

CASQ

Culture Alcohol & Society Quarterly
Newsletter of Kirk/CAAS Collections at Brown

Vol. IV no. 2 January/February/March 2009

This eighteenth new issue of the CA&SQ (since its revival in October 2004) is Volume IV, no. 2. After “News and Notes,” with News on the Templeton Foundation Stony Brook /Case Western Reserve *Helping Others: Science, Spirituality, and Theology* (HOSST) project and on a proposed Panel related to the Washingtonians at the inaugural Conference of Nineteenth-Century Americanists at Penn State in May 2010, and brief historical “Notes” on early members and supporters of A.A. (including the early AAs who were signatories number 43, 44, and 45 in the First Big Book sold – Ginny M.’s copy), we were going have some new material on the Messengers to Ebby (Rowland, Shep, Cebra) who lie behind the early days of A.A. and remarks by two historians of A.A. on writing the history of A.A. Both have been put off to Volume IV, no. 3, making room for additional material recently come to light from work being done on early AA members and for (Part I of) a 2006 paper on Writing History on A.A., by the Editor, to go with the forthcoming paper by the two historians noted above (Part II will appear in our next issue, possibly with their paper). These are followed by a brief *Olla Podrida* and no. 25 in our “Washingtonian Notes and Queries,” looking at John Atler (sometimes misread as “Alter”) of the 1841 Incorporators of the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore. Next issue (IV, 3) 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. All receiving CASQ are invited to contribute notes, queries, studies, data on work in progress.
– Jared Lobdell, *March 31, 2009* (revised *September 2009*)

News and Notes pp. 2-7
News: The HOSST Project and C19 pp. 2-4
Notes: Brief Notes on Early AAs and Friends pp. 4-7
Writing History on A.A. (by the Editor) pp. 7-19
Olla Podrida: Miscellaneous Gatherings pp. 19-21
Washingtonian Notes and Queries (no. 25) pp. 21-22

NEWS AND NOTES

News: The HOSST Project

The John Templeton Foundation has given a major grant to Principal Investigator Maria Pagano, Ph.D., of Case Western Reserve's Department of Psychiatry, formerly of Brown, Co-Chair of the Helping Others: Spirituality, Science & Theology in Dialogue (HOSST) Project. The grant is for research on helping others, particularly in relation to youth recovery from alcohol abuse, and the HOSST Project has been designed as a supplement and preparation for that.

HOSST researchers include Dr. Pagano, Co-Investigator John Kelly, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Psychiatry, Center for Addiction Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Co-Investigator Robert L. Stout, Ph.D., Director, Decision Sciences Institute/PIRE, Pawtucket RI, Co-Investigator J. Scott Tonigan, Ph.D., Center on Alcoholism, Substance Abuse and Addictions (CASAA), University of New Mexico, Stephanie Brown, Ph.D., Preventive Medicine, Center for Medical Humanities, Compassionate Care and Bioethics (CMHCCB) at SUNY-Stony Brook, Marc Galanter, M.D., Professor of Psychiatry and Director of the Division of Alcoholism and Drug Abuse, NYU School of Medicine, Lynn G. Underwood, Ph.D., President Research Integration, Chagrin Falls OH. Theologians, Pastors, and Historians on the team are Co-Chair Stephen G. Post, Ph.D., Professor of Preventive Medicine, Head of the Division of Medicine in Society and Director, CMHCCB, SUNY-Stony Brook, the Rev. Mary Lynn Dell, M.D., Department of Psychiatry, Case Western, the Very Rev. Ward Ewing, D.D., Dean and President of The General Theological Seminary of the Episcopal Church, NYC, and Chair of the General Service Board of A.A. for the United States and Canada, The Rt. Rev. Mark Hollingsworth, D.Min., of Cleveland, Episcopal Bishop of Ohio, and the Editor. Papers will be circulated to the members of the team and the first presentations will be given at a weekend at the General Theological Seminary in NYC at the end of February 2010.

The HOSST team is a "working group of 12 individuals from theology, pastoral care, and alcoholism research, each of whom can meaningfully contribute to an unprecedented new level of integrative reflection around the implications of the 12th step of the 12-step program." Also, the "HOSST group is charged with producing the definitive edited book in this emerging field of integrative study" (quotations from Stephen G. Post and Maria Pagano, Memorandum on "Helping Others: Spirituality, Science & Theology in Dialogue," pp. 1, 2).

News: C19 [Conference of 19th Century Americanists]

The Inaugural Meeting of the Conference of 19th Century Americanists at Penn State [May 20-23 2010] has before it a proposal for a panel that may be of some interest to some readers of this newsletter: *Washingtonian Transformations in Antebellum*

Temperance Literature, the Arts, and Culture: Imagination, Rhetoric and Semiotics [Jared Lobdell, Chair]. Here are the papers proposed:

Richard Bell, “The Specter of Suicide in Nineteenth-Century Temperance Literature”

The author is Assistant Professor of History, at the University of Maryland at College Park. The paper tracks the emergence, deployment, power and effect of the idea that habitual drinking is a form of gradual suicide. In so doing, it attempts to show how the twin scourges of intemperance and suicide came to be deployed as religious, social, and political instruments in 19th-century temperance writing. Between 1780 and 1850, three generations of temperance reformers alarmed at the growth of city tavern culture waged a war of words in the popular press to get drunks off drink by consistently comparing drinking to suicide. By reconstructing how and why temperance writers linked drinking and suicide, this paper examines the intersection between print and politics, between writing and reformation, showing how moral reformers armed only with the power of their own imagination initiated the rhetoric of self-destruction that influenced seven decades of temperance reform in America. The “Washingtonian” decade 1840-1850 at the end of the period is examined for signs of any changes in the rhetoric (and semiotics) of temperance.

Ric Caric, “Philadelphia/Baltimore: A 90-Mile Transformation in Washingtonian Culture”

The author teaches semiotics, popular culture, and government at Morehead State University in Kentucky. He holds his B.A. in Government from St. Lawrence University in 1976, his M.A. in Political Science from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1982, and his Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1989. He has been working on Philadelphia artisanal culture in the first half of the Long Nineteenth Century, and particularly at the importance of Philadelphia *mores* and traditions in that culture, and the new reaches of the “Philadelphia” imagination based on these. This paper looks at the semantics (relation of signs to their designata and the objects which they denote), and the pragmatics (biotic aspects of semiosis – the psychological, biological, and sociological phenomena which occur in the functioning of signs) of the varying semiotic worlds of the two cities, and how these work out in the literature and culture of the Washingtonians there.

Peter Molin, “T. S. Arthur, Baltimore Magazine Culture, and the Temperance Message”

The author teaches at the U. S. Military Academy and will return from Afghanistan in October. His dissertation on Timothy Shays Arthur was directed by Paul Gutjahr. This paper takes note of both the Baltimore Magazine Culture and the Baltimore Tavern “Discussion” Culture and of their interactions, looking at the Washingtonians as a tavern “discussion” group gone public, and looking at Poe and T. S. Arthur as fellow members of another tavern Literary “discussion” group, both linked eventually through the Baltimore Magazine Culture to the (perhaps) stronger Philadelphia Magazine Culture, and then into the popular imagination of the time and perhaps all time. Note that 2009 is/was the Bicentennial for both Poe and Arthur. In some ways, but using a different formal framework, this paper echoes and expands Ric Caric’s work, but of course in an

inaugural meeting discussing new imagination in the Nineteenth Century, Poe leaps to mind – if not necessarily in connection with the Temperance Message.

W. R. Sutton, “Washingtonian ‘Missionary’: John Hawkins and the Rhetoric of Working-Class Temperance Reform”

The author is with the University of Illinois: his dissertation *Journeyman for Jesus* was published by the Penn State University Press in 1995. This paper describes, through the experience of a leading Washingtonian “missionary” (John H W Hawkins 1797-1858) the artisan experience of industrial capitalist dislocation leading to the creation of journeymen's trade unions, the failure of those unions, and the ways the Washingtonians provided necessary survival skills for success in the new culture, without requiring workers to abandon fully the camaraderie and conviviality of the old regime. In the process, it describes pre-Marxist ways 19th-century artisans imaginatively understood class dynamics, concentrating on Hawkins’s career and his rhetoric.

Graham Warder, “Arthur, Temperance and Disability History: A New Framework for Looking at T. S. Arthur and the Washingtonian Decade in Nineteenth-Century Context”

The author is assistant professor at Keene State University in New Hampshire. His recent work in disability history and the changing rhetoric of disability provides a new approach for evaluating transformations around the midpoint of the Long Nineteenth Century. He served on the editorial board for the 2009 *Encyclopedia of American Disability History*, and has written on “Helen Keller: Identity, Disability and American History.” His paper here is on Timothy Shay Arthur, one the most prolific and commercially successful authors of antebellum America. His most famous work was the temperance novel *Ten Nights in a Bar-Room*, published in 1854. The novel was a touchstone for a generation of Americans who came of age in the wake of the market revolution. It explored disrupted community, madness, familial breakdown, and social upheaval. *Ten Nights* was also a reverie on the reintegration of community through moral regeneration. Ultimately, the novel adopted the principles of moral treatment, the therapeutic approach taken by the superintendents of insane asylums, as a rejoinder to the commercialization of American life, which links the terms of self-identity for drinkers/inebriates as disabled from society with Dr. Sutton’s rhetoric of working-class temperance reform and Professor Bell’s alternative rhetoric of self-destruction – and thus with imagination and self-imagining in the time immediately following the “Alcoholic Republic.”

Brief Notes on Early AAs and Friends

There are three current areas of research of particular interest in this connection. First, Archivist Jack B. of North Jersey A.A. is involved in putting together lists and chronologies of the earliest members of A.A., both in Ohio and in the NYC/North Jersey area. The Editor has been able to supply him with some details on some of the A.A.

members in the period 1935-1940. Related to Jack's enterprise (though independent work, including work on tapes from early speaker's meetings has been going on in this connection), there are the signatures in the 1939 "First Big Book Sold" in the GSO Archives. There is also the list in the Rockefeller papers of attendees at the dinner on February 8 1940 (a note on a couple of the attendees was in our *Olla Podrida* section in the last issue of CASQ). Second, there is on-going study on the founding of A.A. in Philadelphia and Eastern Pennsylvania, which has from time to time intersected with work (including Jack's) on both Ohio and New York in the early days (and with work on Washington DC and Baltimore A.A.). Third, there are inquiries being carried out on the years from the first Service Conference in 1951 (list of Trustees available on line) through the Twelve Steps and Twelve Traditions (1953) and the second edition of the "Big Book" (1955), and back to the "Inkstained Wretches" and the founding of the A.A. Grapevine in 1944 (Marty M., Priscilla P., Lois K., Felicia G. [later M.], Chase H., Abbot [Bud] T.). A few notes from these areas of research are printed here.

[1] First, from research by Jack B. or connected with his – John (Jack) B., the AA Archivist in North Jersey, as noted, is working on a book on early AAs, and making use of lists that have come to his hand from Akron and Cleveland (and some material from New York) from the later 1930s. One of the by-products of his work has been proof positive that the Harry Z[-----] who got sober in Akron in 1937 is not the Henry Z[-----] of New York who was a Trustee in the early 1950s. The two names begin with the same letter; they have the same double letter in the middle; and they end with essentially the same vowel-consonant combination; but they are not the same person. Harry Z (1890-1960) was a barber in Orrville OH (I have written the head of the Orrville Historical Society, John Smucker – yes, Orrville is where Smucker makes its jams and preserves and jellies – to see if they have information on Harry's barber shop). Henry Z (1896-1967) got sober in Queens, where he lived, in late 1941, when a librarian who lived across the way rang his front doorbell, handed him an armful of material (including Jack Alexander's article) and quickly retreated (the story is told by Henry's son on a recording made at Stepping Stones in 1982); he was Yev G.'s major coadjutor in the formation of the first Queens Group in 1941-42 and was indeed the first AA to get sober in Queens, though not the first AA in Queens to get sober (1976 interview of Yev G. by Class B Trustee George G).

Among other findings: Jane S., the reported earliest woman A.A. in Akron, married to an executive at a steel company at Cleveland (per *DR BOB and the Gold Oldtimers*), may be Jennie S., married to Orlyn S., a steel company engineer at Cleveland. The 1937/38 list of members in Dr. Bob's hand includes ages: hers appears to be 40 (according to Jack B.), while the Census figures for 1930 would give 43 or 44: this is not a disabling difference. There is also a second (and previously unknown?) woman on the 1937/38 list in Bob's hand, Edith S., aged 38[?], a waitress. She seems to have been from Missouri, married to Dewey S., with daughters Jo Anna and La Donna. Dewey died in Barberton in the Akron area in 1969 at 73; I have no indication on her death. Jane S. died in 1974 and Orlyn S. in 1975; both were born circa 1894.

One of the figures coming clearer from the Brooklyn (182 Clinton St.) days of A.A. is that of Paul K., signature number 44 in the First Big Book Sold. Material on Paul appears in the last issue of CASQ: during the preparation of that material we checked out as much as we could find on the names in the two signatures on either side of Paul K.,

number 43, George Brainard S., b. Feb 16 1886, of Upper Montclair NJ, who died in July 1970, and in 1930 was recorded as a "Manager / Cheese" in the Census (wife Vina was b. August 19 1886: no date of death has come to light), and number 45, Francis L, on whom we have a virtual blank: even if it is the Francis W. L. (b. ca 1892) who appears in the 1910 Census in California as a brother-in-law of oil company executive Fred B[---], this person never reappears under that name and has no demonstrable connection with NYC in 1939. There was a Frances L. in NYC in 1939, but the presence of a thirty-year-old woman at 182 Clinton would surely have attracted notice.

Signature no. 14, between Horace C. (number 13, early Trustee) and Ebby T. (number 15) is that of Frank F. – presumably of Queens, b. ca 1894, married to Irene, with children Katherine, Mildred, Frank, and Muriel. Frank is listed in the 1930 Census as a Chauffeur with the Express Co. It is unclear whether he was an alcoholic, though the signatures around his seem mostly to be those of early alcoholic members. (On the other hand, no. 10 is that of Horace [Popsie] M., who travelled by chauffeured limousine.) One signature arousing the Editor's interest is that of Henry Godfrey H[---], no. 30, who was Yale Class of 1919, a Lieutenant in World War I, and a Lt-Colonel in WW II, buried at Arlington: Henry Godfrey H[---], Lt Col Spec SV Div Army Serv Force WDC AUS, USA, b. 17 May 1897, d. 29 Jan 1959, buried at Section 11 Site 148-A. It arouses interest because Godfrey was a member of the same fraternity in the same class as Charlie B, one of the "three B's" who were co-founders of Philadelphia A.A., and as Steve Benét, friend and colleague of the Yale man whose family connections sent Rowland H. (Yale '03) to see Dr. Jung.

[2] From the early history of A.A. in Eastern PA (beginning in Philadelphia in February 1940), we note the founding Seven (Bayard B., Jim B., Charlie B., Mac H., George I. S., Ed P., Fitz M.), of whom Fitz and Jim B. are well-known and have been covered *in extenso* in *CASQ* and elsewhere. Ed P. seems largely to have avoided being recorded. Mac H. was a well-known novelist who apparently lost the ability to write ca 1934 when his drinking reached – or was reaching – a height (or depth), and gained it back ca 1949 after he got sober. Bayard B. (Johnny L. pronounced it "By-ard") has been covered here and in fact appears in the "A A History" paper (Part I) published in this issue. We have a small amount of additional information on George I. S. and Charlie B. On George I S[-----], we find he was born July 31, 1890, the son of Margaret N[----] S[-----] (b Dec 1850), older sisters Edna (b Sept 1879) and Anna (b. April 1882). [1900 Census]. In 1942 lived with Anna G S[-----] at 4208 Tyson St Philadelphia. In the 1910 Census we find Margaret S[-----] 59 Edna R 29 Anna G 26 George 19; in the 1930 Census George I 31 [!] living with mother-in-law Helen G[-----] 83 wife Laura G S[-----] 38. The 1920 CENSUS shows Helen G[-----] 75 living with husband Robert 74 and daughter Laura G D[----] 41[!]. On Charlie B. , Charles William B[-----], born October 8, 1895, in 1942 resident at 30 Princeton Rd, Upper Darby (Haverford Twp) PA, in 1917 a Private in the National Guard of Connecticut (ROTC) at Ft Niagara NY, being a student at Yale. He was elected a member of Alpha Delta Phi at Yale that year. Among other members were (Class of 1918) Philip Barry, the playwright, and John Chipman Farrar, the publisher, (1919) Stephen Vincent Benét, poet and novelist, (1920) Henry R. Luce, and also Henry Godfrey H[---], as noted above, whose signature is number 30 in the First Big Book Sold in the GSO Archives. The (or at least an) adviser to this fraternity was

Professor the Rev. William Lyon Phelps (1865-1943), famous for his frequent use of the phrase “One Day at a Time.”

Material from the Archives at Yale provides information that Charles William B. died on December 13, 1961. The 1944 Class of 1919 Twenty-fifth Reunion Book provides the following: “Charlie in 1939 was in business with Pure Carbonic, Inc., a subsidiary of Air Reduction Co. Back in 1920 he married Amy W[-----] B[-----] of Overbrook, Pennsylvania, and had three children who should now be between the ages of twenty-five and twenty-one. They are, in order, Louise Waller, Charles William Jr., and Robert Brewster. In 1943 he reported to the University secretary’s office that he had been commissioned as Captain in the Quartermaster Department of the Army and ordered to Camp Lee, Virginia. Later he was assigned to the Philadelphia Depot where he was in charge of Military Training and assisting the Depot Inspector. At the same time he reported that his son Charles was a gunner in a dive bomber in the Marine Corps at Guadalcanal and his son Robert in training as a naval pilot. The B[-----]’s permanent home address is Quaker Neck, Chestertown, Maryland.”

It was presumably Charles William B. Jr. who married on December 4, 1943, Shirley Stevenson, born July 25, 1925, having children William Brewster B. (b. September 18, 1944) and Amy B. (b. July 1947).

[3] The 1951 Trustees list (available on line) includes a number of persons well-known in A. A. History, specifically the three alcoholic trustees, Earl T[----], Thomas Kean B[-----], and J. Richard (Dick) S[-----]. The four other trustees listed are Jonas Ballance Anderson (b. 1885), Thomas Daniel Y[----] (1903-1966) a one-time editor of the *Grapevine* and listed in *WHO WAS WHO IN AMERICA 1961-68*, Henry F Grieme, and Thomas M. Kerr. I have given the name as Y[----] until I can check out the possibility that he was actually an alcoholic, given that he was editor of the *Grapevine* – though that would have created an imbalance, with four alcoholic and only three non-alcoholic Trustees.

WRITING HISTORY ON OR OF A.A. (by the Editor)

PART I OF “PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY AND HISTORIOGRAPHY OF ALCOHOLICS ANONYMOUS” (2006 AHA/ADHS PAPER)

Perhaps there are fewer significant problems (should we say “opportunities”?) in the history of Alcoholics Anonymous than in reconstructing and writing that history. But we might mention at least the following Twelve Problems in the History of A.A. (there are certainly others): (1) Was there in some sense a “golden moment” particularly appropriate to the founding of A.A.? (This might even include such subsidiary questions as, to what degree was the early *cameraderie* of A.A. linked to the illegality of drinking during prohibition?) (2) Who founded A.A.? (3) How did A.A. grow? (4) Why did it grow at the rate it did? (5) And then (apparently) stop growing (at least in the United States)? (6) Is the “next generation” as important as the founders? (7) Can they be studied? And what about the “founders” who haven’t really been studied yet (Fitz M., for example), even though the founding was seventy years ago? (8) What about the “non-founders” who were part of the early generation? (9) Was it important or even necessary

that the founding of A.A. take place outside New York City? (Was it important – just a side note – that New York City and Northeast Ohio were two areas of maximum Rockefeller influence?) (10) What is the relation of religion and medicine to early A.A. and to each other in early A.A.? (11) To and in later A.A.? (12) Was there a kind of “sea-change” in A.A. 1955 (the St Louis Convention where A.A. was “handed over to the members”) to 1975/80? From 1975/80 to the present (2005/2006)? Of the problems in writing the history of A.A. – that is, the problems in historiography – we might mention the following (and once again, we have chosen to list Twelve Problems, now in the Historiography of A.A. rather than its history): (1) Is there really a need to know A.A. history or advantage to knowing it, and if so, why? (2) To what degree is it valuable or necessary to study the history of – say – the Washingtonian Temperance Society (or the Keeley Cure), as part of or prolegomena to the history of A.A.? (3) Is it in fact possible to write A.A. history? (4) Is it possible to write A.A. history without advocacy? (We may look here at some of Bill W.’s writing of A.A. history.) (5) Should it be local history, regional history, or national history? (6) Should the history of A.A. be written from the inside or from the outside? (7) From the top down or from the bottom up? (8) Can A.A. history be written by A.A.s as A.A.s? (9) Is the history of A.A. (from the inside) in some sense written only by the “winners” (thus the official version) or the “losers” (thus attacking the official version)? (This is obviously connected with the advocacy question as well as the inside/outside and bottom up/top down questions.) (10) What can reasonably be said about existing attempts to write the history of A.A., or parts of it? (11) Do we have a usable model or paradigm for writing A.A. history? (12) Overarching our whole set of questions, if history is biography (and much of it is), how can we write the history of those who must remain anonymous? (The model or paradigm can help, but it will not solve the problem – and this is also related to the question of A.A. history by A.A.s or by non-A.A.s).

What we will do here is set out something of the work done for an attempt to write in the field, and even to set up a model or paradigm. As with the pavement artist, this is “all my own work” – but the basic problems and parameters would seem to hold true no matter whose work it is. The attempt is a book (or book section) tentatively titled *Joyous Garde to Area 59: An Exemplary Study of A.A. (in Eastern Pennsylvania) to 1975*. By “exemplary” is meant “as an example of what can be done” (in this case, and thus, by extension, in others.) The study is to be organized according to the following scheme, with six sections of seven parts each:

The first section, “A Model for Historical Research on Alcoholics Anonymous as a Continuing Company or Society,” is designed to have the following subsections – (a) Change or Development in Social Systems (using the Teune-Mlinar model in *The Developmental Logic of Social Systems* [1979]); (b) Definitions of Company or Society in the Social-Systems Context; (c) A.A. as a Social System/Subsystem; (d) The Importance of Individuals and Problem of Anonymity; (e) The Problem of History as Told By the Charismatic Founder, and Its *Reliques*; (f) Periodization, and (g) Comparative Local (Geographical Subsystems) Studies. The second section, “A Framework for Studying the ‘Golden Moment’ for Alcoholics Anonymous,” is likewise designed to have seven subsections – (a) Bill W.’s Threefold Vision; (b) Mind-Doctors, Doctors, and Clergymen; (c) The Founding and the First Groups; (d) The Apostles on the Road from Akron and Cleveland; (e) The Apostles on the Road from New York; (f) How

to Found an A.A. Group – Was it like Founding a Church?; (g) Forgotten Apostles (as Examples): Irv M. and Oscar V.

The third section, “A.A., the Mid-Atlantic Region, and Eastern Pennsylvania in the War Years (1940-46),” is likewise designed to have seven subsections – (a) Fitz, Jimmy, and the Company of Joyous Garde; (b) The Seven Founders in Philadelphia (being Fitz M., Jimmy B., Charlie B., Bayard B., George I. S., Ed P., and Mac H.); (c) JPL (a very early “non-founder” in Philadelphia), Dr. Saul’s Office, and a Side-Note on Jimmy’s Conversion, (d) The Linkage of (Mid)West and East in A.A.; (e) Where Bill W. Failed: Early A.A. in Harrisburg (and a Note on Williamsport); (f) George the Salesmen: A.A. in Reading (and Lebanon and Scranton); and (g) The Lieutenant, the Captain, and the Colonel (A.A. in the Lehigh Valley – Lieutenant Yvelin G., Captain Aaron Burr B., Colonel Robert S. A.D.). The fourth section, “The Time of Postwar Recovery, Growth and Structure (1946-55),” is likewise designed to have seven subsections – (a) Establishment and Re-Establishment: the Second Wave; (b) Traveling Inter-Group Meetings or an Intergroup Association?, (c) The Mill-owner (Dick C.) and the Minnesota Model; (d) Eastern Pennsylvania Attitudes on Mind, Body, and Spirit; (e) The Great Change in 1954: The Beginnings of Structure in Service; (f) The Newsletter Campaign for Delegate in (Eastern) Pennsylvania.: Chit-Chatting into Office; and (g) Clubs, Associations, and Groups.

The fifth section, “A New Society or the Routinization of Charisma? (1955-75)” is also designed to have seven subsections – (a) The New Breed of “Trusted Servants;” (b) The Captains and the Kings Depart; (c) The Third Wave of New Groups; (d) The Curious Specializations of JPL and YG; (e) Eastern Pennsylvania and the Treatment Model; (f) Growth Without Diversity: Implications of the Systems Analysis Model; and (g) A Note on the Thirty Years Since. Finally, the last section before the summing up, “Paradigm Implications for ‘Spontaneous Order’ in the History and Historiography of A.A.,” is again designed to have seven subsections, the first three being fundamentally an extension of theory – (a) Distinctions Between and Among Conventional Order, Natural Order, and Social Order (ordered by human action but not specific human intention); (b) The Question of “Survival of the Fittest” in the Traditional Spontaneous Evolution of Order (including evolutionary dead-ends and the use of reason); (c) Problems of Freedom and Co-ordination Under General Rules Without a Market Mechanism (need for continuously generating and adapting spontaneous rules); (d) Evaluating Well-being as *Accident*, and its Implications for the History and Historiography of A.A.; (e) The Impact of Personality on Developing Order in A.A.; (f) Possibilities of a True “Exemplary” Study; (g) Is the Order Still Developing (and can we ask whether it is developing usefully)?

We begin with the “Twelve Problems of A.A. History” mentioned above, and we will look only briefly at some of them, much more in detail at a few, our intention being to use material from our exemplary study (now in preparation) to provide illumination on these. We then go on to “Twelve Problems of A.A. Historiography,” likewise looking only briefly at some of them, much more in detail at a few, our intention being to use material and procedures from our exemplary study to illuminate these. The first of the historical questions is on the “Golden Moment” for the founding of A.A. My own view, as I have elsewhere written (in *This Strange Illness: Alcoholism and Bill W.*, in 2004, p. 2), is that “it would appear that the fellowship of A.A. was founded at a golden moment.

What is of particular interest for us in looking at its continuance from that golden moment is ... that the cofounder most interested in A.A.'s institutional longevity (Bill W.) subsequently established a singular structure for the 'governance' and continuity of the fellowship – a kind of attempt to prolong the golden moment..." What is of particular interest at that point in that book was the continuance of the "golden moment" – what is of particular interest for us here is that A.A. history has indeed persistently treated this time (say, 1935-1940) as a golden moment, and in a sense the historiography, the persistent treatment, answers the question of history, whether it was golden. The people who were there said it was – though of course we may seek "reasons why" (and one of them may be the recent past of Prohibition when alcohol held a position analogous perhaps to drugs in the 1970s).

The second historical question is, Who founded A.A.? The official story, established by Bill W., is that he and Dr. Bob S. were the "co-founders" in Akron, Ohio, in the Spring of 1935, but Bill also listed a number of "non-alcoholic" founders, including the Rev. Sam Shoemaker, Father Edward Dowling, S.J., Henrietta Sieberling, sometimes Carl Jung, and quite a few others. And there are lists of "founders" in various cities and towns – the list by Jimmy B. for Philadelphia (which has been published on the Internet) includes the seven alcoholics (five from Philadelphia) who were present at the first meeting there. (We'll have more to say on this list.) But any reading of early Philadelphia A.A. history makes it clear (1) that there were "non-alcoholic" founders there (like Dr. Dudley Saul), and (2) that one of the most important figures in earlier Philadelphia A.A. history (whom we will designate as J. P. L.) was not a "founder" but was in fact already sober in Philadelphia before A.A. reached the city. (There are parallels here with "Detroit A.A. Number Two," Henry (Mike) E., and with Jim R. in Baltimore.) In a talk at A.A.'s Conference Dinner a few years ago, Dr. Bob's son suggested that his father was the alcoholic co-founder because Bill needed as a (junior) co-founder an alcoholic who stayed sober (preferably not from New York and Towns Hospital), and Dr. Bob was the first who fit the bill to stay sober – in fact, he was the first whom Bill brought in anywhere to stay sober.

The third historical question is, How did A.A. grow? Here the work of a specialist on the history of the Early Christian Church who has begun to look at the spread of A.A., especially in its first forty years, suggests similarities in the process. Certainly there is substantial evidence of the importance of travelers, especially traveling salesmen, in the spread of A.A., and there was at least one traveling "apostle" of A.A., Fitz M., who was a founder in Philadelphia (he's on Jimmy B.'s list), in Washington D C, Baltimore, Northern Virginia, some other parts of Maryland including the Annapolis area and western Maryland), and North Jersey, besides being the first man to stay sober in New York after Bill W. (Oddly, it is only sixty and more years after his death that he is the subject of serious research.) We shall see how this historical question links in with our overarching historiographical question or problem, about writing anonymous biography, as well as with our seventh historical question. For the moment we will go on.

The fourth historical question is, Why did it grow at the rate it did? Here the work of our historian of the Early Christian Church links with the "official" accounts written by Bill W. and with the work of a retired California lawyer and member of the AHA, Dick B. We'll talk more about this later, but just now we'll note that it links with

the advocacy question in historiography, inasmuch as Dick B. is a kind of avatar of “advocacy history” in A.A. His view is, essentially, that the Christian roots of early A.A. (through the Oxford Groups, generally, and through Christian Endeavor for Dr. Bob) explained what he sees as its extraordinary rate of success – up to 93 percent, estimated on the basis of early Cleveland figures.

In his view, therefore, A.A. grew rapidly because it provided an unabashedly spiritual and thus highly successful program. Dick B. and some of his followers or supporters have done hugely valuable work – I believe – in providing detail on the “Golden Moment” and concentrating attention on the way A.A. was perceived by its members in the earliest days. Our Church historian has provided accounts of the formation of A.A. in the St Joseph River Valley in the “Michiana” region within a framework provided by the history of the early Church and therefore at least a religious (historical) framework if not a “spiritual” one. (But religious history is about spiritual things.) And of course, Bill W.’s own accounts emphasize his (and others’) spiritual experience – which (rather than a “spiritual awakening”) used to be “the result of these Steps” – and which, moreover, could equally well occur at the beginning, as it did with Bill W. and (apparently) with Fitz M. – and even perhaps with the “Atheist” Jimmy B.

The fifth historical question is, Why did it (apparently) stop growing (certainly stop growing at that same rate, at least in the United States)? Dick B. would say, it got away from its spiritual roots. Max Weber might tell us that the period of the charismatic founder must be succeeded by a long “Apostolic” age (or in the Muslim case, age of conquest), when the major growth takes place, after which the gains are consolidated by the routinization of the charisma or the establishment of Imperial or Papal or Ottoman bureaucracy – but developmental systems theory, on the other hand, suggests that the continued growth must be inherent in the process of introducing new diversity set up in the first creation of the system. That presupposes a reward for enterprise (or *entrepreneurship*) in the system, about which we shall see. In any case, at least four answers suggest themselves on the cessation of growth: (1) it was organic in this subsystem as it is in others; (2) there was a failure of belief necessary for the conscious continuing co-creation of the subsystem (to use terminology from the Santa Fe Institute, though the point is Dick B.’s); (3) administrative, managerial, or even “leadership” mistakes were made; (4) new charismatic leadership was necessary for growth but the “governance” established was inimical to this (as with the Church of Christ, Scientist, after the death of Mary Baker Eddy – and possibly, on a much larger scale, in the split of Shi’a and Sunni Islam).

The sixth historical question is whether the “next generation” was as important as the founders, and then (if important) what does it show us? By the next generation we mean the generation after the “Golden Moment” of 1935-40, which would include, for example, the “founders” of A.A. in Philadelphia, other than those who go back to the 1930s (in this case, Bill W., Fitz M., Jimmy B), as well as the founders in (say) the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania, or the St. Joseph River Valley along the Michigan/Indiana border, or in Ireland, or in Canada, indeed in most of the United States and all the rest of the world. The Lehigh Valley “founders” were Colonel Robert S. A.D., Captain Aaron Burr B., and Lieutenant Yvelin G, all of whom got sober after 1940 (though not much after). The “Michiana” founders may be discovered in two books published through the Hindsfoot Foundation, *The Factory Owner & the Convict* and *The*

St. Louis Gambler & the Railroad Man (both published in 2005), as Volume I and II of *Lives and Teachings of the A.A. Old Timers*. These are an interesting mix, based mostly on tapes of “leads” at Speakers’ Meetings in the 1970s and 1980s, and on the author/editor’s understanding on Early Christian theology.

In any case, the answer to the first part would seem to be *yes* – in fact (wherever I have found the materials available for research), this is the generation of A.A.’s greatest growth, from 1940 to 1955, or perhaps a little past that. As to what the study of this generation shows us, the “exemplary” study of Eastern Pennsylvania should be good evidence for the process of growth (and if it is, we can surely hope for other such studies down the pike). Note that evidence on *what* (and especially *who*) brought about the process of growth falls into our next – the seventh historical – question.

The seventh historical question (though it verges on the historiographical) is, Can this next generation be studied? (And if it can, do we have the materials necessary to reach conclusions on the *what* and the *who*?) And what about the “founders” who haven’t really been studied yet, even though the founding was seventy years ago? Let’s look briefly at a couple of short articles published in the last couple of years, as part of a prolegomena to the historical study *From Joyous Garde to Area 59* (and in part giving the book its title).

The articles are in *Culture Alcohol & Society Quarterly: The Newsletter of the Kirk-CAAS Collections at Brown University*, Vol. I (2003), edited by Ernie Kurtz. One deals with Fitz M. (and there will be another also dealing in part with Fitz M. as one of the “Philadelphia founders” in the volume for 2006). The other deals with the founding of A.A. in the Lehigh Valley Both illustrate the affirmative answer to this seventh question. We’ll look here at Fitz, and our first informant on Fitz M. is Fitz’s nephew-by-marriage, a retired officer of the U. S. Navy, in his later eighties, who had been a pupil of Fitz’s when Fitz was teaching at a prep school in Virginia (before 1930), and who visited Fitz and his wife the summer before the nephew entered the Naval Academy in nearby Annapolis in 1935.

I made contact with the nephew through his daughter, who provided some additional family information on Fitz and his wife and children. When the nephew was a child, he lived with his grandparents (Fitz’s parents-in-law) in Norfolk, Virginia, and attended Norfolk Academy, where Fitzhugh M., the husband of his Aunt Libby, was the history and math teacher. The nephew’s grandmother (Fitz’s mother-in-law) died in 1928, when the nephew was eleven. When he was younger, his grandfather would read aloud to him so late at night that his grandmother would intervene and tell him it was time for the boy to go to bed. He recalls that his grandfather read *The Last of the Mohicans*, *Ivanhoe*, and *King Arthur* (in the Sidney Lanier version).

He recalls also that his Uncle Fitz and Aunt Libby at his grandfather’s and sometimes Uncle Fitz read. These books seem to have gone to Libby and Fitz when the house in Richmond was broken up. When the nephew went from Norfolk Academy to Episcopal High School, he had a wonderful English teacher who really opened him up to English literature, including *King Arthur*. This may have been the same teacher – it was certainly the same school – that opened Fitz’s mind to what might be called classic Southern reading, especially *King Arthur*, when he was a student there just before the First World War.

Later, when the nephew was about to enter Annapolis, he visited Aunt Libby and Uncle Fitzhugh on the farm in Maryland, and then on the weekends while he was at Annapolis, in 1935 (the fall Fitz got sober). His uncle was more or less in the background, though he was responsible for keeping the young man out of mischief. Asked about his Uncle Fitz, the nephew said simply, "I took him for what he was and where he was." The ruts in the road on the way to the farm were so bad that "once you got into one, you stayed there." One thing the nephew remembers about those visits was the wonderful relationship his uncle had with the "colored farm hands." One of them was an old man who claimed to have been alive during the Civil War and used to tell wonderful stories. He would "do anything for Master Hugh" because Master Hugh (Fitzhugh M.) made him feel important.

Fitz was born in Atlantic City, New Jersey, where his father had a church, but he was a southern gentleman, in whom the idea of southern chivalry – as well as of the chivalry of King Arthur and the Knights of the Table Round (and the Company of Joyous Garde) – was alive and well. As a personal note, Fitz was of my parents' generation, not mine, but I too grew up on Sidney Lanier's *Boy's King Arthur*, and I too can see the members of A.A. in the first years as the Knights of Joyous Garde, traveling the country to slay the dragon of alcoholism. Libby and Fitz had three children, two daughters (one died, aged 45, in 1976, one, aged 75, in 1998) and a son Fitzhugh, now in his eighties, who is my second informant here.. Libby died in 1984: her death certificate bears the notation "divorced." (Records in the possession of Washington D.C. A.A. indicate that in 1943 Fitz remarried, a woman named Arabella – or Ruth – J. She died, according to Social Security records, in Westchester County, New York, in January 1972, aged 93, making her twenty years Fitz's senior.) I rather reluctantly asked "young Fitz" (he has had a distinguished career as a G.P. and will hereafter be called Dr. Fitz) about the timing of his parents' divorce, and was given to understand it was at the time Fitz left his farm outside Annapolis around 1936-37, beginning his "Apostolic" traveling. He was in New York and Newark in 1938, then in Washington and New York and off to Philadelphia, till he finally got a job for a year in 1941. The three children remained with their mother and in fact Dr. Fitz did not attend his father's funeral in 1943, though that was partly because he was at school at Blacksburg and it was war time.

Dr. Fitz told me one of the most important facts (to him) of his early youth was that one grandfather lived at one end of Chesapeake Bay (down by Richmond), and the other (Fitz's father, the Rev. Robert A. M., Episcopal) at the other, up by Annapolis. He remembered the *Boy's King Arthur*, but the principal books he recalled from his early youth (at his father's and his father's father's house) were Thackeray's, and particularly *Henry Esmond* and *The Virginians*, which detail the transmission of the Cavalier ethic (one could say, in a way, the ethic of chivalry) to Virginia. Fitz's father (born in the late 1850s) was a man of some distinction, a Princeton graduate with a law degree before he entered the church, and his father's father was a Southerner come North who was a cotton or sugar broker living on Staten Island at the time of the 1880 Census. Fitz romanticized the South, and especially Virginia: his son recalls that when Bill W. and Lois visited the farm in Maryland (before going on an Oxford House-Party tour to Western Maryland), Bill played the fiddle, Fitz played the banjo, Bill chose Yankee songs (his favorite was the *Battle Hymn of the Republic*), Fitz chose Virginia songs (my information gives *Old Virginny Never Tire*), but they could agree on some that were more "neutral" and Bill

learned some of the Virginia songs. As one of the things most differentiating the original Washingtonians from the original A.A.s is the absence of singing by the original A.A.s, it at least suggests some lines of thought – given that the early Akron pamphlet *Table Talk* (1940/1) suggests that A.A. meetings are akin to worship services, and most worship services in the United States involve music.

More on Fitz is gradually becoming available – in particular some of his letters to and from Jim B.'s cousin Churchy (who rescued the property for Fitz when his father died early in the Great Depression). He held one job he really enjoyed after getting sober – teaching for a year at the Landon School (he was a popular teacher with the boys, though usually – if not perhaps at Landon – suspect to the school administrators). After that he got an unidentified job with the government, but even when he married Arabella in the Spring of 1943 he knew he was dying of cancer. In fact, Fitz was quite probably too much a romantic to prosper at – or even take – an ordinary day-to-day job. The link between the vision of the Knights of Joyous Garde and the early “missionary work” of A.A., especially Fitz’s work in New York and Philadelphia and Baltimore and Washington, our Middle Atlantic region, deserves attention quite apart from our “exemplary” study – and, as part of this, we need more understanding of what Fitz was “really like” or what made him “tick” Here we’ve made at least a beginning. But here as elsewhere, the beginning is very late. Fitz’s sister Agnes, whose loan of \$1000.00 made possible the publication of the first edition of the “Big Book,” lived until 1991, and was never, apparently, asked any questions about her brother or A.A.

The eighth historical question (also verging on the historiographical) is about studying the “non-founders” who were part of the early generation: do we have the materials for it? or can they be developed? In part, this question is artificially separate from the previous two. In Eastern Pennsylvania, for example, J. P. (Johnny) L. (1903-1983), who got sober in Philadelphia through Dr. Saul in 1938, is a first-generation non-founder rather than a next-generation Philadelphia founder – like Charlie B., Bayard B. (1898-1961), Ed P., or Mac H. (1896-1975) – or a first-generation founder like Jimmy B. or Fitz M. or (evidently) Bill W., who also count as “Philadelphia founders.” Research indicates Johnny L. was a kind of “re-founder” of Philadelphia A.A. after World War II – Fitz was dead, Jimmy B. in California, Charlie B. apparently back in New York, Bayard on Martha’s Vineyard, Ed P. has disappeared from the record, and Mac was first in Western Pennsylvania, and then California. Johnny L. wound up in Albuquerque, and was active in A.A. till his death.

We have been able to trace something of Bayard B.’s life, both before and after A.A., a little of Charlie B.’s before, and quite a bit of Mac H.’s. Bayard, originally as a summer resident, then as a year-round resident, is considered the founder of A.A. on Martha’s Vineyard. He died in 1961, and his son Williamson B. in the 1990s, leaving as his heir a cousin on his mother’s side (Bayard’s first wife, from whom he was divorced by the time he was a year-round resident on the Vineyard): the heir has not yet been a source of information. There are brief passages on Bayard in an anonymous pamphlet history of A.A. on the Vineyard published a few years ago, but no family knowledge to tap into, and no local (Vineyard) knowledge to be found through the Historical Society there. Mac was a novelist who published half a dozen books before 1934 and half a dozen after 1949 – none in between – the first of the second half-dozen reveals some knowledge of A.A. and a couple more of the second bunch make the point that

alcoholism is a disease, but they are not "A.A." novels. He also wrote weekly columns on local Western Pennsylvania history that ought to be collected and reprinted. I've been in touch with his niece and nephew in Pennsylvania: they have promised to put me in touch with his daughter in California. His son was shot down over Chichi Jima in 1945, which (through news stories about a young Louisiana boy who dreamt of Chichi Jima) provided a clue to the present whereabouts of the family. More on that, and the results of the search for the other "Philadelphia founders" later.

In this "missionary period" context, I suggest the advisability of looking (for comparative purposes) at a grouping – one might say a "class" – of early members, specifically those who were already sober through other means when the first members brought A.A. to their cities. These include J. P. (Johnny)L. in Philadelphia, Henry (Mike) E. in Detroit, and John R. in Baltimore. Johnny L., as noted, got sober under the treatment of Dr. Dudley Saul in 1938, before A.A. came to Philadelphia through Jimmy B. and Fitz M. in 1940. Mike E. got sober in Detroit, possibly through the Salvation Army, before A.A. came to Detroit through Arch T. Jim R. of Baltimore got sober through the Keswick Colony before A.A. came to Baltimore through Fitz M. and Jimmy B. Johnny L.(1903-1983) was sober in Philadelphia long after Jimmy B. left in 1946, and Mike E. (1892-1979) was sober in Detroit even longer after Arch T. died in 1956. But Jim R. died in 1946, and there was no "long-time number 2" in Baltimore as there was in Philadelphia or Detroit, to take over when the "number 1" – the local "founder" – died or moved. It has not yet been determined whether the absence of a comparable long-time "A.A. number 2" in Baltimore was important in any way.

The ninth historical question is, Was it important or even necessary that the founding of A.A. take place outside New York City? And, by the way, was it important that New York City and Northeast Ohio were two areas of maximum Rockefeller influence? These two questions are in some senses opposed to each other. If there is an importance to the Rockefeller connection, then New York and Akron are in some sense linked rather than fully separate sites. One can look at the importance of the Oxford Group in the founding of A.A. – the Oxford Group (founded partly out of concern for college-age drinking) had come to Akron in the earlier 1930s, at the invitation of Mr. Firestone, who was indeed concerned (among other things) about his son's drinking. The Rev. Walter Tunks, whom Bill W. called on May 11, 1935, from the Mayflower Hotel, had been Sam Shoemaker's associate in that Akron Oxford Group gathering. Does this tie in with the Rockefellers? When Rockefeller's people heard Bill W.'s presentation on A.A., one of them (Albert Scott) said, "Why, this is First-Century Christianity!" – "First-Century Christianity" being the Oxford Group's name for itself. There were Rockefeller connections and associates connected with (or at the very least strongly sensitive to) Calvary Mission and the Oxford Group.. Of course, Rockefeller funded a number of anti-alcohol endeavors as well as research on alcohol and alcoholism. He convened the February 8th (1940) dinner to enable people from A.A. to meet his associates. The "Akron founding" of A.A. seems to have made little difference here, as the list of those invited suggests. (It included Dr. Bob, Clarence S., and a group from New York, including Horace C., Bert T., Morgan R., William R. – but of course they were listed by full name with no printed indication they were connected with A.A., and even when the Rockefeller list was annotated by hand, it was not only alcoholics who were given an

“A.A.” notation. At least one such notation went to a friendly clergyman, another to the Superintendent of Rockland State Hospital.)

In fact, even though Bill W. is listed in Akron records (in the Dr. Bob Archive at Brown) as Akron A.A. Number One, he was, of course “a rum-hound from New York” and the “founding” in Akron (and continuation and expansion in Cleveland) are important pretty much because he went back to New York. That enabled A.A. in Akron and Cleveland to grow “indigenously” and the outside interest in A.A. “from above” (so to speak) to be concentrated in New York, where the “promoter” Bill was centered. Most of the alcoholic Trustees came from New York (Dr. Bob was included because he couldn’t not be, but for quite a long time most of the Trustees of any kind were within striking distance of New York.) Those, like Dick B., who claim that Akron A.A. was closer to the original vision than A.A. in New York may be seeing a natural effect of the fact that New York became, so to speak, the corporate headquarters.

The tenth historical question is, What is the relation of religion and medicine to early A.A. and to each other in early A.A.? Here we have a number of significant – even “exemplary” – figures. One is J. P. (Johnny) L., another Lieutenant Yvelin G., the “founder” of A.A. in the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania. Johnny L. was a Presbyterian, out of Princeton, and was involved in establishing the Presbyterian Church’s program for alcoholism (in laity and clergy), as well as being Treasurer of the Saul Clinic in Philadelphia for many years. Yvelin G. was an Episcopalian who became a perpetual Deacon (in his home town of Garden City, Long Island), as well as being the long-term number two in the National Council on Alcoholism, the chief institutional proponent of the Disease Concept of Alcoholism. Yvelin G. was Marty M.’s spiritual director, so to speak, for the N.C.A. Both Johnny L. and Yvelin (“Yev”) G. were involved in the North Conway Institute, founded in 1951 by the controversial Rev. David A. Works, Episcopal minister in North Conway, New Hampshire, from 1948 to 1960, The NCI moved to Boston in 1962, and its papers were deposited with the Episcopal Church Archives in Austin, Texas, in 1997. It led into The Ecumenical Council on Alcohol Problems (TECAP), involving not only the Protestant churches but the Rev. John C. Ford, S. J., the editor of the *Blue Books*. The NCI Archives include a number of papers and drafts (and letters) from Yev G. and Johnny L. (I have not yet searched the lists of the John Ford Archives.)

The important point here is that a Episcopal minister (Yev G.) was a principal advocate of the Disease Concept of Alcoholism, working as Marty M.’s deputy in the N.C.A., and a leading Presbyterian layman (Johnny L.), head of the Church’s ministerium for social work, was the organizing officer of the Saul Clinic (and in fact got sober with Dr. Saul before A.A. came to town). There is no warfare here of science with religion. Besides Dr. Saul and Dr. A. Wiese Hammer in Philadelphia, there were doctors early on at least for the groups in Harrisburg and in the Lehigh Valley. It is sometimes overlooked that Sister Ignatia in Akron (herself a religious working in a hospital) had an earlier medical associate, a Roman Catholic, Dr. Thomas Scuderi, before she teamed up with Dr. Bob. The “Michiana” books and a recent article on the formation of A.A. groups in Indianapolis – and rereading of Mitch K.’s *How It Worked: The Story of Clarence H. Snyder and the Early Days of Alcoholics Anonymous in Cleveland, Ohio* (Washingtonville NY 1999) – suggest that the overwhelming presence of Dr. Bob in Midwestern A.A. up to his death in 1950 reduced the general role of the medical

profession there. At the same time, though Dr. Bob was received into the Episcopal Church and attended St. Paul's Akron during the pastorate of the Rev. Walter Tunks (which lasted 1931-1956), it was in the East that the churches were more active, even when the activity was designed to be on a national scale. All this suggests at least the importance of the tenth historical question and the significance of A.A.s from our exemplary area – at least Yev G. and Johnny L. – to the answer.

The eleventh historical question is, what is the relation of religion and medicine to later A.A. and to each other in later A.A.? There are in these days non-alcoholic (Class A) Trustees' positions more or less reserved one for a clerical Trustee (currently the Dean of the General Theological Seminary) and one for a medical Trustee (currently an Addictions Medicine expert from the State of Maine). The rise of the American Society of Addiction Medicine from the Alcoholism section of the New York Medical Society (founded by Dr. Ruth Fox 1894-1989) and the gradual growth of "rehab" modeled on Hazelden and then on Chit Chat Farms (now Caron Foundation, based on Hazelden) have tended to increase the concentration on treatment of alcoholism as an illness of the body and mind. High Watch Farm in Kent, Connecticut, the first of the "spiritual" drunk farms, still exists, but even High Watch is not sticking to the original High Watch model, and I have been unable to find another that is. There were "religious" and "gospel" conversions away from drunken life in the days before A.A., and "spiritual" and "religious" conversions now (as, apparently, that of George Walker Bush), but these are not part of A.A. history and provide no answer to this eleventh question – except that some investigators have found a decreasing importance to A.A.'s relationship to the churches. The strength of that relationship seems to have declined and religion and science (or "spirituality" and medicine) seem likewise to be decreasingly connected.

The twelfth historical question is, Was there a kind of "sea-change" in A.A. from 1955 to 1975/80? or from 1975/80 to the present (2005)? The second part of this fifty year period from 1955 to 2005 is probably too close to us for an answer, but there is sufficient evidence of a sea-change from 1955 to 1980 to lead us to ask what (if anything) happened around 1954 to lead to the change. And there seems to be an answer – and, at that, one centered in Eastern Pennsylvania. (Of course, the changes noted in discussing the tenth and eleventh questions may well play a part here.) We may quote from a local (but "no full names") history of A.A. in Reading, Pennsylvania: "In about March of 1953 Dick C., along with Bob P. and subsequently Freddie B., entered the area from the Midwest with Hazelden "influence" i.e., the stressing of the Steps and daily programs they learned at the rehabilitation center. Up to this time, meetings at Reading generally consisted of 'life story' type meetings – i.e., how much and where I drank, how I got into A.A., and how I am maintaining my sobriety (by 12th-stepping and attending meetings)." On the other hand, Dick and the other so-called mid-westerners "believed strongly in discussing the Twelve Steps at meetings and using the squad system from the home group. The squad system is to divide an A.A. group into smaller groups for better discussion of the 12 Steps.... the squad system ... appeared to be the straw that broke the camel's back. The original 6th Street members objected to these new ideas... During 1957-58, in order to bridge the gap caused by the split between the 6th Street members and the 'midwest' group members, A.A. meetings were exchanged once a month between 6th Street and Franklin Street."

This did not last, and in the Reading area, the mid-westerners emerged victorious. Dick C. had already become Delegate from Eastern Pennsylvania in 1955-56, and although his two immediate successors were Horace H. (from Williamsport) and Eddie H. (from suburban Philadelphia), who had already been active in the A.A. service structure before Dick C. came on the scene, every subsequent Delegate until Dick's death in the early mid-1970s, and most of those thereafter, were in his mold and his tradition, or (it has been said by some) were picked by him. (The first two Delegates from Eastern Pennsylvania were apparently picked by Bill W. on the recommendations of Johnny L. and Yvelin G.)

On this matter of these newcomers of the 1950s, I have had placed in my hands the key (at least on this local level of Eastern Pennsylvania) to what must be considered a momentous change in the structure of Alcoholics Anonymous. This is a run of a little over four months (August 20-December 31, 1954) of a weekly mimeographed news-sheet (running to several pages each week) circulated by Dick C. of Reading to his "A. A. friends," mostly (apparently) in Eastern Pennsylvania, though some were in or from places he had lived before coming to Reading. The very first details the "General Service Representative Plan" adopted by the 1954 General Service Conference, and urges Dick's readers "Please – have an election – Write the Foundation with the name, address, and phone number of your General Service Representative – DO IT NOW!"

The weekly issues include notes of places and people visited or visiting (first names and last initials only), names of correspondents (same form), a pep talk for Hazelden, where Dick C. had recently gotten sober, occasional verses, one liners, ads of the Reading 10th Anniversary Banquet, a second plea (October 29) for the election of a General Service Representative for each group, noting "Elect your Representative for Sunday, November 21st, at Reading PA" for the selection of the next Area Delegate to succeed Aaron B. There are forty-one groups listed, or rather, forty-one cities and towns where there are groups. The December 3, 1954, issue gives the results of the election at the special meeting at Reading on November 21, 1954, and we are not surprised to find that the newly-elected Delegate is Dick C. This represents a major change in the nature of the Delegate, from being someone appointed or at least chosen (for all practical purposes) by Bill W.– as (I believe) Aaron Burr B. was chosen on Yvelin G's recommendation for 1953-54 – to being someone elected after what amounted to an election campaign. Whether that was true in other areas at the time, it is at least arguable that this was the model, the forerunner, the archetype of present A.A. structure. In any case, it may be there is an instructive contrast between Fitz M. and the Company of Joyous Garde, on the one hand, and Dick C.'s Minnesota Model study groups and folksy politicking by mimeograph, on the other. It ties in with our need for establishing a formal approach to studying A.A. history. There is nothing wrong with this change from the Knights of the Table Round to Counselors and Study Groups, though it takes away the romance and we may not like it. Alcoholics Anonymous, like any social system based on charismatic revelation, must of necessity be subject to what Max Weber called the routinization of the charisma, and that seems to be what we have here. From the charismatic Fitz M., romantic, southern friend, southern gentleman, Knight of Joyous Garde, to the well-organized Dick C., with his Hazelden sobriety, Minnesota Model, rehab and halfway house (but still a true believer in the Twelve Steps) seems a long time and a far cry. In the chronology in A.A. nationally, it is only the time from Akron (1935)

to A.A. *Comes of Age* (1958) – or (a slightly different same-length period) from the “Big Book”(1939) to the *Twelve Concepts* (1962). Maybe it was a bit sudden for a “sea-change” – but the degree of the change is not in doubt, and the more research is done (at least at this end), the greater seems the change. (One friend has suggested this “sea-change” should be seen in the context of “the warfare of science with theology” and that the Templeton Foundation should be sponsoring research on A.A.)

The first historiographical question is whether there is really a need to know A.A. history or advantage to knowing it, and if so, why? The most commonly heard argument for studying A.A. history is Santayana’s “Those who will not study history are doomed to repeat it.” Whether there are in fact practical lessons in the history of A.A. might be determined by analyzing the spread of A.A. and the concomitant changes in A.A. more or less in that twenty-three period from the publication of the first of Bill W.’s major works, the “Big Book” (*Alcoholics Anonymous*, 1939), to the publication of the last of his major works, *The Twelve Concepts* (1962). This period encompasses the times for the first eleven of our Twelve Problems of A.A. History, and the very beginning of the Twelfth.

It is my belief that progress on this set of questions may take place in four areas – which progress, by the way, should serve to provide some answers to the historiographical questions. (The second part of the Twelfth Question is asked only to show we are as yet too close to answer it.) First, it may take place in establishing a formal approach for analyzing the historical data we have – technical analysis of change and development (in a social-systems context), periodization, comparative local studies, and so on. Second, it may take place in looking at the generation of the founders, the “Giants in the Earth,” the legendary old timers of the Golden Time before (and perhaps right after) the “Big Book,” who carried the message of A.A. in the time from the late 1930s till the late 1940s (if they lived that long). This has been called, perhaps sarcastically, perhaps not, The Age of the Apostles. Third (and much neglected), it may take place in considering the next generation, who may or may not have gotten sober before the “Big Book” (some did, some didn’t), but who likewise carried the message more than fifty years ago. (Because this area of study is more locally-oriented than those already noted, it will get us into comparative local studies.) This would be the “Post-Apostolic Age.” Fourth, it may take place in looking at the “newcomers” (in the 1950s/early 1960s context), who, it may be argued, began the re-creation of A.A., possibly along lines inherent in Bill W.’s vision, probably not in congruence with the differently-aimed vision of Dr. Bob S. And our twelfth historical question suggests it may not have been along Bill’s projected lines either. [*To be continued*]

OLLA PODRIDA

[1] Billy Phelps and ODAAT and [2] Drink and Irish-Americans

Two brief items here: First is a note on William Lyon Phelps (1865-1943), “America’s Professor” and a Baptist minister, famous by the 1920s for his use of the phrase “One Day at a Time” (or at least the phrase was famous for his use of it). Second is a note on

the entry on Irish-Americans and Drugs and Alcohol in the forthcoming *Alcohol and Drugs in North America: Historical Encyclopedia*, presented for comment and suggestion.

[1] From William Lyon Phelps, *Autobiography* (OUP 1939), p. 152: "In my Sophomore year [1884-1885], after I had definitely given up the idea of becoming a lawyer, I wasted a good deal of time wondering what I should do, and one day I asked an older man for his advice. 'You have nearly three years before you graduate; you should not give the matter a thought; you cannot make any decision until the emergency comes; haven't you got a lesson for tomorrow? Sit down and study it.' This was the first I heard of the advice, 'Live one day at a time.' It seemed to me sound, and I followed it." The phrase "one day at a time" was not in the advice, but is clearly Billy Phelps's own redaction of the advice – suggesting that it was advice he had internalized. Indeed, "One Day at a Time" was used as a title for one of his daily columns in the 1920s, and the phrase appears in a number of them and in several of his books. Since Billy Phelps was adviser to the fraternity at Yale to which Charlie B. of Philadelphia and Godfrey H. of NYC belonged (both Class of 1919), one wonders when and by whom the phrase was brought into A.A.

[2] A preliminary paragraph outline and suggestions for the *ADNAHE* entry on Irish-Americans and Drugs and Alcohol are given here. We will begin with a famous comparison of "Alcohol-Use-Related Problems in Puerto Rican and Irish-American Males," go on to an earlier study by the same author, "A Comparison of Drinking-Related Beliefs of Problem and Non-Problem Drinking Irish-Americans," and from there to a study of "Irish Drinking and American Stereotype" (*A Hair of the Dog*), more or less firmly establishing that Irish-Americans drink more than the Irish in Ireland, or (mostly) other Americans, and more to get drunk – and the reasons seem to lie in Irish assimilation to (and under) American cultural circumstances.

A Hair of the Dog studies an apparent discrepancy between an extremely high rate of alcoholism among Irish-Americans from the mid-19th century through the early 20th century and a more moderate, if not low, rate for the Irish in Ireland during the same period. It tries to put Irish drinking patterns and temperance movements within the larger context of a historically changing Irish culture and social structure. Subsequently, the situation of the Irish-American as immigrant, his exposure to American society and culture, and his neighborhood settlement patterns are examined as leads in understanding Irish-American drinking. Finally, the study includes description and interpretation of facts concerning drink and temperance among the Irish in modern Ireland and America. It takes sharp issue with Daniel P. Moynihan's assertion in *Beyond the Melting Pot* that there is an "Irish Tendency to alcohol addiction." Instead, it builds on a 1944 study by R.F. Bales of Harvard which contrasted low alcoholism rates in Ireland with high rates among Irish-Americans. The author suggests two explanations: in Ireland, a "bachelor group ethic" (arising from relatively few and late marriages, religiously imposed chastity, and cultural segregation of the sexes); in the U.S.A., more severe disruption of social solidarity among Irish-Americans than among other immigrant groups, with consequent intensification of the bachelor group ethic. [Note that this would also in part explain the greater alcoholism among the Irish in England than among the Irish in Ireland.]

One set of suggestions has been made by the Left activist Tom Hayden. Though his great-grandparents had emigrated from Ireland to the United States in the 1850s,

Hayden's parents (he argues) erased his Irish heritage in a quest for respectability. In his book he explores the losses wrought by such conformism. Assimilation, he argues, has led to high rates of schizophrenia, depression, alcoholism and domestic violence within the Irish community. Today's Irish-Americans, Hayden contends, need to re-inhabit their history, to recognize that assimilation need not entail submission. By recognizing their links to others now experiencing the prejudice once directed at their ancestors, they can develop a sense of themselves that is both specific and inclusive: 'The survival of a distinct Irish soul is proof enough that Anglo culture will never fully satisfy our needs. We have a unique role in reshaping American society to empathize with the world's poor, for their story is the genuine story of the Irish.'

With this for background we go on to look at (1) Father Theobald Mathew (1790-1856), who came to the United States to preach temperance to Catholic Irishmen in 1849-51, right after the Great Potato-Famine Immigration, then at (2) The Pioneer Total Abstinence Association of the Sacred Heart (or PTAA), an Irish organization for Roman Catholic teetotallers, whose members are commonly called Pioneers, founded in 1898 by James Cullen S.J. in response to widespread alcoholism among Irish Catholics as the earlier temperance movement of Father Mathew was fading from memory. (While the PTAA does not advocate Prohibition, it does require complete abstinence from alcoholic drink from its members. It also encourages devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus as an aid to resisting the temptation of alcohol.) We look (3) at the Venerable Matt Talbot (2 May 1856 – 7 June 1925), the modern Irish ascetic who is revered by many Catholics for his piety, charity and mortification of the flesh, and who has become the icon of the PTAA – and a considerable figure in non-Irish-American recovery from Alcoholism in the United States, through Matt Talbot retreats and recovery houses, and through such advocates as Father Ralph Pfau and his Golden Books, published through the Society for Matt Talbot. Finally (4), we examine a modern “participant-observer” self-study (that is, memoir) of an Irish-American in the drug culture of Manhattan in the 1960s and 1970s, the late Jim Carroll's *Basketball Diaries*.

WASHINGTONIAN NOTES & QUERIES No. 25:

Gradually we are finding out a (very) little more about John Adler, one of the 1841 Incorporators of the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore. In the 1860 Census for California, we find John Adler Sr (name clearly Adler but indexed online as Alter), age 68 (could be 61 or 60), employment “Fruit Garden,” birthplace Maryland, home in 1860 Township 4, Tuolumne, California, Post Office Big Oak Flat. We have elsewhere noted that there was a passport issued Jan 15 1849 sent to Joseph B Williams Baltimore for John Adler, 5'6” medium forehead, brown eyes, sharp nose, medium mouth, round chin, brown hair, ruddy complexion, round[?] face, age 45[?] or 48[?] – indexed as 45. By the way, the beginnings of vineyards in Tuolumne County and indeed in California are traced to 1863 and Count Agoston Haraszthy, though the Vallejo family vineyards are earlier: nonetheless, John Adler's fruit garden was presumably not viticulture. (One train of thought was suggested by the presence of a John Adler, brewer, in Meadow Lake in Nevada County in 1866, since in California, historically, hops will grow where grapevines grow – but Meadow Lake is nearly 200 miles from Oak Flats, and though the familiarity

of the name “Adler” [as against “Atler”] in California at that time is likewise suggestive, as is the fact that 1863-68 were boom years in Meadow Lake, one can scarcely build anything on so sandy a foundation.)

In an earlier issue of this newsletter we noted that the Marriage records of Baltimore County 1823-1826 show John G Atler, married to Caroline Hoover, Aug 29 1825. Also, we find in the BALTIMORE COUNTY COURT (Chancery Papers) Dates: 1834/06/17 C408: Michael Warner and Michael Warner, Jr. vs. John Atler and Rebecca Hoover. Mortgage foreclosure on lot on Columbia and Emory Sts., and in the BALTIMORE COUNTY COURT (Chancery Papers) Dates: 1835/03/05 C547: Joshua Dryden vs. John Atler. Ratification of sale of lot on Columbia St. This is presumably the John Atler who had married Caroline Hoover. Evidently he left Baltimore for California early in 1849. The handwriting is difficult, but the best guess is he was born in 1800 or thereabouts. The Tuolumne Historical Society has not been able to find him in their records, particularly not in the 1856 Directory, which suggests he may have come to Big Oak Flat between 1856 and 1860. No record of his death has yet come to light.

There is a John Alter bricklayer in *Matchett's Baltimore Directory 1827* on Columbia West of Sharp -- whether this is a misprint for Atler I cannot tell.