1

Introduction

Peter N. Stearns

Over the past thirty years, many Americans have developed not only a healthy fear of tobacco smoke, but an eager disapproval of smokers. Only slightly deflected by criticisms of the ploys of Big Tobacco or possible genetic proclivities on the part of smokers, Americans have turned against smokers not only as threats to health but as creatures of bad character. As one expert put it in 1991, smoking constitutes "some element of human frailty or incompleteness in the smoker" deserving of every reproof both because smokers were nothing more than "merchants of death" and because cessation was simply a matter of self-discipline, "readily mastered with learning and practice."[1] Harsh beliefs translate into rigorous laws and also into the shamed ghettoization of smokers as they cower in building entrances, weathering the glares of self-righteous passers-by. The whole phenomenon is a not inconsiderable passage in recent American history, as both behaviors and attitudes reversed trends of the mid-20th-century decades. But it is not recent history alone. The unusual fierceness and moralism of the American response—quite different from reactions in other industrial countries, despite the same health data—derive from an association of health and good character that took shape in the 19th and early 20th centuries, and with an American delight in castigating sinners—albeit, now, secular sinners—that blended Puritanism with Victorian values even earlier. Our antismoking stance, though partly derived from rational health campaigns that gradually won through, can only fully be understood through a richer history.

This, in turn, is behavioral history in a nutshell: the capacity to understand ourselves, including depths of feeling and differences from other societies and subgroups, through the use of historical explanation. There is

no way to grasp why many Americans react to smokers as they do without looking at some deep features of our history, not only the health campaigns that led up to the reversals of policy in the 1970s, but also the older moralism and its transitions from sin to issues of health and character.

Behavioral history rests on two assumptions. The first involves the conviction that substantial components of beliefs and actions, even in very personal areas, are shaped by developments in the past. They cannot be fully understood without examining their origins and the factors that shaped and sustained them. The second assumption embraces the wide range of behaviors that historians are now capable of probing, well beyond conventional textbook staples of wars and presidents, and even beyond the newer trinity of class, race, and gender. While gaps remain, including some that probably can never be filled for lack of adequate data, an explosion of historical knowledge has occurred in the past quarter-century that greatly improves our capacity to understand ourselves. Behavioral history, as a label, seeks to use this capacity for exactly that purpose, building on but surpassing the historian's delight in adding to the richness of the past.

The idea of using history to understand the present is hardly new, of course. No one would pretend to convey some key aspects of American politics—like the difficulty of forming a significant third party or the aversion to socialism—without significant recourse to historical analysis. The American approach to war, including the delight in highest-possible technology, or the continuing reluctance to abridge national sovereignty even in an age of globalization, are other clear products of an interaction between present and past. Only the most superficial presentation would ignore the historical overlays that help determine contemporary responses in political structure or diplomacy. Behavioral history simply but vastly extends the range of historical application.

The major barriers to this kind of explicit historical understanding of ourselves come from a combination of historians' frequent hesitations (read, sometimes, obscurantism) and a related public impatience with serious analysis of any sort. Many historians, quite sincerely, are reluctant to move into direct connections with the present, because these involve more potential controversy, less certain judgments, than does a more remote past. There's no question that behavioral history is deliberately presentist, in focusing on using the past to explain contemporary patterns. It is important to insist that present-focused history is not the only kind of history that should be done by historians, though it needs more attention

than it sometimes receives—as in survey history courses that somehow never get past World War II. Less excusably, some historians think of the past so completely in terms of discrete stories and factoids that they are really incapable of using it to explain much of anything—it is just a list of things to be memorized. For their part, many Americans who are open to history think of it, somewhat similarly, as an entertaining hobby, full of juicy anecdotes (preferably about past wars), or museum visits stressing the distant quaintness of the past, but not really a serious tool for contemporary explanation.

Behavioral history must overcome these barriers, by arguing, indeed, by demonstrating, that many of our most cherished or ingrained reactions are really constructed by developments in the past—that, once again, we need history to understand ourselves. There are some nice stories attached—who can write about the construction of present grief in contrast to past grief without noting how, 130 years ago, girls were encouraged to buy coffins and black dresses for their dolls, to train themselves in proper mourning?[2] Analysis of contemporary revulsion against smoking can recall the too-easily-forgotten array of legal prohibitions that greeted the rise of the cigarette and that only began to yield in the early 20th century—another good set of stories, but with a bit of a message about our moral proclivities to boot. But it's analysis—explaining ourselves to ourselves through examination of the origins and historical causes of our behaviors—that forms the main point. We deprive ourselves of vital insight if we look primarily to the past for dramatic anecdotes rather than explanation. But we need a good bit of work, from historians and the consuming public alike, to complete the necessary conversion.

Behavioral history faces additional obstacles. Many of the topics discussed in this book are not commonly seen as part of history at all, but rather the province of fields such as psychology, sociology, even genetics. Discussions of the family might offer a historian the chance to write a background chapter, for a bit of cachet, on past patterns before turning to the latest analysis of the impact of the divorce rate or why American parents have become overly anxious.[3] Behavioral historians will insist, of course, that historical analysis is an explicit component of explaining both divorce rates and parental anxieties. But what about really personal stuff such as experiencing or reacting to jealousy? Clearly this is the province of psychology, but it also requires behavioral history to show how current patterns of jealousy emerged from rather different past forms and to explain why Americans react differently to jealousy from the French or the

Dutch (a comparison that psychological findings establish but cannot by themselves account for). (The French, by the way, get mad when they are jealous, the Dutch tend to get sad, while Americans rush around checking with their friends to see if they've behaved inappropriately; and, truly, the history of jealousy can show why.)[4] Behavioral historians deliberately intrude on domains where other explanations are more common, not to displace these explanations entirely but to demonstrate that historical construction must be part of the diagnosis.

There is more to this than disciplinary quibbling. Some of the most ambitious reaches of behavioral history take us into areas where, until recently, we might have assumed considerable constancy in human experience—like the senses, for example, or dreams. But it turns out that the senses aren't just part of human nature; they can vary and change, not just on an individual basis but societally as well. And when they change, they become part of an analyzable past, which is where behavioral history comes in. As an essay in this volume demonstrates, we can't understand why we smell as we do or think about smell as we do without knowing the modern history of smell. This isn't to deny some constant features for the senses, best captured by psychological or physiological studies; behavioral history, in emphasizing the importance of change, inevitably involves dealing with the complex boundaries between nature and nurture. But the elements constructed through historical processes play serious roles, well in front of the background scenery of human affairs. Need and opportunity combine for behavioral history, where the goal is improving our understanding.

And this is where the real excitement comes in. The redefinition of the past to include more than politics, the idea that any significant human behavior, from sex to death, has the potential for change and therefore for history, opens an additional avenue, sometimes a major highway, to self-appraisal. To be sure, there are still some tentative topics. The history of sleep is not yet advanced enough to shed abundant light on contemporary patterns—though it is clear that we worry about sleep more than our ancestors did and that we nap less, and both anxiety and distinctive behavior can be researched.[5] Boredom is a modern term, suggesting the capacity to define a state that has become much more important in modern than it was in premodern life; and it has changed, interestingly, from being something that well-bred people should learn to avoid causing to an experience that can legitimately be complained about as someone else's fault. But though there's a glimmer of analysis here, it has yet to be rounded out into

something that can and must be known if boredom is to be comprehended.[6] Another case, even less developed, involves loneliness. We are sometimes told, probably correctly, that more people are lonely now than was true in the past, which is an open invitation to serious historical analysis, but I have not seen significant work in this direction. Another intriguing instance: despite significant work on emotion, efforts to deal historically with joy are surprisingly limited.[7] Tragically, to take a final example, no one has yet tried a serious historical explanation of modern rates of psychological depression at all—granting that it would be a challenging task.

But the gaps pale before the accomplishments, which is why the definition of behavioral history is overdue. Anyone who wants to know about eating patterns, death, child rearing, emotion, aging, walking, body types, intelligence or retardation, even certain kinds of diseases, needs serious history, well beyond introductory prologue, as a key component in explaining why we do as we do and think as we think. The opportunities are fascinating.

This book is designed to offer a number of case studies in behavioral history. Authors have been asked to identify a contemporary phenomenon, in patterns of action and/or in attendant beliefs and values, that must be, and can be, historically explained at least in part. The phenomenon is a significant part of the way we live, and the historical analysis is intended to be interesting and useful in itself as well as illustrative of the broader case for behavioral history. There is no effort to be comprehensive, either in the list of contents or in individual articles. In terms of overall contents, lots of productive topic areas were omitted simply in the interests of keeping the book manageable (thus, despite the initial example above, no history of smoking habits). And the same selectivity applies to the individual essays. The focus, therefore, is on a particular emotion that can be better understood through history, not on emotions history in general—though it is a rich field; or on one aspect of the history of sexuality, or the history of leisure. The goal is to help people—both historians and others interested in better understanding—become accustomed to doing and using behavioral history.

We're still in a discovery period. Several essays in this book feature research that is just beginning to produce results—the "aha" phase of behavioral history that involves the first serious attempts to show that a familiar phenomenon, such as homesickness, really has a history worth knowing

and capable of being known. Others are drawn from well-established work that still deserves a wider audience. For though behavioral history still has its new frontiers, it has raced ahead of public usage, which still looks to history for less than it can deliver. It is this kind of discovery, of a kind of analysis that provides a new mirror on the present, that is most compelling.

While specific methods in behavioral history will vary with the project, in part because of variations in the types of data involved, there is a common set of requirements that should show up in most explicit efforts.

Hypotheses begin with the identification of the contemporary behavior worth investigating—not always an easy task and one that may sometimes emerge from a more general historical inquiry, sometimes from other social science findings. The next step involves identifying the point of origin of the behavior—not to indulge in a mindless debate about the exact month or year, but because pinpointing in time is essential to the next two stages of analysis.

And these entail, first, an explicit contrast with the ways the phenomenon played out prior to the onset of the contemporary trend or pattern. There needs to be a baseline, in other words, along with the identification of origins. Only with this is it possible to discuss real change and novelty.

This in turn leads to the determination of the causes of the shift from precontemporary to contemporary pattern. Obviously, historians cannot deal with causation through experimentation, and their efforts are always open to some debate. But probable attributions of cause add to the meaning of the contemporary trend. It is fine, for example, to know that a modern concern about dieting and hostility to fat began in the United States around 1900, and that it contrasted with a previous tendency to welcome plumpness as a sign of health. Without moving to an assessment of why this change occurred, the opportunity for a full historical understanding of this important aspect of contemporary life will be missed.

With origins established, contrasted with a prechange baseline, and causation assessed, the remaining task involves tracing the phenomenon, along with any adjustments in course, to current manifestations. This process need not involve detailed narrative. It should allow for the addition of other supporting factors. Modern anorexia nervosa, for example, seems to have originated in the mid-19th century for one set of reasons but then greatly gained momentum when the implications of newly slender body imagery were added in the early 20th century.[8]

Behavioral history, in sum, relies on carefully honed historical analysis, whether the practitioner is a professional historian or another social scientist willing to take on the responsibility of converting, at least in part, to this approach to identification and explanation. (A number of social science efforts falter, in fact, because they don't go to the trouble of really identifying origins and establishing contrast with prior patterns.) Of course, methodologies cannot always be as tidy as suggested here. A clear transition from prior status to new trend—as in the conversion, within two decades, from esteeming plumpness to expressing disgust at human fat—does not always emerge, which means that establishing starting points and before-and-after contrast becomes more complex. It is far easier to evoke the need for assessing causation than to produce clear results. But, pending further experience, there are standards in behavioral history that invite emulation and are open to evaluation.

The behavioral history illustrated in this book, in various topic areas, has a few other general features and issues best highlighted in advance. Without getting mired in complexity, there are four principal items of orientation: where to look, chronologically, for the causes of contemporary American behavior; what kinds of causes to seek or expect; what is American about American behavior; and how American is American. We also need to say a word about what is meant by "behaviors," though the assumptions here are more straightforward than those that frame the historical analysis.

On issue 1: there is no set script in terms of chronology for behavioral history. Some developments—such as the 1970s turning point for attitudes toward smokers—may well be quite recent. But in many cases, essentially contemporary behaviors, or key components of them, go farther back in time. Some may have been imported from Europe or Africa during colonial times or have taken root with the colonies themselves. There is an important argument, for example, that colonial Americans developed an unusual degree of attachment to children because of the importance of child labor and the possibility of flight to the frontier and that elements of these attitudes persist in American reactions to their children even today. Significant changes occurred in the United States around 1800 as a result of the formation of a new nation but particularly because of growing commercialization of the economy. So some behavioral history may cast back to the early 19th century, if not for literally contemporary behaviors, at least for elements thereof.

Another significant set of shifts occurred in the second decade of the 20th century, associated with fuller urbanization, the rise of a corporate and service economy, and the advent of big government. But again, there is no set periodization, and depending on what kind of behavior is involved, explanations may begin at quite different points in time, and some will accumulate as a result of several chronological phases of development. For example, while inquiry into contemporary concern about fat has to begin around 1900, when body fashions first started to shift to the still current direction, a larger explanation of our contemporary obesity problems needs to go back to the earlier 19th century when some characteristic and durable American eating patterns initially began to draw comment.[9] Behavioral historians promise (against some of the canons of the mother discipline) that details of the past will not be explored for their own sake but rather pruned for their analytical value; they do not and should not promise that their purview is confined to recent history alone.

The same variety applies to causation, issue number 2. Significant contemporary behaviors may be shaped by prior changes in values and beliefs. Historians have recently come through a strong emphasis on what is often called the "cultural turn," in which attitudes and values gained primary attention as the essential historical reality and the best single guide to actions and policies. We have already referred to durable facets of American culture, such as the tendency toward moralism, as part of the explanation for behaviors current today. But other behaviors have been shaped by changes in economic organization, such as growing commercialism, a corporate environment, and consumerism—in other words, by developments in material standards and institutions. Technologies can loom large, along with scientific discoveries. Shifts in the birthrate have a prominent role in the formation of contemporary attitudes toward children. Strictly political causation may have less to do with behavioral history, at least in the United States, than might be imagined. But even here historians have noted a significant shift in the relationships between families and the elderly once the advent of social security placed primary responsibility for elderly upkeep on the government—a key, if now increasingly vulnerable, aspect of contemporary intergenerational relationships and policy considerations alike.[10] And of course many current behaviors result from combinations of factors: contemporary approaches to death, for example, have something to do with prior cultures juxtaposed with medical and institutional developments and even with consumerism and a corporate economy.

The types of causes relevant to behavioral history also promise considerable mixture in types of sources. The cultural turn has placed substantial emphasis on prescriptive materials—materials that offer implicit or explicit recommendations about child rearing, emotional behavior, the treatment of criminals, and the like—and on qualitative analysis. But there are limitations here, as in the often-discussed gap between prescriptions and actual values and behaviors on the part of those to whom the guidelines are directed. And cultural explanations do not always suffice, in any event. So analysis of causation may turn also to quite different kinds of evidence, such as changes in death rates or disease incidence, where quantification plays a substantial role. Often, finally, an eclectic analysis will prove essential, mixing qualitative and quantitative factors.

Issue number 3 is comparative. Behavioral history readily applies to issues such as Americans' unusually limited vacations (compared to those in Europe and now even Japan) or their unusually extensive weight gains in recent decades. Several of the essays that follow at least briefly evoke some comparisons designed to show distinctively American features of the behavior in question. Given length limitations, however, the comparative elements are often suggested at best. But behavioral history needs geographical as well as chronological parameters. Some important contemporary behaviors may be shared with other countries, or at least with countries that are also Western and/or industrial. Explanations, in these instances, will not rest in the United States alone. But behavioral historians are also interested—sometimes, probably particularly interested—in behaviors that differ from those found in other modern, Western, or industrial settings, where an American twist applies both to the description of behaviors and, as a result, to their analysis. It has already been noted that American jealousy seems a bit different from French or Dutch, so an analysis of the emotion, in terms of behavioral history, must look to what the particular sources of the American variant are. And all this must be established in terms of some explicit comparative effort.

Many significant behaviors that occur in the United States are not generically American—and this is the fourth issue: coherence. The United States, we are often and correctly reminded, is a diverse place. While behavioral history does not focus on class, race, gender, or region alone, as noted, it must take these factors into account. Many excursions in behavioral history to date have focused disproportionately on the American middle class, with at most some allowance for gender differences. There is nothing wrong with this, in that the middle class is quite important. But

sometimes explicit definitions have been missing, leaving the impression that the middle class is in fact the whole of the national experience—that it is possible to talk about coherent national patterns of behavior, without actually testing the proposition against the nation's various subgroups. Sometimes also, the effort to establish behavioral history for largely non-middle-class groups, such as African Americans, has not received adequate attention, if only because the sources are more difficult. So behavioral history must be tested not only through comparisons with other societies but also through explicit attention to internal variations within the nation itself.

Here too, the essays that follow recognize this issue. A number of essays deal explicitly with gender and with race, treating both variables as factors in behavioral history that require attention. (Social class is also noted, but taken up in less detail.) It is both possible and desirable to deal with these factors carefully but without confining the results to separate subfields such as African American or women's history.

More generally, as behavioral history gains ground, clarity of definition of the interaction between "national" standards or patterns and the experiences of more specific groups will constitute an essential guideline, as against facile generalizations about undifferentiated national character or behavior. Along with explicit justification of chronology, in terms of definable starting points for the identification and analysis of contemporary behaviors, and appropriate range in terms of the combination of causal factors involved, these features must characterize the best efforts of behavioral historians now and in the future.

Behavioral history assumes some agreement on what behaviors involve, and, without belaboring this definitional issue, a brief explanation is warranted. With varying emphases, most of the articles in this book see behaviors as a mixture of attitudes about actions and actions themselves: what people do as they or others die and how they think about death, to take one example. This approach differs somewhat from the more conventional history of death, which may focus more on mortality statistics, objective causes of death, or formal mourning practices; but all these topics, particularly the last, may be part of an explanation of how people react to death and how they contemplate their own demise. Manners, an aspect of human behavior much explored in the past decade, similarly involve reactions to others and to particular social situations, plus the actions that result from these values and assumptions.

. . .

The essays in this book are divided into five kinds of behaviors, though overlaps occur. The first part deals with aspects of the family, with particular focus on relationships with children, currently a rising field in historical research more generally. Family history has moved increasingly from an initial interest in structural matters such as household size or marriage age to relationships and emotional connections, and behavioral history benefits greatly from this expansion. Part II deals with consumer behaviors—behaviors that change and those that revealingly remain stable despite surrounding change. Consumerism is another area of recently advancing knowledge, and behavioral history will contribute to these gains. Changes in emotional life are factored in as well, another expansion of behavioral history's range. Part III covers manners and rituals, the latter particularly focused on American approaches to death. Finally, parts IV (on the senses) and V (on sexuality) deal again both with vital contemporary behaviors and with important extensions of historical analysis. In both cases, behavioral history explicitly takes on any assumptions that innate human qualities preclude a significant past, with current patterns emerging from the familiar but challenging historical mixture of continuity and change. Here is where, correspondingly, some of the most strikingly historical findings have emerged over the past decade or so.

The overall intent of all these sections is to represent exciting findings and the ongoing potential in behavioral history through a sampling of a much wider potential array. All five topical categories involve important recent findings, and all involve basic tensions between qualities inherent in the human species, whether for buying things or for dealing with children or with death, and the actual experience of significant historical change and construction. Emotions, the senses, and the interactions between intimacy and a wider society play out in all the categories, which in turn display the basic apparatus of behavioral history in challenging domains.

Behavioral history is a new term, though it refers to some well-established research in social and cultural history as well as pointing to a new frontier. Both the existing qualities and the need for innovation deserve some final comment.

Innovation must embrace historians and their audience alike, if behavioral history is to realize its promise. Interested historians—and again, this neither can nor should include the whole discipline—need to become more comfortable with topics derived explicitly from current behavioral issues. History has always taken cues from the present in deciding what as-

pects of the past to look at, so the idea of a connection is not new at all. But explicitly using history to explain a current pattern is less common than it should be, particularly outside the arena of politics and diplomacy. For their part, other disciplines devoted to accounting for human behavior need to create a much larger window for historical analysis—for the inclusion of factors of change, and of historically derived explanation.

Happily, some connections have already been made. A number of sociologists and anthropologists, and an occasional psychologist, contribute directly to behavioral history by adding serious historical research—and, equally important, historical thinking—to their repertoire. Even aside from these individual conversions, research conferences in the applied social sciences, on subjects such as addiction, drinking, or crime, now often include historians as central players. Addiction is a particularly interesting case in point. Most addiction researchers battle to demonstrate that their subject is a legitimately scientific-medical topic, that addiction is really a disease worthy of (funded) study. The task is particularly challenging when not only substance abuse, but also behaviors such as gambling, are drawn into the mix. But, as several addiction authorities have recognized, the drive for scientific legitimacy need not preclude serious inquiry into how addiction emerged in modern American culture and into the needs the concept serves in addition to designating a disease entity. For a society eager to identify individual responsibility, the addiction concept, from its inception in the early 19th century, played a significant cultural role in calling attention to the individual but with possibilities of exculpation and treatment. It continues to serve this role in contemporary America, though the range has expanded from initial concerns with alcohol to drugs (late 19th century) and gambling (1920s).[11] Science and historical analysis can conjoin in showing both how addiction works and how its exploration can help individuals and society at large.

What is needed now is an amplification of this kind of connection between history and behavioral inquiry, considering three specific steps beyond simply more examples of the same.

First, we need more historians willing to accept the challenges of behavioral history, from initially defining their topics to setting their research agendas in terms of explanatory analysis.

Second, there must be a willingness on the part of those disciplines most commonly devoted to seeking changeless aspects of the human condition—through the psychology of human nature, for example, or genetics or neuroscience—to allow for a creative tension with explorations of

historical change. Behavioral history does not require either/or dichotomies, such that behaviors are entirely historically constructed or not at all. It is quite possible to allow for significant genetic or psychological components while noting that they work out somewhat differently depending on historical context and interaction with historical variables. Historians have sometimes been guilty of overkill, claiming that people "back then" were entirely different from what they are now, incapable, for example, of the kind of familial love that was discovered in the 18th century.[12] Scientific experts even more often make overstatements by arguing that the past and change can be ignored in the excitement of pinning one more marker on the genome project. In fact, against both extremes, interaction and debate are essential, as behavioral historians make their case.

And further, of course, we need to enlarge the audience for behavioral history as one way to gain understanding of why people act and think as they do. This means more explicit efforts, by behavioral historians, to use their work to this end; it means educating the public to expect new gains from historical research; and it means fostering the wider collaborations among disciplines, history now included, that have assessments of human behavior as their preserve as they address a wider public.

Behavioral history may lead, finally, to suggestions for change. Like any examination of current values and actions, behavioral history may illuminate patterns we find desirable and wish to keep. There is no inherent reform agenda, but behavioral history may also be employed to help explain behaviors that are undesirable, such as the rapid increase in obesity, to take one example where historians have been asked for guidance. Behavioral history faces two obstacles in this connection.[13] First, historians are not usually accustomed to offering explicit advice about how people should behave, unless they follow an older fashion of suggesting past actions or characters that might be usefully emulated in the present—an interesting kind of historical exercise but rather different from behavioral history. It's one thing to show how the past leads to the present, another to say how this analysis in turn might guide conduct. Some behavioral historians, comfortable with their pretentious focus, may nevertheless shy away from the advice column.

Second, behavioral history lessons are likely to be complicated. As a society, we have become accustomed to a quest for dramatic remedy: this bit of psychological advice will help reduce the divorce rates; that medicine will definitely treat our children's Attention Deficit Disorder; this bit of genetic tinkering will lead us to the conquest of psychological depression.

Behavior history, even if we grant its utility in improving understanding, is not so snappy. But, in showing how behaviors emerge as part of past change, it is intrinsically optimistic about the possibility of further change—more optimistic than approaches that emphasize the human condition as a set of natural constants. Knowing that Americans became committed to rapid eating over 150 years ago, and that in a contemporary context rapid eating contributes to obesity, suggests a complex connection that is not likely to be easily broken. But it does suggest a pattern that emerged from specific causes and that can be changed in turn, and it provides a definite target for remedial measures in case the quicker fixes don't work. Learning to use behavioral history as a source of constructive change is not the least of the challenges the field has to offer.

Understanding comes first, however, and that is what behavioral history puts front and center. Identifying distinctive features of the present—with the help of many disciplines—but then using a focused approach to the past to explain when and why these features took shape provides a fascinating window on the human panorama. Even when the result does not yield a clear prescription for change, it will provide the kind of perspective that enables people to think through the behaviors they see around them, free from any sense that they are merely natural or inevitable. And this result of behavioral history, in encouraging personal inquiry, may be far more valuable than the more common how-to approach. A new chapter is opening for one of the oldest disciplines in the book.

NOTES

1. David Keogh, *Smoking: The Artificial Passion* (New York, 1991), 15, 18, 97, 141, 155; Barbara Lyrich and R. J. Bonnie, eds., *Growing Up Tobacco Free* (Washington, 1994), 77, 98; Robert Tollison, ed., *Smoking and Society* (Lexington, MA, 1984); John Burnham, *Bad Habits: Drinking, Smoking, Taking Drugs, Gambling, Sexual Misbehavior, and Swearing in American History* (New York, 1994), ch. 4.

2. Peter N. Stearns, *American Cool: Constructing a Twentieth-Century Emotional Style* (New York, 1994); Paul Rosenblatt, *Bitter, Bitter Tears: Nineteenth-Century Diarists and Twentieth-Century Grief Theories* (Minneapolis, 1983); Jeffrey Steele, "The Gender and Racial Politics of Mourning," in Peter N. Stearns and Jan Lewis, eds., *An Emotional History of the United States* (New York, 1998), 91–108.

3. John Demos, *Past, Present and Personal: The Family and The Life Course in American History* (New York, 1986).

4. Edmund Zilner, *Jealousy in Children: A Guide for Parents* (New York, 1949);

Gordon Clanton and Lynn Smith, eds., *Jealousy* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1978); Peter N. Stearns, *Jealousy: The Evolution of an Emotion in American History* (New York, 1989); Peter Salovey, ed., *The Psychology of Jealousy and Envy* (New York, 1991).

5. Peter N. Stearns, Perrin Rowland, and Lori Giarnella, "Children's Sleep: Sketching Historical Change," *Journal of Social History 30* (1996): 345–66; Roger Ekrich, "The Sleep We Have Lost: Pre-Industrial Slumber in the British Isles," *American Historical Review* 106 (2001).

6. Patricia Spacks, *Boredom: The Literary History of a State of Mind* (Chicago, 1995); Richard P. Smith, "Boredom: A Review," *Human Factors* 23 (1981): 325–40; Peter N. Stearns, *Anxious Parents: A History of Modern Childrearing in America* (New York, 2003), ch. 6.

7. R. Marie Griffith, "Joy Unspeakable and Full of Glory: The Vocabulary of Pious Emotion in the Narratives of American Pentecostal Women, 1910–1945," in Stearns and Lewis, eds., *Emotional History,* 218–40.

8. Joan Jacob Brumberg, *Fasting Girls: The Emergence of Anorexia Nervosa as a Modern Disease* (Cambridge, MA, 1988).

9. Hillel Schwartz, *Never Satisfied: A Cultural History of Diets, Fantasies and Fat* (New York, 1983); Marcia Millman, *Such a Pretty Face: Being Fat in America* (New York, 1980); Roberta Seid, *Never Too Thin: Why Women Are at War with Their Bodies* (New York, 1989); Peter N. Stearns, *Fat History: Bodies and Beauty in the Modern West* (New York, 1997).

10. Tamara Hareven, "Life-Course Transitions and Kin Assistance in Old Age: A Cohort Comparison," in David Van Tassel and Peter N. Stearns, eds., *Old Age in Bureaucratic Society* (Westport, CT, 1986), 110–26.

11. Harry Levine, "The Discovery of Addiction: Changing, Conceptions of Habitual Drunkenness in America," *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 39 (1978): 143–69; Stanton Peele, "Addiction as a Cultural Concept," *Psychology: Perspectives and Practice. Annals of the New York Academy of Science 602* (1990): 205–20.

12. Edward Shorter, *The Making of the Modern Family* (New York, 1975): Lawrence Stone, *Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500–1800* (New York, 1979). It was Stone who opined that in premodern families one would find as much love as one would expect in a bird's nest, in contrast to the emotional intensity of modern family life.

13. It is important to be candid here. Behavioral history, as a new endeavor, needs some time to develop its potential for lesson drawing. Many historians, willing to offer historically derived advice, don't quite know how to do it without seeming presumptuous. They are much more comfortable pointing out erroneous historical references by other kinds of advice givers, as in the family realm where prescriptions routinely oversimplify past family forms and bathe them in a kind of false nostalgia that can actually impede a sensible take on current issues. For their part, audiences frequently crave a specific applicability to which few if any disciplines, history included, really lend themselves without serious distortion. What

we need, beyond greater experience, is some mutual accommodation, with historians willing to think about what behavioral changes might follow from their findings and how these can be framed, while audiences learn to take greater pleasure in analysis and understanding, realizing that much of the responsibility for applying behavioral history lies with individuals themselves.