

Culture Alcohol & Society Quarterly

Newsletter of Kirk/CAAS Collections at Brown

Vol. II, No. 6

January/February/March 2006

This is the sixth new issue of the CA&SQ since it was revived in October 2004. This issue has material on or related to the San Francisco Dashaways, including an article (not on but related to the Dashaways), "Some Talk About Drunkenness," from Volume 1, Number 2 (August 1868, pp. 146-151), of The Overland Monthly, by one J. T. Watkins, which I find historically interesting. My own suggestions as to the author and also my remarks on the Dashaways and the Washingtonians are included as part of an introduction and notes to the article. Following this is our new section on other archives (this being the second installment), looking at the John Ford, S. J., Archive in the Collections of the New England Province of the Society of Jesus, Worcester, Massachusetts (Holy Cross University, Worcester, Massachusetts), and then our continuing series of "Washingtonian Notes and Queries." This issue's "Notes and Queries" provide, first (No. 9) some additional information on the founders from the files of the Maryland Historical Society, and then (No. 10) a brief note on the Washington Temperance Society of Annapolis, which notes a San Francisco connection. Next issue will again see contributions on current work at Brown, plans for future work, and results of past work from the collections and by those on the KirkWorks listserv (including a third Note on materials elsewhere available) – Jared Lobdell, March 31, 2006

J. T. Watkins in *The Overland Monthly* p. 2

The John Ford, S. J., Archive p. 9

Washingtonian Notes and Queries (nos. 9, 10) p. 12

J. T. WATKINS IN *THE OVERLAND MONTHLY*

It was long long ago that I first read the “Twenty Four Years Later” last chapter in Richard Henry Dana’s *Two Years Before the Mast*. I recall noting the passage on the “Dashaways’ – total abstinence societies, which had taken strong hold on the young and wilder parts of society” (Wordsworth ed. 1996, p. 301), and I wondered why the name. Bill White touched on the Dashaways in his *Slaying the Dragon*, James Baumohl began his dissertation with them, and there are accounts by various contemporary writers, including Mark Twain. It was while looking through these that I came upon this 1868 *Overland Monthly* article, which seems to me both valuable and interesting, particularly toward the end of the article. About the author I know this much: he is almost certainly the James T. Watkins whose ruminations on his trip east appear in the October 1870 issue of the *Overland Monthly*, who reports that he was brought from the east to California at an early age. He is almost certainly the James T. Watkins, Jr., clerk, with Ross Dempster & Co, dwelling with his father James T. Watkins, Sr., Captain of the Pacific Mail Steamship *Constitution*, at 8 or 58 S. Park, in the 1864 *San Francisco Directory*. He is therefore almost certainly the James T. Watkins, age 27, born in

Maryland, resident 58 S Park, in the *Great Register of Voters* in San Francisco in 1867. I would therefore place him as the James Thomas Watkins (Jr.), born Anne Arundel County, Maryland, April 28, 1839, died (according to the International Genealogical Index) June 8, 1896, son of James Thomas Watkins (1808-1867) and Eleanor Merriken Watkins (1807-1897), who were married March 1833. The Death Index to the *San Francisco Chronicle*, however, places his death in 1898. The 1880 Census shows him in the Second Ward of San Francisco, but with no occupation listed. His son James F(?). Watkins, aged 8, is shown in that Census as having been born in Maryland. I find no record of James Watkins in the 1890 San Francisco Directory. His son may be the Dr. James Watkins who was prominent in San Francisco in the first decades of the twentieth century. The article in *The Overland Monthly* appears in good company: the same issue includes the first printing of Bret Harte’s “The Luck of Roaring Camp” (Harte was born in 1839, the same year as J. T. Watkins), as well as an installment of Mark Twain’s *A Californian Abroad*. Other *Overland Monthly* authors that first year included J. C. Cremony on the Apaches, J. Ross Browne, and Noah Brooks.

“SOME TALK ABOUT DRUNKENNESS” (I, 2, pp. 146-151)

When it is considered that a comprehensive review of the subject of Drunkenness would involve not only some examination into its various character – its causes, methods, prevention, cure and its consequences – but also its history, geography, poetry, its romance, literature and philosophy – a review which would invade the special provinces of the physician, the sociologist, the philanthropist and the political economist – it is obvious that the thing cannot be done within the limits of one modern magazine. It is equally obvious that the dignity of the subject, venerable in its antiquity and striking in its vitality, renders it at once interesting, curious and instructive.

Glancing along the records of humanity,

from the days of Noah to these present, it would appear that Byron’s famous line is but the statement of a law of human nature: “Man, being reasonable, must get drunk.” The savage, whenever nature has endowed him with sufficient ingenuity to turn properly to account the raw material which she has distributed with a bounty significant of design, becomes as royally intoxicated as ever did his late Majesty, the first gentleman of Europe [George IV]. Of course, an essay of this character cannot pass the threshold of its subject without an allusion to that symposium in celebration of the subsidence of water, which has attached to the name of Noah an unmerited reproach. The patriarch did no more on that occasion that his descen-

dant of London, Pekin or San Francisco would this day repeat – he got very drunk indeed.

The history of the Jews is largely a record of calamities, flowing from indulgence by somebody or other in the flowing bowl. The reprehensible habits of the Assyrians are matters of history. The catastrophe which overtook Belshazzar in his cups is familiar to all. The Egyptians have placed themselves upon the record, and in the pleasing page of Wilkinson one is pained to remark an Egyptian female of the better sort, supported by her handmaidens, and suffering the last extremity of vicious excess. The story of Greece is redolent of intoxication. In the instructive fables of that wonderful mythology, whenever they wanted a god out of the way, they straightaway brought him strong drink. In the persons of Alexander and Alcibiades, we learn at how early a period the army had attained notoriety for its irregularities. It was reserved to Rome to plunge into the last abyss of fierce and foul indulgence, till she sunk beneath the onslaught of the barbarians from beyond the Danube, and the dark curtain of the middle ages fell upon the drama of European civilization. The true story of chivalry is one continuous record of riot and excess. Richard of the lion heart, a notorious gormandizer, would fall down at his cups. The Christian Knights of Spain were sadly given to tipping, and on more than one occasion paid dearly to their infidel enemy for the gratification of this propensity. The holy fathers of the Church were renowned beyond their secular sons, both for the goodness of their vintage and their power of punishing it. In a modern day, what can be more charming than the frank irregularities of the Courts of the Stuarts, more impressive than the steady hard drinking of Queen Anne's wits, more edifying than the tremendous nights of the Wild Prince and Poyns – when my Lord Holland's son would go to bed once in a week or so – more interesting than the very honest square imbibation of the generation not yet wholly passed away, or more gratifying than the contrast presented by these our own times, when habitual intoxication has become disreputable, and even modest excess is discountenanced by the more rigid.

In this brief glance we have traced the trail of the serpent, from the Noachian epoch to the present. It justifies the assertion that the weakness for strong waters is inherent in humanity; that the tendency of civilization is both to moderate and educate it, and rather to eradicate than perpetuate it. We mean, the tendency which is effected through force of public opinion, and the social system of rewards and punishments. We should be pained to class amongst the good fruits of that civilization of which we are somewhat prone to boast, the inquisitorial legislation of zealots, ignorant alike of human history and nature,

But it is necessary to limit the field of our inquiries, and determine the points for investigation. We remark, that the medical man has already taken it in hand, and in the admirable pages of Dr. Macnish's "Anatomy of Drunkenness" will be found the conclusions of a Glasgow physician, who, to opportunities unexcelled for observation, is understood to have united a systematic course of experiment. The history and geography, the poetry and romance, of drunkenness are rather collateral to an examination of the subject in its practical bearings. Between the spheres of the professional philanthropist, the political economist, and our own, there is a great gulf fixed. And thus we restrict our field to the personal, domestic and social relations of drunkenness, and in a limited sense, to its philosophy. But here we encounter at the outset the necessity of a definition.

Our title word is offensive both to the eye and ear, and by it we intend something injurious both to the mind and morals. We may make the distinction between drunkenness and intoxication. The latter expresses a mental condition, varying from a slight vinous excitement in which neither articulation nor locomotion are materially impaired, to the last stage of spirituous prostration. The former word implies a Habit. A man may – and we conceive that they are comparatively few who, on no single occasion, have offended in this regard – pass the five several degrees of exhilaration, elevation, depression, incoherence and prostration, and yet not be amenable to the charge of Drunkenness. It is possible that he may never again drink five glasses of wine at a sitting. Or, on the

other hand, he may, while preserving both his elocution and perpendicular, habitually attain a sodden state, which falls fully within our definition. It appears fair, therefore, to say that by drunkenness may be understood such *habitual* indulgence as enfeebles the faculties and muddles the understanding – varying in degree from the habit of occasional excess to the habit of continual intemperance.

The methods by which a habit of drinking is formed are peculiar and worthy of note. Commonly, the first step toward a habit of drinking is a too liberal indulgence at social meetings and upon wet nights. This thing may be kept up a few years, and the amiable social agriculturalist then harvest his oats, sober and settle down, become a moral and model member of society. Young Hopeful is not yet cast into outer darkness, nor is offence rank before heaven. Retribution is pending in the latent headache, and remorse on the morrow shall torture him no less than the throbbing temples. This is a good time to let Hopeful alone. It is a bad time for preaching sermons. If the latter be compounded of wickedness, perdition, filial ingratitude, grey hairs and the grave, they will be unjust, exasperating and untrue, and Hopeful knows it. About this time, two sensible words from a sensible friend will be received with humility, and reach the seat of the complaint. After some persistence in the practices of occasional excess, the head becomes seasoned and ceases to ache; it is tougher and requires more to upset it; when upset, the entire system, digestion and nervous, is upset with it; recuperation is slower and more difficult. The occasional excess has now become a habit. Day-time drinking, generally at bar-rooms, is much affected among us, and is all thoroughly bad. The stimulus which quickens the faculties beyond their normal activity, is followed by a reaction, during which they are depressed equally below it. This uncomfortable and disagreeable condition is only to be overcome by a somewhat tedious process of recovery, or by further stimulant. Under the latter, the mental activity soon becomes feverishness, and the power of concentration is enfeebled. This has probably been the universal experience of even quite moderate drinkers of this sort. Confessedly,

relief from the dullness of reaction is the less disagreeably obtained by keeping up a full head of steam, and hence there is always a certain prospect that a man who subjects himself to the necessity for relief will adopt this means of procuring it. And when his mental machinery has acquired the habit of feverish action toward the close of banking hours, he is next apt to find evidence of it in the condition of his banking account.

The methods of cure next demand attention. And here we meet a first obstacle in the condition of the patient's mind. (We speak of him as a patient because there is something in him to be cured: not intending to imply that the habit of drunkenness itself is of the nature of disease; that idea is a delusion and snare. It is untrue. Drunkenness is a voluntary thing.) In Mr. Dickens' admirable character of Mr. Dolls (Our Mutual Friend) we have an example of humanity in its last stages of alcoholic degradation, and of those "horrors" and "trembles" which differ only in degree from conditions, mental and physical, familiar to all hard and many steady drinkers. Mr. Dolls shivers into doorways to have out his fit of trembles, and holds onto lamp-posts, moaning in terror of imagined dangers. Before anything intelligible can be got out of him, he must be wound up with potations. The gentleman who, o'mornings, imbibes ether compounds through a straw until he is steady enough to convey them by both hands to his mouth, will next (very like Dolls) slink away in undefined dread of his fellow men, and secretly wind himself up to the pitch necessary for facing them. And ordinarily this dread, this vague terror, will have first to be met and overcome before such a hold can be got upon the man's mind as will give any hope of his resisting the craving for relief which is procured through indulgence. The mental depression of dyspeptics is familiar. It is as nothing to the utter and hopeless gloom of a hard drinker during the earlier stages of convalescence. Shattered in nerves, possessed of a nameless terror, whipped of conscience, sleepless, hopeless, aimless and desperate, nothing can be done with the creature until he be first got out of this state. It is now that they kill themselves. If work of any kind is required it cannot be given – unless under the stimu-

lus of a winding-up. What the man must have is a chance for rest. This is imperative. The mere craving of the physical system for its stimulant is overcome within a short time. With air, exercise and diet the abused stomach will recover tone, and the nerves tension. But mental prostration continues longer. Recovery is slow, and for a while insensible. The man is *stupid*: a condition trying to patience and principle. But the faculties will gradually resume their normal action, and now it will be possible to hold out a motive which may be strong enough to effect radical cure. A mistake is not unfrequently made by well-meaning friends: they will remonstrate with the patient, ignoring the fact that he sees even more clearly than they the force of all and more than they can urge! And yet is unable to exercise this control which they preach. The man, at the time, is irresponsible: and restraint, friendly or forcible – actual restraint – is needed. If he can be shut up somewhere – sent off somewhere – kept under guard anyhow, till the first few days of horrors are passed, he will be reasonable, humble and tractable.

The domestic treatment of a weakness for strong drink is a vital and complicated question. A valuable recipe for a case where the wife has force enough to carry it through, may be found in the following anecdote: A girl of character was wooed and won by a clever and dissipated fellow, whom she persisted in marrying in spite of family and friends. In pursuance of the instinct of newly-wedded pairs, they fled the presence of mutual acquaintance, and were absent during the prescribed month. It is doubtful if, during that time, the groom was once thoroughly sober. Returned, his happy spouse retired, and sent for him. She sat up in bed with her nightcap on – than which earth knows no more appalling vision. He felt his courage oozing away before she spake. “John Smith,” said she, “I married you against the wishes and remonstrances of my family; and this is the return you have made. [He was now quite restored.] Now, sir, I want you to understand one thing: you must give up drinking or give up me!” There was severity in her eye, and determination in her bell-like tones. John Smith perceived the force of the situation, and accepted it. Thenceforward he trod in the path of

rectitude. After Mrs. S.’s demise, he very naturally took to brandy-and-water with renewed vigor and fatal effect.

One favorite and exasperating device of amiable woman is to bolt the front door, sit up for her liege, and when she hears him blowing in the latch-key – conscience-smitten and undergoing a severe self-examination – stalk to his relief, candle in hand, ghostly and speechless. She wears a look of patient suffering and angelic meekness. Another injured woman will work herself to the brink of hysterics, and patiently await the truant. Still another cricket on the hearth will comfortably secure her first nap, and then – not at all particular about the second – proceed to give the erring man a piece of her mind in a style of which her guileless girlhood afforded not a suspicion. All these things cannot be deemed judicious. That they are a delicious relief to the female mind, is true. But it may be submitted to women whether it is quite worth while to perpetuate this grievous domestic evil, for the sake of relieving one’s mind. For there is no doubt whatever that the effect of these methods of discipline is, in three cases out of four, to induce Mr. Young Husband, on his next night out, to get very full indeed. It requires no ordinary courage to face an angry woman, or a woman in hysterics, or a suffering angel in cap and nightgown; and men being in their natures the reverse of courageous, will supply the deficiency by liquor.

But what is the best treatment for late hours and too generous potations? A few things have been shown which are not to be done. A hint will cover the rest. He will be contrite enough in the morning: improve the occasion.

There is a stupid proverb extant to the effect that reformed rakes make good husbands. This is utterly, vilely and mischievously untrue. The cases which appear to justify it attract notice from their very exceptionalness; they command attention, while the hundreds of other cases where the rake remains a rake unto the bitter end, are comparatively unnoted. *Reliance* can never be placed on a reformed drunkard. The stale simile of a guttering candle which sinks and flickers in the socket, then flashes up in one bright tongue of flame and is instantly extinct, is applicable in this case. The

appetite for strong drink may be subdued for years; it may appear to be quenched; and at an unexpected moment it will blaze up fiercer than ever, and then in its extinguishment extinguish the victim with it. Of this the examples are numberless. Men forsake their bad habits and effect reforms. They are pointed to as examples, and the edifying moral of their history adorns many a tale narrated for the enlightenment of misbelieving youth. On an ill-starred day, the model reformer outbreaks in a tremendous drinking match, emerges in *delirium tremens*, cuts his throat, or goes, literally howling, to the shades below. The rule of exclusion which would close upon those who have acquired this habit that door to improvement which leads across the domestic threshold, appears harsh, nor would it, in every case, be absolutely just. But where it might bar one sinner from repentance, it will save the ninety and nine just persons who have merited no condemnation. The wife and children, sinless and innocent – shall their happiness be risked, their peace endangered, their whole future jeopardized, that the chances may be increased for breaking up a bad habit in a man who has willfully earned the retribution visited upon him; and when at best the odds are heavy against success? The bargain is monstrous. And yet many a girl – of rather more sentiment than sense, it is true – full of a romantic notion of reforming some riotous youth to whom she takes a fancy, not only blasts her own whole future, but if she have the misfortune to bear children, brings them into the world foredoomed to a life of trial and not improbable viciousness. There are two familiar quasi-proverbial doctrines, which are peculiarly and preeminently the devil's own: That boys must sow their wild oats; that reformed rakes make good husbands.

Perhaps more efficacious are the public dealing with drunkenness – through abstinence societies, inebriate hospitals, etc. – with which we may fitly conclude this article. Of these, the second may be dismissed to the care of their attendant physicians, with the remark that they supply the means for applying that restraint, the necessity of which, in certain stages of treatment, has been maintained. What to do with the man, after he is caged, is left to the doctors. There is no difficulty in turning

him out sober. But unless he can be put in the way of some improved opening in life – as he ordinarily cannot – permanent good will not commonly be effected. These institutions are beneficial as far as they go, and are practically necessary. Abstinence societies are productive of much good, not unmixed with evil. Generally planting themselves squarely on the proposition that all use of whatever can intoxicate is bad – a proposition rejected by the common sense of mankind – intolerant like all zealots, and meddlesome like all reformers, there is often only too much reason for classing them with the Brick Lane Branch of the Ebenezer Grand Junction Association. These persons do not or will not understand that their usefulness is confined to but one portion – comparatively small – of the human family; the men who *can not* drink in moderation. There are such men. To them, abstinence is necessary. To others, who can indulge with temperance, and without abuse, that use is good. To assert that none can practice this temperance, is to assert what is notoriously untrue. Assuming this doctrine to be established, its logical consequence is a Maine Liquor Law; and a Maine Law is an offence rank in the nostrils of gods and men. Another favorite device is the organization of Bands of Hope; small children are made to pipe denunciations of good wine, and renunciations of tobacco. The benefit of this vocal training is afterwards apparent in Bacchanalian choruses, while tobacco, returning good for evil, becomes invested with a charm beyond its own. Bands of Hope are silly, and Liquor Laws are ridiculous; both are therefore mischievous. They bring their promoters into contempt, and abridge their usefulness. It has been said that there are men who can not drink in moderation. This is a proposition difficult to be understood, generally questioned, and more generally denied, by the men who do exercise temperance. But we all know that there are men who never do drink without running into excess – occasional or habitual. They assert their desire and purpose to avoid it, and give every proof of sincerity except success. Whether or not, then, it be possible for them to succeed, is not so material, provided it be conceded that they never do. To these men, abstinence associations are productive of

benefit. The somewhat impressive ceremony of initiation, the very formal pledge given, the public and notorious character of the step, the sense of personal honor involved, the certainty of detection in case of transgression, combine with a force altogether beyond that of unaided volition, in keeping the brother up to the mark. That there are cases of backsliding argues nothing against the general proposition, save that the remedy is not infallible. The rarity of such cases shows that it is nearly so. The usefulness of that local association, the Dashaways of San Francisco, cannot be denied. Organized by the party of "hard boys," and drawing to itself a large element of a similar character; neither throwing itself wildly upon the grapevines, nor yet constituting its little ones a society for the eradication of the tobacco plant, it has possessed a virility which has commanded universal respect. Nor are these remarks made in depreciation of other analogous bodies, or with a view to provoking comparison. Conceding that the end of each is the same, and is good; that each effects its share of a

valuable work; it is designed only to call attention to one organization which in a career of great success and extended influence, has preserved itself from either the ridicule or hostility often provoked by its co-workers. We may point the probable source of this discrimination in the fact that this association has been conducted as it was inaugurated, by men whose zeal for reform began at home – who applied themselves to the removal of the beam which lay in their own eye, and have thereby come to see more clearly how they may extract the mote that is in their brother's eye. Amongst their many other local vanities, Californians may plume themselves upon having, as a community, turned out not only a crop of Drunkenness which would be a credit to any State, but also a means for its reformation which is more than equally creditable.

NOTES

The article – in the course of what generally seems a humorous or at least good-humored approach to its subject – suggests a parallel between the Dashaways (established San Francisco 1859) and the Washingtonians (established Baltimore 1840). I have wondered if there might be an actual connection, or whether perhaps James Thomas Watkins, Jr., might link with the Washingtonians through his Maryland-born seaman father, with the Dashaways through his San Francisco life from 1859, the date of their founding, to 1868, the date of his article. I have also wondered if he might perhaps link with the young Jack London on the San Francisco scene in the 1890s, though that would virtually require his own descent into alcoholism. The name of James T. Watkins, Sr., does not occur among the incorporators of the Washingtonian Society of Annapolis in 1842 on which, see the list in "Washingtonian Notes and Queries" (No. 10) in this issue, nor among the Baltimore members on the 1841 list published earlier.

On the Dashaways, one interesting point comes from reading about the Rev. Thomas Starr King (1824-1864), the Unitarian Minister to whom Abraham Lincoln gave credit for saving California for the Union. In July, 1860, Starr, then a newcomer to California, was boldly urging the Dashaways to seek state financial support for their Home for the Inebriate (which they did successfully). "I think" he stated in a public address, "by every consideration of justice, of honor and of duty, (regardless of mercy) the Legislature is bound to foster such an institution" (Oscar T. Shuck, ed., *Representative and Leading Men of the Pacific* (San Francisco, 1870), 183; 210, King to Ryer, San Francisco, August 5, 1860, MS, in King Papers). It is interesting to find that in this address King advocated the treatment of alcoholism as a disease, arguing that the state should provide institutions for the inebriate as it does asylums for the insane.

Some contemporary notes may be of interest here to those who do not have James Baumohl's *From Dashaways to Doctors* (1986) before them.

We begin by noting that the Dashaways were founded in January 1859 “by volunteer firemen in San Francisco with the sole purpose of reclaiming the drunkard. With almost 5,000 members in 1862, the Dashaways built a facility that contained a large auditorium and club rooms.... Membership in the Dashaways expanded beyond firemen, and the granting of charters to start new chapters spread the Dashaway influence northward into Canada and as far east as St. Louis. On June 1, 1859, the Dashaways [had] opened the San Francisco Home for the Care of the Inebriate on the fourth floor of the facilities which they were then renting” (White, *Slaying the Dragon*, p. 49).

The following statement from the *Centennial History of the Temperance Movement* (1876) is relevant here (pp. 478-479). “On the 2d of January, 1859, four young men met in a saloon in San Francisco. It was Sunday night; they were jolly lads who had met to have “a good time,” as they called it, over the bowl; and they had a good time, for, taking a sudden freak, they resolved to dash away the intoxicating cup, and formed themselves into a society called the “Dashaways,” with the pledge of total abstinence. The news of this new society spread among their companions, and recruits were daily added to the number, and before a twelvemonth had passed the Dashaways were to be found in every town and city in California and Oregon. The novelty of the name as well as some of their ceremonies took with progressive young men, and the organization was very helpful to the general temperance movement, especially on the Pacific coast. A similar organization was formed in 1860 in Chicago, called ‘The Temperance Flying Artillery.’ The members of this Order were chiefly young men, whose ardor and activity soon organized bands in almost every town and city in Illinois.”

On June 4, 1859, the San Mateo paper remarked that the society of “Dashaways,” in San Francisco, was increasing rapidly in numbers, and was said to be doing a great deal of good in restraining the intemperate, etc. On July 15, 1859, it was reported that the Dashaways appear to be the popular Temperance organization just now in the “large cities” (presumably San Francisco) in par-

ticular, and “are doing much good.” And then “Here [in San Mateo] we have no such institution, but slowly and surely this Division is advancing in the good cause its members have espoused, and in the vicinity of Woodside, where it is located, its influence is very perceptibly felt.”

In Sonora, on July 7, 1860, appeared this note on the Sonora Dashaways – “This temperance society, which organized about six months since, participated in the celebration at this place on Wednesday last, and attracted considerable attention. But little over one-third of the members turned out upon the occasion; and yet their numbers presented a fine appearance. They were really an intelligent, good-looking body of men, and we rejoice at the fact of having a flourishing organization of this kind in our midst. Previous to joining in the procession the society was presented with a large and handsome wreath by a little daughter of Mr. Chas. BURT, of this city. This was carried through the day suspended from their beautiful new banner. The thanks of the society were returned to the pretty young miss for her appropriate and acceptable present.”

All this, we have been told, came from a San Francisco Volunteer Fire Company in 1859. Whether this is true, evidence at least suggests that it was volunteer fire companies through whom the movement originally spread. The Dashaway parallels with the founding of the Washingtonians are evident, though it seems the Dashaways were younger men. We should not forget the grand parade with bands that celebrated the first anniversary of the Washingtonians in Baltimore, and it may be that satellite Washington Temperance Society foundations (such as Annapolis in 1842) had younger members. But this, like the life of James Thomas Watkins (Jr.), awaits further research.

ARCHIVAL NOTE II: THE JOHN FORD, S. J., COLLECTION

Our next contribution provides a brief look at an archival collection (not well known) which can supplement materials at Brown. We hope in subsequent issues to note still more collections useful or adjunct to A.A. history, especially church-related collections. In this issue we cover the “Addiction: Alcohol” folders in the Father John C. Ford, S. J. (1902-1989), Collection in the Archives of the New England Province of the Society of Jesus, at Holy Cross University, Worcester MA. Father John Ford is known as the editor of the Blue Books of the National Clergy Conference on Alcoholism, in addition to being associated with the North Conway Institute. The materials listed here are in seven boxes, comprising 125 folders, under the heading Moral Topic (Addiction: Alcohol). The first six folders in Box 1 deal with abortion. We begin with Box 1 (Publications and Papers), Folder 7. We end right after Box 7 (General Files), Mary Darrah/Sister Ignatia, Folders 1-7.

The John Ford Addiction/Alcohol Folders

B1	F7	Pub & Pap	<i>Alcohol Education and the Church's Role</i>	1968
	F8		<i>Alcohol Education and High School</i>	n.d.
	F9		<i>Alcohol Education in the Seminary</i>	1953
	F10		(same) from <i>N Hampshire Bulletin on Alcoholism</i>	1955
	F11		<i>Alcoholism</i>	1953
	F12		<i>Alcoholism</i>	1961
	F13		<i>Chemical Comfort and Christian Virtue</i>	1959
	F14		<i>Church Goals in Alcohol Education</i>	1958
	F15		<i>Depth Psychology: Morality and Alcoholism</i>	1951
	F16		(book review of above)	n.d.
	F17		(sales record of above)	1959-1974
	F18		<i>Educational Aspects of Alcohol Problems</i>	1951
	F19		<i>Facts and Principles for Alcohol Education</i>	1954
	F20		<i>The General Practitioner's Role in Alcoholism</i>	1956
	F21		<i>Gratitude and Serenity</i> (in <i>The AA Grapevine</i>)	1957
	F22		<i>Helping the Acute Alcoholic</i>	1952
	F23		<i>Man Takes A Drink</i> (Boston Pilot series)	1954
	F24		<i>Man Takes A Drink</i> (Corresp Paulist Press)	1960-61
B2	F1	Lectures	<i>Man Takes A Drink</i> (Hartford Cath Transcript)	1956
	F2		<i>Man Takes A Drink</i> (quotes on)	n.d.
	F3		<i>Shall I Start to Drink? Decide for Yourself</i>	1952
	F4		<i>Temperance and Purity in The Messenger</i>	1956
	F5		<i>Alcohol, Alcoholism, and Moral Philosophy</i> (Yale)	1950
	F6		<i>Alcoholism & Its Relation to Clergymen</i> (UMinn)	1956
	F7		<i>Alcoholism as a Disease</i> (Brighton MI)	1956
	F8		<i>Church Goals in Alcohol Education</i> (No Conway)	1958
	F9		<i>Moral Theology and Beverage Alcohol</i> (Yale)	1954-61
	F10		<i>Moral Theology and Beverage Alcohol</i> (outline)	1954-61
	F11		Lecture Notes to Various Seminary Groups	1950-1967
	F12		<i>The Philosophy of Alcoholics Anonymous</i> (I.A.E.)	n.d.
	F13		<i>Problems of Alcoholism</i> (Faculty Club)	1952
	F14		<i>Problems of Alcoholism</i> (St John's Collegeville)	n.d.

	F15	Questions & Discussion on Alcoholism (Weston)	1953
	F16	SUMA Talks Regarding Alcohol (Milwaukee)	1953
	F17	<i>There But For the Grace of God</i> (Sacred Heart Prog)	n.d.
	F18	Interviews <i>The Modern Approach to Alcohol Problems</i>	n.d.
	F19	Sermon outl I: <i>The Moderate Use of Alcohol</i>	n.d.
	F20	II: <i>The Catholic View of Total Abstinence</i>	n.d.
	F21	III: <i>The Sin of Drunkenness</i>	n.d.
	F22	IV: <i>The Problem of Alcoholism</i>	n.d.
	F23	P & P Others Bacon, <i>Abstinence, Alcohol, Alcohol Use</i>	1979
	F24	Lavin, <i>Alcohol Education in Catholic H. S.</i>	n.d.
	F25	<i>Alcoholism and Aging from America</i>	1980
	F26	<i>Drinking and Responsibility</i>	1968
	F27	<i>The Fairfield Plan: A Model Community Approach</i>	1965
B3	F1	Morgan, <i>How the Priest Can Help</i>	1957
	F2	Mark Keller, <i>Learn to Drink Socially?</i>	n.d.
	F3	Kennedy, <i>Moral Aspects of ... Alcoholic Beverages</i>	1956
	F4	[N.C.C.A.] <i>Pastoral Counseling of the Alcoholic</i>	n.d.
	F5	Kennedy, <i>Pastoral Counseling of Alcoholics</i>	1954
	F6	Kennedy, <i>Religion and Rehabilitation</i>	1956
	F7	O'Riordan, Round the Reviews	n.d.
	F8	Collins, Treating the Alcoholic Parishioner	1957
	F9	Strecker, Warning to Social Drinkers	1954
	F10	<i>Who Me?</i> And similar texts	n.d.
	F11	Conf. etc. [UCLA] <i>Alcohol, Drugs, and Driving</i>	1986
	F12	[UCLA] <i>Abstracts in Alcohol and Driving</i>	1980-83
	F13	[UCLA] <i>Abstracts & Reviews in Alcohol & Driving</i>	1983
	F14	[A.A.] Fourth and Fifth Steps	1961-66
	F15	[A.A.] Confidential	1956-1985
	F16	[A.A.] Material	1977
B4	F1	[A.A.] Sex Discussions In (Corresp Bill W. etc.)	1961
	F2	Al-Anon Family Groups (Ala-Teen)	1961-68
	F3	Alcoholism Information Referral	1972-80
	F4	[S.J.] Commission on Alcohol & Drug Addiction	1970
	F5	Chit-Chat Farms	1969-80
	F6	First Alaska Institute – Papers	1962
	F7	Fordham Clergy Institute – Papers Given	1959
	F8	Foundation of Hope, Inc. (Boston)	n.d.
	F9	N.C.C.A.	1968
	F10	N.C.C.A.	1970-71
	F11	N.C.C.A. (Bouscaren's Votum)	1960-61
	F12	National Council on Alcoholism	n.d.
	F13	[N.C. Churches of Christ in Amer] <i>Problem Drinking</i>	1967
	F14	North Conway Conference	1962-64
	F15	North Conway Conference	1967
B5	F1	North Conway Conference	1969
	F2	North Conway Institute	1980
	F3	North Conway Institute (corresp. David Works)	1965

	F4	North Conway Institute (corresp. Ralph Garrett)	1985
	F5	Alcohol Education – Church Goals	1958-59
	F6	Alcohol Education in Seminary (Provincials)	1962
	F7	Alcoholics – Priests – Mass Wine	1967
	F8	Alcoholics – Priests – Places for Rehabilitation	n.d.
	F9	Clergy and Alcoholism	1985
	F10	Episcopalians – Alcohol Abuse	1955-58
	F11	G. Weidman – A Diocesan Program (Priests)	1968
	F12	General Files Alcohol – <i>New Yorker</i> – Berton Roueche	n.d.
	F13	Alcohol – Varia	1958
	F14	Alcohol Material – Non-A.A.	1973
	F15	Alcoholics – Family of	1956-58
	F16	Alcoholics – Places for	1970-82
	F17	Alcoholics – Rest Homes	1960
	F18	Alcoholism	1949
	F19	Alcoholism	1968-1988
	F20	Alcoholism – Audience Questions (var groups)	1953-56
	F21	Alcoholism – Notes	1957
B6	F1	Alcoholism – Bibliography (IPP St Louis Univ)	n.d.
	F2	Alcoholism – Bibliography for Course	1967-68
	F3	Alcoholism – Brochures	various
	F4	Alcoholism – Central States Inst of Addiction	1967
	F5	Alcoholism – Discussion to Provincials (Wash DC)	1958
	F6	Alcoholism – Hospital’s Obligation (Cleveland OH)	1957
	F7	Alcoholism – New Catholic Encyclopedia	1961-66
	F8	Alcoholism – Total Abstinence	n.d.
	F9	Alcoholism – Varia	1950-62
	F10	Alcoholism – Washington Series to Clerics	1959
	F11	Alcoholism Act 1970	1970
	F12	Alcoholism and Family Relationships	n.d.
	F13	Alcoholism and Matrimonial Consent	1961-67
	F14	Chemical Comfort and Christian Virtue	1959-1977
	F15	Counselling Alcoholics – Lecture Notes	1953-56
	F16	Frank Ketcham, lawyer, case (Wash DC)	1964
	F17	The Living Church	1978
	F18	G. Mertens, Wilmar Therapist’s Manual	1964
	F19	Luke O’Connor, College Drinking (class notes)	1957-59
	F20	<i>QJSA</i> – Abstracts	1951
	F21	Self=Diagnosis – Phases and Behaviors (13 steps)	1952
B7	F1	M. C. Darrah – <i>Life of Sister M. Ignatia</i> (1 of 3)	n.d.
	F2	M. C. Darrah – <i>Life of Sister M. Ignatia</i> (2 of 3)	n.d.
	F3	M. C. Darrah – <i>Life of Sister M. Ignatia</i> (3 of 3)	n.d.
	F4	M. C. Darrah – Sister Ignatia MS	1985-86
	F5	M. C. Darrah – Sister Ignatia MS	1987
	F6	M. C. Darrah – General File	1986
	F7	Correspondence Regarding Sister Ignatia	n.d.
	F8	Toronto – Addiction Research – Materials	1970-71

WASHINGTONIAN NOTES & QUERIES

No. 9

So far as we know (I haven't yet discovered the obituary for John F. Hoss), the six founders of the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore all died in Baltimore City or Baltimore County. Here are the Baltimore *Sun* obituary notices for George Steers (1842), Archibald Campbell (1863), David Anderson (1873), William K. Mitchell (1875), and James McCurley (1881). I wish to thank Cameron Caswell of the Maryland Historical Society for assistance here. The absence of an obituary in the MHS files for Hoss, a former alderman and veteran of the War of 1812, is odd, and we are checking to see if it was misfiled. He is apparently still living in 1871 (according to the City Directory for that year).

George Steers (*Sun* October 11, 1842) – “On the 9th inst., Mr. George Steers, aged 44 years, one of the founders of the Washington Temperance Society.”

Archibald Campbell (*Sun* Monday, June 15, 1863) – “Mr. Archibald Campbell, an old citizen of Baltimore, died in his residence on S. Paca St., on Saturday [June 13 1863] at the age of 67 years. Mr. Campbell was for a long series of years engaged in the silver-plating business in this city, and was of a social and genial temperament. He was one of the six who founded the old Washington Temperance Society. He leaves a widow and family of grown children, several of whom are now in Richmond.”

David Anderson (*Sun* Thursday, August 7, 1873) – “Mr. David Anderson, the well-known blacksmith, died very suddenly yesterday morning, a few minutes before nine o'clock, at his residence, No. 166 West Saratoga Street, of heart disease. He had,

shortly before seven o'clock, proceeded to his shop on German St., near Paca, and after opening it, felt unwell and returned home. In a few minutes after reaching the house he expired. It was not deemed necessary to hold an inquest. Deceased was one of the best-known horse-shoers in the city.”

William K. Mitchell (*Sun* February 15, 1875) – “Wm. K. Mitchell, formerly a resident of Baltimore, d. last evening, at Oxford, Baltimore County, in [his] 74th year. Born in Accomac County, Virginia, he was a merchant tailor and did business at Baltimore Street and McClellan's Alley; Member of City Council in 1867; one of the founders of the Washington Temperance Society, which was organized 5th April 1840. [He is] survived by a daughter, the wife of Mr. Ezekiel Scarborough, of this city.”

James McCurley (*Sun* Wednesday, March 9, 1881) – “Mr. James McCurley, aged 73 years, an old and respected citizen, died yesterday at his residence, No. 133 Franklin Street. Mr. McCurley was at one time in the carriage business at No. 21 N. Liberty St., but had been a retired merchant for several years past. He was one of the incorporators of the Washington Temperance Society which was founded April 5, 1840, and was the oldest organization of the kind in this state. The other incorporators were Messrs John F. Hoss, George Stears, Wm. K. Mitchell, David Anderson, and Archibald Campbell. A book giving the history of the Society was written and dedicated to the founders. On October 16, 1879, Mr. McCurley Became blind. [He] leaves three children, namely James McCurley of James, attorney-at-law, Mrs. Col. Seth G. Reed, and Lt. Commander McCurley of the U. S. Navy.”

WASHINGTONIAN NOTES & QUERIES

No. 10

Besides the January 1841 Articles of Incorporation for the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore, the Laws of Maryland contain the March 1842 Articles of Incorporation for the Washington Temperance Society of Annapolis. Here is Section I of An Act to Incorporate the Washington Temperance Society of Annapolis, passed on March 1, 1842.

Section 1. Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Maryland, That Richard I. Crabb, William McNeir, Edward Brewer, of John, Jonathan But-ton, Richard Sands, William Bryan, Philip A. Magruder, George McNeir, James Callahan, John Miller, Martin F. Revell, Joseph J. Nicholson, John Mitchell, Philip C. Clayton, Daniel Caulk, David Hanlon, William S. Clayton, John E. Stalker, M. Curran Karney, Hyde Ray Bowie and others, who

now are or may hereafter become members of said society, and their successors, are hereby declared to be one community and body corporate, by the name, style and title of the Washington Temperance Society of Annapolis, and by that name they shall be, and are hereby made able and capable in law, to have receive and retain to them and their successors, property, real and personal, also devises or bequests of any person or persons, bodies corporate or politic, capable of making the same, and the same to dispose of or transfer at their pleasure, in such manner as they may think proper, provided always, that said corporation shall not at any time hold or possess property, real, personal or mixed, exceeding in value the sum of one thousand dollars, other than that which may be invested in a hall to be erected for the purposes of the society.

NOTE

The following may be of interest in connection with our earlier question on a connection between the Washingtonians and San Francisco, and particularly the San Francisco medical community. This is the entry on Hyde Ray Bowie (1813-1856) from *The Bowies and Their Kindred* by Walter Worthington Bowie:

[Hyde Ray Bowie] was a student at St. John's College Annapolis, with his twin brother, who was later Lieutenant James K[emp] Bowie, United States Navy [1813-1843]. [He] read law several years, and was admitted to practice before the courts of Baltimore and rose rapidly in his profession. Had a large clientage in Baltimore and Washington, but a few years prior to his death removed to San Francisco, California. His business increased and in 1856 he returned East to plead a case before the United States Supreme Court. While stopping at the National Hotel in Washington, he was stricken with apoplexy and expired a few hours later, aged forty-three.

One son at least was in San Francisco in 1868. Here is the record on his eldest son Wallace A. Bowie (b. 1843), from *The Bowies and Their Kindred*:

At the commencement of the Civil War, Wallace A. Bowie enlisted as a private in the Eighth Regiment Maryland Volunteers, Federal army, and rose to the rank of first lieutenant. [He] was transferred to the navy in 1864 and served as assistant engineer on the U.S. Ship *Kearsarge*. This vessel was ordered to Panama, and while there the crew was stricken with yellow fever. For his gallant and unselfish behavior during this period Engineer Bowie was highly commended, but owing to ill-health resigned in 1868 and settled in San Francisco, California.

But the fullest connection of the Bowies with San Francisco is to be found in the life of the next brother, Dr. Augustus Jesse Bowie (b. 1815), who may also have had something to do with the Inebriates Home – he certainly had a great deal to do

with San Francisco medicine. Here is the record from *The Bowies and Their Kindred*.

[Augustus Jesse Bowie] entered St. John's College in 1825 and afterwards began the study of medicine under the tuition of his uncle, Dr. Hyde Ray, United States Navy. On February 9, 1835 he graduated at the Maryland Medical University in Baltimore, received an appointment as Assistant Surgeon, United States Navy, and passed the examination at the head of a large class of applicants. When commissioned, he was the youngest surgeon in the service, being under twenty-two. He was ordered to the U.S. Ship *Independence* at Boston, and later to the *Missouri*, which was the first steamship built for the American Navy. While Dr. Bowie was attached to this ship, our Minister to Russia, Mr. Dallas, embarked upon it for St. Petersburg, and all the officers of the frigate were royally entertained by the Emperor Nicholas. The ship proceeded to Gibraltar, at which port it caught fire while at anchor and was burned to the water's edge. For a number of years Dr. Bowie was with the European and South Atlantic Squadrons. In 1848 he was commissioned full surgeon and ordered to the China fleet and assigned to duty on the *Massachusetts*, which was about to sail for San Francisco. In April 1849, the ship reached the latter port, making the third steamer which had ever entered the

Golden Horn. Dr. Bowie was selected by the Government as one of a special commission of officers delegated to locate the hospital at the Navy Yard in San Francisco. In 1853 he was ordered to report at Boston, Massachusetts, for duty on board the *Raritan*, but he had become so delighted with the wonderful climate and beauty of California, he decided to locate there permanently and sent in his resignation, which was accepted in the following October. By close attention to his profession and judicious investments in real estate, he acquired a large fortune. Though his practice occupied most of his time, he found opportunity to take active part in local politics and to attend to social matters, entertaining his friends with all the sumptuous hospitality which was with him an heredity from his Maryland forefathers. He was a keen lover of field sports, and excellent shot and perfectly at home with his horse, dog and gun. For thirteen years he was a Regent of the University of California, was Professor of Theory and Practice at the San Francisco Medical College, and filled the chair of Professor of Surgery. His skill as a surgeon was known among the fraternity throughout the State, and his success with difficult operations, gained him much celebrity. He was an expert linguist, and as a classic scholar had few peers. He was a brilliant conversationalist, and his descriptive powers were the admiration of his acquaintances.



Anti-Saloon League convention photo, 1915