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THE PERSISTENCE OF SENTIMENT: CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN LITERATURE AND THE CULTURE OF 12-STEP RECOVERY

The 12-Step recovery movement that began with the founding of Alcoholics Anonymous in 1935 is rarely linked to literary culture, save by critics looking to explain (or deplore) the recent turn towards confessional memoirs and the fiction of “dysfunction.” “The Persistence of Sentiment” seeks to change this. I argue that recovery philosophy has migrated out of the church basements where AA began and into the cultural and literary mainstream. There it provides for the late 20th century what James Machor has called a “historical hermeneutic:” an “area where the reading codes, ideological assumptions…and textual construction of an audience intersect.” “The Persistence of Sentiment” explores the ideas that animate this hermeneutic, as well as the texts, readers, and literary institutions through which it is constituted.

Familiar images of AA emphasize its oral, participatory culture: a world of meetings characterized by personal testimony and the now-ubiquitous “thanks for sharing.” But a rich and thriving recovery book culture exists as well. AA developed a literature immediately after its founding, and today privately publishes seven books and fifty-odd pamphlets for its over 2 million members; profit from publishing in 2000 was over 5 million dollars. During the 1980s and ‘90s, both small specialty presses and recovery imprints at major houses scrambled to capitalize on the popularity of the 12 Steps. Traditional bookstores sold thousands of addiction and “co-dependency” titles, as did direct mail vendors, treatment centers, and “sobriety boutiques.” When the market became saturated, hybrid “spiritual wellness” texts replaced books that hewed narrowly to the 12 Steps. Mixing recovery philosophy with insights drawn from Eastern religion, New Thought, and increasingly, discourses of ethnic pride, these titles continue to be publishing staples. The 12-Step influence has extended to fiction as well, helping to make marketable once taboo stories about addiction, incest, and domestic violence, and infusing stories about less traumatic events with recovery themes of acceptance, forgiveness, and gratitude.
While the recovery movement is a product of contemporary consumer society, AA proper drew its inspiration from the Washingtonian Temperance Association (founded 1840), a fraternal organization devoted to non-judgmental sympathy for the suffering drunkard. These sentimental roots have proved telling. I argue that, like its Victorian predecessor, the recovery movement gives pride of place to what Joanne Dobson has called “the self-in-relation”—the emotional connectedness that links humans to one another and, ultimately, to the Divine. The literature that has precipitated out of the recovery movement cultivates identification and humility, personal powerlessness and a mystical sense of the unbounded self. Like its 19th-century forebears, it deploys rhetoric, poetics, and narrative to emphasize – indeed, to cultivate – the deep affective bonds that join all humans, regardless of surface social distinctions. In this way, recovery sentimentalism frames a powerful (though not recognizably political) critique of the individualism, autonomy, and differentiation valued by Romanticism and its 20th-century inheritors—modernism, existentialism, and psychoanalysis, to name just a few.

Over the last thirty years, two powerful intellectual/aesthetic rubrics have come to dominate criticism of contemporary fiction: on the one hand, a culturalist conception of narrative bound up with identity politics, and on the other a new formalist aesthetic devoted to bricolage, quotation, and self-reflexive signification. The critical force of these two schools and their partisans has obscured the book culture I describe above—a vast body of texts and readers interested in clear prose, coherent subjectivity, and emotional and moral suasion. I argue that these books and their readers demonstrate “the persistence of sentiment” – the belief that reading, because of its unique ability to provoke affective response, can play a crucial role in healing not only troubled individuals, but an entire fallen world. With its heartfelt investments in emotional connection and universal human nature, this contemporary sentimentalism complicates both a postmodern aesthetic of surfaces and an identitarian commitment to cultural difference. As such, it suggests the need to rethink the major critical categories currently claiming to define American literature. I request a 12-month NEH fellowship to complete “The Persistence of Sentiment,” which explores a literary mode largely ignored by the academy, despite (or perhaps because of) its popularity among educated non-professional readers.

As an interdisciplinary literary history, “The Persistence of Sentiment” reads texts, but also explores the infrastructure – institutional and conceptual – that makes the production and consumption of those texts possible. Accordingly, I draw on archives and interviews as well as publications, and use media theory and business history along with close literary analysis. In addition to new insights into contemporary fiction, the book will offer empirical contributions to both the cultural history of the recovery movement and the 20th-century history of the book, revealing their mutual interdependence.

Chapter 1 describes “THE DISEASE CONCEPT AND THE SENTIMENTAL CURE” made popular by AA, both of which were turns away from psychoanalysis and back to Victorian notions of self and community. AA’s founders conceived of alcoholism as a disease of “self-will run riot” – a disease that could be arrested, but never cured, by immersion in a community of equals brought together voluntarily by mutual need and mutual love. For about 25 years, AA maintained this strictly voluntaristic orientation. During the 1960s and ‘70s, however, its philosophy was institutionalized in professionally run treatment centers that, despite billion-dollar budgets, proved relatively ineffective at preventing or breaking addictions. Simultaneously, hundreds of AA-imitators flowered, resulting in 12-Step programs for “diseases” that ranged, in the eyes of outside observers, from the vague (“Emotions Anonymous,” “Relationships Anonymous”) to the silly (“Messies Anonymous,” “Tight Shoes Anonymous”). In the 1980s, poor clinical outcomes and the suspiciously elastic nature of the disease concept led lawmakers and medical professionals to discredit 12-Step philosophy and promote a neoliberal approach to addiction rooted in criminal prosecution and moral interdiction. However, by the time that “Just Say No” and “the War on Drugs”
had become official policies, both the disease model and the sentimental cure had diffused beyond public health institutions and into the mainstream of American popular culture.

Backtracking to the middle of the century, Chapters 2 and 3 detail AA’s growth and its use of print to consolidate and disseminate its sentimental ideology. “READING THE LANGUAGE OF THE HEART” explores the development of devotional reading practices within early AA, and culminates with the creation of ALCOHOLICS ANONYMOUS, commonly known as “the Big Book.” The Big Book’s personal narratives establish identification—the sympathetic recognition of oneself in another’s story—as the key to both personal sobriety and group harmony, and posit a universal alcoholic self with which all readers can identify. In addition, the Book’s publishing history reveals a deep-seated belief that the modern commercial marketplace threatens the AA community, which must hold itself apart from it if it is to remain healthy. “AUTHORITY AND GENDER IN THE SENTIMENTAL WORLD” examines the conflicts that arose as AA diversified and entered the self-help mainstream. I look first at amateur books and pamphlets published by Midwestern AA groups during the 1940s-60s. By and for men, they depict a utopian community at once solidly masculine and profoundly emotional, characterized by fraternal love and humble service, and starkly opposing the workaday realms of business and sexuality. The pamphleteers’ ideals of the recovering self contrast sharply with the ones elaborated by the professional authors that began to dominate the recovery market during the 1970s. Focusing on works published by the Hazelden treatment facility in Minnesota, I argue that new writings by and for women, gay and lesbian, and non-white addicts revealed that a very specific subjectivity—middle-class, white, Christian, and male—lay back of the “universal” alcoholic self on which the sentimental community had been premised. Popular feminism and identity politics, aided by new sites of literary production, generated a massive literature that, ironically, fractured the 12-Step community even as it helped bring recovery into the mainstream.

In chapters 4 and 5 I leave behind the institutions of the recovery movement proper and look at its contemporary fictive manifestations. Well-known for using her talk show to disseminate recovery ideas, in the mid-1990s Oprah Winfrey turned recovery—a historically apolitical discourse—to the service of social justice issues. “THE SPECTACLE OF SYMPATHY AND THE NEW DOMESTIC FICTION” examines the ways that episodes of Oprah’s Book Club (1996-2002) dramatized racial and gender conflicts precisely so that Club members could enact their sentimental resolution. Looking particularly at the Club’s discussions of Ursula Hegi’s STONES FROM THE RIVER, Toni Morrison’s SONG OF SOLOMON and THE BLUEST EYE and Barbara Kingsolver’s THE POISONWOOD BIBLE, I argue that Winfrey urged women to share their tears across races as a means of dissolving the worldly social boundaries that separate the contemporary self from its others. The final chapter examines what David Foster Wallace has called “THE ESCHATOLOGY OF EMOTIONAL APPEALS,” or the poetics of recovery sentimentiality as it appears in the works of three self-consciously literary postmodern writers, Wallace, Raymond Carver, and Chuck Palahniuk. Their works explicitly evoke the masculine culture of early AA, finding in it a realm beyond irony where genuine meanings can be made. Palahniuk’s and Wallace’s glibness ultimately reinserts them within the slick consumer culture they critique, but I argue that their sustained interrogations of AA suggest a desire to use the utopian aspects of recovery sentimentiality to generate critical friction within the existential and political complexities of postmodernity.

Receiving a year-long National Endowment for the Humanities grant will allow me time to integrate and polish the manuscript, which is particularly important to me. My interest in the material began when I left the confines of graduate school and began talking about contemporary literature with my students, the staff at my university, my family, neighbors, and non-academic friends. Listening to the ways that non-professional readers talk about books sparked this project, and I hope it will be read by the people whose habits it
purports to describe. My hope is that it will be marked not only by careful research and a strong argument, but also a dynamic narrative, clear prose, and a coherent voice—the niceties of style whose absence so often segregates academics from regular readers.

**Primary Sources**

- Alcoholics Anonymous Archives, AA World Services Office, NY, NY
- Chicago Area Intergroup Office, Chicago, IL--AA correspondence, editorial files, readership surveys, book and pamphlet literature
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- And, in addition to those authors mentioned in the text, writings by Dorothy Allison, Richard Ford, Jonathan Franzen, James Frey, Mary Kerr, Richard Lewis, Rick Moody, Annie Proulx, Alice Sebold, Jerry Stahl, Jane Smiley, Alice Walker, and Elizabeth Wurtzel.

**Selected Bibliography: Cultural Histories of Addiction and Treatment**


**Selected Bibliography: Publishing and Reading History**


**Selected Bibliography: History and Theory of Sentimentality**


We are looking at the etiology and epidemiology of youth alcohol use and abuse (and dependence) and the prevention of youth alcohol use or abuse (and dependence). By etiology we mean, generally, the cause(s) or origin(s) of a disease or disorder as determined by medical diagnosis. By epidemiology we mean, generally, the study of patterns of disease – who has it, how much, and why. The key point, obviously, is that somewhere here we have something to be considered in some sense a disease (or at least disorder), either literally or metaphorically. But, passing beyond that point (for the moment), we simply ask, Why do young people drink? Why does their drinking occur in the patterns we see? These are, of course, subsidiary inquiries to a more general set of questions: specifically, Why do human beings drink? Why does their drinking occur in the patterns we observe? And the first of these has an antecedent question we should look at: Why do animals seek intoxication? Why (in the words of Siegel in his Intoxication: Life in Pursuit of Artificial Paradise 1989), do “many creatures [besides man] follow paths to natural or artificial sources of intoxicants [with] alcohol found in fermented fruit, grain, or sap [having] almost universal appeal …for food, for fun, for medicine” (p. 15)? One of the most interesting passages in Dr. Siegel’s book (pp. 212-3) deals with dizziness. “Dizziness is not only an ancient and adult form of intoxication; it is one of the first to be discovered by children. It is common to find three- and four-year-olds whirling and twirling themselves into delirious stupors. Many children have discovered that a good way to induce dizziness is to wind up a swing and let it unwind while they are sitting on it…. Many amusement park rides are designed to induce other thrilling experience through dizziness…. Many intoxicants also whirl people around; at least that is the sensation users report happening.” In fact, Siegel calls the drive to intoxication (beginning possibly with the desire for dizziness) the fourth drive – hunger, thirst, and sex being the first three. He also notes (p. 15) that for animals in the wild the availability of alcohol is regulated by seasonal fermentations or other acts of nature. Because humans are animals, this gives us one lead on the question why humans seek intoxication through drinking alcoholic or fermented malt beverages, and of course it suggests that intoxication in one form or another is the original and primary goal of drinking.
Brain Growth and Maturation: Adolescent Differences

Now let us look at Dowling’s recent book (*The Great Brain Debate*). The brain, he remarks, “continues to mature until the ages of 18-20” (p. 3), and maturation “occurs in a roughly tail-to-hind gradient … the last known brain structure to mature is the cerebral cortex, the seat of higher mental functions, including perception, memory, judgment, and reasoning … the so-called higher-order association areas of the brain, concerned with planning, intentionality, and other aspects of one’s personality – are still myelinating axons and rearranging synapses up to the age of 18 or so” (p. 13). Moreover, early high glucose-utilization in the brain (at 4-7 years) subsides to adult levels through childhood and adolescence (p. 14). One theme of brain maturation involves “restriction of axonal terminal fields and a rearrangement and refinement of synapses” (p. 34). Of course, “we continue to learn regardless of our age and this learning causes molecular and probably structural changes in our brain” (p. 50). Language is controlled mainly by late-maturing areas of the cerebral cortex – but songbird studies suggest that circuitry modifications made in young birds and not used for some time can be reactivated in adults, and studies of multiple language acquisition (or second language acquisition) by children as against adults (or even those over 12) indicate that mimetic abilities decline as “language skills” improve – but use of second or multiple languages can be restored in adulthood (as can skills in swinging a golf club or riding a bicycle). Dowling suggests (p. 77) that neuronal changes are additive, and “perhaps both old and new synapses persist, although either might be subdued for long periods.”

Brain chemistry, glutamates, dopamine, serotonin, epinephrine/norepinephrine, adenylyl cyclase in memory, and the differences between quick and slow “brain-change” (pp. 103-04, modulation vs. structural alteration) are all part of the picture. In short – “What neurobiology is telling us – the bottom line – is that genetic directives are critical in brain-building, although the environment can also play some role, whereas environmental factors play the fundamental role during brain maturation, although there are genetic restraints” (p. 165). Very different phenotypes under specific environmental conditions can result from what might be considered insignificant genotypic differences (p. 167). (Note that the genotypic/phenotypic distinction has been a useful way of talking – but it may be replaced as work goes on along Dowling’s lines.)

We might now look in slightly more detail at the physiological – biochemical – realities that may (and, for the purposes of our research programme, do in fact) underlie our sociological, anthropological, etiological, and epidemiological hypotheses. We may look at norepinephrine, glucocorticoids, serotonin and other neurotransmitters and adolescent drinking; then at possible treatment factors – serotonin, adenylyl cyclase, and memory. The treatment of alcoholism through Alcoholics Anonymous is fundamentally based on narrative pattern (thus speech) and memory (including memory alteration): we will not rehearse here the argument made at length in *This Strange Illness*. We will however go briefly into a biochemical discussion, because further understanding here must be a goal of any scientific research programme dealing with youth alcohol use and abuse/dependence, its etiology, epidemiology, and (possible) prevention. It may be all very well to have a model based on social factors. But it would be strange to use the words etiology and epidemiology of something which is purely a social condition and limit our analysis to social factors and behaviors and interactions without looking at what may underlie them – particularly as we know that the body and brain chemistry of those under twenty-one is not the same as the body and brain chemistry of those older.

**Adolescent Chemistry**

Adolescence is a unique neuro-behavioral stage during which certain brain regions – including the prefrontal cortex (PFC) and other forebrain dopamine (DA) projection regions – show marked alteration. These areas have been implicated in mediating the reinforcing effects of alcohol
The absolute PFC volume of the brain declines in adolescence, substantial synapse elimination occurs (linked to developmental loss of glutaminergic excitatory input), and cholinergic innervation of the PFC likewise increases. The hippocampus produces greater amounts of norepinephrine release, as against that in older or younger individuals, accompanying the emergence of inhibitory 2 norepinephrine autoreceptors (p. 318). In short, adolescents find it harder to get the “highs” that used to come unforced, at the same time the HPG (hypothalamic-pituitary-gonadal) axis is greatly awakened, and there are other neuronal shifts in the body. We might expect that those with alcoholism in their family backgrounds (FHPs) – who therefore may have certain hereditary reactions to alcohol and a certain hereditary ability to “outdrink” their non-alcoholic friends – will as continuously as possible engage in “risky” drinking and drink-related behavior. Because it makes them feel “really good” and because the excitement of anticipation includes what they are going to do when drunk and they need to keep the excitatory effects going.

Beta-endorphin is an opioid peptide derived from pro-opiomelanocortin; the enkephalins are opioid peptides derived from the precursor pre-pro-enkephalin. Pro-opiomelanocortin and pre-pro-enkephalin A establish messenger ribonucleic acid (mRNA) levels in the brain before postmessage processing. Research suggests that a genetic predisposition toward high alcohol drinking is accompanied by increased responsiveness of both the beta-endorphin and enkephalinergic systems to alcohol. Alcohol-induced activation of the endogenous opioid system may serve to enhance the reinforcing effects of alcohol and thereby increase the probability of subsequent drinking episodes. (In other words, alcoholics of any age find alcohol more pleasurable than non-alcoholics find it.) Also, alcohol-induced activation of the opioid system may reduce aversion to high-dose effects of alcohol (in other words, as we just said, make “being drunk” a more pleasurable experience than it would otherwise be, for the alcoholic). Lower beta-endorphin-like immuno-reactivity has been reported in FHP (Family History Positive) individuals (“genetic” alcoholics) than in non-FHPs (Archives of General Psychiatry, 53, 1996, pp. 250-257). Also, there is evidence of greater increase in beta endorphins following alcohol consumption in high-risk (of alcoholism) subjects than in lower-risk subjects (Alcohol: Clinical and Experimental Research, 20, 1996, pp. 1542-1552). There is also anecdotal evidence from members of AA suggesting abnormal endorphin-processing in some alcoholics. Perhaps more important to our purposes, beta endorphin activity in teenagers differs from that in adults.

### Drunken Comportment: Adults and Adolescents in Other Cultures

Drinking in many cultures is ceremonial and in that sense religious, and those not inaugurated into its mysteries cannot be expected to take their full part in its process. Among the cultures (or mini-cultures) described early on by MacAndrew and Edgerton, three especially may be noted here: the mestizo village of Aritama in Colombia (pp. 21-26), where young men are bored by drinking sprees on which they are invited by their elders; the small atoll of Ifaluk in the Carolines (pp. 26-29), where, at a drunken farewell party given for two anthropologists in the 1950s, the elders were all very gay because “we liked each other” and very sad because “we would have to part so soon” (p. 29), while at a drunken farewell party given by the young men “reality lost all its hard contours and every man became a brother and the world a paradise” – much less sadness (p. 28); and the island Japanese fishing community of Takashima (pp. 29-33), where the whole society was governed by rigid rules of conduct (as with Aritama and Ifaluk), but the Autumn Festival and its aftermath were considered (this is around 1950) an occasion for boisterous drunkenness, when “young unmarried men (from about sixteen years of age upward) may, without censure, become thoroughly drunk” (p. 32). The expectations of young men’s behavior at the Autumn Festival, the slightly differentiated characteristics of the two farewell parties, the boredom of young men in drinking
“sprees” accompanied by adults, all suggest age-related differences in the effects of drinking – and all moreover testify to the force of tradition and (the authors argue) to drunkenness as a “set-aside” or “time out” (cf. Bakhtin on carnival).

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

As I have been writing briefly about these remote cultures, I have been thinking about the ancient Celtic cultures and their cognates, which of course are among our ancestors. Periodic ceremonial consciousness-altering drinking feasts mark all three orders of the Celtic leadership, and certain reactions to alcohol doubtless conferred advantages in those days that are no longer advantages in ours – which may help explain certain periodic alcoholisms in our days. It may be worth noting that sibyls and oracles were expected to be periodically drunk – and thus listening to the gods – but not permanently soused. We recall that druidic and bardic authority was inherited. FHPs?

Adults and Adolescents in Our Society

We might look historically at our own society. In Malcolm Rorabaugh’s study on The Alcoholic Republic (1979) there is a passage that should be widely noted (p. 14): “White males were taught to drink as children, even as babies. ‘I have frequently seen Fathers,’ wrote one traveler, ‘wake their Child of a year old from a sound sleep to drink Rum, or Brandy.’ As soon as a toddler was old enough to drink from a cup, he was coaxed to consume the sugary residue at the bottom of an adult’s nearly empty glass of spirits. Many parents intended this early exposure to alcohol to accustom their offspring to the taste of liquor, to encourage them to accept the idea of drinking small amounts, and thus to protect them from becoming drunkards. Children grew up imitating their elders’ drinking customs. Boys who played ‘militia’ expected their game to end, like their fathers’ musters, with a round of drinks…. Men encouraged this youthful drinking. Many a proud father glowed when his son became old enough to accompany him to the tavern where they could drink as equals from the same glass.” But with the movement toward and onto the frontier, generational links were largely lost, regular communal drinking was less common, and drunkenness a more pressing social problem than before.

Before going further along this line, I would like to turn toward the Russian critic Mikhail Bakhtin, on carnival as linked to the past. (Rabelais and His World, p. 101). The implication for our purposes is that carnival builds its positive strength on the consciousness of past carnival, and preferably on its continuity with past carnival. Now carnival is the time-out drinking occasion most notable in the history of our culture, lasting in its old form down perhaps to the Christmas books of Thackeray and Dickens. In an altered (and growingly attenuated) form it lasts into New Year’s Eve and St. Patrick’s Day in the culture of our present United States, and an interesting if limited form peculiar to the years 1965-1995 could be observed at concerts given by the group called The Grateful Dead. For a period of thirty years, from 1965 to 1995, followers of all ages, in a kind of traveling city of up to 100,000, would attend the eighty or so concerts given in a year by the group. No full cultural study has been done, to my knowledge, but there was a time in which I was gathering preliminary data for such a study, and I can at least provide an anecdote or two and some very
brief reflections.

One particularly interesting case comes from a Grateful Dead concert at Alpine Valley in Wisconsin in the mid-to-late 1980s. In the parking lot the night of the first concert there was a beat-up station wagon from Illinois whose teenage inhabitants most emphatically did not look like Deadheads. They took part in the communal – or “communal” – drinking and partying, and eventually confessed that they had come up to steal things out of cars while concertgoers were at the concert, being unaware that many of those there were there for the parking-lot scene and not the concert. About 2 a.m. one of them confessed this and said, “This is my last time out before I go to Joliet on a five-to-fifteen, and we were going to make a good thing of it, but now we know this isn’t the way it’s done here, so we’ve got some of our own stash and you’re welcome to party with us” – which is what happened. The key was “this isn’t the way it’s done here” – which fits in with the communal nature of the Grateful Dead culture, “leave it better than you found it,” “mellow out!” and an emphasis on learning to “party” properly. I myself have seen no culture this side of 1965 in this country where there was less break between younger and older, and the younger listened more carefully to the older – until the mid-1980s, when the Dead had a “hit” single, and there came the phenomenon of the “Touch-of-Grey heads,” who came in too rapidly to be instructed in the culture. Note that the “mature responsible adult” – the instructor – in such situations need not, by the world’s standards, be mature, or responsible, or adult.

Youth Treatment and Recovery

We turn now to looking at youth “recovery” from alcoholism or its effects. In the year 2002 I was enabled to attend a “Workshop” put on in the town where I live (Elizabethtown PA) by a local division of Alcoholics Anonymous: the three speakers were men who had been sober in AA more than half their lives, coming in at seventeen, nineteen, and nineteen on the Jersey shore, at a New England college, and in northern Westchester County New York. The topic was “getting sober in your teens – and staying sober” or words to that effect. This is, of course, “only anecdotal evidence,” but note this: the man with the longest drinking history (at nineteen), who had been on his own since his early teens, reported that his way of thinking had “just changed” at the time he came in; the other man who became sober at nineteen had to be coerced by his college to go to A.A., but after a year or so, his mind changed – he had only begun drinking seriously when he went to college at eighteen; the one who got sober at seventeen came under court sentence and had been constrained to come for at least two years, when suddenly what his (much older) sponsor and the (much older) members of his group had been telling him began to make sense (and he had begun alcoholic drinking very early). All three were FHP alcoholics.

It could, of course, be only anecdotal coincidence that the age of mind-change toward sobriety came at nineteen for the early drinkers and twenty for the later drinker. But it is exactly what we should expect, on two counts. First, nineteen or twenty is the age at which teenagers can be expected (biochemically) to stop acting so much like teenagers. Second, though what we have is at best a structured focused comparison – no statistical evidence to bear any weight – it seems reasonable that earlier drinking might be connected with earlier maturity. It is significant, I think, that the seventeen-year-old (1) was constrained to remain alcohol-free by the court for the next several years, and (2) was in the nearly constant companionship with older sober men.

We suggest that youth alcohol use represents an attempt to seek the brain excitement of earlier years (including “dizziness”) once the rearrangement and pruning of synapses is under way in adolescence. Adolescent risky behavior of all kinds is likely for excitation and comes from the fact that the last brain structure to mature is the cerebral cortex, seat of perception, memory, judgment, and reasoning, between the ages of eighteen and twenty. Fundamentally, we suggest the possibility that we will have a (Lakatosian) progressive research programme if we recognize that youthful
alcohol use/abuse (and possibly in FHP cases dependence) is for us a natural phenomenon and engines of adult treatment (mostly through memory and narrative) may not be relevant – in fact may be contraindicated. Note that we are not supporting (or attacking) any “disease concept” of alcoholism, nor are we interested in alcoholism and its treatment, or in the value of AA – except as may be relevant to our scientific research programme on youth alcohol use, abuse, and (use or abuse) prevention. Finally, it should be noted that one of the marks of a progressive scientific research programme is that everything seems to fit together without pressing – and this seems to be the case here.

WASHINGTONIAN NOTES & QUERIES
No. 6: Census Materials Additions and Revisions

The Six Original Members of 1840

William K. Mitchell
William K. Mitchell, merchant tailor, listed in the 1850 Census of Baltimore (296b 12) as William K. Mitchell, aged 49, born Maryland (see CASQ II, 1), was presumably the William K. Mitchell who married Ann Griffith July 1, 1823. He is listed in the 1830 and the 1840 Census: in the 1840 Census he has living in the household one male 10-15, two males 15-20, one male 30-40 (himself), two females 15-20, one 20-30, one 30-40 (presumably his wife).

John F. Hoss
Captain John F. Hoss was a well-known Baltimorean, a veteran of the War of 1812, born in 1792, and in 1842 Alderman of the 4th Ward. He was still living in 1870, when his War of 1812 Pension was commuted to a single lump-sum payment (CASQ II, 1). In the 1850 Census he is listed as John F. Hoss, 56, builder, wife Mary 48.

David Anderson
It was suggested before (CASQ II, 1) that David Anderson, blacksmith and farrier in the Baltimore City Directories from the 1830s to the 1850s, may be the David Anderson, aged 62, in the 1870 Census, 13th Ward. He appears in the 1840 Census, but the Census of 1850 and 1860 are more useful here. In 1850 the household contains David, Jane, children James 13, Eliza 11, Catherine 10, Margaret 9, George 7, one servant Ann Dibbs (b. Ireland), 60, and four apprentice or journeyman blacksmiths (Frank Henry, William Broderick, both born in Ireland, John Brand 18, Charles Hyatt 22, born in Maryland). In 1860 the household contains David, 57, Jane 50, James 24, Elizabeth 22, Kate 20 (milliner), Margaret 19 (dressmaker), George 17 (apprentice wagon maker). In 1870 David, Jane, Lizzie, and Kate are living at home. It is virtually certain that the suggestion in CASQ II, 1, was correct: the David Anderson in 1870 is the same David Anderson.

George Steers (or Stears)
The marriage of George Steers to Mary Lee in the Methodist Episcopal Church in Baltimore on 25 October 1841 (CASQ II, 1) must not have lasted long. In the 1850 Census Mary Stears, 43, is living with her children, David Lee 19, carpenter, three other Lee children (ages 17, 15, 13), and George Stears, 8. In Zanesville, Ohio, in the 1860 Census, we find David Lee, RR master, 29, his wife Jane 24, children Wilbur, David, and George (1), and George Stears 17, apprentice carpenter with wages.

James McCurley
To the full material in CASQ II, 1, may be added the value of the estate and property of James McCurley in the 1860 Census, $20,000 and $10,000.

Archibald Campbell
Archibald Campbell, silver plater, in Matchett’s 1829 Directory and up through Ward’s 1856-1857 Directory, is the one listed as a storekeeper in the 1850 Census, aged 50, with Julia (40), children John H., 25, clerk, James R., 23, clerk, William
18, coachmaker, Samuel, 16, clerk, Archibald jr., 14, Charles, 11, Lucy, 9, Mary, 6, with servants Elizabeth Jones, 45, and Elizabeth Satterfield, 19.

The Other Nine Incorporators of 1841

David Martin
The 1850 Census shows David Martin, stove dealer, 51, born Maryland, living with wife Catherine 51, and John Posey 31, clerk, and Margaret Posey 23. More research needed.

Daniel A. Piper
As noted in CASQ II, 1, this is almost certainly the Daniel A. Piper of Daniel A. Piper & Co., “preservers for exportation, hermetically sealed oysters, fruits, etc.” in Matchett’s Directory 1855-56 and Wood’s Directory 1856-57. To this may be added the Census data on Daniel A. Piper, Census of 1870, born Virginia, age 60, with Alice B., age 14.

Robert Neilson
The records of Baltimore marriages show Robert Neilson m. Deborah Ridgely, September 12, 1816, and Robert Neilson m. Fanny Ridgely October 7, 1822. The 1840 Census shows a Robert Neilson between 30 and 40, which is probably not the Robert Neilson who m. either Rigdely (or both Ridgelys).

John Werdebaugh
The John Werdebaugh who was buried at Greenmount Cemetery, who died October 19, 1871, aged 84 (CASQ II, 1) was presumably the John Werdebaugh, 86(sic!), born in Prussia, listed in the 1870 Census, and the John Werdebaugh, merchant, 60(sic!), listed (with a John Werdebaugh, clerk, 23) in the 1850 Census, who was also presumably the John Werdebaugh who m. Amelia Ratien in Baltimore November 13, 1817.

John Atler
A John Atler married Mary Simons in Baltimore April 4, 1800. If this is our man he was the oldest of the fifteen 1841 incorporators, and may have died before the 1850 Census.

Elijah Stansbury
It was suggested in CASQ II, 1, that this Elijah Stansbury was the future Mayor of Baltimore (1848-1850), who was born in 1791 and died in 1883. He would be the Elijah Stansbury, lime merchant, 58, living with wife Eliza, 49, in the 1850 Census, and the Elijah Stansbury, lime dealer, 68, living with his wife Eliza, 59, in the 1860 Census. Elijah Stansbury m. Eliza Eckle in Baltimore Jul 23, 1817. An earlier Elijah Stansbury m. Elizabeth Gorschuch Nov 15, 1783.

Thomas L. Murphy
Thomas L. Murphy, physician, 50, b. Maryland, appears in the 1850 Census. He may be the Thomas L. Murphy who m. Ann Caroline Harrison in Baltimore September 2, 1822. He is almost certainly the Thomas L. Murphy, physician, in Cecil County 1860, aged 60, with wife Rebecca 54, thus the Thomas L. Murphy who m. Rebecca Creswell November 8 1850, and thus the Dr. Thomas L. Murphy described in a letter in the February 5, 1876 Cecil Whig (see CASQ II, 1), as highly educated, an eloquent and vigorous public speaker, and possessed of rare conversational powers, in which were mingled wit, humor, sarcasm, imagery or poetry as circumstances indicated. He died before 1880.

John Wright
From the Census, as from the directories, it is impossible to determine which John Wright this is. It could be John W. Wright, flour merchant, 60, b. Pennsylvania, from the 1870 Census (wife Abbie C., 40, b. Maine). It could be John Wright, 71, silk hat manufacturer, from the 1860 Census (who might be the John Wright, 80, retired, from the 1870 Census). It could be John R. Wright of the 1840 Census, between the ages of 30 and 40. It could be the John R. Wright, 60, shoemaker, of the 1850 Census (4th ward), with wife Rebecca 59 and children Alfred 26, Robert T. 21, Amanda M. 19, Isabella 16, and John 11. It could be the John Wright, grocer, 60, wife Elizabeth 62, of the 1860 Census. There is also a John R. Wright, shoemaker, 57, in the 1860 Census for Allen County, Ohio (born in Maryland, living with Mary, aged 63, born in Virginia).
Francis Gallagher
If, as suggested in CASQ II, 1, this is the Francis Gallagher, cordwainer, who was an incorporator of the United Beneficial Society of Cordwainers of the City of Baltimore in 1833, then the 1840 Census for the household of Francis Gallagher may be relevant, showing one male between 40 and 50, one male between 60 and 70.

Note that both William Campbell (son of Archibald) and George Anderson (son of David) were apprenticed as coachmakers. To James McCurley?