

Our Roots:

**A Collection of Documents
Relating to the
Origins and Evolution
of
Our Fellowship**

Volume 2
The Washingtonians

Editor's Note. The material in this volume is available to all who look for it on the internet. All I have done is taken the liberty of collecting, reformatting, and compiling it into a form that is easier to store, read, etc. You should feel free to distribute this copy for others to read and/or copy.

Table of Contents

1. “The Washingtonian Movement” (Milton Maxwell).	1
2. “The Foundation, Progress and Principles of the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore, and the Influence it Has Had on the Temperance Movements in the United States” (A Member of the Society)	26
3. “The Institutional Phase of the Washingtonian Total Abstinence Movement” (Leonard Blumberg).	42
4. “The Significance of the Alcohol Prohibitionists for the Washington Temperance Societies” (Leonard Blumberg).	51
5. “The Washingtonians” (Various <i>Grapevine</i> Articles)	74

Milton A. Maxwell. "The Washingtonian Movement." *Quarterly Journal of the Study of Alcoholism*. Vol. 11, 410-452. 1950.

Introduction

Certain similarities between the Washingtonian movement of the nineteenth century and the present day fellowship of Alcoholics Anonymous have been commented upon by a number of observers. In view of this resemblance there is more than historical interest in an account of the first movement in the United States which brought about a large-scale rehabilitation of alcoholics. The phenomenal rise and spread of the Washingtonian movement throughout the land in the early 1940's was the occasion of much discussion, exciting a deep interest. The cause of its equally rapid decline have been a subject of much speculation and are still of concern to the members of Alcoholics Anonymous who may wonder whether or not their movement is destined to a similar fate. This article, therefore, will present not merely a description and history of the movement but also an analysis of the similarities and differences between the Washingtonians and Alcoholics Anonymous.

Since the Washingtonian movement is so intimately linked to the larger temperance movement, it may be well to recall the developments which preceded 1840. Before the 1830's, "temperance" was hardly a popular cause. Even in 1812, when Lyman Beecher proposed to his fellow Congregational ministers that they formulate a program for combating intemperance, "... the regular committee reported that 'after faithful and prayerful inquiry' it was convinced that nothing could be done to check the growth of intemperance..."(1). The custom of serving liquor at ecclesiastical meetings probably influenced the outcome of this "prayerful inquiry." But Lyman Beecher was not to be stopped. He headed a new committee that recommended the following steps: that district assemblies abstain from the use of ardent spirits (not wine) at ecclesiastical meetings, that members of churches abstain from unlawful vending or purchase (not from lawful vending and purchase) of liquor, that farmers, mechanics and manufacturers substitute monetary compensation for the ration of spirits, that voluntary associations aid the civil magistrates to enforce the laws, and that the pamphlet of Dr. Rush (2) be printed and circulated (1). The fact that these proposals were regarded as radical by the custodians of the New England conscience is a sufficient clue to the state of public opinion in 1812.

It was not until 1825 that Lyman Beecher preached his famous Six Sermons (3), in which he defined intemperance not merely as drunkenness but as the "daily use of ardent spirits." In 1826, in Boston, Beecher and Justin Edwards spearheaded the founding of the first national society, "The American Society for the Promotion of Temperance" (American Temperance Society) which sought, according to its constitution, "...to produce such a change of public sentiment, and such a renovation of the habits of individuals and the customs of the community, that in the end temperance, with all its attendant blessings, may universally prevail(4)."

The temperance movement began to take hold. In 1829 there were about 1,000 societies with a membership of approximately 100,000. By 1834 there were 5,000 local societies claiming 11000,000 members, a gain of 500 per cent in 5 years. A temperance press had been established. Effective literature had emerged. Politicians were taking notice. In 1836 the American Temperance Society was merged into the new and more inclusive "American Temperance Union," which decided to take the stand of "total abstinence from all that can intoxicate(5)."

This step required an entirely new orientation. It is therefore not surprising that some 2,000 societies and countless individuals were not ready to go along. Many wealthy contributors, unwilling to forgo wine, withdrew their support. Some leaders were discouraged by the resistance to the new pledge and became inactive. Various controversial issues added to the dissension. The movement fell upon lean years. Its leaders, in 1840, were wondering what could be done to restore the momentum of the years preceding 1836. Their effort were groping and limited.

As for the alcoholic, it was the prevailing opinion, up to 1840, that nothing could be done to help him. Occasionally a "drunkard" did "reform," but this did not erase the general pessimism as to the

possibility of rehabilitating drunkards. Since alcohol was held to be the “cause” of alcoholism, the temperance movement was aimed solely at keeping the nonalcoholic from becoming an alcoholic. This implied indifference to the alcoholic was epitomized by Justin Edwards in 1822: “Keep the temperate people temperate; the drunkards will soon die, and the land be free(6).”

Thus the stage was set for the emergence of the Washingtonian movement.

The Baltimore Origins

One Thursday evening, April 2, 1840, six friends were drinking, as they were wont to do almost every evening, in Chasels Tavern, on Liberty Street, in Baltimore. They were William K. Mitchell, a tailor; John F. Hoss, a carpenter; David Anderson and George Steers, both blacksmiths; James McCurley, a coachmaker; and Archibald Campbell, a silversmith(7). Their conversation turned to the temperance lecture which was to be given that evening by a visiting lecturer, the Rev. Matthew Hale Smith. In a spirit of fun it was proposed that some of them go to hear the lecture and report back. Four of them went and, after their return, all discussed the lecture.

... one of their company remarked that, “after all, temperance is a good thing.” “O,” said the host, “they’re all a parcel of hypocrites.” “O yes,” replied McCurley, “I’ll be bound for you; it’s your interest to cry them down, anyhow.” “I’ll tell you what, boys,” says Steers, “Let’s form a society and make Bill Mitchell president.”.. The idea seemed to take wonderfully; and the more they laughed and talked it over, the more they were pleased with it(8).

On Sunday, April 5, while the six were strolling and drinking, the suggestion crystallized into a decision to quit drinking and to organize a total abstinence society. It was agreed that Mitchell should be the president; Campbell the vice-president; Hoss, the secretary; McCurley, the treasurer; and Steers and Anderson, the standing committee. The membership fee was to be twenty-five cents; the monthly dues, 12E cents. The proposal that they name the society in honour of Thomas Jefferson was finally rejected and it was decided that the president and the secretary, since they were to be the committee to draft the constitution, should also decide upon the name. It was agreed that each man should bring a man to the next meeting. And it was left to the president to compose the pledge which they would all sign the next day. The pledge was formulated by Mitchell as follows:

“We whose names are annexed, desirous of forming a society for our mutual benefit, and to guard against a pernicious practice which is injurious to our health, standing, and families, do pledge ourselves as gentlemen that we will not drink any spirituous or malt liquors, wine or cider.”

He went with it, about nine o’clock, to Anderson’s house and found him still in bed, sick from the effects of his Sunday adventure. He rose, however, dressed himself, and after hearing the pledge read, went down to his shop for pen and ink, and there did himself the honour of being the first man who signed the Washington pledge. After obtaining the names of the other four, the worthy president finished this noble achievement by adding his own(8).

The name, “Washington Temperance Society, 11 was selected in honour of George Washington. Two new members were brought to the second meeting. Strangely enough, they continued to meet for a number of weeks at their accustomed place in Chase’s Tavern. When the tavern owner’s wife objected to the increasing loss of their best customers, Mitchell’s wife suggested that they meet in their home. This they did until the group grew too large, whereupon they moved to a carpenter’s shop on Little Sharp Street. Eventually, they rented a hall of their own.

As they grew in membership they faced the problem of making their weekly meetings interesting. Their resourceful president made the suggestion that each member relate his own experience. He started off with his story of 15 years of excessive drinking, adding his reactions to his newly gained freedom. Others followed suit. This procedure proved to be so interesting and effective that it became a permanent feature of their programs. Interest and membership mounted.

In November the society resolved to try a public meeting in which Mitchell and others would tell their personal experiences. The first such meeting, held on November 19, 1840, in the Masonic Hall on St.

Paul Street, was a decided success. Not only did it bring in additional members but it also called the movement to the interested attention of the people of Baltimore. It was decided to repeat these public meetings about once a month in addition to the regular weekly meetings of the society.

John Zug, a citizen of Baltimore who probably had his interest aroused by the first public meeting, made further inquiry and, on December 12, 1840, wrote a letter to the Rev. John Marsh, executive secretary of the American Temperance Union, in New York City, informing him of the new society in Baltimore. In it he told about the growth of the group:

These half a dozen men immediately interested themselves to persuade their old bottle-companions to unite with them, and they in a short time numbered nearly one hundred members, a majority of whom were reformed drunkards. By their unprecedented exertions from the beginning, they have been growing in numbers, extending their influence, and increasing in interest, until now they number about three hundred members, upwards of two hundred of whom are reformed drunkards - reformed, too, within the last eight months. Many of these had been drunkards of many years' standing, - notorious for their dissipation. indeed, the society has done wonders in the reformation of scores whose friends and the community had despaired of long since(9).

So rapidly did the society grow during the following months that on the first anniversary of the society, April 5, 1841, there were about 1,000 reformed drunkards and 5,000 other members and friends in the parade to celebrate the occasion. This demonstration made a deep impression upon the 40,000 or so Baltimoreans who witnessed the event.

Additional information on the pattern of activities which made this growth possible, and on the components of the therapeutic program which made the reformation of alcoholics possible in the first place, is given in the writings of contemporary observers. John Zug, in his first letter to John Marsh, included the following description:

The interest connected with this society is maintained by the continued active exertions of its members, the peculiar character of their operations and the frequency of their meetings. The whole society is considered a "grand committee of the whole," each member exerting himself, from week to week, and from day to day, as far as possible, to persuade his friends to adopt the only safe course, total abstinence; or at least to accompany him to the next meeting of the "Washington Temperance Society." It is a motto of their energetic and worthy President, in urging the attendance of the members at the stated meetings, "Let every man be present, and every man bring with him a man."

They have rented a public hall in which they meet every Monday night. At these weekly meetings, after their regular business is transacted, the several members rise promiscuously and state their temperance experience for each other' a warning, instruction, and encouragement. After this, any persons present wishing to unite with them are invited forward to sign the Constitution and Pledge(9).

Christian Keener, the editor of the Maryland Herald, made these further first-hand observations:

These men spared neither their money nor their time in carrying out the principles which they had espoused. Many a poor fellow who from the effect of liquor had become a burden to his family and himself was fed and clothed by them, and won by kindness to reform his life; even more than this, they have supported the families of those who they had induced to join with them, until the husband and father had procured work, and was able to support them with his own hands.

The peculiar characteristics of this great reform are first, a total abstinence pledge Secondly, the telling of others what they know from experience of the evils of intemperance, and the good which they feel to result from entire abstinence(9).

John W. Hawkins, an early member, had this to say in one of his Boston speeches:

Drunkard! Come up here! you can reform. I met a gentleman this morning who reformed four weeks ago, rejoicing in his reformation; he brought a man with him who took the pledge and this man brought two others. This is the way we do the business up in Baltimore. We reformed drunkards are a Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union. We are all missionaries. We don't slight the drunkard; we love him, we nurse him, as a mother does her infant learning to walk(10).

Christian Keener, in another communication, summed up the work as follows, making at the same time a comparison with the operations of the regular temperance societies:

The great advantage of the Washington Temperance Society has been this; they have reached hundreds of men that would not come out to our churches, nor even temperance meetings; they go to their old companions and drag them, not by force, but by friendly consideration of duty, and a sense of self-respect, into their ranks, and watch over them with the solicitude of friends and brothers...(9).

Such was the character of the original Baltimore "Washington Temperance Society."

The Spread of the Movement

A phenomenon like this could not be confined to Baltimore, for the Washington men had it in their power to meet many pressing needs. First of all, there were the drunkards in need of reclamation - a need long ignored because the opinion prevailed that there was no hope for them. The meeting of this need partook of the miraculous. Secondly, there was the overwhelming drive on the part of the reformed men to carry their message of hope to other victims of drink - spilling over into a desire to prevent such suffering by winning those not addicted to certain sobriety in total abstinence. Finally, there were the needs of the temperance leaders. Set back by the 1836 decision to put temperance on a total abstinence basis, they needed a convincing argument for total abstinence as well as some effective means of rekindling enthusiasm for their cause. The Washington men were the answer to these needs, for what could be a better argument for total abstinence than its apparent power to reclaim even the confirmed drunkard; and what could excite more interest than the personally told experiences of reformed drunkards?

The first recorded activity outside of Baltimore was the speaking of John H.W. Hawkins, in February 1841, to the delegates of the Maryland State Temperance Society, meeting in Annapolis, and to the members of the State Legislature in the same city.

Hawkins, who was to become the most effective spokesman of the movement, had joined the Washington Temperance Society on June 14, 1840, after more than 20 years of excessive drinking. Born in Baltimore on September 28, 1797, he was apprenticed at an early age to a hatmaker. During this apprenticeship he developed a dependence on alcohol which was increased during 3 years in the frontier communities of the West. His religious conversion at the age of 18 did not eradicate this craving. Resuming his trade in Baltimore, he battled in vain against his addiction. The panic of 1837 left him unemployed, reducing him to a pauper on public relief. Guilt and remorse over his family's destitution only intensified his alcoholism. His own account of his last drinking days and his reclamation, as given in his first New York talk, are preserved for us:

"Never," said he, "shall I forget the 12th of June last. The first two weeks in June I averaged - it is a cross to acknowledge it - as much as a quart and a pint a day. That morning I was miserable beyond conception, and was hesitating whether to live or die. My little daughter came to my bed and said, 'I hope you won't send me for any more whiskey today.' I told her to go out of the room. She went weeping. I wounded her sorely, though I had made up my mind I would drink no more. I suffered all the horrors of the pit that day, but my wife supported me. She said, 'Hold on, hold on. I Next day I felt better. Monday I wanted to go down and see my old associates who had joined the Washington Society. I went and signed. I felt like a free man. What was I now to do to regain my character? My friends took me by the hand. They encouraged me. They did right. If there is a man on earth who deserves the sympathy of the world it is the poor drunkard; he is poisoned, cast out, knows not what to do, and must be helped or be lost... (8).

"It did not take his associates long to discover that he had the qualities of a leader. A splendid physique and commanding presence, combined with a gift for extemporaneous speaking, made him an ideal lecturer.(1)" It is not surprising, therefore, that Hawkins was selected to speak before the Maryland State Temperance Society and the State Legislature. Christian Keener left an eyewitness report of the latter occasion which helps to explain Hawkins' appeal:

.... He commenced his speech by letting them know that he stood before them a reformed drunkard, less than twelve months ago taken almost out of the gutter; and now in the Senate chamber of his native

State, addressing hundreds of the best informed and most intelligent men and women, and they listened with tearful attention. The circumstances had an almost overpowering effect on his own feelings and those of his audience. He is a man of plain, good common sense, with a sincerity about him, and easy way of expressing himself, that every word took like a point-blank shot. His was the eloquence of the heart; no effort at display(9).

About this time, a Baltimore businessman attended a temperance meeting in New York City. News of the Baltimore developments having already been circulated by John Marsh through the Journal of the American Temperance Union, this visitor was requested to give a brief history and description of the Washington Soc3ety. A conversation with Dr. Rease, after the meeting, brought forth the suggestion that some of the Washington men be invited to New York to relate their experiences. This tentative proposition was taken to the Baltimore society, accepted by them, and the arrangements completed for a delegation of five to go. The five were William K. Mitchell, John W. Hawkins, J.F. Pollard, and two other members, Shaw and Casey.

Their first meeting in New York was held on Tuesday, March 23, 1841, in the Methodist Episcopal Church on Green Street. The curious throngs were not disappointed. As in Baltimore, the experiences of these "reformed drunkards" deeply moved and inspired all those who came to hear. Not only that, but real-life drama was enacted at the meeting. The New York Commercial Advertiser reported the next morning:

During the first speech a young man rose in the gallery and, though intoxicated, begged to know if there was any hope for him; declaring his readiness to bind himself, from that hour, to drink no more. He was invited to come down and sign the pledge, which he did forthwith, in the presence of the audience, under deep emotion, which seemed to be contagious, for others followed; and during each of the speeches they continued to come forward and sign, until more than a hundred pledges were obtained; a large portion of which were intemperate persons, some of whom were old and grey headed. Such a scene as was beheld at the secretary's table while they were signing, and the unaffected tears that were flowing, and the cordial greetings of the recruits by the Baltimore delegates, was never before witnessed in New York(8).

All the subsequent meetings were equally successful. John Marsh and the other temperance leaders who were promoting the meetings were delighted. With no church large enough to hold the curious crowds, it was decided to hold an open air meeting in City Hall Park. More than 4,000 turned out for this. The speakers, mounted on upturned rum kegs, again enthralled the crowd. This impressive occasion was merely the climax of a triumphant campaign: about 2,000 were converted to the total abstinence pledge, including many confirmed drunkards with whom the men worked between meetings. At this time the Washington Temperance Society of New York was organized.

The delegation returned to Baltimore in time for the first anniversary parade and celebration, an April 5th. With the memory of the New York success still fresh in their minds, this must have been a very happy and meaningful occasion - not merely the recognition of a year's achievement, but also a portent of things to come.

Things began to happen rapidly now. While the New York meetings were in progress, John Marsh wrote to the Boston temperance leaders about the power of the Washingtonian appeal. Arrangements were quickly made so that within a week after the first anniversary celebration Hawkins and William E. Wright were on their way to Boston for a series of meetings in the churches. There were those who doubted that Bostonians would respond as enthusiastically as New Yorkers, but the coming of these speakers was well published and even larger crowds than in New York greeted them. The first meeting was held on April 15, 1841. The Daily Mail had this report the following morning:

The Odeon was filled to its utmost capacity, last evening, by a promiscuous audience of temperance men, distillers, wholesalers and retail dealers in ardent spirits, conformed inebriates, moderate drinkers, lovers of the social glass, teetotallers, etc., to listen to the speeches of the famous "Reformed Drunkards," delegates from the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore, who have excited such a deep interest in the cause of temperance in other places...Mr. Hawkins of Baltimore, was the second of the "Reformed

Drunkards” introduced to the meeting. He was a man of forty-four years of age - of fine manly form - and he said he had been more than twenty years a confirmed inebriate. He spoke with rather more fluency, force and effect, than his predecessor, but in the same vein of free and easy, off-hand, direct, bang-up style; at times in a single conversational manner, then earnest and vehement, then pathetic, then humorous - but always manly and reasonable. Mr. Hawkins succeeded in “working up” his audience finely. Now the house was as quiet and still as a deserted church, and anon the high dome rang with violent bursts of laughter and applause. Now he assumed the melting mood, and pictured the scenes of a drunkard’s home, and that home his own, and fountains of generous feelings, in many hearts, gushed forth in tears - and again, in a moment, as he related, some ludicrous story, these tearful eyes glistened with delight, sighs changed to hearty shouts, and long faces were convulsed with broad grins and glorious smiles(1).

The Boston Mercantile Journal reported the same meeting in the following manner:

The exercises at the temperance meeting at the Odeon last evening possessed a deep and thrilling interest. The hall was crowded and Messrs. Hawkins and Wright...spoke with great eloquence and power for more than two hours, and when, at ten o’clock, they proposed abridging somewhat they had to say, shouts of “Go on! Go on!” were heard from all parts of the house. We believe more tears were never shed by an audience in one evening than flowed last night...Old grey haired men sobbed like children, and the noble and honourable bowed their heads and wept. Three hundred and seventy-seven came forward and made “the second declaration of independence,” by pledging themselves to touch no intoxicating drink; among them were noticed many bloated countenances, familiar as common drunkards; and we promise them health, prosperity, honour, and happiness in the pursuance of their new principles(9).

When even the standing room in Faneuil Hall was filled, a few evenings later, and the crowd responded with unrestrained enthusiasm, several hundred coming forward to sign the pledge at the close of the meeting, there was no longer any doubt that the Washingtonian reformers had a universally potent appeal. Here was “human interest” material par excellence. No fiction could be more exciting or dramatic. These true-life narratives pulled at the heartstrings. They aroused awe and wonder at the “miracle of rebirth.” Formal religious beliefs had flesh and blood put on dry bones. And, to the victim of drink, the Washingtonian message was like a promise of life to a doomed man. It was the impossible come true.

During these meetings, a Washington Total-Abstinence Society was formed in Boston. Hawkins was also engaged as the paid secretary of the Massachusetts Temperance Society, and on June 1, 1841, returned from Baltimore with his family. Within a short space of time, he and his Boston associates succeeded in carrying the Washingtonian movement into 160 New England towns.

On May 11, 1841, the executive committee of the American Temperance Union, on the occasion of its anniversary meeting in New York City, paid high tribute to the Washingtonians. In July at the national convention of the Union, at Saratoga Springs, this praise was even more fulsome. John Marsh and many of the other leaders saw in the Washingtonians the possibilities of a great forward advance for the temperance movement. None of them, however, even in their most optimistic moments, sensed the vitality that was to be manifested by the Washingtonian movement that very summer and autumn.

Even before the Saratoga convention, two of the most famous of the many Washingtonian deputation teams, Pollard and Wright, and Vickers and Small, had begun extensive tours. By autumn, many teams and individuals were in the field. From the 1842 Report of the American Temperance Union, it is possible to trace the rapid spread of the movement throughout the country.

J.F. Pollard and W.E. Wright, both of Baltimore - the former having accompanied Hawkins to New York, and the latter to Boston - began their work early in the summer of 1841 in Hudson, New York. Their first efforts were discouraging, but soon they got attention and in a few weeks nearly 3,000 of the 5,500 inhabitants of Hudson had signed the pledge. A Hudson resident has left this account of their type of meeting:

Some of the meeting took the air of deep religious solemnity, eyes that never wept before were suffused...the simple tale of the ruined inebriate, interrupted by a silence that told of emotions too big for utterance, would awaken general sympathy, and dissolve a large portion of the audience in tears. The spell

which had bound so many seemed to dissolve under the magic eloquence of those unlettered men. They spoke from the heart to the heart. The drunkard found himself unexpectedly an object of interest. He was no longer an outcast. There were some who still looked upon him as a man. A chord was reached which had long since ceased to respond to other influences less kind in their nature...The social principle operated with great power. A few leaders in the ranks of intemperance having signed the pledge, it appeared to be the signal for the mass to follow: and on they came, like a torrent sweeping everything before it. It was for weeks the all-absorbing topic...(7).

Pollard and Wright attended the Saratoga convention and then toured through central and western New York; and that autumn, through New Jersey and Pennsylvania. On this tour they obtained 23,340 signatures to the pledge, "one-fifth of which were supposed to be common drunkards"(7). Late in 1841 they spoke in Maryland and Delaware. They moved in January 1842 into Virginia, where they worked particularly in Richmond, Petersburg, Charlottesville and Norfolk, pledging Negroes as well as whites.

The other famous team, Jesse Vickers and Jesse W. Small, also of Baltimore, began their campaign in June 1841 in Pittsburgh, where "all classes, all ages, all ranks and denominations, and both sexes, pressed every night into overflowing churches." In a brief time 10,000 were pledged, "including a multitude of most hopeless characters"(7). This success was followed by another in Wheeling, from which place they proceeded to Cincinnati where Lyman Beecher, now president of Lane Theological Seminary, had diligently prepared the way for their coming. Large crowds turned out for the meetings and a strong Washington society was organized which, by the end of 1841, claimed 8,000 members, 900 of them reformed. Cincinnati became the chief centre of Washingtonianism in the West, and Vickers and Small spent a great deal of time preparing the converts who were to carry on the missionary work. One of these Cincinnati teams, Brown and Porter, obtained 6,529 signatures in an 8-week campaign in the surrounding country, 1,630 of them from "hard drinkers" and 700 from confirmed drunkards. Another Cincinnati team, Turner and Guptill, toured western Ohio and Michigan. On December 21, 1841, a team of three, probably including Vickers, began a campaign in St. Louis, laying the foundation for a Washington society that numbered 7,500 within a few months. Many communities in Kentucky, Indiana and Illinois were also visited. It is interesting to note that on February 22, 1842, Abraham Lincoln addressed the Washington Society of Springfield, Ill. Just how quickly the West was cultivated by the Washingtonian missionaries, operating chiefly out of Cincinnati, is shown by the May 1842 claims of 60,000 signatures in Ohio, 30,000 in Kentucky, and 10,000 in Illinois. Of these, it was claimed, "every seventh man is a reformed drunkard, and every fourth man a reformed tippler"(7).

The intensity of this cultivation varied with time and place. How intensive it could be is well portrayed by a citizen of Pittsburgh, in a letter to John Marsh, in April 1842:

The work has grown in this city and vicinity...at such a rate as has defied a registration of its triumphs with anything like statistical accuracy. ...The most active agents and labourers in the field have been at no time able to report the state of the work in their own entire province - the work spread us from place to place - running in so many currents, and meeting in their way so many others arising from other sources, or springing spontaneously in their pathway, that no one could measure its dimensions or compass its spread. We have kept some eight or ten missionaries in the field ever since last June, who have toiled over every part and parcel of every adjoining country of Pennsylvania, and spread thence into Ohio and Virginia, leaving no school house, or country church, or little village, cross roads, forge, furnace, factory, or mills, unvisited; holding meetings wherever two or three could be gathered together, and organizing as many as from 20 to 30 societies in a single county...(7).

In the Boston area, Washingtonian activity was intensive from the beginning. Within 3 months after the first Hawkins and Wright meetings, the Boston society had this to report:

Since this society went into operation the delegating committee have sent out two hundred and seventeen delegations to one hundred and sixty towns in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Maine, Vermont, and Rhode Island, with wonderful success....Some of those towns where we have formed societies are now sending out their delegates. The whole country is now alive to the subject...It is acknowledged on all sides

that no people like ours - although unlearned - could create such a wonderful interest in the all absorbing cause....

There is no doubt that about 50,000 persons have signed the pledge in the different towns that our delegates have visited. Where societies were already formed, a more lively interest was created, - new signers obtained from those who had been inebriates, and thus a new energy imparted...Where societies had not before existed, new societies were formed...(8).

Ten months later, in May 1842, the Boston society had 13,000 members, had sent 260 delegations to 350 towns in New England, and had produced a number of converts who had become effective missionaries outside of New England. Benjamin Goodhue, in December 1841, stirred up great interest in Sag Harbour and the east end of Long Island. A Mr. Cady, during this winter, toured North Carolina, securing 10,000 signatures. In February 1842 Joseph J. Johnson and an unnamed fellow Bostonian conducted successful campaigns in Mobile and New Orleans.

By May 1842 the movement had penetrated every major area of the country and was going particularly strong in central New York and New England. The most vigorous urban centres were Baltimore, New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Washington, Cincinnati and St. Louis. The city of Baltimore had 15 societies and 7,842 members. New York and vicinity had 23 societies and 16,000 members. In the Journal of the American Temperance Union, on April 1, 1842, John Marsh wrote enthusiastically of the New York activity: "We suppose there are not less than fifty meetings held weekly and most of them are perfect jams. Our accessions are numerous and often of the most hopeless characters"(9). In and around Philadelphia, where the societies took the name of Jefferson, some 20,000 members were enrolled. In the district of Columbia there were 4,297 members, and another 1,000 in Alexandria, Va. Later in the year Hawkins visited Washington and was successful in reactivating the old Congressional Temperance Society and putting it on a total abstinence basis. Congressman George N. Briggs, soon to be Governor of Massachusetts, became president of this reorganized society.

To the list of outstanding reformed men who became effective Washingtonian missionaries during this first year, there should be added the names of George Haydock, Hudson, N.Y.(8,000 signatures); Col. John Wallis, Philadelphia (7,000 signatures); Thomas M. Woodruff, New York City; Abel Bishop, New Haven, Conn.; and Joseph Hayes, Bath, Me.

During 1842 the most outstanding temperance orator of all was won to the cause. John B. Gough, a bookbinder, was reformed. When his platform ability was discovered, many Washingtonian societies sponsored his addresses. As his popularity grew he became a professional free-lance lecturer; and during the years 1843-47 travelled 6,840 miles, gaining 15,218 signatures to thepledge(11).

Another important development was the organization of women into the little known "Martha Washington" societies. The first such society was organized "in a church at the corner of Chrystie and Delancey Streets, New York, on May 12 of that year [1841], through the efforts of William A. Wisdom and John W. Oliver"(12). The constitution detailed the purpose:

Whereas, the use of all intoxicating drinks has caused, and is causing, incalculable evils to individuals and families, and has a tendency to prostrate all means adapted to the moral, social and eternal happiness of the whole human family; we, the undersigned ladies of New York, feeling ourselves especially called upon, not only to refrain from the use of all intoxicating drinks, but, by our influence and example, to induce others to do the same, do therefore form ourselves into an association(12).

These Martha Washington societies were organized in many places, functioning to some extent as auxiliaries of the Washingtonian societies, but also engaged in the actual rehabilitation of alcoholic women. In the annual Report of 1843, there is this reference"...the Martha Washington Societies, feeding the poor, clothing the naked, and reclaiming the intemperate of their own sex, have been maintained, in most places, with great spirit..."(7).

Duration of the Movement

How long the Washingtonian movement continued in full force is a difficult question to answer. The most

dramatic strides were made between the summers of 1841 and 1842, but apparently the peak of activity was reached in 1843. That year, Gough was touring New England, and Hawkins northern and western New York as well as sections of Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine. R.P. Taylor was doing effective work in Georgia. Late that autumn Hawkins campaigned in North Carolina and Georgia, stimulating great Washingtonian activity in that region. It was a year of high activity, with the major portion of the work carried on, as it was through most of the life of the movement, by numerous Washingtonians whose names are unrecorded.

On May 28, 1844, in Boston, the Washingtonians were the sponsors of , and leading participants in, the largest temperance demonstration ever held, up to that time, with nearly 30,000 members of various temperance organizations participating. Governor George N. Briggs, William K. Mitchell and John B. Gough were the leading speakers.

In the fall of 1845 Hawkins began one of his most intensive campaigns, in Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, winding up in the spring of 1846 with very successful meetings in New Orleans and Mobile. During this 8-month period Hawkins not only spoke daily but also directed the work of many assistants and helped, as he always did, to organize societies to continue the work. In much of the territory covered by Hawkins on this campaign the Washingtonian movement was still at full tide in 1845 and 1846. This tends to corroborate the generalization of Wooley and Johnson that "for four years it continued to sweep the country." But in some of the cities which had been reached by the movement in 1841, a decline had already set in.

In New York City the Sons of Temperance, a total abstinence order which had been founded with the help and blessing of Washingtonians, had begun, late in 1842, to receive into its membership many Washingtonians. Slowly but increasingly it displaced the function of the Washington societies.

In Cincinnati, in January 1845, Lyman Beecher wrote to John Marsh about the "resurgence of the liquor tide" and of the need for a new type of temperance appeal. He thought that "though the Washingtonians have endured and worked well, their thunder is worn out"(13).

Fehlandt (4) states that "By 1843...interest began to wane, and soon Washingtonianism had spent its force." It might be correct to say that the first signs of waning interest appeared in 1843 but it is not probable that such signs were detectable in most areas before 1844 - and in some areas not until latter. Hence, no generalization seems to apply to the entire country.

Most significant as an index of general interest are the references to the Washingtonian movement in the annual Reports of the executive committee of the American Temperance Union, published in May of each year. The 1842 Report enthusiastically details the spread of the movement. The 1843 Report reflects continued enthusiasm. The 1844 Report notes that the movement "has continued through its fourth year with as much interest as could be expected." The 1845 Report contains news of the crowded weekly meetings and increased success of the Hartford, Conn., Washington Temperance Society, but there is also expressed the feeling of John Marsh that the movement "has in a considerable measure spent its force." In the 1846 Report the movement is referred to as "once so deeply enlisting the sympathies." In the 1847 Report it is admitted that "The reformation of drunkards has not, as in former years, formed a prominent part of the year now past." The 1848 Report contains no mention of the Washingtonian movement at all.

Hawkins, Gough and others were called Washingtonians to the end of their lives, but there is no record, to the writer's knowledge, of organized Washingtonian activity beyond 1847 except in the Boston area.³ There in March 1847, the Washingtonians of New

England held a large convention. In January 1848 the Boston Washington Society reported having 56,380 signatures since the date of its founding in 1841. According to Harrison (8), writing in 1860, the Boston society continued to exist and meet weekly up to 1860, at which time 70,000 signatures were claimed. In 1858 the Home for the Fallen, using Washingtonian principles in the rehabilitation of alcoholics, was in existence in Boston.⁴ But in other parts of the country, by 1858, there were to be found references to "the early days" when Washingtonianism swept the country.

³ The writer has since learned of the existence of the Washingtonian Home in Chicago, founded in 1863 by members of the Order of Good Templars who may well have been Washingtonians. This institution

is still engaged exclusively in the rehabilitation of alcoholics.

4 This institution has been in continuous existence to the present time, having undergone a number of changes in name and in policy. It is now known as the Washington Hospital and engages in the treatment of alcoholism by contemporary medical and social techniques.

Numerical Success

How many persons became members of the Washingtonian societies? There is no satisfactory answer to this question. The statistics that are available are varied, contradictory and, hence, unreliable; furthermore, they are given on two different bases - the number who signed the total abstinence pledge, and the number of drunkards reclaimed. Neither of these coincides with the membership of Washingtonian societies.

Several sources(12,14) repeat the American Temperance Union estimate (7) that by 1843, 5,000,000 had signed the total abstinence pledge and were associated with over 10,000 local societies. Since only 350,000 such signers had been claimed in 1839 (15), this would mean a gain of over 4,500,000 as a result of the Washingtonian "pledge-signing revival." This would represent nearly one-fourth of the total U.S. population aged 15 years and over. When it is considered, as E.M. Jellinek has estimated, that for the population aged 15 years and older the per capita consumption of distilled spirits decreased by only 14.3 per cent (from 4.9 gallons) between 1840 and 1850, some doubt is thrown upon the validity of this estimate. Marsh himself, in 1848, revised his estimate of total abstainers downward to 4,000,000 (7). Even this number points to the probability that a large percentage of the pledge signers were under the age of 15.

Furthermore, since the signers belonged to all kinds of temperance societies, it is impossible to estimate what percentage, or how many, were enrolled in Washingtonian societies.

In attempting to estimate the number of alcoholics reclaimed by the Washingtonian movement, more difficulties are encountered. The major one is the fact that all the societies had mixed memberships - former teetotalers (often children), moderate drinkers, excessive drinkers, and confirmed alcoholics. Nevertheless, estimates have been made and the claims vary from 100,000 (12) to 600,000. The latter figure, often repeated, seems to be based on the 1843 Report (7) of the American Temperance Union, in which it stated that: "A half-million hard drinkers often drunken, and a hundred thousand sots...may safely be considered as having been brought to sign the total abstinence pledge within the last two years." Wooley and Johnson (12) state: "It is commonly computed that at least one hundred thousand common drunkards were reclaimed in the crusade and at least three times as many common tipplers became total abstainers." This seems to be based on Eddy (14), who in turn seems to be quoting an American Temperance Union estimate that, by the summer of 1842, "the reformation had included at least 100,000 common drunkards, and three times that number of tipplers who were in a fair way to become sots."

One chief difficulty resides in the employment of an undefined terminology, including "hard drinkers often drunken;" "confirmed drinkers;" "drunkard;" "common drunkard;" "conformed drunkard;" "inebriate;" "sot;" "tippler;" "common tippler;" and "tipplers in a fair way to become sots." What do these terms mean and how were they distinguished from each other?

Ignoring the loose use of these terms, for the moment, and turning to the percentage of reclaimed inebriates in Washingtoniansocieties, a great variety of claims is to be noted. Eight months after its beginning the Baltimore society claimed that two-thirds of their 300 members were reclaimed drunkards(9). At the close of 1841 it was claimed that 100,000 pledges had been taken as a result of Washingtonian activity, "more than one-third by confirmed drinkers"(16). But in the statistics offered by the same source, and for the same period of time, by the vigorous Cincinnati Washington society, only 900 (11.3 per cent) of the 8,000 members were said to have been reformed drunkards. A Battleboro, Vt., report stated: "We have 150 members already in our Washington Society, six or seven hard cases." This comes to four or five per cent. Of the 42,273 pledged members in 82 Vermont towns cited in the 1844 Report, only 518 (1.2 per cent) were reformed drunkards probably varied greatly from community to community - and probably varied at different times even in the same society.

Since the American Temperance Union records are the chief source of information for later

historians, some weight may be given to John Marsh's later estimate (13) that 150,000 drunkards were permanently rescued as a result of Washingtonian activity. But when his 1843 estimate of "A half million hard drinkers often drunken, and a hundred thousand sots" is recalled, it is impossible not to be suspicious of his estimates - and particularly of his use of terms. The number may well have been less than 150,000, and it may well have included everything from "confirmed drinkers," to "hard drinkers often drunken" to "common drunkards" to "sots." What are the numbers of true alcoholics was, is anyone's guess.

But if there is uncertainty concerning the number of alcoholics temporarily helped or permanently rehabilitated - or the number of persons who became total abstainers - there is no question that the movement made a tremendous impact.

Its results, furthermore, were not short-lived. Within the temperance there was not only a decided gain of strength but also the opening of "the way for more advanced thought and effort...(14)." As for the problem of alcoholism, some permanent though limited gain resulted. Dr. T.D. Crothers, a leading psychiatrist of his time, wrote in 1911:

The Washingtonian movement...was a great clearing house movement, breaking up old theories and giving new ideas of the nature and character of inebriety. It was literally a sudden and intense projection of the ideas of the moral side of inebriety, into public thought, and while it reacted when the reform wave died out, it served to mobilize and concentrate public attention upon the question, of how far the inebriate could control his malady, and what efforts were needed to enable him to live temperately. This first practical effort to settle these questions was the beginning of the organization of lodging houses for the members of the societies who had failed to carry out the pledges which they had made. This was really the beginning of the hospital system of cure, and was the first means used to give practical help to the inebriate, in a proper home, with protection, until he was able to go out, with a degree of health and hope of restoration (17).

Organization and Procedure

As has been indicated, the Washingtonian movement took organized form in the thousands of local total abstinence societies which, almost without exception, had a mixed membership of former teetotalers and moderate drinkers as well as inebriates of various degrees. This was the pattern set by the original Baltimore society. A large percentage of these societies, presumably, were new societies carrying the Washington name. Many were old societies, reorganized and renamed. But often the work was carried on in societies already in existence, without any change in name. Hawkins, it will be recalled, became the paid secretary of the Massachusetts Temperance Society. Nevertheless, he was active in the Boston Washington society. There seemed, at the time, to be no organizational rivalry, and that must have been true in many communities throughout the years of the movement. In Alabama, Sellers (18) states, "This organization [Washingtonian] was never an independent unit, but was attached to temperance societies already existing."

On the other hand, rivalry and mutual resentment between the "old" and the "new" societies did develop in many communities. Even in Boston, in the demonstration in which so many societies of all types participated in May 1844, the old Massachusetts Temperance Society and the old Massachusetts Temperance Union did not take part (1). Krout summarizes the difficulties that developed between the Washingtonians and the older societies in many communities:

Under the compulsion of popular demand many of the old societies had employed Washingtonian speakers to revive a waning interest, but they had been disappointed that the new pledge-signers could seldom be persuaded to join existing organizations. Wherever Washingtonian workers conducted campaigns, it was necessary either to form a new society officered by reform men, or to convert the old group into a Washingtonian abstinence society. To some who had laboured long in temperance work...it appeared...that the Washingtonians had no interest in the triumphs of the struggle prior to 1840. The younger movement seemed to be unwilling to learn anything from the older. Its membership scoffed at the methods and principles formerly held in esteem...The old leaders were being set aside. Any Tom, Dick or Harry could direct the course of the reform. Washingtonian "Heralds," "Standards" and "Advocates" were springing up everywhere, and then expiring from lack of funds. Their existence was too often marked by unpleasant

controversies with other temperance periodicals. The Washingtonians, on the other hand, charged that the older societies refused to co-operate with them...(1).

Further evidence of this distrust and cleavage, as well as of the differences in organization, was given in the Washingtonian Pocket Companion (19), published in Utica, N.Y., in 1842:

Some societies make uniting with them, a virtual renunciation of all membership with any other temperance societies...This is because the principles of the old, and of our societies, differ so widely - and also to prevent the old societies from subverting ours...

Some societies take none but those who have lately made, sold, or used intoxicating liquors - others receive all except children under a certain age - others receive even children with the consent of their parents or guardians.

Some societies omit that part of the pledge which relates to the "Making and selling, directly or indirectly," and pledge to total abstinence from using, only. They think it a benefit to bring the maker and vender into the society first, and then induce them to give up their business.

In some cases, the female members of our societies act as a Benevolent Society, within, or in co-operation and fellowship with us. In others, the ladies form separate and distinct societies. Their names are numerous...(19).

Even though no uniformity of organization or procedure prevailed, yet a minimum of common pattern ran throughout the movement. This might be said to be (A) the reclamation of inebriates by "reformed drunkards" - employing the "principle of love" and the total abstinence pledge; and (B) having reformed drunkards telling their experiences for the dual purpose of reaching the drunkard and winning others to the total abstinence pledge.

The Baltimore pattern, very effectively reproduced in Boston under the guidance of Hawkins, seemed to have been the ideal pattern which the majority of Washingtonian groups approximated in varying degrees. Since records of the Boston operations have been preserved, the organization and procedure of that society will be given in some detail.

The aggressive missionary work of carrying Washingtonianism into 160 New England towns during the first 3 months of the Boston society's existence has been noted. Of even greater interest are the details of the work with alcoholics, during this same period, as related by Samuel F. Holbrook, the first president of the society:

The Washington Total Abstinence Society was organized on the 25th of April, 1841. On the evening of its formation the officers elected were a president, two vice-presidents, a corresponding secretary, and a treasurer; after which there were chosen twenty-four gentlemen to serve as ward committee, whose duty it was to pick up inebriates, induce them to sign the pledge of total abstinence, and forsake all places where intoxicating drink was to be had, and also to visit the families of the reformed and administer to their wants.

It now became necessary to have a place exclusively our own, where we could bring the unfortunate victim of intemperance, nurse him, and converse with him, and obtain his signature to the pledge;...[We] were led to Marlboro Chapel. We obtained Hall No. 1 for a business and occasional lecture room, and the chapel for a public meeting once a week. Hall No. 1 was furnished with newspapers from various towns, as well as nearly all the publications of our own city. A table prepared, and the seats were arranged in the form of a reading room; a fountain of cold water and a desk containing the pledge occupied another part of the room.

Our pledge, for the first week, had two hundred and eighteen names; and then, as if by magic, the work commenced. And I think it is doubtful if in the annals of history there is any record of a work of such a nature and progressing with so much silence, and yet so sure in its advance. Surely it is the work of the omnipotent God...

The gentlemen acting as ward committees were filled with unexampled zeal and perseverance in the performance of their duties; leaving their own business in order to hunt up the drunkard;...So attentive were they to this voluntary duty that in a fortnight we had four hundred names on our pledge; families in all directions were assisted, children sent to school decently clad, employment obtained for the husband, the

countenance of the wife assumed a cheerful and pleasing aspect; landlords grew easy, and in fact everything relating to the circumstances of the reformed inebriate had undergone a complete change for the better...

The reeling drunkard is met in the street, or drawn out from some old filthy shed, taken by the arm, spoken kindly to, invited to the hall, and with reluctance dragged there, or carried in a carriage if not too filthy; and there he sees himself surrounded by friends, and not what he most feared - police officers; everyone takes him by the hand; he begins to come to and when sober sign the pledge, and goes away a reformed man. And it does not end there. The man takes a pledge, and from his bottle companions obtains a number of signers, who likewise become sober men. Positively, these are facts. Now, can any human agency alone do this? All will answer No; for we have invariably the testimony of vast numbers of reformed men, who have spoken in public and declared they have broken off a number of times, but have as often relapsed again: and the reason they give for doing this is that they rely wholly on the strength of their resolution without looking any higher; but now they feel the need of God's assistance, which having obtained, their reform is genuine...(8).

Holbrook also made some interesting comparisons with the attitudes and methods of the older temperance societies:

...As for reclaiming the drunkard, that was entirely out of the question; they must and will die shortly, and now our business is to take care of the rising generation. And when the hard working women complained of her drunken husband, the reply was, and from all feeling of good, to, O send him to the house of correction, or poor house, immediately, and then we will do what we can for you and your children. Now the great difficulty was that our temperance friends were, generally, men in higher circles of life, who would revolt at the idea of taking a drunkard by the arm in the street and walk with him to some place where he could be made sober and receive friendly advice. If the drunken man was noticed at all, he was taken aside from under the horses' feet, and perhaps put into some house and there left...But the method of reclaiming the apparently lost inebriate, such as the Washington Total Abstinence Society has adopted, never entered their heads; it was not thought of until our society was formed. Then some twenty or thirty drunkards came forward and signed the total abstinence pledge and related their experience, and this induced others to do the same; and then the work of reform commenced in good earnest(8).

The "Auditor's Report" contains additional information on the activities of the Boston society during its first 3 months. After reporting the receipt of \$2,537.10, one barrel of pork, four hams, and a considerable quantity of second-hand clothing, he referred to the system they had adopted "of boarding out single persons and assisting the inebriate and his family who had homes."

In addition to not less than one hundred and fifty persons boarded out [in "three good boarding-houses, kept by discreet members of the society"], two hundred and fifty families have been more or less benefited. Families the most wretched have been made comfortable; by our exertions many families that were scattered have been reunited; fathers, sons, and brothers have been taken from the houses of correction and industry, from the dram shops, and from the lowest places of degradation, restored and brought back again under the same roof, made happy, industrious, and temperate...Our society at present numbers about 4,000 members...[about] one third...heads of families...(8).

Harrison rounds out the first 2 years' history of the Boston society:

For the space of two years after its organization the meetings of the society were held in Marlboro' Chappel, while the lodging rooms connected therewith were located in Graphic Court, opposite Franklin Street. From there they removed to No. 75 Court Street...They also fitted up rooms under their hall for the temporary accommodations of reformed, or rather, reforming men. They soon again removed to rooms which they procured and fitted up in Broomfield Street...

During the first two years of its existence the officers and members of the society held weekly meetings in six different localities in the city of Boston, namely: in North Bennett Street, Milton Street, Washington Place, East Street, Common Street, and Hull Street...(8).

Another glimpse of the activities of this society, 4 years after its founding, is provided in a memorial petition presented to the State Legislature in 1845:

...From the period of its formation to the present time, it has sustained a commodious hall for holding public meetings...Large numbers of persons, in various stages of intoxication and destitution, who have been found in the streets and elsewhere, have been led to the Washingtonian Hall, where they have been kindly received, and their necessary wants supplied. The amount of service which has been rendered within the last four years, by this society, cannot be readily appreciated. A multitude of men who, by intemperance, had been shut out from the friendly regard of the world, found in the hall of the Washingtonians, for the time being, a comfortable asylum; and these men departed thence to resume their position as useful citizens. About 750 such persons have found a temporary home at Washingtonian Hall, during the year just closed, nearly all of whom, it is believed, are now temperate and industrious members of society(8). 4

As already noted, this society reported having received 56,380 members up to January 1848. According to Harrison, the central meetings were held each week uninterrupted at least to 1860. Whether an "Asylum" for inebriates was maintained during the intervening years, the writer cannot ascertain. But in 1858 a "home for the Fallen," representing perhaps a renewal of activities, was being maintained on Franklin Place. It was moved to 36 Charles Street in 1860 and renamed the "Washington Home." Conducted by a separate "executive committee," it nevertheless was operating on Washingtonian principles.

So much for the Boston society. Apparently Hawkins and his associates had laid a more sound foundation than was achieved in many communities.

As for organization and procedures elsewhere, perhaps the best clues are given in the 1842 Washingtonian Pocket Companion (19), "Containing a Choice Collection of Temperance Hymns, Songs, Etc.," - containing also the following directions "For Commencing, Organizing, and Conducting the Meetings, of a Washingtonian Total Abstinence Society." I. The Commencement.- Wherever there are a sufficient number of drinkers, to get up what is commonly called "a spree," there are enough to form a Society. It only needs one or more individuals, (If an inebriate, or moderate drinker, but resolved to reform, all the better,) to go to those persons, and to others who make, sell or use intoxicating drinks and explain to them the principles and measures of this great reform, and persuade them to agree to take the pledge at a meeting to be held at some convenient time and place mutually agreed on. In all these efforts, the utmost gentleness, and kindness, and patient perseverance, and warm persuasion, should be used. At the meetings, appoint a Chairman and a Secretary - if reformed inebriates, all the better. After singing a hymn or song, let the Chairman, or other person, open the meeting by stating its objectives - relating his experience in drinking, his past feelings, sufferings, the woe of his family and friends, the motives and reasons that induce him to take the present step, and appeal warmly and kindly to his companions, friends and neighbours to aid him in it by doing likewise. The Secretary, or other person may follow with a like experience...Other persons can be called on to speak, until it is time to get signers to the pledge. Having read the pledge...invite all who wish to join to rise up, (or come forward,) and call out their names that the Secretary may take them down. Publicity and freedom are preferable to private solicitations, whisperings, and secrecy in giving the names...Then let the Chairman or other person, first pledge himself, and then administer it to the rest.

After this, a hymn or song may be sung, and remarks and appeals be made, and other names be obtained. After all have been obtained to take the pledge, let them again rise up, and let the Chairman, or Secretary, or other person, give them THE CHARGE - a solemn address on the nature and importance of the obligations they have assumed and on the best mode of faithfully discharging them. Then let a committee be appointed to draft a Constitution to be presented at the next meeting.

II. The Organization

At the next meeting, after singing, let the Constitution be reported, and amended, if necessary, until it suits those who have taken the pledge at and since the last meeting. Then adopt it. It should contain the following, among the needed provisions. Preamble - A simple statement of the prominent evils of intemperance, and of the resolution of the signers to aid in extirpating their root. Some prefer a Parody on our National Declaration of Independence for this purpose.

Article 1 - The name of the Society, always using the distinctive title, "Washingtonian," in that name.

Article 2 - Declaring that love, Kindness and moral suasion are your only principles and measures, and disavowing denunciation, abuse, and harshness.

Article 3 - Forbid the introduction of sectarian sentiments or party politics into any lecture, speeches, singing, or doings of the society.

Article 4 - Providing for offices, committees, and their election.

Articles 5,6, and 7 - Duties of officers and committees. (One of these should be a committee to relieve the poor, sick and afflicted members and families of inebriates.)

Article 8 - Provide for by-laws, and alterations of the Constitution.

Article 9 - Provide for labours with those who violate their pledges, and the withdrawal of members...

III. How to Conduct the Meetings

After the meeting has come to order, always open with a hymn or song. Transact the business of the society with the utmost order and dispatch....Then call for speakers. Let there be as many "experiences" as possible, interspersed with brief arguments, appeals, exhortations, news of the progress of the cause, temperance anecdotes, &c. Consult brevity, so as to have as many of the brethren speak, as possible - the more the better....And always be sure to call for persons to take the pledge, when the audience feel in the right spirit. While the pledges are being filled up for delivery, pour out the warmest appeals, or sing the most interesting hymns or songs. If any member or other person violates the rules or order, or transgresses the principles and measures of the society, remind him of it in good humour, gently and kindly...KINDNESS must be the very atmosphere of your meetings, and LOVE the fuel of all your zeal, and PERSUASION the force of all your speaking, if you would have your society do the most good...(19).

Even more revealing is the definition, contained in the same Pocket Companion, of the principles of the Washingtonian movement in terms of its differences from the older societies.

I. All the Former Societies Directed Their Efforts Mainly, If Not Wholly to the Prevention of Intemperance.

"Washingtonianism," while it embraces all classes, sexes, ages and conditions of society in its efforts, makes special efforts to snatch the poor inebriate from his destructive habits - aims to cure as well as prevent intemperance. It considers the drunkard as a man - our brother - capable of being touched by kindness, of appreciating our love, and benefiting by our labours. We therefore, stoop down to him in his fallen condition and kindly raise him up, and whisper hope and encouragement into his ear, and aid him to aid himself back again to health, peace, usefulness, respectability and prosperity. By the agency of SISTERS in this labour, we endeavour to secure the co-operation of his family in our effort...

II. Other Societies, Generally Were Auxiliary to a Country - That to a State - and That to a National Society...

"Washingtonianism" ...[makes] each society independent...

III. Before the Washingtonian Reform, Not Only the Poor Drunkard, but Many of Nearly Every Other Class in Society Supposed to Be in the Way of the [Temperance] Cause, Were Denounced as Enemies - Held up to Public Indignation and Reprobation, Threatened with the Withdrawal of Votes, Pecuniary Support, or Public Countenance;...

"Washingtonianism" teaches us to avoid this course...We believe with the American Prison Discipline Society, that "there is a chord, even in the most corrupt heart, that vibrates to kindness, and a sense of justice, which knows when it has been rightly dealt with." We have tried kindness with the poor inebriate of many years continuance - we have found it powerful to overcome the induration of heart caused by eight years of the world's contempt...Hence we adopt the law of kindness - the godlike principle, "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good," in our labours to win the maker, seller and user of intoxicating liquors; and we disavow all compulsions, threats, denunciations, hard names,...or malice or

ill-will toward them...In short, "Moral suasion, not force - love not hate, are the moving springs in the Washingtonian Creed" (19).

The hymns and songs contained in this Pocket Companion are likewise revealing. Most of them are simply adapted Christian hymns and temperance songs, appealing basically to religious and patriotic sentiments. In the preface it is frankly stated that only such hymns and songs have been included which introduce no "sectarianism, party politics, denunciation or harshness," or which contain no "phrases and sentiments which all Christians could not conscientiously sing." The central emphasis is probably contained in the following hymn on the "Power of Love."

*Love is the strongest tie Love softens all our toil,
That can our hearts unite; And makes our labours blest;
Love brings to life and liberty It lights again the joyful smile,
The drunkard chained in night And gives the anguished rest.
Obeying its commands, Let love forever grow,
We quickly supply each need; Intemp'rance drive afar,
With feeling hearts and tender hands
A heaven begin on earth below
Bind up his wounds that bleed.
And banish strife and war.*

The principle of love and sympathy for the drunkard is, in countless references, considered to be the distinctively new feature introduced by the Washingtonians - and their central principle. John B. Gough attributed the success of the movement to "the true spirit of Washingtonian sympathy, kindness and charity...predominant in the bosom of this great Washingtonian Fraternity"(11).

Walter Channing, Unitarian Clergyman, in underscoring this principle, also calls attention to the other distinctive feature of the Washingtonian movement - the role played by the "reformed drunkards" themselves:

It was wholly new, both in its principles and its agents. It laid aside law and punishment, and made love, the new commandment, its own. It dared to look upon moral power as sufficient for the work of human regeneration - the living moral power in the drunkard, however degraded he might be. It had faith in man...[and so] the drunkard became a moral teacher... he rose from the lowest depths of degradation, and became an apostle of the highest sentiment in his nature; viz., the love of man, the acknowledgment of the inborn dignity of man (9).

The Causes of Decline

The materials presented above would scarcely give the impression that the major cause of the decline of the Washingtonian movement was its lack, and opposition to, religion. Yet that charge gained currency and has been perpetuated in later temperance writings. For example, Daniels, in 1877, wrote that "...this effort to divorce temperance from religion was the chief weakness of the Washingtonian movement(20)."

Actually, the charge seems to be based upon the generalization and misinterpretation of certain real difficulties that did develop, in places, between the Washingtonians and the churches - and upon the views of a few extremists. A major source of information about the Washingtonian movement available to later historians were the publications of the American Temperance Movement, edited by John Marsh. In 1842 Marsh did become concerned about the attitudes of some of the Washingtonians: "A lack of readiness on their part to acknowledge their dependence on God, no small desecration of the Sabbath, and a painful unwillingness, in not a few professed Christians, to connect the temperance cause...with religion(13)."

It must be recalled that Marsh was the earliest and most ardent promoter of the Washington movement. He had a genuine interest in the reformation of drunkards, but his greatest interest was the promotion of the temperance cause. Above all, Marsh wanted to establish the identification of temperance with religion and to obtain the support of all church members. When the behaviour of some of the Washingtonians threatened to antagonize some of the church people against the temperance cause, Marsh

did his best in his writings to counteract the threatening trends in the Washingtonian movement. Later historians seemed to overlook the fact that Marsh was addressing himself to minority manifestations - and that Marsh succeeded to a considerable extent in countering these trends.

When, in the summer of 1844, Marsh sponsored and accompanied John B. Gough on a tour through New York State, he was pleased with the fact that Gough was able to speak in many churches - "even upperclass churches." On this improved rapport with the churches, Marsh commented:

The open infidelity, and radicalism, and abuse of ministers, by some reform-speakers had kindled up in many minds an opposition to all temperance effort, especially on the Sabbath; but Mr. Gough took such decided ground on religion, as the basis of all temperance, and the great security and hope of the reformed, as entirely reconciled them, not only to the meetings, but to his occupying the pulpit on the Sabbath (13).

The causes and coolness and even hostility between some of the Washingtonians and some of the churches lay on both sides. For one thing, many Washingtonians felt that their movement represented a purer form of Christianity than was to be found in the churches. In fact, their chief criticism of churches was on this score and did not stem out of antireligious beliefs. They felt that they were living the principles which the churches talked about. This was expressed, for example, in the following hymn stanza:

*When Jesus, our Redeemer, came
To teach us in his Father's name,
In every act, in every thought
He lived the precepts which he taught (19).*

Washingtonians, furthermore, were often critical of the unhealthy other - worldliness prevalent in many churches:

*This world's not all a fleeting show,
For a man's illusion given;
He that hath sooth'd a drunkard's woe,
And led him to reform, doth know,
There's something here of heaven.
The Washingtonian that hath run
The path of kindness even;
Who's measr'd out life's little span,
In deeds of love to God and man,
On earth has tasted heaven (19).*

A number of factors led some of the churches to close their doors to the Washingtonians. Class snobbishness was one of these - a fact which particularly riled the lower class Washingtonians in those communities. Dacus (21) points out that the vanity of some of the ministers may have led them to disdain the movement, since they were neither its originators nor its leaders. Dacus certainly is right that many of the ministers of that day held narrow views that made them unsympathetic to Washingtonian principles. The most striking example of this is the argument of the Rev. Hiram Mattison, Minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Watertown, N.Y. as stated in a tract published in 1844:

FIRST - No Christian is at liberty to select or adopt any general system, organization, agencies or means, for the moral reformation of mankind, except those prescribed and recognized by Jesus Christ. But,

SECONDLY - Christ has designated his Church as his chosen organization; his Ministers as his chosen ambassadors or public teachers; and his Gospel as the system of truth and motives by which to reform mankind, Nor has he prescribed any other means. Therefore,

THIRDLY - All voluntary organizations and societies, for the suppression of particular vices, and the promotion of particular virtues, being invented by a man without a divine model or command, and proceeding upon principles and employing agencies, means and motives nor recognized in the Gospel, are incompatible with the plan ordained of Heaven, and consequently superfluous, inexpedient and dangerous (14).

Mr. Mattison's views, however, were not shared by many of the clergymen; nor were the majority of the churches at odds with the Washingtonians. Almost all "General Conventions of the Protestant Churches endorsed and encouraged the movement (14)."

The writer agrees with Eddy (14) that, except for the attitudes of a few extremists, "Washingtonianism was not an irreligious movement." The reasons for its decline must lie elsewhere.

The lack of adequate organization is another frequently cited cause of the decline of the movement. As Krout points out, there was no connection between the various groups that carried on the work. "Each group was allowed to follow its own course....As a result, systematic organization was impossible; uniformity in methods was never attained; and chance largely determined the formulation of principles (1)."

The lack of organization was first felt, however, with regard to the needs of the newly reformed men for more social and economic support. This need was adequately met by the original Baltimore society. Certainly the Boston society was well organized to help the impoverished, to get them back on their feet, and to give them adequate social support, and this seems also to have been the case in Philadelphia and other places. But in some communities, notably in New York City, "It was felt that these men who had been so under the power of the drinking habit needed more care and fraternal fellowship than could be given by so formal a society as the Washingtonians (10)." This led to the founding, on a plan similar to that of the Rechabites in Great Britain, of the "Order of the Sons of Temperance." Actually this order was founded by a group of Washingtonians in New York City during the fall of 1842.

They had noticed that although the Washingtonian movement was making rapid advance in new fields, there were already many falling away from the pledge, and they desired if possible, to hit upon some new plan of operations, some more perfect organization, one that should shield the members from temptation, and more effectually elevate and guide them....(17).

It soon manifested an esprit du corps, which gathered into it a large portion of their reformed; inasmuch as, on paying a small weekly or quarterly due, they were sure of a useful remittance in case of sickness [\$4.00 a week] or death [\$30.00]. An impressive indication gave the order impressiveness, brotherhood, and attachment; and a regalia, a distinction from other temperance men. Soon divisions and grand divisions were found springing up in every quarter. Old temperance societies lost such of their members as were reformed men; and where there was a revival of temperance [where Washingtonianism took hold], young reformed converts were allured hither, often in large proportions....(13).

The order of Sons of Temperance grew rapidly. By 1850 it had 35 Grand Divisions, 5,563 Subordinate Divisions (local societies), and 232,233 members. Eventually it became international, with a peak membership of 700,000. A later scribe of the order said that it had been brought into existence "to preserve the fruits of the Washingtonian movement." But one of its functional results was the displacement of the Washingtonian societies.

This displacement of loyalties and membership was furthered by other orders. In 1845 the "Temple of Honor" was founded as a higher degree in the Order of the Sons of Temperance. Separating from its parent body in 1846, it soon spread over the United States and Canada, numbering "in its ranks thousands upon thousands of the best and most influential citizens...(8)." "The cadets of Temperance" was another order which sprang from the Sons of Temperance. Designed for youth, it also became independent. There was an order for children, the "Bands of Hope." In 1852 the largest fraternal temperance order of all, the "Independent Order of Good Templars," was founded, with a prominent Washingtonian, Nathaniel Curtis, as its first President. These orders, taking over most of the functions of the Washingtonian movement and incorporating much of the membership under another name, may be considered, from the sociological point of view, an institutional consolidation of Washingtonianism. But they also account, to a considerable extent, for the disappearance of the Washingtonian societies.

The chief causes of the decline of the Washingtonian movement are to be found, however, in its relation to the general temperance movement. Its membership, its purposes, and its ideology were inextricably mixed with the membership, purposes and ideology of the temperance movement.

Even the Baltimore society did not confine its membership to the reclaimed victims of alcoholism -

nor did it lack an interest in the temperance movement. And, outside of Baltimore, these early “Washingtonian missionaries” were invariably sponsored by temperance organizations. When the power of the Washingtonian approach to reclaimed drunkards was demonstrated - and when it was shown that the reclaimed drunkards’ experiences had the power to arouse great interest in the cause of total abstinence, the temperance leaders threw themselves behind the movement. Here was the answer to their prayers - something that would revitalize the temperance movement.

The American Temperance Union and its executive secretary, John Marsh, in introducing and promoting the Washingtonians, may indeed be given “much credit for the success of the Washingtonians (12).” But in the last analysis, Marsh and others looked upon Washingtonianism as a method, and Washingtonians as the means, for “sparking” the temperance cause. That was their chief function. And it appears that this eventually became the chief interest of Washingtonian leaders themselves. Hawkins kept up the original Washingtonian emphasis of work with alcoholics for a long time, but during the last dozen years of his life (1846-58) most of his interest was centred in the larger temperance cause. John B. Gough made a similar shift in emphasis.

Accordingly, then, when public interest in the distinctive Washingtonian technique of experience-relating began to wane, the interest of Marsh and other temperance leaders in Washingtonianism also declined. Lyman Beecher put it bluntly: “...their thunder is worn out. The novelty of the commonplace narrative is used up, and we cannot raise an interest...”(13). Marsh himself, from the perspective of later years, spoke of the Washingtonian period as a phase of the temperance movement, giving way to other methods.

Since Washingtonianism was identified with the relating of experiences by reformed men, the displacement of this method was, to that extent, a displacement of Washingtonianism itself.

Another fact which made temperance leaders lose interest in the Washingtonian movement was its identification with the “moral suasion” point of view.

The temperance movement, up to the emergence of Washingtonianism, was not characterized by advocacy of legal action to attain its ends. Some of the leaders, however, had begun to voice the desirability of such action; the issue was in the air. The success of the Washingtonian method of love and kindness in dealing with alcoholics convinced many Washingtonians and others that this was also the method to use with the makers and sellers of liquor. William K. Mitchell, leader of the Baltimore group but also influential throughout the country, was particularly insistent that Washingtonians

...should have nothing to say against the traffic or the men engaged in it. He would have no pledge even, against engaging in the manufacture or traffic in liquors; nor did he counsel reformed men to avoid liquor-sellers’ society or places of business. He would even admit men to membership in his societies who were engaged in the traffic (14).

Many of the Baltimore missionaries must have felt the same way and must have advocated this idea wherever they went. Just as Washingtonian experience “proved” the soundness of total abstinence, so Washingtonian experience “proved” the validity of moral suasion. It was as simple as that, in the minds of many, and was so expressed in a resolution presented at the Massachusetts State Washingtonian Convention on May 26, 1842:

RESOLVED, That the unparalleled success of the Washingtonian movement in reforming the drunkard, and inducing the retailer to cease his unholy traffic, affords conclusive evidence that moral suasion is the only true and proper basis of action in the temperance cause...(9).

Even at that date, Hawkins and a few others objected and had the resolution modified on the grounds that moral suasion was an inadequate technique for the dealing with “unprincipled dealers,” and that the aid of the law was necessary. Hawkins’ view, however, was not shared by most Washingtonians. Marsh once referred to Hawkins thus: “Though a Washingtonian, he was a strong prohibitionist (13).” John B. Gough, because of his later advocacy of prohibitory legislation, was accused of not being a Washingtonian.

When the general temperance sentiment began to favour legal action, Washingtonian policy was

dated and opposed. For a time, many temperance leaders hardly knew whether to regard the Washingtonians as friends or enemies. Senator Henry William Blair of New Hampshire, in 1888, referred back to this emphasis of the Washingtonians on moral suasion as “a trace of maudlin insanity,” - because of which the temperance movement was left in a state worse than before, and as a consequence of which “we have ever since been combating the absurd theory, which is the favourite fortress of the liquor dealers, that evil is increased because it is prohibited by law (22).”

When the relating of experiences began to pall, and when moral suasion was no longer desired, there was nothing left to Washingtonianism, ideologically, except the reclaiming of drunkards. This, however, became an increasingly secondary interest of those whose primary interest was the furtherance of the temperance cause - and, without the telling of experiences, without the work of alcoholics with alcoholics, and without certain other emotional by-products of Washingtonian groups and activities, this became an increasingly difficult thing to do. And, as fewer and fewer men were reclaimed, the last distinctive feature of the Washingtonian movement dropped out of sight.

A review of various accounts of the Washingtonian movement makes it clear that the movement turned into something which it did not start out to be - a revival phase of the organized temperance movement. There are frequent references to the movement as “a pledging revival,” “a revival campaign,” “a temperance revival.” The net result was a tremendous strengthening of total abstinence sentiment and the actual enlistment of new millions in the temperance cause. But the original purpose of rehabilitating alcoholics was lost to sight. Nor would it be proper to blame the temperance movement for exploiting the Washingtonians. As E.M. Jellinek⁵ has pointed out, the Washingtonian movement was not equipped with an ideology distinctive enough to prevent its dissolution.⁵ Personal communication.

With this background, it becomes possible to make a comparison between the Washingtonian movement and Alcoholics Anonymous.

Comparison with Alcoholics Anonymous

It is apparent that the Washingtonian societies, when they were most effective in the rehabilitation of alcoholics, had a great many similarities to Alcoholics Anonymous. These similarities might be listed as follows:

1. Alcoholics helping each other.
2. The needs and interests of alcoholics kept central, despite mixed membership, by predominance of numbers, control, or the enthusiasm of the movement.
3. Weekly meetings.
4. The sharing of experiences.
5. The fellowship of the group or its members constantly available.
6. A reliance upon the power of God.
7. Total abstinence from alcohol.

Most Washingtonian groups probably failed to meet this ideal program, or to maintain it for long. Even in itemizing the ideal program, some of the differences between the Washingtonian groups and Alcoholics Anonymous stand out. The admission of nonalcoholics as members and the incorporation of the “temperance” purpose - the inducement of total abstinence in nonalcoholics - are the most striking differences. Furthermore, at their best, the Washingtonian groups possessed no understanding of alcoholism other than the possibility of recovery through love and sympathy. Their approach to the problem of alcoholism and alcohol was moralistic rather than psychological or therapeutic. They possessed no program for personality change. The group had no resource of ideas to help them rise above the ideational content locally possessed. Except for their program of mutual aid they had no pattern of organization or activity different from existing patterns. There was far too great a reliance upon the pledge, and not enough appreciation of other elements in their program. Work with other alcoholics was not required, nor was the therapeutic value of this work explicitly recognized. There was no anonymity to keep the public from becoming aware of broken pledges, or to keep individuals from exploiting the movement for prestige and

fame. Finally, there was not enough understanding of their own therapeutic program to formulate it and thus help the new groups to establish themselves on a sound and somewhat uniform basis.

The differences can be brought out more clearly by a more detailed, comparative analysis of the Alcoholics Anonymous program - its principles, practices and content.

1. *Exclusively Alcoholic Membership.* There are many therapeutic values in the cohesiveness and solidarity which a group with a common problem can achieve. But in the light of the Washingtonian experience, the greatest long-run value of an exclusively alcoholic membership is that it permits and reinforces exclusive attention to the rehabilitation of alcoholics.

2. *Singleness of Purpose.* As stated in the masthead of an organizational publication (23), Alcoholics Anonymous "is not allied with any sect, denomination, politics, organization or institution; does not wish to engage in any controversy, neither endorses nor opposes any causes. Our primary purpose is to stay sober and help other alcoholics to achieve sobriety."

Nothing can divide groups more quickly - and certainly destroy the therapeutic atmosphere effectively - than religious and political controversy. Strong efforts were made in the Washingtonian movement to minimize sectarian, theological and political differences, but the movement did not avoid attracting to itself the hostile emotions generated by these conflicts. Even if it had been more successful in this regard, it was still caught in all the controversy to which the temperance cause had become liable. Not only that, but within the temperance movement itself it eventually became stranded on the issue of moral suasion versus legal action.

In the light of this experience, the position of Alcoholics Anonymous stands in decided and hopeful contrast. In refusing to endorse or oppose causes, and particularly the temperance cause, A.A. is avoiding the greatest handicap which the Washingtonian movement had. Some temperance leaders may deplore that A.A. does not give them support, but they have no grounds for complaining that they are being opposed or hampered by A.A.

The A.A. program also contains a happy formula for avoiding the religious or theological controversies which could easily develop even within the groups as presently constituted. This is the use of the term "Power" (greater or higher), and particularly the phrase "as we understood Him," in referring to this Power, or God. The tolerance which this phrase has supported is an invaluable asset.

A further value of this single-minded concentration on the rehabilitation of alcoholics is made obvious by the Washingtonian experience. Whenever, and as long as, the Washingtonians were working hard at the reclamation of drunkards, they had notable success and the movement thrived and grew. This would support the idea that active outreach to other alcoholics is a factor in therapeutic success and, at the same time, a necessary condition for growth - and even for survival. Entirely aside from the matter of controversy, then, this singleness of A.A. purpose is a condition of continued therapeutic success and survival.

3. *An Adequate, Clear-cut Program of Recovery.* Another great asset of Alcoholics Anonymous is the ideology which forms the content and context of its program of recovery, and which has received clear and attractive expression in the book Alcoholics Anonymous (24) and in other A.A. literature. This ideology incorporates the much sounder understanding of alcoholism which has been developed in recent years. It is a pragmatic blend of that which scientific research, dynamic psychology and mature religion have to offer; and through the literature of the movement, the members are kept sympathetically oriented to the developments in these fields.

Accordingly, instead of viewing alcoholism with a moralistic eye on alcohol - as an evil which ought to be abandoned - A.A. sees alcoholism as an illness, symptomatic of a personality disorder. Its program is designed to get at the basic problem, that is, to bring about a change in personality.

This program is simply and clearly stated in the Twelve Steps - augmented by the "24 hour program" of abstaining from alcohol, and the supporting slogans and emphases such as "First things first," "Live and let live," "Easy does it," "Keep an open mind," honesty, humility, and so forth. Great stress is also put upon regular attendance at the group meetings, which are characterized by the informal exchange of

experiences and ideas and by a genuinely satisfying fellowship.

Compared to the Washingtonian brand, the A.A. sharing of experiences is notably enriched by the psychological insights which have been brought into the group by A.A. literature and outside speakers. A thorough analysis and catharsis is specifically asked for in the Twelve Steps - as well as an improvement in relations to other persons. Work with other alcoholics is required, and the therapeutic value accruing to the sponsor of new members is distinctly recognized. The spiritual part of the program is more clearly and inclusively defined, more soundly based, and more frankly made an indispensable condition of recovery.

It appears, furthermore, that the A.A. group activity is more satisfactory to the alcoholic than was the case in many Washingtonian societies. A.A. members seem to find all the satisfaction and values in their groups that the founders of the various orders thought were lacking in the Washingtonian groups.

A decided Washingtonian weakness was its general lack of follow-through. In contrast, A.A. is particularly strong on this point, providing a potent follow-through in a group setting where self-analysis and catharsis are stimulated; where new attitudes toward alcohol, self and others are learned; where the feeling tones are modified through a new quality of relationships; where, in short, a new way of life is acquired - one which not only enables the person to interact with his environment (particularly with other persons) without the use of alcohol, but enables him to do so on a more mature, satisfying basis.

No doubt a similar change occurred in many (though probably not in most) of the alcoholic Washingtonians, but it was more by a coincidence, within and without the societies, of circumstances that were rarely understood and never formulated into a definite, repeatable program. A.A. is infinitely better equipped in this respect.

4. Anonymity. A comparison with the Washingtonian experience underscores the sheer survival value of the principle of anonymity in Alcoholics Anonymous. At the height of his popularity, John B. Gough either "slipped" or was tricked by his enemies into a drunken relapse. At any rate, the opponents of the Washingtonian movement seized upon this lapse with glee and made the most of it to hurt Gough and the movement. This must have happened frequently to less widely known but nevertheless publicly known Washingtonians. Public confidence in the movement was impaired. Anonymity protects the reputation of A.A. from public criticism not only of "slips" but also of failures, internal tensions, and all deviant behaviour.

Equally important, anonymity keeps the groups from exploiting prominent names for the sake of group prestige; and it keeps individual members from exploiting their A.A. connection for personal prestige or fame. This encourages humility and the placing of principles above personalities. Such behaviour not only generates outside admiration of A.A. but has therapeutic value for the individual members. There are further therapeutic values in anonymity: it makes it easier for alcoholics to approach A.A., and it relaxes the new member. It encourages honest catharsis and utter frankness. It protects the new member from the critical eyes of certain acquaintances while he experiments with this new way of life, for fumbling and failure will be hidden.

5. Hazard-avoiding Traditions. Another decisive contrast to the Washingtonian movement is the development in Alcoholics Anonymous not only of a relatively uniform program of recovery but also of relatively uniform traditions for avoiding the usual hazards to which organizations are subject.

In Alcoholics Anonymous there is actually no overhead authority. Wherever two or three alcoholics get together to attain sobriety on the general basis of the Twelve Step program they may call themselves an A.A. group. They are free to conduct their activities as they see fit. As would be expected in a fellowship of independent groups, all kinds of practices and policies have been tried. A careful reading of the A.A. publication, *A.A. Tradition* (25), will reveal how great the variety has been, here and there. Membership has been limited. Conduct of groups has been undemocratic. Leaders have exploited the groups for personal prestige. The principle of anonymity has been violated. Personal and jurisdictional rivalries have developed. Money, property and organizational difficulties have disrupted A.A. groups. Members and groups, yielding to their own enthusiasms and reflecting the patterns of other institutions around them, have endangered the immediate and ultimate welfare of the A.A. fellowship. These deviations could have been serious had there

not existed a considerable uniformity in practice and principle.

In the early days of A.A., the entire fellowship was bound together by a chain of personal relationships - all created on the basis of a common program, a common spirit and a common tradition. This spirit and this pragmatically achieved program and tradition were the only guiding principles, and relative uniformity was not difficult. Alcoholics Anonymous was just a fellowship - small, informal, poor and unpretentious. But with growth, prosperity and prestige, the difficulties of getting all groups and members to see the value of these guiding principles increased. A self-conscious statement and explanation was needed - and this finally emerged in 1947 and 1948 in the "Twelve Points of Tradition," elaborated upon in editorials in *The A.A. Grapevine* (23) and subsequently published as a booklet (25).

In formulating and stating the reasons for these traditions, Bill W., one of the founders, has continued the extremely valuable function which he, Dr. Bob and other national leaders have performed - that of keeping intact the experienced based program and principles of A.A.

Perhaps as important as any other is the tradition of keeping authority in principles rather than letting it become vested in offices and personalities. This tradition is supported by the related principle of rotating leadership, and the concept that leaders are merely the trusted servants of the group or groups. The hazard-avoiding values of these traditions are obvious.

The tradition that membership be open to any alcoholic has value in countering the tendency toward exclusiveness, class-consciousness, cliquishness - and it helps to keep the groups focussed on their main job of helping the "alcoholic who still suffers."

The tradition of complete self-support of A.A. groups and activities by the voluntary contributions of A.A. members avoids the dangers inherent in fixed dues, assessments, public solicitations, and the like - and it is conducive to self-reliance and self-respect. Furthermore, in minimizing money it maximizes fellowship.

The tradition that "any considerable property of genuine use to A.A. should be separately incorporated and managed" is important in keeping the A.A. groups from becoming entangled in the problems of property beyond the minimum necessary for their own functioning. The tradition of "the least possible organization" has a similar value. These last three traditions might be summed up as precautions against the common tendency to forget that money, property and organization are only means - and that means find their rightful place only when the end is kept clearly in view. For A.A., these traditions should help to keep the groups concentrated on their prime purpose: helping alcoholics recover.

The existence of these traditions - and their clear formulation - are assets which the Washingtonian movement never possessed.

What prognosis for Alcoholics Anonymous is suggested by this comparison with the Washingtonian movement?

The least that can be said is that the short life of the Washingtonian movement simply has no parallel implications for A.A. Despite certain but limited similarities in origins, purpose and early activities, the differences are too great to draw the conclusion of a similar fate for A.A.

Are the differences, then, of such a nature as to assure a long life for Alcoholics Anonymous? This much can be said with assurance of consensus: (A) In the light of our present-day knowledge, A.A. has a sounder program of recovery than the Washingtonians achieved. (B) A.A. has avoided many of the organizational hazards which plagued the Washingtonian societies. The success and growth of A.A. during more than a decade of public life, its present vigour and its present unity underscore these statements and augur well for the future.

In the writer's judgment, based on a systematic study (26) of A.A., there is no inherent reason why A.A. should not enjoy an indefinitely continued existence. How long an existence will depend upon how well the leaders and members continue to follow the present program and principles - that is, how actively A.A. members will continue to reach out to other alcoholics; how thoroughly the remainder of the A.A. program will continue to be practiced, particularly the steps dealing with catharsis and the spiritual aspects; and, how closely all groups will be guided by the present traditions.

Finally, the writer would suggest that the value in the traditions lies chiefly in the avoidance of factors that can easily interfere with keeping the ideal therapeutic atmosphere found in the small A.A. groups at their best. Most of the personality change necessary for recovery from alcoholism occurs in these small groups - and that work is at its very best when there is a genuinely warm, nonegocentric fellowship. How well this quality of fellowship is maintained in the small, local groups is offered, therefore, as another condition determining how bright the future of A.A. will be.

Whatever the worth of these judgments, they point up the potential value to A.A. of careful, objective research on these and related conditions. This would give Alcoholics Anonymous another asset that the Washingtonians never had.

References

1. Krout, J.A. The Origins of Prohibition. New York; Knopf, 1925.
2. Rush, Benjamin. An Inquiry Into the Effects of Ardent Spirits on the Human Body and Mind. [1785]
3. Beecher, Lyman. Six Sermons On the Nature, Occasion, Signs, Evils, and Remedy of Intemperance. New York. American Tract Society, 1827.
4. Fehlandt, A.F. A Century of Drink Reform in the United States. Cincinnati; Jennings and Graham; and New York, Eaton & Mains, 1904.
5. Permanent Temperance Documents of the American Temperance Society; Vol.1 Boston; Seth Bliss, 1835.
6. One Hundred Years of Temperance. A Memorial Volume of the Centennial Temperance Conference Held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, September, 1885. New York; National Temperance Society & Publication House, 1886.
7. Annual Reports of the Executive Committee of the American Temperance Union, 1840-1849.
8. Harrison, D. A Voice from the Washingtonian Home. Boston; Redding & Co., 1860.
9. Hawkins, W.G. Life of John W. Hawkins. Boston, Dutton, 1863.
10. Banks, L.A. The Lincoln Legion. New York; Mershon Co., 1903.
11. Gough, J.B. Autobiography and Personal Recollections. Springfield, Mass.; Bill, Nichols & Co., 1869.
12. Wooley, J. G. and Johnson, W.E. Temperance Progress in the Century. London; Linscott Publishing Co., 1903.
13. Marsh, J. Temperance Recollections. New York; Scribner, 1866.
14. Eddy, R. Alcohol and History. New York; National Temperance Society & Publication House, 1887.
15. Cherrington, E.H. The Evolution of Prohibition in the United States of America. Westerville, Ohio; American Issue Press, 1920.
16. Cyclopedia of Temperance and Prohibition. New York; Funk & Wagnalls, 1891.
17. Crothers, T.D. Inebriety. Cincinnati; Harvey, 1911.
18. Sellers, J.B. The Prohibition Movement in Alabama, 1702-1943. Chapel Hill, Univ. North Carolina Press, 1943.
19. Grosh, A.B. ed. Washingtonian Pocket Companion. Utica, N.Y., S.S. Merrell; Bennett, Backus & Hawley; & G. Tracy, 1842.

20. Daniels, W.H. *The Temperance Reform and Its Great Reformers*. New York; Nelson & Phillips, 1878.
21. Dacus, J.A. *Battling with the Demon*. St. Louis; Scammel & Co., 1878.
22. Blair, H.W. *The Temperance Movement*. Boston; William E. Smythe Co., 1888.
23. *The A.A. Grapevine*. New York; A.A. Grapevine, Inc.
24. *Alcoholics Anonymous*. New York; Works Publishing Co., 1939.
25. *A.A. Tradition*. New York; Works Publishing Co., 1947.
26. Maxwell, M.A. *Social Factors in the Alcoholics Anonymous Program*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Texas, 1949.

[A Member of the Society]. "The Foundation, Progress and Principles of the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore, and the Influence it Has Had on the Temperance Movements in the United States."

"I regard the origin of the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore as the most important event in the history of the great Temperance movement." Hon. George N. Briggs.

Preface

The author of the following pages has had no experience in "book-making," and this, his first effort has been made during the few leisure hours, which could be found amid the duties of a laborious profession. This little volume is therefore recommended to the public, not so much on account of its merits as a composition, as for the intrinsic importance of the facts stated, and the principles developed in it. The immediate object in view is to convey correct information; the ultimate motive is to do good.

This volume was written with the design, not only of accurately informing the public of the origin of the recent revival of Temperance throughout the United States, but also of setting forth definitely the foundation and principles of the "Washington Temperance Society" of Baltimore, with which this revival mainly originated.

A new era has dawned upon the Temperance cause. A moral revolution, in the form of the reformation of thousands of drunkards, is now sweeping over the United States like a whirlwind. It meets with little opposition. All see, and few will not admit, that it is founded in right and truth. Thousands of the most abandoned drunkards are being reclaimed from their habits, and are taking their proper stations, as good and useful members of the community. Reformed men are visiting the different sections of the country, under the designation and office of "Temperance Missionaries," - men who have themselves been but recently reclaimed from intemperance, and who are now devoting their time, and using their influence, to rescue others from their degradation, to the same position of safety, which they themselves now occupy.

All these extraordinary movements are but the developments of a system established in Baltimore two years ago, and have had their beginning in the Washington Temperance Society of this city. To trace the foundation, progress and principles of this society, is the design of the following pages.

The Author. Baltimore, April 5th, 1842.

Washington Pledge

"We, whose names are annexed, desirous of forming a society for our natural benefit, and to guard against a pernicious practice, which is injurious to our health, standing and families - we do pledge ourselves as gentlemen, not to drink any spirituous or malt liquors, wine or cider."

Chapter I: Foundation of the Society

The 5th of April, 1840, was an eventful day. Influences were set at work then, which have been developing and extending ever since, and which promise to accomplish much for the good of mankind. On the evening of that day, half a dozen men met in the bar-room of a tavern in Baltimore. They had often met there before, spent their hours in friendly converse, and mingled in the mutual drowning of care in the bowl. It was a place of usual resort to them. And now they had met there as before, to drink together from the poisonous cup, to which they were all too much addicted. Without having become outcasts or sots, they had all confessedly suffered severely from the frequent and intemperate use of intoxicating drinks, - suffered in their health, suffered in their estates, suffered in their families, their habits, their feelings and their reputation.

But though these were plain men, they were men of unusual energy. It is true that alcohol had made its ravages on their characters, their minds, and their hearts. But the energy of manhood still survived. They were the victims, rather than merely the votaries of the pleasures of the bowl. They were in business, and five of them had families. They cared for their business and loved their families. They had all started out in

life when young, with the hopes which usually beat high in the hearts of youth in every branch of business, or situation in life, when first entering upon the world. For a time they ran well. Business was fair. Friends were not few. They had married, and were happy.

Had any man told either of them at eighteen, nineteen, or twenty years of age, that twenty-five or thirty would find them drunkards, - that, like thousands around them, they would suffer from the poison of the serpent, and the sting of the adder in the cup, they would have laughed the insinuation to scorn, and honestly too. They never dreamed then of being drunkards. They drank moderately, and freely too. The habits of society at that time, - of all classes of society, even religious, sanctioned the free use of alcoholic drinks; and they went with the multitude never for a moment thinking of evil. But the love of drink particularly of the "social glass," grew upon them gradually and insensibly, until habit was fixed and appetite strong; and ere they had suspected it, they found themselves in the power of a monster, bound hand and foot in chains, - the slaves of their own appetites. And now they frequented the public taverns; and oft at night, or during the day, and even on the Sabbath, instead of being at their business, or with their families, or at church, they were to be found at the Hotel or Grogshop. They knew it was wrong. They saw the evil; they felt it; they lamented it; and times without number did they promise wife and friend and self, that they would drink no more. They were sincere. They meant to be sober. But at some fatal hour they would take one glass again, "just one glass;" and they found themselves as powerless and debased as ever.

It was on the evening of the day on which we have introduced them to the reader, that these six men were once more together at the tavern. Their families were forsaken at home. Their business for the day was done. But neither was entirely forgotten. The bar with its temptations was near them. Their habits were to contend with. And the cravings of an unnatural appetite within were against all good resolves. But these men had not lost all their principle, their energy, or their feeling. They looked to their homes, and they saw that much of domestic bliss, which should gather round the fireside, was banished by the inebriating cup. They looked to their business, and they knew they had suffered there. They counted the cost, and they were astonished at the amount of money they threw away in visiting the dram-shop. They looked back to the days of their youth, when with free hearts and bounding hopes, they had leaped into life, and had looked forward into the future never dreaming of such a slavery. They looked to their reputation, their influence, their health, their feelings, and their energy of character; and they felt that they would lose all these, if they prosecuted much longer the way in which they were hurrying down to death. They looked into the future, and all was clouds and darkness. They deliberately weighed the movement about to be made; and then rising in the energy of their still surviving manhood, they resolved that hour they would drink no more of the poisonous draught forever; and that to carry out their resolutions, they would form a society with a pledge to that effect, and bind themselves under it to each other for life.

This is no fancy sketch. The circumstances have often been stated by the founders of the society, just as we have detailed them. We do not pretend to say, that the feelings and reflections above stated were matters of grave deliberation and discussion among them. The movement had more of a spontaneous character, and was at once and rather impulsively approved as soon as suggested. But these were the silent meditations and reflections, which were working in each individual breast, so that it needed but that the proper chord should be touched, under the circumstances, and their hearts all vibrated together: the matter needed but a proposal to meet the approbation of all. It should also be remarked that the idea of reformation had been suggested among them at a former meeting, but no conclusion had been arrived at, as to either the certainty or the manner of the accomplishment of their purpose.

And now the deed was done. A constitution was agreed upon; and as the movement was a great and important one, a great name was proposed to be affixed as the title of the society. It was adopted. And this was the foundation of the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore.

From the character of the deed itself, and the extraordinary results, which have proceeded and are yet proceeding from it, justice requires that the names of the founders of this association should be recorded, that they may be handed down in all the future annals of the Temperance cause. William K. Mitchell, John F. Loss, David Anderson, George Stears, Archibald Campbell and James McCurley were the "original six,"

who founded the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore, and of course the originators of that new system of Temperance operations, which has of late attracted the attention of the country.

Previous to the evening on which the society was formed, we have intimated that the subject of reformation had been in contemplation among them for several days. When the adoption of a society and pledge was proposed, several difficulties were in the way of their successful organization. These difficulties were mainly the apprehensions of evil influences being introduced into the action of the society, to divert them from their simple purpose, if, as might be, the society should ever become efficient and numerous.

Upon suggestion therefore it was resolved among themselves, that they would place the temperance cause, so far as they were concerned, in the position of a unit: that the society, as such, was to recognize no creed of religion, nor party in politics; and that neither political nor religious action of any kind, should ever be introduced into the society's operations. Personal abstinence from all intoxicating drinks was to be the basis, and only requisite of membership. Moral suasion was to be the only means by which they, as a body, were to induce others to adopt their principles. As a society, their whole business was to induce others not to drink intoxicating liquors. They would thus be less likely to excite the suspicions or prejudices of any class of men, and have free access to all; this would render Temperance a simple principle of personal abstinence. It would be, in the language of Father Matthew, "a green spot in the desert of life, where all could meet in peace and harmony."

Moreover they determined that the regular meetings of the society should be meetings for the detail of personal experience, and not for debates, lectures and speeches; that even on matters of necessary business, as few remarks as possible only would be tolerated. Thus all temperance addresses were to be in the form of the individual experience of the several members. The spirit of this rule and common sense were to guide them how far any should be allowed to go in his remarks. The society was thus based on facts, and not on an abstraction, and the principle of common honesty was to direct them in all their movements.

These difficulties being out of the way - the society being now organized, and the constitution and pledge adopted and signed, the founders resolved to hold weekly experience meetings for their own encouragement and benefit, and for the good of others who might be induced to attend.

Chapter II: Progress and Influence of the Society

Immediately after the organization of the society, the several members went privately to their friends, especially their former drinking associates, and persuaded them in the spirit of kindness, to abandon strong drink, and join the society. To every excuse and plea that they could not reform, they would reply by referring to their own experience. And they generally clung to a man until they had persuaded him to give up the bottle forever, or at least to go with them to the next meeting of their society. When such was the condition or promise, true to his man, each member on the evening of meeting, instead of going alone and waiting for his friend, would go to his house, or to the Grogshop, and, if necessary, lead him by the arm away from the bar, and conduct him in person to the meeting. This has often been done. When the individual was once within their hall, they regarded him as a easy convert. The experience of others who had been like him, and the good influences set to work upon him, soon led him to feel, think and act aright. Such exertions, judiciously made in the spirit of kindness, have rarely failed of entire success.

In the course of some months, the society gradually increased in numbers and interest. The aggressive principle, or missionary spirit, once at work, grew and spread with the growth and extension of the society. In the meantime, the members had the benefit of several months' experience in the use of cold water. They began to feel better, to look better, and in every respect to be satisfied with the change in their habits. As some of them expressed it: "They were just waking up from a long sleep of many years, and now only beginning to live." The "experiences" of the members were now more and more interesting, and began to attract somewhat the attention of the public; and through their influence many of the most desperate and hopeless subjects of intemperance were redeemed. By the truly Samaritan conduct of these sacrificing men, many a poor inebriate, whose friends had long given him over as beyond the reach of hope, was rescued from his chains, and elevated from the depths of degradation, to which strong drink had reduced him. Each

of these was not only a new experience man, but virtually another missionary.

In six months after its formation, the society numbered eighty or ninety, many of whom were reformed drunkards. And no man could attend their meetings, as the author then first did without seeing that there was a spirit among them which would not die - a principle which would diffuse itself abroad in the community, and pour the richest blessings on the heads of many a family in Baltimore; - and even spread to the farthest borders of the land. As yet, however, their meetings were held in their own private hall, which they had rented for the purpose. The citizens did not generally know of the movement; and such as did, hardly had confidence in the permanency of the reformatations.

In November, 1840, their first public meeting was held in the Masonic Hall, which was crowded on the occasion. As this was their first public effort however, and as the object was rather intended to be an introduction to the public, very little experience was given. In addition to these remarks made by gentlemen invited to address the meeting, the President simply stated the principles of the society, that they might be understood by the community. Not long after this another public meeting was called in one of the churches of the city, on which occasion several of the members of the society publicly told their tale of woe and warning, counsel and advice, and with thrilling effect. Numbers were induced to sign the pledge; many of them victims of intemperance. And in the bosom of the society they found a home, and friends to counsel and defend them.

Frequent public experience meetings now followed, and were continued week after week during the entire winter. Public attention was now fully arrested. The meetings, though held in the largest churches of the city, were crowded to excess. Every family that had a poor miserable inebriate connected with it, hailed with joy and hope the influence which this society was exerting in reforming the intemperate, and used every exertion to induce such persons to attend the meetings of the Washington Society, and sign the pledge. And many a good-hearted, yea, noble-hearted man, who had long found the chains of appetite galling to him, and had often wished and tried in vain to shake them off, now went to this society, signed the pledge, and found him-self a free man. Many reformed, whose friends and the community had long since given them over as irrecoverable, - many even from the lowest depths of disgrace and reproach. Some were almost literally dug up out of the earth, - who had not only been abandoned as beyond hope, but who had been forgotten by their early friends, or reckoned among the dead. Many such were brought out of their hiding-places, and to the surprise of their friends, soon after their reformation, they were found "clothed and in their right mind," and prepared to occupy that position in society, which they had forfeited only by dissipation. Insomuch that the society was familiarly known by the expressive title of the "Resurrection Society."

The society was now increasing in numbers so fast, that their regular place of meeting was becoming too small to accommodate them all. A division was contemplated. But it was at length resolved, the branches should be formed in the various sections of the city; this was accordingly done. In the meantime other societies began to spring up in the city, on the same general principles with the Washington; some auxiliary, and others independent. All of these societies under their present organization, (with two or three exceptions,) owe their origin directly or indirectly to the influence of the parent Washington Society, and have borrowed most of their features, as well as obtained most of their life from it. Many of these associations have been very prosperous, and have done incalculable good in reclaiming the intemperate, confirming the temperate, and advancing the common cause. If our assigned limits would allow, it would afford us pleasure to make honourable mention of some of these societies; but as it is, we can not go into any detail respecting them. We hail them as fellow-labourers in a common cause, take them by the hand, and bid them "God speed." We call upon them to rival us in good works, and in adhering to first principles, - and then our motto is: "We be brethren; let us not fall out by the way."

It should be observed that most of the Temperance societies, in existence in this city previous to the formation of the Washington, have either been remodelled or discontinued, and their places filled up by more energetic ones. Many of the societies admit only of grown men as members; but there are others connected with the various churches, or composed entirely of female or youth, where such may join as

choose to do so.

Chapter III: Missionaries.

In the progress of time, the news of our doings in Baltimore had gone abroad. The friends of Temperance in other sections of the country, by means of the Maryland Temperance Herald, the city papers generally, and private and published letters, had heard of our extraordinary operations, and were looking with hope to the spread of that flame, which had been first kindled among us. By several letters written to individuals in New York, which were published in the daily, as well as Temperance press of that city; and subsequently by the statements made at a public meeting there by a citizen of Baltimore, the New York Temperance Society was led to write to the Washington Society for a delegation of her reformed men, who might go on to that city, and by relating their experience, give a new impulse to the cause, and awaken a fresh interest among them; and especially that they might reach those, who hitherto had been almost beyond their influence - the drunkards.

Accordingly in March, 1841, a delegation, consisting of Messrs. Hawkins, Casey, Pollard, Shaw, and subsequently President Mitchell himself, went to New York, and the abundant and glorious success with which they met, is a matter of public history. Thousands flocked to the meetings held on the occasion in the largest churches in the city. In the space of several weeks, hundreds of the most debased and unfortunate drunkards were reformed, and an impulse given to the cause there, which has not died or diminished; nor is it likely to do so soon. There the second Washington Temperance Society was formed on the model of the first; and under the presidency of Captain Wisdom and his zealous compeers, they have reaped the same glorious harvest, which we were reaping before them. The recent splendid Temperance Procession in New York has shown the country that the cause is still onward there as elsewhere.

The 5th of April, 1841, the anniversary of the formation of the original Washington Society, was celebrated in Baltimore by a grand Procession. This Procession was admitted by all to have been one of the most splendid affairs ever witnessed in Baltimore. It was estimated that at least six or eight thousand persons were in the ranks. The Procession moved through the principal streets of the city, with bands of music, and numerous magnificent banners, and countless badges - with at least fifty mounted marshals, besides hundreds of marshals on foot, with their various insignia. One of the 'original six,' Captain John F. Loss, was the Chief Marshal of the day. President William K. Mitchell and the remaining four, in company with distinguished strangers, and the orator and chaplains of the day, rode in open barouches drawn each by four grey horses. It was a proud and happy day to many a heart, and many a family; and will be remembered by the citizens of Baltimore, as one of the greatest days ever celebrated in this city.

This celebration and procession, as well as the unexampled success of our delegates in New York, produced a deep impression on the public mind of the country. It was evident that a moral revolution was beginning to work, and all eyes were now directed to the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore, as the centre of all its operations. Missionaries were now applied for from almost every quarter of the land, and the Missionary operations of the society began to be developed on a large scale. Messrs. Hawkins and Wright in New England, and the Eastern and Middle States generally - Pollard and Wright in New York - Vickers in the valley of the Ohio - Carey, Stansbury, Morrison, Mules and Michael in various parts of Pennsylvania and Maryland - Carey in North and South Carolina - Michael in Virginia, with numerous others, have engraven their memories on the hearts of many redeemed and disenthralled men. By their influence tens of thousands, yea, we may say hundreds of thousands, have been induced to sign the pledge - many of them the most unhappy inebriates.

Even now, while we write, our Missionaries are in the field in the North, in the South, in the East, and in the West. Everywhere the labors of these Reformed Reformers have been crowned with the most abundant and glorious success. And still "the work goes bravely on." Washington Temperance Societies are springing up all over the land. The right spirit is at work, and it must develop good. Truth in the hands of honest and energetic men will have sway. The fire has begun to spread. May Heaven grant energy and speed to the flames, that they may spread all over the land, to every city, town, hamlet and family; until intemperance,

and all its concomitant evils, be banished from our borders.

Chapter IV: the Temperance Cause Before

We pause here for a moment to look back upon the past. Let us place ourselves back in the Spring of 1840. The Temperance cause had been for some twelve or fifteen years in successful operation. And though errors have doubtlessly been committed in the beginning of the reform, experience had taught wisdom; and "Total Abstinence" had now been for several years the motto of most of those, who professed to be real temperance men. The inconsistency and inefficiency of the old pledge had been proved. Under the new and comprehensive pledge much good had been done, much evil had been prevented; and even many drunkards had been reformed, at different times during the progress of the cause. In general however the exertions of temperance men had been rather preventive, than directly reforming. Indeed it cannot be denied, that many of the honest friends of the cause, despaired of reforming those who were confirmed in habits of intemperance. Their doctrine was: "Let us secure the sober and the youth of this generation, and when the present race of confirmed drunkards shall have passed into their graves, we shall have an entire generation of temperate, cold-water men." This, it is true, was a cold and hard calculation, but we believe it was an honest one with many. Nevertheless some few did entertain and argue the possibility of any and every drunkard's reformation, on the simple and only principle of entire abstinence. But the great difficulty was, they had no access to the victim of drink; they understood not how to reach his sympathies, and bid him be a man.

Far be it from us to cast any reproach or censure upon the old Temperance men, or deprive them of one merited laurel. Much, very much had been done previous to this recent extraordinary revival of the cause. They have proved by statistics the great and astounding evils of intemperance, in reference to the pauperism and crime of the country. They were not only shown that alcoholic drinks were unnecessary, but proved them to be absolutely poisonous, and of course destructive. The manufacture and traffic had been greatly diminished in some places, and in others almost abandoned. In thousands and tens of thousands of families, the bottle had been banished from the cupboard, and both from the table. Instead of the universal use of alcoholic drinks by old and young, male and female, religious and irreligious, hundreds of thousands had signed the total abstinence pledge; and of course, so far as they were consistent, these were safe from the possibility of becoming drunkards. Numerous vessels on our seas, bays and rivers, sailed on strictly Temperance principles. Thousands of men of business had ceased to give liquor to those in their employ. Many farmers had gathered in their harvests, without one drop of alcohol being distributed in the fields. The grog-rations had been abolished in the army. Many drunkards had been saved. In a word, much good had been done, and much evil prevented.

In this reform many of the ablest and best men were engaged. In Maryland, through the zealous and self-sacrificing labors of a few men, much had been done. And though others have merited praise, we can not, in giving a fair history of the past, fail to refer to the zeal and perseverance of one man, who for years has stood foremost in the front ranks of the Temperance men of his State. Than this man, the cause has not had a more devoted, ardent and constant friend. His time, his talents, his counsel, his purse, his pen, and his voice have all been for years disinterestedly bestowed upon the welfare of his City and State, in the promotion of this great reform. He had faith in it, when even his friends hardly presumed to hope. He weathered the storm sometime almost alone, and rested in hope of a brighter day. And now he has the satisfaction of seeing the day, when few men do not admit that he was correct, at least in his general principles. Many of those, who once ridiculed or hated him, have come into his general measures, and now regard him in his true light, as an ardent and devoted philanthropist. No man, at least in Maryland, can fail to anticipate us in saying, that this man is CHRISTIAN KEENER.

But notwithstanding much had been done, much remained to be done. Especially had the efforts of temperance men been rather directed to prevent than to cure. They seemed to have no access to those, who most of all needed aid and counsel - the unfortunate victims of the curse of drunkenness. Very little systematic effort was made to reclaim them. The fact is, the poor drunkard was regarded as an object of

contempt, of denunciation, or of ridicule, rather than an object of sympathy. He was looked upon as a wicked man, rather than as a weak man. When he did form the theme of the deliberations and speeches of the old Temperance men, it was often only by way of exciting the ridicule or the indignation of the audience against him. Instead of being regarded as an unfortunate brother, the victim of violent passions and appetites, he was too often presented and regarded as a monster too degraded or too heinous to excite our sympathies. To these opinions, and to this course there were honorable exceptions. But it cannot be denied, that the tendency was rather to drive away the drunkard, than to seek him out and reform him.

Moreover it is questionable whether the cause was not retarded in its influence upon the mass of the world, by at least a seeming connection with politics on the one hand, and the church on the other. We refer to the systematic efforts made by many Temperance societies, to bring about changes in the laws, and often by the influence of the polls - and those changes too intended to affect long established usages and supposed rights. Again, most of the Temperance societies were identified, in name or otherwise, with some church or other; Temperance speeches too often partook of the nature of sermons, or general lectures on morals, which however much they might influence the conscientious part of the community, it is not to be expected that the intemperate would be influenced by such operations. And then again, the same pledge, which was to reform a man from drunkenness, required him not only to have no connection with the manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquors, but frequently also to proscribe those who had this connection, by refusing a business intercourse with them. Thus prejudices were excited against the Temperance Reform on all sides, from the drunkard, the dealer and his friends. Now the author has no design to defend either the manufacture or traffic. He himself had signed such a pledge as is here spoken of, and still abides by it; and he is not prepared to say, that he would have all such societies and pledges abolished. But it can not be a question, whether with such instrumentalities we are as likely to reach the intemperate drinker and trafficker, as by a system, the only requisite of which is to abstain personally.

In addition to this, there was a general lethargy on the part of the Temperance societies of this State and elsewhere. A recent number of the "Temperance Herald," speaking of the period to which we refer, says: "A short time since, and the cause of Temperance seemed almost naked of support. Those who had been its warm advocates, by that time had nearly all departed, and one by one had left it."

These then were the circumstances, under which this wonderful and glorious revival of the Temperance cause, was ushered upon the world; and now what, in two years, have been the results!

Chapter V. Results

If the amount of good done by this recent reformation was to be estimated only in dollars and cents - in property saved and property gained - then something of a calculation might perhaps be made of its benefits. But while it has blessed thousands, by supplying the comforts of life, where they were wanting before, it has filled thousands of households with joy, and given peace and contentment to many a weary, burdened and distracted heart. These are blessings which no measures can estimate, no calculations compute. Many a family fireside has been made thrice joyous and happy, the abode of peace and plenty, where once the "household gods were shivered on the hearth," and Poverty and Misery sat in ghastly forms. Hard-drinking men, whose only fault, in the eyes of the world, was that they "would drink," have been led to abandon their cups entirely; and the perfect renewal of their comfort, tempers and feelings, has been a matter of astonishment even to themselves. Many of the most abandoned and outcast of the intemperate have been rescued literally from "wretchedness and rags," restored to their friends and society, and now promise to become good and useful members of the community.

Oh! could you enter into the deep-feeling heart of the reformed, and read the thoughts and sensations written there, you would find enough to compensate for all the toil and care bestowed upon this enterprise, from its commencement until this hour. How oft had he struggled with his habits and appetites, and vowed to drink no more, - kept his promise for a day, a week or perhaps a month, and then fallen again as deep as ever. At last despair had well nigh taken possession of his soul, - and drowned in drink, he forgot for a time all his former feelings, and hopes, and vows. Wretchedness perhaps followed him day and night,

except when so steeped in poison, that he had no feeling left. His self-respect almost gone - ashamed to meet those he knew - despised - cast off perhaps by his own family - he is met by some kind Washingtonian, who, like a friend, takes him by the hand, and soon wins him into his confidence, and conducts him to a meeting, where in hearing the experience of others, he learns that he too may be a sober and a free man, - and summoning all the energy of his almost expiring manhood, he signs the pledge. And though with throbbing heart and trembling hand he seizes the pen, yet no sooner has his name been finished, and the pen dropped from his hand, than he feels as though the burden of a mountain were rolled off his heart. His word, his honor, have now passed; and he finds himself not standing alone on an individual promise, or a vow to his own heart; but pledged to and with his fellows, who now welcome him to their circle, take him by the hand, and endeavour to encourage and support him in this effort to be free. Now every thing tends to strengthen him in his purpose; and hand to hand, and heart to heart with his compeers. he feels himself delivered from the most galling slavery that ever enchained the body and the mind. Oh! who can tell the drunkard's joy, when he feels that he is a drunkard now no more forever. And when he has been sobered for a while, and has had time to reflect, he finds new joys daily springing up around him on every hand. When he looks to his home, now so changed, or meets the countenances of his family, now so differently fixed upon him, as he returns noon and night from business or labor, joys spring up in his heart, he had never known before - no, not even before he had been a drunkard.

But these are blessings which cannot be estimated. The restoration of a single drunkard is, so far as he is concerned, the removal of all those ills, which cling to the victims of the "damming bowl." What then must be the change, when hundreds and thousands, and tens of thousands reform!

In fine on this head, by way of stating the general results of this extraordinary moral revolution, we would simply remark: that vigorous and flourishing Washington Societies have been organized not only in all parts of the state of Maryland, but also over the New England, Middle, Southern and Western States. Several hundred thousands have voluntarily pledged themselves against the use of all intoxicating drinks. From fifty one hundred thousand drunkards at least have been reclaimed. From a recent statistical report, it appears that there are two hundred and fifty thousand Washingtonians in the single state of Ohio. Missionaries are now laboring in the North, East, South and West; and who shall presume to say where this work shall cease? An impetus has been given to the cause, such as has never been known before in this country, and such as promises not soon to die.

Some new principles and modes of operation have been developed, which have particularly characterized this movement from its commencement. Some of these are merely the stronger developments of old features. For others we claim originality for the Washington Society. And that our true principles may be clearly understood, we pray the reader's attention to the next chapter.

Chapter VI. Principles of the Washington Society Experience

We have already intimated that experience was clearly the groundwork of the operations of this society. We also mentioned some reasons why this course was adopted. Heretofore the appeals of the friends of temperance were, as a general thing, directed to the moderate drinker, or the strictly temperate. Efforts were made rather to prevent men from becoming intemperate, than to reform them from intemperance. Many doubted the possibility of the reformation of the drunkard; and even those who did not, made but little effort to rescue him. The addresses made at temperance meetings, were rather of a tendency to drive away the drinking man, and those engaged in the manufacture and traffic in intoxicating liquors. And even if the ridicule or denunciation of drunkenness did not constitute the burden of the temperance speeches, mere general lectures on moral duty however just in themselves, were not likely to reach the man, whose mind was beclouded, and whose heart was seared by strong drink. It was of little avail to argue with him of the moral obligation of setting a good example - of the operation of Christian charity, in inducing a willingness to make sacrifices for our own good, and the good of others - to prove that the Bible sanctioned neither drunkenness, nor even the moderate use of alcoholic drinks - to present to him the chemical and physiological view of the question, and show him that alcohol was poison, &c. &c. He cared not for these

things. Nay more, you could not induce him to listen to them. Even a calculation of the expenses of intemperance, or a graphic description of the drunkard and the drunkard's home, had too little effect on him, as they were made from observation rather than from experience; and too often were the result of a mere speech-making spirit, coming from the head rather than the heart.

It must be admitted, however, that efforts were made by some of the ardent friends of the cause, to enlist the sympathies of the unfortunate, win their confidence, and lead them to the signature of the pledge. And not a few had been recovered since the commencement of the reform. But after all, it cannot be denied that the Temperance men of former times, as a general rule, had no access to the drunkard, or to those connected with the manufacture and sale of alcohol.

The difficulty then was, either that the drunkard would not go near a temperance meeting; or, if he did attend, he was likely to be either held up to ridicule, or denounced, or perhaps turned out of doors. Too often he would hear that which he could not appreciate, or which was calculated to embitter him the more against the cause. Mere general lectures on any subject, and more particularly on the subject of drinking, fall unheeded on the ear of the intemperate man. And you steel against yourself all his confidence and sympathies, if you either scold, mock or denounce him for his intemperance. He feels conscious within himself that he is deserving of sympathy, rather than ridicule or denunciation - that he is not so much the willing votary, as the unwilling slave and victim of an unnatural appetite - that he drinks not so much because he is wicked, as because he is weak. He became a drunkard unintentionally, wrongly it is true, yet still unintentionally; he will not defend himself; but he knows and feels that drunkenness with him is rather a disease than a vice. And the cold scorn or ridicule of the world, can have but a bad effect on such a man; it is calculated to drive him to madness and despair by drinking deeper of the cup, that he may forget his degradation; or to embitter his heart against all the alleged sympathies of his fellow men.

There were other difficulties in the way: as for instance, the impression that the Temperance reformation was a 'Church movement,' and that the pledge required more than the abandonment of the personal use of alcohol. On these points we shall remark in their proper places.

There is yet another view: there are dishonest men everywhere, hypocrites in every association; and no enterprise is so righteous, but that designing men, from corrupt and selfish motives, will embrace it, and use their influence in its promotion. Even the Church has not escaped this contamination. No enterprise perhaps had been more injured in this respect than the Temperance cause. It has too often been made a hobby by designing men, seeking popularity and influence - ambitious, aspiring men - broken-down politicians - religious hypocrites - mere babblers, who wished to gain the reputation of speech-makers, by riding the Temperance hobby. From the influence of such men, in one garb or other, this good cause has been much retarded.

In order then to avoid all these difficulties mentioned, and be rid of these hobby-riders, the Washington Temperance Society was founded on the principle, that the statement of personal experience should be substituted for debates, lectures and speeches in their meetings, while the only requisite to membership should be personal abstinence. This at once placed them in a single and invulnerable attitude, and not one of warfare against any man, or class of men. No man could be offended, or find fault. It attacked or excited no man's prejudices. It rendered the reform, so far as they were concerned, a simple unit, and that unit principle was the simple idea of personal abstinence. Behind that, they made no further inquiries. By means of their experience meetings, they at once reached the cases of many of the most unfortunate inebriates. They not only could induce them to attend their meetings; but when there, they interested their feelings, excited their sympathies, by details of their own personal experience; and proved to them that they could reform, by setting before them living examples.

It can not be denied, that the most eloquent and glowing speech on a matter abstract from the speaker, no matter how deeply it concerns us, is less powerful, than a simple, honest statement of a man's own experience on the same subject, however unlearned may be the man who gives the experience. Such a one speaks the thoughts and feelings written. it may be in fire, on his own heart; and they reach the hearts of

his hearers. The difference is as great as that between mere abstract theory and practice. The principle is an admitted one in human nature. How much more influence then has the man, who stands before an audience to persuade them to abandon the use of strong drink, when he can himself tell them of its ruinous and blasting effects on his own life and character - trace the progress of his own habits of intemperance, - and warn others to avoid the rock on which he split. A reformed man has the best access to a drunkard's mind and heart, because he best knows, and can enter into all a drunkard's feelings. And such appeals from such sources, properly directed, can rarely fail of entire success.

It should perhaps be remarked here that there is some limitation to this general rule of the society, in reference to experience speeches. There are many staunch friends of the Temperance cause, who have never been so unfortunate as to be victims of intemperance. We would not close their mouths, nor preclude them from usefulness. On the contrary, when there is occasion, at the regular or special meetings of the society, permission to speak has been given, by common consent, to such friends of the cause, as are known to understand the true principles of the society, and to be prudent and successful speakers. Hence such persons have frequently been heard, and most enthusiastically received by the Washington Society. The rule was adopted not only with the design of having the benefit of experience, spoken in burning words from the heart; but also to close the mouths of designing men - mere talkers - men lacking either common sense on the one hand, or common honesty on the other. No sensible man, honest in his motives, has ever been precluded the opportunity of communicating directly with the society.

We have been charged as a society with advancing the notion, that no good was ever accomplished in this cause before we did it; and that no person is a suitable Temperance speaker, unless he is a reformed drunkard. The charge is without foundation. We have been greatly misunderstood, and doubtless greatly misrepresented. For individual opinions, casually expressed, the society is not accountable. Our true doctrine is: that to operate on the intemperate, experience speakers are the best; and indeed if a sufficient number of them can be obtained, of proper sense and character, let them do most, if not all, the labour of speaking, especially where the object is, solely or in part, directly to influence the intemperate. Moreover, let them for their own encouragement, and in order to reach others, fill the offices, and control the affairs of the societies, as much as possible. The true and honest friends of the cause understand this, and hence, wherever it has been practicable, they have stood aside, and given place to proper persons among the reformed men, thus placing them as high as possible, that they may exert the more influence on others. We do not hold, that everyman who has had the misfortune to have been a drunkard, is fit to be either an officer of a Temperance society, or an experience speaker, as soon as he has been reformed. He should have common sense and common honesty, and this is all about the qualification he needs, except it be some capacity to express himself readily. But there are drunkards, and reformed men, as well as sober men, who may lack one or both of these qualifications; and such men of course are not to have, indeed they cannot have, any influence in this cause. We stand upon common honesty in this matter.

If then, in any place there be not reformed men enough, or not of the proper stamp, to take the most prominent parts in this enterprise, let the true friends of the cause, who have not suffered, act and that with all their might. We do not exclude them. And even where there are reformed men in abundance, all true disinterested friends of the cause have work to do in both counsel and labour, and we give them the right hand of the fellowship in this matter. There are places and circumstances, where it may be judicious to merge all the Temperance movements in the Washington system; there are other circumstances, which may make it judicious and necessary for the old Temperance men to retain their organization; and others again, where it may be best to have every kind of instrumentality at work at the same time. In Baltimore, so far from the opposite being of the case, the reformed men and the old friends of the cause, frequently labour side by side at public meetings in the city, as well as in visiting the surrounding country to advance the common cause. There should be perfect harmony among all true disinterested friends of this common enterprise.

Again, we have been represented as holding that clergymen should not take any part in the Temperance cause. This is no doctrine of ours. Let them in their pulpits or elsewhere say as much in favour

of Temperance as they please or can. Ministers of the Gospel have, on more than one occasion, addressed the Washington Society. But when they come among us, we want not sermons but COLDWATER SPEECHES. Let them lay aside their pontificals, and talk to us as MEN, not as preachers. This is not a DISTINCTION without a DIFFERENCE. Why should religious men, whether preachers are not, introduce their religion into all their discourses? Religious men can address a political, agricultural or literary meeting, and confine themselves solely to these matters, without lugging in their religious tenets at ever corner. Why not on the Temperance question? We have had men address us, in whose piety all men had confidence, and yet the burden of their remarks was Temperance, - cold-water, and they did not once introduce foreign matters, in which they might be certain their audience did not think alike. These are the kind of speeches that are acceptable to the Washington Society, because they are in point.

Let it not be forgotten, that where it can be had, it is better to have experience the burden of the Temperance speaking that is done. The Washington Society have had no occasion to regret the adoption of this wise and salutary provision. Thousands of unfortunate drunkards have been saved by hearing the experience of others, who never would have been saved by a mere sermon or address on Temperance, however eloquent. In the same way thousands more will be reformed.

The Missionary Spirit

Early in the history of the Washington Society, indeed in its very inception, was developed that feature, which has since given it such a commanding position, and so salutary an influence in the country. We refer to its missionary spirit. This is exhibited not merely in the exertions of those who have gone abroad on missions to various parts of the country; but, in one sense, every member of the society is, or ought to be a missionary. One of the many excellent mottoes of President Mitchell, was expressed and acted on from the beginning: "Let every man be present, and every man bring a man." Immediately after the foundation of the society, the "original six" went privately to their friends, especially their former drinking associates, and endeavoured to persuade them to sign the pledge with them. At all events they used their influence to bring them to the society's meetings. By this personal effort the drinking acquaintances of most of the reformed men in the society have been reclaimed. Men have gone into bar-rooms and led their friends away from the bottle by the arm, and persuaded them to accompany them to their meetings. Even the tavern-keeper himself has thus been taken from his bar by his former customer, conducted to the society, and induced to sign the pledge. Very few that have attended our meetings have ever gone away drunkards. The very atmosphere they breathed in these meetings, was that of reformation; and it inspired them with new hopes of again regaining their position in the community. Very few men, if any, are beyond the reach of reformation from intemperance, if the proper judicious means are used for their recovery.

One great secret of the success of the Washington Society has been, that it is emphatically a society of working men, - that is: the society constitutes a grand "committee of the whole;" and the business of each member is constantly to seek out all cases of intemperance within their reach, and to do what can be done to bring such to the society. Heretofore most Temperance societies were confined in their operations to annual, semi-annual, or quarterly meetings; on which occasions the societies met, heard a report and a speech or two, and then adjourned, too often to remain inactive until the next regular meeting. To this there were some honorable exceptions. But after all, the toil and labor rested mainly on the shoulders of one or two men in each society.

The Washington Society meets every Monday night, at which time the pledge is read as often as called for, and the different members, as there may be occasion, or as they may be called on, relate their experience. Thus a constant interest is kept up, being renewed each week, and carried out into the daily intercourse of life.

Of the Delegations or Missions of this society, the manner in which they came to be instituted, and the glorious results of all these missionary labours, we have spoken before. These are but the developments of the aggressive principles, which at the very foundation of the society. All these great and glorious results were actually foreseen and predicted by the author of these pages, several months before any of our

missionaries had left his city. Our true motto should be: action, constant untiring action on the part of every member. What has the Temperance cause not done for us! Let us extend its blessings to every member of the human family; and if the drunkard will not come to us, let us seek him out in his wretchedness, and strive to bring him to reformation by every means in our power.

Our Pledge

The pledge of the Washington Society, though strictly a total abstinence pledge, differs, in several particulars, from that of the American Temperance Union, and from abstinence pledges in general. We require but one thing of our members; and that is personal abstinence. We so not require a man to pledge himself that he will abandon all interest in the manufacture or traffic, nor proscribe those who are engaged in these pursuits. This is a matter we leave to each individual man, as we do every other matter of duty. We do not pass resolutions of non-intercourse with men who traffic in intoxicating liquors; nor proscribe them in any way, further than advising men not to drink their liquors, may be proscription. This course of the Washington Society we think perfectly defensible.

There are many men who have for years been pecuniarily interested in making and selling liquors. It is their only business. These men have their family connections and friends. Many of them are intemperate. How are they to be reformed? They are to be reformed mainly through the influence of Temperance Societies, and the instrumentality of a pledge; and few men are reformed from intemperance by any other means. If then all the societies are barred against those, whose hands are not clean in this respect, unless they first wash their hands from the uncleanness, where is the intemperate dealer to go for reformation? Your societies are all closed against him. Your pledge excludes him, unless he abandons the traffic; and few will give up the traffic until after they have personally reformed. His ears are closed, and his heart is steeled against all your advances, because he considers your very constitution as proscribing not so much him personally, as his business. These prejudices extend not only to the manufacturer and trafficker, but also to their families and friends. A. will not sign the pledge, lest by so doing he proscribes his kind neighbour B., who is engaged in the trade. C. will not sign, because his brother D. is a distiller, and he cannot array himself against his own kindred. These things have occurred frequently. We do not justify these men. We are only stating facts. Men should do right, no matter who is offended. But these men may not be prepared to do so. Shall we therefore close the door against their personal reformation, because they are not prepared to do all their duty on the Temperance question? Why not exclude men unless they pledge themselves also to quit swearing, or gambling, or any thing else that is wrong, and that may have a connection with drinking? Why not require them to abandon every other immoral pursuit in life, which they follow from the love of gain?

The first and main object of the Washington Society is to induce men to quit drinking alcoholic liquors. When they have done this, the rest must regulate itself, and in most cases it will regulate itself. We have no sympathy with this trade in ruin. But we do not array ourselves as the proscribers of all engaged in the business. We beseech all men to give up the traffic; but if they will not, and yet are willing to sign our pledge and reform, we receive them among us; and let the truth work its own way upon their hearts in this, as in every other reformation of their lives.

Of one thing we are certain: if an intemperate rum-seller joins the Washington Society, keeps his pledge, and attends our meetings, he will hear enough to induce him in a short time to abandon the business. The atmosphere of the Washington Society would be rather unpalatable to him, so long as he continues to sell rum. While therefore we do not require it, the most necessary consequence is, that he will voluntarily abandon it himself, after he has been for some time connected with the society.

If then there be any inconsistency in this matter, it is not with the society. We require but one thing; when that is accomplished, our work is done. If a man signs our pledge, and keeps it, we retain him, and are consistent; for that is all we require of him. The society does not set itself up as a censor of morals. It occupies but one position. It has to do only with drinking. If men will be inconsistent in making and selling intoxicating drinks, be it so. To their God and their own consciences they must render an account not only for this, but for every other improper pursuit. We will not be accountable for them; nor shall we plead their

cause.

A number of dealers in intoxicating liquors have already signed our pledge. Many of them are reformed men. And, with several exceptions, they have abandoned the traffic soon after their reformation. Now with the old pledge these men might have been arrayed against us, and we might not have reached one of them. They might still be both intemperate, and engaged in the traffic. It is a matter of public record that the number of licences for the sale of liquors taken out in this city last year, were one hundred and sixty-six less than those of the preceding year - about one-fifth of the whole number; and while other societies and other influences have operated in bringing about this result, the Washington Society claims to have contributed directly and indirectly a considerable share of this influence.

On the same principles, we, as a society, do not wish to identify ourselves with any political movements, intended to result in legislative enactments on this subject. The members individually may entertain what sentiments they please on that question. They are known to entertain different sentiments respecting it. But as a society, we have nothing to do with it. The general impression of the society seems to be, that all legislation bearing on matters of morals, and the habits of the people, is premature, until the great mass of the public mind is prepared for it. When that takes place, such legislation, as enlightened public opinion may consider judicious, will no doubt be adopted. But the few, even though they be right, should not press legislation, so long as there is a danger of exciting prejudices and interests, which may produce a still more violent reaction. The public are perhaps not yet prepared for anything more than a judicious modification of the present license system.

In all these matters, therefore, - the manufacture, the traffic, and legislative enactments designed to limit or prevent the same, the Washington Society occupies no offensive ground; because she occupies neutral ground. And thus not attacking the supposed rights and interests of any, we win the confidence of all; and having access to them, we have the means of doing good to all. But let us be understood. This position is taken by the society, on the most prudential considerations. We would gladly see every bar and distillery in the land closed forever. But more can be done by persuasion, than by the law.

Moreover we do not object to other societies, with pledges formed on the model of the American Temperance Union. Many of our members have signed such pledges in other societies. These societies with the comprehensive pledge have doubtless done much good. If others prefer it, we wish them all success with it. We only wish the Washington Society, with its peculiar organization, to steer clear of all these questions. We occupy our own ground. Let others enjoy the same privilege. We need not quarrel. Yet we venture to say that our pledge will obtain as many signatures, as if it were more comprehensive; and that in addition, we shall secure the reformation and final abandonment of the traffic, of many, who never would have signed the old pledge.

There is a prevalent impression, that none but reformed drunkards are admitted as members of the Washington Society. This is a mistake. Any man may become a member by signing the pledge, and continue so by adhering to it. Many of the best men in the city of Baltimore belong to the society.

We should perhaps make another remark here in reference to our pledge; and it is this. The practice of the WASHINGTON Society is, not to abandon at once the reformed man, who in an evil hour of strong temptation, has violated his pledge; but to bear with him, and try to reclaim him again - and if he comes back penitent, to forgive "seven times" - "yea, seventy times seven." By this mild course many have been ultimately saved, who by harsh measures would have returned again to their old habits. We cannot be too cautious or kind to the unfortunate victim of intemperance. He needs kind treatment; and by means of it, we can generally calculate on his final reformation. It gives us pleasure to remark, however, that comparatively very few have ever violated our pledge.

Politics and Religion

As previously observed, the Washington Society occupies a strictly neutral position on these subjects. All our efforts are devoted to the one single object of inducing all, the temperate and intemperate, to sign a

total-abstinence pledge, and to drink no more while the world stands.

On the subject of political action, we have previously stated the principles of the society. Perhaps our relation to the matter of religion is of more importance, and less understood. We have been represented as being adverse to religion - as arraying ourselves against the Church - as declaring our labors to be higher and holier than those of the Christian ministry - as substituting Temperance for religion. In all these charges we are wholly and entirely misrepresented or misunderstood. Our true principles on this subject are as follows: as a body, retaining our original position as a unit, we have nothing to do whatever with religion or politics; any more than a political party has to do with religion or temperance. If a man will only comply with our constitution he may be a Catholic, a Protestant, or an Infidel, if he chooses. We do not enquire into his creed or notions. This is not our business. He may be anything or nothing in this respect. But he must not bring his creed or party into the society. When he comes into the Washington Temperance Hall, he leaves his church creed and party politics at home; and meet all his fellow-members not as Democrats or Whigs, not as Presbyterians, Methodists, Catholics, or anything else - no, not even as Christians, (for they may not all be such,) but as his fellow-men, on the one common platform of total-abstinence. We do not mean that anyone is to so any thing in the society, or as a member of the same, contrary to his religious creed and obligations, or his political notions; but he is not to introduce them to the society. No matter then who the man may be, we give him the hand of a brother Washingtonian, if he signs our pledge and keeps it, and conducts himself becomingly among us, - and few cold-water men are other than gentlemen. Constituted thus, how then could the society, as such, legitimately have anything to do with religion. The members, as individuals, have to do with religion as they had before they joined. If they were drunkards and have reformed, this only places them back in their original position as men; and to their God and their own consciences must they stand or fall.

With these sentiments, the society does not have any religious worship connected with their regular meetings in their Hall. Yet when they are permitted to occupy, for their public meetings, any usual place of worship, they are in the habit of requesting some minister or religious person to open the meeting with prayer, according to the mode and form in use where they meet.

If a clergyman join the society, he is precisely on the same footing with all the other members; and his ministerial character is not recognized among us.

All this neutrality is necessary in order to combine the heterogeneous elements, that make up the Washington Society. The object is not only to avoid all sectarianism, but even the appearance or suspicion of sectarianism. Indeed we have more in view. The design is to prevent all suspicion that the Temperance cause is a church affair; and that with this wise and benevolent design; we wish to reach and save all men from intemperance, even those who are embittered against the church. Heretofore most of the Temperance societies were connected more or less, nominally or otherwise, with some church or other; the meetings were usually held in churches, conducted with religious exercises, and more or less under the direction of ministers; many of the addresses were made by ministers, and partook of the nature of sermons rather than Temperance speeches. All this was very well, so far as it went. It had its designed effect; but only on a portion of the community. While these arrangements were calculated to accomplish much with the upright and religious, they were strongly calculated to make the impression upon the drinking man, that the Temperance reform was a church affair, and that joining a Temperance society, was more or less a religious business.

Now anyone who knows anything of drunkenness, knows that most drunkards are strongly averse to religion, if not infidel at heart. They want to hear nothing about "moral reform" and "church societies." Hence this class of men rarely went near a temperance meeting formerly. Indeed many of them in their degradation and wretchedness, would not have gained admission to a church. It was to reconcile such feelings and aversions, that this strongly neutral ground was taken in the first place, and is still held by the Washington Temperance Society.

The drunkard is prejudiced against the church and her ministers. Satisfy him that these have nothing to do with your society, and he will listen to you. When he joins and is reformed, and has come to his proper

senses and his conscience, no one can doubt the effect of his reformation will have on his notions of church matters. Cold water clears the head; and though it does not regenerate, it greatly unwraps the heart. And though a man reformed from intemperance, may still be an unconverted man so far as religion is concerned, yet he is now prepared to view matters in their true light, with a cool head; and now, if ever, he will be likely to attend religious worship and become a Christian. Religious influences now have access to him; before they had not.

These statements will explain much in which the society has been wrongly represented. When the president and the members, after the foundation of the society, over and over again said to the public: "We have nothing to do with religion," they meant as we have explained above, and do not array themselves against religion. Indeed there are now men in the Washington Society of as much piety as any men in the city of Baltimore. As regards being opposed to Clergymen, the society has shown no such feeling. We number among our members several of the principal evangelical ministers of the city; which is sufficient evidence that all is right on that score.

The true position of the Washington Society is this: as a body we recognize no creed of religion. Our members may be as much or as little religious as they please, provided they do not violate our pledge. We do not substitute temperance for religion, nor place temperance above religion. On the contrary we hold that a man's reformation from intemperance only places him in his original position, and leaves him to deal with the Church and his God, according to the dictates of his own conscience. Of one thing we are certain: sober men are more likely to be religious than drinking men; and the church will gain more members where there is a Washington Temperance Society, than where there is none.

In conclusion on this subject, instead of the society being infidel, and setting itself up as independent of all divine influence, we have often heard its founders remark, that such has been the result of their efforts, beyond all they could have anticipated, that they cannot but believe that the hand of GOD has been in this reform; and that they have been made the humble instruments in the hands of Providence, of accomplishing these great things.

Conclusion

From the preceding pages we learn that the principal causes of the extraordinary influence of the Washington Temperance Society, are as follow:

1. The drunkard is now regarded in a new light by the Washingtonians. Instead of being considered a cruel monster - a loathsome brute - an object of ridicule, contempt and indignation, as formerly, we are now taught to look upon him as a brother - as more weak perhaps than wicked - as a slave to appetite, and debased by passion - yet still as a man, our own brother. Thus all the sympathies of the public are excited in his behalf.

2. The substitution of personal experience for addresses and lectures, has had the same effect of exciting the sympathy of the community in behalf of the intemperate. A reformed drunkard's experience touches a chord, that vibrates in every human breast. Moreover the drunkard when reformed best knows how to reach the drunkard's heart; for he best understands his feelings.

3. Another cause lies in the simplicity and unity of the pledge, requiring but one thing - personal abstinence. To this add the neutrality of the society, as we have explained it in the preceding pages, and the whole matter is explained on the common principles of human nature.

Kind reader, have you signed the pledge? You have read our history. You have seen how the intemperate have fallen; and you have seen how they have reformed. Now there are but three classes of mankind in this respect - the strictly abstinent, the moderate drinker, and the intemperate. To which class do you belong? If to the first, we hail you as a brother. If to the last, read our history over again, see how others have reformed, and "go and do likewise." You may be free. No man is reduced so far that he may not be reclaimed. If you belong to the second class, remember three things - first, every reformed drunkard in the land will tell you he was once what you are, and equally confident he never would go farther; yet he fell; - second, you are giving no encouragement to the poor unfortunate drunkard to reform, but the influence of

your example is all against him; - third, you are setting such an example to your neighbours, friends and family, that if they follow it, you know some of them will be drunkards ere they die.

For the sake then of yourself; for the sake of those who may be influenced by your example; and for the sake of the unfortunate drunkards who are struggling to be free all over the land, come with us. Save yourself, and save others. Remember that you are accountable, here and hereafter, for the man who stumbles over your example into a drunkard's grave!

Leonard U. Blumberg. "The Institutional Phase of the Washingtonian Total Abstinence Movement." A Research Note. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*. Vol. 39 (9), 1591-1606, 1978.

Summary

Many of the practices and beliefs of the Washingtonian Total Abstinence Movement were adopted by reformatory homes for "drunkards" that were established in Boston, Chicago and Philadelphia in the mid-1800s.

In a Baltimore Tavern on 5 April 1840 the Washingtonian Total Abstinence Movement began as a working-class anti-alcoholism and temperance movement. As a distinct social movement the Washingtonian Total Abstinence Movement had a relatively short life; it had largely lost its dynamic qualities in most parts of the country by late 1844 or early 1845. Within those few years it had a growth curve that may be characterized by the following stages:

1. The movement had a "gestation" period in Baltimore of about 6 to 9 months. Such an inconspicuous beginning and an initial slow development are typical of social movements. The early development was along friendship networks; the six founders of the group agreed that at the next meeting after they established themselves as a society they would each bring two friends who were also drunkards or heavy drinkers.

2. This was followed by a growth spurt and the group held a public meeting in November 1840. To date no newspaper announcement or broadsheet has been located, so that while we know that the Washington Total Abstinence in Baltimore "went public" we do not know the exact mechanism which linked the society with its projected public. But clearly a second component had been added to the way that the group reached out to find those relevant to its concern; this probably included the press (both newspapers and broadsides) as well as the existing temperance organizations in Baltimore.

3. There followed a period of relatively rapid expansion to the major population centers of the United States during 1841 and 1842. This expansion from Baltimore was initiated by the existing temperance societies which wrote to the Baltimore Society and asked for speakers. The Baltimore group facilitated the process by sending "missionaries" to New York, Boston (by way of Worcester), Philadelphia and elsewhere. One of the most prominent of these early missionaries was John Hawkins, a hatter who had become a drunkard and then had been persuaded to stop drinking by the Baltimore Washingtonians; he proved to be a persuasive speaker and his story of his "experiences" was melodramatic (1). Hawking was a star on the temperance-prohibitionist lecture circuit for many years, having been ordained as a Methodist minister with the understanding that he would specialize in temperance work. There were others such as John Gogh, who were caught up in the movement, became powerful speakers and also achieved middle-class status as a consequence.

4. A high point was achieved during the spring and summer of 1842. The expansion into the major cities was quickly followed by a tendency toward regionalization. That is, Washingtonian missionaries were invited to small towns and villages of a region; they went because they were filled with the zeal that was created by their own conversion and by the Washingtonian caring philosophy. Local temperance groups provided both publicity and places to meet. It was during this dynamic period that locally and regionally prominent persons, such as Abraham Lincoln, were called upon (and found it expedient) to give speeches at the Washington Is Birthday and Independence Day parade-picnic-demonstrations that were sponsored by the local Washingtonian Total Abstinence Society.

The theme of these speeches was the denunciation of "King Alcohol" and an analogy between the declaration of independence from the British crown and a declaration of independence from King Alcohol. Often there was a rallying cry for the mobilization of the army of the righteous against King Alcohol, for alcohol was not only anthropomorphized, but a devil figure as well. The excitement about the Washingtonian Movement was sufficiently great within some localities that the local temperance societies (which were probably never very large in numbers in that period despite their vociferousness) were no longer able to function. In Boston, for instance, the local temperance society was unable to conduct its

affairs during this period and discontinued its monthly meetings, the members having voted to join and become active in the Boston Washingtonian Total Abstinence Society. (While aimed primarily at drunkards and heavy drinkers, the Washingtonian societies were open to all persons who signed the pledge.) Thus, the local temperance organizations not only provided the previously existing network of relationships for the rapid expansion of the Washingtonian Movement, a phenomenon suggested by others, but, to use political language, the previously existing temperance societies “co-opted” the Washingtonians and colonized the Washingtonian societies also.

5. There followed a curve of decline into obscurity; most local groups apparently became moribund in the succeeding years, but there is reason to believe that Washingtonian societies continued in Boston (at least into the 1860s), Worcester and possibly in Illinois into the 1870s.

Although a social movement may be highly controversial and may even be objectively a “failure” because it did not completely convert the populace to its program, nonetheless more conservative elements of the population may adopt programmatic elements or “fragments” of a movement. Once these programmatic elements become institutionalized as autonomous entities outside the movement organizations, they have their own course of development which eventuates in programs which are quite different from the methods or concerns of the movement. Thus, Hawkins and Gough, who started as Washingtonian moral suasionists, became prohibitionist speakers, although they continued to be strongly sympathetic to drunkards. The Sons of Temperance, a fraternal order, continued the warm fellowship of the Washingtonians, and Christian temperance revivalists continued “telling experiences”; but they had Protestant church support and thereby undercut the anti-clericalism of some of the Washingtonians (and other temperance-prohibitionist) speakers. In the 1870s the Reynolds and the Murphy ribbon campaigns, while different in important aspects from the Washingtonian Movement, emphasized a missionary approach, telling experiences, the pledge and total abstinence. Reynolds was a physician and Murphy was a former saloon-keeper; both were former drunkards who had had conversion experiences.

The best recent treatment of the Washingtonian Movement is Maxwell’s 1950 article (2). His summary of the movement’s practices and ideology includes the following points: (1) alcoholics helped each other; (2) the needs and interests of alcoholics were kept central; (3) there were weekly meetings of members of the various societies; (4) the fellowship of the group and its members was always available to fellow alcoholics, whether members of the local Washingtonian society or not; (5) there was a sharing of “experiences,” that is, alcoholics told each other of their past lives, how they had bested King Alcohol, and the good things that had come of it (in a way that Americans have come to label a “Horatio Alger” success story); (6) there was a reliance on the power of God; and (7) total abstinence from alcohol was advocated as the only way to meet the problem. To these should be added the following: (8) advocacy of moral persuasion rather than prohibition legislation or condemnation of liquor dealers as the means to fight King Alcohol; (9) heavy emphasis on a total abstinence pledge; (10) a style of spreading the “good news” through traveling delegations that followed the biblical model of the Apostles’ going two-by-two to spread the gospel and convert the sinners; (11) organizational decentralization - the basic unit was the local society, although within several years, at least in the Boston area, some country organizations and a state convention also evolved; and (12) a distinct working-class appeal, although persons of the middle classes also joined and often were prominent at the country and state conventions. Since the movement had a short life, these higher organizational levels were not widespread.

Sources of Information

The discussion which follows is based on a synthesis of materials which vary considerably in completeness and are not equally available for all institutions. The single most important type of source was the annual report; the annual runs were more complete for some periods and institutions than for others. These reports, as well as various ephemeral publications, are available at the Boston Atheneum, the Library and Archives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the Massachusetts Historical Society, the Chicago Historical Society, the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, the Rhode Island Historical Society, the New York Public

Library, the New York Historical Society, and the Countway - Harvard University Medical School Library. Some more recent annual reports as well as some minutes of Boards of Directors' (Executive Committee) meetings were made available by administrators or staff members of the Boston Washingtonian Hospital and the Martha Washington Hospital in Chicago. Information about the Boston Washington Hospital in the early 1940s has also been obtained from the Merrill Moore manuscript collection in the Archives Collection of the Library of Congress. Some records of the Franklin Reformatory Home are on deposit with the Pennsylvania Historical Society. Records and annual reports of the Women Is Prison Association are available at the Isaac T. Hopper Home in New York City. A number of ephemeral publications about the Boston and Chicago institutions were made available by institutional administrators or staff members. In addition to these more or less internal documents, there were occasional references to these institutions in the Quarterly Journal of Inebriety and the Journal of the American Temperance Union. In addition, a number of commentaries and bits of legal testimony throw some light on how the institutions and their leadership were perceived.

This investigation has involved the following kinds and sources of materials: (1) The American Association for the Study and Cure of Inebriety, Proceedings and Journal, 1870-1917; (2) annual reports and Journal of the American Temperance Union, 1837-62; (3) New Washingtonian (monthly newspaper of the Washingtonian Rome of Chicago) 1876-93; (4) Maine Temperance Gazette and Washingtonian Herald, 1840s; (5) Washingtonian speeches, Washington's Birthday and Independence Day, 1842, by Abraham Lincoln (from the Sangamo Journal) and by others; (6) all available annual reports of the institutions discussed; (7) archival materials such as minutes, day-books and ledgers, correspondence and memoranda (mostly of the Boston Home and Hospital) but also of the Chicago Home and Hospital; (8) relatively current materials in organization files, pamphlets, board minutes and miscellaneous reports (mostly of the Boston Home and Hospital, the Chicago Home and the Hopper Home); and (9) interviews with executives of institutions and agencies in Boston, Chicago and New York.

In addition to the Washington Total Abstinence Societies, which met weekly or oftener, there also developed residential institutions that were at first called "asylums" and later called "homes" (or "reformatory homes"). While briefly mentioned in Maxwell's 1950 article, the best published description of the Washingtonian reformatory homes is Arthur's description in 1877 (3). The present report is intended to extend Maxwell's work and, in doing this, to describe the institutional phase of the Washingtonian Movement and its organizational transformation in the years that followed Arthur's ascription.

The Washingtonian homes were residential facilities for persons with serious alcohol problems. In those days "drunkard" was the commonly used term, though medical specialists and other professionals sometimes referred to the condition as "oenomania" (pronounced "winomania") and "dipsomania"; "alcoholic" later came into vogue. The first Washingtonian residential facilities in Boston were purely ad hoc. The Washington Total Abstinence Society of Boston was organized in April 1841. There was an early concern for the "reformed men," and a few committed temperance workers offered to take care of them for a few days until they could take care of themselves. But this proved too burdensome and the society rented some rooms near Marlborough Chapel, where they held their meetings. This also proved too expensive for the society and was given up (4, 1860). The funds that had been solicited for an "Asylum Fund" were used otherwise: "After much thought various calculations were made, it was found to be the cheapest and the best course to pursue the system of boarding out those who might be thrown upon their [the society's] hands, and thus save the expense of house-rent, furniture, keeper, and help in the house, fuel, and many other heavy expenses.

They accordingly selected three good boarding-houses, kept by discreet members of the Society, who have thus far given entire satisfaction: charging no more than the actual time the boarders have remained" (5,p.4). In addition, the reasoning of the Boston Washingtonians was that those so boarded were aware that it cost money, and this was believed to be a pressure to find work and be self-supporting. There was no "treatment" program because those who were cared for undoubtedly were expected to take full part in the activities of the Washington Total Abstinence Society under whose care they were.

This set of arrangements did not last very long. In 1844 the society rented a former museum as a

meeting hall and in the basement “fitted up accommodations for men who were drunkards and had no homes to go to. It was a rough, rude place- bunks built up by the side of the wall, cheap but strong - the bedding clean, yet very plain - the table made of an old chest which contained the cast off clothes begged by the society - the dishes, what few there were borrowed from an adjacent eating house - a small stove and kettle to heat water, and tin cup or two, constituted the principal fitting up of the place” (4, 1867). The society was unable to raise enough money to support its asylum and it was closed in 1845.

A somewhat similar development took place in New York which had “houses of refuge” where “miserable inebriates were taken out of the gutter, and washed, and clothed, and lodged, and fed, and kept until they came to their right mind; when they were suffered to depart in peace, often having some regular employment provided for them” (6, p.58). These houses of refuge did not last through 1842.

The Washington Total Abstinence Society lingered on in Boston until at least 1860, although its principle of moral suasion was substantially eclipsed by the now invigorated absolutist prohibitionist branch of the temperance movement. There seems to have been no organized continuity between the Washington Society’s Asylum, which closed in 1845, and the Home for the Fallen which opened in Boston in November 1857. There was ideological continuity, however. The Home for the Fallen was organized at the urging of Reverend Phineas Stowe, minister of the Mariners’ Bethel in the North End of Boston. Four of the officers of the home, including Stowe, had been active in the Washington Total Abstinence Society in the 1840s. The plan to establish a “Retreat for Inebriates” initially received little support from “old and tried friends of the Temperance cause [who] looked askance at the movement as utopian in its character, and destined to a speedy failure” (4, 1860). A one-term Massachusetts legislator, and longtime superintendent of the home, Albert Day, was instrumental in getting the attention of other legislators; the temperance prohibitionist legislators were organized into the Massachusetts Legislative Temperance Society, a quasicaucas, and a group of “reformed men” from the Home for the Fallen “addressed their meeting with much power” (7, p.64). The legislature incorporated the home in 1859 as The Washingtonian Home and gave the institution a small grant-in-aid for about 12 years (8). It is not clear why the legislature changed the name at the time of incorporation, but presumably it was because the name that Reverend Stowe had chosen suggested that it was an institution for “fallen women”; the Washingtonian label, by the same token, was self-explanatory during that period. The Washingtonian Home in Boston went through a variety of vicissitudes and still exist today as the Washingtonian Center for Addictions - a medical and psychiatric center for alcohol and drug addicts. While it proudly upholds the name, the Washingtonian ideology and practices disappeared from the institution many years ago.

At this point it is necessary to consider a conceptual problem that these data have inadvertently raised. All the currently available evidence indicates that, with a few possible exceptions, the Washington Total Abstinence societies had disappeared into the temperance - prohibitionist movement by the time of the Civil War. There is no evidence of organizational continuity between the Washingtonian societies of the 1840s and the Washingtonian reformatory homes, despite the fact that both in the Boston Worcester area and in Illinois there continued to be Washingtonians after the homes were established. Duis (9, pp.368-375) argues that by the time of the Civil War the term “Washingtonian” had come to be the generic term for drunkard reform. If one takes his approach, the homes are to be regarded simply as manifestations of the temperance - prohibitionist movement. Since the Chicago home was started and received its earliest support from the temperance prohibitionists, this is a reasonable conclusion.

But reference group theory suggests an alternative one, and it is that alternative position that is taken in the present discussion. Reference group theory makes a distinction between membership groups, i.e., groups to which one belongs at a particular time and place, and groups which are referents for one’s behavior and attitudes. One need not be actively affiliated with a reference group to adopt its principles and practices; indeed, the reference group may no longer exist. That is, one may be unconnected with a reference group in both time and place. One “belongs” to a reference group as evidenced by identification, by behavior, and by the statements that one uses to justify one’s behavior. Thus, if we assert that the Washingtonian reformatory homes were the institutional phase of the Washingtonian Total Abstinence

Movement, we are saying that the homes had the movement as a reference group. According to Sosensky (10) we are thereby asserting an analogy and, he argues, analogies must be demonstrated by a statement of “respects,” i.e., in what respect are the two elements in the equation the same or similar? The closer the respects, the more nearly the analogy is correct until we approach the final case where the two elements are identical. The fewer the respects, the more inappropriate the analogy. The assertion of a reference group relationship, then, is the assertion of an analogy, and, in the present case, rests on the fact that the first nine aspects of the Washington Total Abstinence Movement’s practices and ideology that are listed above were also applicable to reformatory homes in their earlier years.

Not only is the Washington Home in Boston the oldest such institution in the United States but it was the model or principal influence for the others that subsequently developed. Thus, on Sunday evening, 31 January 1864, at a public meeting (that is, one open to nonresidents as well as residents) Albert Day, superintendent of the home in Boston, announced that another Washingtonian Home had been started in Chicago. The Washingtonian Home in Chicago had opened earlier in the month, and its prime mover, Rollo A. Laws, a printer and publisher of temperance materials, may well have been in the room when Day made his announcement. Laws visited the Boston Washingtonian Home about that time and it would have been peculiar for him to have gone all that distance and not to have stayed for the weekly public meeting at the Boston Home.

A committee was appointed and subsequently an “address” was prepared and sent: “The Graduates and Inmates of the Washingtonian Home, Boston, to the inmates of the Washingtonian Home, Chicago, Men and Brethren: - We have heard, with profound emotions of gratitude and pleasure, that a Washingtonian Home for the cure of drinking habits has been established in the great city of Chicago; and it has appeared to us meet and proper that we send greetings and congratulations to you upon a fact so encouraging” (11). The address then goes on to recite the principles of the Washingtonians reform including moral suasion and total abstinence. (“Beware the first glass! It is that which does the mischief. Beware the first glass. It contains the seeds of death. Beware the first glass, and you are safe. No power can make you a drunkard again, if you are resolute to refuse the first glass.”) It ends with a claim of fellowship with the Chicago Washingtonian inmates, and a hope that the “peace of God rests upon the Washingtonian Home of Chicago.”

The inmates of the Washingtonian Home of Chicago wrote a response which began: “Words will fail to express the depth of gratification we have felt on receiving your cordial welcome. Separated though we may be by hundreds of miles, yet we feel we are one in purpose, one in determination. To accomplish the great work upon which we entered, required, as you well know, a powerful and active exercise of the will, and a spirit of self-denial unknown to those who have never become wedded to the Use of intoxicating liquors.”

Several years later, when the Chicago Washingtonian Home ran into financial difficulties and began to solicit lifetime memberships, Albert Day became a member of the Chicago Washingtonian Home. While there were differences between the Boston and Chicago institutions, it is clear that at the very beginning the inmates and administrators identified with each other and with the Washingtonians Movement and perceived themselves as manifestations of that movement. Over time the circumstances of the two as well as differences in practice and interpretation had radical consequences.

Although women occasionally stayed at the Boston Washingtonian Home, it remained essentially a men’s institution. On the other hand, the need for facilities for women was recognized early by the Chicago Home. In the annual report for 1867 of the Chicago Washingtonian Home there is a recommendation that a women Is unit be opened, and in June 1869 rooms were made available in the home of Charles J. Hull, a prominent Chicago merchant. (This building was given to Jane Addams in 1889 and under the name of “Hull House” became the center for her social welfare activities.) In May 1870 the Female Department of the Washingtonian Home of Chicago was moved into the east end of the Madison Avenue building which also housed the Men Is Department. The Female Department was discontinued sometime between 1872 (when the great fire of 1871 led the City Council to withhold its grant-in-aid) and 1875 (the old wooden Bull’s Head Hotel, which had been converted into the Washingtonian Home facility, was torn down and

replaced with a new brick building). There was discussion of the reestablishment of the Female Department in 1878, but it was decided to postpone that step because the Board of Directors was still \$25,000 in debt for the new building. Finally, in 1882 the board purchased the 10-acre campus of a former boys' military academy in northwestern Chicago for \$15,000 and reopened a woman's unit well away from the Madison Avenue location, which, after the fire, became the area in which Chicago's Skis Row developed. The Women's Department, known as the Martha Washington Home, continued to operate as a separate facility until the mid-1920s when both the men's and women's work were combined at the campus location and became the alcoholism treatment unit of the Martha Washington Hospital, a general hospital serving the neighbouring community.

The Franklin Reformatory House for Inebriates in Philadelphia was organized in the Spring of 1872. The original plan had been to establish a reading room for temperance men and to "afford [daytime] temperance shelter for inebriates. However, the discussion quickly turned to a residential institution and the group was organized within several months. During this initial formative period the "Committee of 1511 who undertook the project were in correspondence with Dr. Albert Day, who is quoted as saying "Hire a house in some convenient neighbourhood; place it in the charge of one who has the heart and soul for the work and trust to Providence, time and experience for the rest" (12, p.108). (By this time Day had drifted somewhat away from the Washingtonian position, and this was reflected in his advice.) The committee of 15 also had in hand copies of annual reports of the Washingtonian Home in Boston as they framed the Franklin Home's constitution and bylaws. The delegates from the Franklin Reformatory Home who went to the annual meeting of the American Association for the Cure of Inebriates in early October 1872 in New York City were readily classified as "Washingtonian" home delegates along with those from Boston and Chicago. Thus, Dr. Theodore L. Mason in his presidential address to the 1876 annual meeting of the association (in which he tried without success to smooth over the schism which by that time had developed between the Franklin Reformatory Home and the other members of the association) observed that "The [Boston] Washingtonian Home has been the pioneer for that class of asylums in cities, as those in Chicago and Philadelphia, which, although situated in dense populations, do not profess to use physical restraint as a means of cure, but seek to control their patients by the moral influence of kindness, cheerful associations and amusements, by intellectual occupations, and by the powerful influence of religious sentiment" (13, p.10). In short, not long after they began, these institutions were perceived as similar in their therapeutic ideologies and practices.

But why wasn't the Philadelphia institution labeled by its directors the "Washingtonian Reformatory Home for Inebriates," if that is the case? Those who know Philadelphia will find the following explanation plausible: Given the practice of naming moral reform societies after cultural heroes, Benjamin Franklin was a greater hero than George Washington in Philadelphia. There were political overtones, as well, for Washington was a Federalist in his sympathies and Philadelphia for many years was a Democratic-Republican city. Thus, during the height of the Washingtonian Movement in the early 1840s, Philadelphians chose to honour Jefferson as their model rather than Washington. The Franklin Reformatory Home disappeared as an operating institution in 1935, merging with the Sunday Breakfast Association, a Skid Row gospel Mission which was a competitive "spin-off" from the Franklin Home in the 1880s.

Aside from the Female Department of the Washingtonian Home of Chicago, there was one institution for women which warrants inclusion as a "Washingtonian" institution. The New England Home for Intemperate Women was opened late in January 1879 in Boston. In 1881 it was incorporated as the Massachusetts Home for Intemperate Women, and its annual report at the end of that year says that "The object is to do a work for women similar to that of the Washingtonian Home for men, and from the first the institution has been filled, a proof of the need for it" (14). Over the years the Massachusetts Home for Intemperate Women had major financial and community relations difficulties similar to those of the men's institutions. The institution's official transformation took place when the name was changed to the Massachusetts Home and Hospital in 1917; under that name it undertook long-term (a year minimum) treatment of women alcoholics and drug addicts. This was a transitional development for in 1920 the name

was changed again and it became the Massachusetts Home. Since that official label apparently needed some clarification, the institution was identified still further in the Boston City Directory as “for Elderly Ladies”(1927-31), “for Needy Worthy Elderly Ladies” (1932-35), and “for Needy Worthy Women (1936-58). Unlisted thereafter, the corporation that was legally responsible for the Home was dissolved in 1964.

The Massachusetts Home for Intemperate Women originally identified itself as Washingtonian, but its administration found it necessary to compare its work defensively with that of other institutions, and the initial impression that one gets is that these were also Washingtonian. It is necessary, therefore, to clarify the issue before we “close the books” on this inventory of the Washingtonian institutions. The 1888-1889 annual report of the Massachusetts Home for Intemperate Women (14) mentions similar institutions in Chicago, New York, Providence and New Hampshire, and observes that “All of these homes follow the plan we have found so successful in drawing women from habits of intoxication into better living, the combination of home influences with regular habits of life and through industrial training for the work to which they are adapted.” The report goes on to say that, “although we meet with many discouragements in our work, we find upon comparison with reports from similar institutions that our results make very favourable showings, notably in connection with the Martha Washington Home in Chicago and with the Isaac Hopper Home in New York. Our income exceeds theirs, notwithstanding the fact that these homes have every facility for work, while our work is accomplished within the limits of a house built for a private family.”

The Isaac T. Hopper Home in New York began as the “Tempor,3rv Home” of the Female Department of the Prison Association of New York and was reorganized and renamed in 1858 as the residential unit of the Women’s Prison Association of New York. Although it began just as the Washingtonian Movement died back, and for many years most of those cared for by the Women’s Prison Association had been jailed for public intoxication or on “drunk-and-disorderly” charges, the program of the Women’s Prison Association of New York was not Washingtonian. Neither its annual reports nor its other records refer to the Washingtonian ideology or to the Washingtonian practices. The orientation was to crime and delinquency rather than drunkenness, for the association and its home developed out of a concern for crime prevention, prison reform and the rehabilitation of women rather than for temperance or prohibition; it was a manifestation of the great 19th-century Moral Reform. (there was, of course, a great deal of overlap between participants in various elements of the Moral Reform.) The comparison between the Massachusetts Home and the Hopper Home apparently was based on the fact that at the time both institutions served women who were heavily involved with alcohol and both had an “industrial” program in which the women inmates worked in the institution’s laundry, both as a kind of job training and as a way to pay for their keep. Both institutions also placed women in private homes as housekeepers, cooks and seamstresses. It appears that the similarity between the two institutions was superficial rather than fundamental.

The unnamed institution in Providence referred to in the above quotation from the Massachusetts Home annual report was probably the Sophia Little Home. Initially this was the project of the Women’s Society for Aiding Released Female Prisoners, which was an auxiliary of the Prisoner’s Aid Society of Providence. The group found it necessary to organize separately because the Prisoner’s Aid Society was divided on the subject; however, once the home was underway and the initial financial hurdles crossed, the opposition was sufficiently mollified to permit the consolidation of the two groups in 1883. (This never happened in New York.) The leadership was strongly religious and oriented toward the temperanceprohibition movement but apparently was not Washingtonian: “The last few years have witnessed a rapid increase in the agencies employed to remedy evils of intemperance and other vices. Public sentiment has become more widely and intelligently aroused. The truth is likewise become everywhere accepted that the Gospel offers the only sure and effective method of securing the restoration of victims bound by fetters too strong to be broken without Divine aid. It is to this end that the truths of the Gospel are daily sought in our Home; not with reference to any creed, but simply a heart-belief in the Lord Jesus Christ manifested by obedience to his command” (15, 1886). Although the Franklin Reformatory Home also had a

strong religious emphasis, there is no evidence of a Washingtonian orientation in the annual reports of the Sophia Little Home.

By 1894 the concerns of the Sophia Little Home had begun to shift: “[from] helping released female prisoners and other women desiring reformation, we have come to feel that our work should include not only those who have grown old in evil doing and who would otherwise be sent to State Farm or Prison, but to young girls to whom wrong is yet new - to those who, having sinned once, would find here a safe refuge, and who after a stay in an atmosphere of moral purity, strengthened and fortified, could go into the world better prepared to fight its evils and live correctly. Each one who comes to us pledges herself to stay a year, for a shorter time we realize would avail little or nothing” (15, 1894). In 1915 this shift in orientation was made official; thereafter the Sophia Little Home was chiefly interested in delinquent girls, a large number of whom were unwed mothers. It is the current orientation of the home, which still operates in Providence.

Despite the fact that Sophia Little, the founder of the home and a major figure in the establishment of the Prisoners’ Aid Society was active in a local Martha Washington society in the 1840s the available annual reports suggest that, although the home and the society were partial attempts to bridge Sophia Little’s concerns for prisoners and the temperance - prohibition movement, the Home itself was not conceived as Washingtonian in ideology or practice. This does not deny that there was some minimal Washingtonian influence; the annual report for 1886 mentions a visit to the Massachusetts Home by the leadership of the Sophia Little Home (15, 1886). As in the case of the Women’s Prison Association and the Hopper Home in New York City, the Sophia Little Home was initially oriented to female “delinquents” (who often were heavy drinkers); it, too, was a manifestation of the 19th-century Moral Reform rather than a part of the institutional phase of the Washingtonian Total Abstinence Movement.

The identity of the institution in New Hampshire alluded to in the 1888-89 annual report of the Massachusetts Home for Intemperate Women remains unknown. No record of an institution bearing the Washington label in New Hampshire has yet been found, and we are left in an even more speculative position than in the Providence case. Mercy Home (now Boylston Home) in Manchester is the likeliest candidate. It was established in 1889-90 under the care of the New Hampshire Woman’s Christian Temperance Union; it was oriented to homeless and friendless girls, and it apparently had an industrial program. While the Boylston Home seems not to have been oriented to Washingtonianism, further research is needed.

In summary, there were four identifiable Washingtonian institutions located in Boston, Chicago and Philadelphia. While they had a common identification as “Washingtonian,” there were differences between them almost from the very beginning with respect to the application of the Washingtonian ideology to residential therapeutic practice. Over time the ideologies and social characteristics of the leadership, the populations they sought to serve and the professional beliefs and practices of physicians involved in their programs led to the further differentiation of these institutions. As with all institutional settings, their activities had a tendency to become routinized, but organizational routines were upset by conflicts involving the clientele that the homes sought to serve as well as by members of the board and the administrators. In addition, there were fundamental challenges to the viability of the organizations as a consequence of changes in the concept of drunkenness (dipsomania, alcoholism), changes in the public support of the homes as treatment facilities, and, above all, by major events such as the Eighteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and the Depression of the 1930s. The organizational transformation of the homes was accompanied by an ideological drift so that the institutional phase of the Washingtonian Movement has died out even though the Washingtonian name is still carried by the two remaining institutions in Boston and Chicago.

References

1. Hawkins, W.G. *Life of John Hawkins*. Boston; Dutton; 1863.
2. Maxwell, M.A. *The Washingtonian Movement*. *Q.J. Stud. Alcohol* 11: 410-451, 1950.

3. Arthur, T.S. Strong Drink; the curse and the cure Philadelphia; Hubbard; 1877.
4. Washingtonian Home. Annual Reports. Boston; 1860-.
5. First quarterly report of the auditor of the [Parent] Washington Total Abstinence Society with address of the president. Boston; Lewis; 1841.
6. Journal of the American Temperance Union, 22 April 1858.
7. Journal of the American Temperance Union, 23 April 1859.
8. Clapp, O. Prevention, as a means of reducing the material, social and moral burdens and devastations of intemperance; address to the Corporation of the Washingtonian Home at the annual meeting. 29 April 1872. Boston; Wright & Potter; 1872.
9. Duis, P. The saloon and the public city; Chicago and Boston, 1880 - 1920. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago; 1975.
10. Sosensky, I. The problem of quality in relation to some issues in social change. Boston; Houghton Mifflin; 1964.
11. Graduates and Inmates of the Washingtonian Home, Boston. Address to the inmates of the Washingtonian Home, Chicago, with a response. 1884.
12. Godwin Association of the Franklin Reformatory Home of Philadelphia. The life of Samuel P. Godwin. Philadelphia; Traegar & Laub; 1889.
13. Mason, T.L. Anniversary address. Q.J. Inebr. 1: 1-24, 1876.
14. Massachusetts Home for Inebriate Women. Annual reports. Boston; 1881-.
15. Sophia Little Home. Annual reports. Providence, R.I.; 1886-.

Leonard U. Blumberg. "The Significance of the Alcohol Prohibitionists for the Washington Temperance Societies." With Special Reference to Paterson and Newark, New Jersey. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, Vol. 41,(L). 1980.

Summary. The establishment and activities of the Washington Temperance societies in Paterson and Newark are described, and the role of the temperance-prohibitionists in their decline is analyzed.

The Washington Temperance Societies of the 1840s used a self help conversion approach to drunkards and heavy drinkers, assuring them that they could once again become prosperous and respectable members of the community, reassume their socially mandated responsibilities for their wives and children, liberate themselves from their subservience to King Alcohol, relieve themselves from the terrible fate of eternal damnation and renew the prospect of heavenly salvation if they would only sign the pledge that, as gentlemen, they would no longer drink intoxicating beverages. Maxwell (1) and Blumberg (2) have noted the similarities between Alcoholics Anonymous and the Washingtonians. However, the fact that they developed in different societal contexts may explain the greater stability, success and significance of Alcoholics Anonymous compared with the Washingtonians. The Washingtonians were associated with the nineteenth-century moral reform movements, especially the temperance - prohibition movement (Usually referred to as the (alcohol) temperance movement, the movement by the 1840s had become committed to prohibition. The present paper emphasizes this prohibitionism rather than personal abstinence from alcohol), while A.A. has articulated with the medical profession in its mental health and public health manifestations.

The present essay deals with the significance of the temperance - prohibitionist groups of the 1840s for the rise and decline of the Washingtonian societies. It is the thesis of this paper that, while a number of other elements were involved in the decline of the Washington temperance societies, a major factor was the relationship between the Washington temperance societies and the temperance - prohibitionists (The thesis is similar to the conclusion of Tyler (3,pp. 338-346). Tyler's conclusion is undocumented, however, and must be regarded as hypothetical).

The advocates of temperance had already conducted a considerable agitation campaign by 1840, and the Washingtonians may be regarded as one of the major results of the efforts by the temperance advocates to define the consumption of alcohol in their own terms. Thus, the Baltimore Washingtonian Temperance Society developed after a discussion among six friends at Chasels Tavern about an announced temperance lecture; two of their number agreed to go and hear the speaker and to report back (4). They discussed the matter further and agreed that they would give sobriety and total abstinence a try - but on their own terms. In its organizational beginnings, therefore, the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore was autonomous from the local temperance societies in Maryland; it was working-class oriented, while the temperance societies were middle-class in origin and predominantly in composition; it was dominated by artisans, while the temperance societies were dominated by ministers. Further, the Washingtonians pledged themselves to exclude politics and religion from their meetings (in order to minimize the sectarian divisiveness of the era and to keep attention focused on the enemy - alcohol), while the temperance societies made a considerable effort to create a link between their cause and religion. From the 1840s on, the temperance societies advocated governmental intervention in the sale of alcohol in order to protect the community and to preserve the family.

The founders of the Washingtonian Temperance Society of Baltimore decided to use the practice of telling their "experiences" as the basic agenda (i.e., they witnessed to the destructive effects of alcohol and how abstinence had been beneficial both financially and in terms of respectability) and thereby provided a basis for the rapid spread of Washingtonianism among a population that was ready for it. This growth was facilitated by the recruitment procedures of the Washingtonians from the earliest meetings in Baltimore, it was agreed that members would seek out other drunkards and heavy drinkers and tell them about the society and how it had helped them. From this evolved a missionary or evangelistic style; delegations of at least two would go to other cities and towns to tell the story of how others could be saved from drunkenness and

degradation. While a New Testament model is suggested by these practices, it is just as reasonable to suggest that the Washingtonians went in pairs as a way of helping each other over the rough spots of total abstinence. Further, traveling in pairs made it easier to certify that neither had been drinking privately (although it did not guarantee it); the temptation was overpowering at times and alcohol was omnipresent during the period.

Sometimes the Washingtonian missionaries operated as itinerant moral reformers who came into town and began telling their experiences to anyone who would listen; in the bigger towns and cities, however, they were usually invited by local residents who had heard them elsewhere or who had read about them in the local or temperance press. The audience was often sympathetic to begin with. In addition, a number of curious heavy drinkers and “rum sellers” would come, some to scoff and jeer and some hoping to be convinced and converted. The persons who invited the Washingtonian missionaries were deeply involved in the local temperance organizations - they were already committed to a moral cause, which, from their point of view, was of the first magnitude. As committed people they seized upon the Washingtonians as an opportunity to broaden their impact on the community. This was especially important because in the late 1830s the temperance movement was divided as the consequence of a rift between the relativists (who objected only to the use of distilled spirits) and the absolutists (who were against any use of alcohol.) Their network existed in the cities and towns, and they seized upon this chance to mobilize a population that they had been unable to reach - the drunkards and heavy drinkers. By the time the Washingtonian movement began to fade, the absolutists had captured the temperance movement (with the help of the Washingtonians) and had converted it into a prohibitionist movement.

An organizational approach is useful in the analysis not only of the diffusion of the Washington phenomenon, but also of its decline. Whatever their socioeconomic backgrounds, the heavy drinkers and drunkards who were recruited into the local Washingtonian total abstinence societies were not respectable, although they could gain or regain respectability, while the temperance - prohibition advocates who joined the Washingtonian societies were eminently so. That is, one way to view what happened after November 1840, when the Baltimore Washingtonians began to have meetings which were open to the general public, is that a substantial number of temperance - prohibitionists came to the meetings. The temperance - prohibitionists chose to define their activities with respect to the Washingtonians as “lending support;” in political language we might say that the respectables had “infiltrated” the Washingtonian societies. While in the early period it is clear that they did not “take over,” the temperance prohibitionists did seek to influence the attitudes of the converted drunkards and heavy drinkers as well as the policies of the societies. I will examine the process as it took place in two north New Jersey societies, pointing out how the temperance prohibitionists sought to shift the emphasis of the Washingtonian temperance societies from “moral suasion” to “legal suasion.¹¹ Further, when it became possible to do so, the temperance - prohibitionists bypassed the Washingtonians and thereby accelerated their decline.

While the discussion that follows will focus on Newark and Paterson, New Jersey, it is necessary to begin with some attention to the beginnings of the Washington Temperance Benevolent Society of New York, for the origins of the Newark and Paterson societies were both related to the missionary activities of the New York society. As reported in the *Journal of the American Temperance Union*, we can trace the beginnings of the New York Washington Benevolent Society to news about events in Baltimore. In a letter to the editor in the January 1841 issue of the *Journal of the American Temperance Union*, John Zug reports that from 5 April to 12 December 1840 the membership of the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore grew from the original 6 founding members to about 300 members, two-thirds of whom were said to have been “reformed drunkards.” In the same issue of the *Journal* there is a report of a speech by a Mr. Pollard at a Maryland Temperance Convention held late in 1840. We know now that Pollard was a Washingtonian, but the editor of the *Journal*, apparently unaware of this fact, made no connection between the reference to Pollard and the letter by Zug, which was printed several pages later. In the February 1841 issue of the *Journal of the American Temperance Union*, an unsigned letter from Baltimore dated 19 January 1841 states that “Benevolence, philanthropy, patriotism and piety have united in the erection of the proudest

monument which has ever graced the most favored city of Christendom. Men, women and children fired with a holy zeal, are employed assiduously in collecting materials for this noble work, whose base shall rest upon the rock of truth and whose top, though not expected to 'reach to heaven, I shall be guided by the unclouded rays of truth, and glitter in the effulgence of a 'sun that shall go down no more.

The author of the letter adds that there had developed in Baltimore (by inference as a consequence of the Washingtonian activity) a network of "local and auxiliary associations...formed on the aggressive principle, and meet every, and some of them twice in each week, where crowded assemblies, with an enthusiasm rarely seen on any subject, listen to and applaud their deliberations and plans of operations, which hundreds are coming forward, anxious to participate in the honors of this bloodless triumph."

This, then was the dramatic news from Baltimore to New York where the Journal of the American Temperance Union was published. By late February or early March the Baltimore Washington Temperance Society had grown to 1200 members with several auxiliaries numbering about 1500 more. These data are taken from a circular letter of the Baltimore Washington Temperance Society that was published in the March 1841 issue of the Journal of the American Temperance Union Announcing plans for a grand temperance celebration on 5 April 1841, the first anniversary of the Baltimore society. Among the members were drunkards, habitual drinkers, moderate drinkers and those previously committed to total abstinence who were part of the organized temperance movement. Further, we know from the letter of 19 January 1841, cited above, that the membership included juveniles as well as adults. It seems evident, then, that once the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore "went public" in November 1840 there were substantial numbers of persons involved in the society who were not drunkards or even heavy drinkers. We must, therefore, regard the report of the New York Herald of 1 February 1841 that the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore had a thousand members "consisting entirely of reformed intemperate individuals" as an exaggeration, an exaggeration that was repeated in the Journal of the American Temperance Society in the report on events in New York City.

The reports of the activity in Baltimore excited the interest of the Executive Committee of the New York Temperance Society, and they invited the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore to send a delegation of reformed men (5). The visit began on 26 March and continued for more than a week; more than 20 meetings were held in the largest churches in the city and in the park; nearly 2000 persons signed the total abstinence pledge for the first time, and on 29 March 1841 the Washington Temperance Benevolent Society of New York City was formed. By 4 October 1841, it claimed to have 2263 members, 4 city auxiliaries with 600 members and 4 "country" auxiliaries with 1280 members; in that 6-month period it had sent out 62 speakers. Several of these speakers went to Paterson and Newark. Clearly, the New York City temperance society was able to mobilize energy and talent for its cause on a much greater scale than had ever been done before, and this activity was directed not only to the city but to the surrounding areas as well.

Paterson

The response to the efforts of the New York Washingtonians was rapid. The "friends of temperance" in Paterson met in the Second Baptist Church on 16 April and that "The Committee appointed to wait on the Delegation from Baltimore," report that "they are now in Boston" (6). (1) Among these "friends of temperance" were Joseph Perry (Schoolteacher) and Alex H. Freeman (sheet metal and stoves), both of whom were later active in the organization of the Washingtonians in Paterson. (2) The senior partner and editor of the Paterson intelligencer, D.H. Day, who was sympathetic to the cause, seized the opportunity to keep interest alive by reprinting an article from the Boston Journal which described, in glowing terms, the visit of the Baltimore delegation (7): "Our friends in the country will be rejoiced to know that there never has existed so much healthy excitement on the subject of temperance, in our city, as at the present moment. - Meetings are held every evening and are crowded to overflowing," it reported. "The mass of people listen with breathless attention to the speakers, and every man goes away with a new zeal in the prosecution of the holy enterprise...Mr. Hawkins, at the Bethel [North Square, Boston] spoke for one hour with tremendous power, and carried his audience captive at his will. Now a deep and solemn silence pervaded the house; now

was heard the hushed sob; and now again the outpouring of acclamation, like a cataract's roar. Mr. Wright spoke with more interest and power than he had yet done in our city; and this saying much. After his address four hundred and fifteen came forward and signed the pledge!"

So it is no surprise that when Hawkins and Wright (2 of the original Baltimore delegation to New York City), along with several speakers from the New York Washington Temperance Benevolent Society, conducted a series of meetings in Paterson that May they were well received. The Paterson Intelligencer commented (8) the "the lectures had formerly been, according to their own statements, drunkards of the worst sort, and the accounts they gave of their own sufferings, and the sufferings of their families, were painful beyond description. Their lectures were strictly practical, and therefore had a greater effect upon the minds of the hearers than all the temperance addresses by persons who knew nothing of the subject from experience" As a consequence, 300 people signed the Washingtonian pledge; on 10 May the Paterson Washington Temperance Benevolent Society was formed by 30 of those who had signed the pledge, using both the name of the New York Society and its constitution (9). ("Temperance Benevolent" was the New York style, in contrast with Baltimore's "Temperance" and Boston's "Total Abstinence.") The Paterson Intelligencer (8), in its comments on the initial formative meetings in Paterson observed that "The ardor of the new fledged total abstinence is truly exhilarating; it seems to them that nothing has hitherto been done in the glorious cause; instead of opposing, as hitherto, they now will take the lead, and as old soldiers turn aside, as a relieved corps, they will go on to certain victory."

Ultimately, the "old soldiers" found this enthusiasm a source of irritation as well as satisfaction, because the temperance-prohibitionists had been "labouring in the vineyard" for a long time and wanted what they regarded as their justly deserved reward of community recognition. At the time, however, all were caught up in a glowing and expansive enthusiasm that is evidenced in the report from Paterson printed in the Newark Daily Advertiser of 1 July 1841: "We have known many plans devised for the prosperity and improvement of our towns; laws enacted, companies formed, and new projects to facilitate business carried out - but they all sink into insignificance, both in moral and pecuniary point of view, by the side of the work we are now speaking of." Such dynamism and exaggerated expectations are not atypical of movements for social change in their early growth periods.

In its original form, the Baltimore Washingtonian pledge read as follows (4): "We, whose names are annexed, desirous of forming a society for our mutual benefit, and to guard against a pernicious practice, which is injurious to our health, standing and families we do pledge ourselves as gentlemen, not to drink any spirituous or malt liquors, wine or cider." The pledge used by the New York and Paterson societies reflected the influence of the temperance prohibitionists (10): "We, whose names are hereunto annexed, believing that the use of Intoxicating Liquors as a beverage, is not only needless, but hurtful to the social, civil and religious interests of men - that it tends to form intemperate habits - and that while it is continued, the evils of intemperance will never be done away - do, therefore , pledge ourselves that we will not drink any spirituous or malt liquor, wine or cider, and that in all suitable ways we will discountenance the use of them through the community." While this pledge seemed to support nonpolitical moral suasion (the Washingtonian position) its wording also provided the opening wedge for an explicit legal suasion - prohibitionist position.

The same dynamism that galvanized the Baltimoreans, the New Yorkers and the Bostonians was immediately evident in Paterson. During the first quarter-year, the Paterson Washingtonians conducted 9 mission meetings, which led to the formation of 3 new societies in nearby communities. We know the name of only 1 of these, the Manchester Washington Temperance Benevolent Society, which continued through the years to have a close relationship with the Paterson group. Their activity increased during the second quarter, when 39 mission meetings were held, and continued at least to the middle of June 1842, when delegates were sent to towns in Rockland County, New York, some 20 miles away. Street meetings were held from time to time in Paterson during the same period. A special delegation was even sent to "Cheap Josey's," a tavern "situated between Paterson and Bloomfield ... where shoemakers, tailors, pacemakers, cotton and woolen factory boys, and farmers, met together to drink, gamble and fight" (11,p.5).

This dynamism was also manifested in the personal lives of the artisans and workingmen who signed the pledge and joined the Washingtonians. For instance, John Broughton, a tailor, advertised that he had taken the pledge of “total abstinence from all that intoxicates and in consequence am restored to my sober senses again,” and he appealed to his fellow townsmen to give him their “confidence and esteem as a consequence of his constant and sober application to his craft”(12).

The enthusiasm was also evidenced organizationally. By 23 June 1841, there was a [Boys] Juvenile Washington Temperance Benevolent Society of 50 members (13), who recited the following form of the pledge:

*A pledge we make, By drinking gin;
No wine to take, Hard cider, too
Nor brandy, red, Will never do.
To turn the head, Nor brewer's beer,
Nor whiskey hot, Our hearts to cheer,
That makes the sot, O quench our thirst, we always bring
Nor fiery rum, Cold water, from the well or spring.
That ruins home; So here we pledge perpetual hate.
Nor will we sin, To all that can intoxicate.(3)*

The junior society had about 130 members by the time of the Independence Day celebration. The Fourth of July was a time of special significance to the Washingtonians because in the past it had been the occasion for drunken sprees which disrupted the annual civic parades and embarrassed the respectable citizenry who saw it as a quasi-religious occasion for rededication to freedom and morality. Thus the Independence Day celebration in 1841 was different from previous ones; in the morning the town's Sunday School students paraded, and in the afternoon members of the Paterson Washington Temperance Benevolent Society marched in procession to the Congregational Methodist Church and were presented with a banner by the women church members which read “Total Abstinence from all that Intoxicates.” They proceeded to what is now known as Totowa and then to an island in the Passaic River where they heard orations, most of which were by local ministers and ministers from New York (who, we may infer, were temperance-prohibitionists). The brass band of the Passaic Guards, a local voluntary militia group, played music. After a collation, the group met in the Second Presbyterian Church, where some Washingtonian experience speeches were given and some pledges were taken. The Washingtonians were, of course, celebrating their freedom from bondage to alcohol; the temperance-prohibitionist preachers were exhorting their listeners to free the country from its bondage to the rum sellers and rum makers; the contrast with past Independence Day celebrations was stark indeed!

Another sign of vitality was the existence of an active relief committee. The society's constitution provided that when they found a “poor drunkard in distress, from poverty, and unable to provide for his immediate necessities, to furnish him with food, raiment and shelter, or any of them, at his own discretion or if need be, with medicine and medical advice, provided always, that such relief shall in no case be granted unless there be reasonable grounds to believe that such poor drunkard will sign the pledge and reform...11 (10, Art.VI). The relief committee was active in the town although its actual cash resources were very limited. It's work was supplemented by that of the Martha Washington Temperance Benevolent Society, which in the quarter ending 3 August 1842 handed out \$7.72 in cash, 23 articles of clothing and sundry provisions to families of reformed inebriates. The first directress at that time was the wife of Joseph Perry, the school-teacher who was also active as a temperance-prohibitionist.

By mid September 1841, the Paterson Washingtonians felt strong enough to call for a countrywide mass temperance meeting. The meeting was held on 19 November; had there not been a snowfall of several inches, the Martha Washingtonians of Paterson would have marched in the procession under their banner with a slogan that made their position quite clear: “Total abstinence or no husband! 11 Forty years later, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union used a similar slogan: “Lips that touch wine will never touch mine.”

Finally, membership and financial data give us an additional assessment of the strength of the

Paterson Washingtonian society in its formative period, although it is certainly not a clear one. By the end of the first quarter year of its existence, the Paterson society had 290 members and had gotten 1245 pledges, including 230 from the junior society. During the second quarter, the recording secretary claimed that 504 had joined the society, making a total of 1730 members. (4) These membership statistics must be viewed with caution because it seems probable that the distinction between members of the Paterson society and those who had signed the society's pledge had been obfuscated; it seems more likely that the 504 reported new members were those who had signed the pledge during the quarter and that 1730 was the total number of persons who had signed the pledge up to that time. Later data supported this interpretation: in March 1842 it was reported that the Paterson society had 2572 members; during the ensuing week 77 persons signed the pledge, and there was then a report of 2649 members. This confusion makes it impossible to assess the significance of membership statistics. Nevertheless, there is little doubt that through mid-1842 the Paterson society continued to grow; what is in doubt is the rate of growth and the numbers during this period of maximal growth.

The financial data also gives us a mixed picture of the vitality of the Paterson Washingtonians. In the first quarter, the society had a cash income of \$28.35 and an expenditure of \$19.56 for the use of a local Presbyterian church as a meeting place and for the relief of "poor drunkards." But, with a cash balance of \$8.69, the society also had "accounts receivable" (my term) of \$54, some of which was due from members and the balance of which had probably been given as loans rather than as cash grants to drunkards. The financial problem continued into the second quarter when the recording secretary commented in his report that the society was having problems collecting fees and dues owed to it; he recommended the formation of a special committee and also that a collection be taken at each meeting. By November 1842, a resolution was adopted "that some means may be devised to liquidate the debt of the Society, and report some plan to keep out of debt in the future..." (15). The procedure apparently adopted was one common for the period, subscriptions (regular contributions) were solicited among the citizens of Paterson.

The Washington Temperance Benevolent Society of Paterson continued to have considerable vitality at least through Independence Day. In May, the first anniversary of the society was celebrated with a public parade attended by delegates from Manchester, Aquackanonk, Hackensack, Godwinville, New Prospect, Jersey City, Newark, Boonton, Morristown and Mattewan. A company of Washington Temperance Guards with its own band came from New York City. Several weeks later, a group from New York City Hose Company Number 33 came to Paterson "with a view of giving our citizens a Specimen of Temperance song singing," and there was "an overflowing meeting assembled to hear this celebrated company exercise their vocal powers. Their performance was received with great eclat by the audience and gave universal satisfaction. One of them related his experience of the sad effects of drunkenness, and several of our cold water army made short addresses..."(16). They also successfully persuaded the members of the Paterson Company Number 3 to sign the pledge as a group. Sometime in April a group of Temperance Guards, including a choral group that sang regularly at the meetings of the society, was formed in Paterson. The combined Independence Day celebration of the Paterson and Manchester societies went well and was the major celebration in the town.

The Washingtonians apparently continued to perceive themselves as the leaders of the temperance movement, judging by the toast to "Reformed Drunkards" (17), which went as follows: "The great Pioneers, who in front of the army of truth, are now successfully cutting the way through the Alcoholic wilderness of inequity and crime ..." The last pledge of the celebration, however, reflected both the continued concern for heavy drinkers and a recognition that the bloom had begun to fade: "To Backsliders - We pity them - May they again sign the pledge, and 'beware of the first glass.'" This note of realism contrasts with the congratulatory tone of the recording secretary's comments at the close of the second quarterly report of the Paterson society (18): "Before closing this Report, it seems proper to notice the fidelity and perseverance with which the reformed have kept their pledge, and the blessed results to which this conduct has led, whether considered in reference to their own characters, the comfort and well being of their families, their influence in society, or their business affairs; also to invite the temperate and moderate drinker to cooperate

with us in the endeavor to put an end to drunkenness.”

At this time Nathaniel Lane (sheet metal worker and stove merchant) was president of the society and his partner, Alex H. Freeman, was a member of the standing (executive) committee. (Lane was elected town tax collector on the Whig ticket in 1844. Joseph Perry was treasurer and John K. Flood, a storekeeper who short became town clerk, had been recording secretary and was now corresponding secretary. In addition, the arrangements committee included David H. Day, publisher of the Paterson Intelligencer, Abraham Van Blarcom, a temperance-prohibitionist, and John Avison, shoemaker, who was an activist in antislavery politics, a temperance-prohibitionist, and the town post-master. There can be no doubt that the temperance-prohibitionists were in positions of dominance in the society at this time.

By that summer, however, the new recording secretary commented in the quarterly report (19) that “There has been for a short time past, at least it seemed to me, a suppression of spirits among our veteran troops of this town; nor indeed with a reflecting mind is this to [be] wondered at, for preparatory to the great and glorious battles of the 10th of May and the 4th of July last, both resulting in signal victory over the enemy, their exertions, both physically and mentally, was excessive from exercise; marching, countermarching, raising and manning batteries, with a thousand or more etceteras, together with pains of scars (for their were no lives lost on the side of the Temperance Army) which are consequent to the battlefield.” He continued, “Our spirits and wounds now healed up, let the victories of the past encourage to redouble our exertions, in not only guarding against the insidious movements of the deadly foe, but in making secure preparations for the next pitched battle, which will be fought on May 10th, 1843.” Still using military language, he urged the society, “not to retire to our camps in the flush of victory... 11 and to “stand aloof from all political manoeuvring” for he observed that the society was being wooed by “wiley politicians” whom he called “wolves in sheep’s clothing.”

The latter history of the society suggests that he was referring to the “respectables” who had joined the society. Civic life during this period was intensely political, and there can be little doubt that efforts were made to manoeuvre what seemed to be a strong and vital group to express positions favourable to the election of Whig, Anti-Slavery or Loco-foco (Democrat) candidates. The recording secretary had pointed to what proved to be a recurring problem for the society. In contrast to his predecessor in the post, the recording secretary, who warned his fellow Washingtonians of the dangers of alcohol and the need to continue to fight, apparently had an alcohol problem of his own; he was unceremoniously dropped from office on 28 October 1842 because he had broken his pledge, a fact that he acknowledged in a written communication that he requested be placed in the minutes of the society. Other incidents of recidivism began to receive attention, and there was an occasional report in the Paterson Intelligencer. Such a case was that of a 33-year-old man who after 18 months of abstinence, went on a spree and, despite the best efforts of a representative of the society (similar to Twelfth-Stepping in Alcoholics Anonymous), finally drowned himself in the Passaic River.

The annual report of the Manchester Washington Temperance Benevolent Society (20), published just before Christmas, 1842, indicated that the falling off of interest and “backsliding” were not unique to Paterson. The Manchester Society claimed 102 members when it was organized, some having dual membership in the Paterson society. Participation apparently had never been heavy, even among those who signed the pledge and were considered members, but with the help of the Paterson society, the total number had grown to 642. Two of the three taverns in Manchester had closed down, all 4 of the town’s grocery stores had stopped selling spirits, and reclaimed members were now observing the Sabbath in church. Notwithstanding this, Benjamin Geroe, the recording secretary and an active temperance-prohibitionist, commented that some of the officers as well as some of the members “have not paid that attention to so good a cause as they might have done, and probably through their inattention in a measure, may be ascribed the cause of some falling away or returning to their cups.” He concludes, nonetheless, with the hopeful statement that “of late a new impulse appears to be given to the standard of Teetotalism, as if they were determined on nothing less than complete victory.”

Meanwhile the society rapidly became routinized; its meetings apparently were about the same week

after week and much of the early excitement dissipated. Some of the extra-organizational efforts of the society were given up. Both the Junior Washington Temperance Benevolent Society and the Temperance Guards projects were abandoned sometime after the Independence Day celebration. Appeals were made to “make some extra efforts to produce a more lively interest in the cause of Temperance”(15), and a week-long series of meetings, similar to those held in the formative period of the society, was organized. Prominent speakers from New York and Philadelphia were “engaged” for these meetings; special meetings were held as often as possible to hear popular “Washingtonian lectures,” for a degree of specialization had begun to emerge. That comment that “If the above named gentlemen do not draw full houses, we don’t know who can” (21), makes clear that recruitment was uppermost in the minds of the sponsors.

A drift away from Washingtonian practices appears to have begun; at the last meeting in November 1842, a motion was passed that thereafter the pledge would not be circulated at meetings but would be available for those who wished to sign. Evidently most of those who now came to the meetings had signed the pledge; for all practical purposes, the membership recruitment process had reached its peak and only a few who were eligible to sign the pledge were now coming to the meetings. Further, “experience meetings,” which were a central feature of Washingtonian practice, had apparently fallen off during mid-1842, because a motion was passed to hold experience meetings “in order to bring out new speakers to keep up the interest of the meetings” (22). But these experience meetings were to be held on Thursday nights while the regular meetings were held on Friday nights (both were held in the basement of the Methodist Episcopal church). A trial of King Alcohol was scheduled for February 1843 in order to pique the interest of persons who might not otherwise be attracted to the meetings. For a time the weekly meetings were dropped, but they were begun again in the hope that they would attract more members and greater participation.

The second anniversary celebration of the Washington Temperance Benevolent Society of Paterson, on 10 May 1843, was a more subdued affair than the previous one, although there was a procession through Paterson and Manchester. The Independence Day celebration that year included the Washingtonians, but they did not dominate it as they had in the two previous years. The incoming president, Samuel A. Van Saun, was a grocery store keeper, a member of the Township Poor Committee, and a warden of the Paterson Fire Association; the incoming recording secretary was Dr. J. Nightingale; the treasurer was William Moyle, a public accountant and bill collector, who was also an active antislavery advocate; and John Avison was on the standing committee. Given this kind of top leadership in the Paterson society, it is not surprising to find that on 18 June 1843 there was a lecture by Reverend Warren, agent of the New Jersey State Temperance Society, and that on the next day Warren suggested organizing a juvenile band to be coordinated with the activities of the Washington Society. That is, the temperance-prohibitionists now proposed to pick up the juvenile program that the Washingtonians had abandoned.

The liaison with the temperance-prohibitionists intensified in 1844. Until this time, the Paterson Washingtonians had largely ignored the meetings of the county and state temperance societies, but now a delegation was appointed to attend the State Temperance Convention to be held in Trenton on 17 January 1844. Among the delegates were Benjamin Geroe the longtime recording secretary of the Manchester society (which was now an auxiliary of the Paterson society), Nathaniel Lane, Samuel A. Van Saun and Horatio Moses, the incoming president of the Paterson society. The third anniversary celebration of the Paterson Washingtonians on 10 May 1844 was a relatively subdued evening service held in the Methodist Episcopal church. “The audience was large and respectable,” said the Paterson Intelligencer, (23), “principally ladies, whose presence and strict attention, enlivens and cheers a meeting of any description.’, One of the principal speakers was the Reverend E. Cheever, of Newark, secretary of the Essex County Temperance Society, who gave an address “well calculated to invigorate teetotalers with new life and to reward action.” Horatio Moses was the new president; Samuel A. Van Saun was now treasurer, John Avison and Benjamin Crane, an antislavery activist, were members of the executive committee and Wright Flavell, also an antislavery activist, was on the relief committee.

The speaker at the 9 August 1844 meeting was the Reverend Mr. Wise, agent of the New England Temperance Society, whose subject was “the moral character of the traffic in intoxicating liquors; in which

he showed by convincing arguments, that it could not be carried on in obedience to the divine commandments, but was productive of much injury to mankind, producing crime, disease, degradation, and death to a great extent” (24). This was followed by a speech on 30 August 1844 at which a Mr. Root spoke “of the necessity of Christians aiding the Temperance Cause” (25). Root also discussed his theory that evil spirits exert influence over men suffering from delirium tremens (26), which is referred to as a “disease” in the newspaper report. All of this built to a meeting on 15 November at which the members of the society were asked to circulate a petition to the legislature calling for prohibition of the sale of alcoholic drinks on the Christian Sabbath; the members of the Washington Temperance Benevolent Society of Paterson had now been brought around to political activism contrary to the original Washington stance and in line with the temperance-prohibitionist political strategy of incrementalism. The principal speaker, the Reverend Mr. Russell, further “spoke of the influence of Public Sentiment in Republican governments, and showed that in order to sustain good laws we must continue to sow the seeds of truth and thus get public sentiment right in regard to the subject of Temperance, that it will sustain good laws” (27). His speech, in conjunction with those of other recent speakers, provided the basis for a justification of political temperance activity-prohibitionism.

From this point on, reports of the Washington Temperance Benevolent Society become more and more sketchy. The affiliation with the state temperance society had become regularized is suggested by the fact that three of the four delegates sent to the January 1845 convention had also been to the 1844 convention. Informal ties were developed with the Ancient Order of Rechabites, a temperance fraternal order. In March 1846 the Paterson Washingtonians moved another step, toward the temperance-prohibitionist approach with the passage of a resolution stating “That in the opinion of this Society, the Court of Common Pleas, at its present session in granting licenses, have not only violated the strict letter and spirit of the law, but have shown themselves destitute of common morality” (26). This resolution, ostensibly a commentary on who should or should not receive licenses, moves close to prohibitionism when it denounces the members of the court as “destitute of common morality”; only by a refusal of all licenses would the court have been in accordance with the concept of “common morality,” which the group now seemed to espouse. The Paterson Washington society was almost moribund by 1846, but there was still enough life in it for a major controversy, one which illustrates that, for all practical purposes, it had been absorbed into the temperance-prohibitionist camp.

This was so, despite the fact that on 18 March 1846 it published a resolution to the effect that it was neutral with respect to moral, political or religious questions and that it did not attempt to control the individual acts of its members in any respect outside of its business in the Temperance Hall. This was obviously in anticipation of a letter printed in the Paterson Intelligencer of 25 March 1846 by S. Tuttle, a member of the executive committee of the society, in which he tendered his resignation from the committee on the grounds that the society had become political. “There were some,” he wrote, “who were slow to embrace the principles of Total Abstinence, and Washingtonians, forgetting the secret of their success (moral suasion), resorted to political action, to force those men into compliance with their principles. From that time to the present, a shameful course of hypocrisy and double-dealing has been pursued by many of the professed friends of Temperance. They care no more for the progress of Temperance principles than they do for the religion of Mohamet; and they only mount the Temperance hobby, hoping to ride over the ruins of the Whig party.” Tuttle went on to point out that at a recent county temperance meeting called at the behest of the Paterson Washington society a resolution was adopted that “we, as lovers of the principles set forth in the previous address [i.e., temperance-prohibitionist principles], will not give our suffrage to any persons who is not pledged to Total Abstinence,” thereby proscribing every unpledged candidate and raising up a powerful opposition to the temperance cause. Tuttle argued that the Paterson Washington society had called the meeting and that the resolution had been passed unanimously, and so the Paterson Society, was inconsistent in now claiming that it had not taken a political position. Tuttle further claimed that one of the objects of the meeting was to take action to support the formation of a temperance ticket for town officers at the ensuing town meeting.

Tuttle argued that such a ticket could not win but could only lead to the defeat of the Whigs. To which some participants of the convention reportedly replied “God speed” before Tuttle could point out that the major consequence of the plan would be the election of the Democratic slate. When he did point that out and offered a counterrevolution, he was voted down by those who were committed to political action. He charged that “The Society has now sanctioned the political juggling of its members, by telling them in effect, that it will have nothing to do with politics, and that they may come into their Hall and hold a Temperance Benevolent meeting, and then go right into the next room, or any other place and hold a Temperance Political meeting, and it will be all right; and if any man charges the Society with political movements, then he is an artful and designing man! I think, sir, that the Temperance Society, as a body, is secretly in favour of these political movements, and therefore I have declined acting as one of its Business Committee.” He goes on to say that after the meeting one member admitted that he wanted the Whig party to lose at the next election and that he was a Loco-foco (Democrat). An unsigned reply the following week argued that Mr. Tuttle had intruded into a private meeting called expressly to form a caucus (and, by inference, that was not a Washingtonian meeting) and so he was out of order. Efforts were made to resolve the serious disagreement that had arisen within the Paterson Washington Temperance Benevolent Society but they were not very successful.

The society went on with its annual meeting and the Independence Day celebration was conducted in conjunction with the Rechabites and the Sons of Temperance. At one meeting in June not enough members were present to provide a quorum. The struggle came to a head when, at the mid-August meeting, Abraham Van Blarcom, a temperanceprohibitionist, offered a resolution that the society support a local option license law similar to the one in New York State and that the members of the society would not support anyone who was “not known as the open and decided friend of such a law” (29). The motion was tabled, to be brought up at the mid-September meeting. Tuttle offered an amendment to strike out the clause about withholding the vote, and the support of local option licensing passed. There ensued an indecisive struggle between the advocates of withholding the vote and those opposed. The resolution of this struggle was not publicly reported, but it is clear that the temperance-prohibitionist position in favour of legal suasion had been accepted even by those who were opposed to withholding the vote; the struggle was over the next steps of political activity rather than the principle that Washingtonians would refrain from efforts to prevent the consumption or sale of alcoholic beverages through legislation.

That the Paterson Washington Temperance Benevolent Society was now largely irrelevant to the temperance movement in Paterson is evidenced by the fact that in early November 1847 a series of temperance meetings were announced in the various churches in town - the Methodist Episcopal, Baptist and Free Presbyterian. The meetings were strongly legalistic and linked morality to a legislative approach. The Washingtonian society was not a sponsor of these meetings; it had been bypassed. There is even some question as to whether the organization any longer existed except in a nominal sense, for reports of its activities were no longer published in the Paterson Intelligencer, which had been strongly supportive from its very inception.

Newark

On 21 July 1841 the Paterson Intelligencer made the following proud commentary on the effect of the Washington temperance reform, which was then in its triumphant first flush in Paterson (30): “We question whether there is now a town in the state which can boast of a more sober, quiet and industrious population than our own. Nearly all who but a short time since spent most of their time in idleness about taverns and other places of resort, have become steady industrious citizens, and are busily employed in their daily vocations, while their families, who formerly suffered for the want of the necessaries of life, are now made comfortable and happy.” Paterson was a rapidly growing industrial town, and this was a frank statement of the values of its dominant manufacturing and merchant class of this period. These were also values of the temperance-prohibitionists, who used the Washingtonian phenomenon for their own purposes.

This statement of civic pride implied that Paterson was the moral leader of the State, that it was

ahead of Newark. This contrast to Newark was made explicit by the editor, who went on to say that “In Newark the subject of Temperance has been permitted to sleep, until within a week or two back, when a deputation from New York held a meeting in one of the churches in the city, at which one hundred and sixty attached their names to the pledge.” On 12 July 1841, A Washingtonian Temperance Benevolent Society was founded with 119 members.

While the Washingtonian missionaries came to Newark about 2 months later than to Paterson, the editor of the Newark Daily Advertiser, who was also a “friend of temperance,” was already mobilizing his readers for the temperance reform. And, while he gave little attention to it during the Washingtonian period, the editor was prepared to accept the fact that the substantial Catholic Total Abstinence Movement, which was also growing during that period, was another valid approach to temperance. For the period, this was surprisingly broad-minded, but a perusal of the Journal of the American Temperance Union in the early 1840s will show that the temperance-prohibitionist leadership highly esteemed and fully reported the work of Father Theobald Matthew in Ireland, England and (later) in the United States. “I had heard much during the week of the triumphs of the Temperance cause, or rather total abstinence, among the people who “worship” at an unnamed local Roman Catholic church, he wrote (31). “I confess that owing either to my Protestant prejudices or some other cause, I previously felt misgivings as to any permanent good likely to result from the pushing of the multitude under what I supposed a mere temporary excitement to ‘take the pledge.’ But the scene I there witnessed entirely dissipated all my fears ... The clergyman officiating ... preached of Temperance and Righteousness, and Judgments to come. I have heard many temperance addresses, but none I think that could exceed the impressive, fervid, and thrillingly eloquent appeals to his auditory, in the strength of God, to fly the destroying angel - Intemperance. 11 He continued, “The effect was powerful. Upon countenances could be traced sore indications of judgements convinced; and the calm and deliberate manner in which they surrounded the alter, and there solemnly pledged themselves to Total Abstinence from all that intoxicates, gave pleasing proof of the deep and sincere convictions that they would be kept faithful to their high resolve...”

That there are few if any reports in the Newark Daily Advertiser in subsequent years, given the fact that the editor had abandoned his prejudices with respect to Catholics (in this respect, in any case), suggests that local parish priests did not seek publicity. Perhaps the rising controversy over public education, religious education, Catholic education and the use of public funds soured the situation. In any case, the editor had come around to the view that taking pledges of total abstinence was perhaps not as useless as he had believed and he was, therefore, prepared to receive the Washingtonians in a positive manner. There is good reason to believe that he was aware of the Washingtonians by mid-May, for on 12 May there was a report about the meeting of the American Temperance Union which was held in Newark that year (32). Theodore Frelinghuysen, lawyer, former U.S. senator, chancellor of the University of New York, soon to be nominated for vice president of the American Temperance Union, gave the major speech. In it, Frelinghuysen not only mentioned the total abstinence movement in Ireland and in Europe, but the “strong, and in good degree, successful efforts of the drunkards themselves in various cities of the U.States to emancipate themselves of intemperance.” He also reported that 15,000 drunkards had been reformed in the country within the last 6 months - probably an exaggeration.

The following week there was a favourable review of a pamphlet by Dr. David Reese entitled “Plea for the Intemperate,” which argued that intemperance is a disease” and that the subject should be treated, not harshly, but medically and with great kindness” (33). (This was not an uncommon medical view during the period.) The reviewer went on to say that “Mr. Hawkins confirms this view of the matter in his effective practical addresses, and in the plea of Dr. Reese we find a medical man of large experience sustaining the same position, and arguing the question like a man of sense as well as a physician.” The reviewer also remarked on the number “reclaimed” in Baltimore, New York, Boston and “cities farther east” due to the efforts of drunkards, along with “friends of the cause,” who were encouraged “to extend an encouraging voice and benevolent hand to the reclaimed.” He contrasted this with the past when drunkards were simply given up as lost. “Now they are becoming not only temperate, but the preachers and ministering agents of

the cause.” On 5 June 1941 reports from the Baltimore Transcript summarized in the Newark Daily Advertiser (34) noted that “no idea can be formed of the enthusiasm which pervades that city on the subject of Temperance. It is the all-pervading topic, and the moral revolution which has been effected mainly by the drunkards themselves, is almost past belief.”

So it came as no surprise to the readers of the paper when it was announced that there would be a meeting to promote the temperance cause on Friday evening, 9 July 1841, in the Free (Second) Presbyterian Church, and that a delegation of reformed drunkards from the Washington Temperance Benevolent Society of New York would attend: “Friends of Temperance and persons addicted to drinking habits and the drunkard, dealers and vendors of liquor, are respectfully invited to attend” (35).

The New York Washingtonians continued to have a close relationship with the Washington Temperance Benevolent Society of Newark after it was formed on 12 July 1841; speakers from New York frequently came to Newark. Wright, Pollard and Hawkins of the Baltimore society also visited Newark when they were in New York. When the Newark society called a convention of Washington temperance societies for 17 September 1841, speakers from Paterson, New York and Brooklyn came; the Newark society reciprocated when it attended en masse a Washingtonian convention in New York City on 13 October 1841. When the Newark society dedicated its own hall on 9 December 1841, a speaker from the New York City society was among those who addressed the meeting. When a banner was presented to the North Ward Washingtonians on 28 July 1842, the presentation speech was made by Dr. Reese of New York and the acceptance speech for the Washingtonians of Newark was made by Reverend E. Cheever, of Newark, who was Secretary of the Essex County Temperance Society and pastor of the Free (or second) Presbyterian Church.

Information about the Newark Washington Temperance Benevolent Society and its auxiliaries is sketchy and sporadically available because there evidently was an editorial policy against reporting the activities of local groups. There seemed to be such a policy in Paterson also, but the owners apparently contributed space in the announcement section and also published an occasional article of interest; the Newark Daily Advertiser was less generous. What we have then, are bits and pieces that are suggestive but often not definitive.

Available evidence suggests that the Newark Washingtonians quickly evidenced the same kind of organizational activity that developed elsewhere. We have substantial information on the Martha Washington Temperance Union which was formed on 14 August 1841. In addition to an address by a missionary from the Baltimore society, speeches and prayers were offered by the minister of the Newark Mariners’ Bethel, Reverend Pilch, and the minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Reverend Ansel D. Eddy. From the very beginning, the society had close ties to the churches; the board of managers was composed of members of 11 different churches. This was done, said the report of the meeting (36), in order to be “empathically a UNION of all classes and denominations throughout the city. Its object is two-fold. By pledging its members to abstain from using, as a beverage, aught that can intoxicate, it gives the weight of its example; by procuring and making up clothing for the families of reformed inebriates, it extends to them the hand of sympathy and encouragement. ‘In union is strength.’ The Board respectfully invite the cooperation of every lady in this city who has a heart to pity or hand to relieve. 11 Plans were also made for the organization of a Junior Martha Washington Society.

In the first quarter-year of activity, the Martha Washington Temperance Union had completed 89 articles of clothing, including 6 bed quilts; in addition, 70 articles had been repaired, 80 garments had been given out and 106 had been handed over to the president of the Washington temperance society for distribution. The society had gotten 156 persons to sign their pledge and, with an income of about \$56.81, had paid out about \$37.17. Clearly their money-raising efforts had been more successful than those in Paterson. By the time the second annual report was made in 1843, there were 4 women’s temperance societies in the City of Newark - The Martha Washington Temperance Union, the Junior Martha Washington Society, the Lady Warren and the Relief. In the past year, the Martha Washington Union had assisted 44 families, made 160 garments and repaired 107; 375 items had been distributed by the members

and 108 had been presented to the president of the men's group for distribution among needy men. The union had received about \$51.87 and disbursed about \$52.62, so that there was now a slight deficit. (Later reports seem not to be available.)

Another sign of organizational vitality was the participation of the Newark society in a convention of delegates from all Washington Temperance Benevolent societies in Essex County that was originally scheduled to be held on 25 December 1841. Since there was an Essex County temperance-prohibition meeting on 22 December, this suggests that the two groups had little to do with each other and perhaps were in competition. The selection of Christmas Day for the meeting can be considered nothing less than a flouting of the religious proprieties of the period, and it is little wonder that the convention actually took place on 25 January 1842. There were 54 delegates from societies in Newark, Elizabeth, Springfield, North Belleville, Westfield, Orange, Union, Belleville and West Bloomfield. An Essex County Washington Temperance Benevolent Society was formed, with Abner Campbell of Newark, a manufacturer of looking glass (mirrors), as interim president, Wickliffe Woodruff, also of Newark, a coachsmith, was one of the interim secretaries of the county society. The Reverend Mr. Pilch, pastor of the Newark Mariners I Bethel, addressed the group. When the Essex County group met again in February, one of the Newark leaders, J.P. Joralemon (locksmith), was on the nominating committee, and Jacob Johnson (coffee and spice dealer), also of Newark, was elected corresponding secretary of the Essex County society.

Interest in Washingtonianism continued unabated in 1842. A "great temperance meeting" was held on 2 February in the Third Presbyterian Church. "No falling off - no lack of interest was perceptible on this occasion - the work goes bravely on. A more crowded house has seldom been convened on any occasion. The addresses were listened to with deep interest, and the intelligence of the progress of the good cause in other places was hailed with thrilling delight. At the close of the meeting great numbers of both sexes, who had hitherto kept aloof, gave their names to the pledge. There were also some pretty hard customers came up to the scratch. Indeed the influence is like a mighty current - it carries every thing before it" (37). It seems reasonable to conclude that while some of those who signed the pledge were drunkards, a substantial proportion of the signers were moderate-to-light drinkers or were already total abstainers.

By Independence Day, 1842 there were three Washingtonian societies in Newark; in addition to the original (or "parent" society) there was also a North Ward society and a Bethel society. The three societies agreed to plan a celebration based on temperance principles. The planning committee included John P. Joralemon (locksmith), Joseph Burr (painter and glazier), John C. Howell (shoe manufacturer), William B. Donninqton (grocer), Isaac Dennison (carman) and Abner C. Campbell (looking-glass manufacturer) from the parent society, John Rutan (blacksmith), John Scofield (caster) and William Smith (blacksmith and hatter) from the North Ward society, and Garret Ketcham (shoemaker) and Benjamin N. Van Sickell (blacksmith) from the Bethel society. There were, then, a few middle-class persons in this group which was made up mostly of artisans.

A conflict between the Washingtonian committee and the self-appointed General Community Committee immediately arose. Three Washingtonian representatives J.P. Joralemon, W.B. Donninqton and William L. Meeker (carpenter) met with the General Community Committee, and a compromise was finally reached in a controversy viewed as unseemly by some elements of the population; the compromise was for everyone to march in the same procession and for the two elements of the parade then to go to different churches for the balance of the ceremonies. The nontemperance orator was Senator William L. Dayton; on the Washingtonian side, Thomas M. Woodruff, of New York, gave the oration. "The oration was pronounced with great propr3ety, deliberation, and force, and a better address it has seldom or never been my lot to listen to," wrote the editor of the Newark Daily Advertiser. "The allusions to former and even present habits - the practice of drinking and enticing others, were kind but perfectly withering to the guilty" (38). In another comment on the celebration, it was noted that there was "less vice and fewer cases of injury... than on previous anniversaries. There was certainly less drunkenness - a gratifying proof of the progress of the Temperance enterprise"(38).

The Independence Day celebration was shortly followed by a "Grand Temperance Celebration" of

the first anniversary of the Washington Temperance Benevolent Societies in Newark on 12 July. Again there were quite a few delegates from New York, and the main speaker was Joseph Perry (school teacher and antislavery activist in Paterson). The evening concert in the Free (Second Presbyterian Church) was given by members of Hose Company No. 33 of New York City. We also have a report of a series of meetings for the promotion of "Humanity and Temperance" held in Newark late in November of 1842. Again there were speeches by representatives from New York city as well as by F.L. Beers, the local Washingtonian who apparently was regarded as particularly effective. The Liberty Fire Engine Company No. 1 appeared in uniform, several members of Relief Fire Company No. 2 signed the pledge, and there was a brass band recital. As a result an additional 24 constitutional members and 55 pledged members joined.

So 1842 in Newark must be considered a highly successful year for the Washingtonians. The Fifth Annual Report of the Essex County Temperance Society, the principal agency of the temperance-prohibitionists in the Newark area, noted that "No year of our history has ever been so propitious for this cause as the last. Every thing which has been attempted has been successful and secured to the cause new advantages. The movements of the Army of Washington men have been steady, and they are now gaining ground. 'Tis true, like the Army of the Father of his country as it marched across our soil, there may have been a few unhappy occurrences. But it would have required a miracle to have prevented them. And it is almost a miracle that there have been so few desertions and mutinies. Upon this Army very much (under the guardianship of Heaven) may yet depend"(39). The report then goes on to say that public sentiment is now stronger against making, vending or using intoxicating beverages and that the public is now beginning to treat such making, vending or using as an immoral act. It states, too, that a proposal had been made to prohibit the sale of "strong drink" in public houses on Sunday, but that a favourable report was not expected out of committee this year. The executive committee of the Essex County Temperance Society also reported that the county had been divided into districts with a committee assigned to each.

"The object of this movement has been to collect more accurate accounts of the condition of this enterprise, and to convince the members of the Washington societies everywhere, that we are seeking their benefit and success, and as their prosperity did from the beginning depend upon the strong healthful pulse which beat in the public body, so their future prosperity will depend upon the aid and control of the intelligent in the old ranks. We can help one another. And no class can injure either of us, as we can ourselves." The report cautioned that "No youth or reformed man is safe if he withhold his foot from...the benign influence of religion... Let it be the controlling power and we have nothing to fear. Omit or despite this, and we have every thing to fear, even from our success. This is the cause of humanity, of morals, of common safety, of our country, of the world, and of God." This statement cannot be called conspiratorial because it was presented to the public, but it does lay out the claims to dominance and leadership of the temperance-prohibitionists, the middle-class respectables, especially the ministers, who were the most influential element of the Essex County Temperance Society. It also makes it clear that the temperance-prohibitionists had organized throughout the country to develop more effective controls over the Washingtonian societies. That the temperance-prohibitionists were now rejuvenated and were looking forward beyond the Washingtonians to the future is further evidenced by the call in January from the executive committee of the state temperance society to form juvenile temperance societies in the public schools to supplement the existing plans and activities in the Sunday schools. The temperance-prohibitionists clearly sought to capture the entire younger generation, a project that would occupy them in one way or another for many years to come.

But if 1842 was a triumphant year for the Washingtonians, 1843 gave evidence that the perfervid atmosphere had begun to cool. The New Jersey Eagle commented on the fact that the Washington's Birthday celebration had been widely observed but "by more simple methods, better corresponding with the times on which we have fallen"(40). The Independence Day celebration in 1843 was not disrupted by the insistence on a temperance emphasis; the community group had it all to themselves. However, the Washingtonians held a very well-received celebration of their anniversary on 13 July. The planning committee included among others Hiram McCormick (shoemaker), Jacob May (hatter), Caleb Thayer (painter), Thomas Corey (coach

lace maker), Joseph Burr (painter and glazier), J.P. Joralemon (locksmith), David G. Doremus (grocer), John H. Landell (rigger), Jacob Johnson (coffee and spice dealer), James B. Hay (foundry operator), Wickliffe Woodruff (coach smith) and James Cox (book and job printer). While artisans predominated, some middle class persons were also involved in planning the program, especially in raising funds for the event. Among the groups participating in the celebration were Fire Engine Company No. 1, the Lafayette Guards, the clergy of the city and the members of the Essex County Juvenile Temperance Band, who attended at the request of their chief director, Reverend Ebenezer Cheever, despite the fact that his chief aids publicly advised against it because, they said, it was too hot for the children. The children were mainly from Bloomfield, Orange and Newark. The oration was by the Honorable Aaron Clark, ex-mayor of New York City.

The fraternal ties of the Newark Washingtonians with nearby groups continued. Thus, when the Bloomfield Washington Temperance Society celebrated its first anniversary on 22 August 1843, the various Newark societies were represented and George Dunn of Newark (railing and dash manufacturer) read the Drunkards Declaration of Independence. The principal speaker was the Honorable William Halstead, ex-congressman from New Jersey, who took a forthright stand for legal prohibition of alcohol sales on Sundays.

But these brave celebrations could not obscure the fact that a decline had set in. In September, the Newark Washington Temperance Benevolent Society made the following announcement (41): "TO THE PUBLIC: The glaring increase of intemperance within the last few months makes it imperative that the friends of temperance, more particularly the Washingtonians, should do all in their power to eradicate the growing evil. Grog shops are multiplying in all parts of the city, and drunkards and drunkenness increase in the same ratio. And unless something be done to check its onward march, the same dreadfully heart-rendering scenes which formerly disgraced our city must again be witnessed among us," it warned. "This being the case, it becomes the friends of Temperance to be energetic in their efforts to destroy the pestiferous influence of the already annihilated millions of the human family. In order to accomplish this object, the members of the Washington Temperance Benevolent Society at their last meeting, came to the determination to hold a public meeting on Friday evening next, Sept. 15th..." At that meeting a speaker from Jersey City "made some excellent remarks, in which he attributed the ill success of Washingtonianism to an apathetic feeling on the part of Temperance men.

He said that the best way to bring grog sellers to their senses, when moral persuasion fails, is to apply the strong arm of the law; this method had been adopted in Jersey City, and had received the sanction of all right minded men. He advised the Washingtonians of Newark to pursue a similar plan" (42). A resolution was then passed stating that the City council should deny licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors. A second resolution was passed that called for visiting all persons selling alcohol and trying to persuade them to abandon its sale. Some of the members of the committees of visitation were William T. Meeker (shoemaker), H.T. McCormick (shoemaker), Charles Prout (coach maker), James B. Hay (foundry operator), John C. Howell (shoe manufacturer), William Backus (tinware and stove dealer), Abner Campbell (looking-glass manufacturer), David Pierson (coach lace weaver), John P. Joralemon (locksmith), Jacob Johnson (coffee and spice dealer), and the Reverend Mr. Warren. Another large public meeting was held in November 1843 at which the principal speaker was the Honorable George S. Catlin, member of congress from Connecticut, a reformed man and a Washingtonian. He attacked, among other things, "Rum drinking and rum drinkers of every grade from the fashionable wine drinker to the degraded gutter-drunkard; and proved that the former although now perhaps boasting of his ability to take care of himself, was on the downward road, and would ere long, unless he changed his vicious course, sink to the miserable condition of the latter"(43). He also attacked rum sellers: "Avarice," he said, "drove men to offer to their fellows, this liquid damnation, though they Knew at the same time that they were carrying ruin and death to their neighbour's dwellings."

Catlin then went on to say that "it was the duty of all to endeavor to roll back the tide of intemperance and make our country what in truth she professed to be the "land of the free, and the home of

the brave'; then might we enjoy all those blessings and comforts which it was man's inherent right to enjoy, unalloyed, and should become a happy, benevolent and prosperous people." This was typical Washingtonian fare, for the most part. But then a circular which included an appeal to the legislature to forbid the sale of intoxicating liquors on Sunday was read by Jacob May from the executive committee of the Temperance Society of the State of New Jersey. James Cox (book and job printer), corresponding secretary of the Newark Washingtonians commented that "The memorial is a well written document, and cannot fail to convince those who are willing to be convinced of the enormity of trafficking in ardent spirits at any time, and more particularly on the Sabbath!" It is clear from the records of these meetings that the Newark Washingtonians, while still committed in some measure to a moral suasion approach, had also begun to subscribe to the legal suasion stance of the temperance-prohibitionists.

By October 1843 signs began to appear that the Washington Temperance Benevolent Society of Newark was having difficulties. The recording secretary, John H. Landell (rigger), complained that the committee appointed to visit the various parts of the city in an effort both to persuade and to collect statistics had been negligent, though another committee had gathered the information anyway. Landell voiced his complaint in strong language: "I will here state that the progress of the Society is somewhat dampened by some of our members, who, not content with being idlers themselves, seem to delight in finding fault with every one who refuses to be as idle, and is well-known that there is an immense deal of labor necessary to the success of an association of this kind, and where this labor falls upon a few, as is often the case, they must neglect other duties or let the Society suffer; therefore idlers should not find fault"(44). He added, "There is yet another subject which I wish to direct your attention to. It appears there is yet a disposition shown by a great number of our constitutional members not to pay their regular monthly dues, which are the main support of the Society, and now that the inclement season is approaching, it is their especial duty to be more punctual.

There is yet a great number of poor inebriates to be looked after, and perhaps many of our own members may need assistance, and if the regular dues are paid we will be able to meet any emergency..." Landell continued, "The operations of this Society are confined to the reformation of the drunkard, and as far as its influence has extended, it has answered the purpose intended." Apparently, he believed that members had kept the pledge even though they had not been attending the business meetings. His remarks make clear that certain classical organizational problems had begun to emerge - failure of members to pay their dues, failure of members to attend the meetings, failure of committees to complete their assigned tasks, a perception by those who continued to be active in the organization that other less active members were carping and criticizing and not "pulling their weight." Landell was one of those who was still committed to the original Washingtonian concern for drunkards rather than to the emergent interest in governmental intervention.

Landell complained again about lack of membership activity in his next quarterly report in January 1844 (45): "It appears that many who were most active in our meeting but a short time since have now lost all their activity and are generally the first to complain of the Society's proceedings." He went on to say that "there appears to be a retrograde movement with some of our pledged members who, I am sorry to say, have broken the pledge, and again sunk into their old habits. I would urge upon all the members to take the old path, and visit such as have been unfortunate." Finally, Landell commented that "There is, Sir, another evil to which I wish to direct your attention: that is, to the low, disgusting, Jim-along-Josey songs, which are occasionally sung at our public meetings, to the no small annoyance of the respectable part of the audience," calling attention to the fact that some of the members of the society were repelled by the lack of respectability of the behavior of the rest. (There is little doubt that the "Jim-along-Josey" songs came out of the popular drinking culture of the day.)

We have a few useful membership statistics for this period. The Newark society distinguished between persons who merely signed the pledge and those who signed the society's constitution and committed themselves to paying dues. Landell (45) struck out at the constitutional members for not fulfilling their obligation to participate and at the pledged members for their tendency to "backslide" into drinking.

There 3657 pledged male and female members of the Newark Washingtonian Society in mid-October 1843 and 3849 pledged members in mid-January 1844 - a growth of 192 persons. There were 356 constitutional members in mid-October 1843 and 366 constitutional members in mid-January 1844, a growth of 10. Statistics on the Washingtonian conversion of drunkards, however, must be regarded as grossly exaggerated and should be viewed in part as propaganda tools; in societies that did not differentiate between pledged and constitutional members probably about 10 could be regarded as constitutional members and not all these were ex-drunkards or heavy drinkers.

It seems likely that some of the failure in participation by the members may have been due to the fact that temperance fraternal orders had become organized in Newark. In July 1843 the Independent Order of Rechabites announced the existence of a chapter in Newark and invited participation by all those of "good moral character" between the ages of 18 and 50. The Rechabites were a beneficial as well as a benevolent society. "The benefits accruing to persons who belong to this order are not confined to sickness - they are more extensive. If a brother be unfortunate, and at the same time deserving, his necessities will be relieved; and if he come from a distance, or be traveling, like assistance is afforded him should he need it"(46). The order was open to total abstainers only. The notice was signed by Abner Campbell and James Cox, both of whom had been active in the Newark Washingtonians.

The Sons of Temperance had also been active among the Newark Washingtonians. The sons of Temperance had begun to organize in September 1842 in New York City, and in November, 20 persons from Newark joined the New York Division Number 1 on the understanding that as soon as feasible they would organize Division Number 1 of New Jersey. The final organizational meeting of the Sons of Temperance took place in New York City on 10 December 1842, and at that meeting the charter of Newark Division Number 1 of New Jersey was confirmed. The Sons of Temperance was formed expressly to recruit Washingtonians, and so there can be little doubt that most, if not all, of its early Newark members were Washingtonians. Among those I have been able to identify were James Cox, William L. Meeker (carpenter), William B. Donnington (grocer) and James B. Hay (foundry operator). The Sons of Temperance, a beneficial and fraternal society which required total abstinence of its members, quickly became a much larger order than the Rethabites.

One of the appeals of the Sons of Temperance undoubtedly was the fact that at the local or division level, new officers were elected every 3 months, giving everyone an opportunity to participate. By 21 November 1843, when Newark Division Number 1 of New Jersey celebrated its first anniversary, it had 90 members. Though there can be little doubt that the fraternal orders absorbed the energies of many members of the Newark Washington society, some persons were active in several organizations. James Cox, for instance, was active in the leadership of the Washingtonians, the Sons of Temperance and the Independent Order of Rechabites.

By then end of the year, the Washingtonians of Newark were clearly on a downward slide. In addition to the dynamics of membership participation and the diversion of members into fraternal orders, there was also a theory offered by the temperance-prohibitionists to account for this decline. The Sixth Annual Report of the Essex County Temperance Society (47) commented that "The movement of the Washington Associations are less active than last year. Those among them, who from the beginning were opposed to religious addresses being made in their meetings, begin sadly to experience the unhappy effects of such opposition, and the friends of Religion and Temperance are more than ever convinced that we have no perfect security for a reformed or pledged man, or youth, but in deep implantations of religious principles." While cast in terms of religious belief, the temperance-prohibitionist clergymen argued that only if the Washingtonians provided the temperance-prohibitionist leadership easy access to their meetings could drunkard reform be successful. But we know that the temperance-prohibitionist leadership advocated not only religious faith (and the Protestant variety, at that), but also political policies which were directly at variance with the original Washingtonian principles of strict moral suasion.

The downward slide of the Newark Washingtonians was hastened by an internal power struggle (48-51). The immediate focus of attention was on accusations that Joseph Burr, then president of the society,

had abused his position and either taken advantage of or absconded with some of the money of the young ladies, of the Lady Warren Society which was engaged in a fund-raising project for the Washingtonians. There was a nasty charge that Burr had manipulated the situation so that the money was to be given to him “as a token of appreciation for his work as president of the Washington Temperance Benevolent Society” rather than dedicated to charitable purposes as advertised. Burr attested that both charges were incorrect. At the next meeting of the Washingtonians in February 1844, despite objections, Burr was again declared president. Whereupon the following members offered their resignations as officers of the society: C. Thayer (painter), Jacob May (hatter), Hiram McCormick (shoemaker) and J.H. Landell (rigger). The faction also included Thomas Corey (coach lace weaver), J.R. Jilson (hatter), James Cox, J.P. Joralemon, Reverend James Gallagher (pastor, Universalist Church), David Pierson (coach lace maker) and F.L. Rogers (printer). Apparently in anger, Burr then resigned and new officers were elected. These included Angus Campbell, D.G.

Doremus, W.H. Backus (tin dealer), John C. Howell (shoe manufacturer, Nelson Prout (coach maker), Philo Sample (harness maker), Henry Force (saddler) and John Roff (shoemaker). Campbell was an opposition sympathizer but did not yet play his hand. On 25 April there was a rump meeting of the dissident faction at the house of Caleb Thayer, at which a resolution was passed. “That the members of the Washington T.B. Society proceed to the Temperance Hall (formerly occupied by them) tomorrow evening and reassert their rights, and henceforth endeavor, by all honorable means, to re-establish the society on a pure “Washingtonian basis”(52). The next night the group proceeded to the hall where Campbell took the chair and called the meeting to order; then there was a resolution that the proper officers of the society take their seats, whereupon Campbell stepped down and Caleb Thayer took the chair as first vice president, there being at the moment no person whom the Washingtonian strict constructionists recognized. John P. Joralemon was then elected president of the society. In their published statement (signed by James Cox, David Pierson, F.L. Rogers and J.H. Landell) the group summed their grievances as follows (52):

“It is unnecessary to recur to the causes which have been the means of impeding the progress of the Washingtonian reform, as they are too well known to need repetition here. Suffice it to say that the Washingtonians, who formerly carried on the work, were unceremoniously driven from their hall by overpowering numbers, by men who seldom or never lent them their aid, and whose views in reference to the true Washingtonian spirit were in direct opposition to their own. The Washingtonians left the society entirely free from debt, and also with a surplus of 30 or 40 dollars in the treasury. They gave their opponents a fair chance to try the experiment, that the public might be enabled to see how the thing would work in their hands; and the result has been (as we knew it would be) an entire failure.

They have left the society in debt and in a measure broken up. Consequently, at the earnest solicitations of the friends of Temperance, (and more particularly of the ladies) the Washingtonians have determined to rally in their strength; and they do so with the conscientious belief that the Glorious Cause which they advocate cannot possibly prosper in any other hands; and also with a full knowledge that the public will not give their countenance and support to any fictitious abortion which may raise its head under the honored garb of Temperance. Relying then, on the benevolence of the public, together with their own exertions, they have, as will be seen by the above proceedings, come to the determination of pushing forward the work to perfection. It is time something was done, for during the late season of inactivity, drunkenness has been alarmingly on the increase, and many who might have been saved by timely assistance, have probably sunk so low in degradation that it will need desperate effort to redeem them.”

For all practical purposes, the activities of January through April 1844 were the signal for the abandonment of the Washingtonians as a significant force in Newark. The notice of the May meeting, signed by James Cox, does not mention the name of the society (it is incorrectly referred to as the “annual meeting”); the third anniversary celebration in July was apparently conducted with its usual procession and oratory, but it must have been a hollow shell - the society simply dropped from sight and there are no further reports of it.

Meanwhile, we have some evidence that the Washingtonians had been bypassed. In the spring of

1844 a general temperance meeting was announced (53) at which there would be a lecture displaying Dr. Sewall's plates, drawings much used by the temperance-prohibitionists showing the effects of alcohol on the internal organs of the body. The sponsors of the lecture included the following: E. Cheever, A.D. Eddy, John S. Porter (pastor, Reformed Church), William R. Weeks (pastor, Fourth Presbyterian Church), William Bradley (pastor, Central Presbyterian Church), H.H. Brinsmade (pastor, Third Presbyterian Church), James Scott (pastor, Reformed Church), William Roberts (builder), Lyndon Smith (physician), Asa Whitehead (attorney and counselor), Fred T. Frelinghuysen (attorney and counselor-nephew and adopted son of Theodore Frelinghuysen), William B. Kinney (editor, Daily Advertiser), William Pennington (Governor of the State of New Jersey), Silas Condit (president of a local bank) and the Honorable Joseph C. Hornblower (Chief Justice of New Jersey). Clearly, the temperance-prohibitionists' respectables were pushing ahead with their own program and no longer needed the Washingtonians; the disappearance of occasional mention of the society may be specifically related to the fact that the editor of one of Newark's principal papers at the time was a temperance-prohibitionist.

Finally, we have one last sign that the Washingtonians had lost their ability to influence events in Newark. On 4 June 1844 a temporary planning committee was announced for the upcoming Independence Day celebration. For the first time that decade, the names of the committee members were appended—presumably to demonstrate that it had the overwhelming support of the citizenry and perhaps as a kind of defiant statement directed to the temperance-prohibitionists. (The planning meeting was held in Stewart's saloon.) As the following list of committee members, representing 20 of the total, makes clear, the opposition included a goodly number of the middle-class persons as well as some artisans: James Miller (carpenter), D.P. Woodruff (clerk), E.T. Hillyer (attorney and counselor), Stephen G. Sturges (slater), O.S. Boyden (machinist), E.G. Faitout (grocer), Robert Trippe (druggist), Joel W. Condit (grocer), Horace E. Baldwin (jeweller), Ira Merchant (sash and blind), Isaac Baldwin (builder, Ebenezer Francis (currier), Charles Spinning (carpenter), John C. Little (merchant tailor), Stephen Conger (physician), Henry Duryea (hatter), A.O. Boylan (attorney-at-law), Stephen K. Ford (coal dealer), Theodore S. Jacobs (clerk), William A. Baldwin (sheriff), Charles T. Day (clothier), Edwin Ross (baker), Timothy B. Crowell (editor, New Jersey Eagle), James Tucker (currier), Alexander Dougherty (leather), Stephen G. Crowell (dry goods), William S. Pennington (attorney-at-law, not the Governor), and David D. Dodd (cap manufacturer). (It seems likely that the sides taken by the editors of the two newspapers reflect their politics - the Daily Advertiser was a Whig paper and the Eagle was probably a Democratic paper.) Thus, some respectable citizens opposed the temperance-prohibitionists in this matter; whether the basic difference between the two sets of antagonists is interpretable in terms of "status politics" as Gusfield (54) and Donald (55) argue is beyond the scope of this paper.

Discussion

As a therapeutic social movement, the Washingtonian Movement originally focused its attention on drunkards themselves rather than on changing the sociopolitical situation; this was in contradistinction to the emergent temperance-prohibitionist movement which became strongly politicized. The Washingtonians placed strong emphasis on the acceptance of social practices that had previously been rejected by the drunkards and heavy drinkers. While it is true that if all drunkards had been convinced and converted there would have been a major shift in the social practices of the period, effecting such a major social change was not the manifest intent of the Washingtonians when the movement began. This major shift in social practices was more or less latent in the beginning and only became evident during the course of a close association with the temperance-prohibitionists.

One of the striking characteristics of therapeutic social movements is that the demand for change is focused on the individual, who must reform if he is to be "cured." Thus, the Washingtonians were inner-directed, while the temperance-prohibitionists were outer-directed. If the term "discontent" is used in a general way, it could be said that in a therapeutic social movement the person is discontented with himself rather than society and accepts the blame or responsibility as his own. Put another way, the person "protests"

his own behavior, his own inner condition, the way that he perceives that he is perceived by others and, if there is to be a change, adopts a method for securing satisfaction of his protests about himself. Clearly, one of the elements of the “cure” is his awareness of how others perceive him, his acceptance of others’ perception of him as his own perception of himself and his awareness that there is a way to bring himself into conformity with the norms that he has accepted. However, many persons are unable to choose the therapeutic strategy which logically best fits their own situations and, consequently, never do achieve a “cure” or a satisfactory solution to their protest about themselves. The case of alcoholism is notorious in this respect, and the core element of self-help cures (such as Washingtonianism) rests on persuading the alcoholic that he can alleviate the symptoms and arrest the alcoholic condition. The key lies in persuasion, and the drunkards and heavy drinkers of the time of the Washingtonian movement more readily accepted the argument of the Washingtonians that “it works for me and it should work for you” than the exhortations of the temperance-prohibitionists.

That this self-help approach can be the basis of a successful therapeutic social movement is evidenced by the wide acceptance and influence of Alcoholics Anonymous. But the Washingtonian Movement, a therapeutic social movement based on essentially the same principles, “failed” in the 19th century, and I have attempted to explore the significance of the temperance-prohibitionists in the “failure” in Paterson and Newark, New Jersey. This is not to suggest that there were not other factors that contributed to the decline of the Washington temperance societies. In large measure, the Washingtonians and the temperance-prohibitionists agreed on the importance of self-help in the “cure” of alcoholism, although they did differ in ways that will not be discussed in the present essay. Where they were in conflict was on the issue of reliance on moral suasion as opposed to political (or state) intervention. The consequence of these different commitments was that the Washingtonians were concerned about drunkards for their own sake they were therapeutic - while the temperance-prohibitionists wanted to change the political system - they were a political reform movement, although they had a strong concern for the destructive effects of alcohol on individuals and their families.

In recent years there has developed what may be called the “organizational approach” to the analysis of social movements. Those who advocate this approach suggest that we abandon any special consideration of social movements, that there is simply organizational behavior. As McCarthy and Zald (56) point out, the organizational approach to the study of social movements emphasizes both the societal support and constraint of social movement phenomena. It examines the resources that must be mobilized, the links between social-movement organizations and other groups, the dependence of social-movement organizations on external support for success and the tactics used to control or influence socialmovement organizations by those external to it. The present study of the Washingtonian temperance societies of Paterson and Newark has used an organizational approach. While from time to time it has been necessary to engage in the analysis of the ideologies of Washingtonianism and prohibitionism, this has been incidental to what happened to the Washington Temperance Benevolent Societies themselves. I do not suggest that the case studies of two societies in two communities are definitive; rather they should provide scholars with the basis for future research. They should also provide the basis for additional research into a central issue in the study of social movements - the study of the opposition; sometimes the sponsors and friends of the nascent movement also turn out to be a part of the opposition.

References

1. Maxwell, M. A. The Washingtonian movement. *Q. J. Stud. Alcohol* 11: 410- 451, 1950.
2. BLUMBERG, L. [U.] The ideology of a therapeutic social movement; *Alcoholics Anonymous. J. Stud. Alcohol* 38; 2122-2143, 1977.
3. TYLER, A. F. *Freedom’s ferment*. New York; Arno Press;1944.
4. [Zug J.] The foundation, progress and principles of the Washington emperance Society of Baltimore, and the

influence it has had on the temperance movements in the United States. Baltimore; Toy; 1842.

5. AMERICAN TEMPERANCE UNION. Permanent temperance documents. Vol. 2. New York; American Temperance Union; 1852.

6. Paterson Intelligencer, 21 April 1841.

7. Paterson Intelligencer, 28 April 1841.

8. Paterson Intelligencer, 12 May 1841.

9. Paterson Intelligencer, 18 August 1841.

10. Constitution and by-laws of the Washington Temperance Benevolent Society of the town of Paterson. Paterson Day and Waen; 1843.

11. (HAYDOCK, C.) Incidents in the life of George Haydock, ex-professional woodsawyer, of Hudson. 4th ed. Hudson [N.Y.]; Stoddard; 1847.

12. Paterson Intelligencer, 21 June 1841.

13. Paterson Intelligencer, 23 June 1841.

14. WINSKILL, P. T. The temperance movement and its workers., Vol. 2. London; Blackie; 1891.

15. Paterson Intelligencer, 16 November 1842.

16. Paterson Intelligencer, 25 May 1842.

17. Paterson Intelligencer, 6 July 1842,

18. Paterson Intelligencer, 1 December 1842.

19. Paterson Intelligencer, 17 March 1842.

20. Paterson Intelligencer, 21 December 1842.

21. Paterson Intelligencer, 14 December 1842.

22. Paterson Intelligencer, 28 December 1842.

23. Paterson Intelligencer, 15 May 1844.

24. Paterson Intelligencer, 14 August 1844.

25. Paterson Intelligencer, 4 September 1844.

26. RWT, J. The honors of delirium tremens. New York; Adams; 1844.

27. Paterson Intelligencer, 20 November 1844.

28. Paterson Intelligencer, 11 March 1846.

29. Paterson Intelligencer, 19 August 1846.

30. Paterson Intelligencer, 21 July 1841.
31. Newark Daily Advertiser, 8 March 1841.
32. Newark Daily Advertiser, 12 May 1841.
33. Newark Daily Advertiser, 24 May 1841.
34. Newark, Daily Advertiser, 5 June 1841.
35. Newark Daily Advertiser, 8 July 1841.
36. Newark Daily Advertiser, 17 August 1841.
37. New Jersey Eagle, 8 February 1842.
38. Newark Daily Advertiser, 7 July 1842.
39. Newark Daily Advertiser, 29 December 1842.
40. New Jersey Eagle, 28 February 1843.
41. Newark Daily Advertiser, 14 September 1843.
42. Newark Daily Advertiser, 16 September 1843.
43. Newark Daily Advertiser, 30 November 1843.
44. Newark Daily Advertiser, 14 October 1843.
45. Newark Daily Advertiser, 13 January 1844.
46. New Jersey Eagle, 11 July 1843.
47. Newark Daily Advertiser, 23 December 1843.
48. Newark Daily Advertiser, 24 January 1844.
49. Newark Daily Advertiser, 26 January 1844.
50. Newark Daily Advertiser, I Febmary 1944.
51. Newark Daily Advertiser, 24 February 1844.
52. Newark Daily Advertiser, 29 April 1844.
53. Newark Daily Advertiser, 22 March 1844.
54. CUSFIELD, J. R. Symbolic emmde; status politics and the American temperance movement. Urbana, III.; Univenity of Illinois Press; 1966.
55. DONALD, D. Toward a reconsideration abolitionists. Pp. 13-23. In; Gusfield, J.R. Protest, reform, and revolt. New York; Wiley; 1970.

56. McCARTHY, J. D. and ZA@, M. N. Resource mobilization and social movements; partial theory. Am. J. Sec. 82: 1212-1241, 1977.

***Grapevine* Articles: Washingtonians**

July 1945: History Offers Good Lesson for A.A.

A.A.s need to warn each other about becoming too confident. Overconfidence can have sorry consequences. Individual A.A.s need to take the warning to heart; A.A. as an organization of individuals can also profit from it.

All of us, attending meetings of our various groups, have heard, and taken part in, conversations like this:

“D’ja see that story about A.A. in this week’s *Squint*?” “Not yet, but Joe was talkin’ about it. Any good?” “Yeah, a pretty good piece. You know, those editors must think we got somethin’.” Sure, they wouldn’t be giving us space, what with the war and all, if they didn’t think a lot of their readers wanted to know about us.”

Rosy contentment settles over speakers and listeners.

How many of the readers of *The Grapevine* have heard about the Washington Temperance Society?

It was quite an organization in its time - in the 1840's. Its organizers called themselves “reformed drunkards” and they set about “reforming” other drunkards.

Does the idea seem familiar?

Claimed 100,000 in 3 Years. They did all right, too. They got going in the spring of 1840, in Baltimore. In early 1843, they were claiming that they had persuaded 100,000 habitual drunkards to sign the pledge.

Older temperance organizations had to stand aside - or climb onto the bandwagon. The new society was getting the headlines. It organized a mass meeting in City Hall Park in New York City in 1841 that attracted more than 4,000 listeners - the speakers stood on upturned rum kegs - and it had 1,800 new members when it closed its campaign in that city.

There were triumphal parades in Boston - where historic Faneuil Hall was jammed to the doors to hear the speaker - and in other eastern cities. Speakers toured the West and South.

The Press of the day gave the society uncounted columns of publicity. The society petered out.

The “why” contains a lesson - and a moral - for A.A.

There was no ONE reason, of course. A reason was that older temperance organizations hired some of the society’s better speakers. That reason couldn’t have wrecked the society if it had had its feet solidly on the ground.

Another reason was that politicians looked hungrily at its swelling membership. Some of them climbed aboard the wagon (there is inference that in those times, at least, some politicians could qualify for membership) and they helped to wreck local groups through their efforts to line up votes.

The Abolition movement was gaining strength and there was division within groups as men took their stand on the issue of slavery.

The Washingtonians were confident. They rebuffed overtures of older temperance organizations, they scorned old methods. Local groups went their separate ways, made their own mistakes, learned their own lessons. Some, with larger membership, dipped into their treasuries to finance their own publications. There was no overall direction of educational policy. Editors of local society publications got into squabbles with editors of other temperance papers.

Factors Within. There was division, in those times, among the older organizations. Some of them plumped for total abstinence as a rule of conduct; others hedged and wanted to direct their efforts against use of spirituous liquors, accepting use of wines and beers as normal conduct. Some of the more hardy souls already were clamouring for legislation that would outlaw the traffic in beverage alcohol. All of these factions pulled and hauled on the society’s members.

Older temperance organizations were finding it increasingly difficult to interest the public in their aims. The Washingtonians with their unique methods - their missionary work among drunkards, their open-air parades and mass meetings, their “experience” programs that afforded a thrill-seeking public the

opportunity of enjoying vicariously the degenerate experiences of sodden sinners - were stealing the show. The older organizations borrowed Washingtonian speakers and methods to draw larger audiences to their meetings.

Because the Washingtonian movement, in its beginnings, was concerned only with the reclaiming of drunkards and held that it was none of its affair if others used alcohol who seemed to be little harmed by it, the makers and sellers of alcoholic beverages looked upon the new movement with a tolerant, even approving eye. The habitual drunk was no more welcome in the nineteenth century grog-shop than he is in the present day cocktail lounge.

One Fatal Omission. But in its zeal to increase its membership as rapidly as possible, the society pledged many persons to total abstinence who were intemperate drinkers, probably, but who were not alcoholic in the present-day definition of the term.

The Washingtonian movement might have survived, however, might have triumphed over its mistakes, and its enemies (and well wishers), except for one fatal omission.

Its organizers believed they could get along without a Higher Power.

It wasn't a particularly religious time. And inebriates, then as now, had generally lost touch with Him. Many of them, in fact, were outspoken in their denunciations of all of His works, especially as demonstrated in the activities and attitudes of so-called Christian folk. The meetings of the society's groups were conducted usually without reference to Him.

Washingtonians were not atheists; it just hadn't occurred to them that God as we understand Him could help them to stay sober. In fact, some of them believed that if they invited God into their councils, sectarianism also would push its way in, and their movement would be taken over by one or another of the churches.

The society wasn't on God's side and, consequently it disintegrated.

Source of Strength. An editor of that day wrote:

"That the exclusion of all religious forms and the entire abstraction of religion from temperance, was necessary for the reclamation of the drunkard, we have never believed.... The drunkard may have felt hostile to religion while in the bar-room and amid the fumes of liquor, and he may feel so after he has reformed and been taught to believe that he is better than a Christian, but never did a poor drunkard go up in sincerity to sign the pledge, without feeling himself a prodigal, commencing a work of return to his Heavenly Father, and needing that Father's help: and who would not have gratefully knelt and listened to a prayer for that help on his new endeavors. And we believe that if the hundreds of thousands of signatures in our country had been accompanied with prayer and some religious enforcement, their power and efficiency would have been incomparably stronger."(5)

Is it necessarily true that there's nothing new under the sun," or that "history repeats itself?"

A.A. is new, a new partnership with God in a useful endeavor. History NEED NOT repeat, in the case of A.A., the sorry story of the Washingtonians, rise and fall.

There are, however, lessons to be learned from history. C.H.K., Lansing, Mich

August 1945: Modesty One Plank for Good Public Relations. By Bill W

During its brief few years in the public eye, Alcoholics Anonymous has received hundreds of thousands of words of newspaper and magazine publicity. These channels have been augmented recently by radio commentators and, here and there, A.A. sponsored radio broadcasts. Hardly a word of criticism or ridicule has ever been uttered about us. While our publicity has sometimes lacked a certain dignity we can scarcely complain of that. After all, drinking is not such a dignified business!

We surely have reason for great gratitude that multitudes of writers, editors, clergymen, doctors - friends of every description - have continued so sympathetically and so enthusiastically to urge our cause. As a direct result of their efforts, thousands of alcoholics have come to A.A. It is a good record. Providentially good, when one considers how many mistakes we might have made; how deeply, had other policies been followed, we might now be involved. In the "wet - dry" controversy for example. Conceivably

we might even have fallen out with our good friends, religion and medicine. None of these things have happened. We have been unbelievably fortunate, thank God.

But by the Grace of God. While this makes fine success story reading, it is not, to our way of thinking, any reason for self-congratulations. Older A.A.s who know the record are unanimous in their feeling that an Intelligence greater than ours has surely been at work, else we would never have avoided so many pitfalls, could never have been so happily related to our millions of friends in the outside world. Yet history records the rise, and let us not forget, the fall of any number of promising and benign undertakings - political, religious and social. While some did outlive their usefulness the greater part died prematurely. Something wrong or unsound within them always became apparent without. Their public relations suffered, they grew no more; they bogged down to a dead level or fell apart.

Personal glorification, overweening pride, consuming ambition, exhibitionism, intolerant smugness, money or power madness, refusal to admit mistakes and learn from them, self-satisfaction, lazy complacency - these and many more are the garden varieties of ills which so often beset movements as well as individuals.

While we A.A.s, as individuals, have suffered much from such defects, and must daily admit and deal with them in our personal lives if we are to stay sober and useful, it is nevertheless true that such attitudes have seldom crept into our public relations. But some day they might. Let us never say, "It can't happen here."

It Did Happen Then. Those who read the July Grapevine were startled, then sobered, by the account which it carried of the Washingtonian movement. It was hard for us to believe that 100 years ago the newspapers of this country were carrying enthusiastic accounts about 100,000 alcoholics who were helping each other stay sober; that today the influence of this good work has so completely disappeared that few of us had ever heard of it.

Let's cast our eyes over that Grapevine piece about the Washingtonians and excerpt a few sentences: "Mass meeting in 1841, at City Hall Park, New York City, attracted 4,000 listeners. Speakers stood on upturned rum kegs." "Triumphal parades in Boston. Historic Faneuil Hall jammed." (Overdone self-advertising - exhibitionism? Anyhow, it sounds very alcoholic, doesn't it!) "Politicians looked hungrily at the swelling membership ... helped wreck local groups through their efforts to line up votes." (Looks like personal ambition again, also unnecessary group participation in controversial issues, the hot political issue was then abolition of slavery.) "The Washingtonians were confident ... they scorned old methods." (Too cock-sure, maybe. Couldn't learn from others and became competitive, instead of cooperative, with other organizations in their field.)

Like A.A., the Washingtonians originally had but one object: "Was concerned only with the reclamation of drunkards and held that it was none of its affair if others used alcohol who seemed little harmed by it." But later on came this development: "There was division among the older local organizations - some wanted wines and beers - some clamored for legislation to outlaw alcohol - in its zeal for new members many intemperate drinkers, not necessarily alcoholic, were pledged." (The original strong and simple group purpose was thus dissipated in fruitless controversy and divergent aims.)

Editorial Squabbles. And again, "Some of the Washingtonian local groups) dipped into their treasuries to finance their own publications. Editors of local papers got into squabbles with editors of temperance papers." (Apparently the difficulty was not necessarily the fact they had local publications. It was more due to the refusal of the Washingtonians to stick to their original purpose and so refrain from fighting anybody, also to the obvious fact that they had no national public relations policy or tradition which all members were willing to follow.)

We are sure that if the original Washingtonians could return to this planet they would be glad to see us learning from their mistakes. They would not regard our observations as aimless criticism. Had we lived in their day we might have made the same errors. Perhaps we are beginning to make some of them now.

So we need to constantly scrutinize ourselves carefully, in order to make everlastingly certain that we always shall be strong enough and single purpose enough from within, to relate ourselves rightly to the world without.

Now then, does A.A. have a public relations policy? Is it good enough? Are its main principles clear? Can it meet changing conditions over the years to come?

Now that we are growing so rapidly into public view, many A.A.s are becoming acutely conscious of these questions. In the September Grapevine I'll try to briefly outline what our present public relations practices are, how they developed, and where, in the judgment of most older A.A. members, they could perhaps be improved to better cope with our new and more pressing problems.

May we always be willing to learn from experience!

September 1945. "Rules" Dangerous, but Unity on Public Policies Vital to Future of AA. By Bill (Second in a Series of Articles Presenting Basic AA Policies for Discussion.)

Does Alcoholics Anonymous have a public relations policy? Is it adequate to meet our present and future needs?

Though it has never been definitely formulated or precisely stated, we certainly have a partly formed public relations policy. Like everything else in A.A., it has grown up out of trial and error. Nobody invented it. Nobody has ever laid down a set of rules or regulations to cover it, and I hope no one ever will. This is because rules and regulations seem to be little good for us. They seldom work well.

Were we to proceed by the rules, somebody would have to make them and, more difficult still, somebody would have to enforce them. "Rulemaking" has often been tried. It usually results in controversy among the "rule makers" as to what the rules should be. And when it comes to enforcing an edict - well, you all know the answer. When we try to enforce rules and regulations, however reasonable, we almost always get in so "dutch" that our authority disappears. A cry goes up, "Down with the dictators, off with their heads!" Hurt and astonished "Control Committee" after "Control Committee," "Leader" after "Leader" makes the discovery that human authority, be it ever so partial or benign, seldom works long or well in our affairs. Alcoholics (no matter if ragged) are yet the most rugged of individualists, true anarchists at heart.

Of course nobody claims this trait of ours to be a sterling virtue. During his first A.A. years every A.A. has had plenty of the urge to revolt against authority. I know I did, and can't claim to be over it yet. I've also served my time as a maker of rules, a regulator of other people's conduct. I too, have spent sleepless nights nursing my "wounded" ego, wondering how others whose lives I sought to manage could be so unreasonable, so thoughtless of "poor" me. I can now look back upon such experiences with much amusement. And gratitude as well. They taught me that the very quality which prompted me to govern other people was the identical egocentricity which boiled up in my fellow A.A.'s when they themselves refused to be governed!

Non - A.A. Questions. A non-A.A. reader can be heard to exclaim, "This looks very serious for the future of these people. No organization, no rules, no authority? It's anarchy; it's dynamite; it's 'atomic' and bound to blow up. Public relations indeed! If there is no authority how can they have any public relations policy at all? That's the very defect which ruined the Washingtonian alcoholics a hundred years ago. They mushroomed to 100,000 members, then collapsed. No effective policy or authority. Quarreled among themselves, so finally got a black eye with the public. Aren't these A.A.s just the same kind of drunks, the same kind of anarchists? How can they expect to succeed where the Washingtonians failed? Good questions these. Have we the answers? While we must never be too sure there is reason to hope that we have, because forces seem to be at work in A. A. which were little evident among our brother alcoholics of the 1840s.

For one thing our A.A. program is spiritually centered. Most of us have found enough humility by facing the fact that alcoholism is a fatal malady over which we are individually powerless. The Washingtonians, on the contrary, thought drinking was just another strong habit which could be broken by will power as expressed in pledges, plus the sustaining force of mutual aid through an understanding society of ex-drunks. Apparently they thought little of personality change, and nothing at all of spiritual conversion.

Mutual aid plus pledges did do a lot for them but it wasn't enough; their individual egos still ran riot in every channel save alcohol. Self-serving forces having no real humility, having little appreciation that the penalty for too much self will is death to the alcoholic, having no Greater Power to serve, finally destroyed

the Washingtonians.

Unity Thus Far. When, therefore, we A.A.s look to the future, we must always be asking ourselves if the spirit which now binds us together in our common cause will always be stronger than those personal ambitions and desires which tend to drive us apart. So long as the positive forces are greater we cannot fail. Happily, so far, the ties which bind us have been much stronger than those which might break us. Though the individual A.A. is under no human coercion, is at almost perfect personal liberty, we have, nevertheless, achieved a wonderful unity on vital essentials.

For example, "The 12 Steps" of our A.A. program are not crammed down anybody's throat. They are not sustained by any human authority. Yet we powerfully unite around them because the truth they contain has saved our lives, has opened the doors to a new word. Our experience tells us these universal truths work. The anarchy of the individual yields to their persuasion. He sobers up and is led, little by little, to complete agreement with our simple fundamentals.

Ultimately, these truths govern his life and he comes to live under their authority, the most powerful authority known, the authority of his full consent, willingly given. He is ruled, not by people, but by principles, by truths and, as most of us would say, he is ruled by God. Now some might ask, "What has all this to do with an A.A. public relations policy?" An older A.A. would say, "Plenty." While experience shows that in A.A. no policy can be created and announced full blown, much less effectively enforced by human authority, we are, nevertheless, faced with the problem of developing a public relations policy and securing for it the only authority we know - that of common understanding and widespread, if not universal, consent. When this consent is secured we can then be sure of ourselves. A.A.s will everywhere put the policy into effect as a matter of course, automatically. But we must at first be clear on certain basic principles. And these must have been tried and tested in our crucible of experience.

In forthcoming articles I shall therefore try to trace the development of our public relations from the very first day we came to public notice. This will show what our experience has already taught us. Then every A.A. can have a real background for constructive thinking on this terribly vital matter - a matter on which we dare not make grave mistakes; upon which, over the years, we cannot afford to become unsound.

Flexibility Is Vital. One qualification, however. A policy isn't quite like a fixed truth. A policy is something which can change to meet variable conditions, even though the basic underlying truths upon which it is founded do not change at all. Our policy might, for example, rest upon our 12 Steps for its undying truths, yet remain reasonably flexible so far as the means or method of its application is concerned.

Hence I earnestly hope thousands of A.A.s start thinking a great deal about these policy matters which are now becoming so important to us. It is out of our discussions, our differences of opinion, our daily experiences, and our general consent that the true answers must finally come.

As an older member I may be able to marshal the facts and help analyze what has happened so far. Perhaps I can even make some suggestions of value for the future. But that is all. Whether we are going to have a clear-cut public relations policy will finally be determined by all of us together - not by me alone!

(To be continued in the October GRAPEVINE)

July 1947. Lest We Travel Path of Washingtonians. From Outwood, Kentucky

As a member of A.A. for two years I have enjoyed and received much help from The A.A. Grapevine. Bill's articles are always tops.

I would like to add my humble opinion to certain questions which are discussed in our publication.

1. We must keep our anonymity as far as possible if we expect to be effective.
2. Stay clear of those who wish to popularize A.A. in such a way that eventually may lead to its becoming a racket. We do not need to appeal to the public in any way for funds. To commercialize A.A. is to destroy it.

3. Avoid as much as possible holding meetings in churches or any religious houses. The average alcoholic cannot be won through any creed or sect. He is skeptical of religion.

4. We are not out to dry up the world. As alcoholics we are sick people. The vast majority of people can still take their liquor or leave it. Those people do not need A.A. and may never need it. Let's be tolerant with the nonalcoholic. As long as we "stick to our knitting," live by our 12 Steps, and offer our help only to those who are powerless over alcohol and whose lives have become unmanageable and who are willing to go to any extreme to obtain sobriety, just so long will A.A. be effective.

We do not wish to travel the same road as the Washingtonians.

It is gratifying to see how A.A. has grown. I think this is due to its sincerity, the nonprofit motive, and the fact that most A.A.s are trying to live the 12 Steps. There is a heap of brotherhood in this organization which could be destroyed by commercialization in the very minutest form. E.K.D.

December 1948. Washingtonians, by Richard Ewell Brown (The First in a Series)

IT was Friday evening, April 3rd, 1840. Six men, tipplers all, were gathered about a table at Chase's Tavern on Liberty Street in Baltimore. To the casual passerby, there was nothing unusual about them; just another bunch of harmless drunks. From the way they talked, one might gather that they were old friends, that this was no casual meeting but one made familiar through long repetition. Among them were two blacksmiths, a tailor, a carpenter, a coach-maker and a silversmith. At least that's what they were when they set down. But when they left the bar that night, they were pioneers in a new field; the originators of an idea for the scientific rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics that was destined to sweep the country.

WITH the founding of the first temperance society at Litchfield, Conn, in 1789, the early Nineteenth Century found the United States enjoying (or enduring, depending on the viewpoint) a wave of temperance reform. Baltimore was no exception. On the evening of which we speak, a well known temperance lecturer was scheduled to hold forth at a church not far from Chase's Tavern. One of our six drinkers suggested they send a delegation to hear what he had to say - just for the record, of course. Four of their number blearily volunteered, and when these intrepid adventurers returned, quite a dispassion ensued as to the value of temperance. At that moment, the landlord came in with another round.

"What's all this about temperance?" he asked jovially.

"It's not such a bad idea," said John F. Hoss, the carpenter, thickly.

"Temperance speakers are all fools and hypocrites," angrily replied the landlord.

"Of course, it's to your interest to cry them down," argued William K. Mitchell, the tailor, and soberest member of the party.

"That's absolutely right," cried McCurley, the coach-maker. "Think of all the money we spend here, while our poor families-" For the moment emotion got the best of him, and he sought relief from his glass.

"I know what we ought to do," shouted Anderson. "We oughta form our own temperance society." Everyone except the landlord burst into roars of inebriated approval.

But the next day, after they'd sobered up, the idea somehow stayed with them. Realizing they were no longer able to drink in moderation, they made up their minds "to drink no more of the poisonous draft, forever."

Before taking this drastic step, they met again two nights later at the tavern for their last bout. It was agreed that Mitchell should draw up a total abstinence pledge, and they would all sign it. Just before closing time on that same evening, one of them held up his glass.

"This," he said, "will be our last drink." Believe it or not, it was. They decided to convene nightly at their various homes and each man promised to bring a friend with him to the next meeting. By recounting their experiences as reformed drunkards, they hoped to induce the new members to join them in signing the pledge. Thus started the Washington Total Abstinence Society.

The movement spread like wildfire, and branches were soon set up in various parts of the city. In March 1841, a delegation was sent to New York where thousands flocked to the meetings. A Boston chapter was organized in April, and by the end of the year the organization had a total membership of something like two hundred thousand. Reformed men, as they were called, like John B. Gough and John Hawkins, were in demand all over the country as speakers for the various groups.

In Baltimore, a grand procession was held with “six or eight thousand” in the ranks, led by John Hoss and fifty mounted marshals “with their various insignia. Speakers and other dignitaries rode in open barouches drawn each by four grey horses”, while bands and banners added gaiety and color to the occasion.

In the meantime, in Dedham, Mass., a Mr. Thompson proved himself such an eloquent speaker that the entire town joined the Washington movement. The leading liquor merchant gave up his business, signed the pledge and was made President of the village society. “Amid the cheerings and rejoicing of the populace,” the newly elected Washingtonian official supervised the disposal of his entire stock of liquor “by pouring it upon the ground.”

(To he continued)

January 1949. Washingtonians, by Richard Ewell Brown (Conclusion)

What was the valuable secret that the Washingtonians had stumbled upon and why was the movement such a success?

To begin with, they were the first to discover the now widely admitted fact that no one is quite so well equipped to help the chronic alcoholic as the ex-drunk. Here is no superior person, short on sympathy and long on advice, but a fellow sufferer who has been through the mill and knows all the answers. “An inescapable symbol of the successful escape from pain” - to quote Professor Selden Bacon of Yale University.

Secondly. the Washingtonians avoided all the time-honored pitfalls that beset the early Nineteenth Century reformer. Heretofore the drunkard had been generally regarded as an object of contempt, de-nunciation, or ridicule. The new society considered him a sick rather than a sinful man. Religious diatribes and denunciations had no place on the Washington program. According to an early member, self-righteous exhortations or scorn were “calculated to drive him (the drinker) to madness and despair by drinking deeper...(and) embitter his heart.” Modern science puts it a little differently. Professor Bacon says: “The effect of such exhortation is to reenforce the person’s feeling of inferiority and self-depreciation” and to increase his “hostility.” Criticism, as the Washingtonians realized, was one thing the chronic alcoholic couldn’t take.

To make sure that new members would not be frightened away, the Washington charter provided that only ex-drunks could address the meetings. Thus the “benefits of experience spoken in burning words from the heart” were made available for all to bear. If ordinary mortals wished to speak, they had to have permission “by common consent of the members.” Debates, lectures and speeches were definitely out, and matters of business were limited to “as few remarks as possible”. Ministers were not barred, but if they spoke “they were desired to lay aside their pontificals . . . abandon their sermons . . . and speak as men.” Not that the Washingtonian were anti-religious. Dr. Albert Day of that most successful institution for the regeneration of chronic alcoholic, the Washington Home in Boston, had this to say in 1877: “We cannot ignore the religious element in the treatment of inebriety. Let the excellent and heaven-born truth taught by Jesus of Nazareth underlie all our teachings. But let them be shorn of all their dogmatism and taught in all their beautiful simplicity. (The drinker’s) eyes should be opened to new truths,” Although this was said many years after the founding of Washingtonianism, it reflects the beliefs of the earlier members.

Along with religious affiliation, the founders of the Washington society wished to avoid any suspicion of political bias so common to other temperance groups. Politics and denominational religion were both taboo as topics of discussion. Every effort was made to prevent the society from encroaching on anyone’s prejudices, so that all people would feel free to join the organization. One purpose and one purpose only, was held in mind: to rescue men from the toils of drink. To that end, the founders tried to make Washingtonianism, in the words of Father Mathew, “a green spot in the desert life where all could meet in peace and harmony.” “Moral suasion” was their weapon, and sympathy their keynote. There was no censoring of erring members. If a man broke his pledge, he was forgiven “not seven times, but seventy times seven.”

Another favorable aspect of Washingtonianism was its simplicity. Responsibility was divided

equally, rather than among a few officers. The society constituted a grand committee of the whole, and everyone was kept busy doing missionary work, bringing new members to the weekly meetings and helping old members who had slipped back into former habits. This doing for others had as much therapeutic value for the giver as for the receiver, and accounted to a large degree for the Washington success.

Despite the tremendous popular approval which crowned the so-called maiden efforts, however the Washington movement finally met its Waterloo in the conflicting aims of its members. The early Washingtonians had no desire to stop the liquor traffic by legal means, improve public morals or punish wrongdoers. Why, then, was the organization unable to stick to its original platform?

The founders had made one grave error which not only proved a stumbling block for future work among alcoholics, but which eventually led to the disintegration of the society as such. Stipulating that only ex-victims of intemperance could speak at meetings was a step in the right direction, but it didn't go far enough. If the rule had been that only ex-alcoholics could be eligible for membership, the society might well be in existence today.

As it was, the distinction between a temperance organization and a society for the regeneration of alcoholics was never understood. The Washingtonians didn't realize that in their therapeutic program they had something that was far more important than all the temperance ballyhoo before or since their time. They had discovered an oyster; the pearl, if they'd only known it, was inside.

The nonalcoholic member soon grew tired of listening to an endless chain of ex-drunks expatiate on an experience that, in the final analysis, had no meaning for anyone but another alcoholic. It must have been hard, at times, for him to hide his boredom. Sympathy requires understanding.

To make matters worse, many of the "cures" proved to be of a somewhat less than permanent nature. For the non-alcoholic, there was only one answer: close down the bars and bistros. Many tried to dominate the meetings for sectarian or political purposes. Failing in these attempts, they left the organization to heckle from the outside. As early as September, 1842, a large group of Washingtonians formed a new society, The Sons of Temperance dedicated to the complete suppression of the liquor traffic, as well as to personal abstinence. Thus, torn by dissent from within, and opposed by rival organizations from without, it is not surprising that the Washington movement did not live up to its early promise.

February 1953. A Grapevine Milestone Report Washington, Lincoln & Temperance in Their Times

It is perhaps fitting this new February to consider that the month's two most celebrated sons can be curiously identified with the first movement in the United States which brought about a large scale rehabilitation of alcoholics.

The movement was the "Washington Temperance Society," known most widely as simply the "Washingtonians." The name was taken to honor President George Washington, deceased some forty-one years previously, and was selected only after a hassle among founding members who had originally preferred the name "Jeffersonians."

The Washingtonians, founded in 1840, came of age and stature in February, 1841, when they branched out from the first group in Baltimore and began an amazing growth that resulted in a membership variously claimed to be between 100,000 and 600,000.

Abraham Lincoln, himself a lifelong teetotaler, joined the movement and on February 22nd, 1842 made a memorable address in the society's behalf.

"Your Health, General Washington!" The posthumous use of Washington's name for an alcoholics' movement was solely a mark of honor for his military and political achievements. That the hero of the cherry tree incident was temperate is generally projected by his biographers; that he would espouse total abstinence for his colonial compatriots is doubtful. His own taste for good wines was known far and wide; he usually took "four or five glasses of Madeira for dinner and finished off with a draught of beer and a small glass of punch." His journals list large expenditures for "arrack, wine and punch." He had apparent distaste for rum, writing to Comte de Moustier in 1788 . . . "rum . . . is in my opinion, the bane of morals and the parent of idleness." Of George's taste for whisky we are told in a letter of 1794: ". . . as the President will

be going into the Country of Whiskey, he proposes to make use of that liquor for his drink.”

There is a modern barroom legend that is wont to rise on February 22nd (when the cup has aptly marked the holiday) that “George Washington mushta been alc’holic . . . who elsh would stand up in a boat?” Another contemporary celebrant remarked that “Washington musta had a problem or he wouldn’t have thrown a dollar away just for the water in a river!” There are no reasons to consider these patent fancies as historical.

In point of sober fact, there were no maxims, no gems of guidance for the temperance society in our first presidents writings. To add reason to the name of the Washingtonians, an early orator found these quotes for use in membership campaigns:

“We do not need wine to fire our blood. . .,” from Washington’s young days as a colonel of British provincial troops; and, “Labour to keep alive in your breast that little spark of celestial fire,-conscience” from one of the general’s diaries.

Liquor Surrounds Mr. Lincoln. That the “reform” and temperance movements came of age in Abraham Lincoln’s own time of coming of age is duly recorded by newspapers of the early 1830’s. A thousand units of the American Temperance Society had a total of 100,000 members by 1832. Politicians were taking notice of the temperance tide as it surged in. By 1835, there were 5,000 societies, a million members. Effective literature and temperance newspapers were rolling off presses. The Reverend Dr. Lyman Beecher had already proclaimed that intemperance was not merely drunkenness, but “the daily use of ardent spirits.”

In the midwest of young Abe, whisky was the beverage of a heman. Up the Mississippi from New Orleans came other potables ... Holland gin, French cognac, Teneriffe, Malaga and Scotch whisky. There were “men of distinction” in the prairie states, too! A Dayton, Ohio paper reported “whisky, twelve cents a gallon. Eight thousand have signed the temperance pledge in Cincinnati, a fact which has had some effect in lowering the price of whisky.”

“Martha Washington “ societies were appearing . . . to “reclaim the intemperate of their own sex.”

But along the Sangamon river, whisky flowed as placid as the fishbare stream. The Sangamon Hardshell Baptist church refused to take a stand against whisky. Mentor Graham, Lincoln’s friend who taught the school, joined the “temperance movement and found himself immediately suspended by the church trustees! To even things up, the trustees then suspended another member who had gone blind drunk.

Lawyer Lincoln Defines Temperance. By New Year’s, 1842, Abraham Lincoln was the foremost member of the Springfield, Illinois Society of Washingtonians. He had never taken whisky, but he had seen his business partner John Berry overcome by it. His law partner, Mr. Herndon, was often in “the likes of being a liquorhead” Such an enemy as whisky needed a strong foe, and Mr. Lincoln was the natural choice for the Washington’s Birthday temperance meeting in the Second Presbyterian Church. Services proper for the occasion were sung by the choir, augmented by Methodist singers. Then, A. Lincoln, Esq., orator of the day, took the platform to deliver an address on “Charity in Temperance Reform.”

“The warfare hitherto waged against the demon intemperance has somehow or other been erroneous” Mr. Lincoln said. “Either the champions engaged or the tactics they have adopted have not been, the most proper. These champions for the most part have been preachers lawyers and hired agents. They are supposed to have no sym- pathy of feeling or interest with those very persons whom it is their object to convince and persuade”

The best of temperance crusaders, Lincoln told the large audience, is the reformed drunkard. “When one who has long been known as a victim of intemperance appears before his neighbors ‘clothed and in his right mind,’ a redeemed specimen of long-lost humanity, and stands up, with tears of joy trembling in his eyes, to tell of the miseries once endured, now to be endured no more forever; of his once naked and starving children, now clad and fed comfortably; of a wife long weighted down with woe, weeping, and a broken heart, now restored to health; and how easily it is all done, once it is resolved to be done; how simple his language! —there is a logic and an eloquence in it that few with human feelings can resist. They cannot say he is vain of hearing himself speak, for his whole demeanor shows he would gladly avoid speaking at

all; they cannot say he speaks for pay, for he received none and asked for none. In my judgment, it is to the battles of this new class of champions, that out late success is greatly, perhaps chiefly, owing.”

Prohibition and denunciation of dram-sellers and dram-drinkers was “both impolitic and unjust.” The reason? “Because it is not much in the nature of man to be driven to anything; still less to be driven about that which is exclusively his own business; and least of all where such driving is to be submitted to at the expense of pecuniary interest or burning appetite.”

A “Twelfth Step” instruction from lawyer Lincoln: “A drop of honey catches more flies than a gallon of gall. If you would win a man to your cause, first convince him that you are his sincere friend.”

The lanky orator spoke of whisky, commodity of trade, in his own forefathers’ time. “Even then it was known and acknowledged that many were greatly injured by it,” Lincoln asserted. “But none seemed to think the injury arose from the use of a bad thing, but from the abuse of a very good thing. The victims of it were to be pitied and compassionated, just as are the heirs of consumption and other hereditary diseases. Their failing was treated as a misfortune and not as a crime, or even as a disgrace.”

In the audience was the drunkard law partner, Herndon. Perhaps to him Lincoln continued: “If we take habitual drunkards as a class, their heads and their hearts will bear an advantageous comparison with those of any other class. There seems ever to have been a proneness in the brilliant and warm-blooded to fall into this vice—the demon of intemperance ever seems to have delighted in sucking the blood of genius and of generosity.”

And in conclusion, Mr. Lincoln seemed to speak directly to the reformed drunkards of the Washington Society . . . “In my judgment such of us as have never fallen victims have been spared more from the absence of appetite than from any mental or moral superiority over those who have.”

As a code for the success of the Washingtonians in bringing new feet to the path of sobriety, Mr. Lincoln used simple phrases . . . “go for present as well as future good . . . labor for all now living, as well as all hereafter to live . . . teach hope to all, despair to none. As in Christianity it is taught, so in this teach, that ‘While the lamp holds out to burn, the vilest sinner may return.’”

It was five score less seven years before Alcoholics Anonymous that the man who freed other men from bondage and slavery spoke to a church room full of reformed drunkards, and people come to hear, and people come to scoff. Lincoln was never again recorded as speaker on temperance from alcohol. . .but there were to come many words to be graven in men’s hearts and immortalized on granite. Words that had great meaning in the dark and confusion and desperate illness of a whole nation . . . words that are still comfort, and light and milestones for faith for those today who through AA are winning their own civil war . . . who are uniting their own house that it may stand righteously and honestly and undivided. Listen to that homely voice, leaving these words for the ages: “As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master.” “It is difficult to make a man miserable while he feels he is worthy of himself and claims kindred to the great God who made him.” And, from the Second Inaugural Address, perhaps the most sublime phrase of Lincoln’s rich gifts to America . . . a message to a nation sobering up from the dreadful nightmare of four years’ bloodshed . . . a message for our use today . . . “With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right . . .”

A Message He must Carry. It was the second month of the new year, and those to whom he had brought a new way of life, a new belief, were now far away. He could not know if they still kept the faith, if they practiced in their living the simple principles of honesty, of humility and of helpfulness to others that he had found for himself and had, in turn, given to them. He had lived the long first of his own life quite differently. Born to wealth and position he had scorned those who did not share his own sophistication. And then troubled and weary of the old ways within himself, there had come to him a vision, a sort of spiritual experience that changed his whole pattern of living and gave him the courage and the peace that he later described as “passing all understanding.” That others might know the new way, he traveled far and wide, speaking to such little groups as would hear him . . . telling them simply of the change within himself. ‘And many said to him: “This will not work, this loving one’s neighbors and making amends for past misdeeds and finding answers to the hard business of daily living in such vague ways as meditation and prayer.” And

they turned him out of their meeting places and he despaired that anyone should believe him and follow where he led. But he had a message, and he kept on with it. And in the second month of the year 53 AD. this man Paul wrote to those he had sponsored in a place called Philippi. This was his message-just 1900 years ago this 1953: "Brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things" S.H., Montclair, N.J.

October 1962. Before They Had AA How Some Basic AA Ideas Were Tried out Nearly a Century and a Quarter Ago ...

The Washingtonians: An AA colleague recently dropped by at the Grapevine office to leave a tattered and watermarked volume, nearly a century old, called "Six Nights With the Washingtonians." Thought we might like to look through it, he said, and see how close drunks had come to hitting on AA therapy that long before 1935. We began to read. In the spring of 1840, the author, T.S.Arthur, relates,"there were assembled in a drinking-house in this city (Baltimore) six men, well advanced in years, who had for a long time been confirmed drunkards, so wedded to the love of strong drink as to have found it almost impossible to live without daily resort to it." Though they met accidentally, and had gone there to drink, there was, that day, "in the mind of each a strong desire to get out of his enslaved and wretched condition." They talked. "Soon the feelings of each became known to the others, and they felt a sudden hope spring up in their minds-a hope in the power of association. Sad experience had proven to each that alone he could not stand. But together . . . they would conquer!" They organized a society, called it The Washington Temperance Society, and "determined that they would increase in number." What happened to them? By an AA "coincidence" there arrived at the Grapevine the same week an excerpt from a scholarly treatment of "The Washingtonian Movement" written by Milton A. Maxwell, Ph.D. and published in the Quarterly Journal Of Studies on Alcohol.

The Washingtonians, Dr. Maxwell points out, had certain notable features later incorporated into AA: (1) Alcoholics helping each other (2) Weekly meetings (3) Shared experience (4) Fellowship of a group or its members constantly available (5) A reliance upon the Higher Power (6) Total abstinence from alcohol. Unfortunately, the movement eventually was torn apart in the political and doctrinal warfare associated with the temperance and abolition movements. Also, The Washingtonians lacked vitally important features of AA, among which Dr. Maxwell lists: (1) a program for personality change (2) anonymity (3) a steady flow of new ideas into the groups from outside their local memberships, and (4) avoidance of causes and controversies. Dr. Maxwell sounds a solemn warning as to the vital importance of unabated, energetic Twelfth Step work: "Whenever, and as long as, the Washingtonians were working hard at the reclamation of drunkards, they had notable success and the movement thrived and grew. This would support the idea that active outreach to other alcoholics is a factor in therapeutic success, and a necessary condition for growth-and even for survival." The following pictures (not included), taken from the Arthur book, are typical of 19th Century efforts to scare people sober. They indicate that old J. Barleycorn hasn't changed much in the past hundred years.

February 1964 Abraham Lincoln on Alcoholism

The profound insight of the great President into the dilemma of the habitual drunkard From Lincoln's address to the Washington Temperance Society, Springfield, Ill. February 22 1842 "IN my judgment such of us who have never fallen victims have been spared more by the absence of appetite than from any mental or moral superiority over those who have. Indeed, I believe if we take habitual drunkards as a class, their heads and their hearts will bear an advantageous comparison with those of any other class." "When one who has long been known as a victim of intemperance bursts the fetters that have bound him, and appears before his neighbors 'clothed and in his right mind,' a redeemed specimen of long-lost humanity, and stands up, with tears of joy trembling in his eyes, to tell of the miseries once endured, now to be endured no more forever: of his once naked and starving children, now clad and fed comfortable; of a wife long weighed down with

woe, weeping, and a broken heart, now restored to health, happiness, and a renewed affection; and how easily it is all done, once it is resolved to be done-how simple his language! Human feelings cannot resist.”

“I have not inquired at what period of time the use of intoxicating liquors commenced; nor is it important to know. It is sufficient that, to all of us who now inhabit the world, the practice of drinking them is just as old as the, world itself-that is, we have seen the one just as long as we have seen the other.” “Those who have suffered by intemperance personally, and have reformed, are the most powerful and efficient instruments to push the reformation to ultimate success. It does not follow that those who have not suffered have no part left them to perform. Whether or not the world would be vastly benefited by a total and final banishment from it of all intoxicating drinks seems to me not now an open question.”

“The victims of it (alcoholism) were to be pitied and compassioned, just as are the heirs of consumption and other hereditary diseases. Their failing was treated as a misfortune and not as a crime, or even as a disgrace.” “There seems ever to have been a proneness in the brilliant and warm blooded to fall into the vice-the demon of intemperance, ever seems to have delighted in sucking the blood of genius and of generosity. What one of us but can call to mind some relative, more promising in youth than all his fellows, who has fallen a sacrifice to his rapacity? He seems ever to have gone forth like the Egyptian angel of death, commissioned to slay, if not the first, the fairest born of every family.”

“Happy day when-all appetites controlled, all passions subdued, all matter subjugated-mind, all-conquering mind, shall live and move, the monarch of the world. Glorious consummation! Hail, fall of fury? Reign of reason, all hail! And when the victory shall be complete-when there shall be neither slave nor drunkard on the earth-how proud the title of that land which may truly claim to be the birthplace and the cradle of both those resolutions that shall have ended in that victory. How nobly distinguished that people who shall have planted and nurtured to maturity both the political and moral freedom of their species.”

“For the man suddenly or in any other way to break off from the use of drams, who has indulged in them for a long course of years and until his appetite for them has grown tenor a hundred-fold stronger and more craving than any natural appetite can be, requires a most powerful moral effort. In such an undertaking he needs every moral support and influence that can possibly be brought to his aid and thrown around him.” “It is an old and a true maxim that ‘a drop of honey catches more flies than a gallon of gall.’ So with men. If you would win a man to your cause, first convince him that you are his sincere friend.”

“Is it just to assail, condemn, or despise them? The universal sense of mankind on any subject is an argument, or at least an influence, not easily overcome. The success of the argument in favor of the existence of an overruling providence mainly depends upon that sense; and men ought not in justice to be denounced for yielding to it in any case, or giving it up slowly, especially when they are backed by interest, fixed habits, or burning appetites.” “Another error, as it seems to me, into which the old reformers fell, was the position that all habitual drunkards were utterly incorrigible, and therefore must be turned adrift and damned without remedy in order that the grace of temperance might abound, to the temperate then, and to all mankind some hundreds of years thereafter. There is in this attitude something so repugnant to humanity, so uncharitable, so cold-blooded and feelingless, that it never did nor ever can enlist the enthusiasm of a popular cause.”

February 1971. The Washingtonians

A brief history of the organization that grew strong helping suffering alcoholics and then withered away when it lost track of its primary purpose ONE THURSDAY evening, April 2, 1840. nearly 100 years before the advent of Alcoholics Anonymous, six good drinking buddies were gathered at Chase’s Tavern on Liberty Street in Baltimore, Md. The more they drank, the more their discussion centered on temperance, which was one of the most popular topics of the day. This meeting and subsequent discussions led to the formation and brief, spectacular life of the Washingtonian movement, which grew in membership to over 400,000 “reformed drunkards” and then destroyed itself overnight and dropped out of sight. The story of the Washingtonian movement brings sharply into focus the importance of the Twelve Traditions of Alcoholics Anonymous as guidelines of group behavior designed to protect us against a similar fate. To take our

Traditions for granted or to ignore them should at least justify a check mark on the debit side of our inventory charts. Until the time of this meeting at Chase's Tavern, it was the prevailing opinion that nothings could be done to help the drunkard. (The terms "alcoholic" and "alcoholism" were not yet in general use.)

The few occasions when drunkards did reform did not erase the general pessimism over the possibility of rehabilitating drunks. Since alcohol was assumed to be the cause of alcoholism, many temperance movements of that day were aimed solely at keeping the nonalcoholic from becoming alcoholic. The rallying cry was: "Keep the temperate people temperate; the drunkards will soon die and the land be free!" On April 5, 1840, our six good drinking buddies once again gathered at this same tavern around another jug of spirits and were liberally toasting the great advantages of temperance and condemning the curse of drink. Although a number of active temperance groups was already in existence, none was acceptable to our friends Good drunks that they were, they decided to form a group of their own. They elected officers and drew up a pledge of total abstinence: "We, whose names are annexed, desirous of forming for our mutual benefit and to guard against a pernicious practice which is injurious to our health, standing, and families, do pledge ourselves as gentlemen that we will not drink any spiritous or malt liquors, vine or cider."

They chose the name Washington Temperance Society in honor of George Washington, and a membership fee of twenty-five cents was established, together with monthly dues of twelve and a half cents. With fond embraces they parted, each agreeing to bring one new member to the next meeting at the tavern. And they stayed sober! In response to membership growth and at the frantic urging of the tavern owner, the group eventually rented its own hall and decided to meet weekly. At these meetings, a unique format developed. Each speaker told his own story: "what I used to be like - what happened - and what I am like now." The idea was greeted with explosive acceptance.

It gave new impact to the entire temperance movement. Total abstinence had created the miracle of the man at the podium! In November 1840, the group held its first public meeting. Newspaper editors were liberal with coverage, complete with names of members. The audience was standing-room-only. Both alcoholics and nonalcoholics - all who pledged themselves to total abstinence were welcomed into the group. Five months later, Washingtonian membership claimed over 1,000 "reformed drunkards" and 5,000 members who were not sure whether they were drunkards or not, but were also pledged to total abstinence, plus thousands of temperance advocates who welcomed the Washingtonians crusade. Newspaper editors were liberal with coverage, complete with names of members

Enthusiastic promoters that they were, members of the group organized and marched in a parade. It flaunted bands and banners and was witnessed by more than 40,000 spectators in Baltimore. Following the parade, there was a great open-air park meeting to spread the Washingtonian "Twelfth Step" message: "Drunkard! Come up here! You can reform. I met a gentlemen this morning who reformed four weeks ago and was rejoicing in his reformation. We don't slight the drunkard. We love him! We nurse him as a mother does her infant learning to walk!" Tears flowed freely around the secretary's table as hundreds moved to the platform and signed the pledge of total abstinence. The emotional atmosphere was saturated with contagious salvation. Religious groups embraced the program. Samuel F. Holbrook, the first president of the society, thundered of God's part in reclaiming drunks: "The reeling drunkard is met in the street or drawn out from some old filthy shed, taken by the arm, spoken kindly to, invited to the hall, and with reluctance dragged there or carried in a carriage if not too filthy; and there he sees himself surrounded by friends and not what he most feared . . . police officers. Everyone takes him by the hand; he begins to come to and when sober signs the pledge and goes away a reformed man.

And it does not end there. The man takes the pledge and from his bottle companions obtains a number of signers who likewise become sober men, Positively these are the facts." Now, can any human agency alone do this? All will answer 'No!'; for we have invariably the testimony of vast numbers of reformed men who have spoken in public and declared they have broken off a number of times, but have as often relapsed again; and the reason they give for doing this is that they wholly rely on the strength of their

resolution without looking any higher, Now they feel the need of God's assistance, which having been obtained, their reform is genuine. Praise God!"The Washingtonian manifestation of miracles could not be contained geographically. Members were sure it was within their power to meet widespread, pressing needs.

The reclaimed drunks active in the movement proved by their example that drunkards could be helped, and they had an overwhelming drive to carry their message of hope to other drunks who still suffered. This drive spilled over into a desire to prevent such suffering by persuading those not addicted to insure their sobriety through total abstinence. Influential temperance leaders of the day needed salesmen to sell this message of prevention, and the Washingtonians provided a waiting list of available manpower. New York City beckoned. In March of the following year, Washingtonians and spectators gathered at the Methodist Episcopal church on Green Street. During the very first speech, a young man in the gallery staggered to his feet and cried out, "Is there no hope for me? God in heaven! Is there no hope for me? Will you help me?" He was helped to the platform and "pressed his willingness and readiness to bind himself from that hour to total abstinence. Others followed. Some were young men; others were old and gray-headed. The Washingtonians embraced them all. An organization of woman within the group, known as Martha Washington Societies, fed and clothed the poor and reclaimed the intemperate of their own sex.

Members were sure it was within their power to meet widespread, pressing needs In less than four years from the first meeting of our alcoholic friends at Chase's Tavern, Washingtonian membership hit its peak. At that point, it is commonly computed, the movement included at least 100,000 "reformed common drunkards," 300,000 "common tipplers" who also became total abstainers, and untold thousands who were simply enthusiastic temperance advocates.

And then came oblivion.

By 1848, all that remained of the organization's spectacular power as a method of treatment was its Home for the Fallen in Boston. That institution has undergone a number of changes in name and policy, now functions as the Washingtonian Hospital, and engages in the treatment of alcoholism by modern medical and social techniques. Otherwise, the movement destroyed itself completely and dropped out of sight. With it went the hope it had held out for thousands of drunks of that day.

Against this brief background, it is possible to make a limited comparison between the Washingtonian movement and Alcoholics Anonymous and to reflect on the possibility of AA's suffering a similar fate. The similarities between the earlier movement and AA might be listed as follows:

1. Alcoholics helping each other.
2. Weekly meetings.
3. The sharing of experiences.
4. Constant availability of fellowship with the group or its members.
5. Reliance upon a Higher Power.
6. Total abstention from alcohol.

Although it is obvious that this program of the Washingtonians was incomplete and possessed only limited opportunity for personality change, as compared with AA's Twelve Steps, it did provide the tools for at least short-lived sobriety for thousands of drunks. But it failed to provide any standards at all that were comparable to AA's Twelve Traditions. Because there were no such safeguards for the movement as a whole, it died. Most of the Washingtonians' problems lay in areas now covered in our Traditions:

1. The AA Preamble and Tradition Five advise us to protect our singleness of purpose; Tradition One cautions us to protect our unity. Without these guidelines, the Washingtonian movement developed into a three-headed monster. First was the program of reclaiming suffering alcoholics. Second was the call to the general public for temperance through moral suasion. Third was the call for temperance through legal suasion. Influential men controlled the action of each head, and it was not long until the heads were fighting each other.

2. The carnival tactics for promotion and the lack of any spiritual principle of anonymity created an atmosphere for spectacular growth -but also led to battles among personalities competing for prestige and power. One hundred years later, AA adopted Traditions Eleven and Twelve, which guide us to base our

public-relations policy on attraction rather than promotion; always to maintain personal anonymity at the level of press, broadcasting, and films; and to regard anonymity as our “spiritual foundation . . . ever reminding us to place principles before personalities.”

3. Nothing can divide and destroy groups more quickly than theological and political controversy. Tradition Ten states that AA “has no opinion on outside issues” and that “the AA name ought never be drawn into public controversy.” Without this Tradition the Washingtonians walked right into a Donnybrook. A few key church leaders heard Washingtonian reformed drunks proclaiming among other things, they were living Christ’s program - not just giving it lip service, like a lot of pastors they knew. In retaliation, the Rev. Hiram Mattison, minister of the Methodist Episcopal church of Watertown, N.Y., fired this theological blockbuster: “No Christian is at liberty to select or adopt any general system, organization, agencies, or means for moral reformation of mankind, except those prescribed and recognized by Jesus Christ.” He added that his church had been chosen, together with his gospel, as the system of truth and the only system to reform mankind. It was war! Other churches reacted in the same way and finally closed their doors to Washingtonians.

4. As if that were not enough, some of the Washingtonians’ oratorical circuit riders turned professional, having no Eighth Tradition to guide them. So their one-drunk-to-another message lost a great deal of its impact.

A final destructive note came when influential leaders of nonalcoholic groups decided that the need for ex-drunks to reform other drunks was past, and that emphasis should be placed instead on the importance of laws to promote temperance.

In doing the research and writing this article for the Grapevine, my thoughts have kept returning to this question: After the movement destroyed itself, what happened to all the thousands of alcoholics who had found sobriety through the Washingtonians?

It becomes a personal question when I add: What would have happened to me?

During the early days of the AA program, especially prior to the adoption of our Twelve Traditions, AA did suffer some of the same symptoms that destroyed the Washingtonians. The fact that we survived those hazards is one of AA’s many miracles.

But it is still a 24-hour day.

D. P., Ogden, Utah

February 1972. Our Lawyer Friend

Arriving by horse and buggy on the wintry night of February 22, 1842, at the Second Presbyterian Church in Springfield, Ill., a tall, lanky lawyer proceeded to sow the seeds of basic ideas that eventually blossomed in the program of Alcoholics Anonymous. His address on the drinking problem was given before the Washington Temperance Society, so named because George Washington had been “a mild-drinking man who knew when to stop.”* Not yet married, this attorney was practicing in the circuit courts and had already shown congressional interests. With great perception and depth of thought he made keen observations which may come as a surprise to us.

To begin with, he said, “In my judgment, such of us who have never fallen victims have been spared more by the absence of appetite than from any mental or moral superiority over those who have. Indeed, I believe if we take habitual drunkards as a class, their heads and their hearts will bear an advantageous comparison with those of any other class.” Immediately, he established the fact that degree of intelligence and willpower has nothing to do with our condition.

Speaking mostly to reformed drunkards (though the society also included nonalcoholics), he gave a condensed example of a typical AA talk: “When one who has long been known as a victim of intemperance bursts the fetters that have bound him, and appears before his neighbors ‘clothed and in his right mind,’ a redeemed specimen of long-lost humanity, and stands up, with tears of joy trembling in his eyes, to tell of the miseries once endured, now to be endured no more forever; of his once naked and starving children, now clad and fed comfortable; of a wife long weighed down with woe, weeping, and a broken heart, now restored

to health, happiness, and a renewed affection; and how easily it is all done, once it is resolved to be done - how simple his language! Human feelings cannot resist.”

Here, aside from a good description of recovery, we get: the admission in Step One-“once it is resolved to be done”; the sanity in Step Two - “in his right mind; and Doctor Bob’s admonition against complicating things-“how simple his language!”

Removing any misconception that the use of alcohol was something new, he said, “I have not inquired at what period of time the use of intoxicating liquors commenced; nor is it important to know. It is sufficient that, to all of us who now inhabit the world, the practice of drinking them is just as old as the world itself - that is, we have seen the one just as long as we have seen the other.”

Then he quickly expressed doubt that any plan of prohibition might be called for: “Whether or not the world be vastly benefited by a total and final banishment from it of all intoxicating drinks seems to me not now an open question.” The U.S. experiment of national prohibition began in 1920 and was acknowledged a failure by its repeal in 1933.

As a harbinger of the American Medical Association’s decision that alcoholism is a disease, the lawyer said, “The victims of it [should be] pitied and compassioned, just as are, the heirs of consumption and other hereditary diseases. Their failing [should be] treated as a misfortune, and not as a crime, or even as a disgrace ... Is it just to assail, condemn, or despise them?” Even to this day, society jails us and shames us, and disrepute persists.

Again criticizing the attitude of condemnation, he assured his listeners that the alcoholic was not hopeless: “Another error, as it seems to me, into which the old reformers fell, was the position that all habitual drunkards were utterly incorrigible, and therefore must be turned adrift, and damned without remedy. . . . There is in this attitude something so repugnant to humanity, so uncharitable, so cold-blooded and feelingless, that it never did nor ever can enlist the enthusiasm of a popular cause.”

Our lawyer friend realized that no one was spared: “The sideboard of the parson and the ragged pocket of the houseless loafer both hold whiskey.” Further, he noted that the alcoholic was not necessarily a bum: “There seems ever to have been a proneness in the, brilliant and warmblooded to fall into the vice-the demon of intemperance ever seems to have delighted in sucking the blood of genius and of generosity.”

On the addictive nature of alcohol, he reflected, “For a man suddenly, or in any other way, to break off from the use of [alcohol], who has indulged for a long course of years and until his appetite has grown ten or a hundredfold stronger, and more craving than any natural appetite can be, requires a most powerful moral effort.” He was describing a physical allergy coupled with a mental obsession. “In such an undertaking, he needs every moral support and influence that can possibly be brought to his aid and thrown around him” -the AA program, a Higher Power, fearless inventory, fellowship, and the example of other recovering alcoholics.

Whether by foresight or by intuition, and perhaps quite unwittingly, the speaker continued by hinting at a program of attraction: “It is an old and true maxim that ‘A drop of honey catches more flies than a gallon of gall.’ So with men. If you would win a man to your cause, first convince him that you are his sincere friend.”

Even more important, he anticipated the mistrust a drunkard might feel if forced into change: “Assume to dictate to his judgment, or to command his action ... and he will retreat within himself.” Aren’t the Twelve Steps suggestions, not commandments? And aren’t we advised to choose a Higher Power as we understand Him, no matter what our individual conception of that power may be?

But perhaps the most significant observation he made was to picture the reformed drunkard as the best of temperance crusaders: “Those who have suffered by intemperance personally, and have reformed, are the most powerful and efficient instruments to push the reformation to ultimate success.” Where would AA be today had not Bill, a sober alcoholic, gone to see Doctor Bob, a drinking alcoholic, thus marking the beginning of twelfth-stepping.?

Yet the speaker was aware that some of us may in addition require doctors, psychiatrists, and the church: “It does not follow that those of us who have not suffered have no part left them to perform.”

As people went out of the church at the conclusion of the address, an eavesdropper standing at the door reported that many of them were not pleased. One marked, "It's a shame that he should be permitted to abuse us so in the house of the Lord."

The Illinois State Register inquired whether the speaker and his fellow politicians had joined the Washington Society for any other than political reason!

Abraham Lincoln did not drink.

J. M., Dallas, Tex.

July 1976. A Reminder and a Warning...

Alcoholics Anonymous was only ten years old when Bill W., AA's cofounder, wrote: "Those who read the July [1945] Grapevine were startled, then sobered, by the account which it carried of the Washingtonian movement. It was hard for us to believe that 100 years ago the newspapers of this country were carrying enthusiastic accounts about 100,000 alcoholics who were helping each other stay sober; that today the influence of this good work has so completely disappeared that few of us had ever heard of it...."

"May we always be willing to learn from experience?" Bill cautioned.

The quotations in this article are from material in AA's archives.

Founded by six drunks in 1840, the Washingtonians had grown in membership to hundreds of thousands in a short twelve years, and then destroyed themselves as an organization and dropped out of sight. By 1852, all that remained of their spectacular power as a method of treatment was the Home for the Fallen in Boston.

They flourished when
they helped one other

In a talk on the Traditions shortly before his death, Bill said that the Washingtonians had done things "which were very natural to do, but which had turned out to be utterly destructive. And it was this spectacle of the past, brought before us as our Traditions were evolving, that confirmed that we were probably very much on the right track in this matter of no public controversy; in this question of paying our own bills; in this question of not becoming involved with other enterprises, and so on down the line. And above all, it confirmed the great protective guide of our anonymity Tradition."

Later, in the book *Alcoholics Anonymous Comes of Age*, Bill wrote: "In many respects the Washingtonians were akin to AA Had they stuck to their one goal, they might have found the full answer. Instead, the Washingtonians

And they died when they
abandoned certain timeless principles

permitted politicians and reformers, both alcoholic and nonalcoholic, to use the society for their own purposes.... Within a very few years they had completely lost their effectiveness in helping alcoholics, and the society collapsed.

"The lesson to be learned from the Washingtonians was not overlooked by Alcoholics Anonymous. As we surveyed the wreck of that movement, early AA members resolved to keep our Society out of public controversy."

And to a friend he wrote. "I wish every AA could indelibly burn the history of the Washingtonians into his memory. It is an outstanding example of how, and how not, we ought to conduct ourselves. In a sense, Alcoholics Anonymous has never had a problem seriously threatening our overall unity. Yet I notice that some AAs are complacent enough to suppose we never shall."

Bill also recalled the fate of the Washingtonians before 1,500 AAs gathered at the annual banquet in New York City on November 7, 1945. "In short, the Washingtonians went out to settle the world's affairs before they had learned to manage themselves. They had no capacity for minding their own business.... The negatives within them overthrew the positives.

"That won't happen here" Bill urged in closing, "if we remember, publicly and privately, our own simple principles of honesty, tolerance, and humility, and that we live only by the Grace of God."

Traditions! Words to remember! Thanks, Bill, Thank you, Washingtonians.
D. P., Ogden, Utah

January 1991. Fragments of AA History: The Washingtonians

ON Thursday evening, April 2, 1840, six drinking buddies gathered, as was their daily customs at Chase's Tavern in Baltimore. A well-known temperance speaker was lecturing that night, and four of them thought it would be a good joke to go and hear him. As they discussed the lecture later that evening, one of them proposed (still not quite seriously that they form a total abstinence society, and on Sunday, April 5, while strolling and drinking, the six men did make a decision "to drink no more of the poisonous draft, forever."

Each of the six agreed to bring a man to the next meeting, and they wrote and signed a pledge not to "drink any spiritous or malt liquors, wine or cider." The name Washington Temperance Society was chosen in honor of George Washington.

The Society continued to meet for a time in Chase's Tavern, but when the owner's wife objected to the loss of good customers, they switched to the home of one of the members, and finally rented a hall. In November, they held a public meeting which, with subsequent monthly meetings, proved such a success that by their first anniversary, the Baltimore Washingtonians counted "about 1,000 re-formed drunkards and 5,000 other members and friends in the parade to celebrate the occasion."

The Washingtonians were zealous in carrying their message of hope beyond Baltimore. Several leaders turned out to be powerful orators who traveled widely, speaking to large crowds, and "by May 1842 the movement had penetrated every major area of the country and was going particularly strong in central New York and New England."

At its peak, the Society's membership was estimated at anywhere from one to six million, of whom perhaps 100,000 to 600,000 were sober drunks. (One difficulty is the terminology - the Society claimed to have sobered up everything from "confirmed drunkards" to "hard drinkers often drunken" to "sots" to "tipplers in a fair way to become sots," and the distinctions were never too clear.) Others who joined up were friends and families (even very young children), as well as liquor dealers and tavern owners.

Abraham Lincoln (according to the February 1953 Grapevine) was "the foremost member of the Springfield, Illinois, Washingtonians. He had never taken whisky, but he had seen his business partner ... overcome by it." And the December 1948 Grapevine describes how "in Dedham, Mass., a Mr. Thompson proved himself such an eloquent speaker that the entire town joined. . . The leading liquor merchant gave up his business, signed the pledge, and was made President of the village society" and poured his entire stock of liquor on the ground.

Formation of the Washingtonians was tied in many ways to the temperance movement, which had been gaining strength since 1825, but was beginning to lose momentum. At first, the Washingtonians were notable for their differences. Unlike temperance advocates, who considered the drunk a hopeless case (Justin Edwards said in 1822, "Keep the temperate people temperate; the drunkards will soon die, and the land will be free"), the Washingtonians treated drunks with love and won them over with "moral suasion." An 1842 document gave directions for organizing a Washingtonian Society, which included "Declaring that love and kindness and moral suasion are your only principles and measures."

Accounts of the early Washingtonians are in some ways remarkably similar to descriptions of AA meetings. The Washingtonians were the first to insist on the recounting of personal experience in their meetings (apparently this practice began as a pragmatic measure, when public meetings became popular and the Society's leaders had to think up a way to keep them interesting). In January 1949, Richard Ewell Brown wrote in the Grapevine: "The Washingtonian charter provided that only ex-drunks could address the meetings. Thus the 'benefits of experience spoken in burning words from the heart' were made available for all to hear. . . Debates, lectures and speeches were definitely out, and matters of business were limited to 'as few remarks as possible.' Politics and religion were both taboo as topics of discussion."

Brown went on to say: "Every effort was made to prevent the society from encroaching on anyone's prejudices, so that all people would feel free to join the organization. One purpose, and one purpose only,

was held in mind: to rescue men from the toils of drink.” Another aspect was simplicity: “Responsibility was divided equally... and everyone was kept busy doing missionary work, bringing new members to the weekly meetings and helping old members who had slipped back into their former habits.”

Yet by 1848, the Washingtonian movement had “destroyed itself completely and dropped out of sight. With it went the hope it had held out for thousands of drunks of that day,” and the only tangible evidence remaining was its Home for the Fallen in Boston.

How did it happen? The similarities between Alcoholics Anonymous and the Washingtonians are too clear to be overlooked: alcoholics helping each other, weekly meetings, sharing of experiences, constant availability of fellowship with the group or its members, reliance on a Higher Power, and total abstinence from alcohol. Why is AA celebrating 55 years of growth, while its nineteenth century forerunner fell apart within only a few years? Most historians are agreed on the reasons: For one, the Washingtonians had no sustained program of recovery comparable to AA’s Twelve Steps. But the real key to their self-destruction lie in the lack of any guiding principles like those incorporated in AA’s Twelve Traditions. The Washingtonian movement “met its Waterloo in the conflicting aims of its members.

Affiliation with outside enterprises; public controversy: From the beginning, the Washingtonians were closely allied with the temperance movement, and outside of Baltimore, the early “missionaries” were “invariably sponsored by temperance organizations.” Temperance leaders looked upon the Washingtonians as a means of “sparking” their cause, and in the end, this became the chief interest of the Washingtonian leaders themselves. In many places, Washingtonians spoke in churches, and some came into conflict with the beliefs of religious entities. “Nothing can divide groups more quickly ...than religious or political controversy. Strong efforts were made in the Washingtonian movement to minimize sectarian, theological and political differences, but the movement did not avoid attracting to itself the hostile emotions generated by these conflicts ... it was still caught in all the controversy to which the temperance cause had become liable.’,

Singleness of purpose; membership requirements: Formed for the purpose of helping drunks, a Society whose membership encompassed alcoholics, their families, and nonalcoholics of many types could not provide that vital ingredient of AA’s success: identification. “The nonalcoholic member soon grew tired of listening to an endless chain of ex-drunks expatiate on an experience that, in the final analysis, had no meaning for anyone but another alcoholic.” The movement’s founding aim, helping drunks, “became an increasingly secondary interest of those whose primary interest was the furtherance of the temperance cause . . . And as fewer and fewer men were reclaimed, the last distinctive features of the Washingtonian movement dropped out of sight.”

Anonymity.- In his discussion of AA and the Washingtonians, Milton Maxwell comments: “A comparison with the Washingtonian experience underscores the sheer survival value of the principle of anonymity in Alcoholics Anonymous. At the height of his popularity, John B. Gough [one of the most prominent of the Washingtonian missionaries] either ‘slipped’ or was tricked by his enemies into a drunken relapse. At any rate, the opponents of the Washingtonian movement seized upon this lapse with glee and made the most of it to hurt Gough and the movement. This must have happened frequently to less widely known ... Washingtonians. Public confidence in the movement was impaired. Anonymity protects the reputation of AA from public criticism

“Equally important, anonymity keeps the groups from exploiting prominent names for the sake of group prestige; and it keeps individual members from exploiting their AA connection for personal prestige or fame. This encourages humility and the placing of principles before personalities.”

Bill W. cited the experience of the Washingtonians in a number of his writings and he considered them both a forerunner of AA and an object lesson for the Fellowships future.

In an article in the August 1945 Grapevine, he reflected on the lessons of the movement and emphasized the importance of being “strong enough and single-purposed enough from within” to be rightly related to the world: “We are sure that if the original Washingtonians could return to this planet they would be glad to see us learning from their mistakes... Had we lived in their day we might have made the same

errors. Perhaps we are beginning to make some of them now”

A major source for this article is “The Washingtonian Movement.” by Milton A. Maxwell, Ph.D., Quarterly Journal of Alcohol Studies, September 1950. Other sources include Grapevine articles in the December 1948, January 1949, and February 1953 issues.