Jellinek revalued

Our aim in this article is to examine the intellectual roots and cultural background of E.M. Jellinek's theoretical innovations in the field of scientific alcoholism and to explain why he had such a vast impact on his contemporaries and the next generations.

In spite of the fact that the theorist Jellinek has had a lasting impact on modern addiction thought, his personal history has not yet been told. The Center of Alcohol Studies at Rutgers University has recently arranged a conference with the objective of "depicting the mostly undocumented life of E.M. Jellinek" (Bejarano, Ward, Bariahtaris, Goldstein, Thomas, Stewart, and Roizen, 2014). Although the Rutgers team did an excellent job in presenting the factual events of his story, perhaps the purpose of their investigation did not include delving into the cultural framework surrounding those events. Only Judit Hajnal Ward ventured into reconstructing the historical context of Jellinek's aborted financial caper in Hungary which brought him to a turning point in his life. (Ward, 2014). Consequently, many questions have still been left unanswered. The reason for this is that Jellinek himself effectively ensured that his past be concealed until his death. When Jellinek left Budapest on 4 June 1920 (Kelemen and Mark, 2013), on the same day that his country, the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, ceased to exist, he attempted to leave his past behind him. In the historical moment of the traumatic termination of an empire, the borderline between heroes and tricksters became blurred. He who would have been a valiant hero in a victorious country has a good chance of being a rogue amongst the panicking defeated. Following a revolution and a lost war, many of the things that were considered true, just, good or beautiful were to be seen as just the opposite almost overnight. In 1919 Hungary had a bloody revolution followed by a terrifying counter-revolution; and lost all of the wars it was waging. Jellinek's large-scale arbitrage manoeuvre and financial involvements at the expense of the winning powers, including the newly formed neighbouring countries, was to be deemed a sham. (He took advantage of the difference in the dates of the over-stamping of old banknotes in the various successor states and the discrepancies due to inflation in the value of the over-stamped currencies, but was unable to continue in this venture because of the unexpected closure of the borders and shared market.) An international warrant for his arrest was issued (Kelemen and Mark, 2012) and though he was never convicted, the proceedings did not come to an end until 1928 (Budapesti Büntető Törvényszék, 1928). Jellinek chose to live incognito for over ten years.

That botched arbitrage was not the only infringement he committed. During the war, he was unable to complete his studies and obtain a PhD. He postponed doing his doctorate until it became impossible due to his fugitive status. When he eventually got a job in the US in 1931, he presented a fictitious biography together with a false diploma (Worcester State Hospital, 1931).

Jellinek had three options to obtain a graduate degree in 1928:

Firstly, return to the Hungarian capital, Budapest, and try to earn a degree. However, there were two obstacles. The universities (especially Cluj) which had previously offered programmes in accordance with his ambitions, were no longer part of Hungary. Moreover, Hungary introduced a *numerus clausus* in 1920 to restrict the number of Jewish students who entered its universities, establishing racial discrimination against Jews. Although Jellinek was Protestant, his father was born a Jew (Miller, 2011). (Based on the Anti-Jewish Law of 1939,

Jellinek would have been exterminated in Auschwitz in 1944 as were the majority of Hungarian people labelled as Jews, even those with one Jewish parent.)
Secondly, return to Berlin, where he had a flat until 1931 (Berliner Adressbuch, 1931), and complete his studies in Germany. In the 1920s, Berlin was the most popular destination for resourceful Hungarian students of Jewish descent. By 1929, with the onset of the Great Depression, the Golden Era of the Weimar Republic was over. Germany soon became even more inhospitable territory for Jews than Hungary.
Thirdly, enrol in an American university at the age of 38 and restart his higher education from scratch.

Jellinek chose neither of these options, but claimed that he had a degree in education and a doctorate from the University of Leipzig (Roizen, 1997). In the 1930s false claims were not uncommon amongst the refugees from the European countries under fascist regimes. His distant cousin, the renowned child psychologist Bruno Bettelheim, also dressed up his vita with faked credentials (Pollak, 1997). In America Jellinek mentioned his Hungarian past only three times: in 1931 when he applied for his first job; in an article published in 1939 because the editor required a bio from the author (Jellinek, 1939); and in *Current Biography*'s 1947 edition, where Jellinek claimed that he "was biometrician at the Government School for Nervous Children in Budapest, a post which he held from 1915 until 1920" (Rothe, 1948). Apart from that, he decided not to disclose any mention of his Hungarian past.

Since Jellinek chose to hide his Hungarian past, he was obliged to conceal his scientific merits earned in Hungary as well. He never alluded to his first book which could have been a doctoral dissertation in Hungary in 1917. Moreover, Jellinek never made public either his training in psychoanalysis with Sándor Ferenczi or his debut as a keynote speaker just after Sigmund Freud at the Fifth International Psychoanalytic Congress in September 1918 (Mészáros, 2008).

We would like to focus on the untold parts of his history. There are at least three different strands blending into Jellinek's European intellectual development which spanned from 1895 to 1920:

- His study of statistics, taxonomy, standardisation and his contact with experimental methods of psychology.
- His acquaintance with an ethnographic approach in research including field work.
- His psychoanalytic studies, especially the realisation of the business model of psychoanalysis.

In this paper we will explore his European cultural background, give a biographical sketch placing emphasis on his renowned ancestors' expectations for him, and discuss the relevance and lessons of his oeuvre for contemporary addiction studies. We will mainly rely on our own material based on research conducted in the archives of Budapest, Berlin, Leipzig and Grenoble. (Documents not in English have been translated by the present authors.)

Intellectual and cultural background

As it has recently been revealed (Kelemen and Mark, 2012), Jellinek attended the Royal State Catholic Chief Grammar School in the 5th district of Budapest from the ages of 11 to 18. This grammar school was one of the five leading contemporary "gymnasiums" in Hungary. One of his schoolmates and friends, Sándor Hunyady (1890-1942), was the illegitimate son of

the famous Hungarian writer, Sándor Bródy. Hunyady was a frequent guest at the club, Home (Otthon), run by Jellinek's uncle, Aurél. Baccarat was his favourite card game (Kellér, 1978) and Jellinek was himself a passionate card player (Az Est, 1920). Jellinek passed his final exams in June 1908 and received his leaving certificate. According to Jellinek's only child, Ruth Surry (1936-1994), his father "wanted him to take over the transit business and sent him to Berlin Technical Institute for training" (Surry, 1965). Jellinek studied mechanical engineering at the *Technische Hochschule* in Charlottenburg is now and was then in the city centre during the winter semester of 1908/1909 (Archives, 1909).

He was not interested in engineering and trade. Jellinek "got permission to switch to the University of Leipzig", wrote Surry in her memo. Surry's data does not exactly correspond to reality. Prior to enrolling at the University of Leipzig, Jellinek attended the philosophical faculty of the Frederick William University in Berlin from 6 May 1910 to 11 March 1911 (Archives, 1911). Jellinek's best friend in his early twenties, Géza Róheim (1891-1953), started his studies at Frederich William University in 1909 and it is likely that Jellinek's choice was influenced by him. Both of them were members of the International Folklore Fellows (Krohn, 1911) and of the Hungarian Ethnographic Association (Hungarian Ethnographical Society, 1912), as well as having been involved in the same project on comparative folk tale research. This was Jellinek's earliest known publication (his name appeared as a contributor in the introduction), a book on Chuvash folk poetry (Mészáros, 1912). In 1912 Jellinek also published a review paper on Hans Siuts' book entitled *Afterlife Motifs in German Folk Tales.* Jellinek noted that the book was descriptive, but not reflective, as it didn't search for characters' motives (Jellinek, 1912). Jellinek's interest lay in the reconstruction of the original situation and understanding the primary purpose of the objects' usage. In his "armchair" ethnographic work, drawing his subjects from tales, folklore, myths and religions, Jellinek tried to reconstruct the prototype, the roots of a phenomenon, and then went on to analyse its genesis and trace its development. He was following in the footsteps of James Frazer, who was among those who demonstrated the constancy and uniformity in mankind's "elementary ideas". Jellinek shared his research vision with his friend Róheim, who defended the unity of the human species. Jellinek became familiar with the project of constructing the missing theory of human universals and filling this void during his university studies. Amongst his famous teachers in Berlin were Paul Ehrenreich (1855-1914) and Felix von Luschan (1854-1924). Ehrenreich was an Americanist, influenced by Rudolf Virchow's antiracist, progressive liberal ethnographic programme. Jellinek attended Ehrenreich's course on introduction to general mythology in 1910 and Luschan's course entitled anthropology and ethnology in 1911. Luschan pursued the aim of introducing empirical methods, such as measurement, standardisation, taxonomy and statistics to ethnography. For example, he contrived a chromatic scale to measure skin colours.

Whilst in Berlin, then the cultural hub of Europe, he became familiar with statistics. Later, at the University of Leipzig, which was at the heart of experimental research concerning the mind-body relationship, he began tracing his ethnographic field work. Jellinek's interest in the use of statistics probably stems from that period in Berlin. Luschan's influence can be traced in his scientific work: he was the first whom Jellinek quoted in his ethnographic book *The Origin of the Shoe* published in 1917 (Jellinek, 1917a). Jellinek maintained a Virchowian approach to disease throughout his entire career in the field of alcohol science affirming that "disease is never purely biological, but often socially derived or spread" (Virchow, 2006).

Jellinek started his studies at Leipzig on 25 November 1911 and was enrolled until 29 July 1913. He was again enrolled from 22 November 1913 until 12 February 1914, but took no courses. Róheim had joined him in 1912. On 23 March 1917, Jellinek requested a certification from the University of Leipzig for his studies. He stated in his request that prior to Leipzig he had attended the Technical High School of Charlottenburg, the University of Berlin, and the University of Grenoble in France (Archives, 1917). As we know from the Freud-Ferenczi correspondence, Jellinek planned to "get his doctorate" in 1917 (Falzeder and Brabant, 1996) and claimed to be a student at the University of Grenoble. However, the university has denied that Jellinek was ever a student there (Archives, 1910-1920). Nevertheless, Jellinek recognised the importance of the seminal book of the French ethnographer, Arnold van Gennep, entitled *Les Rites de Passage*, written in French. (Although van Gennep once studied in Grenoble, we do not know why Jellinek claimed to have been enrolled at this university.) In a review published in 1917, Jellinek recognised the importance of *rite of passage* as one of the human universals (Jellinek, 1917b). Van Gennep was an arch-enemy of Emile Durkheim. Whilst most of Jellinek's radical peers in Budapest became followers of Durkheim or Marx, he was interested in ethnography first from a nationalist and later from a Freudian perspective. Although moving from one university to another was a common practice amongst German students, we do not know why first Jellinek and later Róheim left the University of Berlin to go to the University of Leipzig. From Jellinek's most important ethnographic study *The Origin of the Shoe*, it appears that Karl Weule (1864-1926), the first German chair holder in ethnology, was the professor who had the greatest impact on him at Leipzig. Weule considered that German colonies were "ethnological gold mines" for ethnographic fieldwork. Upon Weule's return, he published scientific and popular books about the field research he conducted in Africa and New Guinea (Buschmann, 2009). Weule tried to establish organisations to mediate between theory and practice. Jellinek's book relies heavily on Weule's approach. He attended Weule's courses for three semesters from 1911-1913, taking four courses: development of history, ethnology of America, introduction to ethnology and comparative ethnology.

In his theoretical approach, Weule intended to employ a psychological way of looking at ethnographic topics. Although Jellinek never identified with the basic tenets of psychoanalysis, in his formative years he was close to *ethno-psychoanalysis* [i], as Róheim named their orientation. (Róheim applied psychoanalytic concepts to the ethnographic research of Hungarian folklore.) Jellinek gave credit to Róheim in his ethnographic book. Jellinek noted in *The Origin of the Shoe* that the issue of clothing, most specifically the subject of footwear, was a neglected area of ethnography. A notable exception was Baldwin Spencer and Francis J. Gillen's ethnographic research conducted amongst aboriginal people of central Australia at the end of the 19th century. In the 13th chapter of their voluminous book entitled *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, the authors write about a special kind of shoes whose native name is *Interlinia* in the North and *Intathurta* in the South. These shoes are used to prevent enemies from recognising a particular individual and the direction in which he has travelled (Spencer and Gillen, 1899). This is basically the message of Jellinek's book: shoes were originally used not to protect one's feet, but to make one's footprints unrecognisable. Thanks to the shoe, Aboriginal Australians could produce misleading footprints in order to prevent their enemies from being able to detect the direction of their trek. We consider that this forgotten book shows Jellinek's aptitude for *counterintuitive* thinking.

Professionals in the field of psychology or psychiatry very often boast about having met Freud: Jellinek, however, was an exception in that he had done so. One can read in the Freud-Ferenczi correspondence that Freud had declined to treat him, a fact which Jellinek himself had announced to Sándor Ferenczi in 1916. Three years later, Freud mentioned repeatedly that Jellinek delivered the "little yellowish thing" for the Freudian "ring of union", which Freud presented to the members of his secret Committee. Ferenczi wrote that Jellinek, "a very nice young Hungarian ethnologist… a millionaire and also an obsessional neurotic patient of mine… had found something very pretty…." Jellinek said that Australian tribes seal their blood friendships by exchanging their *churingas* [i.e., the preserved dried remnants of their umbilical cord]" (Falzeder and Brabant, 1996). Although Jellinek was a member of the Hungarian Psychoanalytic Association, we have yet to find a single psychoanalytic paper of his. His friend Róheim published a concise summary of Jellinek's presentation delivered at the Fifth International Psychoanalytic Congress in September 1918. He gave his presentation immediately following Sigmund Freud on the platform. Róheim wrote about this presentation entitled *Anthropological Contributions to the Psychology of Friendship* as follows: "blood or saliva represent breasts in blood contracts and the rope is the symbol of the umbilical cord" (Róheim, 1918).

Jellinek was remembered in the history of psychoanalysis as a gold supplier for the "Secret Committee" of people loyal to Freud. The gold was used to manufacture the special rings which symbolise being a part of this committee (Falzeder and Brabant, 1996). Jellinek's generosity was well rewarded in that he was able to closely observe the inner life of the psychoanalytic cartel, which monopolised the trade of their therapeutic "product".

In 1920, when the balance between political power and symbolic authorities profoundly changed in Hungary, the exodus of Hungarian intellectuals started. Many of them were persecuted on political grounds, numerous others left voluntarily because they had been victims of discrimination or were simply dissatisfied. Jellinek's case was different - his financial schemes had gone awry and he was deemed a con man. The history of his decade-long retreat and the story of his career as a biostatistician in Worcester (USA, MA) is not the topic of our paper. Although he was the informal leader of a small group of researchers, it was clear that this hospital environment would never give him a position of real influence. In 1938 when the Research Council on Problems of Alcohol (RCPA) offered him a leading role in the organisation, he grabbed the opportunity.

Personal history: a trans-generational sketch

Jellinek's great grandfather, Isaak Löbl Jellinek was a leaseholder in a Moravian (now today's Czech Republic) village and owned a distillery (Landesmann, 1997; Kempter, 1998). Moritz, Jellinek's grandfather, moved to Hungary in 1850, adopted the national culture and founded the first Hungarian horse-drawn tramway in 1865. This provided a crucial footing for the economic expansion of the capital and the development of the mass transport system. Marcell, Jellinek's father, was not initially attracted to trade. He experimented with theatre directing in Germany. Marcell met the American opera singer, Marcella Lindh, who was touring in Europe. They moved to the US together and married in 1889. Jellinek was born in Manhattan on 15 August 1890 (Ward, 2014). Marcella accepted the invitation of the Sousa Band in 1892 to sing as a soprano with them and frequently went on tour with the band until 1894 (Bierley, 2006). Marcell apparently had problems coping with the demands of American life and the

couple moved to Budapest in 1895, where he joined the family business (Sólyom, 2015). Marcella, who was once called the "American Lark" (The Hillside Daily News, 1996), quickly integrated into the artistic society of the Hungarian capital. She was familiar with Lujza Blaha, a singer, called the "Hungarian Nightingale" and Mari Jászai (Országos Hírlap, 1898; Kozocsa, 1944), one of the most influential actors in Hungary. Jellinek, who liked to imitate women by dressing in ladies' clothes and singing soprano (Frank, 1957), supposedly inherited his affinity with performing from his parents. His theatrical skills would later be useful in the arena of addiction policy. On the basis of his family history, it is not implausible to surmise that Jellinek was entrusted by his successful ancestors with a trans-generational mission of high calling. According to contemporary beliefs nourished by Thomas Mann's popular book, *Buddenbrooks* and by the degeneration theory popularised by Budapest-born Max Nordau, he may have shared the then popular belief that it could be his destiny to find himself in a chain of decadence in the course of four generations.

The end of WWI also marked the end of his life in Hungary. By 1920, not only was Jellinek's scientific career destroyed, but his personal freedom was also at stake. He was involved with the management of a leading Hungarian bank, the Unió, whose officials were implicated in a major financial swindle, but they were acquitted and Jellinek alone took the blame (Kelemen and Mark, 2013). By 1920, not only had Jellinek failed as a business man, he was also unable to obtain a degree or meet the expectations of his family and accomplish the mission transmitted to him over generations. Jellinek seemed at that time to have disappeared from the face of the earth. Although he claimed in his CV on 6 July 1962 to have worked as a biometrician in Sierra Leone from 1920 to 1925 and in the Honduras from 1925 to 1930 (Jellinek, 1961), there was no available evidence to demonstrate or prove this until 1928. Recent research, based on discourse analysis, revealed that a certain A.N. Hartman, who worked for the United Fruit Company and published two papers on the banana between 1929 and 1930, appears to have been Jellinek (Goldstein, 2014). In a scientific sense he was "reborn" at the Worcester State Hospital where he obtained a job and became their chief statistician on 1 May 1931. It took another eight years for him eventually to meet those trans-generational expectations. His great grandfather made his fortune from innovations in alcohol production and marketing. Jellinek too made an impact on the field of alcohol, though in quite a different way. The family history of three generations of male Jellineks is a story spanning social exclusion to economic and cultural inclusion. Jellinek, a member of the fourth generation, spurred the scientific community to look at alcoholism through a new prism that enabled scholars to attain a perspective on recovery.

Utilising his experience from his academic and psychoanalytic studies

When Jellinek entered the arena of alcohol issues in 1939, he appeared as a representative of the modern scientific approach, going beyond both the traditional medical view of alcoholism, based on the pre-Darwinian concept of degeneration and the moralistic view of the temperance movement. His first publications on alcohol problems were co-authored by those medical scholars who wanted to use scientific research not as a tool for greater moral or educational purposes, but rather for the advancement of science itself (Roizen, 1991). Although the RCPA made a far-reaching change, in that science was no longer simply a means to an end, but became an end in itself, their approach still remained within medical orthodoxy. The scientific view was that alcoholism could be defined by the physical and mental complications of heavy drinking. The fundamental conceptual shift came from

Alcoholics Anonymous (AA). In the early 1940s, Jellinek's acquaintance and alliance with AA led to a change in his thinking. He became one of the first scholars to firmly espouse AA's "like-a-disease" approach which helped to promote its acceptance in the scientific community and amongst the general public as well. Whilst AA accepted the "illness" concept of alcoholism, in therapy they declared a *counterintuitive* doctrine, stating that alcoholics cannot be treated in the same way as people suffering from a disease. However, they might be able to manage their condition by a spiritual awakening, allowing them to accept that they were powerless over alcohol. Jellinek, who received an appointment at the University of Yale in 1941, combined the new scientific approach, decontaminated from moral-educational purposes, with the AA therapeutic attitude. Harnessing his abilities in statistics and epidemiological research, and making an *abductive inference* from his puzzling observations, Jellinek established the association between cirrhosis of the liver mortality and the prevalence of alcoholism.

Jellinek's first major work in the epidemiology of alcoholism was published in 1941. Jellinek and Norman Joliffe recognised that "the relative incidence of cirrhosis of the liver in inebriates is approximately 6.7 times as great as in temperate or abstinent persons (Jolliffe and Jellinek, 1941). Starting from this statistical data in 1950, Jellinek developed a formula for the estimation of the prevalence of alcoholism from the number of registered deaths due to cirrhosis of the liver, which was named after him. The WHO Alcoholism Subcommittee, of which Jellinek was secretary, declared that Jellinek's estimation formula is an "estimate of the number of alcoholics, based on careful statistical studies" (World Health Organization, 1951). The fact that the WHO recognized the scientific value of this formula in the measurement of alcoholism prevalence was instrumental in consolidating the place of addiction science in medicine. Efforts to demonstrate relationships between physical and mental phenomena were the very tradition of the University of Leipzig, giving a home to Gustav Fechner's and Wilhelm Wundt's experiments. Fechner was the first to demonstrate a quantifiable relationship between psychological sensation and physical intensity. Later Wundt made Leipzig the citadel of experimental psychology methods. By demonstrating a quantifiable connection between a physical disease (cirrhosis) and a mental phenomenon (alcoholism characterised by craving and loss of control) Jellinek applied and improved the scientific methodology he acquired at the University of Leipzig.

In another ground-breaking publication with Bowman in 1941, Jellinek made a distinction between addiction and chronic alcoholism, characterising addiction by uncontrollable craving. He noted that there were steps in the development of addiction, and exposed a need for systematic, multidisciplinary research, suggesting the establishment of institutions for the study alcoholism (Bowman and Jellinek, 1941). The theoretical edifice of Jellinek's alcoholism concept was elaborated in 1941 when he became the managing editor of the Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol. At that time he believed that addiction science might take "some leads from psychiatry" because "psychiatry has produced some highly valuable working hypothesis on alcohol addiction and inebriety" and "psychiatry has furnished the necessary insight and working hypotheses, sufficient to warrant application of existing knowledge to investigation of the essential and complex problems of the origins of inebriety and addiction, their prevention and treatment" (Jellinek, 1942). During this creative period in his scientific career, not only did he produce his basic text, but he laid out the groundwork for a possibility of a new kind of multi-, inter- and trans-disciplinary hybridisation of the field as

well. This new governing image, as Robin Room aptly named it, was a social category and also a model for the problem (Room, 1978).

In the early 1940s, Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) proved to be the best means of promoting the idea that alcoholics are sick people who can be helped. The Yale Center of Alcohol Studies opened the first Summer School of Alcohol Studies at Yale University in 1943. Bill Wilson the co-founder of AA was the keynote speaker on the final day of the six-week course (Jellinek, 1944). The following year when the ambitious Marty Mann, an early female member of AA approached him, Jellinek immediately became enthusiastic about her aims. Mann wanted to do for alcoholics what Dorothea Dix had done on behalf of the mentally ill a century earlier (Johnson, 1973). She appeared on the one hand to be the appropriate person to popularise the scientific approach to alcoholism, and a key informant for Jellinek on the other. Jellinek was ready to perceive the problem from an insider's point of view, that of a recovering person. At the end of April 1944, Marty Mann moved to New Haven, where she lived for the next five months with Jellinek and his family. So Jellinek had the opportunity to closely observe Marty Mann's own experience and put himself "in her shoes" over a long period of time. Immersion in the field through a key informant, whom he observed and interviewed constantly, can be seen as a quasi-ethnographic experiment. This intensive closeness was fruitful for both of them. Mann's crusade gained momentum. She went on to collect data from recovering alcoholics and requested that Jellinek analyse them. Jellinek performed a secondary analysis of the data which Marty Mann had already collected from members of AA. Although the results of this inadequately designed questionnaire, administered with sample bias, were unsuitable for generalisation, the four phases of the progressive disease of "alcoholic people" which it delineated (pre-alcoholic, prodromal, crucial and chronic), have become a canonised classic in addiction science. In 1958 Max Glatt added the recovery stages to Jellinek's phases of alcohol addiction (Glatt, 1958). Robin Room pertinently remarked that this is "probably the most widely diffused artefact of the alcoholism movement" (Room, 1978). At the time when Jellinek was studying at university, one of the strongest trends in ethnography was the representation of the unilinear evolution of cultures, suggesting that societies progressed (or declined) mechanically through stages according to a deterministic law.

Whilst Jellinek maintained a multifactorial etiology of alcoholism, he wanted to show the distinctive course of a particular group of alcoholics, who were "addicts". For *non-addictive alcoholics* he applied the *stress-reduction* theory, without elaborating it (WHO, 1952). Jellinek could have applied Hans Selye's stage model of stress to them, but he did not. (Selye went to North America at the time when Jellinek had accepted his first job in the United States. They shared similar backgrounds, having grown up in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and both their stage concepts were original departures from the Freudian psychosexual developmental theory.) In 1946 Jellinek considered a unilinear disease progression from the perspective of addict alcoholics. In 1952, using a much larger sample, Jellinek made an ambiguous attempt to repeat his survey in view of its limitations. Whilst in 1946 he presented the different phases in the history of addict *alcoholics*, in 1952 he moved to the phases of addictive *alcoholism* (Jellinek, 1946; Jellinek, 1952). The next step in his theoretical development was the realisation that alcoholism "is a genus with many species. Only two factors are common to this genus, namely drinking and the damage resulting from it" (Jellinek, 1960). Nevertheless, he also often adopted the vantage point of *alcohol*, not only as a product, but also as a milieu of human activity. Jellinek emphasised that the consumption of

alcohol had physiological, psychological, sociocultural and economic effects. Whilst the physiological effects may be similar in animals and humans, the cultural ones pertain only to humans as animals do not lose their jobs or distress their families, nor do they get into trouble with the law (Jellinek, 1948). This shift in perspective was not independent of the transformation of his personal status and the change of scientific setting. By the end of the 1940s, it was not alcohol but *alcoholism* that appeared on the agenda of the WHO, which decided to redefine its system of diagnostic codes for morbidity reporting at the same time. Jellinek was appointed as a *consultant on alcoholism* for the WHO (which is responsible for developing the international classification of diseases) from 1950 to 1955. In 1951, during the second meeting of the WHO Alcoholism Subcommittee, Jellinek presented his chart of alcohol addiction. Due to the demands of developing a nosology, he automatically focused on the disease rather than the person suffering from it. (WHO, 1952)

When telling the story of the shoe in 1917, Jellinek would usually include the standpoint of the shoes themselves and let the shoes speak about the people using them. Similarly, he did not want to omit the very topic of alcohol from alcohol studies. This totality approach to inquiry was his original ethnographic inclination. In 1912 Franz Boas, the father of American anthropology, had visited his country of origin and gave a speech in Berlin. He argued that statistics could only raise biological questions, but not answer them (Herskovits, 1953). In the last phase of his theoretical development, Jellinek apparently returned to his original scientific ethnographic passion in terms of methodology, which is traceable in his papers (WHO, 1955; Jellinek, 1960; Jellinek, 1962; Jellinek, 1977). He realised that history, philosophy, economics, and social science are as important as psychiatry in unravelling the story of alcohol.

Jellinek not only built a bridge between AA and science, but also a link between its economic or political sponsors and the people involved in alcoholism studies, creating a strong bond amongst the individuals chosen to deal with the problem of alcoholism as a vocation or career. Through this bridging, he managed to dovetail and interpenetrate a psychiatric perspective with the recovery movement. Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi, supporters of lay analysis (psychoanalysis performed by someone who is not a physician), made a similar effort several decades earlier. Jellinek was actively involved in the Fifth International Psychoanalytic Congress in Budapest in 1918. The congress succeeded in deftly linking this new discipline with fundraising and politics. A Hungarian millionaire, Anton von Freund, a former patient of Freud and Ferenczi's donated huge amounts of money for the promotion of psychoanalysis “by underwriting two significant projects, a publishing house and a major multi-faceted Institute” combining research, treatment and the teaching of psychoanalysis (Danto, 2005). High ranking representatives of science, politics and the army attended the congress demonstrating the recognition of psychoanalysis in the most eminent spheres. Jellinek could also observe the role of the International Psychoanalytic Association in the business-like operation of psychoanalysis in terms of its leadership, “product development” and distribution or “franchising” of its product to a wider range of customers (Szasz, 1978).

With the opening of a Summer School of Alcohol Studies at Yale in 1943 Jellinek provided not just a forum allowing for interaction between a wide variety of people, including recovering alcoholics and researchers, but also an opportunity for the participants to become “students of alcoholism” in a newly emerging field of science. According to Page, “The field needed a leader who could devote his full time and who possessed the necessary skills to

reach these various groups and pull them together in a common cause. Jellinek assumed this role and used the scientific approach to establish the legitimacy of alcohol problems as a modern field of study" (Page, 1997). In fact, he did more than that. When Marty Mann approached him with her vision of an organisation and action plan, Jellinek instantly recognised that Mann, a charismatic speaker with impressive contacts in the journalism and public relations communities, was uniquely suited for publicising his mission (Brown and Brown, 2001). One result of the five-month cohabitation of the Jellinek family with Marty Mann was the launching of the National Committee for Education on Alcoholism (NCEA) in October 1944. The millionaire, R. Brinkley Smithers, a recovering alcoholic, was elected to the board of the National Council on Alcoholism (which sprang from the NCEA) in 1956. As a principal benefactor and a major officer, Smithers played an invaluable role in funding not only Jellinek's research, but also the development of "nearly every area of the alcoholism field from support in building its organizational infrastructure, to support for public and professional education, policy advocacy, research, treatment, and prevention". (White, 2003). Smithers' support was gained when he attended the Yale Summer School led by Jellinek. Apparently Jellinek was a talented student of the business model of psychoanalysis and capitalised on his knowledge to facilitate and consolidate the modern discipline of alcohol studies.

Relevance for contemporary addiction studies

From time to time eminent members of addiction science give credit to Jellinek, affirming that he played a role of momentous importance in their scientific awakening. Thomas Babor wrote in 1995 that "I first became interested in alcoholism research by reading Jellinek" adding that "Jellinek's seminal ideas about the nature and variety of types of alcoholism have been accepted as dogma by many students of alcohol problems, and ignored as irrelevant by others. Few have attempted to test these ideas empirically, and those who have tried sometimes lacked the broad historical, cultural and clinical framework that is so characteristic of Jellinek's work" (Babor, 1995). Juan Carlos Negrette said, "I was interested from the beginning in the cultural expression of alcoholism, having read Jellinek's book, *The Disease Concept of Alcoholism*" (Addiction, 2013).

In 1991 Griffith Edwards edited a book entitled *Addictions: Personal Influences and Scientific Movements* collecting interviews originally published by the British Journal of Addiction. By interviewing leading figures in the field of addiction science, he tried to demonstrate that Jellinek's influence was paramount amongst the trailblazers of this discipline. Jellinek was an innovator in the posing of theoretical questions, as well as in treatment, rehabilitation and epidemiological inquiries. His role was also crucial in developing international acceptance of addiction science, showing that there are possibilities of diminishing the extent of the related problems. E.M. Jellinek's name comes up time and again and in relation to many countries, according to Edwards (Edwards, 1991). In 1979 the *British Journal of Addiction* (renamed *Addiction* from 1993) launched a series of interviews usually starting with the phrase "in this occasional series we record the views and personal experiences of people who have specially contributed to the evolution of ideas in the *Journal*'s field of interest". The number of interviews is now over a hundred. Several scholars tried to give an account of Jellinek's role in the first interviews. Joy Moyer, who arrived at the WHO at the same time as Jellinek in 1950, remembered Jellinek as "a fascinating person, very strange, brilliant sometimes and childish at other times" (BJA, 1984). Mark Keller, one of his

closest co-workers in the heroic age of the birth of a “new approach to alcohol” recalled this period. He concluded that this multidisciplinary, multifaceted and multidirectional field needs someone to integrate all of these things as Jellinek did erstwhile (BJA, 1985). The Chilean Jorge Mardones organised the first public event honouring the memory of Jellinek, a symposium in Santiago de Chile in 1966. He praised Jellinek as a “promoter” having a mind enriching, humane view of the alcohol problem (BJA, 1986).

Additionally, Jellinek left to us as a legacy the practice of collecting and showing accurate data concerning the prevalence of alcohol use disorders. Jellinek provided an exemplary model for the searching of the biological features associated with the disorder. Any pathognomonic feature (we call them “biomarkers” today) is essential for both individual diagnoses and estimating the population at risk. He initiated developmental research in addiction science, which can be seen as a predecessor of the natural history approach and stage of change model. Despite his periodic efforts to show the universalities of alcohol addiction, Jellinek is also remembered as a systematist of alcohol use disorders and demonstrated that there is no unitary pattern of alcoholism. His early binary model continues to exist in contemporary research-based typologies. He established a non-eliminable scientific interest in craving. It is no accident that the diagnostic criteria of craving has come back into DSM-5 (American Psychiatric Association, 2013).

Last but not least, Jellinek should be remembered as the master of agenda building in the field. In 1931, when Jellinek took up his first job on American soil, bootlegging, along with drug trafficking and gambling, was booming. There are now indications that Jellinek was not involved any of these activities. Still, he distanced himself from the supporters of drug-criminalisation. Jellinek, having entered into the arena of alcoholism in 1938 as a man of science, wanted to lay down the standards of scientific discourse of this very heterogeneous field encumbered by the debris of Prohibition. His skills in ethnography, empirical psychology and psychoanalysis paired with his aptitude for counterintuitive thinking helped him to find ways to proceed. In order to replace the moralistic approach with a new scientific one, he resorted to statistical methods and introduced a standardisation based on a dichotomising taxonomy. His expertise in ethnographic statistics had been established during his years in Berlin and was consolidated in Leipzig, the heart of experimental psychology. This nosology, set out in 1941, was not an accurate view of the reality of alcohol use problems but was appropriate for the contemporary scientific climate. Whilst studying at the German universities, Jellinek also grasped the idea that it was necessary to bring more scientific factualness to ethnography and psychology in order to discredit their adversaries' arguments. Jellinek’s elaboration of a formula for estimating the prevalence of alcoholics based on a modified Fechnerian methodology. Whilst Fechner discovered in Leipzig in 1834 that inner perception was related to the ratios of intensity of outer stimuli, 107 years later Jellinek recognised and made numerical that a mental condition (loss of control) was related to an organic pathology (in people who died due to cirrhosis of the liver) at the population level. Again, the Jellinek formula, which had emerged as a standard technique for estimating alcoholic prevalence, suffers from known biases that weaken its validity as an indicator, though it was adequate for that period and momentously contributed to the stabilisation of the science of alcoholism.

In his very first co-authored book on alcohol issues, Jellinek writes that the "conversion" which can be attained in Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) is an emotional rebirth that “must be

achieved without the aid of 'preaching' and 'holier-than-thou' attitudes" (Haggard, Jellinek, 1942). Jellinek had learnt from ethnography the importance of grasping the aborigine people's relation to life and comprehending their world view. Apparently, he approached recovering alcoholics of AA with the sensitivity, curiosity and openness of an ethnographer. He recognised the importance of this social innovation and was in favour of an alliance between science and a mutual-aid movement of social deviants that appeared to be a prototype of trans-disciplinary cooperation. Sharing his home with a lesbian woman in recovery while constantly observing and interviewing her led to two unexpected results. On one hand, they worked out political and professional actions on behalf of alcoholics, in spite of the fact that AA refuses all involvement in these things. On the other hand, Jellinek started to work on his conception regarding the phases of alcohol addiction model based on a questionnaire made up and administered by the AA journal, Grapevine.

Jellinek was a member of the Hungarian Psychoanalytic Association for four years, until 1920, when the great flowering of psychoanalysis began. He might have recognised trends (e.g., the forming of basic ideas or categories, institutionalisation, integration into medicine) and the interplay of its scientific, public policy and marketing aspects. We agree with Szasz that the leadership (i.e., the secret "inner circle") of the psychoanalytic movement adopted a business model and a monopolistic attitude (Szasz, 1978). Although we cannot prove it, it seems plausible to us that when Jellinek utilised scientific results, as well as former teaching or therapeutic connections for fundraising aims, he had a model which inspired his plan of action.

Working with professionals from different countries at the WHO, Jellinek realised that cultural differences were of considerable importance in the perception of alcoholism. He was also aware of the activity of the United Nation Commission on Narcotic Drugs chaired by Harry J. Anslinger, a proponent of the criminalisation of drug-using. Jellinek's purpose of retaining a therapeutic and recovery focus on the alcohol/alcoholism problem brought him back to his ethnographic roots when he started to conceptualise the matter as a generic term, a "family of problems", not a "definitive nosological entity" with a "medical and public health character" (WHO, 1955).

Conclusion

In 1965 the *Jellinek Memorial Fund* was established to commemorate Jellinek's enormous contribution to the field of alcohol studies. The award is granted to scientists who have made outstanding contributions to the advancement of knowledge in alcohol related issues. There is a short biography of Jellinek on the homepage of the award, but nothing is mentioned either about his 25-year history in Hungary or his activity in ethnography, psychoanalysis and psychopathology (Jellinek Memorial Awards, 1965). There is no longer any need to conceal these things.

Modern science does not abide by the aphoristic truth of the Latin maxim: "of the dead, nothing unless good". In a science based on the principle of openness, transparency, accountability and replicability, we should instead say: "of the dead, nothing unless truth". One of the premises of modern science is its ability to separate the personal life of scientists from their scientific merits. There is no relation between moral integrity and scientific

creativity or intellectual restlessness. However, the integrity of the professional qualified to treat people who are ill is of course essential.

Jellinek was not a therapist, he was a theoretician. The thoughts of his ethnologist, psychologist and psychoanalyst forefathers seem to have had considerable influence on him, although his central ideas remained his own. In ancient Greece “theoria” involved a pilgrimage away from home. However, Jellinek was trapped in a geopolitical and historical situation which made it necessary for him to find a way of resolving his dilemma. He was unable to submit and defend his ethnographic book on shoes as a doctoral dissertation, yet was forced to cover up his own tracks for the rest of his existence, enacting in his own life the very topic of his book. In the process, his life became a fabrication that could collapse at any time. This must have been an extraordinary burden. The man whose work helped millions to recover was not himself able to recover by sharing his story. Our profession should not go on dragging this burden, but learn from Jellinek's experience. Walking backwards in his footprints is actually a good way to move forward, by revealing his historical, social, scientific, and personal “barefoot” truth.

Acknowledgements/dedication

The present scientific contribution is dedicated to the 650th anniversary of the foundation of the University of Pécs, Hungary.

References:

Addiction (2013), "Journal Interview, 106. Conversation with Juan Carlos Negrete" *Addiction* Vol. 108. No 8, pp. 1367-1375.

American Psychiatric Association (2013), *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 5th Edition: DSM-5.* American Psychiatric Publishing, Arlington, VA

Archives (1917), University Archives, Leipzig. Jellinek's student file number: 261 & 262; Róheim's student file number: 347.

Archives (1910-1920), Archives départementales de l'Isère. (Confirmed by Caroline Wahl, researcher of the Isère office of archives)

Archives of University records (1909), Technische Universität, Berlin. Jellinek's matriculation number: 19239. His student file number: 246.

Archives (1911), Humbold University Library, Berlin. Jellinek's registration number: 5455/100.

Az Est [The Evening] (1920), "Szombaton hallgatja ki a rendőrség Jellinek ügynökeit" [[Police to question Jellinek's agents on Saturday] 19 June, p.1.

Babor, T.F. (1995), "Comments of Kahler et al.' paper 'Loss of control and inability to abstain: the measurement of and the relationship between two constructs in male alcoholics' " *Addiction* Vol. 90, No 9, pp. 1037-1039.

Bejarano, W., Ward, J., Bariahtaris, C., Goldstein, S. Thomas, K., Stewart, T. and Roizen, R. (2014), "Mystery and Speculation: Piecing together E.M. Jellinek's Redemption" available at: http://www.researchgate.net/publication/266852892_Mystery_and_Speculations_Piecing_Together_E.M._Jellinek's_Redemption (accessed 28 September 2015).

Berliner Adressbuch (1931), "Schmargendorf", available at: http://digital.zlb.de/viewer/image/10089470_1931/6265/LOG_0470/ (accessed 28 September 2015).

Bierley, PE. (2006), *The Incredible Band of John Philip Sousa*. University of Illionis Press, Chicago IL

BJA (1984), "Journal Interview, 7. Conversation with Joy Moser" *Brit J Addict* Vol. 79, No 4, pp. 355-363.

BJA (1985), "Journal Interview, 8. Conversation with Mark Keller" *Brit J Addict*; Vol. 80, No 1, pp. 5-9.

BJA (1986), "Journal Interview, 9. Conversation with Jorge Mardones" *Brit J Addict* 1986; Vol. 81, No 3, pp. 347-351.

Brown, S., Brown R.B. (2001), *A Biography of Mrs. Marty Man.* Hazelden. Center City, MN

Bowman, K.M, Jellinek, E.M. (1941), "Alcohol Addiction and its Treatment". *Quart. J. Stud. Alc.*, Vol. 2 No 1, pp. 98–176.

Budapesti Büntető Törvényszék [The Criminal Tribunal of Budapest] (1928), 7069/920/181 Budapest Főváros Levéltára [Metropolitan Archives Budapest]

Buschmann, R.R. (2009), *Anthropology's Global Histories: The Ethnographic Frontier in German New Guinea 1870-1935*. University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu.

Danto, E.A. (2005), *Freud's Free Clinic: Psychoanalysis & Social Justice, 1918-1938.* Columbia University Press, New York, NY

Edwards, G. (1991), *Addictions: Personal Influences and Scientific Movements.* Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, NJ

Falzeder, E., Brabant, E. (eds.) (1996), *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sandor Ferenczi Volume 2, 1914-1919*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press; Cambridge.

Frank, L. (1957), *Szélhámosok, kalandorok*. [Conmen, vagabonds] Bibliotheca, Budapest.

Glatt, M.M. (1958), "Group Therapy in Alcoholism" *Brit. J. Addict*. Vol. 54, No 2, 133–150.

Goldstein, S. (2014), The "banana book" by E.M. Jellinek In: *Substance Abuse Library and Information Studies: Proceedings of the 36th Annual SALIS Conference*, Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies, New Brunswick, NJ pp. pp. 62-66.

Haggard, H.W., Jellinek, E.M. (1942), *Alcohol Explored*. Doubleday Doran, New York.

Herskovits, M. (1953), *Franz Boas: The Science of Man in the Making*. Scribner's, New York, NY

Hungarian Ethnographical Society (1912), Member Directory at the end of 1912. *Ethnographia* Vol. XXIII No 6, 374–388.

Jellinek, M. (1912), "Afterlife Motifs in German Folk Tales" *Ethnographia* Vol. XXIII, No 5, 308-310.

Jellinek, M. (1917a), *A saru eredete [The Origin of the Shoe]*. Dick Manó, Budapest.

Jellinek, M. (1917b), "Bibó István: The Meaning of Numbers and the History of Basic Forms of Thinking" *Ethnographia* Vol. XXVIII, No 1, 133-135.

Jellinek, E.M. (1939), "Some Principles of Psychiatric Classification", *Psychiatry* Vol. 2 No 2, pp. 161-165.

Jellinek, E.M. (ed.) (1942), *Alcohol addiction and chronic alcoholism*. Yale University Press, New Haven.

Jellinek, E.M. (1944), "School of Alcohol Studies, Yale University" *Q. J. Stud. Alcohol* Vol. 4. No 3, pp. 490-507.

Jellinek, E. M. (1946), "Phases in the Drinking History of Alcoholics, Analysis of a Survey Conducted by The Official Organ of Alcoholics Anonymous" *Q. J. Stud. Alcohol* Vol. 7, No 1, pp. 1-88.

Jellinek, E.M. (1948), Alcohol, cats and people [booklet] New Haven: Yale Center of Alcohol Studies.

Jellinek, E.M. (1952), "Phases of Alcohol Addiction" *Q. J. Stud. Alcohol* Vol. 13, No 4, pp. 673-684.

Jellinek, E.M. (1960), "Alcoholism, a Genus and Some of its Species" *The Canadian Medical Association Journal* Vol. 83, No 26, pp. 1341-1345.

Jellinek, E.M. *The Disease Concept of Alcoholism*. New Haven: Hillhouse Press; 1960.

Jellinek's C.V (1961), Lane Medical Library, Stanford University, Medical School.

Jellinek, E.M. (1962), Cultural differences in the meaning of alcoholism. In: D.J. Pittman and C.R. Snyder (Eds.), *Society, Culture and Drinking Patterns.* Southern Illinois Press, Carbondale, pp. 382-388.

Jellinek Memorial Awards (1965), available at: http://www.jellinekaward.org (accessed 28 September 2015)

Jellinek, E.M. (1977), "The Symbolism of Drinking" *J. Stud. Alc*. Vol. 38, No 5, pp. 849–866.

Johnson, B.H. (1973), *The Alcoholism Movement in America: A Study in Cultural Innovation*. PhD Dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Sociology.

Jolliffe, N., Jellinek, E.M. (1941), "Vitamin Deficiencies and Liver Cirrhosis in Alcoholism. 4. Cirrhosis of the Liver" *Q. J. Stud. Alcohol* Vol. 2 No 3, pp. 544-583.

Kelemen, G. and Mark, M. (2012), "E. M. Jellinek - a 'Free Floating' Alcohologist" *Psychiatria Hungarica,* Vol. 27 No. 5, pp. 304-319.

Kelemen, G. and Mark, M. (2013), "E. M. Jellinek's Silenced and Silencing Transgenerational Story" *Psychiatria Hungarica,* Vol. 28 No. 4, pp. 349-369.

Kellér, A. (1978), *Bal négyes páholy*.[*Fourth Box, Left Side*] Magvető, Budapest

Kempter, K. (1998), *Die Jellineks 1820-1955.* [*The Jellineks 1820-1955*] Droste, Düsseldorf.

Kozocsa, D. (1944), *Jászai Mari levelei.* [Letters of Mari Jászai] Pintér, Budapest.

Krohn, K. (1911), Zweiter Bericht über die Tätigkeit des folkloristischen Forscherbundes „FF" Folklore Fellows' Communication No. 7 available at: https://de.wikisource.org/wiki/Zweiter_Bericht_%C3%BCber_die_T%C3%A4tigkeit_des_folkloristischen_Forscherbundes_%E2%80%9EFF%E2%80%9C (accessed 28 September 2015)

Landesmann, P. (1997), *Rabbiner aus Wien: ihre ausbildung, ihre religiösen und nationalen Konflikte*. [*Rabbis from Vienna: their training, religion and national conflict*] Böhlau Verlag, Wien.

Mészáros, G. (1912), *Chuvash folk poetry collection II.* Budapest: Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

Mészáros, J. (2008), *"Your Committee": Sándor Ferenczi, the Budapest School of the Psychoanalytic Emigration*. Akadémia Kiadó, Budapest

Miller, L.M. (2011), "Going native: Moritz Jellinek and the modernization of the Hungarian economy". In: Reuveni R and Wobick-Segev, S. (Eds.), *The economy in Jewish history: New perspectives on the interrelationship between ethnicity and economic life*. Berghahn, New York, NY, pp. 157–173.

Országos Hírlap [Nationwide Newspaper] (1898), "Mulatságok" [Merriments] 26 February, p.12.

Page, P.B. (1997), "E. M. Jellinek and the evolution of alcohol studies: a critical essay" *Addiction* Vol. 92, No 12, pp. 1619-1637.

Pollak, R. (1997), *The Creation of Dr. B*, Simon & Schuster, New York, NY

Roizen, R. (1991), *The American Discovery of Alcoholism, 1933-1939*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, Sociology.

Roizen, R. (1997), Jellinek's Phantom Doctorate. Ranes Report No. 11, available at: http://www.roizen.com/ron/rr11.htm (accessed 28 September 2015)

Room, R. (1978), *Governing Images of Alcohol and Drug Problems: The Structure, Sources and Sequels of Conceptualizations of Intractable Problems*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, Sociology.

Rothe, A. (1948), *Current Biography.1947,* H.W. Wilson, New York, NY

Róheim, G. (1918), "About the Fifth International Psychoanalytic Congress" *Ethnographia* Vol. XXIX, No. 5-6, 316-317.

Spencer, B. and Gillen, F.J. (1899), *Native Tribes of Central Australia*. Macmillan, London.

Sólyom, A.E. (2015), *A Physician's Journey with the Hepatitis C Virus*. XLibris, Bloomington, IN

Surry, R. (1965), Memo to R. Brinkley Smithers, in: *Christopher D. Smithers Foundation Files*, Mill Neck, New York NY

Szasz, T. (1978), *The Myth of Psychotherapy*. Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, NY

The Hillsdale Daily News (1966), "American Lark Dies at Age 99". 1 August, p.10.

Virchow, R.C. (2006), "Reports on the Typhus Epidemic in Upper Silesia. 1948" *Am J Public Health* Vol. 96, No 12, 2102-5.

Ward, J.H. (2014), "E.M. Jellinek: The Hungarian connection". In: *Substance Abuse Library and Information Studies: Proceedings of the 36th Annual SALIS Conference*, Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies, New Brunswick, NJ pp. 42-54

White, W. (2003). Christopher Smithers Foundation. In Blocker, J. and Tyrell, I., Eds., Alcohol and Temperance in Modern History. Santa Barbara, CA: ABCCLIO, pp. 154-155.

Worcester State Hospital (1931), "Annual report of the trustees", available at: http://www.archive.org/stream/annualreportoftr134worc/annualreportoftr134worc_djvu.txt (accessed 28 September 2015).

World Health Organization. Expert Committee on Mental Health (1951), "Report on the first session of the Alcoholism Subcommittee. Annex 2. Jellinek estimation formula" *WHO Tech. Rep. Ser.,* No 42. Geneva CH 19-24.

World Health Organization. Expert Committee on Mental Health (1952), "Second Report of the Alcoholism Subcommittee. Annex 2. The phases of alcohol addiction" *WHO Tech. Rep. Ser.,* No 48. Geneva CH 26-39.

World Health Organization. Expert Committee on Alcohol and Alcoholism (1955), Report of an Expert Committee. *WHO Tech. Rep. Ser.,* No 94. Geneva CH.

Author Biographies

Dr. Gabor Kelemen, a full professor at the Department of Community & Social Relations, Faculty of Humanities, University of Pecs (Hungary) and a consultant psychiatrist of CRI London (UK). He was the co-editor of the journal *Addictologia Hungarica* for ten years and currently a member of the editor board of Psychiatria Hungarica. He has sustained a longstanding interest in recovery. Dr. Kelemen is the author of a book entitled *Craving for Sobriety* (with Marta Erdos) and Co-editor of a book entitled *Reflective Recovery*.

Monika Mark is a PhD student of the Doctoral School of Demography & Sociology at the University of Pecs. Her field of interest is the socio-historical context of responses to alcohol problems and she has several years of work experience in therapeutic communities based on a health learning approach and self-help practices for substance abuse.

End Note:

[i] The aim of ethno-psychoanalysis is to combine psychoanalytic and anthropological methods of studying the relation between the psyche and culture. According to the chief representative of ethno-psychoanalysis, Georges Devereux (who, like Jellinek, hid his Hungarian identity) there is an inevitable complementary relationship between the psychological understanding and anthropological explanation of the same phenomenon. Ethno-psychoanalysis tried to merge these mutually excluding discourses.