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NOTES ON TAVERNS AND SOCIAILITY

As recently as twenty-five years ago, to talk of the context of drinking behavior in the U.S. was to talk of the tavern: at that time, 90% of alcoholic beverages in the U.S. were sold for consumption on licensed premises (Klug, 1971). This is true of only about one-third of alcohol sales today. To focus on the tavern, then, is to focus on a contracting and perhaps a dying institution.

"Bars are like high-button shoes," says Herman "Blackie" Leavitt, Secretary of Los Angeles' Bartenders Union Local No. 284. "Friends don't get together in them anymore, chewing the rag and reminiscing and getting smashed. Sure, people still like to talk about World War II or Korea or some girl who was extra special. But in the suburbs they do it at a country club or golf course. In the cities, the poor stiff just takes a bottle home." (Klug, 1971)

We may note in passing that the implications of this little-noted change are worth some study. This belated and accidental triumph of the Anti-Saloon League carries costs as well as gains:

All that can be said against the practice of buying or ordering drinks for home consumption has been said long ago by G.K. Chesterton, and practical experience reinforces it, for the drinker on licensed premises is always circumscribed in his behavior by the licensee's respect for his license, whereas the drinker at home or on parties is not. (Gorham, 1939, p. 14).
In spite of its decline, however, the tavern retains a special importance in the social world of drinking. It is, in fact, a "home ground," a territory dedicated by legal and social definitions to drinking in the presence of others. It is disproportionately populated by the heaviest-drinking segment of the population. Thus Walter Clark's results show that the heaviest-drinking 8% of the San Francisco adult population contributes 39% of the "regular" tavern goers, those who go at least once a week. Fifty-seven percent of the heaviest-drinking group were "regular" tavern goers, as against 8% of the rest of the adult population (Clark, 1966, p. 317). Furthermore, the heavier drinkers do a considerable portion of their heaviest drinking in bars. In a 1961 sample of white males 21-59 resident in San Francisco, one-half reported having been "high or drunk" within the last year, and one-half of these reported having been drunk in a bar in that period.

A further reason for a special consideration of the literature on sociability and drinking in taverns is simply that patterns of sociability are more accessible to observation there than at parties or get-togethers in private homes. As Cavan reminds us, "Public drinking places are 'open regions': those who are present, acquainted or not, have the right to engage others in conversational interaction and the duty to accept the overtures of sociability preferred to them" (Cavan, 1966, p. 49). Researchers do not feel that these rights extend to the open evaluative observation of others' interactions; thus Cavan only made field notes in the bar itself when she was in busy nightspace where the show provided a distracting "conventional shield" (Cavan, 1966, p. 17), and Sommer's observers were provided with a record-form concealed inside a newspaper and "constructed to resemble a mathematics examination paper, so that . . . the observer . . . appeared to be a student doing his homework" (Sommer, 1965, p. 97). Nevertheless, inventive researchers can and have used a variety of methods for obtaining data on bar behavior besides Cavan's basic reliance on memory.
and the conventional latitude allowed women to make repeated trips to the
toilet where she "could jot down brief notes" (Caven, 1966, p. 17). Three
methods have included the researcher's serving as a game demonstrator
(Richards, 1963-4), and as a barmaid (Caven, 1966, p. 198), the enlistment of
her employees as data collectors (Posnock and Spray, 1967), and questionnaire
surveys of her patrons and tavern keepers (Macrory, 1957). None of these
methods are easily adaptable to the study of sociability in less open regions,
and the detailed record of the ethical and methodological difficulties of the
Sociability Project (Riesman and Watson, 1964) make clear how difficult it is
to make such a study.

The tavern as a drink-shop:

The modern literature on taverns tends to concentrate on the social super-
structures of the tavern to the exclusion of any attention to its economic
basis. There is, of course, a great deal more to taverns than simply drinking
alcohol; and, as several studies have found, total abstainers can be found in
taverns (Caven, 1966, pp. 112-3; Richards, 1963-4, p. 261; Clark, 1966). Never-
theless, few taverns could exist on their sales of soft drinks and coffee,
and in the long run the public has a vested interest in arranging matters so
as to maximize the sale of alcohol. The older literature was often more explicit
about this fact:

The saloon, economically considered, is a place where intoxicating
liquors are sold at retail . . . The purpose of the saloon-keeper
is the same as that of the grocer or other retail merchant. He
is there to sell his goods at the greatest possible profit to
himself. If he fulfills any other mission to the community, he
does so because it results naturally from his real business. If
he consciously supplies any other demand than that for drink, he
perceives its commercial value and seizes upon it in order to
increase the amount of his sales (Calkins, 1901, p. 1).
The invitation to drop by a tavern and "have a drink," then, indeed carries with it a great deal more than its denotative meaning; but it does carry its denotative meaning. He who enters a tavern, no matter what his private inclinations or public position, subjects himself to a number of normative pressures towards drinking.

(a) There is a general obligation to the landlord for the "rental" of his use of the establishment, a rental paid by buying a drink, and buying another now and then. This moral obligation can perhaps be felt most clearly when one enters the saloon for purposes other than drinking; e.g., to attend a labor union meeting:

A labor leader, himself a total abstainer, once said that he felt a sensation akin to shame when he passed the bar night after night without paying his five cents for a drink (Calkins, 1901, p. 61).

---or to find a place to urinate:

The saloon is often the only place in crowded sections of our large cities which provides public toilet-rooms . . . Many men who never under ordinary circumstances patronize a bar do so because they feel under some obligation to pay for the convenience afforded them. (Calkins, 1901, p. 19)

Sommer's study suggests that, at least in Edmonton beer parlors, the effective "rental" is four beers per hour, after an initial "extra" drink, and that this rate is essentially the same whether the drinker is alone or with a group (Sommer, 1965, pp. 99, 102, 104). In addition to renting a place for oneself, the patron may also "rent" sociability from employees or quasi-employees (b-girls) of the bar, by buying them a drink:

When a bartender is made the individual recipient of a drink from a patron, control over termination of the encounter between the two is vested with the donor. However, . . . the donor's control
over the interaction with the bartender lasts only as long as the drink lasts (Cavan, 1966, p. 128).

It is clear from Cavan's study that there are strong norms about how long an interaction such a drink should buy, for employees as well as for B-girls:

While I was working as a barmaid, as long as the patron was buying drinks for me there would be no other duties that I had to attend to. However, once my drink was finished and no other offer was made to me by the patron, the bartender would typically find an assortment of minor tasks that needed my attention, tasks which could be immediately dropped if the patron offered me another drink (Cavan, 1966/198).

Her study does not report how much time a drink typically rents, but for B-girls in San Francisco, whose drinks are in any case more expensive than regular customer's drinks, she records one sequence where the rate while engaged must have been at least four drinks an hour (pp. 193-4), and quotes a police report which gave as evidence of B-girl activities a consumption rate of a drink every four minutes (p. 199).

(b) There are the "rituals and ceremonies," as Cavan terms them in her perceptive discussion (1966, pp. 112-132), of ordinary social interaction in the bar. Acquaintances are made by treating drinks, cemented by treating drinks, and celebrated by treating drinks. The form of treating known as "standing rounds" imposes an obligation on all in a group to drink at least as many drinks as there are participants in the group. He who would be sociable in a tavern is not sole master of his drinking pace. Even though the gift drink may be recognized by all concerned to be a symbolic gesture, there is a strong pressure—backed by a threat of ostracism—to accept and consume it:
Should an unattached woman (alone or in twos or threes) decline more than two invitations, she took the chance of losing the aid of the employees [in facilitating introductions]. The bartenders and waitresses could and did discourage other males from making further invitations (Koebuck and Spray, 1967, p. 395).

For employees and quasi-employees, the accumulation of gift drinks becomes an occupational hazard:

When bartenders do take a beer or mixed drink as their gift drink, they will sometimes surreptitiously pour some of it into the sink (Caven, 1966, p. 130).

Sommer's data from Edmonton suggests that there, at least, drinking in a group increases the amount drunk not by increasing the pace of drinking but by lengthening the time the individual stays in the bar (Sommer, 1965). Quite apart from the "glue" of enjoyable interaction which may hold the number of a group in the bar, the institution of "standing rounds," as Caven's discussion makes clear (pp. 116-117), exerts a strong pressure to remain until a number of drinks equal to the number of males in the group has been consumed.

(c) There may also be customs in the specific culture of a bar or its habitués which increase the amount of drinking. For instance, there may be systems of "fines" analogous to those found in early nineteenth-century working groups (Stivers, 1971), as in Richards' description of the "Right-hand, Left-hand" club in a Queens tavern:

Two arrows were mounted above a mirror behind the bar. These could be lighted either simultaneously or independently by a switch located behind the bar but within easy reach of nearby patrons. Members of the club had to raise their drink with the hand that corresponded to the lighted arrow (both hands if both arrows were lighted). Failure to do so was penalized by a small
The fines were used to pay for a club party whenever members felt there was enough money in the kitty. Regular patrons shifted the arrows more often than either the bartender or the owner (who was also a club member). (Richards, 1963-6, p. 262)

Gottlieb describes the same system in operation in a Chicago tavern (Gottlieb, 1957).

Sociability in the tavern

It is the nature of sociability to free concrete interactions from any reality and to erect its airy realm according to the form-laws of these relations. ... We may have two different reactions to it ... The independent and self-regulated life, which the superficial aspects of social interaction attain in sociability, may strike us as a formula-like and irrelevant lifelessness, or as a symbolic play whose aesthetic charms embody the finest and subtlest dynamics of broad, rich social existence. (Simmel, 1950, pp. 55-56)

Simmel's discussion of "the 'superficial' character of sociability" nearly epitomizes the dualities to be found in the literature on sociability in the tavern. On the one hand it is a world of "mysterious radiance":

The doors are shut, but not bolted or barred—on the contrary, they swing—on patent hinges that give the utmost return for the effort expended, so that one can exchange for the wet pavement and cold wind whatever it is that evokes the mysterious radiance in the engraved glass panels. But what is it? ... These portals ... appeal ... to that part of every adult that remains open to thoughts other than those of self-interest, utility, practical politics and expediency. They are the portals to the world of fantasy ... (Gorham and Dunnett, 1950, p. 5).
On the other hand, the actual content of the sociability commonly appears mundane and trivial:

Topics of discussion . . . are . . . casual and general. The typical topics (such as the weather, spectator sports, popular music and gossip) require little beyond personal interest to sustain them and have little, if any, consequential import for the daily lives of the discusser. Even topics which could be treated on a less casual and more specific level customarily remain general.

Bar talk is essentially small talk (Caven, 1966, pp. 57-58).

On the one hand, as Calkins noted, it is a world liberated from time:

The saloon answers to . . . the demand for social expression, and how it is met becomes clear by noting what elements are needed to create what we may call a social centre. These elements are the absence of any time limit, some stimulus to self-expression, and a kind of personal feeling toward those into whose company one is thrown, which tempts one to put away reserve and enjoy their society . . . In a saloon there is no time limit. Loafing is not prohibited, and there are no placards telling men to move on (Calkins, 1961, p. 2).

On the other hand, sociable interaction in the bar is typically episodic, disjointed, and of short duration:

While sociability is available to all in the public drinking place, there is little to guarantee that encounters between the unacquainted, once begun, will proceed in a neat and orderly fashion. Rather, from the outset their career is problematic, subject to a variety of contingencies that make them always tentative and often superficial . . . Since conversational lulls are typically treated as if they were termination points, the interaction between two patrons in a
public drinking place, whether it represents one continuous encounter or a series of sequential encounters, routinely has the pattern of remark/counter-remark/interchange/silence/remark/counter-remark/etc. Silences are thus treated as if the other participant had physically departed and another patron were now in his place (Cavan, 1966, pp. 63, 57).

As Simmel's quotation suggests, the problem of double levels of interpretation—of the elevated purposes of the function and the tedious squalor of the performance—is a problem for the study of sociability in general, and not just for sociability in taverns. It formed a central problem for the only sustained empirical study of sociability so far, the Sociability Project led by David Riesman and Jeanne Watson. On the one hand, sociability was defined and its function conceptualized in terms explicitly of aesthetic criteria:

We see sociability as lending drama to life, intensifying reality (Riesman, Potter and Watson, 1960a, p. 187). The sociable style is built around the dramatization of new experience, with the emphasis placed both on novelty and on the entertainment value of events and experiences (Watson, 1958, p. 283).

Artistic quality [of party sociability]: The achievement of the kind of dramatic or artistic quality or elegance which might appeal to a noninvolved stranger or to the reader of a novel (Riesman and Watson, 1964, p. 302). Riesman was . . . interested in the choreographic flow of interaction, in sociability as a ritual, as patterned movement, as an art form (Riesman and Watson, 1964, p. 320).

On the other hand, there was the bathos of the data. A tape-recording of a party was "a long-drawn-out tissue of inanities" (Riesman and Watson, 1964, p. 299). Even as reconstructed in summary from memory, "not only did people repeat themselves monotonously, but what they said the first time was little more than a stream of consciousness; it had none of the aliveness, subtlety, responsiveness
and humor which can make of conversation a playful and creative activity" (Riesman and Watson, 1964, p. 297).

The parties we have studied are bare of sustained flights of imagination or of language in any way out of the ordinary—and this is among educated people who have read many books out of the ordinary and may even like modern poetry (Riesman, Potter and Watson, 1960a, p. 209).

The party is more like a 24-hour cafeteria than a three-act play, [with]... people sitting around hoping that the affair will justify itself, or at least that they will not miss anything important... We coded some 60 percent of our 2000 IBM-reduced sociable episodes as "routine" in perspective and flat in artistry (Riesman, Potter and Watson, 1960b, pp. 22, 24).

In the published work of the Project, the primary solution to the problem of the disjunction between expectations and reality was to create a myth of a golden age of sociability in the past:

There was a time when sociability as a social form was pretty well restricted to a leisurely aristocracy. Now, with the spread of leisure to all classes and the emergence of what Riesman has called other-directedness, sociability has gained increased importance, certainly in the middle class and perhaps in the lower class (Watson, 1958, p. 285). The decline of puritanism, the spread of leisure, the growth of tolerance—these and many other developments in upper-middle-class culture have accompanied a shift towards more relaxed and more egalitarian norms of behavior in sociability. Monopolies of responsibility for the conduct of a party have tended to shift from the host to the guests, from doyens to demos, from society to Cafe Society; and acceptance of medley performance and even passive nonperformance has increased accordingly (Riesman and Watson, 1964, p. 234).
This solution involved a curiously narrow interpretation of history, an interpretation that was both class-bound and time-bound. Other traditions of analysis might be more likely to locate the touchstone of sociability instead in the "demos." Such interpretations certainly have a long history. Elizabethan writers portrayed sociable interaction primarily in terms of scenes of "low life"; thus in Shakespeare's Henry IV, sociability is found not in the scenes in the court and great houses but in those in the Boar's-Head Tavern.

Sociability has not always been seen as associated with the extension of leisure:

The man who works the longest hours per day spends the most time in the saloon. It is probably true that low wages and long hours are as responsible for the maintenance of the saloon as any other factor (Stiles, 1916, p. 156).

The Sociability Project concentrated on studies of middle-class parties; a consideration of such alternative venues of sociability as the tavern might have redressed the historical balance. As it was, the logical conclusion of the primary line of analysis was the old theme of Addison, Steele and Molière that the new middle-class would have to learn from the old elite how to be properly sociable. But recognizing the "self-defeating" nature of such a course for sociability as they defined it, "robbing it of the spontaneity that is one of its principal charms, and turning play for its own sake into work for the sake of some elusive teleology" (Kiesemann, Potter and Watson, 1960 b, p. 18), the analysis petered out instead into a wistful call for the situation to be saved by a strong man, by an authoritarian party-host.

This primary line of analysis, particularly associated with Kiesemann, overshadowed in the published work of the Sociability Project a number of alternative modes of analysis pursued by the other researchers, involving analysis of the parties studied not in terms of a –priori aesthetic ideals but rather in terms of the qualities of intimacy and collective solidarity (Kiesemann, Potter and
Watson, 1960b, p. 27) which the partygoers themselves seemed to value. Unfortunately these modes of analysis were not fully developed, but some of their outlines can be discerned in the published material.

Riesman was impatient with Watson for having held a "banal" discussion about the weather, in his house, with a visiting psychologist. Watson replied with a memo citing this and other instances in which banal or trivial topics serve as a vehicle for covert communication about matters which are emotionally meaningful to the participants. In most sociable interaction, there are at least two simultaneous conversations going on at once: the substantive conversation serves as the vehicle for the development of interpersonal relationships (Riesman and Watson, 1964, pp. 289-90).

Customary expectations in sociability about what subject matter will be discussed and what sentiments may be expressed, as well as about the kind and amount of personal exposure to be expected, are governed in part by the type of partner with whom one is conversing . . . Two contrasting categories of acquaintance are familiaris, people who see each other frequently as a result of common affiliation with a group based on institutional ties, and casuaux, people who have had little or no contact with one another prior to the situation in which they are observed. Interaction between familiaris is highly routinized and ritualistic; interaction between casuaux is much more likely to be creative, exciting, and even intimate (Riesman and Watson, 1964, p. 238). Sociability is . . . a form of interaction [which produces] an accumulating structure of beliefs about self, others, and the external world. It may seem paradoxical to suggest that the creation of belief is part of the business of sociability; and, indeed, we
would say that much of what is affirmed in sociable situations has the quality of "half-belief." By this we mean that participants speak "as if" they believe what they say to be true, and retain for the next day the right either to deny what they have said, or secretly to adhere to convictions which were expressed in jest. This quality of remaining simultaneously within the realms of fact and fiction is peculiarly characteristic of sociability, and we have tentatively chosen to refer to it as the quality of legend. . . [Thus] we assumed that the creation and maintenance of belief involve cumulative processes; that, within sociable interaction, the processes of affirmation, verification and consensual definition proceed by accretion; and that, in fact, each process consists of the repetition of the same assertions again and again (Watson and Potter, 1962, p. 246).

One form of group-based festivity which seemed particularly characteristic of party interaction is what we came to call reiterative culture-building. Some word of phrase or idea is detached from its usual context and comes to symbolize the party itself. The twin keys to this process are reiteration and nonsense (Riesman and Watson, 1964, p. 302).

To Riesman, this style of analysis remained essentially incomprehensible; Riesman was quite ready to grant that nonsense and even reiteration could, among intimate friends, serve to intensify bonds, enhance gaiety, and provide a change of pace; he was well aware also that many, especially among high-powered or well-known people, do not want always to talk about "big ideas." Nevertheless, he found it
hard to believe that a monotone, serious or frivolous, could actually be refreshing and creative. He was depressed to see that in our protocols, reiterative culture-building served to prohibit any demonstration of real wit, vision, or excellence (Riesman and Watson, 1964, p. 302).

Riesman's problem with the data then, was the disjunction between his ideal of sociability as elegance in the mathematical sense and the "long-drawn-out tissue of inanities" in the actual sociable occasions studied.

Riesman's "perplexity" was perhaps increased by the fact that, by his own description, he was essentially an outsider to worlds of frequent socializing: "Riesman . . . not only does not use alcohol to help him get through a party but finds little opportunity for sociability in a life overfilled with competing demands and obligations" (Riesman and Watson, 1964, p. 319).

Fresh from his imaginative reinterpretation of the relation of the present and the past in The Lonely Crowd, Riesman solved the problem by assuming the ideal to be real in the past and interpreting the present as a fall from that grace. From the perceptive and painfully honest self-analysis of the project by its members, we may tease out an alternative solution to the problem. Aside from Simmel, whose essay was "a stimulus to reflection and speculation but scarcely a program for research" (Riesman and Watson, 1964, p. 239), the major source of sociability as an ideal-type appears to have been literary: in literary descriptions of sociable occasions and in traditional aesthetic criteria for literary works. Riesman's "memoranda on potentially relevant reading" included "discussions of parties in novels" (Riesman and Watson, 1964, pp. 276-277), and his party reports were "largely written on trips; his wife, with a fiction-writer's eye for the detail of a party, cooperated in these" (Riesman and Watson, 1964, p. 307). More crucially, the aesthetic criteria for sociability were consistently stated in literary terms, as can be observed in the quotations we
have given. Parties are described with reference to some literary ideal—what "one of E.M. Forster’s heroines [would] have thought of the proceedings (Riesman, Potter and Watson, 1960a, p. 195), how an occasion "might have been made into a movie by Charlie Chaplin" (Riesman, Potter and Watson, 1960b, p. 22).

To interpret life in terms of art was of course not a new departure, but in the case of sociability it was perhaps peculiarly misleading. All art—and particularly the conservative kind of high culture the Sociability Project tended to have in mind—however "naturalistic" in style, is a selection from and compression of everyday discourse. Synge may have reproduced faithfully the speech patterns of the Aran Islanders, but Playboy of the Western World does not record just any old day, with all its stutters and pleasantry, in that shebeen. It is the particular selection of details which characterize the occasion and point the vignette which the "fiction-writer’s eye" will record.

In sociological analysis, this concentration on purifying and epitomizing is conventionally justified in terms of the Weberian notion of an "ideal type." From this perspective, literature could be seen as offering ready-made idealizations of sociability. But if part of the nature of the phenomenon being studied is its deautorialization and differences, such an ideal-type epitomization may offer a very distorted view of it. The quality of our daily rounds is not well conveyed by our occasional memorable moments.

In our view, then, the parties studied by the Sociability Project were especially banal only in the sense that everyday life is not as elegant and cathartic as a well-made play. It may, in fact, be doubted that the pure and distilled sociability against which the parties were measured ever existed in life for any class and any epoch. By the same token, it should not be assumed that Cavan's descriptions of the humdrum character of bar sociability necessarily mark it off as especially "trivialized" (Cavan, 1966, p. 66) in comparison with sociability elsewhere. In fact, there are some suggestive parallels between party sociability as studied by the Sociability Project and Cavan's descriptions.
of bar sociability. The "half-beliefs" of the parties bear some resemblance to the reconstructed "biographies" of the bars (Cavan, 1966, pp. 79-82). The party punchbowl as the "terminus or place of interchange" (Kiesman and Watson, 1966, p. 291) is matched in the bar by the trip "to the bathroom, the cigarette machine, or the juke box" (Cavan, 1966, pp. 93-94). We might expect the different styles of interaction of "familares" and "casuals" at parties to be matched by differences between interactions among regulars and among casual customers in bars.

The question of whether there is indeed a "peculiar tenor" (Cavan, 1966, p. 57) to bar sociability, distinguishing it from sociability elsewhere, remains open.

Our reactive conclusion, then, is that sociability everywhere falls short of the "kind of dramatic or artistic quality or elegance which might appeal to a non-involved stranger or to the reader of a novel." Improvisational theatre troupes provide a kind of natural experiment by which to test this conclusion. Even with intensive training and strict selection of the participants and extensive rehearsal together, troupes typically find it impossible to hold a well-disposed audience for even an hour on the basis of truly spontaneous improvisation. Instead, episodes or periods of true spontaneity are interspersed with prepared pieces or repetitions of originally spontaneous "bits" which worked out particularly well. The medieval institution of the court jester or fool reminds us that "spontaneous" artistry in sociable interaction has long been organized as an occupation—and as arduous and chancy work, often requiring long preparation, at that.

If ordinary sociability is both artless and formless, what then does it offer to its participants? More particularly, what is the attraction of bars, other than the opportunity to buy liquor at several times the take-home price?

There are, of course, a number of answers. One is that for many people, the attractions do not attract—they remain or retreat to being "unsociable," "unclubbable."
in the upper-class apex of another era.

Cavan's answer is that the tavern offers "time-out," an arena where the "consequentiality" of one's actions is held in abeyance (Cavan, 1966, pp. 3-13, 234-241). But this is surely only a part of an answer. The house also offers "time out"; in fact, Watson labels as the "familial" style of sociable interaction that which offers "sanctuary for the individual" (Watson, 1958, p. 281). And bars are often the scenes for kinds of "action," in Goffman's sense (1967); in fact, the common San Francisco parlance for the bars Cavan categorizes as "sexual market places" (1966, p. 174) is "action bars":

\[ \text{Action:} \quad \text{Most of the customers in these up-to-date action spots are} \]
\[ \text{in the 20s and 30s in age or spirit. The emphasis is less on} \]
\[ \text{drinking per se than fun-and-games and girls-and-boys. The} \]
\[ \text{key words are Now and With It. These expressions, with Geinger} \]
\[ \text{and Action itself, describe attitudes and styles which are} \]
\[ \text{emotional, topical and fickle, evading precise definition. If} \]
\[ \text{you feel their meaning, you'll appreciate these meeting places} \]
\[ \text{...} \]
\[ \text{Action with Music:} \quad \text{They put the whole scene together in these} \]
\[ \text{clubs—live rock bands, dance floors, and plenty of birds. They're} \]
\[ \text{loaded for youth and action by managers who're young, too (Green} \]
\[ \text{and Everett, 1971, pp. 6, 15).} \]

"Action," as Goffman elucidates (1967), is characterized by consequentiality.

And consequentiality is certainly not absent in the "action" bars:

A long-term relationship can ensue out of an initial encounter, and
while the market place may be populated with those in search of
temporary encounters, it may also contain others in search of more
durable goods (Cavan, 1966, p. 174). Incredible friendships begin
at the Cooperae [—motto of a San Francisco action bar] (Green and
Everett, 1971, p. 7)

In her census of taverns in the New York suburbs, Cass Richards found "action" of a different type:

Noisy taverns: . . . Patrons of most noisy taverns are interested in sports, but the attitudes of patrons of different taverns vary sharply. In some, which may be called "competitive," the patrons take sports very seriously. They study rules, figure odds, and winning at anything is crucial. Patrons of these taverns gamble for high stakes on races, televised sports, tavern games, and anything else they can persuade someone to bet on . . . Another sub-class of noisy taverns may be called "sporting." Patrons of these taverns are equally interested in sports, but their attitude toward games is quite different. To patrons of sporting taverns, "fair play" is the most important element, and the game itself is of more interest than who wins it. (Richards, 1963-64, pp. 263-6).

Indeed, the anti-saloon movement was partly oriented around an identification of the saloon as essentially a false front for "the action"; a later sociological manifestation of this line analyzes urban beer taverns as "striking instance of pseudoyniety"—70% of the Dallas beer taverns visited were according to this analysis, a "front" for other "enterprises and activities (legal and illegal)" (Stolle, 1937-38).

The quotations on "action" open up two further functions of the tavern. Irrespective of sociability, the tavern offers a convenient meeting-place for purposive interaction. Its role in this was more inevitable formerly than now; three generations of social reform have at least produced alternative meeting places in big U.S. cities.

Just as in the case of the small boys' clubs, so with these adult and serious organizations [labor unions] the saloon becomes the
saloon becomes the meeting-place... In Buffalo, ... sixty-three out of sixty-nine labor organisations held their meetings in some hall connected with a saloon. In other places the preponderance was so decided as to discourage the investigator, who had thought to find in the union an effective substitute for the saloon. The fault, as we have seen, does not lie by any means wholly with the trade unions. They have always claimed that they could not find other suitable places without putting themselves under obligation to institutions of whose purpose they did not entirely approve... In consequence, they are driven to the saloons. The proprietor is only too glad to supply a hall at a very low rental, and trust to his bar receipts to repay him, which they amply do (Calkins, 1901, p. 61).

Taverns at the turn of the century functioned more or less officially as the hiring halls for many occupations (Calkins, 1901, pp. 9-10); Caven's analysis reminds us that many "home territory" bars still serve as a more informal arena for the shop talk of various occupations (Caven, 1966, pp. 207,211).

The quotations on "action" bars raise an issue which bears not only on the function of the saloon but also on the attraction of sociability in general. Beneath the surface inconsequentialities, as Jeanne Watson noted, there are often hidden personal agendas of consequence. Martin Hoffman has remarked on this as a striking quality of gay bars:

There is a great deal of milling about in the bar and individuals tend to engage in short, superficial conversations with each other. They try to make the circuit around the bar to see everyone in it, perhaps stopping to chat with their friends but usually not for very long... [Those] who are not habitues of the bar scene often express great perplexity about the bars—they cannot quite understand what's going on there. They seem to be bewildered by the sight of
all these young men standing around and communicating so little
with one another . . . One heterosexual observer said he felt as
if everyone in the room were standing around waiting for some im-
portant figure to come in, but of course he never comes . . . Each
is waiting for a handsome young prince to come and carry him off
in his arms . . . The gay bar, then, in a sense may be thought of
as a stage on which is played out a fantasy in which the hero never

Cavan's note on those seeking for "more durable goods" in heterosexual market-
place bars suggest that this form of seeking is not confined to the gay bar; and
we have seen how the Sociability Project found that middle-class parties, too, were
often characterized by "people sitting around hoping that the affair will justify
itself, or at least that they will not miss anything important." The participants
in sociable interaction are often, then, prisoners of hope, waiting for small
epiphanies to break through the patter of small talk. For all of us--though
perhaps to a lesser extent than for the Sociability Project--there are ideals of
sociability influenced by literary models and by the tricks of telescoping of
our memories. The humidum present is always at risk of being compared with the
good old days and the hopeful future. Many independent observations have been made
in the literature on the "precariousness" (Aldrich, 1972, p. 179) and "fragility"
(Kissmann, Potter and Watan, 1960b, p. 25; Blumenstil, 1971, p. 9) of sociability,
and Goffman discusses essentially the same quality under the rubric of "tension":-
"a sensed discrepancy between the world that spontaneously becomes real to the
individual, or the one he is able to accept as the current reality, and the one
in which he is obliged to dwell" (Goffman, 1961, p. 43). The fragility is not
only derived from the fact that a normative requirement of consensus is by defini-
tion violated by even a single disserter, but also from the likelihood that other
participants will also be under "tension," potential converts from considering
the occasion "a good time" to considering it "a waste of time," so that "a
perceived deviation from the norm can . . . have a 'multiplier' effect, infect-
ing the whole encounter" (Goffman, 1961, p. 42). Considering essentially what
we are discussing as sociability under the rubric of "good times," Blumenstiel
has noted the common use of affirmations and injunctions--"have a good time,"
"isn't this terrific," etc. (Blumenstiel, 1971, pp. 5-6--statements which we can
regard as markers of the vulnerability of the situation to alternative definitions.
Those truly engrossed in the situation--experiencing "unmost reality" (Blumenstiel,
1971, p. 7) or "spontaneous involvement" (Goffman, 1961, p. 37)--should presumably
not have so analytical a question as how it is to be defined on their minds.
Part of the defensiveness against analysis of one's sociability which seems to be a
common experience of studies of sociability (Kiesman and Watson, 1964, pp. 261, 263, 300)
may be seen as a result of the tension the participants are experiencing between
the norm of engagement and their feelings of deusexme; for those fully engrossed,
"it is practically impossible to distract their attention" (Goffman, 1961, p. 43),
so that a detached observer becomes one more piece of the scenery. At least in
literature and legend, occasions which are really "fun" are impervious to "spoilting,"
 surviving even transplantation to the local jail.
It was the eighteenth century which made us self-conscious about moods,
defining happiness as a chief goal of mankind, and as a state to be pursued
rather than to have happen. The tavern is certainly an institution whose heart
is the sociable aspect of happiness:

No patio, no parking, no river view, no gas sessions, no table
service. Just good times. (Slogan on the matchbook of Crowley's
Highland House, Cincinnati. Quoted by Flugs, 1971)
Cavan's description of interaction in taverns shows that on this hunting-ground the pursuit is often in vain. Depictions of sociability in other places suggest, however, that this may be due more to the elusive and fleeting qualities of the quarry than to the characteristics of the venue.

Diversities and Commonalities in Tavern Sociability

Tavern studies traditionally lay great emphasis on the diversity of taverns, and no sociological discussion seems complete without a typology of taverns (e.g., Calkins, 1901, pp. 5-34; Macrory, 1952, pp. 625-630; Glanard, 1962, pp. 216-279; Gorham and Danceott, 1950, p. 45; Jansen, 1963, pp. 13 ff.; Cavan, 1966, pp. 142-233; Richards, 1963-64, pp. 263-264).

These typologies tend to attribute different interactional styles to the different tavern-types, but it is also worth bearing in mind some significant commonalities. The differences in style are differences in mixture rather than in nature.

The "Regulars":

All these pubs (the 4000 in London) have one thing in common. Everyone is somebody's local. Everyone has its regular customers, who use it for some reason in preference to other pubs (for in Central London nobody can be very far from two pubs at least). Even the sightseers' pubs have their regulars (Gorham, 1939, p. vii). There are of course considerable variations in the degree of regularity:

There is no reason why one person should not have more than one local. In Central London, where pubs are plentiful, it is always possible to have three or four near your house, and three or four more near the place where you work, apart from any that happen to be conveniently situated, for instance at bus-stops or stations, on the way home.

How many pubs you use regularly depends on your own taste and fancy.
If you want to become an intimate of the house it is better to use as few as possible so as to use those few more, but if your ambition is merely to be nodded to when you come in, that degree of familiarity can be attained in a score of houses without any danger of drinking yourself to death... The most genuine regulars--the people who are real intimates of the house--are to be found in the small neighborhood houses, just round the corner from where they live... The real regular is one of the family. There is nothing he does not know about what happens in the house (Gorham, 1939, pp. viii, 3).

The relationships of the regular with others in the bar may be among the most stable he has. In one case in the Bay Area, customers are reported to have "followed" a particular bartender for 15 years through three different bars. The bar group may in fact take on many of the attributes of an extended family; in the same Bay Area bar one bartender had three people he had met at the bar who needed help and a place to stay living at his house.

The relationship between the individual regular and the tavern may take a number of forms. The relationship need not involve any collectivity at all, although usually regularity will in the end involve at least a position in the collectivity of the regulars of the place. Cavan's analysis suggests that regulars who decline such a position gravitate into the status of a "bar character":

One of the patrons pointed an old man out to me and said, "He's the character of this place. He comes in here every night, orders a pitcher of beer, takes it to the same place down there, and drinks the whole thing... No, he never talks to anyone, just takes his pitcher of beer over there and drinks it down." (Cavan, 1964, p. 83)

For most taverns--quintessentially the neighborhood taverns, but also for most others not catering specifically for travelers or tourasts--the regulars
are very important factor in the business. The bartender's and owner's relationship with customers thus takes on some aspects of the "cultivated relationship" Odie Biguas has described for milkmen (Biguas, 1972). "You are a stranger here but once," proclaims the motto of a San Francisco saloon (Green & Everett, 1971, p. 57). The bartender must seek to increase the tie of the patron to the establishment—although without impairing his own efficiency:

Everyone wants to talk to the bartender. I don't mind five or ten minutes. That's what I'm here for. But with 25 or 30 people you can't and then they get mad and say, "Why doesn't the bartender talk to me?" (Cavan, 1966, p. 129).

From the owner's point of view, the cocktail waitress and B-girl may also be seen primarily in terms of the cultivation of a relationship with the establishment:

When I asked the bartender why he needed a cocktail waitress, he said, "If these guys walk by and see me behind the bar, they don't want to come in and talk to me... All you have to do is serve soft drinks and beer and talk with the guys—you know." (Cavan, 1966, p. 195).

The owner's and bartender's relationships with the regulars, however, unlike the milkman's with his customers, are likely to be complicated by the fact that the regulars are not only individuals but also a collective. The owner will often encourage collective activities to promote greater solidarity among the regulars, in the expectation it will pay off in higher receipts.

"This was a nice neighborhood bar," says George Alvarado, who not long ago owned an unprofitable bar in Los Angeles. "We had picnics, we went on trips. We'd rent a bus and go to the racetrack at Tijuana or to the Ice Follies, to hockey or baseball games. But it doesn't pay off. We just haven't had the people here for the last five years." (Kluge, 1971)
The owner can expect to benefit from encouraging collective organization among the regulars; but their collectivization also makes them a formidable bargaining unit which must be catered to in its running of the tavern. The millman can expect that the damage to his operations from a disaffected customer will be limited. The bar owner may find his stakes to be higher:

A tavern can "get away" from its owner. If a group decides to leave, the owner may be forced to change his behavior or sell the tavern. In one case, the patron-leader of a group was insulted by a new owner. The patron left the tavern and swore he would not go there again as long as the owner remained. Twelve of the regular patrons left with him, although this tavern was on the outskirts of New York City, and was the only tavern in the neighborhood. Within two months the owner had been forced to sell. In another case, business dropped off sharply and the tavern changed from a family tavern to a competitive [gambling] tavern (which the owner was forced to accept against his wishes, to stay in business) because the owner had antagonized the couples by his indiscretions with a married woman (Richards, 1963-64, p. 266).

Overlapping with the issue of "regulars" is the issue of specialization in a particular clientele. Most discussions of taverns remark on the existence of what Jensen calls "category taverns," which "are oriented towards one or more special categories of customers wherever their place of residence: for instance, merchants, students, intellectuals, artists, grocers, tradesmen, peddlers, deviants, soccer players, music lovers, aged citizens, travelling salesmen and so on... Its atmosphere somewhat resembles the neighborhood tavern. Customers know one another and usually maintain lively contacts. Both types are characterized by a relatively stable group of customers--the neighborhood tavern slightly more than the category tavern--and its customers will rarely visit other taverns of the same type." (Jensen, 1963, p. 16)
In American cities, many "neighborhood bars" are in fact "category taverns," a primary meeting place for those of a given ethnicity.

Patrons of the neighborhood tavern commonly are of a similar religious, ethnic, and social class. Four Chicago taverns in our sample catered primarily to Polish-Americans, three to German-Americans, five to southern whites, and three to Negroes. In a suburb with a population of 17,000 the division along lines of class and ethnicity was even more pronounced: there were taverns for Old Poles, New Poles (recent immigrants), Germans, hillbillies, and Italians. In six of the local taverns respondents identified along ethnic lines the patrons of taverns in other parts of the city, and their accuracy was confirmed in later research (Outlief, 1957).

Sherri Cavan has offered an extended analysis of interaction in "category taverns" under the rubric of "the home territory bar" (1966, pp. 205-233). Her discussion tends to collapse the actions of the "regulars" with those of members of the tavern's "category"; in fact, many "category taverns" derive considerable business from members of the category who could not be described as "regulars":

It's claimed that if you stay in a bar long enough, you'll meet every every newspaperman in the country. (Green and Evertt, 1971, p. 23)

Twenty-one years ago, off a ship, Cooper last visited the Barrel House. He has been back to town since then, but for some reason never stepped in again. Tonight, two days back from a run to Indonesia, Cooper thought he'd look for the place again. "They still got a game going in the back?" . . . In the old days, Eddie Matheson is saying, there was a pattern. Guys off a ship would come in first for a little gambling before heading out to look for a woman (Hutchison, 1972).
A customer may then have a claim to a "special relationship" with a bar either on the basis of membership in a population category which has an existence independently of the bar or on the basis of membership in the collectivity of "regulars" at the bar. Shifts in patronage based on one claim may not be matched by shifts based on the other:

Homosexual home territory bars in San Francisco are often in and out of vogue, and one can find an establishment that was literally packed seven nights a week for some time to be virtually empty a month later, with many of its patrons at a new place that previously had little popularity. Of course, some homosexual bars maintain their popularity for long periods, and others, whether they are in or out of vogue among homosexuals in general, may still be patronized on a regular basis by some members of the homosexual population (Goen, 1966, p. 208).

"Category" members may thus be either casual or regular customers of a "category" bar. Presumably in the case of casual "category" customers there is less investment by both the customer and the bar management in the continuation of the particular individual relationship. But the potential of organized action implied by the existence of the "category" presumably gives a group of "category" bar regulars even greater power than other regulars over the arrangements in the bar.

Although frequent tavern-going in the general population appears to be associated with youth (Clark, 1966, p. 322), the anecdotal literature tends to see "regulars"—those who frequent particular taverns—as middle-aged. References in these terms can be found from a long way back:

Here, for example, is a saloon on Ninth Avenue in New York City.

It is typical of a large number of poor saloons in any large city . . . in a nook which is partially protected from the wind, five
or six regular patrons are playing with greasy cards on a black
and dirty table. They are all middle-aged men of miserable type.
The place is not of a kind which would be likely to attract the
younger men, for . . . the general effect is forlorn, uncomfortable
(Calkins, 1901, p. 6).

Middle-aged people in America, unlike young adults, are supposed to have
a home and hearth; as their age-peers fall away into domesticity, the remainders
and those with unsuccessful home-lives are likely to drift into being a bar
regular as a functional equivalent for some of the restorative and sociable
functions of the family. A regular in a Bay Area bar describes the process:

I have been going to Bar X for several years. My husband and I
used to go in for a drink after a movie. After my husband died it
seemed a natural place to go when I felt lonely. Most of my friends
still had husbands and I soon began to feel out of place in our social
milieu. I began to feel at home then at Bar X with other out-of-place
people. There was no problem about feeling like a third wheel or who
should pay; it was all very simple.

The decline of the tavern may thus be seen as linked to demographic declines
in the pool of potential regulars:

The tradition of the Irish saloon, once a mainstream in San Francisco
life, has become an inconsequential creak . . . Bars relying on steady
Hibernian trade are beset by . . . the Americanisation of the Irish.
Previous generations of Irishmen were not noted for rushing into early
marriages and subsequently for sticking like limpets to hearth and
bed. But in this generation, a frightening number of them have
succumbed to this "middle-class morality." Consequently, the bars
which retain the most Irish characteristics are those which cater to the older trade and are far from fashionable joints (Green, 1972, pp. 38, 30).

Among regulars, we may expect the style of sociability to be predominantly "familial," in Watson's (1958) typology, stressing "sharing"more than "presenting" (Watson and Porter, 1964) in the episodes of sociability.

The "Casuals"

Sociological studies of taverns tend to focus their attention on the "regulars" in taverns, often almost to the exclusion of discussion of casual patronage. Yet the casual customer is as omnipresent as the regular; some bars "specialise in the convenience use of setting," but "any bar may be used at one time or another by some as a convenience bar" (Caven, 1966, p. 151).

The tavern is after all, a public accommodation, and thus bound to serve all who are of age and not drunk. English Medieval law mandating open accessibility to the inn were in fact both the first public accommodation laws and the first governmental control of the alcoholic beverage trade.

Caven's analysis of "home territory" bars stresses the exclusion of "outsiders" by both the regulars and the management. Such exclusionary tactics are obviously to be expected in bars where the activity may be defined by outsiders as illegitimate—e.g., gay bars. There are other special circumstances "requiring" exclusion; and on occasion, such tactics even include the presentation of the tavern as a private club:

The door to the tavern was locked. In the window there was a sign that read "For Members Only." I rang a bell, and a man came to the door—he looked out at me and then opened the door.

In a conversation with one of the patrons, I was informed that this closed-club approach was introduced in order to keep Negroes out of the tavern. (Gettlemb, 1957.)
But Cavan extends the argument to a claim that exclusion is in fact a general characteristic of home territory bars: "a bar can be considered as one's 'own' bar only so far as it cannot be considered as 'everyone's' bar. Hence, the maintenance of proprietary interest in a bar is dependent upon the exclusion of others who, for some reason or another, appear to have no 'right' to patronize the establishment" (Cavan, 1966, pp. 217-218). This appears to state the general case too strongly: allowing others to use one's territory is often quite compatible with maintaining a proprietary interest. Cavan goes on to note that "perhaps the most common form of ascit rebuff that an entering outsider is likely to receive upon entering a home territory bar is a conspicuous, questioning look, too long to be taken as a prelude to civil inattention, too intent to be taken as an invitation" (Cavan, 1966, p. 218). This "look" may be regarded more as a simple assertion of territoriality, akin to a sign that "permission to pass over is revocable at any time," than as a rebuffing "no trespassing" sign. While the owner and employees have to humor the regulars, they have of course a financial interest in also serving the casuals, and in maneuvering the regulars into accepting their presence with at least grudging grace. The loud remark, "Oh, boy, make room for the paying customers," which Cavan records (p. 218), pays tribute to this theme. We may suspect that Richards' report that "a regular patron said...that the only subjects tabooed were religion and race relations 'because the bartender is so prejudiced we would have fights instead of discussions'" (Richards, 1963-64, p. 263) is an instance of the kind of subterfuge by which owners and employees minimize the regulars' exclusionary devices.

We may expect the sociable style of the casual to fall more into the "pressing" type of Watson and Potter's, while as we noted regular status and a "sharing" style might be expected to go together. Quite a proportion of
frequent bargers are not "regulars"—thus 47% of the 169 who went at least once a week, in the San Francisco sample initially reported by Clark (1964), said that there was not any particular place where they went about half the time or more. Presumably those who often go to bars but do not become regulars enjoy a sociable style of "one-night stands" rather than continuing relationships. One is reminded of the celebrations in American literature of the fraternity of the road, of the amiable sociability of interaction of those thrown together for a few moments by the accidents of their itinerary.

**The Initiates:**

It is, of course, easier to see and study what is there rather than what is not there, and the literature on taverns offers scant reference to who cannot be found in taverns. There are some obvious differences by social differentiations; although children are not formally excluded in the U.S., as they are in England, they are certainly far from full participants in even the "family taverns" described by Richards—they apparently did not feel sufficiently at ease ever to misbehave (p. 264): The tavern, too, is by and large a man's world; Caven's description of rituals makes it clear how completely the woman in a tavern tends to be defined as a property of males. The ambiguous status of women in taverns is neatly conveyed by a magazine review of "Jean Shepherd's America":

> Like most American storytellers...his material consists of childhood, derring-do, escape, animals, perpetual motion, male camaraderie...It is astonishing what a small part women play in these 13 audiovisual essays. They don't drink beer and they don't go fishing and they hang around saloons instead of prospecting for gold.... Women are the opposite of escape in this scheme of things; the road goes, the river flows, away from them. They
are made to symbolize civilization and adulthood. Cities, too, are evil, oppressive, soul-devouring. Cars are all right, because a car is a raft, a boat for going away to where there aren't any women or cities. Bars are all right, because bars are where men get together to talk about beer and listen to the juke-box instead of going home, where, of course, women are. ("Cyclops," 1972.)

But not all adult men, after all, fit into the world of the tavern, just as not all adult men belong to the "social world"—in Shibutani's sense—of maintaining an interest in baseball, etc.—even though it may be more or less of a norm for men to pick up somewhere along the way enough love of both baseball and bars to get by. There are, in fact, cultural commonalities to bars all over the country which mean that the casual user can drop in anywhere and know a good deal about what to expect. These commonalities are so much taken for granted by initiates as to be almost invisible. But several hints can be picked up in the literature of the existence of the line between the knowing and the unknowing:

Amateur Night was what old San Francisco drinkers called Saturday night and, especially, New Year's Eve. They stayed home those nights. (Green and Everett, 1971, p. 22.) Since we emphasize that the tone in almost all these bars is informal and relaxed, we don't want to sound magisterial ourselves by setting down rules, but many people feel uncomfortable in strange surroundings when they don't know the ground rules... (Green & Everett, 1971, p. 3)
Two patrons whom we questioned specifically about the [Calgary] stampe was indicated that they "couldn't care less." One of these... suggested that if he had his way, he would abolish the Stampe because it interfered with his usual drinking activities by "draining" the number of friends he usually found at the bar. When questioned specifically about this, he responded that during Stampe, "they just stay home." (Oseenberg, 1969, p. 32)

Within the conversations with bar patrons my own ignorance of bar taboos also upon occasion resulted in my asking questions that I had no right to ask (Cavan, 1966, p. 20) "How are you?" is often used as a prelude to buying a gift drink for another... as the following example, quite inadvertent, illustrates. [Cavan and her husband buy a drink for the bartender with a question intended as a polite inquiry after the bartender's health] (Cavan, 1966, p. 125.)

Almost unnoticed by the commentators themselves, we can, then, discern occasionally in their work the line being drawn between the witting and the unwitting, between those who know how to handle themselves in a bar and those who order Pink Ladies, who don't know what it means to be 86'd, who don't even know enough to buy a replacement for a drink they've knocked over (Cavan, 1966, p. 125), sober people whose actions in the bar may be as unpredictable and amusing, if annoying or threatening to the habitué as the drink-clinging-to-the-langou's actions may be to the sober observer. With a sure eye for the most picturesque, glossaries of drinking argot have tended to concentrate on the highly specialized argot of the tight little world of the "urban nomads" of Skid Row; it has not generally been recognized that there is a whole world of lore and a wealth of expressions shared by the much wider company of those who at least occasionally do some "serious drinking."
Taverns are both drink-shops and realms of sociability. Drinking and sociability are often so entwined in American life that it is hard to separate the two functions for analytical purposes. Certainly taverns as institutions often bind individuals to them quite strongly, exerting what would seem to be an unlikely degree of influence over them. Richard's example of the Sheepish habitué hanging around outside a bar from which he had been temporarily barred for acting "mean," despite the presence of the other bars on the block, (p. 266) is a particularly telling instance of a high degree of bonding. Sometimes it is clear that it is the sociability rather than the alcohol that forms the bond, as in the case of abstaining regulars; and Caven's "mechanical men" among her gallery of bar "characters" (pp. 83-84) appear to provide examples of the contrary case, of people for whom sociability appears unlikely to be the draw which brings them into the bar. Perhaps the relative power of company and drink might be gauged by using coffee-houses as a comparison case. The temperance movement, which actually made the experiment by repeated attempts to compete with the saloon, was left with few illusions about the outcome:

The saloons understand too well their own distinct field—that of meeting the demand for alcoholic stimulant—to fear seriously the encroachment upon it of the temperance lunch-room and restaurant. None of the temperance eating and drinking places afford the social and recreative privileges of many of the saloons. The reasons of this are not far to seek. Hunger and natural thirst are soon satisfied, while the morbid demand for spiritsuous liquors increases with indulgence. Therefore, the proprietor of a soda fountain or a lunch-room, unlike the saloon-keeper, would have nothing to gain by inducing
his customers to remain. Then, too, soda water and ginger ale lack that stimulating quality of alcoholic beverages which promotes the feeling of sociability and good fellowship. As a result, one does not care to linger long after he has finished his "soft" drink or eaten his food. Indeed, to sit around a table in the ordinary lunch-room or restaurant for an entire evening would give neither excitement nor pleasure. (William Cole and Kellogg Durland, "Report on Substitutes for the Saloon in Boston," Appendix III in Calkins, 1901, p. 330.)
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