely democratic, making no distinction between their patrons: if you are in a position to accept what they give -- and very few people are not in that position -- then you get neither more nor less than what anybody else gets.\textsuperscript{104}

The sense of modernity Priestley describes has two quintessential factors: first, the “modern things” are meant for enjoyment and expenditure, as opposed to work and austerity; and second, modern British life, according to Priestley, was distinctively affordable and democratic. With this association between an increasingly democratized culture, leisure, and a modern era, it became clear over the course of the 1920s that the epitome of a postwar world was fashionable cheap amusements.

In part, the notion that amusement was at the center of a changing, modern world grew out of the explosion of popular dance at the close of the First World War. By the middle of the 1920s, commentators were defining the popularity of dance in terms that indicated the amusement's exponential growth in a short period of time. In 1926, the *Daily Mail* noted, “The ever-increasing popularity of dancing with people of all ages and the mushroom-like growth of

palais de danse are among the most notable signs of our time.”\textsuperscript{105} Clearly, this \textit{Daily Mail} reporter took the rapid growth in popularity of leisure culture, especially the “mushrooming” of dance, as an integral mark of the era. The dancing “craze,” which proliferated in popular culture so rapidly that it became emblematic of the modern world, meant that dancing had become decidedly fashionable. In a 1925 article, the \textit{Daily Mail} argued that the masses:

\begin{quote}
… dance because they are bored when they aren't dancing; and you can pick them out because their souls come into their eyes when the band starts – a sort of fishy look. Closely allied are the unfortunates who are Afraid of Not Dancing. This is much the same as dancing because it happens to be the fashion; and the earnest devotees follow the news closely to be sure of being right on time with the Charleston or the Continental tango or whatever the dance of the moment may be.\textsuperscript{106}
\end{quote}

The author clearly highlights dancing’s popularity and characterizes it as a fad. The fashion was so potent, so overwhelmingly prevalent, that the \textit{Daily Mail} supposed that many of the dancing masses were “afraid of not dancing,” a statement which implies that, to be included in the popular culture scene, one had to participate in the new cheap amusements. Being part of the \textit{palais de danse} scene meant being fashionable.

Because cinema-going was already an enduring pastime by 1920, it did not undergo a “craze” in the same way as dance hall. Nevertheless, cinema was notably fashionable, and was often incorporated into descriptions of the modern age. Priestley again made cinema’s inclusion in this fashionable modern world clear:

\begin{quote}
This is the England of the arterial and by-pass roads, of filling stations and factories that look like exhibition buildings, of giant cinemas and dance-halls and cafés, bungalows with tiny garages, cocktail bars, Woolworths, motor-coaches, wireless, hiking, factory girls looking like actresses, greyhound racing and dirt tracks, swimming pools, and everything given away for cigarette coupons.\textsuperscript{107}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{105} Anonymous, “Dancing as an Aid to Efficiency,” \textit{Daily Mail Atlantic Edition}, 4 June 1926: 7. The title of this subsection is taken from this article.


\textsuperscript{107} Priestley, \textit{English Journey}, 319.
All of these modern developments, including the new leisure practices, clearly marked a momentous shift, not only for amusement’s participants, but for the country’s cultural landscape as a whole. Because of its availability and democratizing power, the fashionable “craze” created by dancehall and cinema meant that cheap amusements rose to the forefront of British popular culture.
Chapter III

“A Certain Frivolous Universality”: Anxieties Over Popular Culture and the Growth of Cheap Amusements

I wonder why each flapper looks so fortunate,
Why frocks and films (“as advertised”), importunate;
Why every valet deems himself a hero;
Why bunkum grows while income sinks to zero. –
   Lloyd Goerge and fry,
   I wonder why.
   –“I Wonder Why,” *Saturday review of politics, literature, science and art*, 3 January 1920.

There is a veritable craze of “youth-worship” to-day among the nations … the only qualities to complete success are youth, the capacity to dance, eat candy and wear clothes … Youth the happiest time? Without a shudder of horror at the heresy, I hereby declare with my hand on my heart that generally speaking, this time of one’s life is definitely the least happy.

Despite the enthusiasm for and rapid growth of the new mass culture of leisure, there was no dearth of criticism of the public's new penchant for cheap pleasures. Individuals, religious groups, public officials and members the older generations all spoke out against what they saw as hedonistic new pastimes. As there is not enough space here to treat all of these complaints, this chapter will focus on a few of the most prominent anxieties over new leisure practices during the 1920s. Adversaries of cheap amusements focused on the negative impact that cinema and *palais de danse* purportedly had on young people, claiming that participating in these popular culture activities damaged young people’s physical health and exposed them to violence and sex. Additionally, critics cast cinema and dance hall as hedonistic pastimes that encouraged young
people to spend their time at pleasure haunts rather than working. These critiques of the new leisure culture conveyed deep-seated anxieties that hedonism and self-indulgence were overtaking Victorian values of work and self-sacrifice, and supplanting the British way of life with American popular culture. Such fears led observers to stigmatize the taste for cheap amusements as a “mania” or “craze,” labels that harshly condemned the pervasiveness of new leisure practices and the passions they excited.

**Doctors for Dancers: Cheap Amusements as Unhealthy for the British Youth**

One of the main issues about which 1920s critics were concerned was leisure’s impact on the country’s youth. As illustrated in Chapters I and II, young audiences made up one of the main demographics for cheap amusement consumption. Critics especially condemned young people’s penchant for visiting cheap amusements so frequently. In this context, the “youth” included children and adolescents up to people in their mid-twenties. Opponents of modern leisure culture cited cinema and *palais de danse* as hubs of unhealthy activity, claiming that dancing and watching films could be detrimental to both the physical and mental well-being of young participants. What is more, critics denounced the violent and romantically illicit undertones of popular films and dance steps. By associating the “mania” of leisure culture with these negative connotations, those who disapproved of cheap amusements constructed an argument that highlighted (if not fabricated) leisure’s potential dangers to British youth.

One way this anxiety over the British youth’s preoccupation with hedonistic leisure manifested itself was in arguments that going to the cinema or *palais* was somehow unhealthy. A
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108 McKibbin, *Classes and Cultures*, 394.
1921 *Daily Mail* article discussed a solution to eye strain for children at cinemas, explaining that in order “to lessen the danger of eye-strain, Blackburn kinema licensees, says Dr. Dalex, the town’s medical officer, have agreed to exclude young children from the first few rows in the auditorium.” Clearly, the possibility of physical harm to young people was startling enough to merit a response from the professional medical community. The health danger was also a fear for popular dancing. In 1923, the *Daily Mail* discussed the dangerous side of the dancing “craze”:

> At Birmingham Palais de Danse yesterday Miss Lily Goodman, 17, established a British record by dancing continuously for 24hr. 5min. Miss Goodman’s partner, Mr. Webster Gringley, an instructor, collapsed after 19hr. 10min., and she continued with another instructor. A doctor eventually ordered her to retire.

The health risk for dancing was related to the concept of dancing as a “mania” or “craze,” with zealous young leisure-enthusiasts like Goodman willing to dance until it was medically imperative for her to stop. Concerns about health risks associated with new leisure activities centered around the perceived over-indulgence in and obsession with amusement.

Critics also lamented the capacity of cinema and dance hall to negatively impact the mental stability of British children. In 1917, the *Times* reported on a finding by the British Cinema Commission, publishing the Commission’s assertion that:

> Children should visit the theatre at such an hour as will ensure their night’s rest is not encroached on. Their attendance should not be too frequent, and they should not be allowed to stay too long at any one visit. The pictures which the children ought to see should be exhilarating, without leading to undue mental strain.

The Commission was clearly concerned that cinema enthusiasm might compromise children’s ability to get a healthy amount of sleep, affecting both their physical health and their mental well-being. Fears about the psychological impact of leisure on young people went hand in hand

---

with the notion that a “mania” or “craze” was sweeping across the country. In this article, the Cinema Commission is taking a preventative measure, attempting to regulate the frequency, hour, and content of films young people should be able to see. This attempt seems to be a response to a perceived excess in leisure consumption, as its focus is on moderation and prevention.

Young people’s mental health was also a concern for dancing. After a children’s dance held at a dance hall in Bath in 1924, *The Bath Chronicle* posed the question, “Is the ‘Blues’ dance aptly named for the reason that it is conducive to mental depression?”\(^{112}\) The article goes on to mention that “the ‘Blues’ is danced in a very gloomy manner in some ballrooms.”\(^{113}\) Clearly, both dancing and films raised concerns about “mental strain” or “mental depression,” factors which called into question the perceived detriment to mental well-being. Fears about modern amusements’ impact on both the mental and physical health of the British youth permeated amongst critics who believed it was in the country’s best interest to quell leisure “mania.”

### Inappropriate Behavior at the Cinema and Palais

Many concerned about leisure’s impact on young people also took issue with the immoral nature of certain films and dances, as well as with the dangers posed by the cinemas and dance halls in which they took place. Additionally, as cinemas and *palais* grew as meeting places for young people to socialize without parental supervision, many commentators raised concerns that popular leisure fostered unsuitable dating habits. Additionally, both films and dancing were criticized for their encouragement of violence. In 1917, the *Times* announced:


A joint committee of justices and members of the Education Committee formed in 1916 to consider the question of juvenile crime reported in October last that nearly all the witnesses were agreed that constant attendance at cinematograph theatres had an injurious effect on juvenile mind and character.\footnote{Anonymous, “Cinema Influences,” \textit{The Times}, 16 Jan. 1917: 5.}

Cinema attendance was clearly thought to be so detrimental to young audiences that it could cause them to resort to criminal activity. What is more, the rhetoric used in the \textit{Times} again indicates that it was not film and entertainment altogether that led to violent actions, rather it was this “constant” overindulgence in amusement. The obsession with enjoyment was clearly the dangerous element. Over the course of the 1920s, and even into the early 1930s, many Cinema Committees and sociological survey groups continued to argue that constant cinema attendance was responsible for the juvenile (aged 16-21) crime rate.\footnote{Fowler, \textit{The First Teenagers}, 128.} The film and violence theory was commonly held in Britain until about 1927, when the criminologist Dr. Cyril Burt dismissed cinema’s effect on crime.\footnote{Fowler, \textit{The First Teenagers}, 130.} The debate over film influencing juvenile crime underscores the way in which widespread anxiety over constant amusement manifested in public discourse.

Violence was also a concern for patrons of \textit{palais de danse}. Although these concerns never engendered the same kind of mass correlation between crime rates and dancing, many concerned citizens still voiced unease with the violent implications certain dance steps had. In 1926, the \textit{Daily Mail} announced:

Fierce controversy about the Charleston -- a variation on the fox-trot -- promises to be a feature of the London winter dancing season. While managers of fashionable and popular ball-rooms are inclined to frown on this dance, because of the violent kicking steps with which it is so often accompanied, there are signs that people will insist on dancing it. An official of a West End dance-club told a \textit{Daily Mail} reporter yesterday that the dance was being banned as far as possible, because it caused stockings to be torn and legs to be bruised, but about 15 per cent of the dancers performed it.\footnote{Anonymous, “The Kicking Dance,” \textit{Daily Mail}, 16 Sept. 1926: 7.}
Here again is the implication that pleasure-seekers who participate in cheap amusements cannot stop. The Charleston is cast in this article as almost addictive, as young people were dancing the step even though it was banned for its violent nature. The theme of insisting on leisure activity touches upon the anxiety over the perceived incessant consumption of frivolity which fed anti-leisure “craze” sentiment.

Not only were films and dancing faulted for leading to violence, they were also concerning for their implications on youth sexuality and dating culture. During the 1920s, both cinemas and palais de danse became popular spaces not only because of the leisure they provided, but also because they were meeting spaces where young people could enjoy each other’s company outside of the reach of parental control.118 This meant that going to the cinema or palais developed as popular dating options.119 Dating culture was reflected in many of the worries expressed about leisure. In 1924, the Daily Mail published a story by a woman calling herself a “common-sense mother,” claiming that she had tricked her son into not marrying the “wrong type of girl” by inviting the young woman to her home instead of forbidding her son from seeing the woman. This mother claimed:

If I had acted otherwise I am convinced that my son would have become engaged to this girl. He would have dismissed any dislike or misgivings shown or expressed by me as mere prejudice. Cut off from the opportunity of meeting the girl at home, he would have had recourse to the kinema, the music hall, and the palais-de-danse.120

This self-proclaimed “common-sense mother” denounces new leisure venues as places where boys, like her son, whom she presumably considers an upstanding young gentleman, can mix

118 McKibbin, Classes and Cultures, 395.
119 Fowler, The First Teenagers, 131.
with the “wrong type” of woman. This suggestion calls into question the democratized nature of cheap amusements, because they welcome any “type” of young person. The mother clearly sees these sites of leisure as bad influences on young people, implying that the leisure “craze” made young people do things they would not do in other environments. The *Times* report on the 1917 British Cinema Committee findings also alluded to concerns about inappropriate dating, encouraging that “[t]he body of the hall should be lighted sufficiently by means of screened lights during the showing of the pictures to ensure that no objectionable practices shall be possible in the auditorium.”121 The need to protect against “objectionable practices” or dating the “wrong type” of person spoke to the same interest in protecting the masses from the dangers that constant exposure to leisure enabled. From this point of view, the mania for cheap amusements caused inappropriate behavior or violent action.

**All Play, No Work**

The frequency of pleasure-seeking during the 1920s also provoked concerns about what young people were *not* doing while they were off at the cinema and *palais*. The leisure “mania” meant that instead of working, young people were amusing themselves. This anxiety was primarily a response to cheap amusements’ ability to provide leisure to a more diverse class range, which meant that the youths of the *working* class were not, in fact, working. A 1925 *Daily Mail* editorial expressed this fear:

> Dole spent on kinemas and dancing: to a very large proportion of the youthful dole-drawers the assistance received represents nothing but pocket-money to spend on amusements … The old leisured class, which numbered only a few thousand, is being taken out of existence. Its place is being taken by a new

---

leisured class which numbers a million or so, which spends vastly more than did the aristocracy and gentry at the time of their greatest prosperity.\textsuperscript{122}

The author of this article clearly disapproved of the use of public assistance on amusements. By indicating that the dole was used for “nothing but” leisure, this author alludes to the frequency with which young, working-class Britons attended films, dances, or other amusements. It also refers to the entire working class as “light-hearted” and “pleasure-seeking.”\textsuperscript{123} The implication here was that amusement and pleasure-seeking is wasteful, as was spending hand-out money on enjoyments. Because the palais and cinemas were so frequently visited, so ubiquitous, and so inexpensive, they were seen as wastes of time and money for working class youths.

The concern over leisure taking away from young people’s work time, however, was not isolated to the working class. In fact, anxiety about professional careers being influenced by overindulgence in hedonistic leisure practice also circulated in 1920s press. In a 1924 letter to the editor of the \textit{Daily Mail}, a concerned citizen wrote in about the dearth of young, upcoming British politicians, asking, “Where are the young men? Do they spend all their time at the Palais de Danse? Or were all the young men who had brains and energy killed in the war? If they were not, what are they thinking about to-day? Obviously it is not leadership and responsibility.”\textsuperscript{124}

Consequently, it was clearly not only the working class whose obsession with cheap amusements was concerning. Rather, in a larger sense, condemnation of the youthful pleasure-seeking “craze” can be seen as a response to a perceived systemic societal problem that was having a significant impact on all British young people.

\textsuperscript{124} Anonymous, “Where are the Young Men?” \textit{Daily Mail} 2 Jan 1924: 6.
“Americanising Our Young People”

Another widespread concern about dance hall and cinema's emergence as a “craze” in Britain was the sense that it promoted the excessive influence of American popular culture. Many British commentators expressed concern over the lack of British film production, and feared that cinemas were outlets for America to assert supremacy over British culture. Additionally, some Britons lamented the popularity of American and other foreign dance steps at the palais. The fear of “americanization” not only manifested itself by a worry over the influence of American popular culture, but was also represented by a generalized anxiety over a decline in the influence of the British Empire.

The question of the importation of Hollywood in Britain was huge. To summarize this widespread fear, Daily Mail reported in 1925:

The Americans had realised that the kinema was a heaven-sent method of advertising themselves, their country their methods, their wares, their ideas, and even their language and had seised on it as a method of persuading the whole world that the United States was really the only country that counted.125

This Daily Mail article squarely placed the blame on America, claiming that the United States was purposefully using cinema as a tool to promote a “superior” American way of life. The British response to the influence of American culture also went beyond the condemnation of American cultural proselytizing, to outright danger, as one 1926 Manchester Guardian headline put it: “The kinema danger: Americanising our Young People.”126 Clearly, this anxiety was again

125 Anonymous, “U.S. Film Monopoly,” Daily Mail, 16 May 1925: 6. The fear of American influence played into both British anxieties and contributed to a concentrated effort to recruit British film production, and a public debate in media outlets over whether or not British cinemas should even be allowed to show American films. The vast majority of the articles and editorials appearing about cinema during the 1920s in the Daily Mail, the Times, the Manchester Guardian, and the Observer dealt in some way with the Americanization of leisure consumption.

focusing its ability to influence the British youth. Moreover, many Britons regretted the American domination of the film industry because they feared it meant that the British Empire was lagging behind. In 1919, the *Daily Mail* reported that “British film producers are making a big effort to secure a share of the world’s film market. At present nine out of ten films shown to British audiences are American.” Here, American control over film is presented as a problem that needed to be combatted. This interest in supporting British film clearly stemmed from a larger fear that American influence would outweigh British influence throughout the entire Empire. A 1924 *Daily Mail* article warned about American film’s ability to usurp British culture:

> It seems unnecessary to emphasise the vital importance of maintaining a steady flow of British pictures, both in this country and in the Overseas Dominions; for no one can blind himself to what is at once the most powerful medium for propaganda in the world and a source of entertainment for the great mass of its population … They are imperceptibly taught to think according to American lights and to see things from an American standpoint with American ideals.  

The importance set upon revitalising the British film industry reflects the rising fear that American command of the film industry threatened to influence the viewpoints and ideals of the British masses.

The popular dancing “mania” was also said to be subject to American influence. In 1921, the *Times* summarized the conclusions made at the Imperial Society of Dance Teachers annual dinner and dance. In the words of the *Times* columnist, the Society believed that:

> England had long been the dumping ground for Continental and American concoctions, and the time had come for this to cease. British teachers had the faculty of invention, and London should henceforth become the cultured dancing centre of the world.  

---

As was the case with fears of American influence over films, the problem with American dancing steps was twofold. This *Times* reporter is worried about American dance “concoctions” shaping the popular dance, but also saw a need to assert British authority over the world of cheap amusements. Clearly, concern over American influence over film and dance created an interest in fostering British amusements. Americanization and the other anxieties presented in this chapter all represented a distaste for the new and the modern, and disliked the new generation of pleasure-seekers’ rejection of old, British values.
Chapter IV

“The Talk of London” : Advertising Cinema and Dance Hall

As new and controversial pastimes, cinema and palais de danse had to combat the challenge of marketing themselves to the British public. In doing so, cheap amusements needed to overcome two hurdles through advertising. First, cinemas and dance halls needed to appeal to potential audience members and customers. To do so, establishments used conspicuous visuals, enticing slogans, and luxurious offerings, which focused on the modernity and fashionability that helped cheap amusements flourish. Second, cinemas and palais de danse used advertisements as a way to counter the various critiques that cast new leisure as unhealthy and hedonistic.
Amusement companies advertised in a way that presented dance hall and cinema as positive, healthy activities that were good for the nation. Cinema and palais addressed the two marketing needs by modeling publicity techniques on consumer goods advertising. In order to achieve this goal, leisure promotion underwent a noticeable change beginning in the 1920s that transformed leisure into a consumer good in a way that allowed dance hall and cinema to combat negative claims against them, and to cultivate consumer interest in cheap amusements.

**The Growth of Advertising in Newsprint**

Although the modernity and novelty of cheap amusements contributed to their explosive growth during the 1920s, the fact that the modern leisure industry was somewhat uncharted territory also meant that entertainment establishments, such as cinemas and palais de danse, needed to market an unfamiliar experience to prospective consumers. To do this, leisure companies used the medium of print advertising that was already well established for consumer goods. The following two sections provide a brief history of advertising leisure activities in newsprint, and endeavor to show that the amusement industry tackled the challenge of making new leisure activities appealing by marketing these experiences in the same style as consumer goods.

Cinema and dance hall did not represent the first instances of announcing entertainments in the British press. *The Times*, founded in 1785, featured advertisement for cultural experiences throughout the second half of the nineteenth century only in the form of basic event
announcements.\textsuperscript{130} The standard format for this type of notice consisted of a small column of text-only information about shows and events. A nineteenth-century Times reader interested in a theater, opera, or music hall showing would see a visually austere posting that gave logistical information, for example:

Theatre Royal, Drury-Lane. Lessee and Manager, Mr. James Anderson. This evening, The Lady of Lyons. Claude Melnotte, Mr. J. Anderson; Beauseant, Mr. W. Montague; Glavis, Mr. J. Parry; Pauline Deschapelles, Miss Vandenhoff; the Widow Melnotte, Mrs. Griffith. To conclude with Harlequin and Good Queen Bees.\textsuperscript{131}

This informative publicity for leisure and cultural activity continued in The Times through the early twentieth century, and its pattern was common for amusement advertisement during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. By the 1880s, The Derby Daily Telegraph (Derby, England), The Manchester Guardian (Manchester, England), and The Observer (London, England) all had established “Entertainments” advertisement segments.\textsuperscript{132} Although the “Entertainments” sections demonstrated an effort to organize amusement publicity, the columns only gave bare minimum informative details; they did not include the hallmarks of modern advertising such as slogans or images. The standard structure for nineteenth-century entertainment notices in British newspapers and periodicals was not set up to sell an attraction in any modern advertising sense. If a nineteenth-century theater enthusiast knew he wanted to go to a show, he simply looked up the time and venue in the newspaper. Notices were not meant to sell leisure to a mass audience, they were meant to inform the leisured elite. Nineteenth-century leisure enterprises did not yet need to sell amusements like consumer goods.

\textsuperscript{130} See Appendix A.
\textsuperscript{132} See Appendix A.
During the first decades of the twentieth century, amusement advertising began to show the first glimmer of leisure's commodification. Beginning in 1904, variety theatres, most notably the London Coliseum, took out full-page *Times* displays that acted as hybrids between the nineteenth-century informational advertisement and the targeted, slogan-based, and dazzlingly visual advertisements that exploded for cinema and dance hall during the 1920s. Although the Coliseum began to brand leisure like a consumer commodity, these types of variety theatre promotions were few and far between, and they were invariably taken out as one-time, stand-alone endorsements. Furthermore, this technique was not even used for the first cinema and dance advertisement in *The Times*, which began to appear during 1910s. The *Times* 1910s dance advertising section closely mimicked the “Entertainments” column in the nineteenth-century *Derby*; it was headed “Dancing” and listed venues and, as a new concept, telephone contact information. Similarly, the first cinema advertisement *The Times* ran in 1915 was as slogan-free and informational as any nineteenth-century theater notice, but featured slightly larger text that highlighted the cinema’s name and the film titles. Although there was some precedent of leisure enterprises using conspicuous advertisements in the early twentieth century, leisure marketing had not yet incorporated the modern publicity techniques used by consumer-good companies.

Commercial advertising for commodities in British newsprint, by contrast, was certainly well established by the turn of the twentieth century. By the end of the nineteenth century, cigarettes, food products, alcohol, medicine, and home furnishings were all frequently being

---

133 See Appendix A.
134 See Appendix A.
135 See Appendix A.
advertised with attractive slogans and images.\textsuperscript{136} It was only tangible material goods, ones which consumers could take home, that were marketed in this way. The early marketing techniques used by consumer product companies set a precedent for 1920s amusements to commodify experience in the same fashion as consumer goods. By copying the techniques already established by consumer product corporations, cinema and \textit{palais de danse} were able to successfully market amusement in a way that both made leisure appealing to audiences and attempted to counter negative critiques of “hedonistic” leisure.

Following in the advertising footsteps used by consumer-good companies, leisure advertisers began to transform the nineteenth-century notice system into comprehensive and modern marketing projects. By the 1920s, leisure was marketed in many major and traditional British newspapers, but cheap amusements’ first incarnations of consumer advertising appeared in new popular press outlets, such as the \textit{Daily Mail}.\textsuperscript{137} By 1911, the \textit{Daily Mail} was running an advertising section called, “The Season's Greatest Attractions.”\textsuperscript{138} This segment not only included sporting events and exhibitions, but also featured many variety theater advertisements of the type the \textit{Times} ran for the London Coliseum. In contrast to traditional news where display advertising for non-consumer products did not appear until the 1920s, the first visual cinema advertisements in \textit{Daily Mail} appeared during the 1910s, and included slogans like, “The finest entertainment in London.”\textsuperscript{139} In this way, the popular press was instrumental in the birth of advertising for non-consumer goods. The idea that an experience could be sold as a commodity,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{137} Adrian Bingham, \textit{Gender, Modernity, and the Popular Press in Inter-War Britain} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004), 22.
\item \textsuperscript{138} Anonymous, “Daily Mail Travel & Information Bureau,” \textit{Daily Mail} 12 June 1911: 3. See Appendix A.
\item \textsuperscript{139} Anonymous, “Multiple Display Advertising Items,” \textit{Daily Mail} 9 May 1914: 1B. See Appendix A.
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which the popular press recognized in the 1910s, allowed dance halls and cinemas to grow mass consumer audiences, which was evident once this marketing practice took hold during the interwar period. As the twentieth century progressed, popular press continued to highlight entertainments and sell them in the tradition of material possession advertising. On the eve of the 1920s, leisure advertisement was beginning to develop in the same way as consumer marketing.

“London’s Most Fashionable”: Selling Cheap Amusements

The primary achievement of 1920s leisure advertisement was to market cheap amusements to the British public in a way that highlighted dance hall and cinema’s appeal. Because cheap amusements constituted an entirely new leisure sector, differing from older forms of non-democratized entertainment such as opera and theater, marketing was of particular importance in fostering the British public’s understanding of popular leisure’s attractiveness. To do this, leisure enterprises used existing consumer marketing elements, such as slogans and pictures, to highlight the wonderful and modern reasons why all of Britain should want to visit the palais and cinema. Additionally, leisure venues made the inexpensive luxury they provided particularly prominent in their advertisements, a fact which further separated new, modern amusements from old entertainments. By marketing entertainment in this way, new leisure set out to make itself appealing to potential new customers.

One marketing technique 1920s leisure modeled after consumer goods advertising was the use of slogans as tools to quickly entice consumers. The Hammersmith Palais, as the largest dance hall in London, serves the archetypal example of this kind of marketing. Hammersmith's slogan, “The Talk of London,” appeared in numerous ads and in various publications throughout
the decade.\textsuperscript{140} Other dance halls branded themselves in similar ways, for example, the \textit{palais de danse} in Ashton-under-Lyne boasted that it was “[o]ne of the Largest and most Perfect Ballrooms in Europe.”\textsuperscript{141} Both of these slogans played into elements that aided leisure culture in its meteoric rise in popularity during the 1920s, as discussed in Chapter II. Hammersmith being the “Talk” of the town meant that the \textit{palais} marketing was catering to the fact that popular dancing was a fashionable trend; everyone was talking about it. This was beneficial for Hammersmith in that it cultivated the idea that in order to be modern, in order to be in fashion, in order to be involved in the talk of the town, one had to visit the \textit{palais}.

Similarly, the largest and most perfect description of the dancing space at Ashton highlights the novelty of large space that \textit{palais de danse} provided for the first time beginning in the 1920s, a spaciousness that was in line with the super-sized scale of modern life. Furthermore, the concept of being “perfect” shows the way in which the experience cheap amusements provided was now truly being sold as a commodity, rather than simply being listed in the style of nineteenth-century entertainment notices. Slogans for \textit{palais de danse} marked an interest in selling leisure in the same manner as consumer goods, which allowed dance halls to cultivate audiences by establishing \textit{palais} as appealing modern attractions.

Cinema slogans evoked similar themes of modernity, fashion, and splendor to those of \textit{palais de danse}. The New Gallery, Regent Street, as pictured at the beginning of this chapter, claimed to be “London’s most fashionable cinema.”\textsuperscript{142} Similarly, in 1929, Stoll Picture Theatre sold itself as “London’s finest picture theatre,” adding a step-by-step description of the cinema’s space: “arrive at an imposing exterior, then through a luxurious vestibule, to an attractive

\textsuperscript{140} See Appendix A for examples.  
\textsuperscript{141} Anonymous, Display Ad 8 -- No Title, \textit{The Manchester Guardian}, 22 Mar. 1920: 5.  
restaurant, then a cosy seat in a sumptuous auditorium, to enjoy a fine film & variety
programme.” Like dance hall slogans, these reassuring words underlined the reasons why
patrons should visit the cinema. The idea that the “most fashionable cinema” was appealing
again played into the notion that in order to keep up with the times, one had to go to the pictures.
Stoll Picture Theatre’s insistence that it was the “finest” cinema lured potential audience
members to the attraction. The description of the theater’s large space and its appealing
amenities also show how the modern cinema was an enjoyable place to be.

Both cinema and dance hall advertisements also began to include visual elements during
the 1920s. For dance halls, this often meant advertisements depicting happy, young, dressed-up
dancing couples, like in the Hammersmith Palais advertisement pictured at the top of this
chapter. Typically, cinema advertisements would picture the theater and its amenities, or they
might feature an image relating to the film showing that week. For example, a 1929 Stoll Picture
Theatre advertisement showed the lead actors of that Sunday’s film, *Weary River*, embracing.
Including images in advertising, known as display advertising, was a technique borrowed by
leisure from goods advertisements that allowed cinemas and *palais de danse* to sell an
experience to potential consumers.

Perhaps the most notable selling point used in cheap amusements’ advertisements,
however, was the ability of leisure enterprises to market luxury at an affordable price. As
described in Chapter II, one of the noted hallmarks of 1920s leisure was its ability to provide the
same quality amusement to patrons of all socioeconomic classes. The democratizing quality of
popular leisure was used by cinema and *palais* advertisers as another agent of appeal.

---

Advertisements for Hammersmith Palais stressed dancing’s affordability: “The 'Palais' has succeeded because it gives value, as characterised by quality, dependability and economy – that's why it has a definite following. It's a Bond Street Service with a Cheapside charge for admission.”¹⁴⁶ This 1921 *Daily Mail* advertisement illustrates the aim of *cheap* amusements to bring a hitherto inaccessible luxury to wage-earning classes. Advertisers for Hammersmith clearly saw the critical ability to provide “bond street service” at a price that anyone could afford as an appealing and marketable quality. Similarly, when Gaity Theatre in Manchester advertised its transformation into a cinema in 1921, it extolled the economy cinemas provided in the *Manchester Guardian*, declaring that: “the main source of the success will be found in its cheapness – in its low prices of admission … the picture-house is from 30 to 100 per cent lower in price than the variety theatre.”¹⁴⁷ This advertisement clearly demonstrates the fact that the ability to provide leisure inexpensively to many people was a notable change from the old variety theaters. In this way, by demonstrating the inexpensive novelty cheap amusements provided, leisure establishments were able to market their experience in a way that was appealing to its potential new audience members.

“*Let Dancing Be Your Doctor*”: Responding to Criticism for New Amusements

In addition to needing to sell an unprecedented activity in a style that had only previously been used by consumer good products, cheap amusements also used advertisements as a way to deflect negative criticisms about pleasure-seeking culture. One of the most powerful examples of this type of advertising was Hammersmith’s 1919-1921 attempt to market the *palais* as healthy

---

for the nation through the “let dancing be your doctor,” campaign. This attempt to cast the *palais* as a space that made its patrons healthy was very clearly meant to combat claims that cheap amusements were leading to the mental and physical denigration of Britain’s youth. Hammersmith asserted that dancing was a healthy pastime for both mental and physical well-being. Hammersmith focused on dancing as exercise, telling prospective patrons to “come and take an active part in a healthy pastime.” The famous *palais* marketed itself as a medical response to health problems, claiming to be the be “The Nation’s Tonic,” a description that clearly attempted to show that dancing cures individuals of their ailments in a way that helps Britain as a whole. Hammersmith assured that “it’s a medicine you will thoroughly enjoy,” again reflecting an attempt to make cheap amusement a cure. What is more, as discussed in Chapter III, critics were specifically worried about young people’s health. Hammersmith responded directly to this fear, describing dancing as “an elixir of youth.” By medicalizing the *palais* and essentially turning it into a cure for health problems, Hammersmith could address (if not dispel) fears about cheap amusements in a way that played up dancing’s positive health benefits.

Not only did this Hammersmith campaign highlight the positive, medicinal, and physical benefits of dancing as a leisure activity, the *palais* also claimed that it had a positive effect on patrons’ mental health. Advertisements encouraged, “be happy and jubilant,” commenting on dancing’s ability to help relieve mental stress and allow dancers to be carefree. Hammersmith

---

148 Anonymous, “Palais de Danse,” *Sunday Times* 10 April 1921: 4. See Appendix A. The title of this subchapter is taken from this advertisement.
took this campaign so far as to boast that “every afternoon and evening the Palais de Danse cures more fits of depression than the combined hospitals of London.”¹⁵³ This audacious proclamation was designed to explicitly argue against the notion that frequent visits to the palais caused mental health problems for British youth. Instead, Hammersmith turned the preconception that the leisure “craze” was the cause of so many members of the British public pursuing frequent visits to the palais de danse into the concept that dancing was actually beneficial to the health of the nation.

Cinema and palais advertisements also aimed to curb the claim that leisure threatened British influence over the public. Many 1920s amusements advertisements highlighted distinctively British elements. Hammersmith Palais branded itself “the talk of London,” a slogan which appeared on every advertisement the dance hall took out in the early 1920s.¹⁵⁴ This tagline treated London as if it were the center of the popular dancing world, a technique which responded to fears about American influence. In a series of 1923 Daily Mail Atlantic Edition advertisements, both Hammersmith Palais and Rectors Club (another famous London dance hall) explicitly publicized London’s dancing supremacy in an attempt to market to overseas tourists. The Hammersmith advertisement read: “In the same way as London is the commercial and political centre of the British Isles, and one of the greatest cities of the world, so is the Palais de Danse, Hammersmith the capital of the dancing world.”¹⁵⁵ Similarly, Rectors Club encouraged possible tourists:

> After a long absence from London you will doubtless be prepared for many changes. Nowhere is this more marked than in the social life of the town. Amusements have developed, old institution have closed down or re-organised, and fresh ones have sprung up. Even Rectors of the old days has altered, being

¹⁵³ Anonymous, “Palais de Danse,” Sunday Times, 10 April 1921: 4. See Appendix A.
¹⁵⁴ See Appendix A.
now a fully constituted Dance Club with the widest appeal and the finest attractions in London.\textsuperscript{156}

Dance halls like Hammersmith and Rectors fought against claims that popular dancing was proselytizing American culture by branding themselves as tourist attractions. Rectors even offered a special discount price for overseas visitors.\textsuperscript{157} By placing London as the focal point of the dance world, \textit{palais de danse} were able to market leisure in a way that supported national interests, and worked against arguments that dancing was Americanising the British youth.

Cinemas also used advertising as a way to affiliate themselves with British, rather than American, interests. In 1924, a group of British cinemas across the country co-sponsored an all-British film week. The cinemas involved took out joint advertisements in the \textit{Daily Mail}:

“You can see Victor McLaglen and Marjorie Hume in the Granger-Davidson All-British Photoplay ‘M’ Lord O’ The White Road’ by Cedric Fraser at the following Cinemas during the Midlands Great British Film Week."\textsuperscript{158} This advertisement was a way for all of the cinemas involved to market their support of the British film industry. By emphasizing the two renowned British actors, McLaglen and Hume, the advertisement further underlined the support for British involvement in film. Stoll Picture Productions, a British film production agency that also owned a picture house in London, used its British origins as a marketing tool. In a 1922 advertisement, the company claimed:

Supremacy in screen craft, which for years has been enjoyed by foreigners and has given them practically a monopoly in the British market, is now being definitely and successfully challenged by the Stoll Picture Productions, Ltd. -- an all-British organisation with one of the finest and most completely equipped studios in the world … This achievement marks not only a definite step forward commercially, but also socially, for the vast problem of unemployment is partially solved by the

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}
development of new industries, and the home production of films possesses real potentialities.\(^{159}\)

This Stoll advertisement addresses many of the negative claims detailed in Chapter III. Here, Stoll Productions markets itself by countering the foreign control over the film industry. What is more, this advertisement fights the fear that amusements were dangerous to the working class or dole recipients by stressing the fact that the British cinema industry created jobs. By using advertising as a tool to counter disapproval of cheap amusements, British leisure enterprises were able to frame themselves in a positive light.

---

Conclusion

The 1920s leisure “mania” sparked an era defined by pleasure-seeking and amusements. As important players in a modern, fashionable world, cinemas and dance halls redefined a generation of young Britons who came of age watching films and attending dances. Furthermore, these popular culture amusements were enjoyed by all strata of society. Although the primary audience for new, cheap amusements were young, working women, film and popular dance steps reached such a ubiquitous level of cultural relevance that even those who did not directly participate were exposed to these new leisure forms. As the “craze” for cheap amusements reached a peak, so too did disdain for hedonistic obsession with enjoyment and lightheartedness. Often aimed at youth, critics of 1920s leisure culture argued that constant visits to cinemas and palais de danse occupied too much of pleasure-seekers’ time, and caused the breakdown of the nineteenth-century work ethic. Critics also lamented foreign, particularly American, influence on popular culture in Britain. As this thesis has shown, one way in which cinemas and palais responded to the aspersions cast against them was through display advertising, which afforded publicity teams the power to turn negative arguments into attractive selling points. In doing so, cinemas and palais commodified their leisure and thereby furthered the development of amusements as mass entertainment.

By the early 1930s, leisure’s place in the concept of a modern, fashionable England was well established, and the commercial implications of popular culture became more pronounced. The late 1920s saw the rise of conglomerative leisure corporations. National cinema chains like
Odeon Theatres and Gaumont British replaced local picture houses.\textsuperscript{160} During the first few years of the 1930s, the mass conglomerate Mecca Dancing, a subsidiary of a larger, parent company Mecca Cafés, was buying out many popular \textit{palais de danse} across the country.\textsuperscript{161} The establishment of national leisure chains reveals the extent to which mass entertainment had grown over the course of the lighthearted 1920s.

Cheap amusements, which diffused popular culture throughout the country during the 1920s, acted as a societal leveling force universally identifiable to the British masses. As discussed in this thesis, in Britain this universalizing factor during the 1920s in particular allowed young people to interact with and share interests with members of different social classes; this immediate effect carried the larger potential to foster greater understanding between the classes, challenging the entrenched cultural distinctions between the high, affluent, or intellectual milieu and the popular or mass-produced.\textsuperscript{162} Although mass entertainment held the power to erase differences between peoples, its international implications throughout the twentieth century were not always so equilibrating. By the Second World War, leisure’s position as an “opiate” that could control the masses was recognized. The Third Reich used mass entertainment for public “enlightenment” and propaganda.\textsuperscript{163} Clearly, the lighthearted and fun-loving ethos that the emergence of 1920s leisure culture fostered did not apply to all incarnations of mass culture in Europe during the twentieth century.

The 1920s British leisure “craze,” however, did create the origins for twentieth century popular culture. Cinema and \textit{palais de danse}, insofar as they were hubs of youth activity, acted

\textsuperscript{160} Davies, “Cinema and Broadcasting,” 269.
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as mitigating forces to class stratification, imported international popular culture into British
daily life, and were very clear precursors to the outpouring of international mass culture and
consumer society. By the 1950s and 1960s, classless youth culture had become recognizable
throughout western Europe and America, embodied by blue jeans, t-shirts, radio music, films and
dance halls. The historical origins and cultural underpinnings of this defining
twentieth-century obsession with popular culture, and its mass production power to diminish
some of the symbolic markers of class inequity, certainly can be traced to the 1920s and its
cinema and palais “mania of the moment.”

---

130. Entertainments notice section in *The Times*
Entertainments, etc.


CROWN VAULTS and MUSIC HALL, London-street, W. White, Proprietor.—Monday, 11th. GREAT ATTRACTION. Novelty: The TATTOOED AMERICAN, CAPTAIN DAN FISHER, tattooed from head to toe. Course and see him using the Indian Clubs and juggling. To be seen daily from 11 a.m. to 11 p.m. Refreshments of the finest quality at Ordinary Price.

ROYAL JUBILEE EXHIBITION, LIVERPOOL.

THE GREATEST EXHIBITION IN ENGLAND,

VISITED BY HALF A MILLION OF PEOPLE.

EACH WEEK.

THE SPLENDID BAND OF THE ROYAL MARINES

SPECIAL SPORTS AND ATTRACTIONS.

EDUCATIONAL HALLS, NO. 2, PERRIN SQUARE, LIVERPO0L.

 CHEAP TRIPS FROM ALL PARTS.

ADMISSION (except Friday), 1s.

LIVERPOOL COMBINED TICKET.

EXHIBITION, TRAIN FAIR, AND TRIP.


THE COLISEUM.

FOUR PERFORMANCES DAILY.

In to 93. The Programme. 2 to 5. Another Programme.

ALTHOUGH THIS IS A LIVE PERFORMANCE, ALTHOUGH THIS IS A LIVE PERFORMANCE.

ALL SEATS CAN BE BOOKED IN ADVANCE EITHER FOR THE SAME DAY OR AT FUTURE DATES.

THE SITUATION: In the Heart of London.

The first recommendation of the new play is the fact that it occupies a convenient and central position. The Westminister Hall is situated in the midst of the city, at the top of the street of London. A little way is the finest building of the City, and the Coliseum is the finest building in the City. It is really the best entertainment. It is a small place, occupying an area of ground, and, consequently, one of the most striking buildings in the neighborhood, overshadowing the local buildings. It is grand, and is situated on the main road of the city. The Coliseum is the finest building of a moderate size or frame.

ITS DECORATION: Elements kept Aristocratic.

In the Coliseum, in the midst of the city of London, was the site of a magnificent building. The Coliseum was the site of a magnificent building. In the Coliseum there is a site of a magnificent building. The Coliseum is the finest building of a moderate size or frame, is situated on the main road of the city. The Coliseum is the finest building of a moderate size or frame.

133. Example of an early twentieth-century Coliseum advertisement in The Times

134. The Times “Dancing” announcement

136. Example of a nineteenth-century consumer goods advertisement
138. Example of the Daily Mail’s “Season’s Greatest Attractions” page
139. Early cinema display advertising in the *Daily Mail*

140. Example of “The Talk of London” slogan
143. Stoll Picture Theatre Advertisement

145. Stoll Picture Theatre Display Advertising
148, 150, 151. An example of Hammersmith’s “Let Dancing be your Doctor” campaign

149. An example of Hammersmith’s “Let Dancing be your Doctor” campaign
153. An example of Hammersmith’s “Let Dancing be your Doctor” campaign
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