A Lecture on Sugar Beets

Professor H. A. Weber of the Ohio State University gave a lecture on “The manufacture of beet root sugar,” illustrated by stereopticon views. He detailed the manufacture of sugar from beets, showing pictures of the machinery used. The pictures on the screen were so vivid, and were so clearly described and explained by the professor, as to make it seem like being conducted by a well informed guide all through some vast plant for making beet sugar. But it is impossible to report in cold type a stereopticon lecture, which is in effect a well arranged and well explained series of object lessons.

Ohio Farmer, January 18, 1900

Once again, this spring issue of the Gazette is appearing as the summer is nearly over. The delay is largely due to a shortage of submissions to the journal. I hope that readers will find this issue worth the wait. Terry Borton has contributed a truly ground-breaking piece of research on the profession of the Illustrated Lecturer, especially those who booked their lectures through Lyceum Bureaus. This was made possible by Terry’s discovery of a cache of little-known trade publications aimed at lecturers, musicians, entertainers, readers, and other performers on the Lyceum circuit, as well as the Lyceum Bureaus themselves. These publications were rather ephemeral and therefore are rare in libraries and hardly ever consulted by scholars.

His research has revealed the details of a largely unknown, yet thriving industry in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As with other recent articles published in the Gazette, this article reveals a lively culture of the magic lantern, or stereopticon, lasting much longer into the twentieth century than most researchers have realized. The Lyceum lecture circuit employed thousands of people—the lecturers themselves, booking agents, projectionists, equipment manufacturers, slide colorists, etc. Lectures covered every conceivable subject, from the bad state of the nation’s roads to ancient art. The popularity of such lectures was enormous, with some lecturers drawing thousands of people. This reflects the mania for self-improvement that was characteristic of many middle-class Americans in the nineteenth century.

The article covers every facet of this important American industry, from the lives of the lecturers to the price of tickets, the money earned by typical lectures, the process of booking lecture venues, the trials and tribulations of long-distance rail travel between venues, the manufacturers who supplied stereopticons to lectures and sometimes slides, and the colorist who enhanced the appearance of the slides. Terry also puts the profession of Illustrated Lecturer in the context of other performers on the Lyceum circuit, from readers to bird whistlers, musicians, comedians, and lecturers who did not use lantern slides.

Because of the length of the article, it is being published in two parts, the second part to appear in the next issue of the Gazette. Endnotes and references related to part 1 appear in this issue, but the appendices with detailed information on individual lecturers will appear in part 2, along with notes related to that part of the article. The ability to publish long, detailed articles on magic lantern culture like this one is one advantage of publishing in the Gazette, as opposed to typical academic journals, which often have stricter limits on article length and number of illustrations.

I am always looking for additional contributions to the journal. These can be of various lengths, and richly illustrated articles are especially welcome. The next issue will be occupied by the rest of this article. I have one of my own in preparation for a future issue, and one promised soon from another contributor. So if you are doing serious research on any facet of magic lantern history and culture, please consider submitting something to the Gazette, even if part of the material has already appeared in an academic journal.
The Professional Life of
“Magic Lantern” Illustrated Lecturers

With Introductions to Most Professionals Performing from the 1890s to the 1920s

Terry Borton
P.O. Box 44
East Haddam CT 06423-0044
torton@magiclanternshows.com

Nat Brigham, the Illustrated Lecturer, who was usually so energetic and enthusiastic, felt tired tonight, bone tired. He fidgeted as he waited in the wings to speak at Lyceum Hall. What had it been, more than 200 shows again this year? And a 320 mile jump today on that damn milk train! The ache in his back was creeping up his spine, and making him irritable. He tried to settle himself down, to count his blessings. His stereopticon operator was in place; thank Heaven no problem there. The hall was jammed; he couldn’t complain about that. Good. Good. He tucked his chin in and hummed to get his head voice going—a trick he’d picked up at Harvard—then popped a Grobecker’s for his throat. The Committeeman was blathering on about his coming roster: the audience was getting restive. Already a baby was starting to cry. He’d have to deal with that first thing.

But what was he really fretting about? He’d take home at least a half-million this year. Not too many could match that. His “delighted” ratings were at the top of the charts. Who could beat him there? True, Kathy Bowden was getting a lot of attention with her Hiawatha show, and it included some of those new moving pictures. Maybe he should add some to his Grand Canyon lecture. But no, no need. Midland was already getting him more bookings than he could handle. He’d just place another full-page ad in The Lyceumite and leave it at that. After all, Unkapupa—Unkapupa no less—certainly didn’t think he needed movies. What had he written? “I bow low.” That was a review to frame and hang in the office!

Ahh, finally. Time to go on. Last lecture of the season. End with a flourish!

[Imagined internal monologue of Nat Brigham, 1906. Income expressed in today’s dollars.]

Introduction

If truth be told, most of us interested in the magic lantern’s place in American history have had rather vague notions of how it was used 100+ years ago, especially its most prestigious uses. Anyone looking at the thousands of slides on eBay, or the fat antique slide catalogs, knows there was a lot of activ-
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filling halls of a thousand seats, artfully shaping the nation’s culture? And who were these showmen, standing at the apex of their field in skill, compensation, and renown? Clearly they towered far above the 30,000 to 60,000¹ who used most of the catalog slides—the neighborhood showmen, the teachers, the college professors, faux-experts, photographers, ministers, Sunday-School teachers, secret-society “lantern masters,” super-star wannabes, get-rich-quick entrepreneurs, and doting grandpas—all affecting the culture in their own way, but now largely buried by the sands of time. How were the professionals different? What kind of performances did they create, and where? How did they find the millions of people that made up their following? What was their business like? What were they like? What was their impact?

Sometimes, doing media archeology² to answer such questions, you dig and dig and dig in the “sands of time,” and find nothing. Sometimes you dig and dig, and, if you’re lucky, find a few media shards, perhaps letters or programs, that help explain a lost art. And sometimes, when you least expect it, you find a treasure trove—a huge pile of material with precise dates and clear context that reveals a much more coherent and comprehensive view of the past.

So it was when I began exploring the Lyceum’s use of magic lanterns for professional “illustrated lectures”—lectures built around projected photographs or drawings—and found a large collection of rare and almost totally unexplored trade journals designed for the performers, agents, and venue managers of the Lyceum and Chautauqua circuits. (The “Lyceums” were a major series of 19th and 20th century educational and entertainment assemblies, usually held in a hall in the winter for city audiences. Their sister series, the “Chautauquas,” refers primarily to “Circuit Chautauquas”—similar gatherings usually held in 1,000-seat outdoor tents or open auditoriums in summer for rural communities.) Though the two were different, there was a significant overlap between them in performers. Together they provided the majority of the large venues for American professional Illustrated Lectures.³ And, as the editor of one of the trade journals suggests, Illustrated Lectures were an especially important component of the Lyceums:

It may be doubted whether any one kind of lecture has meant so much in pleasure and information as the [illustrated] travel talk, now so important a part of our great Lyceum system.⁴

When I began this article I intended it to be an introduction to these Illustrated Lecturers of the Lyceum—a companion piece to my earlier article in The Magic Lantern Gazette called “238 Eminent American “Magic-Lantern” Showmen: The Chautauqua Lecturers.”⁵ Like that essay, the current article was meant to provide an introduction to a group of professional American lantern showmen for whom lecturing was a “primary occupation” or at least a major source of livelihood.⁶

This article does indeed provide a starting place for other researchers by supplying, in Appendix A, introductory information on a large group of professional lantern performers (Fig. 2). It covers a thirty-two-year time span (1891–1923), and is primarily based on three Lyceum trade magazines and the related book, Who’s Who in the Lyceum.

However, as I dug into the Lyceum trade publications—6,000 pages worth—I realized that they opened an opportunity not available in my previous discussion of Chautauqua brochures. They told a much larger and more important story than simply providing background for specific lecturers. Above and beyond the data on individuals, these journals opened up detailed information on the business life of Illustrated Lecturers as a group—evidence that not only revealed their workaday activities, but also defined the structure of the profession itself. This kind of information gives a sense of the ambiance of the profession, such as I tried to capture in Nat Brigham’s imagined monologue. At the same time, it can be expressed in hard numbers that give specificity to our understanding of Illustrated Lecturers in American culture.

Fig. 2. The information on Illustrated Lecturers in this article may help elucidate the lantern connection of various artifacts, such as this photo (right) of N. Market St., in Frederick, MD. The detail is a close-up of the two men at the far left of Market St. reading a broadside that promotes an “Illustrated Lecture” about a comet. Appendix A suggests that the lecturer may well have been William Robert Brooks. Brooks discovered 25 comets, was the nation’s leading expert on the subject, and was a very active lecturer.

As a result, this article is much longer than originally intended, and explores many aspects of the profession of Illustrated Lecturer. Taken together with the Chautauqua article, it supplies the names, background, subject matter, and dates for what I think are most of the professional performers operating in the national arena from 1891–1923. It also provides an estimate of their “eminence”; statistics about their average
Why Professional “Magic-Lantern Shows” Are So Little Known Today

One of the reasons that professional “magic-lantern shows” are largely ignored in modern academic and popular descriptions of American culture is because there was no such thing. The term “magic lantern” was never used for professional shows, and the descriptors that were used varied enormously. Unless one understands that all these different terms meant lantern shows, it is impossible to comprehend how ubiquitous and important the lantern phenomenon was. Here are the 41 different words or phrases that the Lyceum lecturers used to describe their shows. (See Appendix A.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stereopticon show</td>
<td>illustrated lecture</td>
<td>pictorial production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stereopticon lecture</td>
<td>pictorially illustrated</td>
<td>picture drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>story of/in pictures</td>
<td>illustrated views</td>
<td>illuminated views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pictorially told</td>
<td>illustrated tours</td>
<td>dissolving effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illustrated journey</td>
<td>dissolving views</td>
<td>50 views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illustrated</td>
<td>with slides</td>
<td>with pictures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>best/new pictures</td>
<td>panoramic slides</td>
<td>illustrated songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lantern slides</td>
<td>with slides</td>
<td>travelogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beautiful lantern</td>
<td>with pictures</td>
<td>with photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colored views</td>
<td>pictures from negatives</td>
<td>picture gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>picture lecture</td>
<td>illus./illust.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fine illustrations</td>
<td>colored slides</td>
<td>platformist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projected views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>picture after picture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(name), colorist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fine views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>picture play stunning pictures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illuminated tours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a lecturer who illustrates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The term “Magic Lantern” is used in quotes in the title of both this and the Chautauqua article because, although it is the phrase commonly employed today to refer to the projected entertainment and education of the period, and was often used 100 years ago in the title of catalogs of lantern equipment and slides, it was never used by professional Chautauqua or Lyceum lecturers to refer to themselves or their work. Both groups thought of the “magic lantern show” as an amateur affair, often an entertainment of stories, songs and cartoons—primarily for children. And indeed that kind of magic lantern show comprised less than 10 percent of publically available lantern performances. The professionals wanted to separate themselves from such activities, even the amateur lantern lectures, and so usually referred to themselves as “Illustrated Lecturers,” or “stereopticon lecturers,” who presented more important and educational subjects. (“Stereopticon” was the American term for an adult-sized professional lantern, usually a double or “biunial” lantern, occasionally a “triple.”) Many Lyceum Illustrated Lecturers used other phrases or euphemisms to describe their work, like “life pictures” or “illuminated stories,” or they made no mention of the lantern but simply referred to their “beautifully colored slides.” But none of the Illustrated Lecturers ever referred to their “magic lantern,” or their “magic lantern slides.”

Now, let’s turn to an examination of the group of venues in which many of these professional Illustrated Lecturers performed, the Lyceum system itself.

The Lyceums—Ideal Venues for Professional Lecturers

The Lyceum movement started in 1826 with the publication of a proposal for a national network of “associations of adults for mutual education,” a proposal written by Josiah Holbrook, a farmer, teacher, and scientific lecturer. Holbrook’s idea was to create forums where local people could share their knowledge and teach each other, combining “instruction and entertainment,” and appealing to a broad spectrum of the community including older children. The proposed presentation formats were lectures, debates, and essays. The first Lyceum opened in Millbury, Massachusetts in 1826, and the idea soon caught hold: Two years later there were 50–60 in New England; three years later, 4,000–5,000 in the country. In the early days the groups met in various public halls, but soon began to build their own meeting spaces—at first modest, but soon evolving into the stately “Lyceum Halls” (Fig. 3) that still dot the country, especially in New England.

Right from the earliest days—in fact in 1829, only three
Holbrook had originally seen as an integrated whole—would persist throughout the Lyceum movement. Gradually, as local talent began to wear thin and more entertainment value became needed to draw an audience, more paid lecturers were brought in from outside—at first from the immediate region, and then from the larger world. Two new technologies facilitated this process: The spread of the telegraph (ideal for hurried communication with touring lecturers), and the spread of the railroad (ideal for getting the lecturers rapidly from town to town). By the 1850s, outside lecturers were common; by 1860, “lecturers” became a U.S. census classification; and the New York Tribune was listing 202 individuals who were available to give lectures in Lyceums. But the chaos of the Civil War seriously disrupted the Lyceum movement, and though individual Lyceums continued, the system fell apart in the ante-bellum period. Lecturer status slumped, and the lecturers’ pay, once significant, dropped to donations of potatoes and hams.

What saved the Lyceums was the development of lecture bureaus and agencies that organized tours of famous lecturers from town to town. The first of these, for the 1868–69 season, was in the West, and was wildly successful, putting 35 lecturers on a circuit, and giving them reasonably consecutive dates among the 110 allied societies. Other entrepreneurs, scenting opportunity, quickly followed suit. The nation’s most eminent men were soon on the road, for the pay was remarkable. In a period when $1 was worth about $18 in today’s buying power, the “coarser clay” were paid $25–$100 an evening, but truly eminent lecturers could make $300–$500 ($5,000–$9,000 today) for a night’s work (Fig. 4).

years after the movement started—the magic lantern was a part of the Lyceum experience. In the Concord Lyceum, the home lecture platform of Ralph Waldo Emerson and Henry David Thoreau and consequently a bastion of intellectual rigor, the “most popular lecturer” was Nehemiah Ball, who used the “Phantasmagoria Lantern” as part of his presentations on natural history and astronomy. Fifty years later, one of the attendees still talked of the impression it had made:

I well remember a course in natural history illustrated by a magic lantern on a very large scale, and the delight with which the young people viewed the representation of every known species of ape, monkey and baboon, accompanied by a very precise and accurate statement of their length, from the tip of the nose to the insertion of the tail.

The tension between the rigor of the standard non-illustrated lecture, and the appeal of the illustrated lecture—emblematic of the poles of “education” and “entertainment” that
By 1906, at the center of our study, there were 6,000 established Lyceum “courses.” (A “course” was usually a series of 5–10 lectures on unrelated subjects.) The top six bureaus (or “agencies”) were booking 18,000 dates a winter for a broad mix of serious education, light-hearted entertainment, and everything in between. Adding in the other 144 bureaus, and the many engagements made without agency assistance, one contemporary author estimated the number of bookings to have run up into the hundreds of thousands. (That seems wildly optimistic to me; I’d settle for 30,000–40,000.) And that contemporary estimate of “hundreds of thousands” was not even counting the Chautauquas, by then numbering 400 assemblies; the university extension courses which had spread to almost all institutions of higher learning; and free lecture courses in major cities, which, in 1888 in New York alone, offered 2,000 lectures reaching 1,200,000 people.

The demand for Lyceum-like experiences had grown insatiable. One lecturer, Ralph Bingham, a “boy orator” who grew up to become president of the International Lyceum Association, logged 8,000 performances between 1877 and 1906, an average of 275 a year, sustained over 29 years. And the good performers garnered good-sized audiences, even on the Lyceum circuit, where the venues were much smaller than the outdoor summer Chautauqua auditoriums and tents.

During the period of the Lyceum’s growth, lantern technology had also been growing more powerful. While that first 1829 Lyceum lantern show in Concord was probably for less than 50 people, by the 1880s it was possible to do lantern shows for several thousand (Fig. 5). The lantern lecturers, wielding their brilliant stereopticons and their skills at presenting serious educational subjects in an entertaining manner, were perfectly positioned to succeed on the Lyceum circuits that retained an aura of academic scholarship, but counted on entertainment to pay the bills. Indeed, of the 42 lecturers that the Star Lyceum Bureau offered in 1903–04, ten, or about a quarter, were Illustrated Lecturers.

The Trade Publications—a Window into the Lantern Profession

The performers of the Lyceum needed ways to advertise the merits of their productions. They had to reach two distinct groups—the general public, of course, but, just as important, the managers and Lyceum committee members who might hire them in the first place. Everyone today is familiar with entertainment advertising for the general public—billboards, subway posters, newspaper ads, TV, radio, and social media—all aimed at the audience itself. People in the 19th century would have been familiar with the same media used for the same purpose (See Fig. 2), except of course for the last three. But there was and is a whole other channel of media—the trade magazines—designed to help performing professionals reach those who make the booking decisions. The average person today never sees this channel, nor did the average person of 100 years ago. But advertising in trade magazines was essential for the professional performer, as it was the main way to reach those who might actually pay them to perform. This article focuses on the trade magazines of interest to Illustrated Lecturers, because these journals provide a unique window into their professional world. It contains an analysis of the ads and articles in four such magazines spanning the period 1891 to 1923—Talent; The Lyceumite; their eventual combination, Lyceumite and Talent; and its later condensed title, Lyceum Magazine; plus a related reference volume, Who’s Who in the Lyceum.

By their nature these publications never had large circulations; today, with a few exceptions (volumes newly available on Google books and The Hathi Trust Digital Library) issues are rare and difficult to access. Despite the rich vein of material they contain, previous publications in the field either do not mention, or barely mention them—so a little background about each is in order, especially since they played such an important role in the lives of professional Illustrated Lecturers, and since more and more are becoming available online. For simplicity, further citations for advertisements and articles in these magazines are given in the text in the format, (T, Oct., ’06, 23)—publication, month, year, page. T = Talent magazine, L = The Lyceumite, L&T =

Talent (1890–1906) began as a quarterly, but within a year was a monthly, a self-covered, inexpensive 16-page publication. The circulation in 1891 was 5,000, and a lecturer could reach that audience for ten dollars a year with a “professional card” ad—the size that almost everyone used. Talent maintained its modest format through at least 1899, but by 1904 had morphed into a very handsome monthly magazine—published in a lavish oversized format (9 ¼”x12”), of 45-60 pages with an occasional double issue of 90, printed on glossy paper, with a two-color cover that often featured a modern or historical performer (Fig. 6). Its tag line was variously (1904) “Published in the Interest of Lyceum Talent and Patrons of Lecture Courses”; (1905) “A Monthly Magazine of the Lyceum”; and (1907) “A Magazine of Public Speaking.” Its editorial tone was relentlessly upbeat; its content focused on what different Lyceums were doing, biographies of key figures and stories about their home life, poems that might be good to present on stage, and gossip. Advertising was lavish, with many full-page ads, carefully designed and presented. Most of the advertising—the focus of this article—was about performers, including the Illustrated Lecturers. Issues of Talent surveyed were from 1891 to 1907.

The Lyceumite (1902–1907), Talent’s competitor, was started by Talent correspondent Edwin Barker, and was initially a rather fusty publication in a slightly smaller format (8”x10”). At 20–30 pages it was about half the size of Talent at the time, and was printed on matte and glossy paper, covered in drab green with a small black logo. In 1903 it was upgraded to a two-color cover, usually featuring a current performer’s picture (Fig. 7). Its tag line (which I think irresistible) was:

For the Man On The Platform
The Manager Who Puts Him There
The Committee That Keeps Him There
And The Vast Audience That Wants Him There

Like Talent, The Lyceumite’s tone was generally upbeat but its editor for most of its life could be quite pointed and argumentative. As its name suggests, its content was more about the business and personalities of the Lyceum movement than was Talent’s, including reviews of performers, and reports of Lyceum Committees’ reactions to performers—409 such reports in 1905. By its third year of publication, 1905, it had a circulation of about 90,000. Issues surveyed here were from 1903 to 1907, with some issues missing. Ads were few in the early issues, but became numerous later, and like those in Talent, could be quite lavish.
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The Lyceum and Talent, (1907–1913) was a merger of its two predecessors, and became the official magazine of The International Lyceum Association. The merged magazine immediately became more substantial than either of them, spreading itself across the Chautauqua and Lyceum audience. 23

The Lyceum Magazine, (1913–1933)—with the 1920 sub-head, “For the Lyceum and Chautauqua,” was a re-branding to avoid the awkward name of The Lyceumite and Talent. At that time the magazine was 50–60 pages, and as its name indicates, skewed editorially toward the Lyceums, though there was still plenty of news about Chautauquas (Fig. 8). 24

Who’s Who in the Lyceum, was published as a small book in 1906, and heavily promoted in both Talent and The Lyceum. 25 It was not an advertising vehicle, but was sold by subscription and was almost fully subscribed by the time of publication. Anyone working in the Lyceum movement in any capacity was invited to submit an entry, which was to be strictly factual. Candidates had to provide information that would answer three questions which determined whether they would be included. (1) “Is the candidate pursuing Lyceum work as an artistic vocation, or merely as a negligible avocation?” (2) On average, how many engagements does he fill annually? (3) What is the nature, and to some indicative extent, what is the ideal of his work?”

Though the criteria were vague, as the editors admitted, these criteria were essentially an effort to determine whether candidates were professional enough to be included in their Who’s Who. Listings were alphabetical; the length seems to have been determined by how much candidates wrote about themselves; it varies from a half-column inch, to 2-1/2 columns. Entries were characterized by profession (lecturer, readers, etc.), and often a designation of “illustrated lecture” was included in the description—but, unfortunately, not always. If you did not know that Nat Brigham was one of the nation’s top Illustrated Lecturers, you would not learn it from Who’s Who. 26

The Professional Environment—Competitive Advertisements

Many different kinds of performers competed fiercely for the attention of Lyceum managers; many products competed for the attention of the performers themselves. Together their advertisements in the trade publications give a good indication of the nature of the hotly-contested professional environment in which the Illustrated Lecturers operated. A quantitative overview of this environment can be obtained by counting ads (weighted by size) from three comparable and complete issues, covering seven sample years of the trade publications, spread over a thirty-two year period, from 1891 to 1923. 25 This information is summarized in Table 1, Weighted Trade Magazine Advertising, by Category and Date. Explanations and discussion of the categories follow the Table. For performers, the weighted ad score, and the percentages of scores of Total Performers are given. For Illustrated Lecturers, the weighted ad score, the percentage of Total Performers, and the percentage of all Lecturers, is given. Percentages for Agencies, Schools, and Miscellaneous are given as a percent of Total ads.

Several cautions in reading this Table: (1) Pay attention to the percentages, rather than the ad counts themselves. The ad counts bounce around dramatically, depending mostly on what advertising opportunities were available in a given year, particularly the existence of classified ads—called (confusingly) the “Who’s Who” section—and indicated in

Fig. 8. The cover of Lyceum Magazine, January, 1923 features explorer and illustrated lecturer Vilhjalmur Stefansson. One of the last of the great Illustrated Lecturers, his agent said that on an earlier tour, “His box office receipts were greatly in excess of those of any other explorer who has ever told his story to the public through the medium of a lecture tour.” (LM, June, ’19, 14)
Table 1, Weighted Trade Magazine Advertising, by Category and Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performers</th>
<th>1892</th>
<th>1898</th>
<th>1906</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1913 (WW)</th>
<th>1920 (WW)</th>
<th>1923 (WW)</th>
<th>Average Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers (Non-Illust.)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Total Performers</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrated Lecturers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Total Performers</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Lecturers</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Total Performers</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainers</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Total Performers</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Lecturers</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co./Musicians</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Tot, Performers % Grand Totals</th>
<th>174</th>
<th>180</th>
<th>731</th>
<th>503</th>
<th>688</th>
<th>476</th>
<th>677</th>
<th>---</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Grand Total</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaus, Agencies</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Grand Total</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, Colleges</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Grand Total</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Grand Total</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| GRAND TOTALS                     | 213 | 236 | 968 | 650 | 874 | 726 | 975 | --- |

Table 1 by a “WW” under the year. The classified Who’s Who section made advertising much cheaper, and encouraged greater participation by some advertisers. In general, however, the percentages are much more stable and revealing than the ad count, since the changes in advertising opportunities affected all advertisers equally. (2) The entries indicate weighted ad counts (and percentages), not counts of the performers themselves—and there is usually more than one ad per performer in the three month period. (3) And, to repeat, the counts are for three issues per year, not for twelve.

The Competitive Environment

Table 1 demonstrates that throughout our study period many performers of many different varieties were trying to attract the Lyceum committee man’s notice. It was a “hard sell” situation (Fig. 9). At the peak,
The most common lecture subject listed in *Who's Who in the Lyceum* might be classed as “Inspirational” (28 percent), and the most common inspirational word by far was some variant of “sunshine”—as in lectures on “Sunshine and Sense,” “Laying Up Sunshine,” “The Sunny Side of a Soldier’s Life”—there were 13 “Sunshine” lectures in total. Thus rather than holding down the substantively informative “education” end of the traditional Lyceum “education/entertainment” continuum, the most frequently advertised lectures were often motivational talks—for which, it must be said, the audience seemed to have an insatiable appetite. It is in this context that the *Talent* editor’s comment begins to make sense: Illustrated lectures not only gave more “pleasure” but also more “information” than any other type of lecture in the Lyceum system.

The next largest category of lecture described in *Who’s Who* was the Arts (20 percent), followed by Social Action (11 percent), Patriotic History/Politics (ten percent), Travel (ten percent), Religion (nine percent), Humor (nine percent), and Nature/Science (four percent). The Travel, Nature/Science, Social Action, and Visual Arts categories included performers who may well have been using the lantern but simply did not mention it. For instance a lecturer who discussed the politics of England probably did not use a lantern, but someone who promised a tour of London might well have used one but not said so. And although almost all science and nature lectures were “illustrated” with experiments or artifacts; many might also have used the lantern as part of their presentation without making it the star of the show, as it often was, for instance, in astronomy lectures.

**Who’s Who in the Lyceum on How to Treat a Showman**

In addition to listing performers, *Who’s Who* also contained an article on how to organize a Lyceum, with some helpful advice on platform logistics:

The only thing that the [front row] should never be used for is [a place] on which to seat a row of children. If the reason for this is not obvious, ask any one of the several thousand platform men and women of America for an explanation.

When the audience is assembled to hear a certain attraction, should the next attraction on the course be announced? . . . When the guests are seated at your beautiful Thanksgiving table, with the brown, savory turkey so conspicuously in view, do you keep them waiting five or ten minutes to hear you tell of the boiled eggs you are going to have next Easter?

---

The category of “Lecturers” refers to all kinds of lecturers, including humorous lecturers, but excluding (for our purposes) the “Illustrated Lecturers.” Often Lecturers might add visuals other than slides to their performance by dressing in foreign costumes, displaying foreign artifacts, using scientific apparatus, etc. Not surprisingly, given the Lyceum history and focus, Lecturers were the most frequent advertisers, accounting for an average of 37 percent of all performer’s ads—47 percent if Non-Illustrated and Illustrated Lecturers are combined. But most of these lectures were not like modern college lectures—not a series of content-filled talks on a single academic subject. For the most part, a series of lectures on a single subject was rare in the Lyceums, though more common in the sister “Institutes.”

The Lyceum lectures were generally one-offs, providing incidental, rather than systematic information. And, despite the Lyceum heritage, most of the lectures were not heavy on academic content.
Forty-four such cases are included in Appendix B, Other Possible Illustrated Lecturers.

The Illustrated Lecturer—“Illustrated Lecturers” denotes any performers using a stereopticon, including Science Lecturers, and “Picture Plays.” (The latter was an evening-long story told by a single lecturer, illustrated with photos of five actors that changed on screen about every 30 seconds.) Ads for “Illustrated Lecturers,” which were counted separately from those of “Lecturers,” were a smaller percentage than “Lecturers,” at an average of ten percent of the total. However, if the “Illustrated Lecturer ads” are looked at as a percentage of “Lecturers,” (the second percentage in each column), we see that they account for an average of 21 percent of all lecture advertisements printed, indicating that they were an important segment of the lecturer market.

The ads for illustrated lecturers often displayed some of the arresting images from the lectures, or of the lecturers themselves. If the lecturers were not personally appealing, they could certainly dress up in exotic foreign clothes, or pose as intrepid adventurer with manly beard and gun. And because a full page ad gave them plenty of room to display such pictures, the large format was particularly effective for them. (See p. 28 for samples.) Even a small ad like Frederick Cook’s, with its unique close-up of foreign culture, could be an eye stopper (Fig. 10).

![Fig. 10](image1.png)

Fig. 10. Even in an ad run at this size, Frederick Cook could display an image that was bound to attract attention. (L., May, ’05, back)
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We will have much more to say later about the Illustrated Lecturers, and their change of fortunes over time, but first, let’s review their other competitors—those who were also advertising in the trade journals and competed for the “eyeballs” and dollars of the Lyceum managers:

The Readers—“Readers” was the term given to those who gave readings, without pictures, usually of serious literature. The Readers (11 percent) were a striking group of advertisers, because many of them were quite glamorous. About three quarters of the Readers were women, and personal beauty seems to have been an important element of their appeal (Fig. 11).

![Fig. 11](image2.png)

Fig. 11. The portrait of Illustrated Lecturer Mrs. Hubbard (left) in an ad for The Lyceumite, June, 1906, contrasts dramatically with that of knockout Reader Nellie Peck (right), as she appeared in The Lyceumite, May, 1904.
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The female Illustrated Lecturers also made use of their looks, even if they were not stunners. For instance, Mrs. Leonidas Hubbard (Fig. 11), who gave a lecture called “A Woman’s Way Through Unknown Labrador,” and who was not particularly glamorous, was nonetheless quite happy to play up her face and figure in her advertising:

Her youth, her slender and graceful figure, and the delicacy of her features are in striking contrast to the arduous and daring nature of [her] great undertaking.
Hubbard may not have been able to match the allure of a Reader like Nellie Peck, but then, Nellie had never been to Labrador, and Nellie had no “stereopticon views of the grand and beautiful scenery.”

**Concert Companies and Musicians**—“Musicians” includes all types of musicians, whether solo or group. Musicians often traveled in a Concert Company—a group of musicians and a reader. Musicians accounted for 19 percent of the total ads. The type of musician reflected the historic Lyceum tension between education and entertainment. Though in the early years any kind of music was seen as getting away from the intellectual purpose of the Lyceum, by 1906 music was well established as an important part of the offerings. But classical music (74 percent) was overwhelmingly the type most represented in Who’s Who, followed distantly by lighter, more popular fare (17 percent) and ethnic music like the Jubilee Singers (8 percent). As we will see later, a significant number of Illustrated Lectures also capitalized on the interest in music.

**The Entertainers**—The Entertainers category (23 percent) was comprised of Magicians, Whistlers, Monologists, Interpreters, and Characterists. They went by many names, but most were solo performers who created their own “character” or “action” on stage. Most Entertainers were impersonators and creators of dialect characters (52 percent), followed by the “chalk artists” (20 percent) who performed their own kind of illustrated lecture by drawing or sculpting on stage while they talked about their picture. Two of the entertainers (Charles Oxenham and Daniel Robertson) offered programs of movies, the coming competition for the lantern. (Oxenham promised an “anti-flicker attachment and other apparatus of his own invention,” probably in a move to head off resistance to the “flickers.”)

**The Schools**—“Schools” (2 percent of the total) refers to Schools of Drama and Expression, catering to those who aspired to the stage. One indication of the frenzy of lecturing in this period is the number of advertisements for “Schools of Oratory” found in these magazines, and discussed in depth in the June, 1905 issue of Talent. Fourteen such schools are described, most with variations on names such as “The National School of Elocution and Oratory” or “The School of Expression.” Many were substantial institutions in impressive buildings, often run by leading lecturers, with up to 200 students taking courses that ran for two-to-three years (Fig. 12). The objective of The Leland Powers School, for instance, was “To awaken the student; to free him from erroneous habits of thought, action, and voice, quickening his imagination and giving him a knowledge and control of his agents of expression….”

As we shall see later from the reviews of lantern shows, the period was one of change in oratorical styles; the professional Illustrated Lecturer was less likely to be expected to “orate and declaim” than he had been in an earlier era. A more conversational tone was now appreciated, and several schools promoted this approach. But whatever their style, the schools had, with one exception, little success with Illustrated Lecturers; only six of the 93 listed in Who’s Who attended one of them. The school’s real market was the Readers, for whom a school certificate was almost a union card. Fully three quarters of them had attended one of these schools, or a similar program sponsored by a university. Eloquence and beauty seem to have been the twin requirements for an eminent Reader.

**Fig. 12.** The Ott School of Expression (top), was held in an imposing building, as were most of its competitors. The solidity of the structure suggested the solidity of the enterprise. (T, June, 1905, 6). The California School of Artistic Whistling (bottom), specializing in bird whistling, and was perhaps not quite so solid an enterprise. (LM, April, 1920, 42)
The one kind of school that probably targeted Illustrated Lecturers—and admittedly it was an odd sort of school—was the California School of Artistic Whistling, established in 1912 by whistler Agnes Woodward.\(^{37}\) No doubt it was heavily influenced by the phenomenal success of Illustrated Lecturer Charles Kellogg, whose long career began in 1888. By 1906 he had filled 2,200 engagements,\(^{38}\) combining whistling with slides of birds, so it is likely that the School’s curriculum included instruction in obtaining, coloring, and presenting lantern slides of birds. Indeed, as we shall see, “Bird Whistlers” were a significant segment of the Illustrated Lecturers. (To hear some truly remarkable recordings of Kellogg in action, search for his name on YouTube.)

**The Agencies**—The category of “Agencies” or “Bureaus” includes the companies that had a roster of performers to present to Lyceum committees.\(^{39}\) These Agencies and Bureaus were a major source of advertising in the trade publications (12 percent of the total), and are an indication of how many of the Illustrated Lecturers got their bookings. These ads generally displayed the agency’s full roster, and were often full page, or double-page spreads, or even four-or-eight-page spreads, sometimes on heavy stock or red paper. They generally simply listed their artists, perhaps with picture and a word or two about their specialty. (A similar style is still followed today by major agencies.) The concept was simply to remind the reader of how impressive the agency’s roster was; the “sell” of individual artists would come in person later. Often, in fact, the agency sold a prepackaged “course” of talent, which they moved from town to town.

The Agencies were also major users of the classified ad sections introduced in 1913, and seen also in 1920 and ’23. There was a special classified section for Agencies, so they may have felt obligated to participate, or be conspicuous by their absence. As a result, the percentage of ads run by Agencies doubled from 1906 to 1923, at a period when the Illustrated Lecturers advertising was falling, despite the classifieds.

*Who’s Who* collected information in 1906 on which agencies or bureaus the artists, including the Illustrated Lecturers, had used or were using. Ninety-five different agents were listed, but acting as one’s own agent was the most common choice, accounting for 35 percent of the responses. This independence, however, was often combined with working through an agent; indeed, often through multiple agents covering different territories. The most common agency, at 15 percent was the one that was the source of the Library of Congress/University of Iowa Chautauqua collection referred to earlier, the Redpath Lyceum Bureau.\(^{40}\) Five others each had about 5 percent, including the famous James B. Pond Bureau, and The University of Chicago Extension Bureau. One agency specialized in Illustrated Lecturers (Fig. 13).

Gradually, many of the bureaus consolidated, so that one agency could book towns across the whole country for a whole season. Their reach became astounding. In the 1921–1922 season, for instance, Affiliated Bureaus reported that ten and a half million people had paid admission to their Lyceum and Chautauqua events (about one million of them to Lyceums), in four thousand towns, with gross receipts of $922,000 from Lyceums, and $2,496,633 in total, or, in today’s dollars, about $12,000,000 from Lyceums and $33,000,000 in total.\(^{41}\)

How big a bite did the Agencies and Bureaus take out of the lecturer’s fee? *The Lyceumite* in 1906 suggests that fifteen percent was standard.\(^{42}\) But writing about the beginning of his career in 1936, Illustrated-Lecturer Thayer Soule (the anointed successor to Burton Holmes), described his first meeting with A. H. Handley Management of Boston—not a Lyceum Bureau, but, according to Soule, the dominate bureau in the Northeast “since the Revolution.” Mr. Handley laid out the contract:

> We work only with an exclusive contract. We would handle all your booking and all the correspondence. All you’d have to do is give the shows. Our commission would be one third of your fee. You pay your expenses and provide your equipment. How about it?\(^{43}\)

After that brief summary and Soule’s agreement, Handley whipped out their standard contract. Soule signed (with a quill pen, no less!) and worked under that contract for the next 50 years, so we can assume that he considered it a fair one. It seems likely then that a fee of 15-30 percent was typical, depending on range of services, extra fees, etc. That is confirmed by a series of letters between Chautauqua Illustrated Lecturer Harry A. Frank and James Pond, a leading agent, that contain several allusions to their contractual arrangements, suggesting a fee of about twenty-five percent.\(^{44}\) That is, interestingly, about what agents charge to-

---

Fig. 13. This small agency specialized in Illustrated Lectures. It advertised consistently through the 1890s, but seems to have closed thereafter. (7, March, ’93)
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day. You can find a “15 percent agent,” but you’re also likely to discover that printing, conference attendance, web site design, etc. are all extra, amounting, when all is said and done, to that extra 10 percent.

Miscellaneous, and The Ads Directed to Illustrated Lecturers—About 8 percent of the ads in the trade magazines were aimed not at the Committee men who hired performers, but at the performers themselves. These included ads for hotels and railroad lines, for purveyors of advertising materials, for travel trunks and fake mustaches. They give a nice sense of the professional performer’s daily concerns.

A small number of ads were clearly aimed specifically at Illustrated Lecturers (Fig. 14). They included one by McAllister, the largest distributor of lantern slides, which touted its “One Hundred Thousand Slides illustrating all topics constantly in stock,” and also offered to create special lectures from the Illustrated Lecturer’s own prepared materials. Other companies offered similar services.45 Chicago Film Exchange claimed, in 1907, that you could make $100 a week with the newest projected fad, the movies. And most intriguing of all, The Art Electric Stage Lighting Co. offered “the largest photographic transparencies ever made,” and “Imaginary Trips by Airship, Submarine and Thought Travel—Around the World—Through the Earth—Under the Sea—To the Moon, Mars, and Other Worlds.” (There were, in fact, illustrated lantern shows on all of these subjects, but I admit I don’t understand the allusions to “Thought Travel” and “Imaginary Trips,” unless they refer to the lantern-lecture medium itself.)

Not all these companies were steady advertisers, but McAllister and Albany Calcium were regulars in the 1903–07 period, suggesting that at least these two companies thought Talent and The Lyceumite were likely ways to reach not only the professional lantern showmen, but new lantern lecturers—perhaps those who subscribed to the magazines because they could imagine themselves soon basking in the glow of adoring crowds and lucrative ticket sales.

Fig. 14. Equipment ads aimed at Illustrated Lecturers.

Sources: Albany Calcium Co—(T, May, ’07, 44); McAllister Mfg.—(L&T, Jan., ’08, 52); Harbach, (T, June, 1906, 48); Kleine Optical Co.—(T, Oct., ’04, 49); Chicago Film Exchange—(T, March, ’07, 29); Art Electric Stage Lighting Co. —(T, July, ’04, 27).
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Slide Colorists—An especially important sort of advertisements aimed at professional Illustrated Lecturers were placed by those who offered to color the lecturer’s slides. The photographic slides themselves were often taken by the lecturer, or by an unacknowledged photographer, and do not seem to have attracted much attention. But the extraordinary coloring of professional slides was one of the things that most impressed audiences, probably because it was so far superior to what they were used to seeing from local amateurs. In an earlier article in this journal I have discussed in detail the most outstanding colorists of American lantern slides. Several of those colorists advertised in the trade journals, and were discussed in them editorially. A. G. Marshall, for instance, advertised his coloring services heavily in the 1890-1900 period (Fig. 15), and an article in Talent called him “the most artistic lantern slide colorist living,” citing a number of famous lecturers for whom he colored slides. In general, however, the colorists were anonymous. Even the top professional colorists like Marshall, Charlotte Pinkerton (another advertiser in Talent), and Joseph Hawkes (colorist for J. P. MacCorry) or the performer’s wives who were colorists, rarely got a credit in the programs or advertisements of the showmen they served.

Projectionists—Even more obscure than the colorists were the projectionists, those unsung heroes without whom no show could go on. A few lecturers may have operated their own lantern, but this was certainly rare at the professional level. Usually they depended on a local “for hire” operator. A number of lecturers, however, travelled with their own projectionist, and even credited them by name. Truman W. Harrington, for instance, worked with John B. De Motte, for 1800 engagements; Charles Bowden always ran the lantern for his wife Katherine. And Albert Wiggam, though he did not give the name of his assistant, was quite insistent that all venues use his services (Fig. 16).

Changes in Relative Advertising Over Time—With very few exceptions, there is a remarkable consistency of the relative advertising by the different categories of performers over the thirty-two year period. That is, Lecturers, who were the largest advertisers over the whole period with a 37 percent average, also had the largest percentage of ads in each individual year, with little relative change over time. The same kind of consistency generally held true for the other categories of performers—Entertainers (23 percent av.), Concert Companies and Musicians (19 percent av.), Readers (11 percent av.), and Illustrated Lecturers (10 percent av.). (There is a gradual drop-off in relative Illustrated Lecture advertising that will be addressed later, and, as already indicated, an increase in Agencies, due to the classified section.) Thus an analysis of the relative rates of trade magazine advertising does not support the contention that the Lyceums became more entertainment-oriented over time.

General Characteristics of the Lyceum Illustrated Lecturers

We’ll turn now from discussing the different types of Lyceum advertisers and the competitive professional environment they represented for Illustrated Lecturers, and concentrate on an in-depth look at the Illustrated Lecturers themselves, first examining some of their group characteristics, and then the individual performers.

Education—The education of professional Illustrated Lecturers was generally impressive. Who’s Who collected information about this and other subjects in a more or less systematic manner, which means that the Illustrated Lecturers listed there can be analyzed quantitatively in a way that information from ads cannot. About 75 percent of them had a four-year college degree—at a time when only two percent of the general population finished college. In addition, 20 percent also had a Divinity degree and 22 percent had an advanced degree other than Divinity, usually in the sciences. Six percent had attended the “schools of expression” promoted in Talent and The Lyceumite which were discussed earlier. Those without degrees generally cited relevant experience such as extensive travel.
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Practical Education

Many essential truths about lecturing were not taught in professional schools, but learned through hard experience on the road:

When the baby begins its cry, put the brake on your voice, platformist [lecturer], and take a quieter tone. The louder the baby the more quiet you, all the time never looking toward the location of the noise or paying the least bit of attention to it. In thirty seconds auditors will begin directing frowns toward the baby and wishing the "brat would keep quiet." The audience wants to hear you, the baby prevents, and in less than a minute some ticket holder will request the removal of the infant. Try this, ye who strive to please, and stop the baby cry without a detriment to your career. (L, Oct., '05, 390)

Evaluation—On-going professional evaluation was an essential feature of the Lyceum system for all performers, including the Illustrated Lecturers. Booking bureaus kept careful track of how well their audiences were satisfied with each presentation, using, in the case of the Star Lyceum Bureau (Fig. 17), a four-point scale from “Delighted” to “Unsatisfactory.” They delved into such key issues as whether the lecture was too long, and whether the sponsor thought a “return date would be advisable.” They also provided a space for general remarks. (In my own experience with such feedback forms, the “general remarks” are often the most helpful kind of information because they can suggest what is behind the numbers.) The Lyceumite used a similar feedback system, publishing the feedback results from all reporting towns for each performer and giving quantitative data in the format, “78 percent delighted.” This kind of evaluative information was of course priceless to those responsible for picking the performers, but it was also important for maintaining and improving the quality of the performers themselves. It weeded out the “weak sisters,” insuring that only the best survived. And, though perhaps painful at times, it surely served as a powerful spur to continuing professional improvement, even for the best. In addition to this formal feedback system, both Talent and The Lyceumite published reviews of individual lecturer’s performances—sometimes rather pointed reviews. These reviews obviously affected the public perceptions of the reviewed performers, but more important, they helped to establish the qualities that were essential for a high-quality professional illustrated lecture. (This information is so helpful for understanding the profession that I will provide a detailed treatment of it in a later section.)

Experience—The Lyceum Illustrated Lecturers in Who’s Who were a very experienced group. Of those reporting the date they began Lyceum work (59 of 93), 81 percent had been performing in Lyceums for more than five years; and 55 percent for more than ten. Eleven, or 19 percent, began in just one year, 1896. (This cohort’s attempts at establishing themselves in the profession may account for the fact that there is a jump in Illustrated Lecturer advertising percentage in 1898, to 18 percent from an average of 10 percent.) The Illustrated Lecturer who had been performing longest, William Robert Brooks, an astronomer, had been wielding his lantern slides from 1861 to 1906, for 45 years. Now that’s stamina!

Degree of Professional Employment as Illustrated Lecturer—Fifty, or 54 percent of the Illustrated Lecturers in Who’s Who indicated that they not only lectured, but had other employment. (It is impossible to be sure that those who did not list another job were relying exclusively on revenues from lectures; they may have simply neglected to fill in that portion of the form.) Of those who said they had other employment, twelve were pastors, 12 were professors, 17 were authors or journalists, three were scientists, and six were Other. The pastors and professors had flexible schedules, which would have melded nicely with the demands of the lecture circuit. Authors and journalists also
had flexible schedules, but these two professions provided a critical advantage to the lecturer. Many travel lecturers wrote travel books; the superstars also wrote for middle-brow publications like The Mentor; both activities increased their profile and prestige. But some reached further afield. For instance, Illustrated Lecturer Albert E. Wiggam, a psychologist, eugeniciast, and “Apostle of Efficiency,” appeared in a wide array of middle-brow and low-brow publications—American Magazine, The Patriotic Review, The Little Blue Books. The more people read the works of these Illustrated Lecturers, the more likely they were to attend lectures. The more they attended lectures, the more they bought the books and magazines. It was the beginnings of the multi-media synergy that Disney would develop into an empire.

**Pay for Illustrated Lecturers**—The pay of Illustrated Lecturers varied enormously. Those at the top rank who played the big halls of the big cities—superstars like Burton Holmes, Dwight Elmendorf, and E. M. Newman—might receive $750 for a performance in the 1920s, about $9,000 today. (By and large, the superstars did not advertise for the Lyceum or Chautauqua circuits, playing instead in very large big-city halls.) At $9,000 a show, 100 performances a year would gross $900,000; 200 shows—a common enough though demanding pace—would gross $1,800,000, less manager’s fee, agent’s fee, travel, etc. But these were the superstars; how about the everyday lecturer? An informative 1920 article with the wonderful subtitle of “A Glimpse into the Sacred Lyceum Mystery of Money” describes how a beginning lecturer (not necessarily an Illustrated Lecturer), might start independently on the Lyceum circuit, without an agent, and make $5–$25 a night ($60–$300 today). Then, if successful:

| He might start with a bureau at $50–$75 [$580–$875] a week | week engagement, plus [an allowance for] hotels and railroads. As the young lecturer goes on growing, making good, and making a return demand for himself, he might expect to get $100 to $150 [$1150–$1750] a week before long. If he grows and wears, he can look after some seasons for perhaps $200 [$2,300]. A few rise to $250 to $500 [$2,900–$5,800] a week for long seasons. So the best salaried lecturers do not average better than the best salaried preachers or professional men, or very little better, and they live an exposed, irregular life, on trains, among strangers and away from their families. Most of them make under $5,000 [$58,000] a year. |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|

Energy and entrepreneurship could make a big difference in compensation. Talent recounts this story about Frank Roberson:

Rumor and gossip say that Frank R. Roberson, the Illustrated Lecturer, had forty dates at fifty dollars a night booked in advance of the season. When the Philippine war arose … he wrote the forty committees and said he would give them a Philippine and Manila lecture if they would double his fee . . . The committees agreed and Roberson is now in the Philippines or just returned from there with a batch of slides and a lecture already written, and taken on the spot. [Thus] he has jumped from a fifty to a hundred dollar man by a great stroke of enterprise and “get there.”

**Life on the Road**—As I can attest from 23 years of personal experience, the life of a traveling showman is a hard one, and the pages of the old trade magazines are full of the complaints from those who spent so much of their lives on the road. One of the leading complaints was the strain of “the jumps”—the term the lecturers used to describe traveling, or “jumping,” from one venue to another. Ideally, the lecturer would rise late, have a large breakfast with his assistant in a luxurious hotel, board the train for an hour’s ride to the next town, have a large lunch, rest his voice and spirit with a two hour nap, and be ready for his evening performance.

The reality was often quite different. The train ride might be brutal: “A leading illustrated lecturer, with an assistant and excess baggage, has averaged 328 miles a day this season. The Illustrated Lecturer might not have his own assistant; the projectionist might be “for hire,” arriving on another train: “On account of a delay of trains his operator did not arrive until after 9 o’clock p.m. While the audience waited, Mr. Roberson entertained them by giving personal reminiscences.” The food might be suspect; even the water was not to be trusted: “You must boil it or use lemon juice to be sure.” After all that, the voice might not be properly rested for that next performance, so . . . “Use Grobecker’s Magic Throat Tablets, price 15 cents per bottle, an indispensable companion in all my travels and platform work.”

These trials and tribulations paled, however, in comparison with the indignities suffered by “colored” performers, like Illustrated Lecturer Daniel Webster Davis, or James Balmer’s “Kaffier Boys Choir.” After the Choir arrived in Mechanicsburg, PA exhausted from the usual indignities of travel, their hotel would not admit them, saying, “We remember you telling us they were Africans, but we did not know that Africans meant negroes.”

**The Qualities That Made a Showman “Eminent”: Reviewing the Reviews**—The advertisements in the trade publications and the entries in Who’s Who give a good sense of many aspects of the professional life of Illustrated Lecturers, but they do not capture the qualities that made some of them great, or, “eminent.” For that we need to turn to the reviews, particularly those carried by The Lyceumite.
The Jumps

Why looks the lecturer so pale? They haven’t jumped him far—
He only rode all day and night within a choo–choo car.
The seats were made of softest plush, he got to turn one over
And stretch himself at fullest length— why sure he was in clover!
The distance was a thousand miles, half-way the train was freight.
At Punkinhurst and Turnipthorpe four hours he had to wait.
He slept upon an iron seat from 1 to 6 a.m.—
Why looketh he so wan and worn? That journey was a gem.

(L, March, ’06, 163)

In order to make sense of these reviews, it is helpful to hark back to a little performance history. Lantern shows were ubiquitous in the period of our study, but they were not always considered serious offerings, especially by some Lyceums or universities. This is understandable, since the Lyceums, as we have seen, began as a way to bring important political and intellectual speakers to local communities, much as did the universities. The use of pictures seemed—to some at least—to undercut that effort. For instance, Charles Haskins Townsend, Director of the New York Aquarium from 1902 to 1937, was upset by attending an ornithological conference dominated by illustrated lectures, perhaps like those of Charles Kellogg (Fig. 18). "Good pictures are dangerous in the wrong hands," he wrote.

The general public is pretty well satisfied with what it gets [from illustrated lectures] and is incapable of distinguishing between the noted authority and the mere amateur who has the same kind of pictures. Shall we be satisfied with this kindergarten way of lecturing? . . . Lecturing with lantern illustrations has so nearly superseded the well-prepared, authoritative discourse that the latter has become a rarity.63

That is one point of view—that the pandering Illustrated Lecturers were undercutting the prestige of serious scien-
tists. On the other hand, as The Lyceumite pointed out, Lyceums were a business:

One of the chief duties of the [Lyceum] committee is the selection of the course. . . Mr. Committeeman, the vast audience is not furnishing money to bring attractions to town that will please you. Not by a long shot. The audience buys tickets to provide itself with the kind of entertainment it enjoys. . . You, Mr. Committeeman, may delight in heavy lectures, in music or in readings, but that’s not the point. The point is this: What pleases your people?64

It was, of course, the illustrated lecture that pleased the people, as Talent’s editor has already pointed out. It might not have been the most serious production a Lyceum could offer, but it was likely to be one of the most popular. It is within this context that the critical appraisal of illustrated lectures took place. The problem such appraisals faced was not so much to distinguish the serious lecture from the illustrated lecture, as to distinguish the qualities of professional Illustrated Lecturers from those of any “professor” in the neighborhood church or school, using slides and scripts easily rented through dozens of catalogs—an extreme form of the “kindergarten way of learning.”

Fig. 18. Ad for Charles Kellogg, “The Bird Man,” whose show combined a lecture, lantern slides of birds, and bird whistling. Such talents put pressure on professional ornithologists to compete for public attention and applause. (L, Feb., ’05, front)
An obvious source of information about lecturer quality would be reviews, but it has not been easy to find reviews of illustrated lantern lectures that are more than puff pieces. My earlier article on the Chautauqua lecturers was based on a survey of promotional brochures prepared by the performers or their agencies. While these brochures often quoted reviews of performances, they were, of course, only the good reviews. In addition, they tended to be so general that it was impossible to tell much about the performances except that the reviewers liked them, and that “realistically colored” slides were considered important.\(^6^{5}\) Likewise, in a study of newspaper reviews of lantern performances in 1895, my wife and I found much the same thing. Local newspapers dependent on local advertising were loath to be critical of performances at local venues.\(^6^{6}\)

Professional magazines like Talent and The Lyceumite, however, felt a professional responsibility to take a critical stand toward their profession. Talent’s editor, for instance, writing in the column on “Men and Measures—By the Man in the Audience,” acknowledged that, “Many of our readers look in their journals for a fair criticism of any attraction which is presented and heralded as something great.”\(^6^{7}\) Talent generally qualified any negative criticism with an immediate “on the other hand.”\(^6^{8}\) The Lyceumite’s editor, acting as critic under the logo “Unkapupa the Critic,” could be blunt, even caustic (Fig. 19). Thus the trade journal reviews can teach us what several experts in the performing profession of the time thought was important in a good illustrated lantern lecture. And Unkapupa, at least, was definitely knowledgeable. He claimed to have seen “every popular illustrated lecture in the country, save three.”\(^6^{9}\)

Lantern Technique—Both the editors of Talent and The Lyceumite thought—not surprisingly—that mastery of technical matters was essential to a good illustrated lecture. Talent’s editor described Frank Roberson’s lantern expertise in presenting his “Russia and Japan” show, and by implication suggested some of the problems that could make a stereopticon entertainment “commonplace”—i.e., like the amateur show put on by that local “professor.”

There are few men who can make an illustrated lecture anything more than a commonplace stereopticon entertainment. . . . There are many things that can go wrong. . . . With Frank R. Roberson, however, everything is necessarily perfect. He has the best machine to be bought, the focus is always perfect so that the pictures are clear, and his assistant manages the dissolving views perfectly. Indeed, I have never seen an operator get such unusually pleasing effects with slides.\(^7^{0}\)

Unkapupa was also quick to notice, and praise, technical improvements in lantern presentation, even small ones. For instance, he described how Father MacCorry, whose show “The Story Beautiful” mixed Bible images with orchestral music and a chorus, set his screen away from the audience, up stage instead of down, so there was more room for the musicians.\(^7^{1}\) Or he pointed out that when Father MacCorry performed, he stood, “backed by a curtain of black plush . . . with a spot light full upon him, [so that] the speaker is seen as plainly as are the illustrations which accompany his words.”\(^7^{2}\) Or, he noted how Charles Kellogg, “The Bird Man,” framed his screen in red, harkening back to the red cardinals in his advertisements.\(^7^{3}\)
Illustrated Lecturers

And yet—and yet—he holds his audience breathless for as long as he chooses to speak, [even up to two hours] . . . The secret of it all is in the overwhelming earnestness and sincerity of the man. He uses the simplest of language and speaks in a quiet and unimpassioned manner, making no apparent effort to impress his hearers. Yet every word is charged with his message... His talk has the strength and pathos of absolute simplicity and the never failing power which deep feeling lends to even the most commonplace of words.

At the other extreme, the editors of both Talent and The Lyceumite were annoyed by those who used their oratorical talent to “make preposterous statements,” or stretch beyond the facts, or belittle foreigners. Talent said of Frank Roberson (Fig. 20):

Through all his talk there is a definite personal element, [so] you can easily imagine that you are taking the journey with him. This personal element is at once a strength and a weakness. It makes the narrative vastly more interesting, but some of the incidents are so highly colored that the less credulous in the audience discredit his stories….The general impression received from the numerous references to Kruger, [the leader of the Boers described in Roberson’s “Boer War” show,] was that Roberson had an intimate acquaintance with the president of the Transvaal, [which in] the nature of the case was impossible.

Beyond clarity and carrying power of voice, a “natural” delivery was preferred. “It has always been understood,” said Talent, “that the unpardonable sin of the platform is ‘preachiness’; anything savoring of nasal uncouthness or Puritanic strenuousness is instantly repelled.” But it was not just “nasal uncouthness” that was frowned upon. In 1899, Talent, speaking of elocutionists, pointed out that:

Elocution, as an art, has changed radically within the past decade. The day of the shrieking female who rendered “Curfew Must Not Ring Tonight” on every possible and impossible occasion has passed, and her place has been taken by the dignified and quiet woman, gracefully gowned, who interprets your favorite word pictures in a manner wholly charming. The interpretation must not be classed with her wildly gesticulating forbearer or her infant prodigy imitator—they are as different as night and day.

What counted, in Talent’s view, was not histrionics or the “spread-eagle, white-hot oratory,” of Father MacCorry, but a voice that projected authenticity:

Col. Havers has seen service in the English army, he has been before the mast of a sailing vessel, so that he knows by actual experience the great scenes he describes, and invests his statements with an authority indisputable and his words with a thrill of inspiration which inspires his audiences with enthusiasm and intense interest.

So important was this sincere and personal presentation that it could even compensate for a speaker’s failings in vocal presentation, as in the case of the illustrated lecture of Wilfred Grenfell, a medical missionary working in Labrador:

The interest in Dr. Grenfell’s lectures lies in the man and his message, for he is by no means a finished speaker. He is a trifle hesitating, and sometimes even searches for words with manifest difficulty in finding the right one. The material in his lecture might be much better arranged; as it stands it is often uncontinuous, and he sometimes repeats himself.
The worst offender at stretching beyond the facts, in Unkapupa’s opinion, was John. B. De Motte, who filled over 2,500 engagements. His most popular illustrated lecture was called “Python Eggs and the American Boy”—about the importance of breaking bad habits before they grow to be uncontrollable snakes. Unkapupa hated De Motte’s “chopped up, mouth-full-of-marbles articulation.” But what really drove him wild was his insincerity. “De Motte said at the beginning that he was there to state facts—nothing but facts—scientific facts. And then he didn’t.” What he did was revel in tales of “dissipation, pollution, debauchery, the full stories of which made up the bulk of the lecture”—all reformed at the end by an application of “unscientific” religion (Fig. 21). Unkapupa considered De Motte’s illustrated lecture, dressed “in the name of reform” to be only the “yellowest streaks in yellow prints,” towing the audience “through the undercurrent of the dirty waters of reform.” It was what we might today call “slumming,” and was, to his mind, the antithesis of Dr. Grenfell’s “overwhelming earnestness and sincerity.”

Fig. 21. This evocative image, probably from John B. De Motte’s show called “Harp of the Senses,” suggests why his performances might have been so popular, but also that they were more poetic and religious than “scientific” as he claimed. (T, March, ’98, 16) New York Public Library

The Slide Images—There are relatively few comments about the slide pictures themselves—little discussion, for instance, of the qualities that contribute to the artistic nature of the images (other than clear focus and good coloring), or of what makes a good sequence of illustration. This lack is surprising because these lecturers were engaged in sequential illustration that was to some degree similar to that in an illustrated lantern story, which raises issues of continuity, pacing, and dramatic flow. What comments there were tended to be general.

The Lyceumite, for instance, said Nat Brigham’s pictures for “The Apache Warpath” were “very good and always in harmony with the subject,” and Father MacCorry had “gathered and arranged a most beautiful collection of pictures, many of them exact copies of the famous paintings of the world.” Unkapupa did take Frank Gamel to task for using, in his “The American Boy” lecture, “a few pictures...of a lurid and somewhat sensational order.” Whereas in discussing Jacob Riis’s photographs of tenements, images that might well be considered shocking, Talent said only that the “intensely interesting lecture [was]...well and fittingly illustrated by pictures taken by Mr. Riis himself in the course of his battle with the slums.”

And perhaps most interesting, the Talent editor, writing about Burton Holmes, creator of the term “travelogue” and perhaps the most famous showman of his period, said:

Burton Holmes well deserves his reputation as a showman of such wonders of the world as may be reduced to a photographic plate. His remarks are slightly humorous and mildly entertaining, excellent accompaniments for the picture, which are meant, of course, to be nearly, if not quite, “the whole show.” As to the pictures, well, everyone knows the Burton Holmes pictures, and there seems small need of our adding our voice to the chorus of praise.

The pictures of Burton Holmes were indeed extraordinary—look up “Burton Holmes travelogues” on Google images for a quick peek—but if they were “the whole show,” the two publications did not think that was true in most cases. It was the relationship of image and voice that mattered, and on this subject they were much more detailed and explicit than about the images themselves.

Relationship of Voice and Image—How did the editors treat the most fundamental issue in illustrated lectures—the relationship of the voice to the pictures? Wrote Talent’s editor of Frank Roberson:

Most lecturers who show pictures take themselves too seriously: they talk too much about each; nor
do the pictures wait on his talk. It is like a seasoned traveler on an express train, chatting to a friend who is a stranger to that road about the things seen along the way. . . . He knows the proportion of facts, description, and stories that make a travel lecture interesting.\textsuperscript{89}

In his discussion of Burton McDowell’s lecture on “Samoa,” The Lyceumite’s Unkapupa was even more emphatic about not waiting for the picture, parodying the voice qualities that made a poor illustrated lecture

To me the [bad] illustrated lecture nearly always bears a semblance to the album fiend, who turns the leaves and hesitatingly says: “and—uh—now—oh, this is Aunt Jane and —er—this is Uncle Hiram before he had his whiskers shaved off; and now—uh—now—oh, this is mama when she was a young girl,” and so forth and fifth, and—— “Tis seldom an illustrated lecturer goes right ahead and allows the pictures to accompany him—he accompanies the pictures—hence the hesitating talk, as if waiting for the next slide and half trembling in fear that it might be the wrong one or come on upside down. I have heard some who had this halty-balty-talky way so bad that they threw their audience into the last stages of rickets. . . . Mr. McDowell doesn’t do this, although he has not entirely divorced his mind from the screen.\textsuperscript{90}

Unkapupa went on to contrast the “halty-balty” delivery with his ideal of a good illustrated lecture.

Unkapupa went on to contrast the “halty-balty” delivery with his ideal of a good illustrated lecture:

In an illustrated lecture the picture should bear the same relation to what is being said that [Gustave] Doré’s art does to Dante’s “Inferno.” We admire the pictures; but they are not paramount—they only emphasize the poem.\textsuperscript{91}

Or again, writing of Nat M. Brigham’s (Fig. 28) “The Grand Canyon of Arizona,” Unkapupa commented:

His pictures are in keeping with the subject. They are not made to overshadow all else; they are merely an illustrative accompaniment. . . . The day has passed when a lot of colored pictures, [simply] talked about, travels far as an illustrated lecture. That is a picture show—nothing more.\textsuperscript{92}

For the editors of Talent and The Lyceumite, then, it was the talent of the showman that counted, much more than the pictures. With the possible exception of Burton Holmes, the wise and eminent showman “divorced his mind from the screen,” and let the images support him (Fig. 22).

If I may add a personal comment on this subject, based on 20+ years of performing lantern shows, and watching others do likewise, the editors’ formulation is the correct one. Even when the pictures are fabulous, and some modern showmen have collected the very best that were used 100 years ago—the show will not be a good one if the showman allows himself to be governed by his own pictures. Slides light up the screen; showmanship lights up the show.
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Illustrated Lecture

BY REV. A. C. DERR

ON A NIGHT IN THE PINE FOREST

He has a story to tell & knows how to tell it.

Geo. E. Smith, Toledo, Ohio, Manager for United States and Canada
Booked by Leading Bureaus (Seventh Season)

Source: (L, Jan., '03)