

“From the culture of wowsers to the culture of healthism: law, custom, fashion and etiquette in Australian smoking, 1900-1990s”

Ian Tyrrell
UNSW

This paper examines the interplay of law, custom, fashion and etiquette in Australian smoking practices; looking at the “wowsers” culture and the forces promoting its moral standards and legal restrictions on smoking before 1914; the role of supply and demand constraints in the consumption of tobacco (including comparisons with alcohol); the uneven rise of the modern consumer economy and its contradictory impacts; the impact of outside coercion and health information in the curbing of smoking practice since the 1960s.

Traditionally within Australian historiography the study of attitudes towards legal drugs has been pursued not through the use of the language of restraint; rather it is through the terminology of the much despised wowsers that the tone has been set. At the turn of the twentieth century, John Norton’s irreverent scandal sheet, *Truth* referred to the ‘mournful croakings of the wasted wowsers who denounce every earthly pleasure as sinful.’¹ Wowsers were reputedly non-smokers, non-drinkers; anti-gambling; and against obscene literature. All Australia was said to be in the grip of wowsers.² A wowsers was an abstainer from social sins but, more than that, the emphasis in critiques was upon the interfering element. The wowsers was supposedly someone trying to crush the allegedly immoral and detrimental behaviour of others, rather than simply practicing self-restraint. The self-restraining person necessarily starts with the self. But as far as Australian culture as a whole is concerned, to some extent the two concepts are indeed linked. Critics of the wowsers generally suspected that those who abstained from most of these allegedly sinful practices were, under certain circumstances, wowsers seeking to judge and secretly to change other people’s behaviour. Moreover, the presence of a group of interfering people may indeed have conditioned others into more moderate patterns of behaviour; it was not uncommon for journalists and other commentators to state that wowsers went too far in condemning smoking or drinking, but that abstainers had a point because tobacco and alcohol were potentially dangerous drugs. In any case, the wowsers remained the inner core of the culture of self-restraint, whether self-restraining or interfering.

Mapping the extent of this culture is not easy. Certainly a good many Australians believed in abstinence from alcohol. The

Woman's Christian Temperance Union had about 10,000 members in the 1890s—this may not seem much, but was roughly comparable to its US parent body when population difference is taken into account, and no one doubts the political and social impact of the WCTU in that society at the time.³ In Australia as in the United States, the range of church and secular temperance societies went, when men are included, far beyond this narrow measure. The Good Templars had just over 300,000 members in 1901 (out of 3.7 million people, including children).⁴ We do not know the exact numbers who might claim the mantle of wowsers. Few were as open as the famous Australian prohibitionist and anti-smoking advocate Robert B. S. Hammond, who openly rejoiced in the title⁵; his fellow wowsers may have been no more than 100,000 at their hard core in Australia in the early 20th century; however we do have estimates that about 28 percent of Australian adult males were non-smokers while perhaps 97 percent of women were non-smokers; thus less than half the adult population smoked; and far less when age factors are taken into account. If all non-smokers, including children, were considered wowsers, that would make the population of wowsers over two million, a figure fitting the claim of polemicists that, at the turn of the century, Australia risked falling into the wowsers' grip. Such a figure would be far beyond all reliable evidence of their extended influence. Women's non-smoking at that time was not a mark of the wowsers, because of the gender restriction on smoking. Ditto children's. But adult men's non-smoking (28 percent) may be the closest measure we have to the wowsers culture's precise extent in early twentieth-century Australia.⁶

When we move from the caricature of wowsers to the practice of cultural history, we quickly find that wowsers-like behaviour did not apply with equal intensity to all commodities – but in ways that make the concept of self-restraint useful. Smoking and drinking were understood to be different in their effects; they received different responses.⁷ Alcohol was taken more seriously because of its effects on the social order, in terms of battered wives; violent crime; and drunk and disorderly behaviour; tobacco did not have these anti-social effects. Doctors and even some temperance reformers noted that tobacco calmed the nerves and facilitated concentration and quiet contemplation. Based on legal and medical observations, tobacco was more likely to be acceptable provided it was used in moderation. Contemporary observers placed the concept of moderation in contrast to the concept of addiction; tobacco “slaves” or “fiends” had lost self-control and were in the grip of lady nicotine. Moderation might effectively measure self-restraint and, thereby, tobacco may be the commodity where an ethic of self-control was most clearly enunciated in public discourse.⁸ Considered in this way, self-restraint might well be from the 1890s to the 1950s a powerful cultural force in Australia.

Tobacco itself was considered unobjectionable provided its use was kept within certain boundaries. Because it was immoderate use that won social opprobrium, self-restraint was highly valued. While the historiography has focused on the killjoy, to use the American equivalent, or wowsers, this conference is concerned precisely with self-restraint, and with rediscovering its cultural force and traditions. Who were the self-restrainers? At the core they were Protestants, particularly Methodists, though Catholics could also harbour similar instincts about legal drugs. Many of the Methodists, though far fewer of the Presbyterians, who often allowed moderate use of alcohol, would indeed have been wowsers; whether wowsers or self-restrained, Christian and especially Protestant culture provided traditions upon which all these people could draw—traditions of asceticism, moderation, and of abstinence as a mark of purity, conversion, and commitment. But, as I have argued, self-restraint cannot be limited to abstainers. There were simply not enough to extend their cultural preferences to a hegemonic position, politically or culturally; if there was a culture of restraint, it must extend beyond the minority of abstainers to those who practiced moderation.

There was in early 20th century Australia a widely diffused mentality of moderation expressed, for example, in manners and etiquette for drinking and smoking. Thus women's and men's drinking in public was largely segregated, though in Australia, unlike the United States, women could serve in bars.⁹ In the matter of smoking, these standards prescribed aspects of decorum such as when and where to smoke and how to smoke; and developed customs and practices reflected in everyday life, as in the architectural feature of the smoking room that was common in upper middle-class housing; male smoking nights and concerts; and the pause in the world of work known as the smoko. Most importantly, these customs discouraged smoking in front of women.

A great deal of this practice of restraint was governed by a larger set of ideas concerning gender, in both male-female relations, and male-to-male relations. Under the Victorian doctrine of the separate spheres, relations between the sexes were closely monitored and a set of sexual taboos applied. To break these taboos in shared consumption would have involved a process of reciprocity and bonding that transgressed the spheres. Such sharing would have been a kind of sexual exchange or gift. Certain acts became symbols or instruments within this process. Offering a cigarette was a gesture invested with a set of sexual and other social meanings. Concepts of purity and impurity were attached to the boundaries of social smoking, because the latter might transgress socially established behaviour, mix categories and generate symbolic pollution. Smoking and drinking were both practiced as

rituals, and historians, anthropologists and sociologists have analysed these deeper symbolic meanings.¹⁰ From the 1870s to World War I, there is no doubt that gender was one of the most powerful forces conditioning restraint across a range of social practices. In the case of smoking, gender governed not only who could smoke with whom, but also how to treat the opposite sex. For example, anyone who wished to be thought of as having manners did not blow smoke on a women. As late as the 1920s, smoking at cafes and restaurants was frowned upon because it interfered with the public spaces that non-smokers inhabited.¹¹

By the same token, these actions when applied in sexually segregated company could reinforce the existing gender division and create a kind of social solidarity. For males this process sanctioned smoking. To fail to smoke was an abrogation of the group ethic, and a rejection of masculine bonding. This set of norms and values was also true of drinking, through the idea of the shout. These symbolic exchanges in social action could equally reinforce drinking, and transcend in some circumstances moderation, but such behaviour was usually experienced as timeouts – as in smokos and smoke concerts at men’s clubs; such periods in the case of drinking could be episodes of excess, but they usually remained within strict temporal limits.

Yet these limits were not uniformly generated, and not explicable in terms of unchanging sociological or anthropological norms. The internal gender oriented norms of self-restraint were not philosophical values either, but socially and historical conditioned mentalities, whether of abstinence, moderation or excess. Where excess was socially sanctioned through the masculine solidarity of the shout, and through the socially constructed episode of the spree--as with itinerant workers after receiving wages, or pay day for manual workers--the conditions were specific to the historical presence of itinerancy, manual labour, masculine trade union development, and like factors.

Other circumstances affected self-restraint through class expectations. Restraint expressed middle-class status and could signify either functional or symbolic connection to social respectability. Yet this attachment to the social order begged the question of how the middle classes’ moral and social standards were generated and sustained. We need therefore to locate the conditions of restraint more firmly in an historical rather than a purely sociological or anthropological order. The rise of a highly urbanised society in the second half of the nineteenth century, the extension of white collar and professional employment after 1900, and the redressing of the earlier gender imbalance in Australia created a society in which the forces of self-restraint could more effectively operate.

Self-restraint rested in part on a productionist ethic—that it was more important to produce than to consume. This ethic had at least two components. One of these might be described as a discipline of industrial society. Self-restraint was one of the foundations of a productionist ethic in Australia at the turn of the 20th century until the 1950s, when the desire for a rationalised system of production in an age of mechanisation and urbanisation peaked. That is, the more urbanised society became and the more economic progress depended on mechanical instruments, certain kinds of drug use became problematic for functionalist reasons. The drunken worker fitted in poorly with factory schedules, work discipline and time management imperatives, at first in the early industrial revolution of the 19th century in Britain and the Northern United States, but then spreading to Australia unevenly in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century. Cigarette use in armaments factories or mines was similarly outlawed. (In our time the same concern is obvious regarding such things as marijuana use by airline pilots or train drivers, but in modern society the general importance of mechanised factory production has decreased since the 1960s.) Campaigns against drink driving from the wowsers element began in the 1930s because of the growth of the automobile industry. However ineffective at first, the beginnings of that agitation coincided almost exactly with the milestone of 500,000 registered cars, a feat achieved in Australia in 1936.

A second way in which a functionalist ethic underlay the concept of restraint is the issue of availability or supply of commodities. In part the ethic of restraint could not be easily challenged in the late nineteenth century because there were not enough goods to consume. Temptations to consume simply were not always present because the supply and/or the variety of goods did not exist. For example, the plethora of drugs that we have today did not exist; certainly there were some, but the level of availability was not always very high. Synthesised drugs, for instance, have largely been a product of a highly technological society. In the nineteenth century opium was available and prescribed by doctors for so-called female complaints and other uses. Drugs were available in the form of additives to patent medicines but until the very early 20th century not heroin or morphine, let alone (for Australia) such modern examples as cocaine (1920s); marijuana (1930s); LSD (1960s), crack cocaine (1980s); and ice/methamphetamines (2000s).

In late colonial Australia, the supply of even legal drugs was often inadequate, more generally speaking, because adequate transport and communication did not exist; and the systems of mass production did not apply until the early 20th century. The cigarette machine, invented in the 1860s is a very early example of a

mechanized mass production process turning out a standardised drug product. Cigarettes, however, did not flood the global marketplace until James B. Duke's American Tobacco Company not only bought out the patent for the machine but also experimented extensively with its use and the marketing of its products. Factory-made cigarettes came to prominence in the 1890s to 1910s in Australia. Until that time, smoking meant for Australians smoking either a pipe, or highly expensive and rare hand-made cigarettes. Smoking a pipe was much cheaper, and adaptable to a variety of social rituals, but the tobacco needed for a pipe was acrid and unsuitable for inhaling. It would take the introduction in the 1920s of milder tobacco for cigarettes before these would be widely consumed. Women could conceivably have smoked pipes; indeed they did so in parts of rural pre-industrial Europe, but not in Victorian England or Australia. Women's and children's non-smoking was partly a function of the predominance of acrid pipe smoking. Though the latter was a taste that could conceivably have been learned, the gender divisions of society did not promote the social conditions for so learning.

So long as pipe smoking predominated, a large part of the population, children, youths and most women would have neither to inclination or the opportunity to smoke. A further condition of pipe smoking built moderation into the habits of its use even among males. Preparing the pipe for smoking, lighting up, and so on, were elaborate, complicated, and time-consuming rituals. It was difficult to smoke pipes immoderately. Even if puffed on almost constantly, a level of restraint was built into pipe-smoking's material practices. Self-restraint in turn of the century Australia was partly a product of such inadequate consumer supply, and a lack of variety of products suitable for cross-gender and cross-age mass consumption. Rituals in pipe smoking developed upon these material restraints, and further contained the habit.

Constraints of supply were also a product of law; but the functions of law in turn reflected community standards, and may be considered compatible with an idea of collective community restraint and with the political impact of the so-called wowsers. Alcohol prohibitionists first sought to restrain themselves – before others – and shielded themselves against temptation by associating in defensive groups such as the Good Templars or Rechabites.¹² Yet these groups also attempted to enforce rules on the whole society. Certainly a major reason for seeking community-wide action was the threat to the middle-class family; failure to control temptations coming from outside the home led to prohibitionists asserting the predominance of their social expectations over others in the wider society; for this reason, laws on morals had and still do have a coercive function as well as educational and expressive ones.¹³

The laws that expressed community standards in the area of smoking clearly were laws seeking to restrain deleterious smoking practice, not to prohibit smoking entirely. Juvenile smoking laws were enacted across all jurisdictions in Australia from 1900 to 1917. All but one referred to smoking under the age of sixteen. Only in Western Australian was eighteen the standard, and there the act combined anti-drinking and anti-juvenile smoking provisions, because this act was passed during the war when the anti-alcohol agitation reached its peak. All these laws reflected a moral panic over the breakdown of the practice of juvenile smoking, and over the rise of the cigarette challenging the masculine and time-honoured practices of pipe smoking. More generally, the laws expressed growing concern about the lack of juvenile restraint, for example alleged increases in bad public behaviour or petty criminal activity.¹⁴ There is little evidence that these laws were systematically enforced but they marked community expectations, and provide a benchmark of the mentality of moderation that underlay them.

A second type of law gave effect to common practices concerning the boundaries of smoking, and delineated non-smoking areas, for example rail and tramway carriages; food halls and food preparation areas; parks, where no-smoking zones existed from the 1880s because women and children frequented them; and theatres and dance halls. However the ban in the latter cases was uneven from one colonial/state jurisdiction to another and from time to time, and reflected not morality so much as fire safety, but also an ethic of respect for others.¹⁵

A third type were Sunday trading and early closing laws for shops; these laws more generally restricted working hours and prescribed patterns of leisure activity; conversely they curtailed retail sales and commercial activity. Thus the sale of cigarettes or pipe tobacco after hours would not be legally possible in many places. These laws demarcated a line within which restraint in many forms of commercialisation were practiced. The contrast with today's world of 24/7 shopping and wide access to legal drugs could not be more extreme. Alcohol restrictions piggybacked on this type of restriction. Four states (New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania) implemented six o'clock closing laws in 1915-16 for hotels on the broad model of the early closing laws for mercantile pursuits. Western Australia introduced 9 o'clock closing at that time as a less drastic measure. Queensland introduced 8 o'clock closing later, in 1923; and the New South Wales law became permanent in the same year. The laws were supposedly war measures, in response to evidence of wild drinking and bad behaviour among soldiers adjacent to army camps, particularly at Liverpool. But these laws were clearly a part of the wider local option and no-license strategies of the Australian temperance

movement led by Anglican Canon F. B. Boyce and Robert Hammond. The fact of these early closing laws' later adoption by Queensland and implementation of permanency in NSW in the same year (1923) showed that these were not purely war oriented. They paralleled though on a less ambitious scale the prohibition measures adopted at the same time in a number of other countries. Though these laws are today almost uniformly regarded as failures, and ones that stimulated excess rather than restraint through the six o'clock swill,¹⁶ in fact the consumption of alcohol went down during World War I and continued to decline (slightly) in the 1920s and (more steeply) in the 1930s. Robin Room has shown that in Australia this series of alcohol control measures "significantly reduced total alcohol consumption as well as the incidence of alcohol-related health problems, notably cirrhosis mortality. From a peak of 9.15 cirrhosis deaths per 100,000 in 1912, Australia's cirrhosis rate fell to 3.83 in 1933, and fluctuated between 3.15 and 5.12 for over 20 years." Mortality from alcoholic psychosis experienced a similar drop.¹⁷ All of this happened under regulated sale, not prohibition. There is a widespread theory among the alcohol studies community that the presence of a given number of outlets and the abuse of drugs are closely related phenomena; the more liquor outlets, the more drinking; so the restrictions of six o'clock closing may indeed have had some effect on aggregate consumption. But the same period also witnessed stagnation in tobacco consumption, where legal reforms were fewer. When measured in weight and age adjusted terms, tobacco consumption rose only very slightly over the fairly long period from 1903 to 1945.¹⁸ The case of tobacco suggests that more than law was at stake, since tobacco consumption was less rigorously policed or controlled.

There may be another reason for static consumption of this common social habit of smoking, and also for the trough in alcohol consumption that coincided with six o'clock closing. That is the constraint of economics. The lack of money for discretionary consumption was a factor in both the gender distribution of smoking and in the flat pattern of per capita consumption. Patterns of smoking in the early and mid-twentieth century appear to follow the economy, just as economics appears to sustain both the gendered nature of and the decline in alcohol consumption. Budget studies indicated that women's housekeeping money was rationed by husbands, limiting women's access to both liquor and cigarettes; and consumption of tobacco products was strongly demarcated by class. Working-class men smoked roll-your-owns in the 1920s and 1930s, both as an expression of mateship and bonding, and because of low cost, a point that advertisements repeatedly stressed.¹⁹

A broader limiting factor was the general economic health of the

society. Though the 1920s is often thought a period of economic prosperity and rising consumption, I prefer to think of the decade 1919-1929 as the “not so roaring twenties”. Contrary to popular understanding, this period was one of uneven, not generally shared, prosperity and characterised by sharp stops as well as starts in economic growth. Unemployment, caused by technological change, was very high by the standards of the 1950s and 1960s, and even of today. The 1930s economic catastrophe extended and deepened the ethic of restraint. According to A.E. Dingle, a “dramatic decline in drinking occurred” during the 1930s.²⁰ For smoking this can be measured roughly by the shifting from tailor-made (factory) cigarettes to roll-your-owns, items which peaked in use in the 1930s, despite heavy advertising of factory-made cigarettes.

Another important and closely related constraint was war, to some extent in 1914-18, but more clearly from 1939 to 1945, when stringent rationing of tobacco applied as a part of general wartime austerity. Rationing in the post-1945 period extended the culture of restraint into the early 1950s. Thus a long period from the 1910s to the 1950s was highly conducive to the survival of the old concepts of self-restraint within Australian culture. Six o’clock closing continued in NSW until 1955, and in Victoria and South Australia until the 1960s, though the early closing law had been modified in Tasmania to 10 o’clock closing in 1937. In Western Australia and Queensland restrictions also continued as 9 o’clock closing into the 1960s (in Western Australia changing in 1960).²¹

Thus far I have mapped the wowser culture and its impact upon and intersection with a wider culture of restraint, self or otherwise. One would expect that for this culture to be undermined, there would need to be changes in gender roles, and in the question of the marketing and consumption of commodities more generally. Of course this is precisely what happened.

The modern culture of consumption at first arose in the 1920s in the United States built around mass production of cheap goods, but extending way beyond cars, to electrical goods, to the innumerable items at cheap chain stores. But in Australia, this brave new world of consumption applied largely to the upper middle class; not until the middle of the 1950s and 1960s did mass consumption patterns flourish in Australia, measured, for example, by the onset of television, time payment systems of debt, and the spread of retail chain stores. The turning point was the mid-1950s, when the number of registered automobiles began to rise sharply.

The defeat of the wowser culture was also symptomatic of an intellectual shift underlying yet also sustained and extended by the abundance of goods. Though based on the right to consume, the

permissive culture of the 1960s and beyond was sometimes pitched in terms of civil liberties. This is why the anti-obscenity laws issue looms so large in the late 1960s, in the debates initiated by Geoffrey Dutton and Max Harris.²² The latter, incidentally, engaged in polemics against tobacco control as well. It was also in the 1960s and 1970s that the wider range of anti-alcohol laws broke down; not only was six o'clock closing finally abandoned in its strongholds of Victoria and South Australia. The latter passed swiftly from being the state of repression to the permissive society. In the late 1970s and 1980s state governments across Australia introduced Sunday trading for hotels.²³ It is at this time that the historiography of the wowser culture was established through the work of Keith Dunstan, who associated a wide variety of repressive tendencies with that label.²⁴ The justification for relaxing restraint in availability was often, in addition, progress towards more "civilised" modes of consumption, and played heavily on the inanities of the six o'clock swill.²⁵

The rising culture of consumption accompanied increased advertising and the powerful new medium of television. Though television appeared in Australia in 1956, its metropolitan reach was not complete across Australia until at least 1960. The post-1963 boom period to the 1970s was the golden age of the mass expansion of this medium and its associated promotion of mass consumption. It was in this period that the consumption of cigarettes began to rise sharply and overall tobacco consumption with it. Alcohol consumption also rose from around 20 to 31 gallons of beer a year per capita from 1950 to 1973-74, stimulated by mass marketing.²⁶

Ironically the same period saw the germination of a new ethic of restraint, the consumerist ethic within a consume culture. Along with the rise of the consumer culture came awareness, among some, of the need to protect consumers. This new consumerist ethic can perhaps be dated from the American Vance Packard's *The Hidden Persuaders* (1957). All consumers must be well-informed, so the argument went; they must make informed choices. This was not a repudiation of consumer society but an endorsement. The story of the tobacco industry's fall followed this shift in attitudes towards consumer goods. In many ways it represented a paradigm of the pattern. With the discovery almost simultaneously in 1950 to 1954 in both Britain and the United States of the epidemiological evidence for a link between smoking and lung cancer, American consumer advocates began to agitate for restrictions against tobacco use. But in a consumer oriented society, the easiest and most legitimate way to deal with this issue was through better consumer information. Tobacco companies competing against themselves led the way by advertising their products as safe, or safer at least than some other (unnamed) manufacturer. Though

this approach was deceptive, and deliberately so by the late 1950s in the United States, after the 1964 Surgeon-General's report and the earlier Royal College of Physicians report of 1962, the medical evidence led to the formation of lobby groups such as the Australian Council on Smoking and Health (1967) modelled on the Interagency Council on Smoking and Health established in the United States in 1964. These organizations lobbied for health warnings for both print and electronic media.²⁷

The use of warnings and health information only worked even reasonably well when there was clearly articulated government support. In Australia this came only from the election of the Whitlam government in 1972 and the introduction of federal health warnings; this was followed by the ban on direct television and radio advertising of tobacco products from 1976. Despite the introduction of a huge amount of anti-smoking information since that time, and particularly since the coming of the Hawke government in 1983, smoking restrictions worked only partially in cutting smoking rates. They worked best when combined with government sponsored anti-smoking programs and when little conflicting interpretation and evidence was available, a situation that the tobacco industry's own publicity campaigns worked against.

More important than the introduction of new scientific and administrative information was the role of changing consumer preferences. Antismoking became an element of consumerism, centred on a cluster of beliefs and practices that I call healthism: in a way, the ethic of restraint returned seriously to community judgements on tobacco for the first time since before World War I. From the 1980s, medical knowledge of tobacco's ill-effects combined with growing concerns over unhealthy life styles. The latter could be dated roughly from the emerging of jogging as a form of exercise, symbolised in the early 1970s by the emergence of fun runs in the capital cities of Australia. The fitness craze burgeoned in response not only to medical knowledge about tobacco and health but also the rise of modern environmentalism itself. As historian Samuel Hays has shown, modern middle-class environmentalism embodied a consumerist approach to environment amenity that stressed health and recreation benefits.²⁸

Current mechanisms of restraint regarding tobacco are beginning, and I think quite rightly, to be copied by those properly concerned about the equally damaging case of alcohol. But it remains to be seen how effective the shift to a less tolerant view of alcohol will be. In the United States the anti-alcohol revival has gone much further, the anti-tobacco crusade has not gone as far as here. Self-restraint as a theme is variable in content by national culture and

circumstances even in this highly globalised world. Self-restraint is culturally constructed --anthropologically and sociologically as well as historically constructed--but the overriding forces, if the case of tobacco is any guide, are the larger historical processes of social change and continuity. In Australia, these changes were rooted in the fluctuations of war, depression, changes in women's work, industrialisation and urbanisation. These broader social changes spurred changing mentalities of health, morality, fashion, aesthetics, and social action that have defined this nation's ambiguous relationship with tobacco for the last 120 years.

¹ For the etymology, see

http://www.anu.edu.au/andc/res/aus_words/aewords/aewords_sz.php#wowse: most plausible is the statement that “there is a British dialectal word to wow meaning ‘to mew as a cat, howl or bark as a dog, wail, to whine, grumble, complain’, and it is possible that this is the true origin of the word.”

² Keith Dunstan, *Wowzers: Being an account of the prudery exhibited by certain outstanding men and women in such matters as drinking, smoking, prostitution, censorship and gambling* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1968).

³ See Ian Tyrrell, *Woman’s World/Woman’s Empire: The Woman’s Christian Temperance Union in International Perspective, 1880-1930* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1991).

⁴ G. D. Clark, *The Good Templar Movement: Its History and Work* (Sydney: Grand Lodge of New South Wales of the International Order of Good Templars, 1928), p. 112.

⁵ Joan Mansfield, “Hammond, Robert Brodribb Stewart (1870 - 1946),” *Australian dictionary of Biography*, at <http://adbonline.anu.edu.au/biogs/A090173b.htm> “revelling in the nickname of ‘the Wowser’.”

⁶ Ian Tyrrell, *Deadly Enemies: Tobacco and its Opponents in Australia* (Kensington: University of New South Wales Press, 1999), e.g., p. 113.

⁷ Ian Tyrrell, “The Anti-Tobacco Reform and the Temperance Movement in Australia: Connections and Differences,” *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society*, 84 (June 1998), pp. 10-25

⁸ Ian Tyrrell, “Before the Surgeon General’s Report: Public Discourse in Australia over Tobacco Addiction to 1964,” *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 44 (No. 2, June 1998), pp. 177-90.

⁹ See Clare Wright, *Beyond the Ladies Lounge: Australia’s Female Publicans* (Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 2003).

¹⁰ For example, see Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *Tastes of Paradise: A Social History of Spices, Stimulants, and Intoxicants*; transl. David Jacobson (New York: Vintage Books, 1993).

¹¹ Tyrrell, *Deadly Enemies*, p. 119.

¹² Clark, *Good Templar Movement*, passim.

¹³ Jack S. Blocker, Jr., *Give to the Wins Thy Fears’’: The Women’s Temperance Crusade, 1873-1874* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1985).

¹⁴ Tyrrell, *Deadly Enemies*, pp. 21-23.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 119-20.

¹⁶ Walter Phillips, “‘Six O’clock Swill’: The Introduction of Early Closing of Hotel Bars in Australia,” No. 75 (October 1980), pp. 250-266; Tanja Luckins, “Pigs, Hogs And Aussie Blokes: The Emergence Of The Term ‘Six O’clock Swill’,” *History Australia*, 4 (No. 1, 2007).

¹⁷ Robin Room, “The Dialectic of Drinking in Australian Life: From the Rum Corps to the Wine Column,” *Australian Drug and Alcohol Review*, 7 (1988), pp. 413-437, at 420; Harry G. Levine and Craig Reinerman, “From Prohibition to Regulation: Lessons From Alcohol Policy For Drug Policy,”

<http://www.drugtext.org/library/articles/craig102.htm>

¹⁸ Tyrrell, *Deadly Enemies*, p. 227.

¹⁹ Ian Tyrrell, “The Limits of Persuasion: Advertising, Gender and the Culture of Australian Smoking,” *Australian Historical Studies*, No. 114 (April 2000), pp. 27-47; Tyrrell, *Deadly Enemies*, pp. 83-84.

²⁰ A. E. Dingle, *Drink and Drinking in Nineteenth-Century Australia: A*

Statistical Commentary (Clayton, Vic.: Department of Economic History, Monash University, 1978), p. 37; Dingle is slightly incorrect in saying that “beer consumption revived” in the 1920s, as the Commonwealth figures showing both six o’clock and non six o’clock states show consumption both falling and less than pre-war before the Great Depression.

²¹ Milton Lewis, *A Rum State: Alcohol and State Policy in Australia, 1788-1988* (Canberra: AGPS Press, 1992), pp. 76, 86.

²² Geoffrey Dutton and Max Harris, eds, *Australia’s Censorship Crisis* (Melbourne: Sun Books, 1970); Tyrrell, *Deadly Enemies*, p. 170.

²³ Lewis, *A Rum State*, pp. 91-92.

²⁴ Dunstan, *Wowsers*.

²⁵ Smith, *Rum State*, pp. 89-90.

²⁶ Dingle, *Drink and Drinking in Nineteenth-Century Australia*, p. 35; Tyrrell, “The Limits of Persuasion”; Tyrrell, *Deadly Enemies*, pp. 207, 188.

²⁷ See Allan M. Brandt, *The Cigarette Century: The Rise, Fall, and Deadly Persistence of the Product That Defined America* (New York: Basic Books, 2007); Pamela E. Pennock, *Advertising Sin and Sickness: The Politics of Alcohol and Tobacco Marketing, 1950-1990* (De Kalb, Ill: Northern Illinois University Press, 2007).

²⁸ Samuel P. Hays, *Beauty, Health, and Permanence: Environmental Politics in the United States, 1955-1985*, with Barbara D. Hays (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987).