

Culture Alcohol & Society Quarterly

Newsletter of Kirk/CAAS Collections at Brown

Vol. II, No. 2

January/February/March 2005

*This is our second new issue of the CA&SQ. We have brief reports from Bill and Ernie on current or recent work, a draft of my introduction to the new edition of MacAndrew and Edgerton, *Drunken Comportment*, for review and comment, and a new addition to our on-going “Notes and Queries on the Washingtonians,” which gives an interesting perspective on their efforts and a little information on William K. Mitchell. Next issue will again see more contributions on current work at the collections, plans for future work, and results of past work from the collections and by those on or entering the KirkWorks listserv. In the meantime, we call your attention to the Alcohol Temperance & Prohibition Brown University Library Digital Collection <dl.lib.brown.edu/temperance> which includes a student essay by Leah Rae Berk, “Temperance and Prohibition Era Propaganda: A Study in Rhetoric,” and author, title, and subject lists for browsing. – Jared Lobdell, March 2005*

Note on Communications

We have two communications of interest this quarter from our colleagues. One is from Ernie Kurtz, the other from Bill White.

I. From Ernie Kurtz

Ernie Kurtz has obtained the donation of the Daniel J. Anderson and Jean Rossi papers to the libraries of Brown University through the Brown University Center of Alcohol and Addiction Studies. Both are, with Nelson Bradley, considered the founders of the “Minnesota Model” of alcoholism treatment, on which most treatment modalities since have been based. The Kurtzes drove to Taylors Falls, MN in October 2004 to collect and transport the papers, much enjoying the Wisconsin foliage on the way.

In early February 2005, Ernie went to Providence, RI and with Bill White sorted both sets of papers so that they might be accurately appraised. If anyone knows of any even rela-

tively distant sale or donation of such papers, Ernie will appreciate it if you get in touch with him: kurtzern@umich.edu. In order to do a good appraisal, one needs knowledge of “comparable” sales and/or donations.

On a sadder note, Edith Lisansky Gomberg, one of the few remaining people who were part of the original Yale School of Alcohol Studies, died peacefully in her sleep in mid-January in Ann Arbor. Ernie has begun to go through her papers at the University of Michigan. Edith is very well-known for her very solid research on alcoholism in women and among various minorities.

II. From Bill White

Reconstructing the History of Native American Recovery

History cannot proceed by silences. The chronicler of ill-recorded times has none the less to tell the tale. If facts are lacking, rumors must serve. Failing affidavits, we must build with gossip. – Winston Churchill

In an earlier issue of *CA&SQ*, I briefly outlined the major findings of a book-in-progress entitled *Alcohol Problems in Native America: The Untold Story of Resistance and Recovery* that I was collaborating on with Don Coyhis, a member of the Mohican Nation from the Stockbridge-Munsee Reservation in Wisconsin and founder of White Bison, Inc., the most prominent Native American recovery advocacy organization in North America. The project grew out of discoveries I made in researching the book, *Slaying the Dragon: The History of Addiction Treatment and Recovery in America*. These discoveries included documents that challenged the popular conceptions of the source and nature of Indian drinking problems, suggested extensive tribal efforts to resist the infusion of alcohol into Native communities, and revealed the presence of Native American recovery “circles” more than 200 years before the founding of Alcoholics Anonymous and a hundred years before the Washingtonians.

In our efforts to reconstruct the history of recovery among Native American tribes, we confronted challenges that seemed at first insurmountable. The historical knowledge we were pursuing spanned hundreds of tribes whose individual histories were either not well-documented, were recorded primarily by the representatives of colonizing countries or existed in intergenerational oral histories imbedded within each tribe. It was clear that we were going to have to look beyond traditional sources of historical data and reconcile the written archival records with oral histories, but one further

challenge was that the chain of transmission of these oral histories had been diluted or broken by sustained physical and cultural assault on Native tribes.

We took several steps to overcome these challenges. We drew upon the advice of Native Elders who had guided the work of White Bison since its inception. The Elders confirmed the importance of this project, guided our search for the stories we were seeking and helped interpret the larger pattern the stories were forming. The research drew upon primary and secondary archival sources on Native American history; compared popular “firewater myths” about Native alcohol problems against the scientific literature on the etiological roots, prevalence, and patterns of Native alcohol problems and their resolution; and utilized interviews with leaders of Native communities to uncover the history of recovery within their tribes. The interviews were done in tandem with White Bison’s recovery organizing activities within Native communities. After four years of work on this project, we have a working draft of the book and are assembling all of the photographs and illustrations that will visually amplify the book’s stories.

The next step in this process will unfold this spring at White Bison’s Fifth Annual Wellbriety conference. At that conference, we will place a draft of the book in the hands of Native American tribal and recovery advocacy leaders from across the country. We will at that same time invite them to become co-authors in this project by reviewing what is included and missing from the book and correcting or filling in missing pieces through the perspective of their local tribes. In a process, similar to that used to move from the pre-publication lithograph to the first edition of *Alcoholics Anonymous*, we will seek to filter our own interpretations of this

history through the respective tribal histories and through the multiple communities of recovery that exist within Native tribes, from the “Indianized” AA fellowships to the Native churches to the Red Road. We see an evolving history as our work elicits additional historical data and interpretations from Indian communities.

This is a time of great healing within Native American communities, and that healing is being fueled in part by the growth of new recovery advocacy organizations within these

communities. We have tried to anchor our central conclusions within two traditions: archival research through which we can document the sources of our statements and conclusions and a respect for the legitimacy of oral histories as a source of historical data. Both of those traditions reveal a powerful, untold story that needs to be communicated within and outside Native communities. One of the central themes of that story is that resistance to and recovery from alcohol problems is alive and well in Native America and has been for more than 250 years.

Draft Introduction to MacAndrew and Edgerton, *Drunken Comportment*

Jared Lobdell

More than thirty five years after its original publication, we can thank indeed that Transaction (which now owns the Aldine line) has brought this classic Aldine Press study back into print. The years have seen some further studies of drunken comportment, particularly among the Native American tribes, and some new cross-cultural work, especially by Dwight Heath at Brown (whose work goes back before this book), but nothing seems to have altered the likelihood of the basic claim advanced by MacAndrew and Edgerton. This basic claim is that there is a social explanation for the different varieties of drunken comportment across cultures – “that in the course of socialization persons learn about drunkenness whatever their society presumes to be the case; and that, comporting themselves in consonance with what is thus imparted to them, they become the living confirmation of their society’s presumptions” (*Drunken Comportment* 1969 ed., p. 137).

Although the whole book is reprinted here, and easy enough to look at and indeed read through, it still may be worthwhile to set out in this introduction the progress and plan of what MacAndrew and Edgerton did in 1969. They begin with the conventional wisdom that alcohol – despite what we know about it chemically – is a disinhibitor, that it “depresses the activity of

the ‘higher centers of the brain’” (p. 13), thereby “producing a state of affairs in which neither man’s reason nor his conscience is any longer capable of performing its customary directive and inhibitory functions” (pp. 13-14) – and it is this conventional wisdom the book is designed to attack. The attack musters anthropological cross-cultural evidence from around the world, most of it published between the end of the Second World War and the publication of *Drunken Comportment*. MacAndrew and Edgerton then go on to talk about disinhibition and the “within-limits” clause (Chapter 4), drunkenness as “time-out” (Chapter 5), and then an application of their new paradigm (not yet a research programme) to the North American tribes (Chapters 6 and 7), followed by a brief conclusion in Chapter 8.

The question that the authors’ new paradigm is designed to illuminate is the “disconnect” between the traditional view of alcohol and what in fact alcohol is chemically, and the way the human body should ordinarily respond to that. By looking at other cultures besides ours, MacAndrew and Edgerton sought evidence that drunken comportment, drunken behavior, is socially determined, is in fact learned behavior, and differences across cultures are learned differences. Of course, we might think it a little

odd if drunken comportment were so very different from other varieties of comportment that the basic rules of learned behavior would not hold. But there is another possibility, which is that drunken comportment sometimes differs from culture to culture because members of different cultures are sometimes neurophysiologically different – in other words, that cultural differences may reflect genotypic differences. There is evidence, for example, that Native Americans and certain Celtic Irishmen are in fact genotypically different from other peoples.

Note that rigorous application of Occam's Razor would go against this more complex twofold explanation of differences in drunken comportment. But, as Imre Lakatos has taught us, a progressive scientific research programme need not apply Occam's Razor – consider the fact that scientific advances come from considering light as waves and from considering light as particles. There would be nothing unexpected if we found that we can make advances in understanding drunken comportment, alcohol abuse, alcohol dependence, teenage drinking, old Uncle Tom Cobbleigh and all, simply by using a scientific research programme with a twofold approach.

Drunken Comportment provides a good answer to that question that had needed answering for quite a while – given that alcohol seems chemically an unlikely candidate for a general disinhibitor, why has it been so widely considered in our society to be just that? But instead of leading to significant new advances in theory or treatment, as I believe it should have, the book has seen its etiological and epidemiological value become to some degree a hostage of arguments for and against (particularly against) Alcoholics Anonymous and the (apparently widely misunderstood, certainly widely argued about) “disease concept of alcoholism.” The book's argument was considered to hold against Alcoholics Anonymous, as though Alcoholics Anonymous itself were not predicated on the belief that real changes in the mind, indeed in the brain, can be co-created by the alcoholic and the

world and new comportment learned as previous drunken comportment had been learned.

Now, though “alcoholism” is certainly not what *Drunken Comportment* is about, I would like to call attention here to a couple of points suggested by some of my own study of “alcoholism” (recounted in part in my *This Strange Illness: Alcoholism and Bill W.*, Aldine 2004), by re-reading MacAndrew and Edgerton, and by a brief note on some of the literature since – because I believe that the book has significant implications both etiological and epidemiological in the area of alcohol use and abuse, particularly among young drinkers. I also believe that we can use recent neurophysiological study – in combination with, of all things, the work of Mikhail Bakhtin – to support the book's view of drunkenness as the same kind of “time-out” as Bakhtin's *carnival*.

Some of these suggested points have to do (1) with Native American abstinence, (2) with suggested typologies (possibly genetic) of alcoholism, along with recent developments in studying the origins and development of brain and mind – that is, of physiological and psychological conditions, including those involved in drinking, and (3 – perhaps even more controversially) with what one can learn from the phenomenon of “alcoholism” (including what may be learned from the seventy-year history of Alcoholics Anonymous). Some of what follows here is taken from *This Strange Illness*.

In *Drinking Careers: 25 Year Study of Three Navajo Populations* (Yale 1994), Kunitz and Levy reported that most Navajo drinkers who suffered withdrawal symptoms while drinking heavily in their younger years (usually taken as a sign of “alcoholism”) became abstinent (apparently as a natural event) by the age of thirty-five or forty. On the other hand, beginning as early as the eighteenth century, the Eastern Woodlands tribes of North America used the sweat lodge and tribal mutual-help societies to regain their lost sobriety (See, e.g., D. Coyhis and W. White, “Alcohol Problems in Native America” in *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly* 2003, pp. 157-165, as well as their more recent

work in the area). Similarly, in *Drunken Comportment*, MacAndrew and Edgerton (pp. 42-48) report on the history of native Tahitian drinking, from grave and ceremonial comportment in the earliest days of western contact, to violent western-style drunkenness in the nineteenth century, to much more amiable and non-violent drunken comportment in the 1960s, through a process designed and constructed (we are given to understand) by the elders of the Tahitian society.

Quite probably the old nature/nurture dichotomy in the study of alcoholism and alcoholic drinking is now being subsumed under more general findings of more recent study – as, for example, in John Dowling’s *The Great Brain Debate: Nature or Nurture* (Washington 2004). As was noted in a recent review of that book in *Science* (25 Feb 2005, p. 1204), the “pace of discovery has increased with recognition of the plasticity of the nervous system (including its ability to remodel itself in response to epigenetic programming driven by maternal behaviors), exciting reports of gene-environment interplay involving specific genes and specific behaviors in important behaviors, and the ability to search bioinformatics databases on line to find gene homologies.” But the fundamental truths have always been, I think, that there are varying (possibly genetic) responses to the ingestion of alcohol, and that phenotypic (*not* genotypic) reconstruction of drinking patterns is frequently (but not always) a willed co-constructive process – though it may simply come with the passage of time. (By speaking of a “willed co-constructive process,” I intend to bring into consideration not only the work of Stuart Kauffman and others at Santa Fe (*Investigations*, New York: OUP 2000), but also Edelman and Plomin and the whole business of primary and secondary repertoires on the one hand and physiological and psychological maps constructed by entrance and reentrance of neural linkages on the other (*This Strange Illness*, p. 127.))

Some years ago Dr. Robert Zucker suggested a typology of alcoholisms that I have elsewhere adapted in my own writing (in *This*

Strange Illness, pp. 103-04): three of these are secondary or co-morbid alcoholisms (those he calls Anti-Social Alcoholism, Developmentally Limited Alcoholism, Negative Affect Alcoholism); three are primary (Isolated, Episodic, Developmentally Cumulative Alcoholism). Now MacAndrew and Edgerton (quite reasonably) were not primarily concerned with differential response to alcohol ingestion within our culture – in part because they are not primarily concerned with our culture. But typologies developed from our culture, along with their work (and some subsequent work) on some other cultures, does have something relevant to say here. (I would suggest that the neglected Jellinek typologies, based on attitudes and conditions in the early days of Alcoholics Anonymous, also have evidentiary value.)

One of the major contributions made by MacAndrew and Edgerton to the history of alcohol among the Native American tribes is found in their analysis of the Algonquian and adjacent tribes from the beginnings to their downfall (pp. 100-164), from which it is clear that initial reactions were like those of a child who doesn’t like the taste, followed (for the tribe) by the abandon we know among “party-ing” (and anti-social) adolescents, unreasonably (perhaps) prolonged beyond the appropriate years. At the risk of seeming to hold that phylogeny can recapitulate ontogeny, I find myself entertaining the idea that this is on a tribal or supra-tribal level what happens on an individual level with Developmentally Cumulative Alcoholism – suggesting the possibility of genetic predisposition. Certainly such predisposition is not ruled out here. The Tahitian case could (but need not) be parallel.

The Navaho case noted by Kunitz and Levy would fall into the classification of Developmentally Limited Alcoholism, which mimics Anti-Social Alcoholism – that is, alcohol is used as an excuse for anti-social activity, which is the main goal, and this use of alcohol is of course socially dictated according to beliefs on drunken comportment (as MacAndrew and Edgerton suggest), but then there are anti-social “alcohol-

ics” who have a predisposition to alcoholic drinking, while the developmentally limited “alcoholics” do not. No doubt (it is an underlying argument of *Drunken Comportment*), drunkenness in many cultures (including our own Western medieval culture) provides a time-out (as in *carnival*). But it is, as MacAndrew and Egerton also suggest, the more firmly-rooted cultures wherein the time-out is best understood and most useful, while some mobile or fragmented cultures (frontiers, military life) and perhaps the cultures of Celtic or Nordic or Germanic peoples have greater incidence of less useful drunken comportment. And yet it must have been useful once, if we are to trust Darwin (see my *This Strange Illness*, pp. 129-142, 350-51). But that is doubtless another story, to be told another time.

Now let us look at Dowling’s recent book (*The Great Brain Debate*). The brain, he remarks, “continues to mature until the ages of 18-20” (p. 3), and maturation “occurs in a roughly tail-to-hind gradient ... the last known brain structure to mature is the cerebral cortex, the seat of higher mental functions, including perception, memory, judgment, and reasoning ... the so-called higher-order association areas of the brain, concerned with planning, intentionality, and other aspects of one’s personality – are still myelinating axons and rearranging synapses up to the age of 18 or so” (p. 13). Moreover, early high glucose-utilization in the brain (at 4-7 years) subsides to adult levels through childhood and adolescence (p. 14). One theme of brain maturation involves “restriction of axonal terminal fields and a rearrangement and refinement of synapses” (p. 34).

Of course, “we continue to learn regardless of our age and this learning causes molecular and probably structural changes in our brain” (p. 50). Language is controlled mainly by late-maturing areas of the cerebral cortex – but songbird studies suggest that circuitry modifications made in young birds and not used for some time can be reactivated in adults, and studies of multiple language acquisition (or second language acquisition) by children as against adults

(or even those over 12) indicate that mimetic abilities decline as “language skills” improve – but use of second or multiple languages can be restored in adulthood (as can skills in swinging a golf club or riding a bicycle). Dowling suggests (p. 77) that neuronal changes are additive, and “perhaps both old and new synapses persist, although either might be subdued for long periods.”

“Whereas some plastic changes can be shown to occur in subcortical structure in adults, the major site of plasticity seems to be the cortex” (p. 91). Learning and memory involve alteration in synapses by increasing or decreasing synaptic strength or by sprouting new neuronal processes and forming entirely new synapses (pp. 92-93). The cortical area called the hippocampus has been implicated as a key structure in memory formation for more than half a century. “Bliss and L_mo ... found that if you provide a strong activating stimulus to the axons providing input to the hippocampus, the subsequent response of the neuron to a weak stimulus is dramatically increased ... This phenomenon is called long-term potentiation or LTP” (p. 95). “With repeated strong stimuli it is possible to alter a neuron’s responsiveness for ... days to weeks, and this ... suggests how neuronal excitation (in experience) can cause a long-term change” in the neuronal system (pp. 96-97).

We will not here go further into brain chemistry, glutamates, dopamine, serotonin, and epinephrine/norepinephrine, and the differences between quick and slow “brain-change” (pp. 103-04, modulation vs. structural alteration), though that is all part of the picture. For the time, let me conclude our discussion of the building and maturation of the brain. “What neurobiology is telling us – the bottom line – is that genetic directives are critical in brain-building, although the environment can also play some role, whereas environmental factors play the fundamental role during brain maturation, although there are genetic restraints” (p. 165). Very different phenotypes under specific environmental conditions can result from what might

be considered insignificant genotypic differences (p. 167).

This may seem a bit of an unneeded neurobiological excursus, but I believe it speaks to the fundamental nature of what MacAndrew and Edgerton found, and that it is important to rehearse the physiological basis (as we understand it) of their historical and cross-cultural findings. One point to be noted at the outset: though it is mentioned only in passing (if at all) in the sources (but see MacAndrew and Edgerton, *passim*), there seems to be little doubt that younger members of a tribe (or culture) occupy a position different from that occupied by those more mature. In fact, drinking in many cultures is ceremonial and in that sense religious, and those not inaugurated into its mysteries cannot be expected to take their full part in its process.

Among the cultures (or mini-cultures) described early on by MacAndrew and Edgerton, three especially may be noted here: the mestizo village of Aritama in Colombia (pp. 21-26), the small atoll of Ifaluk in the Carolines (pp. 26-29), and the island Japanese fishing community of Takashima (pp. 29-33). I choose these, firstly, because they demonstrate unusual versions of child-rearing and unusual restraint on drunken comportment, and, secondly, because they have something else significant in common. In Aritama, to ask personal questions is one of the worst breaches of proper conduct, immortality is deemed desirable only for the purposes of revenge, children are a nuisance except for their “asset-value,” good and bad character traits in the children are considered by each parent to be inherited from the other, and the whole society seethes with hostility – the children especially, until in adolescence they adopt the rigorous mask of seriousness and uncommunicative demeanor characteristic of the adult society. Young men are bored by drinking sprees on which they are invited by their elders, and except for ritual drinking by gravediggers while digging, the drinkers are solitary and uncommunicative even when drinking with each other.

The Ifaluk on the other hand kiss and fondle their children until they are four or five and then reject them (as opposed to rejecting them from birth) – but they labor to suppress the aggression that this rejection would ordinarily produce, and are apparently successful. “From the time that children can speak, their training is directed with an awesome single-mindedness and ... no little harshness, to stamping out all manifestations of discord” (*Drunken Comportment*, p. 27). At a drunken farewell party given for two anthropologists in the 1950s, the elders were all very gay because “we liked each other” and very sad because “we would have to part so soon” (p. 29), while at a drunken farewell party given by the young men “reality lost all its hard contours and every man became a brother and the world a paradise” (p. 28).

With the people of Takashima, even non-prurient discussion of things sexual was considered an occasion for embarrassment (*hazukashii tokoro*), no young man would accept a bride who was not a virgin, and the whole society was governed by rigid rules of conduct. The Autumn Festival and its aftermath were considered (this is around 1950) an occasion for boisterous drunkenness, when “young unmarried men (from about sixteen years of age upward) may, without censure, become thoroughly drunk” (p. 32), but the day of the festival was formally defined as a day on which personal animosities were forgotten, and there was no conflict (*ibid.*).

These are rigorous (as we would say) authoritarian cultures, wherein MacAndrew and Edgerton suggest the disinhibitory and excitatory effects of alcohol ought – if anywhere – to be felt, if there are such effects. Of course, the expectations of young men’s behavior at the Takashima Autumn Festival, and the slightly differentiated characteristics of the two farewell parties on Ifaluk, both suggest age-related differences in the effects of drinking – as, indeed, does the boredom of young men in drinking “sprees” accompanied by adults in Aritama. The point I would particularly note, however, is the strength of the inculcated inhibitions in all three cultures. Also, I cannot speak for

Takashima (though it seems it might apply there as well), but both in Aritama and on Ifaluk training in conflict-avoidance and what one might in another context describe as brainwashing both conduce to the “pacifism” and extreme reserve necessary to preserve a tiny, remote, and beleaguered culture.

These three examples are together just one point at which MacAndrew and Edgerton, taken with neurophysiological and other advances, can suggest new treatment paradigms for populations subject to alcohol overuse, abuse, or dependence. Another lies in the evident point, made again and again, that drinking alcoholic or fermented malt beverages has a communal and ceremonial and indeed religious and spiritual dimension. (In a late letter, Carl Jung suggested that the way for “alcoholics” to stop drinking was for them to employ *spiritus contra spiritum*.) As I have been describing these remote cultures in the last page or two, I have been thinking about the ancient Celtic cultures and their cognates, which of course are among our ancestors. Periodic ceremonial consciousness-altering drinking feasts mark all three orders of the Celtic leadership, and certain reactions to alcohol doubtless conferred advantages in those days that are no longer advantages in ours – which may help explain certain types of alcoholisms in our days. Moreover, the Brythonic Celts (and I think the others) were a people who mourned at a birth and celebrated at a death, so we are told – and passing out drunk is a closer approximation of death even than sleep. (It may be worth noting that the sibyls and oracles were expected to be periodically drunk – and thus listening to the gods – but not permanently soused.)

What we should be doing now is using those approaches we can adapt from this book, in combination with our increased understanding of neuronal systems and the brain, and the knowledge from increased research on symptomatic and asymptomatic drinking, to attack those problems involved with alcohol that seem to afflict our society. Before I make some

suggestions along this line, I would like to turn in a very different direction, toward the Russian critic Mikhail Bakhtin, on *carnival* as linked to the past. A precise statement occurs in his discussion of the “privatization” of the comic (*Rabelais and His World*, p. 101): “Limited to the area of the private, the eighteenth-century comic is deprived of its historical color.” The implication of this statement of importance for our purposes is that *carnival* builds its positive strength on the consciousness of past *carnival*, and preferably on its continuity with past *carnival*. Now *carnival* is the time-out drinking occasion most notable in the history of our culture, lasting in its old form down perhaps to the Christmas books of Thackeray and Dickens. In an altered (and growingly attenuated) form it lasts into New Years’ Eve and St. Patrick’s Day in the culture of our present United States, and an interesting if limited form peculiar to the years 1965-1995 could be observed at concerts given by the group called The Grateful Dead – the institution in our times most like those to which the ancient Athenians (in T. L. Peacock’s words) appropriated their most sacred and intangible fund, giving to melopoeia, choreography, and the sundry forms of didascalics the precedence over all other matters both civil and military.

We should before going on note – and keep in mind – the story MacAndrew and Edgerton tell of the two varieties of Papago drinking. Once each year, in the old days, the Papago engaged in a ritual they believed instrumental in making the rains occur, a ritual coming from their rain myth of Elder Brother and the saguaro cactus (*Drunken Comportment*, p. 38). “When the figlike saguaro fruit was ripe . . . the Papago went forth from their villages and gathered up this fruit in great quantities, allocating some to the common store and some to their private preserves. After sufficient fruit had been collected, the wine was made – the ceremonial wine in one large batch and the rest in numerous smaller family batches.” The wine-baskets were passed ceremonially around in a circle, counterclockwise, a cupbearer dipping out a portion for

each participant and saying as he did so, “Drink, friend. Grow beautifully drunk” (p. 39). And later, “some of the young men, still able to walk, went around to every ... house and touched every man on the shoulder with a stick of saguaro wood – a summons to go to the tizwin house and get drunk. This summons could not be disregarded....”

But by the 1940s, the old men were dying off, the young men were off the reservation at least part of the time (or had been off, in the CCC), and as the women complained (p. 41), drinking, which “should bring happiness and singing, as it does in the wine ceremony, not cruelty and fighting” had begun to bring cruelty and fighting in more ordinary, less ceremonial, circumstances. Here we catch the society, the Papago culture, in the midst of a change for the worse in drunken comportment, *because the old traditions and customs no longer hold*. The sticking point is in the break between the old culture and the new. The young men need to have the older men among them and need to internalize the traditions and customs (however that may be achieved), if they are to continue to hold. The part of the brain devoted to memory, as Downing points out, is among the last parts to become mature and stable – and, of course, experience in remembering leads to more experience in remembering.

Here let me set out some notes on one kind of paper I think might be written on this basis, using MacAndrew and Craig as well as recent neurophysiological study (and with some insight from the study of alcoholisms), a paper I might entitle “Toward a New Scientific Research Programme for the Etiology and Epidemiology of Youth Alcohol Use, Abuse, and Prevention.” Starting with Dean (*Chaos and Intoxication* 1997) and Siegel (*Intoxication: Life in Pursuit of Artificial Paradise* 1989), and perspectives on brain building and brain development/maturation advanced by Dowling (*The Great Brain Debate: Nature or Nurture?*), I might suggest that youth alcohol use represents an attempt to seek the brain excitement of earlier years once the rearrangement and pruning of synapses is under way

in adolescence. Adolescent risky behavior of all kinds is likely for excitation and comes from the fact that the last brain structure to mature is the cerebral cortex, seat of perception, memory, judgment, and reasoning, between the ages of 18 and 20.

As suggested by MacAndrew and Edgerton, particularly on youth participation (or not) in ceremonial drinking, and consonantly with Dowling, I might suggest that youth alcohol behavior is mostly phenotypic – apart *perhaps* from those cases with a genetic predisposition to alcohol abuse/dependence. Here we should, in the paper, look at types of alcoholisms and at human connections with alcohol over time. We should then look at the effect of our youth cultures on youth drinking and at over-all cultures other than ours that seem to handle the matter better, perhaps recognizing the importance of the brain-building period. We should examine brain redirection implicit in Alcoholics Anonymous and other conversion experiences, asking, are programs to this end useful for those under 21? Fundamentally, we should suggest the possibility that we will have a (Lakatosian) progressive research programme *if* we recognize that youthful alcohol use/abuse is for us a natural phenomenon and engines of adult treatment may not be relevant – in fact may be contraindicated. (Also, of course, there might be a suggestion that the whole DARE program is ill-conceived, but that is far beyond our scope here. I do, however, recall a high-school senior on Bainbridge Island in Washington who asked an investigator if he didn’t think that drumming material on drugs and alcohol into the ears of students from 6 to 18 might not reasonably have the effect of increasing their interest in drugs and alcohol?)

This suggested paper is just one way in which further steps might be taken from the base MacAndrew and Edgerton have provided. We might also, of course, check the accuracy of their review on the Algonquian and neighbor tribes, noting the work of William White and his coadjutors (and see also his *Slaying the Dragon*, Normal IL 1998) – though it is my belief that any corrections would be corrections in detail.

Perhaps there should be a follow-up on the Papago, to see if the Tahitian case has been – or could be – replicated. Historical evidence on our own culture and its antecessor cultures would be welcome indeed (see Chapter 9 in my *This Strange Illness*).

And I suppose we should seek a definition of the “disease” of alcoholism that would encompass both a possible hereditary predisposition and phenotypic development through social interaction and societal norms. We may not have needed MacAndrew and Edgerton to suggest this, but suggest it they surely do. I do not believe, given the work reported by Dowling

(and others – including “twin” studies in research on alcoholism), that we need cancel the possibility of genetic inheritance. But it remains clear – and their argument remains largely convincing to this day – that though the acorn may not fall far from the tree, it may nonetheless, if picked up, grow into a straighter better tree. And I think I had best get to work on the paper I suggested above, with this book in part for inspiration.

Note: The paper suggested here has been accepted for presentation at the Kettil Bruun meeting in Riverside CA in May.

Washingtonian Notes & Queries

Materials for a Better Understanding of the Washingtonians

No. 5

The following is taken from pp. 130-139 of Charles Jewett, M.D., *A Forty Years Fight with the Drink Demon, or A History of the Temperance Reform As I Have Seen It, and My Labor in Connection Therewith* (New York: National Temperance Society and Publishing House 1872), providing an interesting alternative view of the Washingtonians.

But little more than a year had elapsed since we [the Massachusetts State Temperance Union] began working under a new plan of operations [on May 1 1840], when the influence of the Baltimore or “Washingtonian” movement, began to divert attention from our efforts, to a new and more exciting mode of operation. When the new movement reached Mass., our State Union sought to make of it an efficient auxiliary in the work before them. They secured, at considerable expense, reports of the speeches of the most prominent of their [131] speakers, and published them in tract form for general distribution. Thousands and tens of thousands were scattered over the state, and everywhere much curiosity was excited to hear the reformed men. Our local societies, auxiliary to the State Union, anxious to meet the wishes of

the people, would often secure a visit from some of their prominent speakers, and these everywhere insisted that the intemperate could not be got to join existing organizations, and that a new “Washingtonian” society must be formed in each town, and the more surely to interest the intemperate, some of that class, if they could be persuaded to sign the pledge, must be placed at the head of the new organization.

Grave and thoughtful men hesitated. It seemed such a perilous proceeding to give up an organization which, in some localities, had existed in ten years, was officered perhaps by some of the most reliable men in town, and numbered its hundreds of pledged members, and go into a new society with a recently reformed man at the head of it, who *might* make a life-long and successful struggle against his old masters – depraved appetite – habit – and the dram-shop, and *might* possibly fall off in a month and bring reproach upon the organization. But clamor, and a love of the new, and the sensational, carried the day, and thus, all over the state, the local societies were re-organized, and the *State Temperance Union lost its auxiliaries*. The agents of the “Union” counseled against this re-modeling of our organizations and the turning of all public

efforts into that channel, but their counsels were in vain. Heartless men charged their honest efforts to mercenary motives – to a desire to maintain an order of things by which their salaries were secured – and so the work of disorganization [132] went on ...

[135] I have already recorded the fact that one of the practical results of the Washingtonian movement was the crippling of the “Massachusetts Temperance Union” by revolutionizing and ultimately destroying that multitude of local organizations which were its auxiliaries, the elements of its strength, the active agents through which its publications had reached the people, and by the aid of which measures planned by its executive officers and agents had been carried out and rendered effective ... [136] Oh! it was a stunning blow to the most effective temperance organization which ever existed in this country, when the friends of temperance in all the towns and villages of the old Bay State, through an honest but mistaken zeal in behalf of a popular but necessarily partial and ephemeral movement, consented to the abandonment of tried, reliable, and well-officered organizations, and the substitution there for of Washingtonian societies, officered, generally, by men but recently reformed.

Nor was this the only mischievous influence of the new movement. Some of the most prominent of the new disciples, although they advocated total abstinence, held and advocated zealously, doctrines utterly unsound in many important principles. Mitchell, one of the original five [sic!], and the leading spirit of the group, held that, as Washingtonians, they should have nothing to say against the traffic or the men engaged in it. He would have no pledge even, against engaging in the manufacture or traffic in liquors; nor did he counsel reformed men to avoid liquor sellers’ society or place of business. He would even admit men to membership in his societies who were engaged in the traffic, and in my hearing he admitted that he had paid for liquor, at the bar, for others to drink after he had signed the pledge. He would not drink liquors, but if others chose to, that was their business. Of

course, with these views he was decidedly opposed to all legal measures for the suppression of the trade. Our business was, so he argued, to get everyone to sign the pledge of abstinence, and then, of course, grog shops would do no harm, as [137] they would have no customers. To shallow reasoners, or men of little observation, this was very plausible, and great numbers accepted the doctrine as sound and adopted it as a plank in their temperance platform. A division was thus effected in our ranks, and papers were started to advocate the *new* temperance doctrine as distinct from those of the Temperance Union, and there were large numbers of men in various parts of the state who labored very industriously for a time to widen the breach between the Washingtonians and the old advocates of the cause....

Among the other false notions advocated by Mitchell was, that religious exercises of every kind were out of place in temperance meetings, including prayer. This notion, however, was so preposterous that but few of his followers accepted it, and it was pretty soon abandoned.

Looked at coolly, from this distance in time [1872], that Washingtonian movement was a curious phenomena [sic!]. It had elements of power in it, which will always be potent among men. The utter absence of all regard for station, social position, or distinctions created by wealth or superior education, was one striking feature of it. A man, with not a penny in his pocket, and who could neither read nor write, if he had once been a “hard case” and was now sober, and a member of the Washingtonian Temp. Society, was just as good a fellow [138], and was just as much honored as a reformed judge, statesman, or major general, and was heard in the meetings with just as much attention.

Another important feature of it was, the retention by its individual members, so to speak, of their individuality, if I may so speak. It was not a society, acting as such through its chosen officers, or certain committees, to whom certain duties were assigned, but rather an aggregation of individual reformers, associated by mutual sympathies rather than definite forms, each a

missionary of the common faith, and so far from losing a sense of their individual responsibility in the association, that in the early history of the movement, each member was expected to work just as though he stood alone and was singly and alone responsible for the enlargement of the temperance Zion....

The utter disregard, by its members, of all conventional notions of propriety, as to the detail of one's personal experience, was another element of its power which can hardly be estimated. Some very fearful people are restrained from relating in public, very important and interesting facts in their own history, lest some fastidious critic should whisper the word egotism. That folly was utterly cast aside in the Washingtonian movement, and if the freedom these reformers took, sometimes degenerated into license and ran on to absurdity, it was not a novelty in the history of reforms....

[139] The sentinel at the door [of the Temperance Orders that eventually replaced or absorbed the Washingtonians], the trappings and the tinsel, the multiplicity of offices and forms, the engrossment thereby of too much precious time in their weekly and occasional meetings, and the tendency of the *social features* to engross too much attention, are their elements of weakness.

Note: Dr. Charles Jewett was born in Lisbon, New London County, Connecticut, Sept 5 1807, began the practice of medicine in East Greenwich RI in 1829, married Lucy Ann Tracy on May 5 1830, and died April 3 1879 at the age of 71. His life story to 1872 will be found in the volume from which these passages are taken.

THE LADIES' HOME JOURNAL

Endorses
Beer as Opposed to Patent Medicines.

Of course, a pure, wholesome beer
is meant—that is

Budweiser

Mr. Edward Bok, editor of The Ladies' Home Journal, in a page article in the May issue gives a list of 36 medicines, with official analysis, asserting them to contain 12 to 47 per cent. of Alcohol

And he adds in black type:

"In connection with this list, think of beer, which contains only from two to five per cent. of alcohol, while some of these 'bitters' contain ten times as much, making them stronger than whisky, far stronger than sherry or port, with claret and champagne way behind."

Mr. Bok continues:

"A mother who would hold up her hands in holy horror at the thought of her child drinking a glass of beer, which contains from two to five per cent. of alcohol, gives to that child with her own hands a patent medicine that contains from seventeen to forty-four per cent. of alcohol."

Budweiser contains only $\frac{3}{100}$ per cent. of alcohol. It is better than pure water because of the nourishing qualities of malt and the tonic properties of hops.

Budweiser is pre-eminently a family beverage; its use promotes the cause of true temperance — it guards the safety of health and home. Budweiser is

"King of Bottled Beers"

Bottled only at the home plant of the
Anheuser-Busch Brewing Ass'n, St. Louis, U.S.A.

FOR MAY 1904

MEDICINAL USE OF ALCOHOL