

INSIDE THE FANTASTIC LODGE: RELATIONAL TIES, GENDER, AND ADDICT IDENTITY

JOSEPH SPILLANE

Abstract. *The Fantastic Lodge* (1961) is a remarkable life history and a powerful rendering of mid-century heroin use and drug addiction. This article considers the experiences of its subject, Marilyn Bishop, from a network perspective, examining the intimate relational ties that gave shape and meaning to life within the world of Chicago's postwar scene. Reconstructing the social networks of Marilyn's "fantastic lodge" combines a close reading of her narrative with extensive historical research to de-anonymize significant details from the published text, along with a careful consideration of the dynamic nature and conduct of the drug war in Chicago. The resulting account considers social relationships as a foundation of addict identity and a support for shared cultural narratives, but also as a source of conflict and a reflection of racial and gender hierarchies. From a drug war perspective, social networks operated within a risk environment created by state actions to surveil and control illicit markets. Policing transformed law on the books into an actual set of risks and outcomes for vulnerable heroin users; these vulnerabilities were unevenly shared, in part based on the strengths and weaknesses of network ties. Marilyn Bishop's story reminds drug historians of the continued importance of reconstructing user experience and developing concrete accounts of addict agency, action, and identity.

The Fantastic Lodge, first published in 1961, is a remarkable life history and a powerful rendering of mid-century heroin use and drug addiction. The book presents an edited version of an extended series of recordings made a decade earlier by sociologist Howard Becker with Marilyn Bishop (identified in the text by the pseudonym "Janet Clark"). Although Becker and Bishop knew each other socially, the interviews out of which *The Fantastic Lodge* emerged took place under the auspices of the Institute for Juvenile Research (IJR) in Chicago, which had initiated a project to collect interviews with drug users.¹ Charged with identifying research subjects, Becker approached Bish-

Joseph Spillane is Associate Dean and Professor of History at the University of Florida.

op: “So I said to Marilyn, you know, these people do life histories, they pay their informants, the kids that they interviewed about heroin addiction, \$5 an interview, so I said I could get them to pay you \$5 an interview. Why don’t we do one of these life histories?” As Becker recalled: “The minute she started talking I knew it was going to be something special. The tape was quite dramatic, full of information, and beautifully stated.”²

Why was Marilyn’s story called *The Fantastic Lodge*? The title was taken from a phrase Marilyn Bishop uses once, late in the text, after she describes the manner in which her fellow inmates of the federal Lexington Narcotic Hospital would “quack on...all is junk, and that’s all, you know; that’s the way it is.” Marilyn then makes a kind of parenthetical remark, of the kind that occur throughout the text, as she abruptly switches from the narrative to the reflective and analytic: “This identification of yourself as a junkie. After the first six, eight months that I was making it, I never said, ‘Well, I’m a junkie,’ as an excuse or anything. But now I say it constantly. I always refer to myself as a junkie, even when I’m not hooked or anything. And when you’re introduced to somebody for the first time, the first thing you find out is whether he’s a junkie or not. It’s like belonging to some fantastic lodge, you know, but the initiation ceremony is a lot rougher.”³

Rather than referring to Lexington itself, the massive New Deal-era prison/hospital serving as the lodge building of opiate-using fellow travelers, Marilyn is referring to a common junkie identity she shared with heroin users more generally, an identity which preceded her arrival at Lexington. The grand order of the junkies was more a state of mind than a place. Indeed, despite the social implications of the “lodge” formulation, *The Fantastic Lodge* reads as determinedly, even aggressively, individualized. In part, this derives from the distinctive qualities of Marilyn’s own voice. She possessed an extraordinary ability to – in the process of being interviewed – paint vivid pictures of her environment and of her internal state, wrapped up in an engaging and moving narrative.⁴ Marilyn’s own preoccupation with psychoanalysis frames much of the narrative, and reflects mid-century psychiatric interest in the connection between alcoholism, addiction, and issues of parent-child relationships, sexuality, and gender roles.⁵

But the individualized feel of the book is also a product of the social science universe that gave rise to its production. Mid-century sociology was rapidly distancing itself from the contextual, social group, and community studies of the pre-war era, and moving into survey research and other types of work that took the individual as the critical unit of analysis. Sociologically, *The Fantastic Lodge* is about Marilyn Bishop’s integration into a heroin subculture, exploring the construction of personal identity through the process of interaction with a social group. Unlike an actual fraternal lodge, the subcultural lodge was an internal state: one learned to appreciate a drug’s effects, one learned what it meant to be addicted, and what it meant

to be a junkie.⁶ This internal boundary crossing between the normal and the subcultural is one conceptual engine of *The Fantastic Lodge*; another such engine is derived from external responses to individual behavior, or what would later be called labeling theory.⁷ The sociological world of the lodge features internal interaction (subcultural) and external interaction (labeling), but the unit of analysis remains the individual.

This article reconsiders *The Fantastic Lodge* from a network perspective, examining the actual relational ties that shaped both forms of interaction.⁸ Social networks allow historians to explore the simple but vital question of “What happened and how did it happen?” and to develop a more concrete account of agency and action. The project of bringing Marilyn Bishop’s relational ties into clearer focus involves a close reading of her narrative and some considerable historical detective work to de-anonymize significant details from the published text, combined with an examination of the dynamic nature and conduct of the drug war in postwar Chicago. The resulting portrait of drug-using networks reveals the manner in which broad structures of gender, race, and other hierarchies profoundly shaped the highly personal and intimate social networks within which Bishop, like other heroin users, made decisions and constructed a sense of self.

MARILYN’S LODGE

As Marilyn Bishop recorded her life history, Chicago was in the midst of an “epidemic” of heroin initiation and use, one that had taken off in 1947, and which had parallels in major cities across the United States including New York, Washington DC, Baltimore, Detroit, Cleveland, Los Angeles, and Seattle. It was largely an epidemic of intravenous use; new heroin users either initiated their use with this route of administration, or switched after a short period of heroin sniffing or subcutaneous injection (“skin-popping”). Neither heroin nor intravenous use had predominated in Chicago before World War Two; the most comprehensive study undertaken in the 1930s found that heroin was the exclusive drug of only 12.5 percent of opiate users in the city, and intravenous injection was the primary route of administration for fewer than two percent. Chicago’s postwar cohort of heroin users was also considerably younger than its counterpart in the immediate prewar period. Opiate users in Depression-era Chicago were an aging population, many years removed from their first use – and even their initiation age had been higher than the postwar group. Card files of the Chicago Police Department collected between November, 1950 and December, 1952, showed that the highest portion of users had been born between 1928 and 1932, meaning that they would have been between fifteen and nineteen years old in 1947; this is consistent with reports from the Behavior Clinic of the Cook County Court that the average age of first heroin cases referred there in 1951 was 16.4 years.⁹

The postwar heroin network was also predominantly African-American. Although young white users were almost certainly underrepresented in the official data, there is no question that black Chicago experienced an extraordinary and disproportionate increase in heroin initiation between 1947 and 1951 (indeed, Patrick Hughes and his colleagues found that this cohort still dominated admissions to the Illinois Drug Abuse Program twenty years later).¹⁰

Harold Finestone interviewed many of these young heroin users and concluded that “the activity centering around these narcotics had many characteristics of a fad – that is, the restless searching, the uncertainty and excitement and exclusive preoccupation with novel experience, the pressures to ‘go along’ and the final capitulation on the part of many, despite the existence of strong doubts and inhibitions.” The junkies regarded themselves as the “true ‘down cats’ on the best ‘kick’ of them all.” The young heroin user “discussed his pattern of living as though it were a consciously cultivated work of art.” This latter sentence points the way toward an exploration that goes beyond the simple boundary crossing from non-user to user, one which satisfies the epidemiological imperative (Finestone’s interest in “spread” and “diffusion”) and moves us to look at what the patterns of living may have been, beyond thinking of “style” as deluded and empty talk to serious inquiry into the relationships and networks that supported that style.¹¹

Kathleen Frydl has observed that “contagion” became one of the primary ways of framing rising incidence of heroin initiation in way that was comprehensible to social scientists, policy makers, and the general public. While the notion of contagion implicates social networks, the narrow focus – the spread of heroin initiation – tends to ignore everything else that might flow along those same relational ties.¹² Historical network analysis, then, must take seriously the cultural flows along the lines of network relationships.¹³ The makings of identity, affinity, and a shared cultural narrative, all travel between network actors. Even more than this, we find flows of information, social support, and the sort of things that collectively represent something like social capital.¹⁴

Doug McAdam’s social network study of the Freedom Riders is a useful model for historians examining addict networks.¹⁵ Defining participation in Freedom Summer as a “high risk/cost behavior,” he observes that consuming involvements in these sorts of movements were almost always preceded by a series of safer, less demanding forms of behavior. In a way, McAdam observes, these behaviors led individuals to push beyond purely rational decision making, because of the increasing importance of behavior to identity. Identity is a variable product of collective action; for Marilyn Bishop and Chicago’s heroin addicts, it was not simply the pursuit of the drug that bound them together, but the pursuit of “the life.”¹⁶

Consider the close companionship between Marilyn Bishop and a young woman the book identifies as “May” as they shared the Lexington Narcotic Hospital experience. Though Marilyn was white and May was black, and though neither had known the other prior to Lexington (or associated afterward), their connections to the same larger network gave them common ground; they had the same heroin supplier, and May updated Marilyn on the Chicago scene with news of arrests and imprisonments. Mostly they scrubbed floors together and discussed “the life” – a discussion framed by their common musical connections. Marilyn sang “Everything Happens to Me” and May sang a version of Billie Holiday’s then-new recording of “Detour Ahead”:

Smooth road clear day
 But why am I the only one
 Traveling’ this way
 How strange the road you love
 Should be so easy
 Can there be a detour ahead¹⁷

Cultural-relational ties help restore categories of all kinds to network analysis, including gender.¹⁸ These are narrative networks held together by cultural cues; Marilyn and May used this shared story to express solidarity, trust, and respect. These shared understandings function as a kind of cultural bridge across structural barriers and geographic distance. We might think of this as bounded solidarity, women’s shared identity facing common threats. But it is also important not to understate the continued importance of actual networks of relation. Marilyn and May were, after all, both from Chicago and actually shared a heroin dealer. So the network structure here is not purely nonmaterial, nor is it simply the structural equivalence of being a woman or being a junkie. Real network connections mattered as well.

It is important not to romanticize the relational ties in this network. Network analysis has long clarified that there are both constraining and enabling elements.¹⁹ The communicative, normative, and negotiation processes of the network do not have to be built upon mutuality, trust, and solidarity. Marilyn herself did a better job of describing it than any social scientist has done since: “It’s like a bunch of cripples getting together at a convention and pooling their crutches, in order that one or two of them can sort of stagger around. It’s really one of the best examples of cooperative animosity that I’ve ever seen.”²⁰ Network relationships can readily convey constraining elements, flows of information, or concepts that actually hinder or harm.²¹

The role of intimate and family relationships in drug use have only just begun to receive some attention from historians.²² In *The Fantastic Lodge*, there is no closer or more intimate relational tie than the simple dyadic re-

relationship between Marilyn Bishop and the jazz musician with whom she lived as husband and wife (though they were not legally married). Referred to by the pseudonym “Bob Lockwood” in the text, his name was Hal Russell (though the question of “name” is more complicated still, in that he was born Harold Luttenbacher, Jr., then began calling himself Hal Russell at the start of his professional music career). Russell had been living and working as a drummer in Chicago since receiving his bachelors and masters degrees from the University of Illinois (the latter in 1948). His university years had been spent playing big band jazz; because of wartime personnel shortages, his summers included tours with big names like Woody Herman and Boyd Raeburn. Like so many of his peers, he found himself transformed by bebop in the postwar period. “It hit me like a thunderbolt,” he later recalled, “I couldn’t believe they were playing that way.”²³

Hal Russell and Marilyn Bishop began their relationship in 1949, by which time Hal had already risen to a position of some note in the Chicago jazz scene. When Miles Davis arrived in the city for an extended engagement with Anita O’Day at the Hi-Note for the club’s big 1949 holiday season shows, he recruited Hal to play drums in his backing group. Miles Davis’ appearance coincides with Marilyn’s transition from snorting heroin to injecting it.²⁴ Marilyn and Hal spent considerable time with Davis, and she described him as “such a cool cat in spite of the terrible habit he has... This was my first experience with a real out-an-out junkie. A cat that would do anything to get heroin.”²⁵

Howard Becker and Hal Russell played jazz together, and through that connection Becker was introduced to Bishop, the two of them sharing multiple categories of relation: the jazz world, close relationships with Hal Russell, marijuana, and an abiding interest in the nature of drug addiction. These multiple points of connection are what led James Bennett, in his account of *The Fantastic Lodge*’s creation, to suggest that Becker and Bishop had an “egalitarian” relationship, a point echoed by the Everett Hughes, Helen MacGill Hughes, and to some extent Becker himself. Considerable evidence from Bennett’s account does show Becker acting as both advocate and friend for Marilyn Bishop. Yet the Becker-Bishop relationship was not purely egalitarian in network terms. Becker was “somewhere in between” the worlds of academia and jazz, and Everett Hughes pointed out that Becker “was not a person who ever had any of the personal difficulties of the people he was describing.”²⁶

The classic romantic/partnership dyadic relationship of Marilyn and Hal was very much the heart of *The Fantastic Lodge* when it appeared in 1961. The resonance of this relationship with the book’s audience was akin to that of the heroin users Karen and John in Bill Eppridge’s famous 1965 *Life Magazine* “Needle Park” photo essay, or even Jack Lemmon and Lee Remick in the 1962 film *Days of Wine and Roses*, with the tag line on

the poster: “This, in its own terrifying way, is a love story.”²⁷ What made these relationships terrifying was the enduring popular and social scientific preoccupation with the “hidden” addict, whose subcultural attachments were dangerously obscured by the superficial trappings of domesticity.²⁸ This preoccupation accounts for the potency of the negative symbolism of addict-pairs like Marilyn and Hal, Karen and John, or Kirsten and Joe.

Implicit in the social framing of these pairs is a sense in which efforts to pass as normal masks the pairs’ underlying disdain for, and separation from, traditional gender roles. For historians there is a danger, as Lisa Maher has observed for contemporary ethnographic work, “that activity is confused with equality and presence is read as participation.”²⁹ Status hierarchies, including gender, hardly disappeared from the social networks in *The Fantastic Lodge*. The relationship between Marilyn and Hal, far from being liberated from mid-century gender role conventions, featured frequent and disabling conflicts about the failure to reproduce them.

Marilyn believed that heroin began to destroy her relationship with Hal, or at least transform it from a time when “love was joy” and not “all pain and anger.”³⁰ A failure of domesticity meant failure to contribute in the appropriate ways to the relationship: “I wasn’t giving Bob anything. I didn’t treat him right in any sense of the word. I didn’t make a home for him, I didn’t cook for him – the simplest, smallest little requirements for a relationship.” In Marilyn’s view, Hal’s connections to the jazz world – to the world of work, in other words – mitigated his own responsibility for maintaining domestic stability. It is not hard to observe gender-situated behavior deeply embedded within this seemingly nontraditional social network. Moreover, Marilyn was conscious of the need to retain her connections to a social network organized in the first instance around Hal’s own network of musicians – her recruitment into that network was through Hal, and could only be sustained by the maintenance of that intimate relationship: “I spent every night at every gig, constantly. I went everywhere, and not just not to be alone, although that was part of it too...”³¹

At times, Marilyn recalled to Becker, her own fears of separation would cause Hal to miss gigs. “I was reacting like a child being abandoned by its parent,” she said, “not like a woman whose husband is going to work.”³² The gendered nature of mid-century jazz networks meant that flows of work, information, and mutual assistance were far more available to Hal than they were to Marilyn. With only weak ties to female networks, Marilyn’s account shows her fighting to maintain her ties to the male-dominated social networks of jazz and heroin. Marilyn herself poignantly described the heroin user’s reaction when a fellow user would leave the network (i.e., give up their use of heroin): “it gives him a little feeling of panic; like, are they all fleeing the scene? Am I going to be left here alone? I have to have these people.”³³

THE SOCIAL NETWORKS OF DOPEVILLE

The social scientists serving as gatekeepers to Marilyn's life history included some of the most notable figures of mid-century Chicago sociology, and they largely agreed: Marilyn was a wholly idiosyncratic heroin user. Clifford Shaw, director of the IJR, dismissed her as one of the "minor social types encountered among youthful opiate addicts." At another juncture, Henry McKay expressed concern that Marilyn's story might be misrepresented as that of a "typical junkie."³⁴ While Marilyn was making her recordings with Howard Becker, the Cook County Jail (where sociologists could presumably locate and observe the typical addict) housed an overwhelming percentage of African-American users (90%) and male users (88%). White, female heroin users in the jail accounted for only two percent of the population.³⁵ But to understand Marilyn only in terms of gender or racial "typicality" ignores the fact that she was nonetheless connected to the larger network of heroin users.

Marilyn and Hal lived on Chicago's South Side, near the intersection of Woodlawn Avenue and 47th Street, an area in transition, four blocks east of Cottage Grove Avenue. They found an apartment "right in the heart of Spade Town," an "old, old pad" rented from "the last spade family in a series of those houses that all stick together." Large scale black migration to Chicago had dissolved the old Cottage Grove boundary of the Black Belt, and areas to the east were rapidly becoming majority African American in the 1940s. This area was situated near the southern end of a heroin market that extended from the older entertainment district at 39th and Cottage Grove (popularly known as "Dopeville") southward to 47th Street, not far from clubs like the Congo Lounge that featured "dope dispensers...thick as flies."³⁶ A former Chicago police captain recalled that "the Sixth District was beginning to have a lot of activity that was involved with dope...after the war, things changed a lot around Forty-Seventh Street in terms of the use of narcotics."³⁷ The locational specificity of "Dopeville" should not mislead historians – while it existed as a geographic reality, it is better understood as label for a set of network relationships. The various elements of Marilyn Bishop's egocentric social network – in other words, a network based around the central figure of Marilyn herself – are readily understood using her own account.³⁸

All the categories of network participants were described in *The Fantastic Lodge*. The friendly junkies are the most central figures to Marilyn herself – the ones she most frequently interacted with, had the closest connections to, and trusted (those "with whom you have a little something more in common"). The superior junkies Marilyn described as "the old die hards and usually spade junkers who can op in Spade Town" and on whom Marilyn's friendly addicts were often dependent for connections. The square junkies were inexperienced users, dependent on Marilyn's group, and gen-

erally valued as sources of money – “you need a certain amount of square junkies, the ones that can be gypped out of bread and so forth.” The fringe junkies could be part of any of the groups, but were people highly unlikely to be sought out in any circumstance – “even under the guise of junk, because what could you possibly have in common with them?” At the top were the Big Connections, “the unseen hands behind everything...you’re always aware of them and you usually know who they are and you’re definitely dependent on them and you watch their busts very carefully.” Marilyn had only a single “Big Connection” in her network, a woman called “Fran” in the book, and the extent to which all other heroin connections depended upon that one actor is clearly stated: “if Fran gets busted, then that whole side of town for a while is going to be out of luck.”³⁹

A strikingly flat organization characterized Chicago’s postwar heroin networks, with little distance – physically or organizationally – between large-scale “connections” and the peddlers and addicts they handled. Nonetheless, Marilyn understood that she and Hal were highly dependent upon “big connections” for their supply, and that they were not among the “superior” junkies who could “op” more freely in the largely black neighborhoods of Chicago’s South Side. Marilyn’s network was interracial – but with limits. Marilyn understood the advantages of her whiteness; despite her friendship with “May” at Lexington, she was able to check herself out as a voluntary patient, leaving a sobbing May (eight months pregnant) to finish 18 more months of involuntary confinement. And while Marilyn and Hal could use jazz networks to bridge substantial racial divides, those divides reappeared with particular force outside of that context.⁴⁰

As more marginal figures in the network, Marilyn and Hal were obliged to take greater risks, increasing their vulnerability to a variety of harms. Interestingly, in late 1951 Marilyn reported of “a new...group that seems to be just growing up, from what I can hear. And this is almost exclusively a spade group. These are the runners that the swingers are using right now because things are so hot.”⁴¹ In the pages of Marilyn’s testimony, the organic social network reacts and responds to external contingencies – particularly state-directed efforts to penetrate and weaken it. When Marilyn observed that “things are so hot,” she meant that the police were actively and aggressively working to disrupt her own social network.

LIFE DURING WARTIME: NETWORKS AND RISK ENVIRONMENTS

Marilyn’s account of the rise of the runners reminds us that networks function in an environment in which external forces can modify their functioning and structure. These contingencies can weaken networks, and impose new or greater costs on actors within those networks. These costs are often distributed unevenly, based on the strength of individual or group positioning within a network. In *The Fantastic Lodge*, the most salient outside

force is the criminal justice system. Positional vulnerability of heroin-user networks generates some of the book's strongest and most powerful sections and, according to Becker, really sparked Marilyn Bishop's commitment to the project as "an outlet for the rage she felt against the criminal justice system."⁴²

Arrests are critical to the narrative flow of *The Fantastic Lodge*, and reveal much about the changing risk environment for addicts in the face of a rapidly expanding drug war. Hal's first arrest, on October 22, 1951, turned into front-page news in Chicago newspapers, because he and a musician friend (Willie Green, called "Dickie Arnold" in the book) had been stopped by police while driving with Peggy June Ellsworth, Miss Michigan of 1947 (referred to as "Melanie Furth" in the book). All three were arrested and booked on disorderly conduct charges; Marilyn was at home and not with the three when they were detained.⁴³

Hal's arrest reflected three distinct features of the changing network environment in 1951 Chicago. First, that the arrest was made at all reflected a new policy of the Chicago Police Department to penetrate addict networks through the use of mass arrests and the creation of a new Narcotics Squad. Addict networks in prewar Chicago had been stable and thoroughly penetrated; in that environment, there was little public pressure or police interest in expanding surveillance activities. Youthful heroin users in the first years of the postwar epidemic were therefore, for all practical purposes, invisible to the state. Not until the winter of 1948-1949 did published reports of the heroin problem begin to circulate, with settlement houses, the juvenile court, and South Side residents providing most of the detailed information. One observer noted that the youthful drug user was "not a furtive looking, sallow-complexioned individual...this difficulty of recognition makes the detection of youthful users or addicts a serious problem to the law enforcement agencies."⁴⁴

Over the course of Howard Becker's interviews with Marilyn Bishop, however, the city would construct an extensive surveillance apparatus for identifying and tracking Chicago's heroin addicts. In 1951, the Chicago Police Department reorganized its drug law enforcement, creating a new Narcotics Division. The city's first Narcotics Court opened in April to handle all criminal violations by known or suspected drug addicts. The following month, the city amended its loitering ordinance to include loitering by a narcotic addict – in effect, criminalizing the status of addiction, and providing the basis for Hal, Willie, and Peggy's arrest.⁴⁵

The scale of this new surveillance was impressive. While annual arrests for narcotic violations averaged about 500 in the prewar period, the Narcotic Court processed 4,307 addicts in just the first ten months of its operations. More than half of all these cases (2,221) were discharged, but that was not the point – all of the men and women who appeared in Narcot-

ics Court were added to the Narcotics Division recordkeeping system. By 1955, the Chicago Police Department boasted files on over 18,000 addicts and dealers. One consequence was that “known junkies” began experiencing a pattern of repeated arrests and convictions. In 1951, at the start of the campaign, only thirty-eight percent of drug arrests were repeat offenders, but by the end of the decade ninety-six percent of all drug arrests involved repeat offenders.⁴⁶

The arrest also demonstrated how the Chicago Police understood the distinctive racial organization of the heroin-using social network in the city, Hal and Peggy were white, Willie Green was black, and, as Marilyn recounted it, the “nabs” wanted to know why Hal “had a spade and a fay chick in the car.” Indeed, Marilyn imagined that Hal’s wanting “to go out and cop knowing that the car lights were not working decently and taking a fay chick along with this spade piano-player” must have reflected an unconscious desire on his part to be arrested. One might speculate that this attention from law enforcement had something to do with racial fears about the “cultural contamination from sexual proximity between white women and men of color,” but it also served as an all-too-easy indicator of participation in a heroin network that was conspicuously interracial.⁴⁷

The arrest sent Hal and Peggy to the city’s Narcotics Court, which had come into existence in April of 1951, as a mechanism by which large numbers of drug addicts could be managed in the criminal justice system – a critical step in the new bureaucratization of addiction.⁴⁸ Caught up in the mechanism of mass arrest, Peggy and Hal were aided by their relative status. Former beauty queen Peggy had the more unusual connection, for she was living with well-known Chicago Tribune feature writer Norma Lee Browning. An earlier drug arrest in Detroit had placed the national media spotlight on Peggy, as readers marveled at her fall from grace. Ever alert to a sensational story, reporter Browning had arranged for Peggy to be released by Detroit authorities into her custody and brought to Chicago. Browning planned to help Peggy restart her dreamed-of singing career, to be featured in a multi-part Sunday series on Peggy’s redemption. The first installment of the series appeared on October 21 – one day prior to Peggy’s arrest with Hal.

Peggy’s first call on arriving at jail was to Norma Lee Browning, but both the Tribune and Browning “dumped her, fast.” Browning allowed the Sunday series to continue, but wrote a front-page repudiation.⁴⁹ It was this article that Marilyn read and remarked on in *The Fantastic Lodge*. In the article, Browning, recounting her kindness toward Peggy, wrote: “Apparently this was not enough. Maybe nothing can be enough for anyone who has strayed even briefly into the back alleys of dope addiction.” Peggy had thrown away her chance to “become a normal human being again.” Casting herself as a “soft-hearted reporter” trying to give Peggy another

er chance, Browning “finally learned why hard boiled reporters get that way.”⁵⁰ Browning ensured that Peggy was released from custody and that no charges would be filed as long as Peggy quietly left town.

Hal, for his part, was given the unusual privilege of an immediate phone call from the stationhouse. He called Marilyn, who contacted Hal’s father, who owned a private detective agency and served as an auxiliary police officer in Riverside. He drove Hal’s mother and Marilyn to the police station, assuring them that “I’ll go in and take care of this.” Marilyn was forced to sit in the back of the car, looking out the window in frustration as she watched another network in action, from which she was literally held apart: “But to sit in that car, not knowing what the old man in quacking about, seeing him through the window and the nabs all converging together, first two, then three, then the captain, then Mr. Lockwood [Hal’s father], then the laughter, then the bad looks, then good looks – and oh! I was just dying in the car, you know. I couldn’t hear a thing. It was like watching a dead show going... When you’re first confronted by the law and it’s acting against someone you love and you hear all the wheels grinding and you don’t know what the wheels even mean, it’s a terrifying thing.”⁵¹

Police tactics help shape the story of *The Fantastic Lodge’s* second arrest, which took place the night before Thanksgiving, November 21, 1951 – in which both Marilyn and Hal were arrested at the Sheldrake Hotel (the “Park Hotel” in the book).⁵² The two were headed to the apartment of James Method (“Lock Brainer” in the book), a small-time heroin distributor and master of ceremonies at a Calumet City strip club.⁵³ As Marilyn observed, Method was their primary connection and “we were buying in bulk now, packages; fifteen bucks for a thirty-second of an ounce or a level teaspoon of cut heroin.” Unbeknownst to Marilyn and Hal, Method had been under police surveillance for two weeks. Earlier that evening, police observed two strippers leaving Method’s room and arrested them downstairs in a grocery. As additional customers arrived, they were also arrested.⁵⁴

In the interrogation room, the police prepared a statement for Marilyn to sign and then took her for a ride to try and bust Marilyn’s “Big Connection” Fran.⁵⁵ The idea was to have Marilyn make a buy from Fran with marked bills while the police waited nearby. A typical police tactic, it reflected the overwhelming interest in using informants to penetrate the social networks of heroin users and sellers, efforts that ultimately served to disrupt those networks. For her part, Marilyn ultimately refused to make the buy – in large part because she had come to the end of her comprehension of distribution networks, and she (rightly) feared the unknown: “No. I don’t want to do it. I don’t want to get shot in the back. Who do I know? How do I know she’s not connected with the syndicate?”⁵⁶ Marilyn’s experience echoes Nelson Algren’s observation that “the known addict lives in a totally lawless world, a man or woman with no rights at all.” Policing

transformed law on the books into an actual set of risks and outcomes for vulnerable people like Marilyn and Hal.⁵⁷

CODA: HISTORIANS AND THE ADDICTS WHO SURVIVED

Historians know almost nothing about long-term outcomes for addicts in the twentieth century. Oral histories of elderly methadone patients in New York City, collected in 1980 and published in 1989 as *Addicts Who Survived*, constitute the most significant scholarly effort to date.⁵⁸ This group, of course, was a very particular sort – still alive, and still involved in the addict world (as methadone patients). Claude Brown, in his perceptive Preface to the work, noted that the subjects were “an ordinary group of people endowed with extraordinary vitality and mental vigor for coping with an intensely demoralizing and physically corrosive socio-medical affliction.” But, Brown observed, they were not just individually different, they also maintained work and family connections over decades of addiction.⁵⁹ Marilyn Bishop, Hal Russell, and Peggy Ellsworth represent the other categories – the addicts who did not survive, and the addicts who recovered.

Peggy Ellsworth’s story lies solidly within postwar recovery narratives, though it took her some time to get there. Peggy left Chicago and returned to Canada (where she had grown up) to kick her heroin habit. Intent on a singing career, Peggy returned to New York City and found gigs in Times Square nightclubs. In early 1952, she married her first husband, saxophonist George Morrison, with whom she had previously done some touring, and was arrested on an old federal charge of possession and forgery of an income tax refund check. Eventually, she divorced Morrison, gave up the nightclub life, and moved to Hollywood with her second husband, who described her as one of the “wildest women” that he had ever met. Having replaced opiates with alcohol, Peggy was a confirmed alcoholic until an arrest at the age of forty-five resulted in lost custody of her children and a diagnosis of liver disease. Having “hit rock bottom,” Peggy entered Alcoholics Anonymous and stayed sober for the last twenty years of her life, serving as a popular AA speaker, operating a successful Palm Spring real estate business, and becoming, in the words of her son, “the person I remember as Mom and my best friend.”⁶⁰

As for Hal Russell, his liberation from heroin coincided with his musical liberation. In 1959, he met and married his partner for the remaining 33 years of life and, at her insistence, stopped using heroin (apparently without any formal treatment intervention). With “the monkey off his back” Hal returned to earning money through his music, playing commercial jingles and working local Chicago lounges. But while he diligently played for money, his musical inspiration became free jazz, starting with his pioneering work with the Joe Daley Trio in the early 1960s (“planning out

what it means to be free”).⁶¹ Before his death in 1992, after years joyfully toiling at the musical margins, Russell emerged as one of Chicago’s leading free jazz figures: “out there on our own, beyond the barlines, beyond the changes, beyond the time, tiptoeing in some wild and lonely space.”⁶² As he reflected, “I don’t like to take things too seriously because I think that can be deadly.”⁶³ Late 1980s European tours with his NRG Ensemble began, finally, to attract wider attention. An appearance at the Berlin Jazz Festival in 1991 led to a succession of major-label recordings, including *The Finnish/Swiss Tour* and *Hal’s Bells*.

His final recording with the NRG Ensemble, released just after his death, was a musical autobiography, *The Hal Russell Story*. On this remarkable record, Hal intersperses his own narration and commentary with a series of musical pieces illustrating the evolution of his artistic life. Most references are to musical influences, but “Dope Music” finds Hal looking back on his time as an addict: “Best of times and the worst of times. Victims of all the occupational hazards, high on whatever you got. We fired up in the after-hours sessions, and pumped the paycheck into the collective arm. Wheeling and dealing on the dog-eat-dog scene. And that’s jazz.” His final speech on the record reflects the wonder and joy at finding an audience at last: “No happy endings outside Hollywood? The camera pans to a circus tent in a German field and a crowd of five thousand, so help me. Ovarions. Encores. Hats in the air. Worth the wait? Oh yeah! Land ho! Land ho! Pinch me, mama. This old ship’s a-coming in.”⁶⁴

Marilyn is the addict who did not survive. Her Thanksgiving arrest in 1951 left her shaken and separated from vitally important connections. With Hal taken away to stay with his parents, Marilyn returned to their apartment, scored heroin and, for the first time in her life, injected herself alone; “I guess that’s what I always knew would happen,” she told Howard Becker. One month later, she committed herself to the Lexington Narcotics Hospital, “a chance for me to stay off long enough to get some kind of perspective on just what I was doing, and where I was going.”⁶⁵ Later, after her first stay at Lexington and her subsequent relapse, arrest, and imprisonment, Marilyn’s account ends with her considering of a return trip to Lexington and reflecting on the unknowable future: “it seems that the only way I will stay off, realistically speaking, is to be locked up someplace. And it’s pretty horrible to have to put your self someplace...I hope I can do it. And then, okay, so I stay there three or four months, or two or three months, or whatever amount of time the doctors set, will it make that much of a change?”⁶⁶

Marilyn Bishop died alone in the lobby of the Dunning State Hospital on January 9, 1959 – from an overdose of barbiturates, perhaps accidental, perhaps intentional. Early death was all too common among mid-century opiate addicts; one long-term study found nearly half of all subjects had

died by the follow up date, most by overdose, others by suicide.⁶⁷

It is a commonplace to note that, but for her recordings with Becker, Marilyn Bishop would be lost to memory entirely. But that only hints at the profound isolation and marginalization that Marilyn experienced. After her death, some of those who knew her best, given the opportunity to acknowledge Marilyn's role in their lives, chose not to. Hal Russell, interviewed numerous times, never mentioned her. The 1950s, he recalled, were "hard to remember, because drugs seemed to take over my life."⁶⁸ In another interview, Hal simply said, "for me, a lot of the 50s is a blank."⁶⁹ The only reference in *The Hal Russell Story*, "Dope Music," focuses on heroin as an occupational hazard shared by the jazz fraternity. Marilyn's mother, who in 1961 signed the final book contract for *The Fantastic Lodge*, spent the remainder of that decade in Chicago before retiring to southern Illinois. Her obituary made no specific mention of Marilyn, referring only to "a daughter" who predeceased her. Only Howard Becker, friend and advocate while she lived, made public acknowledgment of Marilyn as a person, more than forty years after her passing.

By the end of the 1960s, Howard Becker had become an influential figure in the field of ethnographic and qualitative research on drug users and other marginalized populations. The 1970s were a positional heyday for scholars in the field – they had busted up Lexington's research monopoly, attracted substantial state funding, and developed important relational ties to various national and international policymaking networks. But this Becker-influenced network soon headed to the margins once again as neuroscience began to dominate the addiction research field, squeezing out socially oriented work that seemed to offer little to the paradigm of the chronic, relapsing brain disorder.

The great irony of this development is that, despite the general reluctance of historians to abandon social-constructionist perspectives on medical science and addiction concepts, the re-centralization of the addiction research network around the neurobiological has defined terms of debate within historical fields as never before. This is true whether members of *the fantastic lodge* of historians are tentatively embracing the fruits of contemporary scientific research or whether they remain deeply skeptical; debates are ever more centered around the construction and meanings of addiction, on representation and discourse.

Historical studies of drug users in social context, rich empirical detail and built on archival sources, may be losing ground in much the same way as the Becker-influenced ethnographers did. Historians may now be deconstructing that which they never really finished constructing in the first place. There is a great deal of empirical work left to do. Historians can demonstrate the extent to which Marilyn Bishop's world matters to the collective project of comprehending postwar Chicago, of the racial and

gender dynamics of postwar urban life. We must, as David Herzberg has written, “pull the history of drugs and medicines out of its isolation back into contact with other broad developments in postwar America.”⁷⁰ This means continuing the project of reconstructing and situating social networks – the “fantastic lodges” that allow us to develop concrete accounts of addict agency, action, and identity.

Gainesville, Florida
spillane@ufl.edu

ENDNOTES

1. The IJR project itself was among the very first recipients of funding from the then-new National Institute of Mental Health to study drug use and addiction among young people, a response to the then-current heroin epidemic in major US cities.

2. James Bennett, *Oral History and Delinquency: The Rhetoric of Criminology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 218. Bennett’s comprehensive account related in considerable detail the long and tortured history of the project. For decades, Marilyn’s identity remained unknown to all but those who had been a part of the project, or who had seen the documents related to the project. Because Marilyn Bishop herself had, at least one point, signaled that a condition of publication would be that her identity not be revealed, later scholars who almost certainly did know her identity (such as James Bennett) did not use it. In recent years, however, Howard Becker has begun making direct reference to “Janet’s” true identity. One mention, for example, appears in an oral history interview conducted in 2005 by Nancy D. Campbell, who has also subsequently identified Marilyn in print. See <http://howardsbecker.com/articles/campbell-interview.html> (accessed 24 June 2017) and also Nancy D. Campbell, *Discovering Addiction: The Science and Politics of Substance Abuse Research* (Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, 2007), 65-68.

3. *The Fantastic Lodge*, 214.

4. Bennett, *Oral History and Delinquency*, 232.

5. Marilyn’s psychoanalyst, “Dr. Zimpert” is ever-present in the book, advising her on nearly every critical decision. During early discussions regarding the book’s publication, an essay by “Dr. Zimpert” was considered for inclusion. Marilyn Bishop was hardly alone in postwar America in subjecting substance use to a psychoanalytic reading. See Michelle McClellan, “Lady Tiplers: Gendering the Modern Alcoholism Paradigm,” in *Altering American Consciousness: The History of Alcohol and Drug Use in the United States, 1800-2000* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2004): 267-97 and Lori E. Rotskoff, *Love on the Rocks: Men, Women, and Alcohol in Post-World War II America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002).

6. See, for example, Howard S. Becker, “History, culture, and subjective experience: An exploration of the social bases of drug-induced experiences,” *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 8 (1967): 163-76. Along similar lines, see John A. O’Donnell and Judith P. Jones, “Diffusion of the intravenous technique among narcotic addicts in the United States,” *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 9 (1968): 120-30.

7. Campbell, *Using Women: Gender, Drug Policy, and Social Justice* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 155-58.

8. On social network research in contemporary studies, see Samuel R. Freidman and Sevgi Aral, “Social networks, risk-potential networks, health, and disease,” *Journal of Urban Health* 78 (2001): 411-18; Miriam Williams Boeri, “‘Hell, I’m an addict, but I ain’t no junkie’: An ethnographic analysis of aging heroin users,” *Human Organization* 63 (2004), 236.

9. For prewar patterns in Chicago, see Mary D. Bailey, “Drug peddling, addiction, and

criminalism,” *Journal of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology* 23 (1932), 88; Bingham Dai, *Opium Addiction in Chicago* (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1937); and Charles E. Sceleth, “What we believe to be the facts concerning drug addicts,” *Illinois Medical Journal* 46 (1924), 71. On postwar patterns, see William H. Haines and John J. McLaughlin, “Narcotic addicts in Chicago,” *American Journal of Psychiatry* 108 (1952): 755-57.

10. Patrick H. Hughes, Gail A. Crawford, and Noel W. Barker, “Developing an epidemiologic field team for drug dependence,” *Archives of General Psychiatry* 24 (1971): 389-400.

11. Harold Finestone, “Cats, kicks, and color,” *Social Problems* 5 (1957): 3-13.

12. See Kathleen J. Frydl, *The Drug Wars in America, 1940-1973* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013). Frydl’s work is notable for the extent to which it takes seriously the need for an empirical reconstruction of actual drug war practices. Once completed, this allows Frydl to create an entirely new chronology for the drug war in twentieth-century America.

13. See Mark A. Pachucki and Ronald L. Brieger, “Cultural holes: Beyond relationality in social networks and culture,” *Annual Review of Sociology* 36 (2010): 205-24. This level of attention to symbols, culture, and meaning might surprise those familiar with network research in its more structural guises; see also Jan Fuhse, “The Meaning Structure of Social Networks, and Dualities of Culture and Structure: Seeing Through Cultural Holes,” *Sociological Theory* 27 (2009): 57-73.

14. See Guian McKee, “Are urban historians bowling alone? Social capital theory and urban history,” *Journal of Urban History* 36 (2010): 709-17.

15. Doug McAdam, *Freedom Summer* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988).

16. Doug McAdam, “Recruitment to high-risk activism: The case of freedom summer,” *American Journal of Sociology* 92 (July 1986): 64-90. See also Finestone, “Cats, Kicks and Color.”

17. Herb Ellis, John Frigo, and Lou Carter, “Detour Ahead” (1947) **we need more publication info for this song.**

18. Doug McAdam, “Gender as a mediator of the activist experience: The case of freedom summer,” *American Journal of Sociology* 95 (March 1992): 1211-40. See also Lynn Smith-Lovin and J. Miller McPherson, “You are who you know: A network approach to gender,” in Paula England, ed. *Theory on Gender: Feminism on Theory* (Transaction Publishers, 1993): 223-54.

19. On the dangers of romanticization see Loic Wacquant, “Scrutinizing the street: Poverty, morality, and the pitfalls of urban ethnography,” *American Journal of Sociology* 107 (May 2002): 1468-1532. On the positive and negative functions of networks relationships more generally, see Mustafa Emirbayer and Jeff Goodwin, “Network analysis, culture, and the problem of agency,” *American Journal of Sociology* 99 (1994): 1411-54.

20. *The Fantastic Lodge*, 139.

21. Samuel R. Freidman, Pedro Mateu-Gelabert, Richard Curtis, Carey Maslow, Melissa Bolyard, Milagros Sandoval, and Peter L. Flom, “Social capital or networks, negotiations and norms? A neighborhood case study,” *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 32 (2007): S160-70; Michael Kenney, *From Pablo to Osama: Trafficking and Terrorist Networks, Government Bureaucracies, and Competitive Adaptation* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007).

22. See, for example, Caroline Jean Acker, “Portrait of an addicted family: Dynamics of opiate addiction in the early twentieth century” and Sarah W. Tracy, “Building a boozatorium: State medical reform for Iowa’s inebriates, 1902-1920,” both in Tracy and Acker, *Altering American Consciousness*, 124-81.

23. Howard Reich, “Chicago avant-garde musician, Hal Russell,” *Chicago Tribune* (7 September 1992), S6. Harold Russell Luttenbacher, Jr. was born in Detroit on 28 August 1924, to a family that was (ironically) very active in the state’s Prohibition Party (the same year Hal Russell was born, his father was an elector for the Prohibition party in the 1924 Presidential election). Hal Russell attended Riverside-Brookfield High School outside of Chicago, where he led a jazz group and, after graduation in 1943, went to the University of Illinois and began

playing professionally; possessed of a severe stutter, he was classified as 4-F and did not serve during the war. Hal's stutter is alluded to at least once in *The Fantastic Lodge*; the 4-F reference comes from Francis Davis, "A jazz elder," *Philadelphia Inquirer* (19 October 1991). Howard Reich, "After the revolution," *Chicago Tribune* (27 June 1993), N18. See also Michael Jarrett, *Pressed for All Time: Producing the Great Jazz Albums* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2016), 236-38

24. 24 Miles Davis is almost certainly "Ron Slater" in *The Fantastic Lodge*, who arrived in the "middle of winter" from out of town and "made arrangements for Bob [Hal] and some other cats to make a gig with him" (*The Fantastic Lodge*, 122). Note that most female opiate addicts at mid-century reported initiating use with a male user, while virtually all male users initiated with other men. See Carl D. Chambers, Arthur D. Moffett, and Judith P. Jones, "Demographic factors associated with negro opiate addiction," *The International Journal of the Addictions* 3 (1968): 329-43.

25. *The Fantastic Lodge*, 122-23.

26. Bennett, *Oral History and Delinquency*, 229.

27. Bill Eppridge, "John and Karen, Two Lives Lost to Heroin," *Life Magazine* (26 February 1965), 66-81.

28. See Caroline J. Acker, *Creating the American Junkie: Addiction Research in the Classic Era of Narcotic Control* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), 185-86.

29. Maher, *Sexed Work*, 18.

30. *The Fantastic Lodge*, 135.

31. *The Fantastic Lodge*, 135. In retrospect, jazz musicians reflected on the solidarity of their own networks. Sonny Rollins once observed, "I never ripped Miles off. I never ripped off Monk or Bud Powell. Ripping off is something I did, but only to guys who couldn't play, guys you might consider to be squares. I only ripped off people that were outside our life." Eric Nisenson, *Open Sky: Sonny Rollins and His World of Improvisation* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2015), 42.

32. *The Fantastic Lodge*, 135.

33. *The Fantastic Lodge*, 144.

34. Bennett, *Oral History and Criminology*, 221-22.

35. Haines and McLaughlin, "Narcotic addicts in Chicago"; Robert L. McFarland and William A. Hall, "A survey of one hundred suspected drug addicts," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 44 (1953): 308-19.

36. *The Fantastic Lodge*, 120-21. On the Congo Lounge, see "Close Chicago nitery after 4th dope death," *Chicago Defender* (6 August 1949), 1. More generally on Dopeville, see Edward Kenneth Burbridge, *Chicago Boy: The Life and Crimes of a Southside Street Fighter* (West Covina, CA: LA & Chicago River Underground Press, 1991).

37. Milton Deas, Jr., interviewed in Timuel D. Black, Jr., *Bridges of Memory: Chicago's First Wave of Black Migration* (Northwestern University Press, 2003), 415.

38. See Barry Wellman, "Structural analysis: From method and metaphor to theory and substance," in *Social Structures: A Network Approach* ed. Barry Wellman and S.D. Berkowitz (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 19-61.

39. *The Fantastic Lodge*, 139-40. It is worth noting that even the Big Connections of Marilyn's networks were only wholesalers supplied by the Syndicate, a series of highly fluid and overlapping groupings of mostly Italian-American organized crime figures bringing heroin in from New York City.

40. In describing the Chicago House of Detention, following her third arrest, Marilyn observed: "The spade chicks – they were the ones that adjusted the best, the small clique of spade junkies. They were the sharpies, the ones who had their uniforms specially pressed down in the laundry, and who would have the matron's crocheted handkerchiefs – pink and red handkerchiefs – at so many packs of cigarettes per handkerchief...So they're always sharp...They are the upper strata of society in the joint. And the lowest, because they are still spades. The real lower class in the joint are the lusher, who are essentially not criminal peo-

ple...they're horrified being in the place, and they're scared of the spades who talk the sharp language and everything...I didn't make any real effort to be in with the top group because I didn't figure I was going to be in that long. And because I didn't like most of them...So I was sort of halfway – in the middle – without being in either, and yet leaning in both directions” (*The Fantastic Lodge*, 255).

41. *The Fantastic Lodge*, 141.

42. Bennett, *Oral History and Delinquency*, 218.

43. “Miss Michigan of 1947 seized with drug users,” *Chicago Tribune* (23 October 1951), 8.

44. W.L. Prosser, “The narcotics problem,” *UCLA Law Review* 1 (1954): 455.

45. Palmer D. Edmunds, “The Judicial System in Illinois,” *University of Illinois Law Forum* (Winter 1952), 500.

46. See Harry Hoffman, Irene Sherman, Fannie Krevitsky, and Forrestine Williams, “Teen-Age Drug Addicts Arraigned in the Narcotic Court of Chicago,” *Journal of the American Medical Association* 149 (1952), 655-59; also W.B. Eldridge, *Narcotics and the Law: A Critique of the American Experience in Narcotic Control* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967).

47. Campbell, *Using Women*, 71.

48. For the “bureaucratization of disease,” see Charles E. Rosenberg, “What is disease? In memory of Owsei Temkin,” *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 79 (2003): 491-505.

49. “The press: Sob sister’s job,” *Time* (5 November 1951), 47. The arrest made front pages in the city’s papers, with the *Tribune*’s rivals taking particular delight in the scuppering of Norma Lee Browning’s redemption story.

50. Norma Lee Browning, “A Benefactor Learns More About Dope,” *Chicago Tribune* (24 October 1951), 1.

51. *The Fantastic Lodge*, 149-50.

52. “2 Strip Teasers And 4 Booked in Narcotics Raid,” *Chicago Tribune* (24 November 1951).

53. James Method had been a Golden Gloves champion as a young man, living in Milwaukee. After boxing, he had started a career as a night club entertainer in Milwaukee. His first reported drug conviction came in 1949, for selling heroin to a juvenile (“Narcotic drive in Milwaukee,” *St. Joseph Gazette* [23 August 1949], 5). The following year, Method had been picked up in a vice raid and sent to the Mendota State Hospital in Madison for an addiction cure. He had been arrested in Milwaukee for illegal possession of marijuana (“Method delays dope charge plea,” *Milwaukee Sentinel* [4 March 1952], 12). See also the account of the original Chicago raid in “Chicago Police Seize Method,” *Milwaukee Sentinel* (22 November 1951), 15. Method was sentenced to federal prison after this raid, served his time, and was almost immediately re-arrested in Chicago on drug charges, after which he disappears from the historical record.

54. *The Fantastic Lodge*, 164. See also “2 Strip Teasers,” 4; “Strippers lead police to dope cache; seize 11,” *Chicago Tribune* (22 November 1951), B2. From a network perspective, Becker recounted that musicians and dancers occupied separate social worlds: “And there was a world of musicians and...actually we didn’t have hardly anything to do with anybody else, nobody had anything to do with the dancers” (Diane Hagaman, *Everybody Winked*, 15; http://www.diannehagaman.com/books/ew/ew_01.html [Accessed 15 October 2017]). And, in fact, Marilyn dismissed the two strippers [“Celeste” and “Ruth” in *The Fantastic Lodge*] as “dumb kids” – despite their being the same age. The three spent Thanksgiving “sick as dogs” in lockup, and finally made an appearance in Narcotics Court on the 24th.

55. *The Fantastic Lodge*, 171.

56. *The Fantastic Lodge*, 172.

57. For more on the contingency of drug-related harm, see Caroline Jean Acker, “How crack found a niche in the American ghetto: The historical epidemiology of drug-related harm,” *BioSocieties* 5 (2010): 70-88. See also an important study notes “the fingerprints of

the criminal justice system are everywhere to be found in the behavior” of intravenous drug users...and “high arrest and incarceration rates, or other police practices that influence injection partnering, could be actively causing the disruption of stable networks,” Burris, S., K.M. Blankenship, M. Donnoghoe, S. Sherman, J.S. Vernick, P. Case, Z. Lazzarini, and S. Koester, “Addressing the ‘risk environment’ for injection drug users: The mysterious case of the missing cop,” *Milbank Quarterly* 82 (2004): 125-56.

58. David Courtwright, Herman Joseph, and Don Des Jarlais, *Addicts Who Survived: An Oral History of Narcotic Use in America before 1965* (Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 1989).

59. Claude Brown, “Preface,” in *Addicts Who Survived*, xi-xiii.

60. I am indebted to Gerard Noonan, Peggy’s son, for the information he furnished about her life in California, and for his willingness to tell her story.

61. The quote is from *The Hal Russell Story* (ECM Records, 1993); he made one notable recording with the Trio, *At Newport ’63* (RCA Victor, 1963).

62. Howard Reich, “After the revolution,” *Chicago Tribune* (27 June 1993), N18.

63. Art Lange, “A Fickle Sonance” <http://www.pointofdeparture.org/PoD41/PoD41FickleSonance.html> (accessed 15 October 2017); Lange recalled that there “was no artifice, no posturing, no gamesmanship...when he was performing his exuberance exploded out into the audience.”

64. *The Hal Russell Story*.

65. Marilyn seems to have departed “Against Medical Advice” in April or May of 1952. The narrative compresses the time, but this is the best guess based on clues (Marilyn reports that there was a “Western Union strike on” the day she was released, and a nationwide Western Union strike began at the start of April and continued until late May).

66. *The Fantastic Lodge*, 260-61.

67. In the 33-year follow up conducted by the Drug Abuse Research Center at the UCLA Neuropsychiatric Center with a group of California opiate addicts, 48% were dead at the follow date, 15% were current methadone or opiate users, while 22% were abstinent (the rest were either incarcerated or unknown to the researchers). See Yih-Ing Hser, Valerie Hoffman, Christine Grella, and M. Douglas Anglin, “A 33-year follow-up of narcotics addicts,” *Archives of General Psychiatry* 58 (2001): 503-8. Shorter term studies from the same time period still reflect substantially higher annual death rates than for corresponding non-addict populations.

68. John Corbett, *Extended Play: Sounding Off From John Cage to Dr. Funkenstein* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1994), 110.

69. Hal Russell: “It’s a 10-year period that seems to consist almost entirely of standing on corners, getting money together, going through all the things that junkies go through, and working whenever I could...At that time, very few musicians weren’t into drugs. For one thing, the road musicians did drugs just to keep awake for the next show. Don’t forget, we had to do five shows a day, with no days off, traveling by bus. It was physically whipping. Plus everyone thought that doing drugs would make them play like Bird, and you can see how stupid that was” (Reich, “After the Revolution” N18).

70. Herzberg, *Happy Pills in America: From Miltown to Prozac* (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009), 197.