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This is the first in a series of papers depicting the mostly undocumented life of E.M. Jellinek. This paper serves as an introduction to several more topics related to Jellinek’s pre-alcohol studies life and scholarship, including his family background, his years in Hungary, his time abroad, his tenure at the Worcester State Hospital, and his relationship with Mark Keller. This first part focuses on some major controversial issues about Jellinek’s life, which challenged those who attempted to write a biography. The information in these papers was first presented at the 36th Annual Substance Abuse Librarians and Information Specialists (SALIS) Conference on May 1st, 2014, by seven presenters in a panel entitled “Mystery and speculations: Piecing together E.M. Jellinek’s redemption.”

Introductions, intentions, and scope

There are essentially four goals we¹ want to accomplish with this panel, which are as follows:

(1) To honor and acknowledge the founder of our library, one of the figureheads of the Center of Alcohol Studies, and the primary driving force behind the emergence of alcohol science.

(2) To show the research processes involved in collecting, digitizing, and analyzing all of the information we have uncovered. Of particular importance with this goal is an emphasis on making as much information as

¹ The “we” in this article refers to the joint efforts of the Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies staff and Dr. Ron Roizen
possible accessible, as we never know what will become relevant in the future. In keeping with the theme of the Conference (entitled “Looking forward, looking back”), we have been building on our past to better prepare us for our future.

(3) To give a fuller picture of the foundations of alcohol science, as rooted in the making of the man who was a large part of its beginnings. We believe it benefits those of us who work in substance abuse libraries to have a working knowledge of one of the founders of our discipline, as his personality had a very large influence on its structure.

(4) To document this history in our voice (because who else will do it?). We are essentially two generations removed from the foundation of this field, and it is important to make information accessible in hope that it does not get distorted or filtered through those with biases one way or another on the topic. Essentially, our job is to uncover as much of the material as we can, utilize the material we have uncovered, and perhaps most importantly, provide context when available.

Jellinek is of course most famous for his numerous contributions to the alcohol science field, some of which I make mention of below, but it should be noted that he started this phase of his career when he was approximately 50 years old, which leaves quite a lot of life to consider before he took up this cause (Jellinek, 1947a). So as mentioned, the focus of this panel, while certainly making reference to his years in alcohol studies (especially during Molly Stewart’s portion on his relationship with Mark Keller), is on the forging of his personal, educational, and professional interests pre-alcohol.

The panel’s intention is to give a well-rounded picture of this complex and interesting man, and show how his unique take on life and scholarly pursuits is reflected in the work we are doing as substance abuse librarians, decades after his passing. Included in this work is the research involved in trying to fill in the gaps of his life, and we have come to find that the more we learn about Jellinek, the more we learn about the foundation of alcohol studies as a discipline. In keeping with his (either second or third) ex-wife Thelma Pierce Anderson’s wishes, in a letter to colleague Mark Keller about a potential Jellinek biography, we plan to reveal the man in several aspects of his life (Anderson to Keller, 1984). Of course, an honest assessment of an individual will always expose flaws in character, but our intention is not to defame. We plan on showing the true human being, flaws and all, and on charting his failures and subsequent successes in equal measure. (Hence, the word “redemption” prominently displayed in the title of the panel.) Above all, we want to show that this is a man who contained multitudes and defies archetype.

Speaking to the fourth goal of ours (“Who else will do it?”), and with respect to Thelma’s concerns, we want Jellinek’s biographical information to be placed in the proper context, and not sensationalized or used to push an agenda. While the dubious claims and alleged indiscretions we will discuss can certainly paint him in an unflattering light, it is too simplistic to think in such binary terms as to discredit his great contributions to the field. The theme of this panel is to recognize a man who failed often, and surely felt the reverberations of those failures, but continued to work at his craft.

For an example of how cherry-picked information can be used for defamatory purposes, take the response to Dr. Ron Roizen’s 1997 column “Jellinek’s Phantom Doctorate”, which explored his attempts to verify Jellinek’s academic credentials and detailed his discovery that Jellinek may have been less than forthright about his claims. Roizen concludes that this shows just how marginal a figure Jellinek was in the scientific world, and postulates that the field of alcohol science itself was marginal by extension. He even makes sure to state: “a doctor-less Jellinek should by no means vitiate either his career or his accomplishments in the alcohol science movement. Indeed, some of us may even be inclined to grant Jellinek a few extra-credit points--i.e., for accomplishing as much
as he did with a c.v. as problematic as his appears to have been!” (Roizen, 1997).

Shortly after Roizen’s article was posted, Dr. Stanton Peele chose not to focus on these balanced and nuanced conclusions, and instead used Roizen’s research to write an article entitled “Jellinek Was a Cheat!” for his personal blog (Peele, 1997). It is probably not coincidental that discrediting Jellinek outright would fit in with his views against the disease concept of addiction, as Jellinek’s perhaps most publicized work is entitled The Disease Concept of Alcoholism. Thirteen years later, in 2010, Peele reposted the same article to his website dedicated to his addiction recovery program (Peele, 2010).

We will be getting into Jellinek’s academic credentials shortly, but first, as to our intentions, a reminder of his innumerable contributions to the field of alcohol and substance abuse studies. The following list is by no means exhaustive, but provides an overview of just how many initiatives in which he was involved. Perhaps his most enduring contribution to the field is his idea of “phases” of alcohol addiction (Jellinek, 1946, 1952), later modified by Dr. Max Glatt to include a recovery element (Glatt, 1958), but still popularly referred to as the “Jellinek Curve.” This curve has been modified and applied to all sorts of addiction disorders over the years and remains highly cited to this day (Fisher 1990, Hoffman 1994, Baird 2008).

And of course, spanning both popular and scholarly audiences is perhaps his most comprehensive work, the book The Disease Concept of Alcoholism (Jellinek, 1960), which combined with his other work has left an impact exemplified by the fact that alcoholism is occasionally referred to as “Jellinek’s Disease” (Keller 1984).

Further still, he developed the idea and curriculum for the Summer School of Alcohol Studies, still holding its annual sessions along with several specialized courses, under its current moniker the Summer School of Addiction Studies (Jellinek, 1943). His appeal to librarians and information specialists may be best represented by his work on the CAAAL collection, an organizational system for all of the alcohol literature available at the time (Jellinek, Efron & Keller, 1948). And finally, his legend lives on via the periodically granted “Jellinek Memorial Award”, in which
the Canadian-based Jellinek Memorial Fund recognizes scholarly contributions to the alcohol field, represented by the “Bunky” bust (Jellinek Memorial Awards).

An un-examinable life?

I’d like to begin showing our research process by highlighting just how difficult this man’s life is to piece together, taking you through attempts to sort everything out in a biography. The first true attempt at a Jellinek biography got underway in 1965, less than two years after his death. His daughter, Ruth Surry, took up the effort, funded by a $2,000 grant from the Brinkley Smithers Foundation. We have a series of memos written shortly after Jellinek’s death between Surry, R. Brinkley Smithers, and someone we have only been able to identify as “CPF” (possibly an editor or otherwise in Smithers’ employ) detailing an outline of her discoveries, her sources, the costs involved, and reports on her progress (Surry, 1965). In these memos, the initial emotion is pleasure that things were moving along so rapidly.

She began by speaking to family members and tracking leads. However, approximately one year later, in a message from CPF to Smithers from 1966, the sentiment became significantly less optimistic. By this point, Ruth was under significant pressure, and seemingly overwhelmed by the “tremendous amount of research involved” (CPF, 1966). She began to express trepidations about revealing Jellinek’s relationship to his family, and CPF worries in the memo about how long a book from her might take to complete. In a handwritten note at the bottom of the letter, he mentions that she promises a progress report soon. By December of 1966, she notes that the “biographical work is proceeding very slowly indeed” and that much of the information is contradictory (Surry, 1966). (If you are curious about what she must have gone through, a brief preview of some of this confusing information will follow shortly. We have only these memos as sources for this attempt, which include a helpful outline of Jellinek’s life, but have no actual pages produced in her effort. We remain optimistic, however, as we contacted the Smithers Foundation to see if they may possess anything beyond these memos, and they recently replied, offering to send over anything that may be related to the project, so we hope to gain more information about this attempt soon.)

Several other Jellinek biographies were attempted outside of Ruth’s ill-fated effort. Mark Keller actually makes mention of a potential biographical piece in 1963, only a few months removed from Jellinek’s death, in a letter to Thelma Anderson. Though, he does stipulate that he doesn’t “have in mind a biography in the true sense, but one essentially limited to work and achievements. (Someone with literary ambitions could try a real biography)” (Keller, 1963). The aforementioned CPF letter notes that Max Glatt, one of the pioneers in the treatment of alcohol problems (and as noted earlier, the man who added the “curve” to the “Jellinek Curve”), had the idea to work on a Jellinek biography with more of an oral history bent, collecting statements from prominent
members of the alcohol science field with their views of the man. He is quoted as saying that the lack of a Jellinek biography is like “a building without the cornerstone” (CPF, 1966). Nearly twenty years later, Keller asked Thelma herself to take up the task. In a letter from Thelma in 1984, she appears apprehensive, but then delves into some hypotheticals about the potential scope and focus of the book (Anderson to Keller, 1984). By 1990, Keller had apparently taken the reins himself, and even crafted a title—“Bunky: A Remembrance of E.M. Jellinek”. Thelma mentions the title while wishing Keller luck in its undertaking (Anderson to Keller, 1990). We do have a copy of about 8 pages taken from an early draft of that attempt. Perhaps the most comprehensive biography comes courtesy of J. George Strachan, who wrote an unpublished 63-page draft entitled E.M. Jellinek: His stay in Canada (Strachan, 1989). The title is a bit of a misnomer, as nearly two-thirds of the draft covers Jellinek’s personality and his career before arriving in Canada. Despite all of these ambitions, none of these biographies have been completed and published, so that proverbial cornerstone in Dr. Glatt’s quote is still missing.

Let us now see some examples that may have confused Ruth and perhaps some others during their research, such as his ever-changing academic credentials. In 1918, a 28-year old Jellinek was listed as “Doctor” in the proceedings of the 5th annual International Psychoanalytics Congress held in Budapest (Psyalpha, 1919). (Note: Jellinek presented at this conference along with Sigmund Freud and his close colleague Géza Róheim, the details of which will follow in a subsequent paper). In 1933, while working for Worcester State Hospital, he published with the title Master of Education, with no sign of a doctorate (Hoskins et al, 1933). By 1935, he had earned a Doctorate of Science (Worcester State Hospital, 1935), but in 1940, he qualified that Doctorate as honorary (Jellinek & McFarland, 1940). In 1942, the honorary qualifier was dropped, as was the Master of Education (Jellinek, 1942). In 1947, he did away with titles altogether (Jellinek, 1947). And in the aforementioned unpublished Strachan biography, he is listed as a Doctor of Science, Master of Education, and an honorary Doctor of Medicine (Strachan, 1989).

To avoid confusion, perhaps we could just refer to him by his preferred nickname, “Bunky”. One of the ongoing myths is that his father called him “Bunky” because it means “little radish” in Hungarian (Keller, 1984). Interestingly enough, we have a native Hungarian speaker on our panel and two attending the conference, all of whom agree that the Hungarian word for “radish” is “retek”, not “bunky”. We will explore this further in Dr. Judit Ward’s paper on Jellinek’s Hungarian past.

**Poring through the documentation**

Jellinek’s CV and biography, provided by the Strachan Files from Alberta, sheds a little light on his credentials, but also leads to more questions. As we have found with much of the material on him, we tend to move two steps forward, and then one back.

We can see that he attended the University of Grenoble in 1911, though no degree is listed. Next, it lists that in 1914 he received his Master of Education at the University of Berlin, though it appears he received it three years after he had left the school. Twenty-one years later, in 1935, he
received his Doctorate of Science, but no institution is listed. This also raises the question of what exactly he was doing in those 21 years, another topic we will get into later. Twenty years after that, in 1955, he receives an Honorary Doctorate of Medicine from the University of Chile (“Additional Biographical Information,” 1963).

In 1947 the publication *Current Biography* compiled his early education into a narrative (Jellinek, 1947a). It makes mention of University of Berlin (1908-1911), which corresponds with the Alberta bio; Grenoble for the year 1911 (still holding true), and then a previously unmentioned school, referred here only as “Leipzig”, from 1911-1914, as where he earned his Master of Education. It also mentions that his Doctorate of Science degree comes from Leipzig, issued 21 years later. It should be noted that *Current Biography* gets its information from various sources, and there is a good chance Jellinek wrote this bio himself. By 1988, in an article written by CAS librarian (and former SALIS member) Penny Booth Page, his education is spoken of in general terms, though she mentions that his Doctorate of Science from University of Leipzig is honorary (Page, 1988). And in 1997, Dr. Ron Roizen tracked this down a little further, noticing that *The Historical Register of Yale University, 1937-1951* has the same Leipzig information regarding his M.Ed., but that his 1935 Sc.D. is from the University of Tegucigalpa, located in the capital of Honduras (Yale University, 1952).

In the memo from Ruth Surry to Smithers (1965) in reference to her attempted biography, she mentions that Jellinek first went to Berlin Technical Institute, then left for University of Leipzig, and went to Grenoble for graduate study after that. She does not specifically mention that he graduated from Leipzig. Finally, in correspondence from Thelma to Keller in 1988, she remarks on his various titles and degrees, quoting his answer that “European degrees are not comparable to American degrees but they were like doctorates”, before positing that “the truth may be more interesting” (Anderson to Keller, 1988).

Jellinek’s career, according to the Alberta file, begins in the 1920s. But according to that file and the *Current Biography* piece, he earned his Master’s in 1914, either from Berlin or Leipzig. So what was he doing between then and the “1920s”? The possibly self-written piece from *Current Biography* expands on that a bit. It mentions that from 1914-1919, he was employed as a biometric consultant, and as a library and field researcher. Again, no institutions are listed. Also, he was apparently working simultaneously (1915-1920) as biometrician at the Government School for Nervous Children in Budapest (perhaps that is the biometric consultant job that he mentions in the previous sentence). We should also note that we have not been able to verify whether or not this school ever existed. These years are shrouded in mystery, but luckily Dr. Ward will expand upon them in her paper detailing his Hungarian years.

The following decade also lacks substantial sources. We have not been able to find any corroborating evidence of his years in Sierra Leone, though both his CV and (auto?)biographical piece mention his stint ending after five years. After looking everywhere for information on the Elder Dempster company, our findings on this claim are again inconclusive. One other scrap of evidence we have about his time in West Africa comes from his posthumously published article in the *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* in 1977 entitled “The Symbolism of Drinking”, in which it is mentioned that he had observed some tribal symbolism during his time there (Jellinek, 1977).

Another piece of corroborating information comes from the Worcester State Hospital Annual Reports, in which he is introduced as a statistician who worked in West Africa for Elder Dempster and R. Pariser, the latter a firm not mentioned in any previous or subsequent document (Worcester, 1931).

After his African years, Strachan’s biographical narrative lists his title as
assistant director of research with United Fruit Company in Tela, Honduras, and his bio adds that he worked for them for five years, starting in 1925 (Strachan, 1989; Jellinek, 1947a). His daughter also mentions a book about bananas written by him during his time there (Surry, 1965). Again, this somewhat correlates with his educational background, as he claims to have earned his Sc.D. from a school in Honduras, but if you have been able to follow along this tangled web, he claims to have earned that degree in 1934, approximately four years after leaving the country.

Finally, further complicating our research process is the fact that Jellinek allegedly changed his name when he left for Sierra Leone, and kept that pseudonym until he began working for Worcester State Hospital in 1931. We found this in the aforementioned memo from his daughter regarding his biography, in which she mentions that he took the name *Nikita Hartmann* (Surry, 1965).

**Conclusions**

So, what to conclude from such a convoluted mess of dates, facts, and claims? The confusing nature of this introduction is at least partly intentional, as the purpose was to show just how maddening and difficult it has been to track Jellinek's life over the years. The good news is that the subsequent segments of this series will provide some clarity and answer some questions posed here, though there is still much work to be done. In Jellinek's 73 years of life, he traveled from New York City to Budapest, West Africa, Central America, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Texas, Canada, Switzerland, California, and possibly beyond. He worked in many fields, possibly under different names, and was allegedly involved in activities that one would likely be inclined to keep under wraps. For these reasons and more, attempting to follow his chronology is frustrating and difficult, but we hope as you follow along the different parts of this series, that the adventure of it all holds as much interest for you as it does for us.
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This is the second in a series of papers depicting the mostly undocumented life of E.M. Jellinek. This paper establishes the connection between Jellinek Morton, a well-known figure in Hungary in the early part of the 20th Century, and E.M. Jellinek, one of the founders of alcohol studies. Newly found documents in Hungary and at the Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies Library and Archives provide compelling evidence of this connection and shed some light on the mysterious circumstances of his 1920 disappearance from Hungary. The information in these papers was first presented at the 36th Annual Substance Abuse Librarians and Information Specialists (SALIS) Conference on May 1st, 2014, by seven presenters in a panel entitled "Mystery and speculations: Piecing together E.M. Jellinek’s redemption."

Hungarian names and other references to a Hungarian connection in Jellinek's life are clearly noticeable for the native speaker\(^1\). The Worcester State Hospital Annual Reports list five Hungarian names as follows: Ralph Banay, who became a renowned and controversial psychiatrist; his brother, George was the librarian. The physician András Angyal and physicist Béla Lengyel are also listed, and in 1938, another Hungarian, anthropologist Géza Róheim joined the

\(^1\)All translations from the original Hungarian for the panel were made by the author, a native of Hungary.
Worcester State Hospital. At the Yale CAS, András Angyal and George Banay were on the faculty of the Summer School of Alcohol Studies. András Angyal was also Associate Editor of the Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol (1950-1960). George Banay and Géza Róheim both published in the journal. Finally, Hedda Bolgar, who later became a famous psychoanalyst, also worked for the Center for a while.

For all the discrepancies in the available biographical sources on Jellinek, one common element prevails: the Hungarian connection. What it actually entails is an obscure past with vague details and hazy facts. In most of the available private communications, such as letters written by Mark Keller, Vera Efron, i.e., his closest coworkers, and Thelma Pierce Anderson, his second wife, several clues indicate that there is more to the story than they wish to circulate. Thelma suggests that a biographical article should begin not earlier than the banana book, and preferably with the Worcester years, i.e., in the 1930s. She explains: "I should be happy to tell you my reasons privately, but I do not want to put them on paper; believe me they are good reasons!" (Anderson to Keller 1963). The question will probably remain unanswered: Was Jellinek hiding his Hungarian years deliberately?

There was no mention of him being of Hungarian origin in any publication during his scholarship activities in alcohol studies. From the Hungarian perspective, the idea of his potential Hungarian roots was literally rejected, even though his interest in Hungary was later confirmed (Métnéky, 1996). An article claims that Jellinek’s work “entirely lacks any interest in Hungary or Central-Eastern-Europe or features reflecting related mentality” (Kelemen, 1990). The same author recently revisited his view after a physician of Hungarian origin, Antal Sólyom, from Virginia, pointed out to him that his neighbor for two years in Detroit (1972-1974) was Edna Jellinek. Jellinek’s younger sister, who spoke perfect Hungarian, explained that her parents met in Paris, and after living in New York, they relocated to Budapest where she was born. However, her brother, Morton had been born in Brooklyn (Kelemen and Márk, 2012, Kelemen and Márk, 2013).

Up to that point, the world separated these two identities. There was a Jellinek Morton (pronounced “yelinek”, last name comes first in Hungarian), a promising young Hungarian scholar from an affluent family, who became involved in some extralegal currency trading activities and fled the country in 1920. His story was passed on by a popular communist propaganda book entitled Conmen, vagabonds (Frank, 1957), where a whole chapter was dedicated to him as one of the four major Hungarian con-artists.

Another book, The good old world: the biggest panamas from the Horthy-era (Horváth et al., 1959) also depicts him in a chapter entitled Morton Jellinek disappears with the money. Jellinek’s other claim to fame in the Hungarian literature was his friendship and close professional relationship to an outstanding anthropologist, Géza Róheim. Biographies on Róheim do not miss mentioning the fact that Jellinek later became known for his swindles (e.g., Verebélyi, 1977).
The better known identity of E. M. Jellinek as the father of alcohol studies includes a long list of achievements, presented in details in biographical articles. Although there were several indicators that these two people were the same, until recently, it was virtually impossible to establish the connection without reasonable doubt. With the advances of modern technology, archives are becoming more and more accessible, which allows research and discoveries on both continents. His handwriting from the early years of the 20th century looks very similar to the one from his personal correspondence in 1947. Word of mouth and facts based on a single source, although unacceptable on their own as research methods, can serve as useful tools to point researchers to the right direction on both continents when seeking for answers in archives.

**Name variations**

He is known in alcohol studies as *E.M. Jellinek*. His identity has been concealed by the name variations found not only in publications about him, but also in primary sources in both English and Hungarian. Noteworthy is the reverse use of first name and last name in Hungarian (as *Jellinek Morton*), and the consistent use of the middle name as first name, instead of *Elvin*. We located his birth certificate issued by the State of New York, which has *E. Morton Jellinek* as his name, but the letter *o* looks more like an *a* in the title, thus showing *Marton*: it would be the Hungarian version, less the diacritic on the á (*Márton*). He is listed as *E. Morton Jellinek* in the Worcester State Hospital Annual Reports in the 1930s, but as *Elvin Jellinek* in the Current Biography entry in 1947 (Jellinek, 1947). His first name varies as *Elvin, Erwin*, and even *Alvin* in the various sources. His middle name shows even more variety: *Morton, Marton, Márton, Martin, Merton, Morty*, and *Mortimer*.

Of even more interest is his well-known nickname, *Bunky*, which will be discussed later in detail. Less known are his other alter egos, *Petronius* (his satirical persona) and *Habakkuk* (a nickname for his ulcer), used during the Worcester years. With Jellinek’s interests and background in classics and religion in mind, these seem to be heteronyms, i.e., imaginary personas created by a writer to write in different styles. Both names lead us back to his Hungarian era, i.e., to his high school studies and his Jewish heritage. The mysterious *Nikita Hartmann* alter ego played a role in his life in the late 1920s. The name variations go down in the entire Jellinek family. The start date of this lifelong crafting of various personalities has remained unknown. Jellinek’s biography seems to present self-imposed multiple personalities as shown by these variations.

With two given names, *Elvin* and *Morton*, Jellinek was casually called *Bunky* by his colleagues and friends. According to several sources, he insisted on being called *Bunky*. He often signed his letters as Bunky too. He is mentioned as “*Bunky Jellinek*” (Greenberg, 2008). Jellinek’s popular nickname has been claimed to originate from his father, meaning ‘little radish’ in Hungarian (e.g., Page, 1988). The first occurrence of the nickname is unknown, there is no evidence of its use before the Worcester Hospital years. By the time he was introduced to Mark Keller in 1939, he had already been known as *Bunky*.

In his unpublished and unfinished memoir on Jellinek, Keller mentions how difficult it was for him to use this nickname at first.

*Bunky means “little radish” – a pet name in Hungarian. Very early in our acquaintance he mentioned that it was his nickname and he invited me to call him so. For many years I was unable to do so – even when I heard colleagues and minor assistants who had known him at Worcester familiarly calling him Bunky, even when I realized he liked to be called Bunky. I did finally manage it, after several years of close association and
collaboration. (Keller to Anderson, 1988, p. 5).

It is very possible that by the time Thelma Pierce, his soon-to-be his first American wife, started to work with Jellinek on October 10, 1932 at the Memorial Foundation for Neuro-Endocrin Research at the Worcester State Hospital, the **Bunky** nickname had already been in use. Thelma consistently refers to her ex-husband as **Bunky** in her letters to Mark Keller between 1963-1988 (e.g., Anderson to Keller, 1963).

Elvin Morton Jellinek's early written communications in the United States, well represented by our collection, are mostly signed simply as **E. M. Jellinek**. Letters and postcards from the 1930s till his death are consistently signed as **Bunky**. He was also addressed or mentioned as **Bunky** by many in official and casual texts. According to the Historical-etymological dictionary of the Hungarian language (Benkő, 1967), there is no root **bunk-** meaning "radish" in Hungarian. The Hungarian word for "radish" is **retek**. The nickname **Bunky** in its written form shows a more closer resemblance to the Hungarian word **bunkó** (pronounced boonko), which is presented as an entry in the oldest and most comprehensive dictionary of the Hungarian language published in six volumes between 1862 and 1874 in Budapest (Czuczor and Fogarasi, 1862). It refers to a node on the end of a branch cut off a tree, of a club (**dorong**) or stick, or a mace. It also refers to the club itself. Another meaning evolved in the Hungarian slang referring to an ill-mannered, rude, or uneducated person. The ending -y is rather an English y than a Hungarian diminutive (which would be -i, see for example, Jellinek daughter's nickname **Dundi**, meaning "chubby"). Finally, the letter u in Hungarian is always pronounced as "oo", so it would sound "boonko" in English. A linguistically sophisticated person, such as Jellinek, was probably aware of all these meanings in Hungarian, and he could be called anything but ill-mannered.

Proficient in many other languages, including English and Spanish, and a man of card games as member of high society in Hungary, he might have chosen and worn the **Bunky** nickname as some playful self-deprecation after his 1920 caper to insinuate himself for the rest of his life. An alternative explanation to the origin of the **Bunky** nickname is suggested here originating from gambling, based on a card game called **banca** ("bank") in Spanish, known as **bunco** or **bunko** in English, one of the three variations of **baccarat**.

As reported by Hungarian newspapers (e.g., Pesti Napló, June 19, 1920), Jellinek's favorite card games before he left Hungary were **chemin de fer** (a variation of baccarat) and **baccarat**, also known as **bakk** in Hungarian. These were very popular and illegal at the turn of the century, but nonetheless widely played in Hungarian cafes of big hotels frequented by writers, poets, journalists, and other affluent or aspiring members of the high society. Baccarat was always played with a group of friends, very rarely with strangers. **Banco** and **punto** are two baccarat terms (pronounced as "bunco" in Hungarian). It's still speculative, but more justified etymologically than the "little radish" explanation.

**EMJ: The early years**

According to a birth certificate dated August 25, 1890 retrieved from the New York City Birth records archive, E. Morton Jellinek was born on August 15, 1890 in New York. His mother was Rosa Jacobson, 24, and his father was Marcell Jellinek of Austro-Hungary, 32.

The family address on the certificate is 1202 Fulton Ave. The New York City Directory from 1891 has Marcell Jellinek living at 12 Lincoln Place, Brooklyn (New York City Directory, 1891, p. 677). Marcell Jellinek married Rose Jacobson (stage name Marcella Lindh) in New York City sometime in 1889. Their marriage certificate is #1727 ID#0000023902 (Dept of Health, 1869-1880). It is not clear when exactly the family left the United States to relocate to Hungary, but 1895 seems to be the most probable year.
According to the data collected in the Budapest Archives, Jellinek went to the Váczi Street elementary school in the sixth district. He attended high school first at the Barcsay Street High School in the seventh district, and took his maturation exams, i.e., graduated in 1908 from the Royal State High School in the fifth district (Budapest Archives, VI. 502. D).

His college years seem to be a bit more obscure. According to a transcript acquired by Ron Roizen in 1996 from the school, Jellinek studied philosophy at the Leipzig University from November 11, 1911 to July 29, 1913, and then again from November 22, 1913 to February 12, 1914. The letter from the Leipzig registrar also added that Jellinek lived in Berlin and Grenoble between the two dates. The document also contains the list of courses Jellinek took at the university, and claims that he was not awarded a doctorate (Roizen, 1996). The courses listed include linguistics (Introduction to linguistics, German syntax, German linguistics, phonetics), ethnology (Introduction to ethnology, comparative ethnology, American ethnology) and religious studies (Roizen, 1996). Jellinek studied in Leipzig at the same time as Géza Róheim. It seems that they shared interest in anthropology and psychoanalysis. Jellinek was registered in 1913, but did not take any courses. No similar documents have resurfaced so far from other universities, such as Berlin or Grenoble. A thorough search has not found any trace of Jellinek attending any universities in Budapest (Kelemen and Márk, 2012).

At this point we have to emphasize that Jellinek’s education is more important than his credentials. It is not only Jellinek’s family background that guaranteed above-average erudition, but growing up in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy at the turn of the century, which assumed a great cultural significance. Vienna and Budapest became cultural centers of Europe with exciting intellectual and artistic events daily. To demonstrate this point, here is an incomplete list of Jellinek’s contemporaries in Budapest, which was a major cultural and scientific center in Europe: Béla Bartók, Karl Polányi, Georg Lukács, László Moholy-Nagy, Ernő Dohnányi, Sándor Ferenczi, Tódor Kármán, Leo Szilárd, Eugene Ormándy, and Albert
Szentgyörgyi, who all made significant contributions to culture and science later.

Hungarian sources collected so far offer several other examples to illustrate Jellinek's broad interests and early scholarly activities such as his membership listing from the Hungarian Folklore Society as a humanities student in 1912 (Magyar Néprajzi..., 1912). He was board member of the Hunnia Press, his father's company (Magyarország..., 1917). He also received a medal, the WWI Gold Merit Cross with Crown on Military Drape for driving an ambulance during the war (Hungarian National Archives, K 148 1916-2-9028).

In his early years as a scholar, Jellinek focused on anthropology and psychiatry, trying to marry the two. His first known book entitled The origin of the shoe (A sarú eredete) is dated 1917 and reads more like a long article than a book (Jellinek, 1917a).

Jellinek also published book reviews in a folklore journal, Ethnographia (Jellinek, 1912, Jellinek, 1917b). More importantly, he was a speaker at the 5th International Congress of Psychoanalysis, Sept 28-29, 1918, Budapest, where Freud was the keynote speaker. According to a conference report, the auditorium of the Hungarian National Academy was so crowded that "not even three more people would fit in" and the audience listened to Freud's presentation in "...religious silence". Jellinek presented on the psychological explanation of blood pacts and similar contract ceremonies. In his report, Róheim writes:

The most ancient ontogenetical approach to the world is hatred. The child receives his first positive stimulus from the world via his contact with his mother's breasts and via nutrition, this archaic situation serves as unconscious prototype any time he has to overcome his neophobia in the form of adaptation to an individual new to him. Blood or saliva in blood pacts serves as breast milk, and rope also present there is the symbol or remainder of the umbilical cord. Hopefully this paper will be fully

The publisher is not his father's Hunnia Press, but a popular book vendor and publisher, Manó Dick, of Jewish origin. Dick operated his business in the 7th district in Budapest. He also published Freud's Totem and taboo as first Hungarian edition (Freud, 1918) and Sándor Ferenczi's Hysteria and pathoneurosis (Ferenczi, 1919). According to a comment before the dedication and thanks to Róheim, Jellinek's book is meant to elaborate on his presentation at the Ethnography Society in November, 1916. He thanks Róheim for "valuable references". Contrary to what the title promises, the main topic is not the origin of the shoe, but its various appearances in traditions, folk customs, or even religions and cults from all over the world. Some Jellinekian traits are definitely noticeable in the text, such as finding new connections, approaching globally and from a fresh perspective, quoting in four different languages, and providing evidence of a wealth of knowledge in several fields.
mature to be published soon. (Róheim, 1918).

It should be noted that one of the guests listed is a Mrs. Hedwig Jellinek, the only reference by name we have found to his first, Hungarian wife. Court documents and newspaper articles mentioned her as Jellinek Mortonné according to Hungarian naming rules for married woman at that time, i.e., Mrs. Morton Jellinek (Budapest Archives, VII. 18.d. 18460).

A close friend: Géza Róheim

One of Jellinek's closest friend was Géza Róheim, anthropologist-psychoanalyst, the second most read Hungarian scholar (after philosopher Georg Lukács). His life was well researched and documented, and may shed light on Jellinek's life too.

Just as Jellinek's name is related to alcohol studies, Róheim is credited for founding the field of psychoanalytic anthropology. Both coming from prosperous Jewish-Hungarian families, their lives crossed paths several times.

They both studied subjects such as philosophy, psychology, anthropology, linguistics, and literature at the universities of Leipzig and Berlin. They both took classes on ethnology, which discusses social and historical topics from the perspective of science, with Karl Weule in Berlin, whose impact can be traced in their early texts. Róheim was a member of the Hungarian Ethnographical Society since high school, Oct 21, 1909 and also a Folklore Fellow. Róheim was very active in the Hungarian Ethnographical Society. He was board member since 1914, and seems to have involved Jellinek in many activities. Róheim was analyzed by Ferenczi and Vilma Kovács in 1915-16 (which refers to laymen analysis, i.e., the person analyzed received training in analysis and started to work with others, such as Vilma Kovács, a practice reoccurring at Worcester State Hospital). Róheim presented at the 5th International Congress of Psychoanalysis, Sept 28-29, 1918, Budapest, where he met Freud.

Géza Róheim (1891-1953)

Róheim's rising career was broken after he was fired from his job at the National Museum based on charges that he actively participated in the Hungarian Soviet Union in 1919. He was unable to get hired into an academic position in Hungary after that, but he completed several successful field trips to carry out anthropological research in Australia, Africa, and Central America. He gave talks in the United States and was in New York from March 6 through April 4, 1931. In 1938, after the Anschluss, upon his friends’ advice and with their help, he emigrated to the US. He worked at Worcester State Hospital, gave professional development lectures to the doctors and treated schizophrenic patients. His connection to Jellinek can be illustrated with a quote from a letter to Vilma Kovács from this time. Since Róheim is afraid of his mother, he writes the following:

I can see Morton coming on the road. We are going over to have lunch, goulash. [...] I got a letter from my mother... Don’t
mention Morton to her, for the obvious reasons (Róheim, 1992, 128).

The relationship between Jellinek and Róheim would deserve an article of its own. They seem to have a lot in common in addition to their family and educational background, the exceptional talent for languages, and their interests in anthropology, psychoanalysis, and research methods. They both acquired vast knowledge from many areas and felt committed to not only book science, but fieldwork and statistics. They both developed effective methods to find relationship in large material, and often times they were the first to find connections. They were both full of brilliant ideas, but had to struggle with the consequences of a broken career path for various reasons.

**Jellinek’s Caper**

As presented in the SALIS newsletter’s collage (Ward & Bejarano, 2013), Jellinek’s name showed up in the title of articles of many Hungarian newspapers starting from June 18, 1920, for example, *The mysterious disappearance of Morton Jellinek, secretary to the Prime Minister. Where did Morton Jellinek’s diamonds go? Police questioning Jellinek’s agents. Chasing the currency speculators’ half billion. Arrest warrant against Morton Jellinek. Was Jellinek mentally ill?* To put these headlines into context, it should be noted that there was an enormous amount of newspapers to fill with sensational news daily in Hungary in the early 1920s, such as *Budapesti Hírlap, Az Est, Friss Újság, Kis Újság, Magyarország, Magyar Újság, Neues Politisches Volksblatt, Neues Pester Journal, Népszava, 8 Órai Újság, Pester Lloyd, Pesti Hírlap, Pesti Napló, Új Lap, Az Újság, Világ*. By 1925, there were altogether 934 newspapers published in Hungary: 618 in Budapest, 316 local (Buzinkay, 1993).

The articles retrieved from the microfilm collection at the National Széchényi Library tell us the following story. On June 18, 1920, Hungarian newspapers appeared with sensational headlines such as *Currency fraud for half a billion* (Népszava, June 18, 1920). These articles revealed a complicated Ponzi scheme starting earlier that year, which was made possible by the political and financial turmoil. After the dismantled Austro-Hungarian Monarchy introduced stamping old bank notes of crowns in the successor countries to be used as currency of the new state, with the deadline scheduled at different times in each. According to the articles, a mysterious currency broker acquired dollars for 140 crowns, which cost 230 crowns in the market, promising a quick turnover with large profit. If needed, he even provided a written warranty issued by Gusztáv Létay, director of the Hungarian Unio Bank. Part of the trick was reported as purchasing jewelry for crown to be smuggled out of the country and sold there for good currency. Then the foreign currency was brought to Budapest by diplomatic couriers of the allied countries, whose luggage was never checked at customs.

The mastermind behind the operation was said to be Dr. Morton Jellinek, the ministerial secretary of the prime minister’s office, who allegedly worked with several female agents. At the beginning of June 1920, he was reported to have collected a large amount of money to exchange, but he disappeared instead. According to the newspaper articles, Jellinek and Létay took a train to Szeged (in southern Hungary, located close to the Yugoslavian and Romanian
border) to meet a courier on the Simpson Express. Lacking proper documents, they were not allowed to cross the Tisza Bridge to make the appointment. However, Jellinek still wanted to go, without Létay. The trip was risky as the Serbs shot at every boat. The story goes that wearing only a sports coat, Jellinek got in a small boat. He left his leather briefcase, containing documents, but not any valuables, with Létay. That was the last time anyone saw Jellinek in Hungary.

A few days later, his wife reported him missing at the Budapest Police. The family lawyer, Mihály Vándor, went looking for him in Vienna. Meanwhile, the creditors and investors demanded their profit, and rumors of his escape were spread all over the capital. Eventually, on June 18, 1920, the newspapers picked up the story. The victims, among them banks, barons, several millionaires, government officers, artists, and owners of companies, were unwilling to press charges, even though they claimed to have suffered significant losses. This can be interpreted as an admission of co-conspiracy, i.e., that they were all aware of the illegal ways of profit-making, but still opted for the quick money.

On June 29, 1920 an arrest warrant was issued in Hungary and was sent to major newspapers in four languages. Jellinek was accused of fraud, embezzlement, and smuggling. The warrant is reported to have a photo of him too, which hasn’t been recovered.

The judge of the Budapest criminal court issues an arrest warrant for fraud, embezzlement, and smuggling unstamped Hungarian currency outside the country against Jellinek Morton, born in New York, 30 year old, religion reformed, former secretary of the prime minister's office, citizen of Budapest, who caused a damage of several million crowns to several individual and groups by setting up fraudulent transactions with foreign currency and who collected large amounts of money recently to do more transactions and then he fled. The above mentioned is of medium height, slim, with bluish grey eyes, with dark and slim face, dark brown or rather black hair, clean shaven, speaks Hungarian, German, English, French and Italian quickly and nervously, and he was wearing a dark grey suit a similar color overcoat, soft hat, and black shoes with laces. We want that under your auspices search for Jellinek Morton in case of locating him please secure any values on him, arrest him, and inform us about this. [sic! *poor phrasing] (Az Est, June 29, 1920).

An overstamped banknote
(Courtesy of Andrea Hajnal Kicsák)

The historical context to understand how the scheme was possible is as follows. The Austro-Hungarian Empire just collapsed in the fall of 1918, as a result of being defeated in World War I. An attempt to set up a Communist Hungarian Soviet Republic was crushed in the spring of 1919. Instead, the Kingdom of Hungary was restored, spearheaded by the last commanding admiral of the Austro-Hungarian Navy, Regent Miklós Horthy. The Treaty of Trianon was signed on June 4, 1920, to regulate new borders, which became major economic barriers. Hungary lost 72% of its territory and the majority of its natural resources. The successor states continued to use the Austro-Hungarian crown (krone, korona), limiting the validity to its own territories by overstamping the banknotes. For example, Austria stamped the word DEUTSCHÖSTERREICH, on the notes circulating in Austria. The new currency was undergoing inflation at a fast rate due to the consequences of the War and Trianon, and people were concerned about their assets losing its value day by day. As such, they were
willing to take serious risks in the hope of a quick profit. Stamping notes created an influx of unstamped notes in certain regions, and the lax procedures the movements of crowns between the successor states allowed significant profits (for more on cross-border currency flows see Gerber & Spencer, 1994).

Jellinek: Myths and legends

The first legends about Jellinek were created around the time of his escape from Hungary by word of mouth and the daily newspapers. The articles written at this time provide a mixture of accurate and inaccurate information in addition to editorializing the story. A few examples of articles from that period (translation by author):

Jellinek Morton is the son of Marcell Jellinek and Marcella Lindh, who was born in the United States and was brought up in England and the Netherlands and arrived in Budapest five years ago. The 35 year old, elegantly dressed, short, and hearing impaired ministerial secretary speaks seven languages perfectly (Budapesti Hírlap, June 18, 1920).

In an editorial entitled “The Craze of Speculation” the Pesti Hírlap describes him: “This young man is from a respected family, wealthy himself; he lived an exorbitant gambling life” (Pesti Hírlap, June 18, 1920). More details, true and false mixed, can be found in another early newspaper article:

As for the person of Morton Jellinek, we can report Dr. Morton Jellinek is the son of Marcell Jellinek, the brother of the well-known director of the Budapest train company and of Marcella Lindt, the famous singer, who was born in America, raised in England and the Netherlands, and arrived in Budapest five years ago, now is 35 years old, very well dressed, short, and hearing impaired. He speaks several languages perfectly, English, French, Hungarian, German, Dutch, and Danish. Due to his language proficiency, he was a member of the press department of the prime minister’s office, and later he was the secretary of Dr. Henrik Gonda, ministerial advisor, press secretary of Dr. Sándor Wekerle, and he gained the rank of ministerial secretary. (Pesti Napló, June 18, 1920).

His interest in gambling was the focus of many articles:

Jellinek played two card games—bakk (baccarat) and chemin de fer. Especially with the second one, his style raised some eyebrows even among experts. There was no amount high enough that he wouldn’t “knock” without blinking, which means whenever it was his turn, he always called. He would play throughout the entire night and knocked very frequently, calling 30-40,000 crowns. One night the difference was half a million. Jellinek usually lost when he was gambling, and we can state that the lost amounts were negligible compared to the millions he conned from others. (Pesti Napló, June 19, 1920).

The existence of the first wife can be traced back to not only court documents, but to various news items, such as:

Investigating officials haven’t yet started their work because no official victim showed up yet, no charges have been pressed, but the police are running inquiries and started investigation within their own capacity. Police proceedings are based on the report made by Morton Jellinek’s wife at the police headquarters in which she informed them that her husband disappeared, and she related them the mysterious circumstances of her husband’s disappearance. (Az Est, June 19, 1920).

The Jellinek story with its budding myths, however, quickly disappeared from the newspapers and was replaced by other and more sensational stories of the time, such as
the international labor boycott of Hungary beginning on June 20.

Summary
Little has been known about Jellinek’s Hungarian period so far. The newspaper articles above would never be sufficient to verify the events, especially given the fact that prominent players in the scandal were affiliated with some newspapers. That is where librarians, archivists, and digitization efforts will come into play. We collected most of the currently available materials from the Budapest Archives, and with their ongoing digitization supported by European Union funding, hopefully more material will resurface in addition to the folder related to the Jellinek trial, which does not contain the actual trial documents. Its docket number, B.7069/1920, is well cited, but it only leads to another accession number, which loops back to the original docket number for unknown reasons. Some tampering with the ledger is evident. However, documents from the related procedures and trials, including the Hungarian Royal Attorney’s reports and notes, provide plenty of details about the Jellinek case too. Indictments, witness testimonies, and other legal documents are available about other partners in crime, written by lawyers or the Royal Attorney, including a list of the transactions.

It should be noted that many pages of the Royal Attorney’s report sound similar or even identical with Frank’s text, Conmen, vagabonds. References are made to the circumstances of the transactions as well as to the events of the day Jellinek disappeared. The legal documents prove clearly that his alleged partners still accepted money from investors after he left the country. It is also speculated that all partners were in the fraud together, and eventually helped Jellinek escape, then split the profit. There is some reference to jewelry transactions too. Noteworthy is the full documentation how Marcell, his father, was involved, while the name and address of Mrs. Jellinek is also listed living with Marcell Jellinek in the Nyúl Street apartment. However, the Jellinek docket has not shown up yet.

Jellinek disappeared from Hungary for good in June 1920. Perhaps it remains a mystery forever whether he was the mastermind behind the currency transactions, or simply took the blame for others. His story pops up in obscure Transylvanian newspapers and in the New York Times as late as 1925 (New York Times, 1925), containing false information about his location. Private correspondence and even librarians have been perpetuating myths without enough details. Our work aims to put an end to this by collecting, digitizing, and providing access to all related materials.
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E.M. Jellinek’s mother, the famous opera singer, Marcella Lindh, c. 1895

This is the third in a series of papers depicting the mostly undocumented life of E.M. Jellinek. This paper investigates Jellinek’s family history from a genealogical perspective using popular resources from the field. The author points out the potential connections and influences of Jellinek’s notable and distinguished family as related to the little known period of Jellinek’s early life. The information in these papers was first presented at the 36th Annual Substance Abuse Librarians and Information Specialists (SALIS) Conference on May 1st, 2014, by seven presenters in a panel entitled “Mystery and speculations: Piecing together E.M. Jellinek’s redemption.”

Since beginning our investigations on E.M. Jellinek at the Center of Alcohol Studies, the research has, more often than not, yielded more questions than answers. He was clearly a charismatic and brilliant man, who was able to adapt his interests and abilities to any given situation. Why pursue his family as a particular research interest? In researching his family history, we hoped to uncover clues as to how Jellinek came to command such
abilities, as well as people that may have helped him between the time he left Budapest in the early 1920s and arrived at Worcester State Hospital nearly a decade later. Hopefully, our research can add to the previously documented Jellinek family history, such as Kempter (1998) and Kelemen and Márik (2013).

Previous research had discovered enough to know that there were the three core figures with which we could begin our research. Morton’s father was Erwin Marcel Jellinek of Budapest. The Jellinek family was affluent and well connected. As a young man, Marcel was an actor and theatre manager in Germany before moving to New York. Morton’s mother was notable soprano Marcella Lindh (born Rose Jacobson), who sang with John Philip Sousa’s band. Letters from family members also indicated that Morton had a sister named Edna, but no birthdate is mentioned in these letters. The most promising starting point for exploring Morton’s family was his mother, given her status as a notable public figure in her time.

The first source of information that I used was the Google news archive and Google Books search. I searched using all three of her well-known aliases: Rose Jacobson, Rose Jackson and Marcella Lindh. The most results appeared for “Marcella Lindh”, primarily reviews of performances in which she was included or announcements of upcoming singing engagements.

The majority of the results was from 1890-95, when the family was still living in New York City and Marcella was engaged with the Sousa band and several shows at the Metropolitan Opera. The only contemporary descriptive account that could be found of her singing appeared in a published diary of Alma Mahler-Werfel, the widow of Joseph Mahler, who saw Rose perform (Mahler, 1999).

There are virtually no results for Rose Jacobson or Jackson that match, and none at all for Marcella or Rose Jellinek. Searches for Marcel Jellinek show that he made a career change, owning a printing business with a relative of his wife (The Etude, 1890); advertisements for Jellinek & Jacobson Publishers appeared in several newspapers. He is also listed as a business manager for a theater in downtown Manhattan. Mentions of Marcel and Rose become scarce after moving back to Europe in the mid-1890s.
The CAS archives contain letters written from Thelma Pierce Anderson, Jellinek’s likely second wife, to Mark Keller at the Center of Alcohol Studies. Thelma’s letters make mention of other family members, such as Johanna Fuchs, Morton’s maternal grandmother, with whom he was very close. They also make the first mention of any of Rose’s relatives, an Aunt Elsie in New York City, and that the family name may have been changed to Jackson at some point (Anderson to Keller, 1988). Searches for Elsie Jackson or Jacobson on Google News did not turn up any promising information. Thelma’s letters are invaluable in that they relay some anecdotal and charming stories about the Jellinek family, mostly relating to Morton’s youth in Hungary. Information about his parents and sister can also be sifted from her letters. One excerpt gives us an important clue that Rose and Edna returned from Europe to the United States sometime during Thelma and Morton’s marriage. The letters are relatively short of information on Morton’s life after his departure from Budapest. We do not know if he simply never told her any details about his life during that time, or if she chose to omit them. It does not appear that Thelma met any members of Morton’s family (Anderson to Keller, 1963, Anderson to Keller, 1984).

I then opted to continue our search on Ancestry.com, a proprietary database favored by many amateur genealogists. I had joined Ancestry to do personal research and was impressed by the amount of information I was able to find quickly. This made me very optimistic about our chances for uncovering information about Morton’s family. I was also eager to apply Ancestry’s family tree feature to our project. The Ancestry feature keeps track of all the sources attached to any given person, and became an invaluable feature once we began digging into the family history. I began my search using Jellinek’s full name, Elvin Morton Jellinek, to ensure that the most accurate results appeared. I did try searching under his supposed alias, Nikita Hartmann, to see if he had been in America during the 1920s, but could not draw any real conclusions from the searches. The vast majority of the information about Morton on Ancestry.com covers the 1930s through his death, including city directories with his addresses, US Census accounts, passenger lists for boats and trains, and records of his death certificate.

Some of the first records that appeared were marriage certificates. Morton had at least four wives. We were able to find information about some of them through Ancestry. One of the first finds on Ancestry was the record of Morton’s marriage to Thelma in 1935 (New Hampshire, Marriage Records Index). Once I began searching under her name, I could also approximate from census records that their daughter was born around the mid-1930s (the actual birthdate, June 29, 1936, was verified later from the California Death Index, 1994), and could confirm that the marriage lasted approximately 10 years. In 1946, Morton is not listed in residence with his wife and daughter, confirming the information that Thelma had provided in her letters. The second marriage record that I was able to find was Morton’s marriage to Cora Lee Boylston in 1947 in South Carolina (Richland County, SC, Marriage Index, 1947). Documents from our Canadian colleagues showed that Morton’s fourth wife was named Martha Mary Healey (Strachan, 1989). Keller makes mention of meeting her father once in New York City (Keller to Anderson, 1988), but cannot provide any additional details. Martha
or Mary Healey is a common name, and search results under her name did not yield any promising leads.

Prior research had not uncovered any prior connections to South Carolina, so I decided that Cora merited some additional research. When searching under her name, one of the first results was the report of her death abroad from pneumonia while she was on a trip to Geneva with Morton in 1951. Her death was reported to the American consulate so that they could notify her relatives, including her parents, mother-in-law, and two children from a previous marriage. I decided to do some more searching into Cora's first marriage, since I wanted to see if I could unearth how she and Morton crossed paths. Several census records show that she lived with her first husband, Edward Boylston, in Baltimore with their three children. Edward passed away at a young age and she was left a widow. Ancestry searches led us to a photograph of Cora's gravestone, which she shares with her first husband. The most relevant and intriguing piece of information on the grave is the listing of a Christopher Jellinek. In all other aspects of our research, we never found any mention of Christopher, but he is likely her son by Morton, given his last name. We were able to find a Christopher Jellinek listed on Ancestry who was born in 1947.

After deciding that I had turned up as much information as I could on Morton's marriages, I turned to his immediate family. One of the first documents I uncovered was a record of Marcel's birth in Hungary, listing his full name as Markus Erwin Marcel Jellinek (JewishGen). Most of the additional documents were city directories that listed both home and business addresses in New York City, beginning in the late 1880s and ceasing with the family return to Europe. Most importantly, I found a record of Marcel's naturalization as a US Citizen which was witnessed by a Solomon Jacobson (US Naturalization Index), most likely the same relative of Rose's who went into the publishing business with Marcel; additionally, several of his passports were witnessed by a G. S. Jacobson (US Passport Application, 1895).

Ancestry soon confirmed that the difficulty in pinning down Rose's background was mostly due to her own actions. I had hypothesized that searching under her given name or married name on Ancestry would be more successful to find official documents, but I was mistaken – Marcella Lindh was still the best search term. She applied for several passports at US consulates and embassies in the 1890s to travel for singing engagements. Rose appears to have traveled broadly within Europe, and always lists intention to return to the US. However, she is very inconsistent about her personal information. For example, she lists her birthplace once as Mexico City (US Passport Application, 1896), which is not corroborated by any other documentation. After WWI, information on Marcella is scarce except that she traveled in the early 1920s with her daughter to New York (New York Passenger List, 1920).

While researching Marcel, I uncovered a passport application from 1901 that lists Edna as being three weeks old (US Passport Application, 1901). Armed with a birthdate, I decided to tackle Edna's history next. The vast majority of information found on Ancestry about Edna spans from 1920-26, when she traveled frequently to the United States from Europe. The best sources of information are her passport applications, which include addresses, occupations (she was a musician), and personal photographs (US Passport Application, 1921).

Her full name is Edna Eugenie Jellinek Lindh Pariser after her marriage around 1921 to Robert Pariser, a businessman from Berlin and possible school friend of Morton. A birth record turns up for her daughter, Marcella Krisztina Pariser, born 1926 in Budapest (US Consular Report of Births, 1924). We have a theory that Robert may have been a school friend of Morton's, and may have aided him after fleeing Budapest. Robert and Edna's marriage did not last – we do not know the exact date of divorce, but his second marriage to a German woman in Italy in 1939 was reported to the US consulate (US Consular
Reports of Marriages, 1939). After that, the records disappear.

![Edna Jellinek’s passport photo from 1921](image)

I returned to the Google News search to see if I could find any additional information on Edna. Edna Jellinek's name appears frequently in the *Baltimore Sun* during the late 1940s and early 1950s as the director of the International Center at the Baltimore YWCA, considered an expert in folk art. There are several articles that feature her prominently, such as a piece about her and her mother's struggles in Budapest during WWII, where they lost virtually everything. Marcella lived in Baltimore with Edna (Baltimore Sun, 1947, Scarborough, 1947, Baltimore Sun, 1949). Additional searching showed that she and Marcella eventually ended up in Detroit, where Edna held a similar position for an art collection (Windsor Star, 1964). The Baltimore connection is important in another manner. Edna and Marcella arrived in Baltimore right after the end of WWII – seemingly, as soon as they could secure passage out of Europe. It is possible that, when visiting Edna and his mother in Baltimore, Morton met of Mrs. Cora Boylston for the first time.

At this point, I felt I had investigated Morton's immediate family to the best of my ability, and devoted my attention to tracking down the Jacobsons. The US Census became invaluable during this part of my research. An 1870 census record for Kalamazoo showed a Rosa Jacobson born to Solomon E. Jacobson (the same name as the witness to Marcel's naturalization) and Johanna Jacobson in 1867 (1870 US Census). She had three older brothers, but there is no mention of a sister named Elsie. Her parents and her oldest brother, Gustave, are listed as having been born in Mecklenburg, Germany. I was sure that I had found Rose. The second piece of convincing evidence was an 1881 ship manifest that shows parents Solomon and Johanna sailing to Hamburg with children Gustave, Charles, Rosa and Elsie (Staatsarchive, 1881).

During our research, we noticed that we had a large pile of home and work addresses from city directories and census records, prompting us to create a Google Map to track them. Once we began to collect members of the extended family, we realized that the map would be an excellent way to visualize the movements of the family and potential patterns of interaction. When examining the spread of Manhattan addresses, we could see that the Jellineks and Jacobsons stayed within the same bounds, even over decades. The goal for this map would be to put each decade into a different layer so that they could be viewed individually or applied so that you could do one-to-one or one-to many comparisons. The map includes all of the addresses that we have for the Jellineks and Gustave Jacobson's family globally.

My final piece of research on Morton's family focused on his daughter, Ruth. Ship manifests on Ancestry showed she accompanied her father on some of his travels to Europe when she was a teenager (New York Passenger Lists, 1951, 1952). We knew from Thelma's letters that Ruth's married name was Surry. I was able to find some city directories that show Ruth lived her later years near Santa Barbara, California. We know from other research that, unfortunately, Ruth took her own life in 1994 (California Death Index, 1994). Research into her youngest son, Shawn, reveals that he passed away in 2011 (Social Security Death Index, 2011), but we have not been able to verify the
cause of his death. I was able to find whom I believe is Christopher Jellinek, but I am unable to verify the information.

Researching the Jellinek family was an enriching and enlightening task that has proved helpful in understanding the roots of Morton’s personality and academic interests. He grew up surrounded by various people with a multitude of interests and abilities, and this may have contributed to his ability to adapt so readily to the scientific study of alcohol and addiction.
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The “banana book” by E.M. Jellinek

Scott Goldstein, MA, MLIS

Belk Library and Information Commons
Appalachian State University

This is the fourth in a series of papers depicting the mostly undocumented life of E.M. Jellinek. This paper details another intriguing and even lesser known period of Jellinek’s life—the ten years that he allegedly spent abroad, after his disappearance from Hungary, between 1920 and 1930. A mysterious book on banana diseases serves as a lead to support the claim that A.N. Hartman, listed as the author, was Jellinek’s alias during this period. This paper describes how the quest for this book opened new avenues of research to fill in some of the gaps in Jellinek’s life during this period. The information in these papers was first presented at the 36th Annual Substance Abuse Librarians and Information Specialists (SALIS) Conference on May 1st, 2014, by seven presenters in a panel entitled “Mystery and speculations: Piecing together E.M. Jellinek’s redemption.”

The 1920s is the decade most shrouded in mystery when it comes to E. M. Jellinek’s life. We know virtually nothing about this period, and what we do know is highly speculative and more or less unverifiable. One source is Jellinek’s biography from the 1947 Current Biography entry, that says

the subject of plant growth next was the young scientist’s chief interest: he worked as biometrician at Elder Dempster in Sierra
Leone, West Africa, for five years beginning in 1920; and as biometrician, and later director of research, for the United Fruit Company for five years beginning in 1925 (Jellinek, 1947, p.334).

Further information about this decade of his life is mentioned in the 1931 Worcester State Hospital Annual Report as follows:

E. Morton Jellinek, M.Ed. University of Leipzig, was appointed chief statistician May 1, 1931. Mr. Jellinek has been statistician to the Prime Minister of Hungary, biometrician for the research departments of the firms of R. Pariser and Elder Dempster and Co. (West Africa), assistant director of agricultural research, United Fruit Company (Central America). Various publications in ethnology and biometry. (Worcester State Hospital, 1931, p.18).

The Report of Research Service contained within the Annual Report introduces Jellinek as an asset around whom they organized a statistical service. The assistant superintendent, Francis H. Sleeper, M.D., claims that

we have been fortunate enough to obtain the services of Mr. E. Morton Jellinek as chief statistician. Mr. Jellinek brings to bear on the problem many years’ experience in biometrical research and notable adaptability to the various needs of such a comprehensive research. (Worcester State Hospital, 1931, p.15).

He is listed as assistant director of research with United Fruit Company in Tela, Honduras, according to an unpublished biography prepared by J. George Strachan about

the history of the events and people leading up to and concerned with Dr. Jellinek’s ‘STAY IN CANADA’ with the Alcoholism Foundation of Alberta (in Edmonton, Alberta), and with the Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario (in Toronto, Ontario) between Sept. 1958 and January 1962 (Strachan, 1989).

Another source, Jellinek’s daughter Ruth Surry’s memo to R. Brinkley Smithers, supports the claim of his stay in West Africa. As she mentions,

He was in Sierra Leone working for the Elder Dempster Steamship Line under the name of Nikita Hartmann. He said that before he went to work for Elder Dempster he had traded with the natives—taking medicines to them in exchange for skins and shells and worked as a cook in a restaurant. (His exact job for Elder Dempster in vague (sic). He was either a plant biologist or an engineer.) (Surry, 1965, p.3).

Later on in the decade, however, the evidence of his whereabouts is slightly sturdier. All indicators point to the likelihood that between 1926 or 1927 and 1930, Jellinek – still as Nikita Hartmann – was living in Honduras, working for the United Fruit Company, first as an agronomist or in a similar research-oriented capacity, then as a director of research.

According to Jellinek’s former wife Thelma Pierce Anderson, these are the approximate dates and positions that Jellinek occupied (Anderson to Keller, 1988):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/01/26</td>
<td>Timekeeper, agriculture, Tela, Honduras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/01/2?</td>
<td>Agronomist, Tela, Honduras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/01/29</td>
<td>Assistant, Research Department, Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/17/30</td>
<td>Resignation requested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, there is no way to verify this. Even more problematic, Jellinek reportedly told László Frank in 1930, that he was on a coffee farm.

“...I don’t want to talk about my escape... the fact is that I spent a few days in Romania, then I fled to Yugoslavia, and
from the Dalmatian Shore, I traveled to Italy. Then to New York... then to South America”

“And you came from there to visit here in Berlin.”

“From there. In Grunewald... you know, here in West Berlin... I bought a villa for my parents... They live here... I visited them—finally... now... since I can... but in a few days I’m traveling back to South America.”

“And there... in South America... where do you live?... Or is this a secret?”

“Not anymore. But I still don’t want anyone to know in Budapest”

“And... what do you do for a living?”

“I have a coffee farm. I’m an excellent farmer... but I also continue my studies in ethnology. I have recently published a book on Indian Folk Customs.”

“Of course, under a different name... You have changed your name.”

“You bet”, laughed Jellinek.

(Frank, 1957, translated by Judit Hajnal Ward)

The source of this conversation is a 1957 propagandistic adventure novel published in Hungary, entitled “Conmen, vagabonds” (Frank, 1957, second edition Frank, 1966). While the events in the book may be based on facts, we cannot be certain of the extent to which the story was dramatized for the reader. That Jellinek spent some years in South or Central America is likely, especially given his later demonstrable knowledge of botany in some of his journal articles. But did he ever work for the United Fruit Company, or was that just a cover story?

There may be only one way to prove that someone named Nikita Hartmann genuinely worked there. If we were to find the company personnel files, we could probably track down a Nikita Hartmann during a particular period. We have not been able to obtain these documents. Even with the document in hand, however, there would still be the perhaps more challenging task of connecting Nikita Hartmann to E.M. Jellinek. As of now, all links are speculative based on family recollections.

Instead, what we have now are two mentions by members of Jellinek’s family that he published a book about bananas during his time at the United Fruit Company. First, Ruth Surry writes,

While working for United Fruit he published a book on the diseases of bananas. To finish the book he went to Boston where United Fruit has its main office. He went to Boston as E. M. Jellinek, thus causing United Fruit great embarrassment and confusion (Surry, 1965).

Along similar lines, Anderson writes,

It may be well here to mention the ‘banana book.’ Probably the title is known to you; it is not to me. I have seen a copy — bound in dark green, hard cover; about 5”3~x8 in size, and approximately 3/4 inch thick. It is possible that a copy can be obtained from the United Fruit Company (Anderson to Keller, 1963).

To give a bit of historical background, the United Fruit Company, which was founded in 1899, had by the 1920s negotiated hundreds of thousands of acres for growing bananas in the West Indies, Central America, and South America. Along with Standard Fruit, it
dominated the banana market. The company maintained a laboratory in Tela, Honduras, for studying Panama disease (*Fusarium wilt*), a disease which infects the banana root.

We set out looking for Jellinek's alleged banana book, not realizing how many books were published about bananas. After extensive searching, we finally caught a break when we discovered, in an obscure footnote, a 1962 book that had a good bibliography of early twentieth-century banana research. That book led us to this reference:


In an email, Andre Lassoudiere, French banana expert, to Ron Roizen, gave us two citations with "Hartman, A.N." as the author, one the same as found in the footnote and another entitled "Biometrical Studies of the Gros Michel Banana" (Lassoudiere, A., personal communication, July 16, 2013). This lead introduced A.N. Hartman to us, who published in United Fruit Company journals in the second half of the 1920s. The only available copy of this title exists in microform. We requested and received this item via interlibrary loan, and had it digitized for posterity. Like this title, most of Hartman's publications appeared in research bulletins, but at least one was listed in OCLC’s WorldCat as a popular title.

We tried and failed to acquire a copy via the regular library channels, but based on the WorldCat holding, we contacted Harvard’s Herbaria Botany Library. An extremely helpful librarian there scanned the cover and first few pages of the brittle book, *Banana Growth and Fruiting: A Popular Summary*.

From the scans, it appears that it is a somewhat abridged and less technical version of the earlier publications. This fact intrigued us because it reminded us of the dichotomy between scholarly and popular publications that would later become a staple of the Yale Center of Alcohol Studies. An example of this is the Lay Supplement series which were published in order to educate the broadest audiences beyond the scholarly community.

*Banana Growth and Fruiting* immediately became the prime candidate for the supposed banana book.

From the scan, we can determine that it is the correct dark green color that Anderson remembered, though not exactly the same dimensions. It was published in 1930, around Jellinek’s transition from South America to Boston and thus consistent with Ruth Surry’s recollection. Furthermore, the circumstantial...
evidence is encouraging. It was published in the right country at the right time by a man with a similarly-abbreviated moniker as Jellinek (and possibly using an Americanization of the name “Hartmann”). Further confirmation may come from using discourse analysis software to compare Hartman’s banana book with some of Jellinek’s early English language publications.

Although it is virtually impossible to prove or disprove authorship, at first glance, there is some reason to think that the two works were authored by the same person.
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This is the fifth in a series of papers depicting the mostly undocumented life of E.M. Jellinek. His years at the Worcester State Hospital, a psychiatric facility, are summarized in this paper, based on available reports and recollections on the hospital’s daily activities. Included here are his broad research and creative interests during that time, which may tie his Hungarian scholarship with his later output in alcohol studies. The information in these papers was first presented at the 36th Annual Substance Abuse Librarians and Information Specialists (SALIS) Conference on May 1st, 2014, by seven presenters in a panel entitled “Mystery and speculations: Piecing together E.M. Jellinek’s redemption.”

It was in the multidisciplinary environment of the Worcester State Hospital in Massachusetts that Jellinek may have developed his ideas on the research of diseases. The progression of his work with schizophrenia has clear influences on his work with alcoholism in the following decade. This period in Jellinek’s life is important to understand. We can trace similar trends in his process, such as defining a concept or disease before attempting to study it, apparent in both the first few articles he published on schizophrenia and his early articles on alcohol studies (Hoskins & Jellinek, 1933; Jellinek, 1939; Bowman & Jellinek, 1941).

In many ways, Katherine Dexter McCormick is responsible for bringing Jellinek to Worcester. While most famous for
her work on birth control, McCormick was also significant in the field of schizophrenia. Her husband succumbed to the disease only two years after their marriage. She strongly disagreed with the doctors’ course of treatment, focusing mainly on psychological and psychiatric treatments. As a response, McCormick established the Memorial Foundation.

Mrs. McCormick imposed stringent limitations on the use of the estate funds, directing that money be allotted only to organic studies and not for any purpose related to psychiatry and psychology. Afterwards, although psychophysiological items were occasionally “sneaked” into the research, funds for these as well as for anything pertaining to psychiatry and psychology had to be obtained from other sources (Shakow, 1972, p. 70).

Thus, a committee was established under David Shakow to develop a methodology for quantifying and treating schizophrenia through applied physiology and biochemistry. Thanks to this, it is known that Jellinek was recruited as part of this committee with Forrest Linder, Joseph Looney, Hugh Carmichael, and Joseph Rheingold, as stated in the Annual Report 1931 of the Worcester State Hospital. In the same report, Jellinek’s hiring is noted as follows:

Mr. Jellinek brings to bear on the problem many years’ experience in biometrical research and notable adaptability to the various needs of such a comprehensive research (Worcester State Hospital, 1932, p. 15).

Further information about Jellinek’s arrival was gleaned from a series of letters written between Thelma Anderson, his wife during the Worcester years, and Mark Keller, his friend and colleague. In one of these letters, Thelma states that

Various sources say that Bunky arrived at Worcester in 1931. How he came to be a biometrician is vague. One story has it he met the “angel” of the Memorial Foundation for Neuro-Endocrine Research by invitation. Roy Hoskins, M.D., the Director of the project, was impressed and Bunky was hired! (Anderson to Keller, 1988).

Naturally, this “angel” could refer to the Mr. Stanley McCormick. However, András Angyal was often referred to as “angel.” Angyal (pronounced ON-dyal) means “angel” in Hungarian. He began at Worcester in 1933, shortly after Jellinek, as a Special Worker in Research.

Regardless of how he arrived, Jellinek found the environment at Worcester to be congenial and encouraging to research. David Shakow, in a 1972 article about Worcester’s research on schizophrenia, mentions that

At Worcester [researchers] had close contact not only with students and staff in their own professional areas but others as well. Perhaps most important were the limitless opportunities for intimately working with students from many other

The Annual Reports of the hospital between 1832 and 1953 were digitized and are available online through the State Library of Massachusetts and the Internet Archive.
professions for which the Hospital was an active training ground. During the year, and especially in summer, the Hospital hosted nursing, medical, social work, psychiatry, psychology, occupational therapy, theology, biochemistry, and statistics students, with an occasional sociology and anthropology student thrown in for good measure. (Shakow, 1972, p. 80).

He goes on to describe frequent parties and open houses. He attributes the familial environment at Worcester to the isolation caused by the Great Depression. In addition to the numerous cross-department seminars was the professional medical library maintained by George Banay.

Further evidence of the environment at Worcester comes from this verse written by Jellinek as a response to the frequent time audits the hospital underwent:

Don’t you know it, little Miss?
Statisticians must not piss.
If they wish to dehydrate
They must wait, they must wait
For some suit’ble transformation
In the shape of perspiration.
That is better for their health,
As well as for the Commonwealth.
(Shakow, 1972, p. 83)

Many marriages came to be as a result of the Worcester environment, including that of E.M. Jellinek and Thelma. Again, thanks to the letters from Thelma, a timeline can be created. Thelma was working as a clinical psychologist at the New York State Psychopathic Hospital in Syracuse under Harold Hildreth, who knew Jellinek from his time at Worcester. While Jellinek was visiting, Hildreth told Jellinek that Thelma was in need of a job. Shortly afterwards, Jellinek offered Thelma a position as his statistical assistant at $20.00 plus maintenance a month. After four or five months, Jellinek confessed that he had not been authorized to hire anyone and had been paying her salary from his own pocket. Jellinek was able to convince the director, Dr. Bryan, to allow Thelma to stay on, sharing the salary of one hospital attendant between several assistants (Anderson to Keller, 1963). Jellinek and Thelma were married in Keene, New Hampshire on October 18, 1935. They divorced a decade later, on March 25, 1946.

Early on in the research process, Jellinek and others researching at the foundation came to understand that it was important to first define schizophrenia prior to moving forward. In 1933, Hoskins and Jellinek published an article stating this point (Hoskins and Jellinek, 1933). It is likely that the interdisciplinary nature of the hospital environment lead to an interdisciplinary approach to schizophrenia. The Seven Months’ Study was intended

to obtain base-line data on schizophrenics and to determine both their intra- and interindividual variability, the finding which had so impressed us in our earliest studies (Shakow, 1972, p. 84).

Amongst the many things it accomplished, according to Shakow, was laying

the groundwork for many subsequent studies; encouraged us to set high standards of performance; and, because of the exercise in multidisciplinary, cooperative techniques, helped us to become a smoothly functioning research group (1972, p. 86).

Over 500,000 quantitative observations were recorded and then analyzed by Jellinek and his department in order to establish a five-point rating scale system.

Impressed by Jellinek’s work, the hospital appointed him to a committee to a yearlong examination of the research environment at the hospital in 1934. Jellinek was appointed as the chair of the Committee on Coordination of Research with H. Freeman, P. E. Huston, and W.C. Miller (Shakow, 1972, p. 87). Dr. Harry Freeman was a pathologist at the hospital. Paul E. Huston was a research associate in 1930 but never appears on the
Staff list in the Annual Reports although his publications are listed. W.C. Miller may have been E.C. Miller, a visiting doctor of internal medicine who spent most of the 1930s at Worcester. It also may be Wilber R. Miller, a psychiatrist who began with the hospital in 1935.

Much like the Seven Months’ Study established strong parameters for future studies, the Committee led to a reemphasis on psychiatry. It noted that the psychiatric department was not producing many publications and that such publications were rarely in the field of psychiatry. It also resulted in a Research Council, which met weekly to emphasize research principles. Jellinek’s ties to the psychoanalytic movement in Budapest showed potential that resonated with the Worcester State Hospital’s practices. As Shakow notes:

*Jellinek made his influence felt in relation to psychoanalysis because of his obvious knowledge of the field, the respect in which he was universally held as a competent biometrician, his broad culture, and his rare sense and intelligence. If ‘Bunky,’ as he was without exception called, felt positive toward psychoanalysis, then presumably psychoanalysis was indeed important and worth paying attention to (Shakow, 1978, pp. 44-45).*

After completing the Seven Months’ Study, Jellinek became involved in the next stage of the research, assessing different treatment methods. Numerous reports from Europe were suggesting that insulin was the best treatment for schizophrenia. While researchers at Worcester were skeptical, it fit within the requirements of the Memorial Foundation’s grant as an endocrine treatment. Therefore, Cameron with Jellinek developed the Insulin Study in 1937. When completed, there was little evidence which showed the European studies were correct. Instead, it seemed that insulin had little to no therapeutic effect. Despite this, the insulin study provided a large portion of the work performed by the Biometric Department under the direction of Mr. E. M. Jellinek. There was first the continuous recording of this data, next the preliminary analysis, and lastly a detailed final analysis. The most outstanding results have been referred to already in connection with the insulin study (Worcester State Hospital, 1938, p. 20).

**The Gang at Worcester**

*Staff members at the Worcester State Hospital*

The environment at Worcester continued to affect Jellinek’s research and life. He was surrounded by a substantial Hungarian population at Worcester, many of whom would come with him to Yale in the following years. Brothers Ralph and George Banay were amongst them. Ralph received his medical degree from Royal Hungarian University in 1920 and became the first medical director of the Yale University’s Alcoholic Clinic (New York Times, 1970). George worked at Worcester as the librarian. He developed the medical library at Worcester. András Angyal was a psychotherapist. Late in Jellinek’s career, Angyal was hired as the Head of the Psychiatric Research Unit at Worcester.

Angyal was early to recognize the Alcoholics Anonymous program as the desirable model for psychological recovery. Alcoholics are never ‘recovered’ but always ‘recovering’ (Stern, 1992, p. 366).
Géza Róheim, a childhood friend of Jellinek, was hired at Worcester in 1938 as psychoanalyst and anthropologist. Many of the non-Hungarians Jellinek worked with also went on to be substantial research forces. Joseph Looney, Director of Laboratories at Worcester, is best known for the "Looney Technique" of blood analysis (Boston College Heights, 1939). Anne Roe began as an assistant psychologist at Worcester, but went with Jellinek to Yale to conduct a review of literature on alcohol education (Wrenn, 1985). David Shakow was the Director of Psychological Research and went on to Yale as the director of the Fund for Research in Psychiatry (New York Times, 1981).

Jellinek left Worcester in 1939. Very little about his motivations are provided in the 1939 Worcester State Hospital Annual Report: “E. Morton Jellinek, D.Sc. Biometrician, to private consultation practice in New York City” (p. 7). Jellinek was recruited by Norman Joliffe to head the literature review study being conducted by the Research Council on Problems of Alcohol and funded by the Carnegie Corporation (Roizen, 19911). However, at the point of his departure, he had apparently not yet been appointed to this new position, as there is no mention of the Research Council in the report.

Thanks once again to the letters between Thelma and Keller, there is a record that Jellinek claimed there was tension between himself and Hoskins. Shakow does mention that pressure that Hoskins was under from both the Memorial Foundation and hospital staff, but nothing about Jellinek’s departure (Shakow, 1972, 79). Thelma speculated that Jellinek had become bored with the problem of schizophrenia from an endocrine standpoint (Anderson to Keller, 1963).

Keller agrees, stating

You can explore a special aspect like that just so far and then it gets tiresome to have to adjust one’s planning to the special perspective especially as one’s thinking is anyhow not narrowed (Keller to Anderson, 1963).

Of course, it is possible that Jellinek’s Hungarian past, or lack of credentials, caught up with him. In addition to Hungarians at Worcester, there was a strong Hungarian community in psychiatry in New York City who might have brought up his past. Two of his former peers in psychoanalysis from Hungary, Franz Alexander and Sándor Radó, established themselves in the United States in the early 1930s. Gábor Kelemen speculates that Jellinek’s open opposition to Radó’s views on addiction may have been risky, since Radó knew about Jellinek’s past. (Kelemen and Márk, 2012, p.309).

Three leather-bound volumes with all articles published during Jellinek’s time at the Worcester State Hospital. Photo courtesy of their owner, Richard Noll.

Appreciation for Jellinek at WSH is well-represented by an unusual gesture from the staff. He received three leather-bound volumes with all articles published during his time, with his name inscribed on the spine, the photo of which is courtesy of their owner, Richard Noll. The accompanying farewell letter furthers this sentiment, commenting on the staff’s “continuing privilege and pleasure

---

1 On the Carnegie funded study, see Chapter 8, Section I and Chapter 4 of Ron Roizen’s dissertation – available, respectively, at www.roizen.com/ron/dissch8.htm and www.roizen.com/ron/dissch4.htm
to draw freely upon [his] wisdom.” What is known is that, after leaving Worcester, Jellinek went on to do very important research on alcohol, first with Jolliffe and then at Yale. Looking at Jellinek's early research on alcoholism, there are potential indications that his experience at Worcester parallel with his later methods on studying and treating alcohol problems.
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This is the sixth in a series of papers depicting the mostly undocumented life of E.M. Jellinek. Jellinek was known to make a great impact on his co-workers in many ways. Perhaps his closest colleague and friend during his years in alcohol studies was Mark Keller, editor of the Journal of Studies on Alcohol. This paper draws heavily upon the newly discovered content from Keller's correspondence with Jellinek’s former wife, Thelma Pierce Anderson. These letters provided leads in researching topics presented in the previous five papers, as well as corroborating evidence. The information in these papers was first presented at the 36th Annual Substance Abuse Librarians and Information Specialists (SALIS) Conference on May 1st, 2014, by seven presenters in a panel entitled “Mystery and speculations: Piecing together E.M. Jellinek’s redemption.”

While much of E.M. Jellinek’s history is unknown, his time in the alcohol research field has been well documented. For many of these years Jellinek worked closely with Mark Keller, his friend and colleague. The Center of Alcohol Studies Library is fortunate to have numerous letters between Keller and Jellinek’s former wife Thelma Anderson, in addition to articles, speeches and interviews from Keller describing his relationship with Jellinek. These materials create a clearer
picture of Jellinek, in both his professional and personal life.

Mark Keller was born in the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1907 and immigrated to the United States in 1913. He was a self-educated man, and despite never attending college, he had a broad knowledge of several topics. He began researching in the alcohol field in the 1930s in a group led by Norman Jolliffe. One of the first original staff members at what would become the Center of Alcohol Studies, Keller worked for the Center at both Yale University and Rutgers University. During his time at Rutgers he helped create the Center’s library and its extensive alcohol research collection. Working his way up from editorial assistant, Keller was named editor of the Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, the highest position within the journal.

Norman Jolliffe was appointed medical director of the project, and began work at NYU Medical School with Keller as his editorial and research assistant. Recruited by Jolliffe to work on the project, Jellinek was shortly appointed executive director. In a 1972 speech Keller remarks that “Jolliffe went up to Worcester where Jellinek was lured away from schizophrenia to alcoholism” (Keller, 1972). In a later interview Keller would say, “he [Jellinek] didn’t know anything about it, about alcoholism” (Blume, 1980).

Although Jellinek had been named executive director of the literature review, it’s evident that he was not wholly trusted, especially when it came to money. Keller writes in a letter to Thelma Anderson, Jellinek’s ex-wife,

> Jolliffe’s decision to ship me up to the Academy to work with Bunky had multiple reasons, one being to raise my income. But there was another…He expressed the feeling that this Jellinek fellow was evidently a holy wonder—but didn’t impress him as a very solid character. What would he do, especially budgetwise, left all to himself? So I was to try to keep Jellinek on an even keel (Keller to Anderson, 1963).

Keller was sent to the Academy to keep an eye on Jellinek, however, according to Keller, Jellinek recognized Jolliffe’s suspicions and played along quite well. Again, Keller writes to Anderson,

> I think Bunky understood my position and he cleared lots of things with me, such as buying this and that, about which I didn’t care a hoot. In retrospect, maybe Bunky understood this aspect of my position better than I did (Keller to Anderson, 1963).

Once the alcohol literature review was finished, Jellinek was invited to join the Laboratory of Applied Physiology at Yale, which would be responsible for creating the Center of Alcohol Studies. Jellinek brought with him the results of the literature review.
and continued his work. In 1941 Mark Keller joined him at Yale, where they collaborated on numerous projects. Jellinek and Keller made important contributions to alcohol research literature, in particular the Classified Abstract Archive of Alcohol Literature, manuals and publications focused on organizing and disseminating information and large bibliographies. After Jellinek's departure from the Center, he and Keller continued to have a close working relationship. In addition to editing Jellinek's book, The Disease Concept of Alcoholism, Keller was instrumental in having the work published. Even after Jellinek's death, Keller was invited to carry on his work, and was asked to complete the alcohol encyclopedia Jellinek had been working on.

Beyond their professional relationship, Jellinek and Keller developed a close friendship. In a 1972 speech Keller says, "It didn't take long for Jellinek and me to become friends" (Keller, 1972). In letters, speeches, and memorials, Keller's affection for Jellinek is obvious. As evident in their years-long correspondence, Keller was also close with Jellinek's ex-wife, Thelma Anderson.

As the field of alcohol studies grew, Jellinek encouraged Keller to grow as well and seek new opportunities. At one point Jellinek suggested Keller switch careers and join him in becoming a research consultant. Keller worried he could not join an endeavor of which he knows nothing about, but Jellinek, ever the innovator, believed the ability to think is what matters, as knowledge can be taught. Keller recalls,

My first reaction was, 'But I don't know anything about it!' To which he replied, 'What you think is more important, and anything you need to know I'll teach you.' But I am terribly unenterprising (my belief in free enterprise is strictly for the rights of others)... (Keller to Anderson, 1963).

The encouragement and admiration between the two went both ways. Jellinek was a mentor to Keller, but Keller was also responsible for helping to create and produce some of Jellinek's most accomplished works. The two enjoyed a fruitful 25-year working relationship, and Keller would remain a loyal friend and colleague to Jellinek throughout their relationship. After Jellinek's death, Keller's loyalty only grew. He wrote several memorials, articles, and remembrances of his friend. In each of these, he stressed the importance of Jellinek's role in changing and developing the alcohol research field (e.g., Keller, 1964, Keller, 1970, Keller, 1972, Keller, 1984).

Keller so admired Bunky that in 1965 he, along with several others, created the Jellinek Memorial Fund. In addition to a cash prize, the winner receives a bust of Jellinek, nicknamed a “Bunky”. Keller won the award in 1977 and his inscribed bust is now housed at the Center of Alcohol Studies, Rutgers University.

![The Jellinek Memorial Award presented to Mark Keller in 1977 (Rutgers, Center of Alcohol Studies Archive)](image)

Although many could say that Jellinek may not have had the credentials necessary for his position, Keller knew there were no limits to his abilities. Keller describes Jellinek as having "boundless imagination and vision,"
while cultivating an interdisciplinary approach to the field. He attributes the rational, scientific approach to alcohol problems to Jellinek and states that Jellinek “fought...to replace the absence of knowledge which had prevailed in the realm of alcohol problems” (Blume, 1980).

In one memorial article Keller best describes his feelings on the controversial subject,

E. M. Jellinek was essentially a universal scholar. He never really earned a doctorate, although along the way he acquired a couple of honorary degrees, and he allowed himself to be referred to as Dr. Jellinek because it was too inconvenient to correct everybody all the time. Of course he was a doctor of doctors in the truest sense (Keller, 1970).

Keller, among others, attempted to write a biography on Jellinek after his death, stressing that the biography was a “grand and needed project” that “lots of people were waiting for” (Keller to Anderson, 1988). Keller would correspond with Thelma for years, trying to piece Jellinek’s life together. During that time he realized how much of Jellinek’s history was a mystery to him, despite their close personal and professional relationship. Keller also believed that others would not be successful in writing a biography, failing to “understand Bunky” (Keller to Anderson, 1984).

When Keller wrote to Thelma Anderson asking for her help with the biography, she asked which Bunky the public would be interested in: “Bunky the man, the scientist, the humanitarian, the ruthless, the genius or the screwball?” (Keller to Anderson, 1984).

Among friends, Bunky was known for his nonsense verse. One of Keller’s letters even references a nonsense verse competition to decide what would be written in a going away card; Keller won that one. These nonsense verses give us a sense of Bunky the smart, lighthearted joker. An example of Bunky’s nonsense verse:

I felt that time was hanging by its toes,
I felt the goosedflesh creeping up my nose,
I felt the shudder of an unknown thought,
I saw the world behaving like a kite,
I felt as loving as a Hitlerite;
I wondered what the cause might be—
I found: My cigarette was smoking me.
(Jellinek, n.d)

One of the most interesting finds among the Keller-Anderson correspondence was a story told by Thelma describing Jellinek’s talent for becoming an expert on any topic.

Parenthetically—on some occasion, I believe it was while he was with United Fruit, he was asked to supervise the construction of a bridge. Now, you and I know that Bunky had the mechanical sense of a billygoat but—he had a weekend to get the bridge project worked out. He gathered together a pile of books and went to bed. On Monday morning, the plans for the bridge were ready! (Anderson to Keller, 1963)

Jellinek took a similar approach when beginning his career in alcohol research.

I do remember Bunky coming home and saying, ‘How would you like to be married to an alcohol expert?’ I said something along the line of, ‘But you don’t know one damned thing about it’. …I said I thought he could probably learn enough to bull his way along until he needed to know more. Again, Bunky took to the books, and I swear that within ten days he had developed a number of really good and original ideas on a subject about which he (nor anyone else it turned out) had had not one reasonable notion in 50 years (Anderson to Keller, 1963).

Mark Keller is an important factor in telling the Jellinek story, because a lot of what we know about Jellinek comes from Keller, who gathered information from Thelma.
Anderson. Keller’s fading and selective memory colors the past and what we’ve come to know of Jellinek (Roizen, 2011). Some of the Jellinek mythology comes from hearsay or word of mouth stories, which for librarians can be a good starting point. The next step involves locating primary sources whenever possible, searching for secondary sources to provide context, and putting the pieces together. As librarians, we’re responsible for finding materials and providing access.
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The Jellinek project: Summing up, so far

Ron Roizen, PhD

Independent scholar

This is the seventh in a series of papers depicting the mostly undocumented life of E.M. Jellinek. This paper wraps up and contextualizes the findings of the previous six papers, and points out potential areas for further research. The information in these papers was first presented at the 36th Annual Substance Abuse Librarians and Information Specialists (SALIS) Conference on May 1st, 2014, by seven presenters in a panel entitled “Mystery and speculations: Piecing together E.M. Jellinek’s redemption.”

I was delighted when Judit Ward invited me to “bat clean-up” -- or, in other words, offer some summing-up remarks for her Jellinek biography project’s research experience and progress.

Let me begin by reminding readers that E.M. Jellinek was a key figure in the emergence of “a new scientific approach to alcohol” in post-Repeal America. He, more than others, saw “the big picture” regarding what was necessary to establish a beachhead for mainstream science’s cultural “ownership” of the nation’s alcohol-related concerns in the post-Repeal period. He also served as an adept and skillful “front man” or “impresario” (to use Penny Booth Page’s apt term) for this newly emergent scientific specialty.1 He had a knack for bridging warring (and not always friendly) camps within the new modern alcoholism movement that emerged in the 1940s and 1950s2, something evidenced, for example, by the affection accorded him by many members of the Alcoholics Anonymous fellowship.3 And he could be flexible and nimble in advancing science’s values and advantages to different audiences. He also managed to displace “temperance science’s” past hegemony by outlining the main features of a new, mainstream scientific presence and authority – even despite sometimes bitter and


3 A.A. co-founder William Wilson (Bill W., “Let’s Be Friendly With Our Friends: Friends on the Alcoholism Front,” The A.A. Grapevine, March, 1958), for example, wrote of Jellinek: “Presently, the Research Council took on a live wire, Dr. E.M. Jellinek. He wasn’t an M.D., but he was a “doctor” of pretty much everything else. Learning all about drunks was just a matter of catching up on his back reading. Though aprodigy of learning, he was nevertheless mighty popular with us alcoholics.”
vitiportative objections from some dry diehards.4

Jellinek’s career and life after joining the new alcohol science enterprise in 1939 became enmeshed with the story of alcohol science’s subsequent evolution and growth. This period spanned, for Jellinek, the remarkable distance and journey from his role in the early Carnegie-funded literature review project to, in his final years, his important role in conceptualizing the influential Cooperative Commission on the Study of Alcoholism report.5 Yet, Jellinek began his new career in alcohol science when he was pushing 50. Remarkably, however, very little — very, very little — has been known about his pre-alcohol-studies life and work. It is this pre-alcohol life experience that, happily, is the fertile and fresh field this Rutgers project has sought to cultivate.

Much has been accomplished by this Rutgers-based biography project so far -- and, of course, much still remains to be accomplished. High on my own remains-to-be-done list, incidentally, are: (a) collecting and exploring more of Jellinek’s files and correspondence — especially any personal correspondence in the 1930 and, if luck favors the project, the dark and mysterious 1920s; (b) finding and making use of Ruth Surry’s fugitive but allegedly rich biographical materials; (c) securing a copy of the broad report on how Worcester’s schizophrenia research should be restructured, chiefly authored by Jellinek; and (d) (in the best of all possible worlds) traveling to all the important venues in Jellinek’s life. Hence, should the project continue on its course, there is little prospect of rest for its investigators in the coming year. Obviously, enhanced support will be necessary to carry out further work too.

The Rutgers project has divided Jellinek’s pre-alcohol life into three broad periods: the “Hungarian Years” (25 years, from 1895 to 1920), the “Time Abroad” (the decade of the 1920s), and the “Worcester State Hospital” period (the 1930s). I will say just a few words about each. Respecting the first, the Hungarian, period, the project has enjoyed a number of very nice advantages. Judit Ward, herself a native Hungarian speaker, has made periodic visits to Hungary collecting primary source material on Jellinek’s life and times. New scholarship on Jellinek has also recently emerged among addictionologists and librarians in Hungary as well. Thanks to these efforts — although much newly collected material is still being processed — our understanding of Jellinek’s Hungarian period has already been greatly expanded and enriched. This period was by no means unconnected to Jellinek’s later involvements at Worcester and with the new alcohol science movement. At Worcester State Hospital, as Karen Thomas’s article in these pages reported, Jellinek’s advocacy for greater emphasis on a psychoanalytic approach to schizophrenia appears to have been heeded. As Karen quoted: “If ‘Bunky,’ as he was without exception called, felt positive toward psychoanalysis,” wrote David Shakow of Worcester, “then presumably psychoanalysis was indeed important and worth paying attention to.”6 Skipping far, far ahead: Jellinek’s final alcohol studies article, published posthumously in 1977, 14 years after his death, returned to the symbolic level of analysis he’d become fascinated with and developed while in the Ferenczi circle.7 Regarding Jellinek’s currency trading caper in Hungary, it may be noted that only relatively recently have students of Jellinek’s life come to understand the “E.M. Jellinek,” who rose to

prominence as an alcohol science specialist in the U.S., was actually the same person as the “Jellinek Morton,” who made off with millions of crowns in Budapest in 1920. Judit Ward’s article, in these pages, draws upon a bounty of new information and sources on this notorious escapade.

The “Time Abroad” period, which Scott Goldstein’s article in these pages examines, represents a particularly difficult biographical challenge. Scott has done an excellent job conveying how very sketchy are the available source materials on Jellinek’s life and work in the 1920s – and therefore also how important was the discovery and collection of Hartman’s (i.e., Jellinek’s) “banana book” by this project. As recently as April, 2013, Judit Ward and I, were lamenting -- in a post to Points: The Blog of the Alcohol and Drugs History Society -- that the banana book was proving very difficult to find. Not finding the book would have left Ruth Surry’s mention of it and Thelma Anderson’s recollections about it unconfirmed and iffy. Finding it, therefore, provides a kind of solid rock anchoring a nice little verity that otherwise would have been left adrift in a sea of biographical uncertainty. Of course, and as Scott has noted, we still cannot say with certainty -- not yet, at least -- that the scientist and writer who signed himself A.N. Hartman was actually E.M. Jellinek. But, and with the discovery of a green-cover book matching Thelma’s description, the odds have now been shifted markedly in that direction. And that shift, in turn -- given the paucity of sources we have on the ’20s -- is big news.

My own pursuit of Jellinek’s life in Honduras led me to an interest in the possibly parallel experience of O. Henry -- real name, William Sydney Porter -- the celebrated American novelist and short story writer. Porter ran into trouble with the law in Texas in the 1890s and fled, in July, 1896, to Honduras, which had no extradition treaty with the U.S. He stayed there only about half a year, but managed to write a book of fiction, titled Cabbages and Kings, in which he drew broadly from his experience there. Porter was ashamed of this short period of his life and never talked about it. Hence Porter’s biographers, later on, faced much the same paucity of material the Rutgers project has faced regarding Jellinek’s Honduran stay. C. Alphonso Smith, Porter’s earliest biographer, titled his chapter on Porter’s Honduran period, “The Shadowed Years.” It was interesting to read this chapter with an eye to how Smith managed to finesse his shortage of source material to work with. I’ve also been pleased to find evocative passages in both biographies of Porter and Porter’s Cabbages and Kings. These sometimes struck me as words that might have been written by or about Jellinek’s experience in Honduras. Two wonderful examples of such passages were presented in one of my slides in my remarks to the SALIS conference in May at Rutgers.

Karen Thomas has provided a useful overview of Jellinek’s decade-long experience at Worcester State Hospital in the 1930s. The record of Jellinek’s Worcester years is still pretty scanty, but it is much, much better, at least, than what’s available for Jellinek in the 1920s in West Africa and Central America. Indeed, when contrasted with the 1920s, we have a bounty of material at Worcester in the 1930s. For example, we’re blessed (a) with a record of Jellinek’s many co-authored and singly authored publications; (b) with copies of papers offered in the biometric journal he launched while there; (c) with the prospect (at least) of collecting the important internal report on reform of the research process at Worcester, produced by a committee Jellinek chaired; (d) with David Shakow’s descriptions and assessments of Jellinek’s work and place in Worcester professional staff; and, finally, but no less significantly, (e) with Thelma Pierce Jellinek’s wonderfully

---


Jellinek’s first issue of the Biometrics Bulletin appeared in June, 1936; it subsequently ran for four issues (in Dec., 1936; Dec., 1937; and Sept., 1938), to which he and other investigators contributed articles.
revealing correspondence about this period. We know, in addition, that Jellinek certainly was not sitting on his hands during his Worcester period. He clearly rose to an important place in that institution’s research enterprises, as evidenced by the bound volumes and glowing letter of thanks signed by staff and as well by Shakow’s very favorable and even perhaps affectionate remarks in at least two historical accounts.\textsuperscript{10, 11} Two additional indicators of the high value of Jellinek’s contributions at Worcester may be noted. First, he was made a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences near his departure from Worcester in 1938. Second, Jellinek has, in the fullness of time, been recognized as a key player in the biometric movement and its impact of psychopathological research during the 1930s\textsuperscript{12}. Karen’s article touched on potential links and influences that may have flowed from Jellinek’s work at Worcester to his subsequent career and central role in the alcohol science movement. Let me add only that this area affords an inviting topic for further fruitful exploration. Jellinek’s research contexts in relation to schizophrenia research at Worcester and alcoholism research later in life harbor some intriguing similarities and differences.

I will be brief in my comments on the three remaining articles on the Jellinek project in this issue: namely, Christine Bariahtaris article on Jellinek’s family history; Molly Steward’s, on his relationship to Mark Keller; and, finally, William Bejarano’s, on Jellinek’s not entirely unproblematic formal education and c.v. and the positioning of this project’s inquiry. All three have offered valuable starting places for further digging and thought. Christine’s genealogical investigation, with its harvest of a great deal of new information on Jellinek’s immediate family and in-laws, is a very welcome addition to the project’s knowledge base. What might be emphasized about Jellinek’s family and family history, it seems to me, is that Jellinek came from a distinguished background of great wealth, great achievement, great learning, and even no little fame (in the case of his mother, the famous soprano, Marcella Lindh). He seems to have been regarded as something of a black sheep with respect to this family legacy, perhaps especially so by his mother. That Jellinek’s paternal grandmother’s, Johanna Fuchs Jellinek, “...read four newspapers each day, each in a different language,” and that Jellinek’s mother was friends with Giuseppe Verdi – biographical items gleaned from one of Thelma’s wonderful letters – speak volumes about Jellinek’s cultural and educational experience that cannot of course be captured in his c.v.\textsuperscript{13} Christine cited, in passing Klaus Kempter’s German language volume on the Jellinek family’s illustrious European history in her article’s first paragraph,\textsuperscript{14} I would like to point out merely that there is a great deal still to be mined for our project on Jellinek’s distinguished ancestry, drawing on Kempter’s work and other sources as well.

Bill Bejarano deserves our thanks for his article’s overall framing of the Jellinek project’s fairminded and balanced intentions and orientation to its subject. Bill noted that Jellinek’s best remembered scientific contribution was arguably his phases of alcoholism papers\textsuperscript{15, 16}. These caused no little

---


\textsuperscript{13} Thelma Anderson to Mark Keller, letter, April 16, 1988, p. 3 and p. 2.
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controversy in succeeding decades, often being subjected to criticisms regarding their faulty sampling approach, the biased sample subjected to analysis, and other weaknesses. I would merely point out that a careful reading of Jellinek's 1946 paper, the longer and more detailed of the two, will reveal that Jellinek was entirely conscious of his analysis's weaknesses and fully cautioned readers to keep them in mind in evaluating his results. In this sense, Jellinek has received something of a "bum rap" for many of his analyses' shortcomings – although, I hasten to add, that Jellinek's suggested phases of addiction and natural history cannot be said to have fully stood the test of time as a scientific schematic. Beyond this aside, I would suggest that Bill’s recounting of Jellinek's educational experience and past attempts at biographies for him well succeeded in showing, as Bill surmised, "...just how maddening and difficult it has been to track Jellinek’s life over the years."

Finally, I would simply add a closing comment to Molly Stewart’s useful and illuminating account of Jellinek's relationship to Mark Keller, longtime editor of the Journal of Studies on Alcohol. The preservation of an historical legacy, and debt, requires agents who remember, who carry memory forward, and who, indeed, cherish the memory of the founders and inspirational figures in an historical story. Keller’s appreciation of Jellinek’s significant place in the launching and shaping of the new scientific approach to alcohol was nicely captured, I thought, in the quotation I presented in my final slide to the SALIS meeting. This Rutgers project is of course another expression of the importance of institutional memory. It has, under Judit’s direction and encouragement, given us a promising start and a revealing look at lots of new information about the man, his work, and his times. I’m quite certain Bunky himself would have been pleased with how far the project has come!
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Rich histories merge: Meet the new Hazelden - Betty Ford Foundation

Barbara Weiner, MLS
Manager, Hazelden - Betty Ford Foundation
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In the addictions treatment field, both the Betty Ford Foundation and the Hazelden Foundation are well known. Less well-known, however, are the interactions of these two organizations over many years. Learn their differences; learn their similarities. Now, with their formal merger creating a new foundation, meet the new Hazelden Betty Ford Foundation.

SALIS has the most wonderful presentations, highlighting research, technology, and cutting edge ideas. But today I’m happy to talk about another aspect of the addiction field, namely, drug and alcohol treatment, helping the individual addict restore hope, health, and healing to their lives. Many invaluable treatment centers serve their communities and regions. However, I’ll focus today on two alcohol and drug centers in the US, each which has a national reach -- the Hazelden Foundation of Center City, MN and the Betty Ford Center of Rancho Mirage, CA. On February 10th of this year, these two organizations merged into one.

Setting the stage
Before the founding of Alcoholics Anonymous in 1935, alcohol and drug treatment as we know it today did not exist. Addiction treatment as a specialized enterprise grew from a few dozen programs in the early-1960s to more than 16,000 programs in 2012—a number which does not include solo practitioners. This explosion in the number of treatment programs was brought about by changes in legislation, in economics, and a growing idea that alcohol and drug addiction was a disease, which could be helped by treatment.

A few statistics:
- 57% of treatment programs in the US are private non-profit organizations; 31% are private for-profit organizations, with the remaining programs operated by various government levels, or tribal governments.
- Private non-profit addiction treatment programs treat approximately 2/3 of all persons treated for a substance use disorder in the United States. Both Hazelden, founded in 1949, and the Betty Ford Center, founded in 1982, are private non-profit foundations.

RICH HISTORIES MERGE:
SETTING THE STAGE

- 1935: Alcoholics Anonymous
- 1949: Hazelden Foundation
- 1960s (early): a few dozen programs
- 1982: Betty Ford Center
- 2012: more than 16,000 programs
- 2014 (Feb. 10th): Hazelden Betty Ford Foundation
Today addiction treatment is a $35 billion industry. A 30-day residential stay can run from $30,000 to $100,000, with both the Betty Ford Center and Hazelden at the mid to lower end of this range. Intensive outpatient treatment at Hazelden is about 1/3 the cost of residential treatment, depending on individual needs. Nationally, 90% of patients seek treatment on an outpatient basis.

There was a lot of press this past February when Hazelden and the Betty Ford Center merged into one foundation. This presentation will provide a brief view of what led to this merger, and what the new foundation looks like.

**Missions**

Why did this merger take place? Why did both Boards give their approval for a merger?

First, the missions are almost identical. Hazelden is credited with spreading the abstinence-based, 12 Step-based, multidisciplinary professional care model that permeates the treatment industry. The Betty Ford Center was based on Mrs. Ford’s mission to “help others live their best possible life” and is recognized around the globe for its commitment to patient care.

### RICH HISTORIES MERGE: MISSIONS

- **BFC:** Our mission is recovery. We restore hope to individuals and families suffering from addiction through world-class treatment and education.

- **Hazelden:** Hazelden helps restore hope, healing, and health to people affected by addiction to alcohol and other drugs.

There are some differences. For example, Hazelden allows use of certain medications to reduce cravings during initial treatment, while the Betty Ford Center has resisted this approach. The Betty Ford Center offers a unique prevention program for children ages 7-12. Hazelden works with insurance companies, while the Betty Ford Center is self-pay. Finally, Hazelden, but not the Betty Ford Center, has a long-established research department for documenting patient follow up data to quantify treatment effectiveness.

Both organizations have a commitment to 12-step fellowships, an abstinence-based clinical model, and multidisciplinary professional care. They also have a long, rich history of collaboration dating back to the founding of the BFC.

Regarding the merger, as Susan Ford Bayles, Trustee of the Elizabeth B. Ford Charitable Trust, stated: "Mother would be pleased."

**1980**

This is one of my favorite photos, taken in 1980 when Betty Ford was visiting the Hazelden campus in Center City, Minnesota. It’s a beautiful summer day, with sunshine instead of snowflakes!

![Photo: McElrath, Ford, Anderson](image)

Mrs. Ford is in the center. To your left is Damian McElrath, former administrator, author, and official Hazelden historian. To your right is Dr. Dan Anderson, former president of Hazelden, and one of the founders of the Minnesota Model of treatment, who actually created the Hazelden Library in 1966.

From this photo in 1980 until the merger in 2014, both organizations have worked...
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Collaboration

These two books are unique to their organizations. Betty: A Glad Awakening is the autobiography of Mrs. Ford, and in it she recounts her personal struggle with addiction, and her journey to sobriety and recovery. Hazelden: Spiritual Odyssey, is written by Damian McElrath, and is the official history of Hazelden's first 20 years.

One more quote from a Hazelden staff newsletter of 1999, the year of Hazelden's 50th anniversary. A personal letter from Betty Ford to Hazelden was included:

Congratulations to Hazelden on 50 years of assisting men, women, and their loved ones to begin the process of recovery. In the last decade, as many programs have been forced to close or cut back, how reassuring it is that Hazelden and the Betty Ford Center continue to be "Beacons of Hope.

In 1980, Leonard Firestone and I turned to Hazelden and Dan Anderson for counsel on the first steps in developing our treatment center. Hazelden advised us on our campus and buildings, but more important guided us on our treatment program. Dan Anderson and Gordon Grimm offered us their years of experience and wisdom and then helped us hire John Schwarzlose, who had been trained at Hazelden.

Over the 16-plus years of the Betty Ford Center, we have enjoyed many exchanges of staff and Board with Hazelden. We share the mantle of leadership and the duty to