Dear Mr. Hughes:

Thanks for the note about the Ceremony paper sent you in June. I hope you have not found time to read it, so that should you find time it can be sent on the enclosed version illustrating the Goffman-Parsons Law that later versions are longer versions. Added is a paper your duties have made you familiar with, and which I agree perhaps was not quite worth publishing.

Please save some England stories for us. Some day going to another country must be a degree requirement in sociology.

Regards,
I have just read your little monograph on the characteristics of total institutions. It is great stuff. I would like to make a few running comments. This is a subject in which I have been interested for a long time and in the last few years I have several times given a lecture to my institution class on institutions which have an element of restraint. This is not the same as your total institutions but, of course, the total institutions all do have an element of restraint. One is free to walk out of the monastery, I suppose, although it is not and has not always been true that he could do so, even if one were willing to go naked. The school boy in a boarding school is, of course, under a certain kind of restraint. Perhaps he would not be detained forcibly, but then again he might be. And of course girls are always climbing down drain pipes to get out of boarding schools and convents. Every little boy in school who looks out of a window at the cows in the field knows that he is not really free to get up and walk out. Likewise in the turpentine camp in the south the Negro workers were certainly no more free to leave than when they were on the chain gang. At least so it is said. This is a matter of degree that is of constraint or restraint, if you like. Sometimes people in mental hospitals are restrained and even in some mining camps they have been restrained as of course they can always be on board ship if something goes wrong. So perhaps we have two concepts here, that of institution in which there is some small measure or a large measure of restraint or constraint for one class of people to stay there. They are not completely free to come and go as is the case of the grand central station which you mention. The other dimension is that of totality. Although as in the case of the concentration camp or the totalitarian state, totality and restraint tend to go together. As a matter of fact I suppose one might think of almost all institutions...
in this perspective. There is some group of people who are as it were captives. Although it might be in some cases hard to say which is which. I was once held strongly captive by a class. It was a discussion group in one of our courses here. I really had nothing more to discuss and nothing was happening from the floor. So I said, well I guess we just better go home. One student spoke up and said, oh no, you don't, we have this half hour coming to us. I stayed to hear what he had to say and to discuss the interesting question whether he had really something coming to him. It was rather fun, but I was in a measure captive. In the case of the mental hospital and the school we know of course more or less what group are the captives. This brings up another item here, which perhaps you can fit into your dimension. That is the extent to which some one category of people in any group of institutions is there of its own will and accord. Children may love school, but they are there because their parents and perhaps community at large wants them to be there. The arrangement is not of their making. If there is a contact, there is a third party to it, and to this extent the functionaries of the school are like those of the mental hospitals, engaged in what you call "people work." As a matter of fact many of the situations of life involve a functionary doing something to or for someone else on the behalf of a third party. This seems to be the case with most of your total institutions, although perhaps not so in the case of the company town, or the turpentine camp. The turpentine camp, however, is a marginal case for it differs from the chain gang in that there have been no formal court proceedings. Very often the sheriff I understand did actually advise Negroes to go and to stay at a turpentine camp if they knew what was good for them. So that even in the case of certain total institutions there appears to be direct contact between the inmates and the functionaries in charge, in this case the employer still in some sense there may be a third party in the offering. I am sure you will catch up all these ideas quickly and will improve upon them. At least it appears to me that we have several dimensions
here: totality itself; restraint; that is, the dimension of relative unwillingness of the inmates to be there. Their lack of control over whether they are to be there or not, and third the question of agency. What are they there for, who are they there for, who are the parties involved, who is acting on whose behalf. This raises the question of mandate and of licence which are themes in the paper I will read on occupations at the society meetings at the end of this month. I would like to mention a few items of literature on this topic. Your bibliography is a good one. You might be interested in the thesis of Gordon Ericksen. Ericksen did the thesis here in our department, and it is about a little barracks community of aircraft mechanics who were sent out to Africa just before we were in the War to repair planes en route to the east. The men went in "voluntarily." It was a one sex community of young people, from which any individual was in theory free to resign, but there was no place to go and no way of getting back home. Ericksen kept a diary there, while he did not have your kind of insight or analytical mind. Still the material is very interesting and would be useful for your analysis. The big thing that I would add to your list is the work which I consider best of all on the subject of concentration camps. It is the book by A.S. Adler, entitled "Theresienstadt." I reviewed it for someone. I think it must have been commentary. Theresienstadt was the so-called paradise ghetto, established by the Nazis in Czechoslovakia as a place to intern Jews who were not German nationals; that is, the Jews of Czechoslovakia itself, Holland, and various other countries which were 'protected' by the Nazis. Adler himself was in Theresienstadt for nearly the whole of its course and has written a most remarkable record. One of the points of interest is the phantastic system of "self-government." Unlike most of the totalitarian or total institutions of which you speak, this one was established to destroy people. You do mention the concentration camps, of course. In Theresienstadt there was kept a circus illusion that the people who left were being transported to some mystical place in the east,
where Jews would settle on the land and would be restored to moral healthy after having been all these centuries parasites on the good people of Western Europe. Everyone knew this was a fiction, but no one punctured it openly. A system of self-government was set up, one of whose powers or duties rather was to make up the list of those who would be thus transported to the east, that is, to Auschwitz gas chambers. Of course the people making up the list could find themselves on the approved list came back from the SS officer in charge. Next morning, when the approved list came back from the SS officer in charge.

I think the Theresienstadt story was something of a dimension to the whole business of self government and the phantastic bastard or perverse identification of inmates with their masters. As a matter of fact for some time there was an apparently formed ardent group of young people in Theresienstadt who did something like the Hitler youth and who cultivated the true Germanic virtues by joy through sport. The book has not been translated, but perhaps you read German. Adler is working on some articles in English to give some of the main points of his work. The trouble is that he is trying in the English article to write an abstract sociology of the concentration camp. The book, which does do some extent, is better for your purposes, because of the material in it. You can also find my review of it somewhere in 1956. That is in Commentary.

The company town is another excellent example of the total institution, whether it be of the nice Hershey chocolate kind or whether it be a mining camp or a turpentine camp in the piney woods of the south. At one time I read a great deal of the subject and made some notes, which I would be glad to show you sometime when you come here. There were of course the model company towns such as Hershey and the Sunlight town of the Lever Brothers in England. There are some really nice company towns in the northern frontier of Canada, although in most of them the totalness is quite apparent. In the nice ones such as Pullman,
on which I wrote something, there was an attempt to use totalness to make what the founder regarded as an ideal community. In this they approached in some respects the sectarian communities which were so numerous on the American frontier. In Pullman there was a free theatre, a free library, there were gondolas on Lake Calumet, where young lovers were to court one another and breed good workers.

Something of the story how this broke up I have put in a little memorandum which I will send to you along with this. Someone has to follow all of these leads. I think you might have done more with the phenomenon of the kangaroo court. All of these total institutions seem to develop more or less some bastard judicial procedure for trying and punishing those who yield too much to the blandishments of those informal authority. In prison of course this is quite common; the army has not been without the kangaroo court; and even when I was a student, there was a trial, a sort of mock trial of a fellow who went to classes on the day when we had all decided to call a one-day celebration and did it. This poor fellow was a divinity student. The boys captured him almost physically, brought him to the back door of one of the fraternity houses, where a group of students in masks and balaclava judges' robes solemnly condemned him to death. Of course it was all a joke and no harm was done to him, no, was there any thought of doing him any physical harm. Nevertheless it humiliated him or would have humiliated him if it had not been that he was such a true believer that he did not quite know what was going on. He probably thought it was a foretaste of what the cannibals of Africa would do to him in the mission field. However, the idea is this, that there is a secret law of people of the masses of the underdogs, of the inmates; and that those who violate this law by yielding too much to the suppose higher law must be tried and punished by their peers. This is found to some extent in boarding schools. It is certainly found in prisons. Whether it is ever found in a mental hospital or a TB hospital, I do not know. You mention
Julius Roth and his work on the tuberculosis hospital. Have you seen his notes kept during the time when he was last in hospital himself? At that time he took a document from Sutherland's book The Professional Thief. He ran in parallel columns the things which happened to a newcomer in a prison and those which happened to a newcomer in a veteran's tuberculosis hospital.

Speaking now of the mental hospital attendant we had a student named Willoughby, who did a little master's thesis here on attendants in several state mental hospitals where he himself had worked as one. His contention is that these men are not so cruel as made out, but that it is very important to them to have a quiet routine life so far as possible. Disturbances bring in the nurse, the bring in the doctors; doctors mean investigations, inquires and the suggestion that the attendant was wrong. Willoughby tells of some of the practices which attendants adopt to keep patients quiet. The quiet patient, within limits, is the good one. He told of the way in which they wrap a wet towel around the neck of a patient who appears to be restless and aggressive, and twist until he can hardly breath. They say nothing, but the patient is supposed to understand that things will get very very painful indeed for him if he gets wild. Willoughby gives other cases to support his contention that the main object of the attendant in building up his own means of control is to keep the institution running, at least his corner of it, with a minimum of disturbance. Incidentally, therapy in any serious sense is a great disturbance of the routine. If one add to this the general notion among many attendants that these people are not so much sick as immoral, it is easy to understand how they develop a very strong ethos, a very strong set of rules of their own about how to act, rules which do not square with those held nominally at least by those in charge of the institution. All of these points bring up still another one which is an old one in sociology. There has long been the notion that an activity once
it is institutionalized is thwarted by the institution itself. It is almost as if one were to say the back achievement of a purpose and establishment of an institution are mutually exclusive. That is to say in the strongest sense, that schools are inimical to education, persons inimical to reform, and hospitals inimical to cure. Like most propositions of this kind it is not completely true, on the other hand it is true enough so that we need really to investigate much more thoroughly than we have. To what extent it is possible so to organize mental hospitals that therapy might be carried on at the level at which the best conceivable therapist would wish to carry it on with a patient, let us say with a private patient. Let us think of schools in this connection. To what extent would it be possible to organize institutions which would combine great freedom of the individual to learn what he will with excellent free running examples and models of learning and intellectual activity on part of the teachers. One might that such an institution, that is, the arrangement which would satisfy my condition would be socially frictionless, if it were possible to conceive an organization which is without friction. That is of course in itself a contradiction. But it would certainly have to be an arrangement with a minimum of discipline. As we know, howie Becker's school teachers complain greatly of having to devote their time to discipline. On the other hand it is quite likely that after having disciplined youngsters for some years most of the teachers could not possibly keep busy at anything like true teaching for more than a few minutes of each day. The effort would be excruciatingly painful. In colleges and universities even, if the youngsters were to work as hard at learning as we say we want them to do, it would again be painful and impossible for a large share of the staff. And of course when one does institutionalize an activity at least when one moves at all in the direction of your total institution, or of those which I say have some restraint in them, one must have a professional staff whether of the law order
of attendants or of the supposed high order of teachers and therapists. When
one has functionaries, one sets an upper as well as a lower limit on activities
of various kinds. That is to say, I believe it could be argued that the very
fact of organizing a school cuts down probably the best work of the best possible
student. That is to say, the best imaginable imaginable speed and rate of learning
of the best possible student in the best possible situation. Institutions may
perhaps be in and of themselves mechanisms for producing mediocrity, and
mediocrity is itself some sort of frustration of the very best. In the case of
many of your total institutions, let's say a good boarding school, it may of
course produce high level mediocrity, raising the general level of mental
and educational activity of those who become its inmates. I suppose the dumbest
most resistant student at old Oxford learned more Latin than most people who
didn't go to Oxford at all. Best possible students may have learned
less than they otherwise would have done. In the case of the mental hospital
I suppose it would be hard to say what society would be like without them.
Apart from the burden on families and I suppose the actual danger to families
and to people, the hospitals don't really do much. At least it seems to me
that very little in the way of therapy goes on in them, and I suppose it is an
open question whether those who get well might not have got well anyway. We
might therefore look at the mental hospital and ask what indeed is its function.
It would certainly turn out to be only in a very minor way that of therapy. I
notice I am beginning to wander off into rather obvious points which are
more familiar to you than to me. Let this be the end.
November 25, 1958

Mr. Erving Goffman
Department of Sociology
and Social Institutions
University of California
Berkeley 4, California

Dear Erving:

My thanks both for "The Moral Career" and for the verses.

I don't mind your calling me father and I know of no sin which requires forgiveness, but I did not realize they were about to crucify you. Let's hope that it is not so. Olive Streetbrook once said you would do a lot of very good and original work if they let you live.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

Everett C. Hughes

ECHGW
November 28, 1960

Erving Goffman
Department of Sociology and Social Institutions
University of California
Berkeley, California

Dear Erving:

You no doubt will have been one of the first to read David Riesman's thing on "Sociability, Permissiveness, and Equality" in the November issue of Psychiatry. I will call it to your attention anyway for it makes very skillful use of some of your leads on the presentation of self.

Please do me a great favor — have your complete bibliography to date duplicated and send me a few copies. I often have need of such a bibliography and have to spend a lot of time looking about to find the items. Just to make it fair play, I enclose a copy of my bibliography.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

Everett C. Hughes

ECH:jb

Copy of 17 from p. 27 of Lying Days by Borden, sec 11-29-63

QB
Dear Everett Hughes:

Thank you for the reading list, and for the lovely quote from Gordimer. I suppose in one's home there must be a special reason to be on guard, while in the world, there must be a special reason to be off it. In the New World, however, most of us developed some sense of one's house being a part of oneself (between 6 and 16 I lived in the same house), but how can we understand, say, the English sense of "own" town, of the utter foreignness of someone from the next village? (In Unst, Shetland, about 200 years are required for full membership, clusters of 10 or so cottages have an identifiable accent, and depopulation has left some single cottages sustaining an accent. By the way, I would greatly (as would my wife) appreciate any of your 59 or 30 pieces, almost as much as we would a visit from you.

Until Christmas I'll be in the field, and return for 9 months in August, the field in this case being the city of non-homes, Las Vegas. Tomorrow I get my police card to "go on the slots," and after a few days of that I'll start training to deal 21. The Establishment I'll start out in goes in heavy for roof mirrors behind which an invisible man watches the employees. To remind them that they are being watched he sends down daily chits reminding them that their shoes need polishing, etc. Of course he is hated, and is not allowed in any case to associate with help. The girls complain they can't straighten their bra without his knowing it, let alone sit down. If a player wins, the House gets sore at the dealer (or so he feels); and if a player loses, then he gets sore at the dealer; dealer gets it either way. A nice place to study the service relation and the frayed edges of American civilization. In any case, I'll save my card, collect one from Howie and members of all the other locals, and we'll present them to you on a birthday; for by their union cards you shall know the participant observers.

My regards to the managing editor,
August 23, 1961

Dr. Erving Goffman
Department of Sociology
University of California
Berkeley, California

Dear Erving:

Goffman rides again. Many thanks for Encounters, and when may I have the opportunity of encountering you in person. Thanks for the book.

Sincerely yours,

Everett C. Hughes

ECH:nh
November 14, 1961

Mr. Erving Goffman
Department of Sociology
University of California
Berkeley, California

Dear Erving:

I am on page 85, where you say "The staff problem here is to find a crime that will fit the punishment." This may very well be the most important statement in your whole treatment of total institutions. I have been reading a great deal about Africa lately, and it is quite clear that in Africa they decide to punish the Negro and then seek the crime of which to accuse him. The more I think of it, the more I think that this is the key to a theory of criminology or, let's say, a theory of punishment.

When I shall have finished Asylums, I will write you at length. I have made a lot of notes, including at one point reference to Montesquieu and The Spirit of the Laws. I may even review the book and try to foist the review on some publication.

Congratulations and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

Everett C. Hughes
Professor of Sociology
Dear Everett:

Thanks for your note about Asylums. I hope you like it, including the later papers that should have been cut and criticized before being published. To have as one's teacher someone better than oneself, who reads what one writes and likes it, is rather a special experience, in part, I'm afraid, a family feeling.

A crime to fit the punishment. An attempt is made to complete the sentence on page 384. For wherever there is punishment there is a theory of the human nature of the person punished that makes the punishment seem the only right course of affairs. And a crime is taken as an "expression" of the nature of this constructed person. So, we not only construct a crime to fit the punishment, we also construct a criminal's nature to fit his crime and his punishment. Here is the salt in the wound, the moral price he must pay for others making him pay a price. The more one is made to bear the lash, the more one must then bear up the lashers.

Do send notes if you have them. Any chance of you and Helen visiting California?
May 9, 1966

Professor Erving Goffman
Department of Sociology
University of California
Berkeley, California

Dear Erv:

I just now picked off the shelf your book Stigma. You sent it to me with a very nice inscription, -- I suppose three years ago when it was published. The inscription is nice in two senses -- accurate, I suppose, and also friendly. As I take the book off the shelf I find in it some sheets of hand-written notes, which I wrote about the book as I read dit on an airplane. The yellow paper is quite faded so I must have written the notes two or three years ago. They follow. I have very godd impulses, but I usually don't quite finish the action.

The odd thing about this is that I also picked off my shelf this morning the book called Die Peripheren. The book, Die Peripheren was written as I say in my notes by a German refugee who had fled before the Nazis. He most certainly must have been thinking of the problem for many years. I was lecturing the class or discussing with them the whole problem of identification noting how that if any of us was not in some respects clear he simply would not exist -- we would be a non-person. That brought to mind the book about peripheral people, Park's Marginal Man, and your book on Stigma.

There you have it. I have other things on my mind, but perhaps you will sometime turn up where I can talk to you. With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

Everett C. Hughes

Grunfeld, Ernst. *Die Peripheren*. Amsterdam, 1939

ECH: 11
Forgive me oh Father
For one more favor
A stolen word
From your "Moral division of labor."
Don't forget to send the notes to him later.
Do you know a little book

*The Periphery* (Peripheral People)
written by a refugee in Holland
on his first stage of flight from
the Nazis — he included
crippled, etc. To think the
coming of the Nazis made a

revulsion when more remarkable
a change in norms could make
any of us stigma­ized.

I'm standing among
the crowd in the subway train,
with colored hair and grey eyes
among the small, rich, complex:ful
people with black hair & slant
eyes that catch the light.

I learned how an albino
albinoid feels, but was certainly
looked at constantly.

But are we not stigma­ized.
deft-handed, one shoulder higher
than the other, teacher's son
who liked school, eating, the
small. I made a virtue of
left-handed. Took exercises
for years to straighten my
black (and my 12th year or so had
get away from the cry 'High­down'
"As for being the preacher's son, it was easy for my brother and me to be a little more serious, to be exceptionally good at baseball & fighting. The priest & leading the class were no handicap; the village respected the minister & really did not expect us to be like everyone else. Besides, only those finished high school who meant to go to college.

Prof. Aron (Chicago) once told me the story of a little intellectual, near-sighted Jew became the companion at their place of work with a hunchback. One day the Jew proudly got confidential & told his friend, "I've got a secret to tell you. I'm a Jew." His friend replied, "Now I can tell you my secret. I'm a hunchback." There is literature a member of such friendships of two stigmas."

Have you read Dickens? "Great Expectations," the penal colony escapee with a great scar. Once in the time of a woman. Our Mutual Friend..."
Dickens, also Les Misérables.

p.l.e. The Saints. Every Catholic is supposed to pick a saint to emulate, not as a point for the saint is not really normal. He exhibits the ordinary virtues in an heroic degree. That very phrase tells us that it is not normal to be that holy.

The costume of the priest or man is the badge of his because he is holier than others. The man cannot wear even be offered a drink (except that I heard of a French-Canadian who spirited the drink of his sister who was a nun and got her drunk on a visit home — it was considered a great joke.)

The costume is a sort of stigma, almost as good as a brand, a mark of letter.

Every profession, in some measure, means a stigma — undertake to handle dead people, doctors cut it. Normal people don't do that things.
20 November 1968

Professor Erving Coffman
Department of Sociology
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19100

Dear Erving:

Is a man really respectable if mail addressed to him is returned to the sender? Of course, nobility put a notice in the TIMES that no mail will be answered during an absence in Europe, but I saw no such notice. The letter simply wandered around and eventually came back.

Sincerely yours,

Everett C. Hughes

ECH/es
Enc.
February 12, 1969
(Dictated 2/4/69)

Professor Erving Goffman
Department of Sociology
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Dear Erving:

How appropriate of Time to put side by side on their section on Behavior the story of Goffman and a piece on left-handers. I love the piece about you; whoever did it had got the main points pretty well. As I read it I thought of a bright spring morning in which I sat in a class of Park’s many years ago. It was on the ground floor in Harper and we looked out to the green midway. He was talking about the sensitivity of people to each other’s behavior. Somebody in the class raised his hands to object; after all people did not pay all that much attention to what was going on around them and most people didn’t care what other people present might think. Park answered as follows: Look out there in the midway, what a lovely spring morning. Just think how it would be nice to be walking out there in your BVD’s with the wind blowing around your legs. Now tell me, why did you wear pants to school this morning? Park, also, at some time perhaps in the class (perhaps personally) spoke of his first hanging as a reporter. It was a rather stupid young man, up somewhere in the northwest, who had killed somebody in his family and was being hanged. And here was everyone gathered around and this young man who had never been before a big crowd before in his life stood up on the platform ready to be hanged. He did not look horrified or anything of that sort; he was embarrassed, and stood there with a sort of sheepish grin on his face in front of all those people.

Now about the left-handers. I happen to be a sinister. In fact, I think I was one of the first who was allowed to remain so. My father marched me to school to the first grade when I was five and informed the "old war horse" who had been the first grade teacher of my younger uncles and my older brothers that I was left-handed. Miss Marsh replied, "Mr. Hughes, many have come to this room left-handed, none has ever left it left-handed." My father replied, "Miss Marsh, Everett will then be the first," and he outfaced her. She made no attempt on my left-handedness. It is an interesting thing to be left-handed. My next older brother had the distinction of having been born on the 29th of February. This was always a peculiarity which he could carry with him. When he did have a birthday, that was wonderful! As a matter of fact, he didn’t have on when he was four years old because that was 1900 and the way the calendar works the 100’s are not leap years, so he didn’t have a birthday until he was eight. Thus there was great attention given to his non-birthdays every year, and a fantastic to-do when he was eight. All the family gathered around: grandparents, great uncles, cousins — dozens of cousins — and no doubt some neighbors. With this I could only compete by being left-handed. And it
is a pretty good show. You can get a certain amount of distinction in the family by being the left-hander. Everybody is ready to notice it and of course you can say it various ways. I played it to be left-handed whenever it was to my advantage and at the same time to acquire enough skill to avoid attention when I wanted to. We were too poor in our parsonage to buy a special set of baseball mitts for me, but I learned just the same to do things with the baseball mitt on the wrong hand, and acquired a certain notoriety as a good pitcher, catcher and shortstop. There I took advantage of my left-handedness. However, I took great care to learn to hold the cup in my right hand so I would not be noticeable at dinner time, or at table, I should say, by peculiar behavior. Even so, however, my knife and fork behavior was always wrong end too and was sometimes remarked upon by other people, but at any rate, I conquered the handling of cups and glasses with the right hand. I also learned to use the scythe and certain instruments of that kind with the right hand, since it would have been just too ridiculous to try to get anyone to manufacture anything so crooked as a scythe handle in reverse for a left-hander. And I wanted to be in on these skills. I also learned to handle a left-handed repeating rifle with my right hand, although along with my left-handedness I aimed from the left eye. As a matter of fact, I do shoot left-handed, but simply reached over the butt with my right hand to get hold of the hammer. This was quite a trick but I did it and became a marksman good enough to rank with most.

Sometimes you should put your pixie-like mind to work on the advantage which people take of their smaller peculiarities. Such as having been born on the 29th of February or being left-handed. In addition to being left-handed, I had distinct inequality of level of my shoulders. So much so, that when I was in the fourth or fifth grade I was called high-low shoulders. This, however, I did not wish to take advantage of and the local doctor (the same one who had told my father that he was under no circumstances to allow me to be changed into a right-hander) gave me a set of exercises which I followed morning and night for a good ten years, from about the time when I was eight or nine years old until I was all through college, to straighten up that affair. It soon got beyond the point of being noticed. And as a matter of fact, in course of that, I became a person who paid rather particular attention to walking and standing straight. I am sure that in any family there is a certain interaction, at table, in the living room, out playing, and everywhere in which each member learns to make the most of his slight differences if something can be made of them and to play down the others which do not help him in building the kind of self that he would like to present to others. Left-handedness might have in some ways been much more important than one would think in the formation of my whole self. I have a good many other ideas on this point but will not at this moment pester you with them.
This is written on the occasion of having seen the article in *Time*. It has a deeper meaning. I have it on my mind to write to all the people who did something for the Festschrift. It seemed a good occasion to write what might be a second thanks to you for your piece in it. The interesting thing about that is that most of the people who wrote in it did really catch some facet of me. It must have been a matter of resonance. I certainly did not create anything in any of those people. You, for example, came down from Toronto already with your feelers out in all directions to pull which you have since not only perceived but called to the attention of others. I am very grateful to all of you who had a share in that gift.

Sincerely yours,

Everett C. Hughes

ECH: mf
Dear Everett:

That was a very nice letter on *Time*, time, and left-handedness. It made me feel what I do when I read one of your book reviews. There is the command through memory of one's past, something that must come from what a novelist has and from having respect for past events because they were events. I have none of it, and still at my late age look only forward. And more important, there is that commitment to the jointly lived life of one's discipline that leads you to write book reviews and letters in the first place. No one insists on it; you don't put the pieces in a bibliography. They are something extra, something that won't get paid for, something to show that even when an official occasion is not in progress, a man should be involving himself in the life that exists between himself and others. They always tell me, those pieces of yours, what I am not that I should be. They do what your seminars did for us (besides, that is, giving us the conceptual framework we would later live off), they do what you may not think you did and what the *Festschrift* fails maybe to show that you did; they provide, to put it simply, a sense that sociological inquiry is real. Underneath it all, I think that is the task teachers are really involved in: to demonstrate that what they do is substantial and real. The point about yourself is that you did that job for so many of us -- not because you had many students but because you had that effect on so many of the ones you had. And you do it still. And that is the lesson of the master. Thanks.

Regards to Helen,

Yours,

[Signature]

Erving Goffman
June 9, 1969
(Toronto, 6/5/69)

Professor Erving Goffman
Department of Anthropology
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Dear Erving:

In reading about hanging, I am reminded of a story Park told. His first hanging assignment as a reporter was somewhere in the Northwest, North Dakota or perhaps in Minnesota. The person to be hanged was a young Swedish farm boy not very bright. Park said that he himself had to write hard in order not to vomit. He kept writing as hard as he could, noting all sorts of details about the large number of people gathered to see this great event and then writing about the victim himself.

The victim had never before been before a crowd. He stood up there ready to be hanged, while the prayer was being said, and so on, with a sheepish, embarrassed, little grin: a grin of a timid boy before a great crowd, and that was the look on his face when he was hanged.

I am reviewing the collection of yours -- that face-work in it and the whole business on chance and action. I am enjoying the reading and am deciding now what to say about it in a review. I think it best, however, not to tell you the line I will take.

Yours truly,

Everett C. Hughes
Dear Everett:

I am glad indeed that you can come and visit with us in New York. The meeting is on urban ethnography in general and race in particular. A letter from John Szwed ought to have reached you by now with the details. If it hasn't and doesn't, do let me know and I'll have another sent.

I enjoyed your article on the occupationally sacred and profane. Regards to Helen.

Erving Goffman

EG/lac
January 7, 1970

Dear Everett:

It was very nice of AJS to send you my book of papers to review, and nicer still that you were willing to do it and nicest of all what you did with it.

Thanks. Seasons greetings to Helen.

Regards,

Erving

EG/lac
23 February 1970

Prof. Erving Goffman
Dept. of Anthropology
University of Pennsylvania

Dear Erving:

Yesterday there came in the mail an offprint of your "The Insanity of Place." I have a busy day but I have had time already to read the first page. You speak of how "the whole be made to share the burden." I wonder whether you are going to raise the question which I have sometimes heard raised about which person from a sick set-up, as you call it, should be the one to be locked up. I have often heard people say, "They locked up the wrong member of that family." Perhaps you will raise that question later on in the paper. I will read it over the week-end.

I enclose to you a rambling paper which I read to the ASA meeting in September.

With best wishes,

Yours truly,

Everett C. Hughes

Enc.

P. S. I guess the reason I am stimulated to writing you first thing off this morning is that when Helen was getting up a list of people to ask for dinner next week, I suggested she put you on the list. She reminded me that you don't live here. Well, it isn't far.
Prof. Erving Goffman  
Dept. of Anthropology  
University of Pennsylvania  
33rd St. and Spruce St.  
Philadelphia, Penna. 19104

Dear Erving:

On August 8, 1957 I dictated a memorandum to you starting with the sentence, "I have just read your little monograph on the characteristics of total institutions. It is great stuff." I then dictated comments which run to eight pages. The reason I know this is that I have just run across a transcription addressed to you from me on University of Chicago memorandum paper. Do you remember whether I ever sent you a copy? If not, I will send you one now.

With best wishes,

Yours,

Everett C. Hughes
March 24, 1970

Professor Everett C. Hughes  
Department of Sociology  
Boston College  
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts 02167

Dear Everett:

Yes, I got your recommendations but don't have them available any more, so if you can, please do send what you found. Why can't we have dinner some time some place? Regards to Helen.

Erving Goffman

EG/lac
31 March 1976

Prof. Erving Goffman
Department of Anthropology
University of Pennsylvania
University Museum
33rd and Spruce Street
Philadelphia, Pa. 19104

Dear Erv:

I will have a copy of those notes sent on to you. We will be in New York for the Eastern Sociological meetings. Might we meet then?

Yours,

Everett C. Hughes

FC:nh

Enc.
29 July 1970

Prof. Erving Goffman
Dept. of Anthropology
University of Pennsylvania
33rd and Spruce Streets
Philadelphia, Penna. 19104

Dear Erving:

I have meant for some time to thank you for the reprint of "The Insanity of Place."

When I was a youngster, I used to go often with my next older brother to spend some time on a very large farm which was run by one of my uncles. We loved to be allowed to handle a team of horses and go off to a field a mile from the house to bring in a load of hay or other grain. The question was when should one come in out of the rain? There are those big thunderheads overhead, coming your way; maybe a few drops fall. If one comes in to the house, or to the barn, that is, with an empty wagon and it doesn't rain, he is ashamed and considered somewhat guilty. On the other hand, if he gets a load of hay or grain on the wagon and it gets soaked because he didn't come in at the right time, that, too, is bad. There are all sorts of "when to come out of the rain" situations in medicine and in family life. It is, it seems to me, exactly the style of problem you should work on.

This spring a member of my close kin connection suffered a stroke. It was obviously quite bad and after a day or so it was evident that he could not communicate with anyone. But it was uncertain how long he might live and what kinds of decisions might be taken by his own grown children and the medical staff of the hospital. The question arose whether I and another brother (for this was our brother) should set off to southern Ohio for a possible last look at the oldest one of us and the first one to be about to die. (There were six of us.) My next brother and I, the two closest to the age of the suffering one, kept in touch with each other on the phone and with the family and decided not to go. We might have gone and been there a month, or we might have started and not got there in time. In any case it was clear that we could not communicate with our brother if we got there in any respect. It was also clear that his own children - who are very capable and competent -
were there and that the doctors did not want any more visitors. So we did not come in out of the rain. We simply stayed at home. One brother, however, came in from California and was away from home a little longer than he could well afford until finally our brother did die. If you make any use of this case, do it without connecting it with anyone. But there is always this question of the bargain between the doctor and the family in this sort of case: there is always the question of the decision of who should come to the bedside and from what distance and who should stay away. In this case the two brothers who were closest in their age and had really been childhood playmates of the person who was about to die did not go. We felt clean in conscience and glad that we remembered our brother as we last saw him which was only a short time ago. There were other complications than this, but it seems to me this is the kind somebody should be working on. Incidentally, this case involved homeostatic functioning of the human machine for my brother's stroke turned up in the form of uncontrollable high temperature. His thermometer had stopped working. Also other of the homeostatic functions stopped and this meant that in order for him to live, the hospital machinery had to be used to perform these functions - which meant that he was not a self-operating machine anymore. But every moment that he continued to live was based on a decision of the people operating the machinery. How that decision was arrived at between my brother's grown children and the doctors I do not know, but I am practically certain that there was a decision. One of the children is a very sensible woman, a trained nurse, who handles emergencies very sympathetically and well. My brother lived about ten days after the stroke, long enough for the implication of his condition to become clear even to those who were closest to him.

Yours,

Everett C. Hughes
9 February 1971

Professor Erving Goffman
Dept. of Anthropology
University of Pennsylvania
33rd and Spruce Streets
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

Dear Erv:

One of my students, who is mainly a football player and, only incidentally a student, has written a paper on a Total Institution of which I enclose a xerox copy.

I also refer you to The New Yorker, February 6, 1971, which has an article entitled, "Only Human" by Elizabeth Cullinan about another Total Institution.

Sincerely yours,

Everett C. Hughes

ECH: s
Enclosure
Dear Everett:

Thanks for the paper on football practice and reference to the New Yorker article, which otherwise I would have missed.

The football business is interesting. Many years ago Lloyd Warner said that the first effort at Yankee City was weak in regard to churches because the people who worked for him were not the sort who frequented the houses of the Lord, either in actual practice or in the fieldworker fantasies of it he wanted to study. Someday you should write a note on the areas that sociologists tend to overlook because of the various sources of their own provincialism. In spite of the apparent interest in the lower orders, the masculine world of football, beer drinking, and the like, is one of them. Thanks for reminding me.

Regards to Helen. Will you be at the Colorado meetings?
Dear Erving:

I have been looking this morning for a copy of a lecture which I gave in a course on institutions, noting from Cooley's the chapter on "Social Institutions" where he said, "Institutions are made up of people, but of only parts of people; thus, the legal part of a lawyer." I went on to say some institutions use only one part of a person, but others such as nunneries and prisons remain in control of the whole person and of all their mind and effort, and even dictate what clothes they must wear. I think you were in that class. I can't find that copy now, but I did have it typed up. Maybe it was taken down at the time by a dictating machine. I don't find it now, but still hope I may find it somewhere.

However, in the course of looking I found a typed "Draft of a Ph.D. thesis, Erving Goffman." I find I have several copies of it. I am sending one to you although it may be that you have it already.

I become more and more grateful to colleagues and circumstances which prevented me from trying to separate social science into numerous departments unrelated to each other.

With best wishes.

Yours,

Everett C. Hughes

ECH:s
Enclosure