
Reviewed by Pamela E. Pennock, University of Michigan-Dearborn.

At first glance, David Herzberg’s *Happy Pills: From Miltown to Prozac* and Andrea Tone’s *The Age of Anxiety: A History of America’s Turbulent Affair with Tranquilizers,* published just a month apart, are remarkably similar books. Each covers the period from the 1950s to the present and treats the American experience with meprobamates (Miltown), benzodiazepines (Valium) and anti-depressant SSRIs (Prozac) in chronological order. Both historians begin by stating that their studies are not narrow histories of medicine or technology but rather place medical or pharmaceutical developments in a cultural context, asserting that they are most interested in exploring the stories of the people who sold, prescribed, and used the drugs, and in the larger American cultural contexts that informed their motives and behaviors. Furthermore, both Herzberg and Tone assert that, as cultural historians, they are not interested in whether the incidence of anxiety and depression was actually rising in the postwar period, or if the tranquilizers prescribed for these conditions were actually necessary or effective.

And yet, while taking the same general trajectory and approach, the two studies are in no way carbon copies of one another. They share different pieces of evidence and follow some different paths of analysis, although these differences are largely complementary and not conflicting. Overall, Herzberg’s *Happy Pills* is the more compelling and sophisticated of the two studies.

Tone’s *Age of Anxiety* seems to be aimed at a more general audience than Herzberg’s book, and one mark of this approach is her frequent incorporation of stories about the individual scientists, psychiatrists, and businessmen involved in the tranquilizer trade. *Age of Anxiety* also recounts the Hollywood popularity of the blockbuster drug Miltown in the 1950s, providing anecdotes about celebrities such as Lauren Bacall, Lucille Ball, Milton Berle, and even Salvador Dali – stories that do not show up in Herzberg’s account – to buttress her claim about “Miltown mania.” Tone’s central arguments about the popularity of Miltown and similar tranquilizers in the 1950s are that the anti-anxiety drugs must be seen in the context of “a culture suffused with atomic anxiety” (94), as well as a nation in the throes of a consumer convenience mentality, and that we must recognize that patients were not victims of psychiatrists foisting these drugs upon them but that patients sought out these pharmacological panaceas during that “golden age of applied science” (81). She argues that in this Cold War culture, the American public was making a connection “between tranquilizers and social stability” (116). Tone’s account of Miltown also illuminates developments in the psychiatry profession, including the shift from Freudian psychoanalysis to “a biochemical model”
(80), and the expansion of the pharmaceutical industry, with emphasis on its marketing strategies.

Tone’s treatment of the subsequent development of benzodiazepines, with a concentration on Librium, focuses on a descriptive history of the pharmaceutical firm Hoffman-LaRoche. Despite some early scientific reports about addiction risks, she argues, both doctors and patients were enthusiastic about the “benzo” drugs throughout the 1960s. She also includes a discussion of the ongoing shift to biological psychiatry, and how the American Psychiatric Association’s revised Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders in 1980 (DSM-III) contributed “to the view that anxiety is a biochemical disorder of the brain” (166). But the downside to “the medicalization of anxiety,” Tone asserts, was a “social veiling” and stigmatization of what had been a “quasi-public” and fashionable experience in the Miltown era (168).

Age of Anxiety proceeds to examine the controversies over benzos in the 1970s and 1980s, incorporating factors such as federal government regulation of controlled substances, the feminist movement, the consumer movement, and media coverage. Although sympathetic to patients who did suffer from addiction to the drugs, Tone is implicitly critical of the extent of the “benzo backlash” and the “reigning punitive mind-set” that it produced (203-4).

The last and briefest part of the book looks at SSRIs in the 1990s and specifically examines panic disorder and Xanax, and Social Anxiety Disorder and Paxil, but barely examines panic disorder and Xanax, and Social Anxiety Disorder and Paxil, but barely

David Herzberg’s Happy Pills does not pick up on these final discussions that appear in Tone’s book, but his section on Prozac is well-researched and features nuanced analysis of gender, social class, racial, and consumerist themes. This type of rigorous analysis is indicative of Herzberg’s approach through the entire book. He succeeds at elucidating some complicated cultural processes and interactions by using cultural theory in an engaging and clearly written way, stressing multiple players and cultural agendas, as well as their unpredictability. His discussion of Miltown in the 1950s, like Tone’s, emphasizes patients’ consumer desires, but he much more deeply engages ideas about agency, self-fulfillment, and especially the postwar crisis of the “organization man,” showing that, in fact, tranquilizers were controversial at the time because they represented a “consumerist threat to masculinity” (66). Herzberg also presents some novel interpretations of women and tranquilizers in the 1950s and 1960s, for example pointing out the irony that Miltown’s advertisements that emphasized unhappy housewives and portrayed the drug as a panacea for them can actually be seen as reinforcing Betty Friedan’s message that housewives were discontented. He writes, “the notion that tranquilizers and antidepressants were women’s drugs served a variety of agendas, from selling drugs, to supporting the normative housewifely role, to opposing that same role” (81).

Two inter-related themes of Herzberg’s book that will especially interest drug and alcohol historians are how meanings of addiction changed over the postwar period, and
how the emergence of these prescription tranquilizers both challenged and reinforced the public’s ideas about “the hard and fast lines between medicines and dope” (84). As with gender, class, and consumer culture analysis, these are ideas that appear in Tone’s *Age of Anxiety* but are much more successfully investigated and explicated in *Happy Pills*. By placing the Valium panic in the context of older drug panics (including the recent barbiturate scare), the middle-class drug scene of the 1960s, the emergence of the disease model of addiction and the modern alcoholism movement, and changes in government regulation, he shows how the public’s concerns about the addictive qualities of legal tranquilizers prescribed for “respectable” patients “challenged the punitive logic of the 20th century’s war against drugs” (124). Yet he is quick to point out that the stories told about Valium “did not ultimately break free of the race and class politics of the antidrug tradition” because Valium users were portrayed as innocent victims, and ultimately the critical depictions of tranquilizers did not “reorient the war against drugs” (124). Herzberg’s examination of the feminist movement’s criticism of tranquilizers in the 1970s is similarly nuanced. He argues that when feminists seized on the anti-Valium panic, they “redeployed the powerful cultural tools of the antidrug genre for their own agendas… to sensationalize addiction among affluent white women as a central symbol of sexism” (124).

*Happy Pills’* analysis of Prozac nicely employs all of the themes developed thus far in the book, showing how the drug fit into the privileged, white, and female “demographics of the nervous illness tradition” and how the promotion of Prozac as a consumer product “positioned the drug in the nexus where medicine met commerce in ways that appeared to give pill takers, not doctors, real authority” (176-77). Most interestingly, Herzberg argues that Prozac was designed to be portrayed as the “anti-Valium.” Mass media represented it as a major departure in pharmacology that allowed for precise controlling of the brain to create perfect selves, and Prozac’s marketing used the character of the supermom, “replacing narratives of addiction and enforced conformity [associated with Valium and before that Miltown] with liberating tales of choice and empowerment” (182). Still, he argues, it would be wrong to characterize Prozac as a feminist drug because it was addressed to only privileged white mothers (juxtaposing crack mothers with Prozac mothers) and because it sent the “message that the nation’s women needed medical treatment, not political change” (188). All in all, the meanings of the Miltown, Valium, and Prozac are slippery, he observes, because they served as a “complex symbol of the promises and perils of seeking a middle-class psychological standard of living,” and while the drugs could be “an agent of liberation,” they could also function as a “tool of conformity” (191).

Herzberg concludes his book with a helpful conclusion that features a plea for changes in America’s attitudes toward drugs, arguing that we have created “demonstrably false categories of drug problems” and we must challenge “the distinctions between street and medical drug use” in order to “mobilize the forces of political relief rather than punishment” (201). While Andrea Tone’s *Age of Anxiety* is an effective book that shares valuable pieces of information, Herzberg’s accessible book is the more intellectually satisfying and analytically sophisticated of these two recent studies. Together, both illuminate complex cultural, scientific, and political processes that have produced America’s complicated relationship with tranquilizers over the last 60 years.

Reviewed by Susanne MacGregor, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine and University of London.

In the past thirty years, and especially in the last ten, there has been a phenomenal growth in research and publications in the field of illicit drugs. Unhappily, there has been no commensurate rise in the public understanding of drugs and drug-taking and very little impact on policy. How to account for this paradox? Axel Klein offers some important explanations in this excellent new book.

Clearly written and nicely produced, the book is distinctive in its approach. Klein is a medical anthropologist at the University of Kent and has worked previously as a development consultant for international agencies. He draws on his field trips to the Caribbean, West Africa and the South Caucasus to illustrate insights informed also by his wide reading and sure grasp of social theory. Adopting a comparative and historical approach and exercising sound judgement, Klein argues strongly and consistently that the prohibitionist stance in policy, while counterproductive in its effects, maintains its predominance because it serves the interests of an expanding international drug control bureaucracy, as well as, at national level, certain interests of state control and professional advancement.

While drug control was introduced to protect core American values of the dignity of man and freedom and to help people avoid falling into addiction and losing control of their lives, “in the process many far more concrete liberties have been sacrificed, and the powers of the state have been strengthened exponentially. The policy of incarcerating people to protect their freedom, tenuous to start with, has become a grotesque perversion of public policy” (194). “While it is increasingly clear that the costs of prohibition are outweighing the benefits, there is no shift in policy in view, with policy makers shrugging off critical voices” (ibid). This is because, Klein argues, an alternative set of advice and data is on tap from the drug control establishment, “a dynamic, well-endowed internal lobby with a strong institutional base in the UN and at national level. Professionals working for the drug control industry have no interests in dismantling the machinery that provides benefits and prestige” (ibid).

The book is thematically organised with eleven chapters, beginning with a discussion of the phenomenon of drug use and drug-taking and ideas and evidence about its pathology and possible benefits, and ending by recovering the notion of pleasure, too much absent from orthodox discourses. In a work of considerable synthesis which never loses sight of its main argument, chapters review comparative and historical evidence on drugs, offering a welcome sociological approach in a field more often dominated by individualistic and behaviourist notions. So concepts such as status, power, conflict, social organisation, state interest, symbolic meaning, prestige and bureaucracy are employed to inform the analysis in a persuasive account which ranges widely and lives up to the ambitions of the title *Drugs and The World*. The links between drugs, modernity (and post-modernity) and ideas of development are explored with an interesting discussion of how the “drug problem” became a world issue at the very core of international relations as it moved out from its original location in North America and Europe to encompass the globe.

Klein also explores the complicated relationship between public health and criminal justice approaches to drug use. In recent years the public health approach has been identified by some with the concept of harm minimisation and seen as opposing the dominant prohibitionist and abstinence based model. Yet the two share features of
state intervention and control and in the drugs field are both contained within the limits set by international conventions. The association of public health with the good society sets norms for personal and public behaviour which are policed by both health professionals and police officers and courts. Most recently in a number of countries, the close linking of treatment interventions to the criminal justice system has further sealed this unholy alliance. “The dual notions of the addiction disease and the drug epidemic continue to provide key concepts in the conceptual foundation of the drug control regime” (64).

Klein also helps to cast light on a further important question in the political sociology of drugs – the way in which illicit drug-taking seems often to be linked to the corruption of public institutions. This one fact of the corrosion of the public realm presents a huge challenge to the goal of spreading western democracy around the globe, as for example currently in Afghanistan. Simply put, however, it is not the drug-taking but the definition “illicit” which creates the context in which organised crime can flourish and use violence to enforce rules in areas beyond and beneath the state. In the Caribbean for instance “it is the very policy of penalization of drug use, and the criminalization of drug users, that is overburdening the criminal justice system and straining social relations” (150). Similarly, in the United States, the control of drug use serves another function in controlling a marginalized (and historically subject) group: “the number of African-Americans imprisoned for drug offences is ten times the number of Caucasians even though prevalence surveys testify a higher level of drug use among the latter” (130).

Finally, just to indicate the breadth of material covered in this delightful book, I will mention how Klein draws on physical anthropology to reflect how the origins of man may be integrally bound to psychoactive substances. How did the early hominid, a comparatively weak and vulnerable creature, climb to the top of the food chain? The rise of homo sapiens around 100,000 years ago may be explained by the psychedelic mushroom. Dung-loving mushrooms, growing in the droppings of ungulate herds traversing the African plain, when eaten in low levels by humans had the effect of increasing their visual acuity and giving them an advantage as hunter-gatherers. Taken in larger quantities, they would catalyze consciousness and initiate self-reflection. Significantly, “human language forming ability may have become active through the mutagenic influence of hallucinogens” (McKenna quoted by Klein, 77). Thus the link between the human capacity for language and the creation myth present in many religions, the essence of human society as Durkheim explained: “In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God, and the Word was God” (St John 1:1).

Modern western societies have aimed through reason and science to liberate humanity from ignorance and dictatorship. However, attitudes to “poisonous substances” and the effects of the international drug control industry illustrate the dark side of the Enlightenment. In spite of this, its ideals are noble ones. By writing this illuminating book, Axel Klein has made a major contribution to improving public understanding, without which no progress can be made.


Throughout human history and social life, drug use has occurred, originating from the use of plant materials and progressing to chemical manipulation. Debate around
what is acceptable substance use and what is not has shifted over time. Consistently throughout history problematising discourses around substance use have centred on concerns such as crime, risk and addiction, and have rarely focused on intoxication. Angus Bancroft has produced a crucial piece of work, which offers the reader insight into the pleasures and gains to be had from intoxication.

Chapter one starts by defining drug use in society and considers intoxication as a practice through a detailed look at history and culture. Drug taking behaviour is found to be not a meaningless act, but a practice embedded in structures shaping social life. Bancroft aims to explain how certain drugs acquire immoral notoriety whilst others are hailed as “cures.” He argues that the status attached to drugs are the result of a process of social power rather than chemistry.

Chapter two continues to lead the reader through a historical journey of substance use and concludes that history offers insight to how present day substances have evolved and continue to develop. The chapter describes historical narratives that have formed and defined drug and alcohol problems as public problems for the modern era. Bancroft illustrates past eras of substance use and contrasts this with the modern condition – where drug-taking behaviour requires surveillance and intervention.

Chapter three proposes that intoxication is more than a merely pharmacological experience and is shaped by the individual’s expectations, experiences, culture and environment. It looks at how substance users learn to use different substances for different purposes and eradicates the notion that the chemical make-up of drugs is solely responsible for the generation of pleasure or pain.

Chapter four describes how substances offer chemical solutions for social problems and argues that problematic substance use is an extension of normalised use. Bancroft attempts to demarcate between recreational and problematic use – the familiar and the dangerous – and portrays how some substances come to be defined as problems and others do not. The chapter contends that discourses around substance use act to hide underlying contributing factors to use.

Chapter five progresses to consider the different methods and opportunities for intervention – from regulatory practice (prohibition and legislation) to the government of self (that is, ultimately, we have control over what we put in our bodies). Bancroft concludes that regulatory practice has defined some substances (and therefore their users) as social problems which have legitimised social control. This has resulted in stigmatisation of the most vulnerable.

In Chapter six the book’s historical discussion of drugs leads to a point where Bancroft can portend towards a new era in substance use: the idea of the “pharmaceutical society” that extensively uses drugs to “enhance and direct rather than to treat.” Lifestyle drug use has become extensive and society now seeks ways in which to ease the stresses and strains of the complex demands made on the individual. In this chapter Bancroft takes a look at psychopharmacology and cites the drugs Viagra and Ritalin to show how the onus is on the individual to deal with public problems on a private level.

The final chapter reminds us that drugs are commodified objects, part of material culture holding both symbolic and economic value and which allow transformation of self. Bancroft contends that self-transformation has become part of everyday life. On a daily basis we have to negotiate through a world of advertisements encouraging us to buy into products that have the potential to revolutionise our lives – transporting the user to an enhanced state of being. Substances (from coffee to heroin) are social substances and intoxication is a social practice.
Throughout the book Bancroft’s work is supported by case studies, stories and historical perspectives and includes excerpts from fiction ranging from Coleridge to Homer Simpson. These fictional interludes provide fascinating insight into the changing perceptions of substance use and usefully act as a reminder that drugs have been part of culture for a considerable period of time. As a researcher in the field of illicit drug use and a specialist treatment practitioner, I found the book refreshingly different. There are facts, statements and quotations that I will make a note of to inform my treatment sessions with young clients. My favourite and perhaps the most pertinent quotation that is included in the book reads “In the 60’s, people took LSD to make the world weird. Now the world is weird and people take Prozac to make it normal” (150).

Much has been written about the control, regulation of drugs and ensuing policy decisions. This book goes some way to redress the balance by providing an account of people’s experiences, how users can find pleasure, comfort and creative insight from intoxication. It provides a non-reactionary, equable account of substance use that moves beyond drug related moral panic and taboo. The notion of a “pharmaceutical society” means that coffee, tea and cola drinkers, aspirin, paracetamol and chocolate users are made to face up to their substance use as the result of clever commodification wherein the consumer is made aware of a problem they didn’t know they had. Such substance use is shown to be analogous with less socially accepted types of drug use. This book will appeal to students across the social sciences, academics and practitioners and heralds a move towards an understanding of intoxication as intrinsically linked to the modern condition – policy makers take note.


Reviewed by Virginia Berridge, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine.

We might think that the subjects of addiction as a concept, and drugs in literature, are both pretty well-worn in the canon of substance literature. Nothing much new could be said about them. Susan Zieger’s book indicates this is not the case. Her central question is articulated at the outset. What do the common tropes and themes of addiction narratives have to tell us about the way the concept functioned in public culture? Addiction, and its change as a concept in literature, in her view functioned in a way which was emblematic of changing conceptualizations of Anglo American selfhood, freedom and identity.

Zieger identifies a transatlantic framing of addiction and its metaphors which changed over time. Addiction was a contingent social idea and also a lived reality. To unpick this change of conceptualization, she utilizes a set of writings not always associated with the standard canon of “drug literature.” So the book deals with *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, *Dracula* and Marryat’s *The Blood of the Vampire*, alongside the more traditional addiction literature of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. She identifies moments when addiction and the addict became newly visible through changes in the narratives and metaphors used in describing them.

The book’s first half, “Travel, Exile and Self Enslavement,” shows how the addict was ethically enslaved in a new world of consumption. In *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* the metaphor of intemperance as self enslavement created two figures, the sodden vicious slave master and the drunken slave. She traces the emergence of the contrast between white
susceptibility to drugs and “simplistic black conviviality.”

In the second half of the book, subtitled “Disease, Desire and Defect,” addiction is located within new late nineteenth century configurations of gender, sexuality and race. Gender and sexuality first. The idea that women were becoming secret drunkards and addicts, not just the wives of the same, showed ideas about women’s addictions as unfolding in private, while men’s consumption was on public view. Ziegler relates this to emergent ideas about homosexuality at this time: she underlines that the depiction of this “private vice” began to resemble same sex desire. In her chapter on Jekyll and Hyde she again relates “queer desire” and “addicted desire.”

The final shift in the book is from disease related to deviance, to racial defect under the discourses of degeneration and eugenics from the 1890s. Vampirism is linked to addiction in that it was characterized as a habitual compulsion. There is a fascinating dissection of the content of Dracula in this light. The book ends, rather oddly, linking Dracula with the emergence of international drug control in the early twentieth century. American imperialism as personified in this system, changed concepts of addiction towards the medical non-medical divide and a focus on ideas of criminality.

The book is based on wide reading but it is not an easy read. Its ideas are densely expressed in the in-house language of cultural history. Nevertheless the domiant ideas are interesting and give a new take on some familiar themes. I particularly liked the relationship of desire and addiction and the discussion of vampirism and compulsion which is well done. Her conflation of Britain and the US in this argument needs greater justification than it has here. Was race such a major theme within public concepts of addiction as expressed though literature in Britain? There, the concept of the Chinese opium smoker in literature would need to be explored alongside the US located drunken slave of Uncle Tom’s Cabin. Or is Ziegler arguing that the widespread international distribution of this US book ensured that its concepts were also applicable in cultures outside that of the US? Was this the beginning of a global culture expressed through literature? Ziegler seems more confident on US ground and her statements – for example that in both the US and Britain drug use had a greater relationship with criminality in the 1920s (5) – do not always stand up to scrutiny. Nonetheless this is an interesting book which articulates new ideas about addiction through the changing culture of the nineteenth century. Could a sequel look at the change post international control in the twentieth century?


Reviewed by Alex Mold, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine.

In *Drug Use and Social Change: The Distortion of History* Michael Shiner sets out to answer one of the key questions raised about trends in illegal drug taking over the last fifty years: why is there so much more drug use today than there was in the recent past? To unravel this complex problem, Shiner primarily makes use of data and theoretical perspectives deriving from criminological research, but he also attempts to locate this work within a historical context. Relying heavily on two key studies of young people and their drug habits, the British Crime Survey (1998) and the Youth Lifestyles Survey (1998/9), Shiner presents an analysis of who takes drugs, why they start and why they stop. He then uses this data as a jumping off point to draw wider conclusions about the growth of drug taking in post-industrial societies. There is, he suggests, a profound
sense of amnesia around drugs, that “All too often drug use is treated as though it has no past, with all the attendant distortions and lacunae that this involves” (1). This is a sentiment drug historians are sure to agree with, but it rapidly becomes clear that the “distortion of history” Shiner is concerned with is less about the past and its interpretations, and more about a perceived distortion of recent patterns in drug use.

At its core, this book is a critique of the normalization thesis of drug use. The notion of the “normalized” drug taker rose to prominence in Britain during the 1990s, principally through the work of Howard Parker, Fiona Meacham and Judith Aldridge.

Based on studies which suggested that somewhere between a quarter and a half of all British young people had taken an illegal substance, Parker and his colleagues contended that by the late 1990s drug use was no longer a deviant, sub-cultural activity; instead this had moved towards the mainstream of youth culture. Shiner seems to take issue with both parts of this thesis: firstly he argues that drug use was not always confined to a deviant minority in the past; and secondly, he suggests that it is not necessarily “normal” for young people to use drugs now. To make this case, he returns to some early work on the criminology of drug use, particularly Jock Young’s *The Drugtakers* (1971). Young drew on elements of the “new deviancy” theory to assert that drug taking represented a meaningful choice, and that such rule breaking was commonplace rather than exceptional. Drug use, as Shiner points out, was a key part of the counter-culture of the 1960s and 1970s, a subculture which was made up of large numbers of middle-class, well-educated and generally well-adjusted young people. In this way, drug taking was already, to some extent, “normalized.” At same time, Shiner argues, this did not mean that drug use was, or is, a universal experience of adolescence. The data he presents indicates that only around 20 percent of young people today take drugs regularly, and the vast majority just use cannabis. Moreover, drug taking is bounded by gender, race, and age: women are less likely to be drug users than men; ethnic minorities take far fewer drugs than whites; and once young people reach their mid twenties, their consumption of illegal substances tends to decline. This suggests that there was no paradigm shift between “deviant” drug use in the 1960s and “normal” drug use today – instead Shiner sees these episodes as part of a continuum of drug taking stretching back into prehistory.

What is different about drug use today, however, is the scale on which drugs are consumed. In part, Shiner explains, this is due to increased availability. Drugs have become global products, accounting for approximately eight per cent of all world trade, which is more than iron and steel. On the other side of the equation, there have also been changes that have facilitated a growth in demand. Shiner asserts that the cultural revolution of the 1960s and deindustrialisation in the West “combined to accentuate the motives behind drug use, to provide the means and opportunity for realising them, and to relax the controls that might otherwise have held them in check” (159). A cult of individualism, greater amounts of free time and the commodification of leisure have, he suggests, helped to produce a more hedonistic lifestyle of which drug use is a part.

This seems like a plausible answer to the central question posed about the post-war upswing in drug use, but where this book falls down is in its rather shallow use and understanding of history. Despite his stated desire to locate drug taking within its historical context, Shiner makes little attempt to outline the history of drug control and regulation or distinguish between the different histories of various substances. Where historical parallels are drawn, these tend to be under-developed. Much more could be said, for example, about the nature of drug panics from the gin craze of the eighteenth century, to cocaine in the 1920s, and ecstasy in the 1990s. There is, of course, a pleth-
ora of historical analysis that could be applied here, but Shiner does not appear to have made use of the work of many historians. Indeed, it becomes clear in the conclusion that the history he thinks we can learn from concerns past sociological approaches to drugs, especially the work of Young, and not the past itself. As a work of history then, this book is clearly flawed, but as an analysis of very recent trends in drug taking it is much more successful.

ENDNOTES


Reviewed by Elaine Frantz Parsons, Duquesne University.

Gene M. Heyman’s monograph is the newest challenge to the disease hypothesis. Heyman argues that the understanding of addiction to alcohol and other drugs as a disease lacks a coherent scientific basis, fails to explain the fact that many addicts do recover without treatment, and leads to ineffective treatment regimes. Instead, he makes a case that addictive behavior is fundamentally tied to users’ discreet processes of decision-making. This understanding predicts spontaneous cessation when external factors make use significantly less attractive and suggests that rehabilitation is best aimed at tilting the scale against use by making use less attractive, or sobriety more attractive, and by encouraging users not to simply consider the consequences of a single use, but also the longer-term consequences of larger patterns of use.

As its title reveals, the book claims that addiction should be thought of not as a disease, but as “a disorder of choice.” At its heart is an attempt to reframe the popular idea of “voluntary behavior” so that it encompasses and explains addictive behavior. (116) The book focuses on each discreet choice that a user makes to take drugs. Each choice is based on an informal calculation of whether using would be preferable to not using. An individual who thinks of an individual choice as part of a pattern of use choices that he or she will make for, say, the month, “global accounting,” will either choose abstinence or infrequent, controlled use (“chipping”). The individual who only thinks about the impact of this choice on this day, “local accounting,” however, is likely to frequently choose drug use. Particularly if a sober day would entail dealing with withdrawal and other consequences of previous use, drug use is often preferable to a user for a given day.

The tension between “local” and “global” accounting explains why certain substances, such as opiates and alcohol, are particularly addictive. They are “behaviorally toxic,” in that using them lowers the value of other competing activities. Their rewards are immediate and certain, while their costs tend to be uncertain and delayed. Unlike, say, fatty food, indulgence in drugs does not “cause fatigue or satiation,” which might lower the value of the next episode of use. Finally, the intoxication caused by drugs tends to undermine the user’s ability to make more complex long-term (global) calculations of their interests (144-47). All of these factors increase the relative attractiveness of the next episode of drug use, and therefore constitute the “addictive” quality of certain drugs.

Heyman does not deny the research showing that some people have a biological predisposition to addiction. Rather, he suggests (though he acknowledges that scientific
evidence is still weak on this point) that certain individuals may have a genetic tendency to make calculations based on short-term rather than long-term (local rather than global) calculations. Heyman also suggests that religious views and attitudes about the importance of following rules, both of which influence addiction, might have genetic components (94). Still, while these factors may make it more likely that a given individual will choose drug use, use is nevertheless a choice.

As a historian interested in the evolution of cultural ideas about addiction and choice, I am not able to evaluate Heyman’s ambitious clinical claims. I did find, however, that Heyman’s book was at its weakest when he moved outside of his clinical background and into the history of the idea of addiction as a disease. His first and second chapters begin with an effort to provide a historical and trans-cultural framework for the addiction debate, but the effort is so unsystematic, and so thinly sourced – hurtling through the Neolithic period, Homer, Parcellsus, Benjamin Rush, the Opium Wars, the Harrison Narcotics Act – that it was more a collage of potentially relevant facts than a coherent account. As a historian, I was also struck by Heyman’s casual use of historical sources: showing that opium smokers were stigmatized in the nineteenth century, Heyman rightly cites David Courtwright, but then points the reader to the film McCabe and Mrs. Miller. (6) He bases his claim about the prevalence and social acceptability of opium and heroin use in Vietnam during the war on “According to novels and movies (e.g., Apocalypse Now)” (30).

Heyman’s innocent use of popular cultural sources extends beyond his historical framing and into his case studies. The book would have benefitted from the use of stories that had not been preselected by the media precisely because they fit into widespread cultural ideas about addiction. So, for instance, I am skeptical about Heyman’s decision to feature a StoryCorps story broadcast on Morning Edition as an illustration of cost of drug abuse to families and to rely on published autobiographies of drug users, including William Burroughs, to discuss the experience of addiction (47, 51-52). Heyman also slips into talking about these stories as if their value was more anecdotal. After giving an account of one man who quit cocaine, Heyman writes “Taken literally, his story predicts that most heavy cocaine users will quit by their early thirties” (59). Of course Heyman is not in fact simplistically claiming that his anecdotes are scientifically meaningful, but the book too often refers to anecdotal or popular cultural examples as though they were or were equivalent to scientific evidence.

This book is written for a general audience: Heyman clearly hopes that this book will do some cultural work, convincing readers of the fallacies of the disease model. Its weaknesses emerge from its attempt to connect with a broader readership by mentioning common cultural reference points and avoiding technical phrasing. Yet since much of the book is about how society has come to a faulty understanding of the nature of addiction, the use of popular cultural sources as though they were unmediated expressions of the experience of drug use is problematic.

Notwithstanding these weaknesses in its cultural framing, this book is a compelling and fascinating addition to the literature opposing the disease model of addiction. Creatively bringing together a broad array of often-little-discussed experimental results, secondary literature, and popular cultural texts, Heyman articulates and advocates for the scientific and practical advantages of conceiving of addiction as a problem with the process through which drug users make their decisions rather than as a disease that eliminates the possibility of choice.

Reviewed by Stephen Snelders, VU-University Medical Centre, Amsterdam.

There is a singular lack of historical awareness and understanding of past developments in the fields of drug policy and the prevention and treatment of addiction and substance abuse. One is struck by the extent to which past experiences in defining and dealing with “drug problems” are not a matter of serious analysis to professionals and politicians. They seem to prefer to see the past in terms of some enduring myths. To a cynical observer this would not be surprising. Treatment of drug addiction at the start of the twenty-first century, after all, has become “big business.” As Alex Mold reminds us in her new study of the history of treatment of heroin addiction in Britain, more than half a million pounds are spent annually in that country alone on drug treatment services – meeting the problems of 300,000 drug users. In addition, addiction (or “dependence”) over the last years has become an imperialistic concept that seeks to encompass all kinds of behaviors that some people have trouble with, including tobacco smoking, gambling, and even having sex and buying clothes. It is obvious that one has to present oneself in this arena as someone with new, daring, innovating ideas that will, at last, make some headway.

It is the significant achievement of Mold’s study that her historical analysis of ideas and practices on heroin addiction treatment in Britain since the First World War challenges present-day myths on three important points. First, new approaches were not always that new. Underneath all the changes within and expansion of medical treatment, such as the development of the Drug Dependence Units (DDU) within the National Health Service since 1968, a few themes have remained the same. Discussions of the proper method of treatment, and especially whether one should go for short-term withdrawal (as generally favored in British public practice) or maintenance and long-term “building off” of the addiction (more often favored in private practice) were there in the 1920s and show little signs of disappearing. Another theme is the power struggle within the medical field over who is the most competent to administer treatment. The “psychiatrisation” of addiction, again connected to the psychiatric specialists of the DDU, seemed to win the field in the 1970s. However, in the 1980s, the generalist in the form of the GP made a comeback, which coincided with a renewed interest in biographical medicine.

The second myth that Mold’s analysis challenges is that of the so often perceived dichotomy between “medical” and “moral” approaches of addiction, between seeing addiction as a disease or as a vice. Though Mold starts out by looking for these different approaches, their boundaries turn out to be blurred in history. In fact, she concludes that there has been a continuous interplay between criminal justice and medical treatment approaches from the 1920s to the present day. This conclusion accords with the findings of other drug historians (including myself) and it poses the question whether the disease-vice dichotomy has not always been little more than a rhetorical trick in presenting oneself in the drug field.

This is closely connected with a third myth that Mold expressly debunks: the myth of the “British system,” a liberal drug treatment policy (compared to the repressive policies in the United States) based on the Rolleston Committee report of 1926. Following the appearance of this report, addiction is supposed to have been seen as a disease, not as a vice, and maintenance, i.e. long term-prescription of opiates, remained possible. Following earlier observations by Virginia Berridge, Mold shows that this
“system” was less enlightened policy than the result of the characteristics of the group of addicts in Britain until the 1960s. Not only were they very small in number (registered addicts since 1935 did not exceed 700, were still only 2,000 in 1977, and rose to 10,000 in 1987), they tended to be middle-class adults, not the drop-out youth of the 1970s and 1980s. The extent of liberalism in drug policy, Mold confirms, is closely connected to our perception of the drug users.

Mold succeeds in reaching her conclusions by a fairly straightforward historical empirical approach. Her detailed analysis of discussions around heroin treatment is primarily based on archival sources from the Ministry of Health, the Medical Research Council, and so on, while the archives of dissident London GP Anne Dally shed new light on her conflict with the psychiatric addiction specialists in the 1980s. These sources, of course, also dictate the limits of the study. Though Mold does set the discussions within a wider social context of the “drug problem,” this reader was left confronting a vacuum. As Mold writes, “As seen throughout this book, the views of addicts were largely ignored” (146). There is a history of heroin treatment addiction, but where is the drug and where are the addicts? There is reference to the important symbolic nature of heroin, but nothing on subjective experiences and benefits of the drug, nothing on the place of heroin within the drug culture of the 1970s, or on the loser romanticism of the 1980s junkies. We also hear nothing about the alternative addiction treatments developed outside of the medical system. If medical treatment specialists were not interested in these, why was this? Were they, as in the case of their fight against Anne Dally, so obsessed with the idea of “containing” the drug problem that any suggestion of association with alternative methods, and the idea that drugs might do something good, had to be avoided at all costs? After all, on an international scale, psychiatrists who were or had been working with drugs, such as Laing in Britain or Bastiaans in the Netherlands, were pushed to the margins of their profession. And what did the addicts themselves feel about all this?

*Heroin* is an important contribution to our historical understanding of the development and dynamics of addiction treatment. Hopefully, the writer and other British historians will expand and use the work to place it within a social history of heroin and other drugs in which those in treatment, as well as those who wish to treat, have their place.


Reviewed by Matthew Smith, University of Exeter.

In *Speed, Ecstasy, Ritalin: The Science of Amphetamines*, Oxford pharmacologist Leslie Iverson tackles the use and abuse of amphetamines from their emergence during the 1930s to the present day. A follow-up of his successful *The Science of Marijuana*, it is an insider’s account of “the positive and negative aspects of amphetamines” from a scientist who has researched the mechanisms by which drugs affect the nervous system and has advised the British government on drug policy. By exploring how amphetamines have been employed, for good and ill, as medical treatment, and for performance enhancement and illicit recreational use, Iverson argues that the medical benefits of amphetamines, a cause of debate in itself, cannot be separated from their illicit use. Indeed, as soon as Benzedrine inhalers were approved for use as decongestants in 1932, they were being cracked open so that their contents could be ingested or injected.
Although Iverson is hopeful that research into amphetamines and their effects may lead to psychopharmacological breakthroughs, particularly in the areas of schizophrenia and depression, he warns that their profitability as drugs of abuse will make them increasingly difficult to control.

In order to establish the ambivalent nature of amphetamines, Iverson begins by contrasting the stories of Hawaiian and Thai methamphetamine (speed) abusers with that of a man whose life improved when he was diagnosed with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) at 30, and prescribed Ritalin. While the speed abusers suffered disturbing side effects ranging from paranoia and hallucinations to weight loss and insomnia, the man prescribed Ritalin experienced better work performance, improved relationships and no side effects. This is despite the fact that the drugs they were using are virtually identical chemically.

Within these initial examples lies one of the themes of Speed, Ecstasy, Ritalin, specifically, that perceptions about the harm or benefit of amphetamines are largely contextual, and dependent on issues related to why the drug is used, the quantity being used, frequency of use and who uses it. That Iverson selects an adult diagnosed with ADHD, rather than a small child, highlights these differences. An adult, in control of when he takes Ritalin, and more able to judge its side effects, is much more empowered to make decisions about his use of the drug than a six-year-old whose parents are being coerced by educational and medical authorities to consider Ritalin. Moreover, “the prudent user[s]… who use amphetamine occasionally, usually in low dose, and always for a particular purpose, such as playing football, decorating, house cleaning, driving for a long distance” are less likely to experience ill-health effects as gay men whose use of methamphetamines is associated with increased rates of HIV infection. Similarly, perceptions about the safety of ecstasy, a drug which may have psychopharmacological benefit according to Iverson, is “clouded by politics as well as science” as governments have “sought to use scientific evidence to defend their classification of ecstasy as a dangerous narcotic.” In this way, Iverson’s depiction of ecstasy is reminiscent of Erika Dyck’s exploration of the medical uses of LSD [see review, this issue – Ed].

Iverson stresses that the ambivalent nature of amphetamines extends to how medical researchers and pharmaceutical companies have tried to market the drugs for various ailments. Amphetamines have been drugs in search of diseases, having been sold to treat nasal congestion, narcolepsy, depression, obesity and ADHD, as well as dozens of other conditions. Ritalin, for example, was initially used to treat depressive and lethargic psychiatric and geriatric patients, not hyperactive children. Among the various medical uses of amphetamines, Iverson regards the employment of drugs such as Ritalin and Adderall to treat hyperactivity as being among the most positive, stating that they “have helped hundreds of thousands of children live more positive lives.”

While there might be some truth to this statement, and while he does state that American physicians have prescribed Ritalin too eagerly, Iverson nevertheless oversimplifies the trend of prescribing amphetamines to treat children’s behavioural problems. It might be true that amphetamines can calm some children down, but what has led to the desire to calm such children down during the last fifty years? Iverson takes some steps in identifying why over-achieving young professionals, shift workers and single mothers might rely on amphetamines to get them through the day, but leaves this issue unaddressed when it comes to children. Indeed, he is fairly dismissive of those who have questioned the pharmaceutical treatment of ADHD, and suggests that new generations of amphetamines will be even more effective. Perhaps more effort, how-
ever, should be spent on analysing and changing the conditions in which such drugs are necessary, rather than designing more of them.

Iverson’s approval of the pharmaceutical industry’s production of drugs to treat ADHD disappears in the case of amphetamines marketed to treat obesity. The anorectic properties of amphetamines were identified during the late 1930s and, by the late 1940s, they had enormous popularity as diet pills. During the 1970s, stricter FDA guidelines curtailed the use of the drugs to treat obesity somewhat, but, as concern about the disease grew, pharmacologists sought out new ways to utilise amphetamines as appetite suppressants. One result was the infamous Fen-Phen cocktail, a mixture of fenfluramine and phentermine, which became popular during the early 1990s. Fen-Phen did suppress patients’ appetites, but users were also at a much higher risk of developing primary pulmonary hypertension (PPH), a potentially fatal lung disease. Although its makers, Wyeth and Interneuron, reluctantly withdrew the drug in 1997, their delay in releasing information about its side effects led to the largest civil action in American history, involving 300,000 patients and resulting in more than $16 billion in damages.

Iverson argues that our assessment of amphetamines must be based on what science proves about their effects. The social, economic and cultural aspects of many of the conditions for which physicians have prescribed amphetamines (ADHD, obesity, depression), however, suggest that the issue is more complex than that. While Speed, Ecstasy, Ritalin succeeds in sketching the complex relationship between medicine, society and amphetamines, it lacks the depth of analysis which might explain why so much of the world is becoming reliant on either prescribed or illicit amphetamines, and what to do about it.


Reviewed by Suzanne Taylor, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine.

This book provides a useful account of the transformation of LSD from a medical marvel to a public pariah. Discovered and synthesised by a Swiss biochemist Albert Hoffman in the 1940s, the discovery that LSD caused hallucinations and delusions was utilised by scientists in the 1950s to uncover a new understanding of the pathogenesis of schizophrenia and opened the door to the possibility of biochemical solutions, and was viewed as a means towards a better understanding of mental health patients. However, over the next twenty-five years, the drug moved away from the clinic and into the recreational domain becoming one of the most feared psychedelic drugs of the 1970s, and medical research drew to a standstill. By focusing on a large set of medical experiments carried out in the remarkable province of Saskatchewan, Canada in the 1950s, Erika Dyck, an associate professor of history at the University of Saskatchewan, moves the history of LSD beyond a focus on controversial military experiments, and its use in the counterculture. She presents a more balanced account of its history, and unearthing the medical origins of LSD she adds to our understanding of how a “borderline substance” can shift spheres between legitimate medicine and illicit drug. This is particularly timely with current interest on other “peculiar substances” such as cannabis, and tobacco.

A wide variety of sources has been drawn upon, ranging from archival material including patient files, records of the experiments, personal letters and accounts, to oral
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interviews with doctors, nurses and patients involved in the experiments. In tracking the evolution of LSD the book discusses the developments in psychiatry, and psychopharmacology and in particular the changing understandings of mental health, considering, for example, the development of a biochemical approach to schizophrenia, and novel approaches to the treatment of alcoholism. Of interest, too, is the history of the rural province of Saskatchewan which in the post-war period saw, “an activist government committed to radical experimentation in public health policy” (19). Developments in the history of LSD are examined through the work of key individuals including Humphrey Osmond, Abram Hoffer, and Timothy Leary. Intimately bound up with the story are issues of supply of LSD, the largely negative influence of the media, the relationship between government and scientists in the formation of regulation, the growing dominance of clinical trial methodology and its role in legitimising research results and fears over the flourishing counterculture of the 1960s and 1970s.

Roughly chronological, the book is divided into six main chapters. The first chapter, “Psychedelic Pioneers,” traces the initial development of LSD and its introduction to Saskatchewan. Dyck draws out the role of key individuals, from Albert Hofmann’s initial discoveries in the lab at Sandoz Pharmaceutical Company in Switzerland, to the English psychiatrist Humphrey Osmond’s role in bringing LSD to Saskatchewan, to the joint projects with Abram Hoffer, a trained agricultural chemist who developed an interest in biochemistry related to medicine and psychiatry. The role of the changing models of mental health and the rise of biochemical explanation is discussed, as is the political context with a revealing description of Saskatchewan’s novel public health strategies and the attraction it provided for international scientists.

Chapter Two, “Simulating Psychoses,” charts the early experiments. Initial self-experimentation focused on the physiological effects of LSD and the required dosages. Such experiments highlighted the conflict between the traditional psychoanalysis approach and the novel biochemical explanation. Experiments aimed to provide a psychedelic “experience” and the promise of a “conscious raising, identity changing therapy within a medically sanctioned… environment” (31). After two years of experiments, further volunteers were requested in the hope of proving a biochemical theory of psychosis and to help identify a method of reversing the reaction and thereby a route to curing schizophrenia. The experiments were controversial, and the chapter highlights some of the challenges to research such as the growing dominance of clinical trials (described by Hoffer and Osmond as a tool of the pharmaceutical industry) and raises ongoing questions on the history of clinical trials. The subsequent chapter, “Highs and Lows,” moves on to examine the extension of the experiments on LSD to alcoholism, and the role of these experiments in changing the perceptions of alcoholism as incurable behaviour, to a treatable disease. Chapter Four, “Keeping Tabs on Science and Spirituality,” considers the impact of the widening of the network interested in LSD and the benefits and challenges this brought to the medical field. Interest moved beyond the medical sphere and became increasingly associated with claims based on its alleged benefits for creativity and spirituality. This widening role of LSD partially contributed to a loss of pharmaceutical industry interest, and raised concerns over the blurring of the line between science and spirituality.

The final chapters examine the shift of LSD to the recreational sphere and subsequent loss of medical authority. Chapter five, “Acid Panic” concentrates on the growth of recreational LSD use, the negative impact of media interest and the hysteria and moral panic around the drug in the 1960s. The chapter considers the emergence of the counterculture and the perceived association of LSD with revolutionary ideas. The
chapter contrasts Hoffer’s desires to keep LSD within the medical setting to Harvard University psychologist Timothy Leary’s popularisation of LSD and his formation of the League for Spiritual Discovery. The final chapter, “The Perfect Contraband,” charts the death knell for LSD as medicine, with its eventual inclusion on the narcotics list and marginalisation from the medical community.

The very readable text is dotted with images bringing to life the characters discussed, and personal sketches of the LSD experience taken from accounts of those who took the drug help to provide a more intimate account of the Canadian experience. The book adds to the literature on borderline substances and triggers interesting comparisons with substances such as cannabis which emerged in Britain as a medical wonder drug, only to fall out of favour and then to see medical interest re-emerge. The history would benefit from further discussion of the story of drug regulation, especially the impact of the international regulations which were consolidated in the 1960s and 1970s and the impact this had on domestic policy and research. Additionally, greater context on the state of international research on LSD would have more clearly situated the Canadian experience in the broader history of LSD. Nonetheless, this is a useful and interesting addition to the work on LSD and mental health. It would appeal to both professionals and those with general interests in medical history, psychiatry, mental health, alcoholism, drugs, the counterculture and anyone with an interest in borderline substances.


Reviewed by Joseph Spillane, University of Florida.

Getting right to the point, Paul Gootenberg’s marvelous *Andean Cocaine* represents the full maturation of a new global history of drugs. Gootenberg was a member of the Social Science Research Council’s collaborative network “Illicit Flows and Criminality,” and influence of that enterprise is clear – the concept of the “commodity chain” is of central importance here. Examining the cocaine chain takes Gootenberg through the networks that connect the participants in the trade, from the cultivation of coca leaf to the retail sale of processed cocaine. That, of course, is a transnational story, working outward from the Andean region through various points of connection to much of the globe.

In a sense, Gootenberg is taking up David Courtwright’s challenge in *Forces of Habit* to study drugs through a world-historical lens. But where *Forces of Habit* operated at breath-taking altitude, Gootenberg’s book is a richly detailed archival history. The author is, for example, ever attentive to the “inconsistent and badly deployed statistics marking the history of cocaine everywhere” (63). By digging so deeply into the archives (especially the Peruvian sources), Gootenberg is able to conjure up history that many of us might have imagined to have been lost. Two examples should suffice. First, Gootenberg reintroduces us to the cocaine adventurers who struggled to develop an export market for the drug at the end of the nineteenth century, such as Arnaldo Kitz and the Austrian Amazonian colony of Pozuzo. Their failure helps make sense of the first collapse of cocaine in Peru, when the trade “neither modernized itself into a fully integrated industry (as nationalists called for) nor converted into an illicit export chain” (134). Second, Gootenberg gives the best account to date of cocaine’s lost decades between 1910 and 1945, using extraordinary sources like chemist Emile Pilli’s secret
1943 report to Merck, assessing Peru as a source for coca leaf supplies.

For all of its archival substance, *Andean Cocaine* never loses sight of the ways in which commodities are socially constructed. Indeed, late in the book Gootenberg allows that this project is really an attempt to “bring closer what may be called objective ‘structuralist’ and interpretive ‘culturalist’ sensibilities… integrating material development with its representation and commodities with the passions they arouse” (323). In doing so, Gootenberg takes obvious pleasure in smashing up well-worn drug dichotomies. One such – the “native/traditional” versus the “modern” – gets a fine update in his chapter on Peruvian coca science. Here, a splendid account of the manner in which Peruvian medical and social nationalists embraced the traditional coca leaf as the foundation of a modern export economy and for the extension of national control over the development of the Peruvian Amazon. Here, Peruvians are not simply the bearers of some mysterious and unchanging cultural legacy of coca chewing, but are active protagonists in the emerging world cocaine trade.

Another attractive aspect of this work is the careful attention paid to what Gootenberg calls the “political economy of control” (197). So American efforts at containment of coca cultivation and cocaine distribution are carefully examined here, with extensive use of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics records in the national archives, but they are studied alongside Peruvian resistance to the imposition of transnational control regimes. The interaction of control with resistance is an area that is still oddly underdeveloped in the historical literature, and Gootenberg provides a useful model for how it can be studied. The story of control here is a familiar ironic tale, in which a lack of control measures keeps incentives low for the illicit business, while drug wars seem to promote the very illicit enterprise they are designed to eradicate.

The only real failure of *Andean Cocaine* is the inability to provide a really persuasive account of the consumer as part of the commodity chain. Gootenberg’s account of the emergence of the modern illicit cocaine economy, for example, is full of compelling stories that do seem to explain a lot. He takes care, for instance, to show the ways in which the collapse of economic development schemes in the Huallaga Valley pushed many peasants toward coca cultivation for an illicit market. Likewise, *Andean Cocaine* documents the manner in which the overthrow of Salvador Allende precipitated a rapid collapse of the Chilean cocaine business, giving an opening to an aggressive group of Colombian traffickers. But demand is still the “black box” of drug history. Just why did U.S. demand rise so rapidly after the 1960s? The growth of international demand for cocaine is a development that remains in plain sight, obvious to anyone, and yet very poorly understood.

Paul Gootenberg’s *Andean Cocaine* is unquestionably the single most important volume on cocaine’s international history, richly documented, and conceptually exciting. It deserves a very wide audience, and will hopefully spark similar efforts in the drug and alcohol field.


Reviewed by Jane McGregor, University of Nottingham.

This new work is as timely as it is important given alcohol’s current political salience in the UK in recent years in England. It is a colourful and vastly readable account of the history of drink in England that contributes in no small way to the more recent his-
tory of drink, of which there is a relative dearth of historical work. Nicholls provides a fast paced yet eloquent account of the “politics” of drink. His is not a “high end” study of policy but a look at drink as a political issue in its broadest sense; as a cultural and political activity. Nicholls presents the reader with a panoptical view of the issue of drink through the seventeenth century to the present. In less capable hands, this might prove a challenging undertaking but Nicholls has an easy style and masterly grasp of the subject matter, and makes light of the task. Whilst the pace is brisk, the analysis has depth and his account of the social political and cultural history of alcohol in the context of England is full of vitality.

Nicholls deals with the transformations that have characterised thinking about drink over time. What gives the book structure is the way he identifies certain constants and frames his arguments around these. These include anxieties over heavy sessional drinking and the rituals accompanying such patterns of consumption, heightened concern about women, disputes over the proper role of licensing authorities and conflicts between the rights of drinkers and the responsibility of the State to prevent excess. His central tenet is that there has been a failure to resolve the tensions between free trade ideologies and the need to maintain social order. This theme is embedded and interwoven effectively into the book. The decision to look at the history of drink from this perspective has significant advantages and allows for the emergence of problems and concerns arising in society to be viewed alongside political responses and legislative activity to the issues. In this way the book draws attention to the interweaving and connections between cultural shifts and policy responses to drink. Nicholls views drink as a “ubiquitous social activity” (2), and manages to convey how issues emerge and become politically important at times and not others. He argues that it often “acts as a barometer of cultural anxieties and political attitudes” (ibid). This line of thinking is a well developed theme of the book. His main argument, that responses to drink have always been tied to broader issues of national identity, individual freedom and the relationship between the state and the market, resonates throughout.

Claims that the British have an inherent tendency to drink heavily are challenged in this book. Nicholls argues that accepting the idea of a national “binge” tradition risks reinforcing social norms and expectations which can encourage heavy drinking. Here he contributes to current drink policy debate and exposes the gross simplification of the idea of there being a fixed and immutable “binge” culture in England. In the book he takes a strong stand against the view that England is a nation of “boozers” (233-37). Though he concedes that there are cultural themes to emerge from this past and sees some parallels between present day concerns about a “new kind of drunkenness” and the “gin craze of Georgian England,” Nicholls makes plain that public debate on drink is often caught up in or reflects concern about other issues emerging in the social milieu. He concludes that English drinking culture has changed significantly over time and undergone all sorts of transformations. Having identified the early years of the twenty-first century as a shift towards viewing drink increasingly in problem terms, Nicholls suggests patterns of consumption have fluctuated in response to economic, legislative and social factors. Though other historians; Peter Borsay, Jessica Warner and Virginia Berridge included, have put forward similar arguments, Nicholls extends the debate about “Binge Britain” and advances this line of argument. He looks to cultural changes and shifts in the drink milieu since the 1960s to support his views. Here, the benefits of combining cultural and high end policy responses are highly apparent. His emphasis on post Second World War changes in the social environment alongside discussion of the gradual liberalising of licensing during the period of the early 1960s
to the twenty-first century is a particularly good illustration of the benefits to be derived from viewing the history of the politics of alcohol in such a broad way. Here he writes about industry responses in the post war era that combined aggressive consolidation of the market with the introduction of new drinks (192-94), particularly lager, targeted at the youth market and women drinkers. He argues that the Licensing Acts in 1961 and 1964 were explicitly geared towards liberalisation of licensing. He explains how this shift made it easier for the new supermarkets to compete in the drinks retail business, as well as further blurring the distinction between alcohol and other consumable commodities. These shifts and Nicholl’s accompanying arguments are highly relevant to the present policy conundrum surrounding drink (free trade ideologies and the need to maintain social order).

Ultimately, according to Nicholls, drink exists as much a subject of discourse as it is an object of consumption because it sits at the heart of so much cultural activity (260). This book is thus not only a commentary on drink but in many respects, a commentary on how much broader concerns abound in society over time. To this end, Nicholls contributes in an important way to the cultural history of the recent past, as well as to the history of drink. This book therefore is an important contribution to the history of alcohol and is essential reading for anyone interested in alcohol policy because it adds an important historical dimension to contemporary debate on drink.


Historians have never lavished as much scholarly attention on the American or British temperance movements as they have on the abolition movements. Recently, the Gilder Lehman Institute, a privately endowed foundation to promote the study of American history, helped establish a center for the study of abolition and slavery. Why not a center for the study of temperance and addicting substances? Unfortunately, temperance does not resonate very powerfully with contemporary moral and political concerns, yet as the most popular of the nineteenth century’s reform movements, it has the potential to reveal more about the dominant culture of nineteenth-century Anglo-America than abolitionism, which arose out of a culture of religious radicalism. Scott Martin’s book on American antebellum temperance ideology realizes that potential and, owing to the richness of its analysis, may be profitably read and assigned by cultural historians, scholars of women and gender, as well as those who investigate class formation or the politics of social movements.

Martin joins other historians, such as Elaine Frantz Parsons and Catherine Murdoch, in using gender to probe the cultural politics of drinking and the political culture of temperance reform in the antebellum period. While social historians of temperance have portrayed temperance as a middle-class reform effort concerned both with middle-class self-control and with the social control of working-class and immigrant populations, Martin argues that antebellum temperance ideology and politics reflects male concerns over controlling, or rather marginalizing, middle-class women’s activism. Hence temperance, which historians usually consider to be a movement that empowered women in the home and the public sphere, was reconfigured in the antebellum years to disempower them. It was out of this experience that the woman’s rights movement was born.
Martin begins his history of temperance with an overlooked social fact: the wide extent of female drinking and drunkenness in antebellum America. This posed a problem for ideologists of the emergent middle class, who made the natural purity of women a foundation of middle-class moral legitimacy. The dominant solution was to shift attention away from drunken women (a tactic that has obscured them from historical view) to morally pure women victimized by drunken men, also a much more culturally potent trope for promoting temperance. Martin does a great service by reminding us of the misogynistic tendencies of temperance discourse. Drawing on medical opinion, which emphasized women’s natural propensity for suffering, temperance fiction depicted women as faithful to, yet powerless before, their drunken male kin who pauperized, maimed and killed them with depressing regularity. The vulnerability of these female characters neatly undercut claims that women’s moral purity could influence men for the better. And, while women could not unmake drunkards, they were criticized for making them by serving alcohol at social occasions. Literary historian David Reynolds pointed out long ago that temperance fiction made titillating revelations of immorality acceptable for pious middle-class readers by offering it in the spirit of didactic edification (Reynolds, 1998). Martin’s analysis penetrates further, showing the corrosive gender politics of a literature widely read by and to middle-class children and youths.

Within the temperance movement, the Washingtonians demonstrated that men had better luck persuading other men to give up drinking voluntarily. The masculinization of moral suasion was temporary, however. Backsliding Washingtonians (a proportion of whom had been hard drinkers or drunkards) and the failure of moral arguments to convince rum sellers to change their ways persuaded many temperance regulars of the necessity of “legal suasion,” or prohibition. At least that has been the usual historical narrative. Martin argues that the turn to politics proper was intended to exclude women, who had used increasingly aggressive and public techniques of moral suasion, from meaningful roles in temperance reform. He calls attention to the little known history of the Daughters of Temperance, founded in 1843 as the female auxiliary of the Sons of Temperance. As it grew in membership, the Daughters became increasingly independent of its male counterpart. Factions within the Daughters of Temperance fought publicly and split into two competing unions, each of which declared the other insubordinate. Male temperance advocates viewed such partisan wrangling as more than unbecoming: it betrayed an increasingly uninhibited public activism that threatened male hegemony in the public sphere. Women should instead promote total abstinence within the home, they argued. Only in this way could women’s moral legitimacy – and the separation of spheres central to middle-class ideology – be restored.

By focusing attention on the emergence of the woman’s rights movement, with its clear challenge to established gender roles, Martin elides some of the complexity of women’s responses to the male backlash. As Lori Ginzberg has pointed out, a rising generation of elite women reformers by the late 1840s had come to doubt the efficacy of specifically female powers of influence and tendency to appeal to the public’s moral sense more generally. Such women campaigned to enlist state power to achieve a whole range of reform objectives, undeterred by the failure of the Maine Laws. Activist women of lower social status lacked such political access and tended to be more religious and evangelical than the elite women who forged the women’s rights movement. But neither did they withdraw to the home. Rather, they pursued benevolent and religious work in charity and mission societies, or, like abolitionist women, supported male societies by raising funds or signing petitions. Even in the hostile climate of the
1850s, women continued to join temperance fraternities. The Independent Order Good Templars, which admitted both men and women on an equal basis at all levels of leadership (and of which Amelia Bloomer, the feminist editor of The Lily, approved), grew in popularity through the 1850s and had surpassed that of the Sons and Daughters of Temperance by 1865. Women joined the Good Templars in part to support prohibition, but also to influence their lodge brothers – and find temperate husbands).

In the face of a male backlash against women’s activism, therefore, women found ways to continue accumulating social and organizational capital and to employ moral suasion. Scott Martin’s history, though it does not explore such subtleties, does facilitate appreciation of their achievements. And he accomplishes his main purpose, namely to show that the gendered ideology of women’s temperance activism after the Civil War was established in the antebellum period.


Reviewed by Josh McFayden, University of Guelph.

The meetings of fiction’s friends and strangers are often most memorable in taverns and inns. This is where Ishmael wakes up next to Queequeg, in *Moby Dick*, and where Boule de Suif makes her great personal and ideological sacrifice in *Boule de Suif*. These settings grew out of real encounters in the nineteenth century, and they are equally as vivid in *In Mixed Company*, where ordinary tavern goers shared beers and beds in the public spaces of Upper Canada. This much anticipated monograph from Julia Roberts’ doctoral dissertation is serious scholarship, and an important contribution to Canadian history, tavern studies, and the history of alcohol and drugs. Beginning in the 1790s, it covers over half a century of everyday life in the taverns of what is now Ontario, Canada.

This book brings Upper Canadian drinking out of the shadows of temperance studies, and proves that tavern goers were a heterogeneous group that rarely transgressed social boundaries. Women drank beside their men, Natives shared space with non-natives, and people from multiple ethnic and economic groups all mingled in these establishments. Mixed company “did not necessarily imply inclusion,” however, and the difference between shared space and equality is a major theme in the book (10). Closely related are the rituals of public life that encouraged mixed company without disorder. Regulation was both formal through legislation and informal through custom, and so most customers drank only socially acceptable amounts and in prescribed ways or rituals. The tavern was a place of singing, celebration, toasting, treating, story-telling, gambling, bloodsporting, eating, and of course, drinking. “[D]rinking started early and continued throughout the day as a normal accompaniment to meals, as a physical stimulant to labour… and as a leisure activity” (91).

Every chapter contains a meticulous arrangement of material from many of the best sources social historians have come to expect from this period, and as a result, the descriptions of taverns, keepers, and customers are rich in detail and analysis. Excellent manuscript collections allowed Roberts to unfold the worlds of Upper Canadian taverns, such as the journal of a keeper that spanned at least forty-two years and the wills and account books of many others. Through these sources we see what women bought at taverns, and we get one of the clearest descriptions yet of First Nations and African-Canadians in nineteenth century public spaces. Rejecting the stereotypes of
the drunken Indian, Roberts uses contemporary accounts and a quantitative study of a tavern keeper’s journal to suggest that Native alcohol consumption was about moderation, off-site drinking, and trade with keepers. First Nations used tavern rituals for cross-cultural connecting and trading, and “it is apparent that Native-white association was part of everyday life in Upper Canada, especially in public spaces like taverns” (108).

For the most part the story is told from the tavern keeper’s perspective, but other voices are featured such as Harry “Jones and his cronies,” part of “a group known, at the time and since, as the ‘respectability’” (122). Jones’ diary also spanned half a century and forms the basis for Chapter 6. Tavern keepers and respectable gentlemen like Jones had various ways of distinguishing their surroundings for white, middle-class men, even though the whole social spectrum met in these spaces. Also, most tavern designers attempted to separate public and private spaces without inhibiting the functional relationship between them (Chapter 1). Space was similarly structured in private dwellings: formally in affluent homes and informally elsewhere.

Jones’ preoccupation with mental and physical separation from the hoi polloi brings me to some small problems in the text. Roberts qualifies the historiographical argument that taverns were equalizing spaces, but non-specialists will need more information on both the literature and the evidence from Upper Canadian taverns. We know that Upper Canada had deep inequalities, and Roberts adds an excellent public perspective to this image, but economic inequality within the patchwork of tavern goers is only partly addressed. Her subjects are often given “pre industrial” periodization, but she does not link industrial growth and change to this part of public life. We are told there were “differences in economic access,” a range of quality in taverns, and formal rituals to separate gentlefolk from ordinary customers, but we need more analysis on the way neighbours with different means shared, or did not share, space and consumption patterns in their local tavern (2, 54).

Moreover, since the chapters are arranged thematically we do not get a clear sense of how taverns evolved between 1791 and Confederation. Implicit in her argument but not fully explored are the reasons people met here and not somewhere else. She explains that the early tavern was often the best community institution available in the absence of courts, or even church buildings, but less about the persistence of tavern rituals even when homes, bees, and sport and social clubs filled similar needs. Again, there are references to other sources but no explicit analysis for the general historian. The bibliography is an excellent resource, especially for primary materials and the historiography leading up to Roberts’ dissertation (1999) and article in the Canadian Historical Review (2002). Some recent literature in consumption and even local tavern history has slipped through the cracks.

To readers interested in alcohol and drug history, In Mixed Company will explain where most people drank in public and how those spaces were designed to encourage socializing among large groups within the boundaries of orderly conduct, gender, and race. Tobacco smoking does not figure heavily here, and another drug absent from the discussion is caffeine. It would be useful to know more about coffee and tea consumption since “all minor houses had coffee mills” (29-30). These are small criticisms, however; the book delivers on many levels, and answers most of the questions a reader could ask about this area of public life and everyday behaviour in a rapidly developing British colony.

Reviewed by Alistair Mutch, Nottingham Trent University.

Liverpool is an important city for those interested in the social history of alcohol. The city had a reputation for drunkenness and disorder in the nineteenth century which meant that it often featured in national debates. Its local politics were riven by deep divisions in which Temperance and the Drink Interest faced each other, leading to abortive experiments such as the Free Licensing period in the 1860s (an important episode which prefigured later debates on the relative merit of market forces and regulation in controlling the impact of alcohol). Out of these battles emerged the dominance of the direct management of public houses in a way which prefigured a later emphasis on the branded, managed public house. In these debates the firm of Robert Cain & Sons was a significant player and is worthy of book length treatment. Unfortunately, this book does not do justice to the complex history of either Cains or the city itself.

Cains: The Story of Liverpool in a Pint is a fairly short and popular account which is sparsely referenced to some standard published material. The writing is clear and easy, but one wonders just who this book is aimed at. It seems a little pricey for a general readership and it is unsatisfactory for an academic audience. The history of Cains is intertwined with much comment about the general history of the city, although classic sources, such as Waller’s account of the politics of the city (vital for an understanding of the centrality of the drink question) are not referenced. Although not commented on by the author, one problem with writing the history of Cains is that little archival material survives. There is some new material in here, such as a section on how the Cains reinvented their background, but these are slim pickings. Even where there is new archival material, such as an early brewer’s diary, the most is not made of it.

The book is not a conventional company history, but has as its main focus the Mersey Brewery. When Cains merged with its local rival, Peter Walker & Son, after the First World War, this building was declared surplus to requirements and sold to another local brewery company, Higsons. Routledge then follows the brewery through subsequent changes of ownership. Much of the Higsons story has already been told in the history of that company, but the material on the revival of the brewery by the Dusanj brothers is new and up to the minute. Their ambition for Cains to become known for beer from rather than for Liverpool is noted, but this distinction is not as powerful as it might be because of the lack of analysis in the earlier sections.

For Routledge, “Who could think of Newcastle without Brown Ale, Dublin without Guinness, or London without its Pride” (viii); hence his sub-title, “the story of Liverpool in a pint.” But what is distinctive about Liverpool is not its beer (which has never travelled very well) but its pubs. One of the most famous examples, often used in publicity for the city, is the Philharmonic Hotel, with its magnificent Edwardian interior décor (and highly decorated toilets!). However, it is important to distinguish these magnificent, but atypical pubs, from the legions of standard pubs which supported them. Because this is not done, Routledge’s discussion fails to take adequate account of the local context. Rather, he anachronistically refers to the Philharmonic as, “a standard bearer for what was known as the ‘Improved Public House’ movement” (97) – despite the fact that the Philharmonic’s construction predates that movement by some twenty years. The nature of the Philharmonic owes more to its location near the Philharmonic Hall and the stipulations of the licensing justices about the nature of the accommodation to be provided. What was significant about the city’s pubs was the
overwhelming use of managed houses by the time the Philharmonic came to be built, with the full support of the city’s magistrates and police. This was in sharp distinction to most of the rest of England (with the exception of Birmingham), but it provided a model for those who were advocating management as a way of overcoming the perceived social ills of the pub which was indeed to find fruit in the Improved Public House Movement of the inter-war years. Walker Cain was involved in this movement, but the baton for public house retailing was passed to the Midlands and London brewers.

One would not know from this book that Cains, alongside other Liverpool pub-owning companies (most notably Peter Walker & Son), employed so many managers and that this had a profound impact on the nature of the pubs in the city. The key innovation of Walker’s, which Cain and others were to copy, was the use of salaried managers, rather than tenants, to run their pubs; however, none of my own extensive work on Walker’s, based on archival material, is cited in this book. There is a fascinating story to tell about the inter-relationship between these two companies, both the creation of immigrants to the city. Detailed work on the location of the pubs and their relationship, especially in the case of Cains, to the Irish community, would be really valuable. Routledge notes the merger of Walker’s and Cains in 1921, but a reading of the Walker minute books would indicate that this was, in management terms, a takeover by the smaller but more dynamic company. This does suggest to me that considering one without the other produces only a superficial account and misses the real significance of Cains.

This is, then, a readable, but rather superficial and disappointing account which fails to take full account of the available evidence. From a university press one might expect more attention to the detailed evidence available both in the archives and in published and peer-reviewed material.


*Beer in the Beehive* is Utah brewery owner Del Vance’s passionately written and profusely illustrated beer-lovers’ coffee table history of brewing in Utah. This second edition adds information that came to the author’s attention following the publication of the first edition. The book begins with a general history of everything about beer, and ends with micro-histories of Utah’s breweries, past and present. Vance also stresses the continued clout and dangers of what he calls the modern “prohibition” movement. Vance’s love of beer so pervades the text that he offers a tongue-in-cheek warning to his readers – “this book will make you thirst for one of Utah’s delicious, locally brewed beers” – and the warning is not far from the truth!

This is truly a book for beer lovers who want to acquire technical, historic, and legal knowledge about this universally popular alcoholic beverage. Roughly the first 100 pages is a beer encyclopedia which describes the types of beers, reviews the history of beer, examines the techniques for brewing beer, surveys the history of temperance and prohibition in the United States, and complains about past and current beer and liquor regulation in the United States and Utah. The next section contains thirty-six micro-histories of individual Utah breweries. The illustrations which adorn every page include, among other things, pictures of vintage beer bottles and cans, corporate logos,
photographs of Utah breweries, letters on brewery stationary, newspaper articles, and pithy quotes about beer by famous people. The book ends with seven appendices of primary sources, a chronology of 85 different Utah breweries, a bibliography, and a map of Utah. The appendices contain primary sources on such fascinating subjects as the brewery-sponsored “carry the keg” public relations competitions, alcohol-related excerpts from the Great Salt Lake City Council meetings between 1851 and 1884, and newspaper reports about a brewery owner who brutally murdered his wife. There is no index, however, so it is difficult for the reader to reference specific units of information.

The writing style is appropriately lively and fun, and at points, humorous. Vance artfully provides the informative and fascinating technical details about beer and beer making one would expect from a brewer, and his passion for his subject is as conspicuous as the frothy head on a good cold glass of beer. His discussion of how the interplay of evolving technology and ever shifting local, state, and federal regulations influenced both the rise of national breweries and the decline and resurgence of craft breweries is a major strength of this book. Vance’s brewery histories are largely composed from his extensive research in several nineteenth-century Utah newspapers, combined with information gained from personal contacts with relatives or descendants of Utah’s entrepreneurial brewing families. The progressive, pro-industry ethos of the late nineteenth-century press meant it reported on local entrepreneurial brewery ventures as much as it did any other industry, and Vance benefited from this by mining extant issues of seven newspapers.

Equal to his love of beer, however, is Vance’s hatred of the prohibition movement and beer and liquor regulation in the United States, and in Utah, specifically. The book is replete with serious and sarcastic critiques of government laws based either on incorrect information or uninformed prejudices. Vance’s sentiments show in his overview of nineteenth-century temperance, which is hastily and rather poorly done. He inaccurately repeatedly calls the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union the “Woman’s Temperance Christian Union.” Vance chooses to discuss the sensational Carrie A. Nation and completely ignore the much more sophisticated and diplomatic Frances Willard, drawing an unappealing and militant image of the “WTCU,” as he calls it. The heart of his attack on current liquor-control practices is contained in the chapter titled with the misnomer “The Craft Brewery.” Vance uses the bulk of this chapter to attack Mothers Against Drunk Driving and the current labyrinthine and Byzantine alcohol regulations of Utah. He considers M.A.D.D. to be nothing but a front organization of the current prohibition movement, citing a statement from the founding president who left the organization and said it had become “more neo-prohibitionist than I ever wanted or envisioned.”

A passionate libertarian in his sensibilities, Vance also attacks recent case law which penalizes purveyors of products like alcohol and firearms for the crimes committed by the individuals who abuse them. He argues instead for strong penalties for those who commit crimes while intoxicated, but occasionally overstates his case. Vance’s most incredulous assertion is that a person who is “significantly intoxicated” would “think long and hard” before getting behind the wheel of a car if the penalties were severe enough. He complains incessantly about Utah’s current alcohol regulations, saying that it amazes him that any brewery is profitable, and maintains that the state is hurting its own economy because alcohol sales are so critical to its largest industry, tourism. Ironically, however, towards the end of “The Craft Brewery” Vance reports that the brewing industry grew more than twenty-five percent between 2001 and 2007, confus-
ingly undermining his argument that Utah’s laws are detrimental to the industry.

Despite the book’s polemical nature, the illustrations are priceless, and there is unlikely any single work containing so many micro-histories of Utah’s breweries. Because writing the book was so clearly a work of love for the author it makes for a fun read. I recommend this book primarily for its illustrations, and its history of the U.S. and Utah brewing industries, and its discussion of Utah’s liquor regulations.


Reviewed by James Lapsley, University of California, Davis.

Although trailing distilled spirits in total value of sales, and still behind beer in both volume and value, wine in the United States has become big business in the twenty-first century. At the beginning of the millennium, the United States passed the United Kingdom, becoming the leading market in wine sales by value. At the end of this decade, the United States is projected to pass both France and Italy in total consumption of wine, becoming the largest wine market in total volume. According to the Wine Market Council in 2008, approximately 35% of American adults consumed wine, a 40% increase in the past ten years. All California wine regions have benefited from the increased interest in wine on the part of American consumers. The Napa Valley, which is the best known and respected California appellation, has perhaps benefited the most. This reality is manifested in Napa’s expanding vineyard acreage, increased number of wineries (approximately 10% of all California wineries), and the high prices its wines receive – on a par with wines from Europe’s top appellations.

Readers of the second edition of Charles Sullivan’s *Napa Wine* will not find an explanation as to why some United States consumers have fallen in love with wine or why wines from the Napa Valley have become their first choice among California regions. Readers will find a detailed and meticulously researched history of Napa Valley wine producers, but with limited discussion of broader social and economic trends. Originally commissioned by the Napa Valley Wine Library Association, *Napa Wine* is intended as a local history. Sullivan does an excellent job in performing an historian’s first duty: Describing “what happened.” He has combed through 150 years of regional newspaper and trade journal articles, read oral histories and conducted his own interviews with California vintners, assembled statistical information on acreage and grape prices derived from government reports, and analyzed wine pricing and quality assessments made by third parties such as The Wine Spectator or the Vintner’s Club of San Francisco. The result is a text that is based on a multitude of diverse primary sources that have been integrated and enriched by Sullivan’s almost half century personal experience with (and love of) California wine.

At times the facts tend to pile upon themselves, and the reader may wonder why a particular fact is included in the narrative or long for an explanation of the importance of a specific reference. The need for more context or themes is exacerbated by the author’s decision to segment chapters into stand-alone sections, such as a review of harvest conditions for each vintage, profiles of specific producers such as the Mondavis, or a discussion of what proportion of Napa’s vineyards are winery owned versus grower-owned. Although each topic is interesting in itself, the interrelationship between topics is not always made clear or fully explored (for example, how has foreign and/or corporate ownership of some of Napa’s major wineries affected Napa’s
prominence and profitability?) While the wealth of material may perhaps overwhelm the general reader, the depth of detail in combination with an excellent index and bibliography, makes *Napa Wine* one of the first books to which a researcher on California wine should turn.

The first edition of *Napa Wine* was published in 1994, with the narrative ending in 1993. In the second edition, Sullivan has brought Napa’s wine history up to 2007. By and large, the major change between the first two editions is the addition of a new concluding chapter, “When Cabernet Was King,” which spans the period from 1994 to 2007 in approximately fifty pages, although the previous chapter, “What Is This Valley?” has been expanded from the previous edition to include a seven page discussion of Napa’s second *phylloxera* infestation. Sullivan apparently did not avail the opportunity of a second edition to update earlier parts of his book. He thus comments that the Mission variety has no “Old World counterpart today” (9), although recent work by Spanish grape geneticists has found Zinfandel to be identical to Listan Prieto, an obscure Spanish variety. Similarly, in his discussion of the Larkmead winery, he writes that the winery “survives today as the home of Hanns Kornell’s sparkling wines.” (159). Although true at the publication of the first edition, but Kornell is now out of business. These are very minor points, but it is a pity that the occasion of a second edition was not used to review and update the entire history.

The new chapter covers a dynamic period of Napa’s history, chronicling the emergence of Cabernet and other Bordeaux varietals as Napa’s dominant grape varieties, the incorporation and eventual sale of the Robert Mondavi winery, and the collective action of Napa’s vintner and growers to prevent the use of the name “Napa” (or a Napa place name, such as Rutherford) as a brand name on a wine label unless the resulting wine contains at least 75% wine produced from Napa-grown grapes. Each individual segment is well written, but the parts are not treated as a whole. All three segments relate to the growing value of Napa wine and the resulting increased cost of vineyard land and wine production. Aged red wines generally are valued more highly than are white wines – hence the impetus for Napa producers to move to red wine production. As wine and vineyard prices increase, so do capital requirements, thus explaining why the Mondavi family incorporated their winery as a publically-traded company in order to raise capital for expansion (and replanting caused by *phylloxera*). And, as brand “Napa” increases in value, some other producers have attempted to trade on the Napa name by producing wines labeled with Napa place names but employing lower-cost, non-Napa grapes. Such attempts must be met by growers and vintners who collectively use the Napa appellation on their labels. The point here is that the various parts are related, making a unified story, which could be told more clearly. That said, the book remains an excellent history of California’s major wine region. For those readers who do not own the first edition, and who are interested in the history of California wine, the second edition of *Napa Wine* is a recommended starting point.


Reviewed by Matthew J. Bellamy, Carleton University.

This year marks the two-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversary of the founding of Guinness Brewery at St. James Gate in Dublin, Ireland. The brewer of “the black stuff” has held a special place in the Irish economy and consciousness. Guinness is now a global
brand whose brewing operations define the way Ireland sees itself and the way that the world sees Ireland. It is not surprising therefore that the brewery is the most visited tourist attraction in the country, and that the harp which graces every bottle and barrel of Guinness stout is internationally associated with Ireland.

Thanks to the work of academics and non-academics alike we now know a good deal about the company. Indeed, there have been over a dozen books addressing various aspects of the Guinness story. Some of these books have focused on Guinness the drink, while others have focused on Guinness the company. But until now, none of them have focused exclusively on Guinness the man.

Arthur’s Round attempts to fill this historiographical gap. What distinguishes this work by Patrick Guinness (a direct descendant of the subject) from those that have come before is the fact that it is the first to concentrate on the patriarch himself. The work draws on everything from proper evidence-based historical research to genetic analysis to destroy many myths about Arthur Guinness and the early years of his brewing concern.

The biggest myth destroyed is the claim that Arthur Guinness and his father Richard descended from the Magennis chieftains of Iveagh, in County Down, Ulster. The last-but-one Viscount Iveagh, Bryan Magennis, had fled abroad after James II’s defeat at the Battle of the Boyne in 1690, about the time Arthur Guinness’s father was born. During his lifetime, Arthur Guinness maintained the family’s name was a reworking of Magennis. So confident was he of his blue-blood lineage that, at the time of his marriage in 1761, he had a silver cup engraved with the Magennis crest. Future generations followed the patriarch’s lead. In 1814, for instance, Arthur’s eldest son, Hosea, had the family’s use of the Magennis arms authorized by the Ulster Herald. And when Edward Cecil Guinness, Arthur’s great-grandson, was elevated to the peerage in 1890 it was as Baron Iveagh of Iveagh.

Arthur’s Round, however, effectively blows these ancestral pretensions out of the water. Drawing upon the findings of a recent scientific study conducted at Trinity College, Dublin, which looked at the Y-chromosomes of three hundred men with Gaelic East Ulster-origin surnames, Patrick Guinness shows that, while the Guinesses have Y-chromosomes that match some of these families, they do not match the Magennis. Instead, the closest link is with those from a lesser County Down clan, the McCartans. Even more disappointing for Guinness pretensions, the closest genetic match is not with the chiefly McCartan line, but with those who would have taken the McCartan surname as followers rather than family. According to Patrick Guinness, this group of lesser McCartan lived in a hamlet in County Down named Gion Ais. When anglicized, the hamlet’s name becomes Ginnies or Guinness. Thus, contrary to what has long been maintained, the Guinesses did not derive their name from a family, but from a place; they were not related to Magennis chieftains, but descended from far more common stock.

There is still no explanation of how this family from Ginnies came south to Dublin. Nevertheless, Patrick Guinness succeeds convincingly in pushing back for the first time Arthur’s ancestry another generation past his father, to his grandfather, Owen Guinness, who was a tenant farmer in Simmonscourt, County Dublin. Owen Guinness is believed to have died in 1726, leaving a surviving son named Richard. In the early 1720s, Richard Guinness married Elizabeth Read. Their first child was Arthur, born in Celbridge in 1725. In later life, Richard worked as household agent for Dr Arthur Price, a local clergyman, who would eventually rise to the rank of archbishop. Richard lived on the edge of Anglo-Irish culture and thus spoke both Gaelic and English. This
fluency, as well as Richard’s acumen for money management, was a principal factor in the family’s early success.

Richard’s second marriage occurred in 1752 to Elizabeth Clare, who ran White Hart Inn in Celbridge. Outside of any possible household brewing for Dr Price, helping to brew ale for the Inn was Arthur Guinness’s first full-time brewing job. Soon thereafter, he took a step into brewing on his own when, in 1755, he leased a brewery in Leixlip. As a result of the Seven Years War’s depreciating effect on land values in Dublin, Arthur Guinness was able to purchase his own brewery in 1759. The disused brewery at St James’ Gate proved to be a sound investment because it came fully equipped. The water used at St James’s Gate, Patrick Guinness states, debunking yet another myth, came from the Poddle River, not the Liffey as is so often claimed.

Arthur’s Round is less iconoclastic when it comes to dealing with Arthur Guinness’s political thoughts and actions. We have long known, for instance, that Arthur Guinness was a supporter of Henry Grattan – a member of the Irish House of Commons and a tireless campaigner for legislative freedom for the Irish Parliament – in the 1780s and 1790s, not least because Grattan wanted to reduce the tax on beer. Like Grattan, Guinness was publicly in favour of Catholic Emancipation from 1793, but was not a supporter of the United Irish during the 1798 rebellion. Yet while Arthur’s Round offers little that is revolutionary in terms of Arthur Guinness’s politics, it is unprecedented in its level of detail.

If Arthur’s Round has any shortcoming it is perhaps the fact that it does not make clear when exactly Guinness started brewing porter. It is known that the company stopped brewing ale altogether in 1799, and that, when the St James’ Gate brewery burned down in 1795, it specialized in varieties of porter after the reconstruction. Thus the evidence points to Arthur moving to brew porter sometime in the 1790s, but no exact date is provided. Given that this beverage is, if not the topic, certainly part of the basis for Arthur’s Round, Patrick Guinness’s lack of attention to this detail is regrettable. This deficiency should not, however, prevent a wide readership. Arthur’s Round is the most thorough and detailed look at the origins of one of Ireland’s most famous families, and one of the most well-established global brands.
ANNOUNCEMENTS

Intoxicants and Intoxication in Cultural and Historical Perspective

Three-day Conference
Tuesday July 20–Thursday July 22, 2010
Christ’s College, Cambridge, UK

Funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (UK), this inter-disciplinary and trans-historical conference brings scholars from around the world to talk about intoxicants in their material, spatial, representational, medical, visual, communal, regulative, and physiological contexts.

**Keynote speakers include:**

David Courtwright, University of North Florida
“Intoxication, Limbic Capitalism, and Pleasure Meccas”

Martin Jones, University of Cambridge
“Intoxicants in the Deep Human Past”

Christine Guth, Victoria and Albert Museum
“Intoxication and Otherness in Japanese Visual Culture”

Allen Grieco, Harvard, Florence
“Teaching Consumers to Drink Wine in Late Sixteenth-Century England”

Tom Brennan, US Naval Academy
“Voices in the Tavern: A Comparative Perspective on Public Drinking”

The full programme can be found at [www.intoxesrc.org](http://www.intoxesrc.org), with an on-line registration form to follow.