

## THIRTY-THREE YEARS OF TEMPERANCE, 1971-2004

*Ian Tyrrell*

If background were to play a significant part in the making of a scholar, I was probably bound to study temperance. Our family church was Scottish-Presbyterian, though my family was not Scottish but Australian-born with Irish, English, and Cornish ancestry. In Brisbane where I grew up in the 1950s and 1960s, the Presbyterian Church did not allow the use of fermented wine, and the drinking of alcohol was frowned upon too. My mother was a teetotaler and sometimes warned of the dangers of drink. Even rum in cakes was suspect in our circle. I remember the disdain we all felt as we passed the smelly local pub, with its concrete floors and its bars awash with grog. My aunt was somehow affiliated with the Woman's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU), though I think only as a childhood member. One of her best friends was a WCTU stalwart, however. Though I did not share these anti-drink convictions, I did not drink alcohol until I was 20 or 21. Yet despite this background I was hardly conscious of the issues of alcohol use and temperance in Australian history, and left for graduate study in the United States in 1970 with images of American prohibition drawn only from Elliot Ness and the *Untouchables*.

As a Commonwealth Fellow at Duke University, I was paid to study the British Commonwealth though my secret love – not to remain a secret for very long – was American History. Not until my second year of graduate school in 1971 did I re-encounter the topic of temperance. In a course on nineteenth-century social history I found myself attracted to a topic that required the reading, among other things, of *Ten Nights in a Barroom*,

Timothy Shay Arthur's famous novel on the dangers of the demon drink. Contextualising this topic, I began to study the career of Neal Dow, and read Frank Byrne's biography of the author of the Maine Law (*Prophet of Prohibition*), along with Dow's autobiography.<sup>1</sup>

Though I was by now hooked on the antebellum temperance movement as a topic for my dissertation, I can provide no advertisement for the claim that Brian Harrison stimulated the surge of interest in temperance in the field of American history. My first exposure to interdisciplinary work and theories about drinking and temperance came rather from the sociologist Joseph Gusfield, whose *Symbolic Crusade* (1963) was much better known in the American scene than Harrison's work at that time.<sup>2</sup> This is not surprising since Harrison's *Drink and the Victorians* had been published only just after I wrote upon Arthur's work, in 1971. Not until the research on my dissertation was well underway in 1972 did I discover Harrison. Harrison's book provided many points of inspiration, notably its wealth of empirical detail. But it immediately created something of a problem for me since Harrison's approach was structural. The focus upon the social roots of British temperance in the culture of English dissent and the apparent stand-off in the cultural conflict over drink through most of the Victorian period I hardly wished to dispute, but I felt that my story of American temperance was rather different. The temperance movement had been more successful in the United States, and could not be fully explained by locating it in a defensive and somewhat static dissenting culture. Rather, I sought the origins of prohibition in the study of dynamic social movements. Gusfield's *Symbolic Crusade* was part of this influence.

The rise of the study of temperance in the United States had as much to do with a reaction against the conditions of the 1960s as with intellectual influences, however. We of the 1960s generation wished to understand social protest, and the temperance movement was, though arguably repressive in its effects, certainly

impressive in its social impact. Why had that movement achieved political success and social acceptability while others such as the crusade for racial equality had a harder road to travel? The rehabilitation of the abolitionists from the charge of fanaticism by younger so-called New Left historians such as Martin Duberman also had an effect. If abolitionists were not fanatics then perhaps temperance reformers, who were often in the antebellum period the same people, could not be characterised that way either. Thus I rebelled against the unflattering portrayal of antebellum social reform given by David Donald and Stanley Elkins, as did many of my fellow American graduate students. In contrast, Brian Harrison's book was more respectful of Elkins and in fact Elkins's ideas of anti-institutionalism in the abolitionist movement seemed to play a (small) part in the intellectual scaffolding of Harrison's book. I found instead stronger institutional links within the temperance movement and connections to the power politics of the Jacksonian era.

In regard to the influence of the 1960s, a second point was the rise of a self-conscious and highly publicised drug culture associated with the social revolts of those troubled times. Historians also sought to make connections with this phenomenon. I did not study alcohol as directly as did Bill Rorabaugh, in *The Alcoholic Republic* (1979)<sup>3</sup> but our conclusions on the rise of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century drinking as a stimulus to the rise of the temperance movement, and our explanations of the rise of drinking were in some respects similar (though Rorabaugh put more emphasis on psychological factors than I did).

The temperance movement did not disappoint me as a rich source. My dissertation, completed in 1974, located the movement in the context of antebellum reform. When I returned to Australia and to a job at the University of New South Wales, I deepened the context because anonymous press readers and my colleagues wished to contextualise alcohol even more than I did. They did not really see alcohol history as a worthy subject in its own

right. Rather they would concede only that it might be used as a “window” into American history. This was congenial to me in view of the origins of the project in the study of antebellum social protest movements.

Published as *Sobering Up: From Temperance to Prohibition in Antebellum America*<sup>4</sup> in 1979, the book was an unusual development of a dissertation in that it was longer, and not a distillation of the thesis but a considerable development of that project in the direction of social history. By this time I had become thoroughly influenced by E.P. Thompson’s *The Making of the English Working Class*. Reflecting the rising prestige of English Marxism of the 1970s, I saw class and class agitation as important in the temperance movement. I did not, however, ever agree with John J. Rumbarger’s view of the temperance movement as the imposition of a business-oriented elite.<sup>5</sup> This, the product of an exaggerated and distorted political economy, left no room for oppositional cultures within temperance. Though I regarded temperance as in part a matter of labour discipline and reflected the demands and aspirations of an upwardly mobile entrepreneurial class, from the beginning of my study in the early 1970s, I placed emphasis on the social diversity and cross-class aspects of the temperance movement over time as its leaders sought intellectual and social hegemony. My work on the Washingtonian temperance movement, I believe, illustrates the importance of both working-class temperance and cross-class alliances with the middle class. Others have built upon this approach but it remained the first American attempt to take the social history of the working and lower middle class temperance groups seriously. Clearly it was influenced by the social history trends of the 1970s, especially the work of Thompson and his disciples such as Herbert Gutman, who recognised the role that religious dissent could play as a cultural resource for working-class people.

Until I returned to the United States in 1981 on study leave, I had no sense of belonging to a field called alcohol and temperance

studies. I was of course aware of others working on similar projects, but I had no contact with them until about 1978, when I was invited to do a paper for Jack Blocker's book, *Alcohol, Reform and Society*.<sup>6</sup> Bill Rorabaugh's book, *The Alcoholic Republic*, came out in the same year as mine, and so did Blocker's collection of essays. My fellow alcohol and temperance historians all appeared to be influenced by variants of the same kinds of factors that motivated me. I met Bill Rorabaugh in Evanston, Illinois, in the summer of 1981 and formed an enduring friendship, as I did with Jack Blocker, whom I met shortly afterwards in London, Ontario. For me, however, the key to the development of the field was the conference organized by Robin Room at Berkeley in early 1984. This conference gave me the opportunity to see the newly specialised field developing, and to present the first fruits of my new research project. In fact this project had already been underway since 1980. I was privileged to meet such luminaries of the field as Per Franberg of Sweden and Joseph Gusfield.

As with other scholars working in a university environment, a big question had been, what to write the next book on? Here my location in Australia drew me away from a narrow or specialised preoccupation with the temperance movement—but not completely so. North American readers will probably not realise the depths of derision with which the study of the temperance movement was greeted in Australia in the mid-1970s. A well-known Americanist in Australia made a point of meeting me, saying he wanted to meet the “temperance man.” There was a slight hint of scepticism or criticism in his comment. In Australia we were just in the 1960s emerging from decades in which drinking laws and censorship had been amazingly strict—at least in theory. Six o'clock closing of pubs was not full prohibition but, introduced in 1916, it had lasted much longer into the 1960s in some states otherwise noted for their sophistication. Alcohol consumption had declined in line with war, depression, and the changes in morals and customs, and then risen again by the 1970s, though with wine rather than beer beginning to take prominence.

Studying anti-alcohol movements was considered not mainstream, therefore. Those who did it were considered more than oddities. They were suspected of being secret admirers of the killjoy philosophy of the dissenting churches, the pro-censorship groups, and other groups collectively known by that distinctively Australian epithet of the “wowsers.” As Australia relaxed, academics at the forefront of the attack on provincial culture wanted to forget this wowser heritage. This is one reason why the extraordinarily diverse and interesting history of temperance and drink in Australia has never been told, except by the protagonists such as Gar Dillon (pro-temperance) and Keith Dunstan (anti-wowser).<sup>7</sup>

The wish to avoid being typecast as the temperance historian became a consideration in my future choice of topics. It led me to conclude that if I were to continue to work on temperance, I must cast my net fairly broadly, and also root my studies of American history more deeply in the theoretical and historiographical perspectives of the discipline internationally. I determined I must write two books, not one, and I embarked almost immediately on a study of American historiography and the place of Marxism within it.<sup>8</sup> At the same time, in choosing a study that would connect with my speciality, alcohol and temperance movements, I also had to face the difficulty of getting local sources for any study of *any* American topic. Here, chance influenced me to stick with temperance but to broaden the connection to another emerging field. The *Temperance and Prohibition Papers* were being published in microfilm, and a microfilm collection seemed to be the only way that I could continue to work on American history seriously in any field other than historiography. Within these papers were the rich collections of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union.

Joined to this practical pressure was my growing interest in women’s history, which stemmed partly from awareness of the importance of references to women in the antebellum temperance movement. Though I had been perfectly aware of the new field

and the need to include gender analysis in my dissertation, the framework of social movement and the over-arching theme of the development of temperance strategies and tactics left little room for a separate and comprehensive treatment of women for the pre-Civil War years. Moreover, until the 1850s, the women's temperance movement was not independent, and was very much determined within the larger pattern that I had studied as *Sobering Up*. And properly in a national synthesis that I did in *Sobering Up*, the role of women could be fairly considered as part of a larger story. I had in fact gathered a great deal of material in the course of my research, much of which remained unpublished, and, apart from the brief treatment in *Sobering Up* not until 1982 did some of this see the light of day.<sup>9</sup>

Whatever the case for the pre-Civil War period, for the period since the Civil War it would be impossible to do full justice to the women's temperance efforts within the context of a larger study of prohibition. It was necessary to engage the women directly. The existence of the WCTU provided the perfect vehicle. The conceptual framework of this study was drawn from the literature on social history, especially the new women's history of the 1970s and 1980s. Historians such as Barbara Welter, Ellen DuBois, Carroll Rosenberg, and the ever-present Marxist social history influence of E.P. Thompson and Eugene Genovese provided inspiration. I first made use of a mixture of these ideas in "Women and Temperance in Antebellum America" (written in 1979 but published in 1981). Again my work paralleled that of others. Jed Dannenbaum, with whom I exchanged many letters on the subject, was working on a similar topic.<sup>10</sup>

Until this point I regard the work I had done as very much within the developing tradition of American social history. But with the WCTU I struck out on a new direction, a path few if any had taken. Located in Australia and aware of the reach of the WCTU to my part of the world, I had researched in 1980-1981 and published in 1983 a pilot study on the WCTU in Australia and its international influences.<sup>11</sup> This provided an excellent background

for the study of the American and later the World's WCTU sources.<sup>12</sup>

In turn I was heartened by the Berkeley conference of 1984—which was comparative and cross-national. The sociology of alcohol was already necessarily concerned with cross-national comparisons of both consumption and control, so the work provided inspiration, and empirical detail of the history of prohibition and temperance in many countries whose languages I could not hope to encompass or master.<sup>13</sup>

By the late 1980s, my academic lifework as an advocate of transnational approaches to American history was set out. My research on the WCTU became a study of gender and imperialism, and of the cultural expansion of American reform institutions. Published in 1991 as *Woman's World/Woman's Empire*, I found myself being drawn into a debate about the boundaries of American history that coincided with the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the apparent acceleration of globalisation processes. Since *Women's World/Woman's Empire* was partly about the reciprocal effects of cultural expansion on the American women themselves, it fitted into the new transnational approach.<sup>14</sup> Because of the impact of this book and my article “American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History,”<sup>15</sup> I was once again deflected from my specialisation. Whereas earlier it had been opposition to specialist alcohol and temperance studies from within Australia that influenced my turn to American historiography, now the acceptance of transnational approaches *within* American historiography and the critique of American exceptionalism drew me once more away from my early specialist approach.

Henceforth I operated in the 1990s very much as a serial specialist, writing in turn books on Australian-Californian environmental reform, in part to show different aspects of the comparative and transnational themes in interplay,<sup>16</sup> and on smoking and anti-smoking in Australia. In both of these cases, however, temperance and alcohol studies provided path-

breaking leads to me, and illustrated the power of the field not simply to develop as a sub-field, but to influence others. Alcohol and temperance studies therefore continued to be part of my career, but more indirectly than hitherto. When in the 1990s I began studying the history of smoking, I did this in part because smoking was such a politically and legally charged question, a matter of considerable public importance, and I wanted to put perspective into the current debates. I was, however, drawn to the subject in the first place by the work of the WCTU, which had opposed the use of tobacco and other drugs. Through my study of the Australian WCTU I became aware of its Anti-Narcotics Department. I became convinced that there was considerable historical amnesia on this question of the perceived dangers of smoking and I proposed to show this. (In fact I had first contemplated a study of the history of smoking back in the early 1980s, but deferred the idea in favour of writing transnational history.) Of course it would have been a topic of wider interest had I chosen to do the American case, but I was also desirous of making a contribution to Australian history. I was sure that someone would turn to the topic of American tobacco and anti-tobacco, and with Cassandra Tate's work (and others) they did.<sup>17</sup> My own study depicted the anti- and pro-tobacco campaigns in tandem.

In studying this subject of smoking, too, I hoped that I was making good my claim in the Keynote Address to the 1993 International Congress on the Social History of Alcohol that historians of temperance should connect their work to wider fields in drug research. In fact they should contribute to those fields with concepts developed in the alcohol field, but appropriately modified. They would thereby be able to show broader, underlying trends in the development of drug policy and prohibition.<sup>18</sup>

By the end of the 1990s, with the publication of *Deadly Enemies: Tobacco and Its Opponents in Australia*,<sup>19</sup> I thought that my time working on drug and alcohol history was over. I had plans

to turn back to the study of American historiography. But fate again intervened. An email from Jack Blocker inviting me to participating in the editing of the *Alcohol and Temperance in Modern History* through ABC-Clio proved an offer too good to miss.<sup>20</sup> It would further my agenda to see temperance and alcohol questions transnationally and comparatively. Jack was insistent on the need for international perspective, and I supported him. We were fortunate to have been joined by the tireless and ever-knowledgeable David Fahey. The encyclopaedia shows strong cross-cultural appeals in drinking rituals and restrictions on drinking behaviour, moderated of course by many factors, and illustrates the importance of the temperance and alcohol questions across a whole range of societies. But the encyclopaedia also shows the imbalance in the academy between geographical areas studied, with country entries prevalent in most cases – or even regional/transnational entries – but many specialist entries for the United States. Thus, for example, we editors discovered that there was still no good general study of temperance and alcohol in India, despite the topic's immense importance, due to the complexity and variation in that huge nation. Africa remains understudied, despite outstanding recent work by Justin Willis and Charles Ambler, and for the Pacific Islands we rely on anthropologists. Some good work was clearly being done on Japan, but large parts of Asia remain a lacuna, for example Southeast Asia. For Australia we still await a study of the alcohol question based on deep understanding of the primary sources. Here the reason for the neglect of this sub-field are plainly related, as in the case of many other countries outside the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom, to the relatively small pool of professional historians. There just is not the volume of scholars to build up expertise in a country such as Australia with only thirty-eight universities compared to over three thousand colleges and universities in the United States.

Thanks to the efforts of the editors of the Encyclopaedia and its enthusiastic contributors, the transnational part of my

agenda outlined in 1993 seems to be about to be fulfilled, albeit unevenly and slowly; but until the 2004 International Conference on Drug and Alcohol History (ICDAH) less had been done on the drug parallels and connections. We have seen of course the very important cross-drug study of David Courtwright, in *Forces of Habit*, but much remains to be done.<sup>21</sup> For example, the prominent case of tobacco control today raises similar issues to that of alcohol prohibition, yet little has been done. Temperance historians are well equipped to comment on this particular case. My brief article for *SHAR* is about the only one that I could think of that addressed this issue up to 1999.<sup>22</sup>

Within the historical profession, alcohol studies have remained, as others have testified, somewhat marginalised. The shift of interest within the profession to new topics and subfields such as the history of women and the history of sexuality and, more recently, the ebbing of the high tide of social history as the predominant historical fashion have restricted the impact of the alcohol and temperance field. But the significance of alcohol issues has been enduring and one reason is the transnational character of the phenomena of commerce in alcohol, drinking customs, and the strategies of state control, including prohibition. My 1991 article on American exceptionalism in the *AHR* relied in part on the examples of prohibition and women's temperance, and the transnational focus of these movements was not contested at all. Readers and later commentators alike did not all agree with my overall argument, but they accept that the thrust of the temperance movement made it ideal for such transnational study.

Within itself, the alcohol and temperance history field has attained a certain stability of interpretation that resulted from the tide of scholarship in the 1970s and 1980s.<sup>23</sup> One thing that has made for stability in the profession in regard to the interpretation of alcohol questions has been the limited turnover of scholars. Most historians working on the topic took advanced degrees, like myself, by the early 1970s. They have advanced within academic life for twenty or thirty years, and few new positions were created.

As these people retire in the next ten years there will be an opportunity to renew the field. In the 1980s we lost some good people because not enough academic jobs were available. Yet recent contributions such as Catherine Murdock's *Domesticating Drink* illustrate the continuing vitality of the temperance and alcohol field in the United States.<sup>24</sup>

It is unlikely that this demographic shift will fail to challenge the existing orthodoxies to which I have contributed along with many others. Sea changes in historical interpretation in my view come along only rarely, and require major demographic, cultural and political shifts. Such was the shift of the 1960s that produced the work superseding John Allen Krout's 1925 classic, *The Origins of Prohibition*, which in turn reflected the cultural shifts of Progressivism, the first world war and its aftermath. With the internationalisation of historiographical influences, it is likely that a further change in interpretation will occur sometime in the next ten or fifteen years, but what direction it might take is difficult to predict. One trend might be further towards the history of manners, etiquette, and fashion, drawing upon theories of ritual and exchange. I took such a turn myself in studying the changing sensibilities concerning the rise and fall of approval of smoking as a social custom. Though these ideas draw upon the so-called new cultural history, the role of Gusfield's example in his "The Social Symbolism of Smoking" was closer to my aim.<sup>25</sup> Similar work could be done for alcohol and, in such works as Murdock's, we can see a preview of the possibilities.

Whatever way the field turns, I don't think that we should be disappointed that alcohol and temperance has not become a really prominent sub-field of history such as slavery became in the 1970s or women's history in the 1980s. The strength of alcohol and temperance studies remains its ability to make connections with other fields, to broaden the scope of the discipline of history while bringing in strong interdisciplinary insights from the sociology and anthropology of ritual, custom, and so on. In my experience,

the average historian of alcohol and temperance has been more widely read and more aware of what is going on in other fields than is often the case in American historiography. Perhaps because the field has had to position itself continually vis-a-vis other fields and justify itself in terms of the use that alcohol and temperance studies can be to understanding the broader sweep of history, we have been able to do a good job of avoiding the pitfalls of over-specialisation.

A good example of the outreach of temperance and alcohol studies has been the recent effort, during my current presidency of the Alcohol and Temperance History Group, to join alcohol studies to those of wider drug issues. This effort follows on from the stimulating work of two recent conferences on comparative and transnational alcohol and drugs history. One was organized by Dan Malleck and Greg Marquis in Canada; Jim Mills organized the other in Britain. With the decision to create the *Social History of Alcohol and Drugs: An Interdisciplinary Journal* to continue the *Social History of Alcohol Review*, the change in focus is nearly complete. The tandem decision of Northern Illinois University Press to start a series on drug and alcohol history is a further positive step in the same direction. Our group has now been renamed the *Alcohol and Drug History Society*. The aim will not be to obliterate distinctions between the effect of various drugs, their different treatments, and impacts on society. It will rather be to recognise the historical evolution of the ways that we have treated drugs differently—to explore common patterns and discontinuities. The future now looks bright for this evolving field.

*University of New South Wales*  
i.tyrrell@unsw.edu.au

NOTES

1. Frank L. Byrne, *Prophet of Prohibition: Neal Dow and his Crusade* (Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1969).
2. Joseph R. Gusfield, *Symbolic Crusade: Status Politics and the American Temperance Movement* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1963).
3. W.J. Rorabaugh, *The Alcoholic Republic: An American Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979).
4. Ian Tyrrell, *Sobering Up: From Temperance to Prohibition in Antebellum America, 1800-1860* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1979).
5. John J. Rumberger, *Profits, Power, and Prohibition: Alcohol Reform and the Industrializing of America, 1800-1930* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989).
6. Ian Tyrrell, "Temperance and Economic Change in the Antebellum North," in J. Blocker, ed., *Alcohol, Reform and Society: The Liquor Issue in Social Context* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1979), 45-68.
7. Gar Dillon, *A Delusion of the Australian Culture: A Brief History of the Clash with Alcohol in New South Wales 1788-1983* (Sydney South, N.S.W.: N.S.W. Temperance Alliance, 1985; Keith Dunstan, *Wowsers* (1968; Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1974).
8. *The Absent Marx: Class Analysis and Liberal History in Twentieth-Century America* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1986).
9. Ian Tyrrell, "Women and Temperance in Antebellum America, 1830-1860," *Civil War History* 28 (Summer 1982): 128-152.
10. Jed Dannenbaum, "The Origins of Temperance Activism and Militancy Among American Women," *Journal of Social History* 15 (No. 2, 1981): 235-252; *Drink and Disorder: Temperance Reform in Cincinnati from the Washingtonian Revival to the WCTU* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984), ch. 8.
11. Ian Tyrrell, "International Aspects of the Woman's Temperance Movement in Australia: The Influence of the American WCTU, 1882-1914," *Journal of Religious History* 12 (June 1983): 284-304. See also my "Sara Susan Nolan,"

in *Australian Dictionary of Biography* 11 (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1988): 37.

12. Additional material in the form of microfilm came from New Zealand and Canada.

13. Susanna Barrows and Robin Room, eds., *Drinking: Behavior and Belief in Modern History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990).

14. Ian Tyrrell, *Woman's World/Woman's Empire: The Woman's Christian Temperance Union in International Perspective* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991). See also "Temperance, Feminism and the WCTU: Recent Interpretations and New Directions," *Australasian Journal of American Studies* 5 (December 1986): 27-36; "Prohibition, American Cultural Expansion, and the New Hegemony in the 1920s: An Interpretation," *Histoire Sociale/Social History* 27 (November 1994): 413-445.

15. Ian Tyrrell, "American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History," *American Historical Review* 96 (October 1991): 1031-1055.

16. Leading protagonists in the story I was telling, the leaders of the Californian land reform in the late nineteenth century, were pro-temperance. Ian Tyrrell, *True Gardens of the Gods: Californian-Australian Environmental Reform, 1860-1930* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).

17. Cassandra Tate, *Cigarette Wars: The Triumph of "The Little White Slaver"* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).

18. Ian Tyrrell, "Tasks and Achievements in Alcohol and Temperance Historiography," in Jack S. Blocker and Cheryl Lynn Krasnick Warsh, eds., *The Changing Face of Drink: Substance, Imagery and Behaviour* (Ottawa: Histoire Sociale-Social History, 1997), 381-401.

19. Ian Tyrrell, *Deadly Enemies: Tobacco and its Opponents in Australia* (Kensington: University of New South Wales Press, 1999).

20. Jack S. Blocker, Jr., David M. Fahey, and Ian R. Tyrrell, eds., *Alcohol and Temperance in Modern History: An International Encyclopedia* (2 vols., Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2003).

21. David T. Courtwright, *Forces of Habit: Drugs and the Making of the Modern World* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001).

22. Ian Tyrrell, "The Temperance Movement and Smoking in Australia: Themes and Implications for the Study of Drugs and Social Reform Movements," *Social History of Alcohol Review*, 38-39 (Fall 2000); see also Ian Tyrrell, "The Anti-Tobacco Reform and the Temperance Movement in Australia: Connections and Differences," *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society* 84 (June 1998): 10-25.
23. Ian Tyrrell, "The US Prohibition 'Experiment': Myths, History, and Implications," *Addiction* 92:11 (1997): 1405-1409.
24. Catherine Gilbert Murdock, *Domesticating Drink: Women, Men, and Alcohol in America, 1870-1940* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998).
25. Joseph Gusfield, "The Social Symbolism of Smoking" in *Smoking Policy: Law, Politics, and Culture*, ed. S. Sugarman and R. Rabin (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).