THE MANSON FAMILY: THE FOLKLORE TRADITIONS OF A SMALL GROUP

Gary Alan Fine

Over the past decade folklorists have begun to study groups with increasingly local traditions, bringing about a cross-fertilization of folkloristics with group dynamics.[1] Folklore is seen as characteristic of individual small groups and may not be diffused outside of that social circle. My goal in this article is to describe the folk culture of one small group (the Manson Family) and, in the process, to explicate some features which affect the creation and continuation of small-group folklore generally.

Every group engaging in meaningful interaction will develop a culture (folklore)[2] of its own, which I term its *idioculture*.[3] An idioculture is defined as a system of knowledge, beliefs, behaviors, and customs particular to an interacting group to which members can refer and employ as the basis of further interaction. Members recognize that they share experience and knowledge and that these topics can be referred to with the expectation that other members will understand them. By "traditionalizing" their activities, participants construct shared meanings.[4]

In folklore most attention has been paid to the family as a generator of folklore traditions because of its relative stability and because of the emotional salience of the internal relationships. As a rule, the longer a group has been functioning, the greater the social and psychological importance of the group to its members; the more stable the membership and the more intense the interaction, the larger and more robust will a group's culture be. While families are prototypes of small-group cultures, similar analyses have focused on fraternities, friendship cliques, boy scout troops, and military units.[5]

THE MANSON FAMILY AS A FOLK GROUP

To indicate the range of folklore possible in a small group, I have chosen a dramatic case study, recognizing that few groups have a comparable range or content of traditions. In this article I shall examine published accounts of the Family of Infinite Soul—the communal group formerly headed by Charles Manson.[6] The data about the Manson Family covers the period from 1967, the year Manson was released from prison, to 1970, the year he and other Family members were convicted of the Tate-LaBianca murders in Los Angeles. Because the Manson Family existed for several years, had considerable psychological importance for its members, and was characterized by intense interaction (although membership was not always stable), its culture was considerably more extensive than other groups. Despite the difference in cultural extent, this analysis should be relevant to cultural processes in small groups generally.

IDIOCULTURE AS A CRITERION OF GROUP MEMBERSHIP

Culture is an emergent property of group interaction. At the inception of a group, an idioculture does not exist, but its formation begins in the opening moments of group interaction.[7] When individuals meet, they typically begin to construct a shared culture by asking for names and other biographical points which can be referred to subsequently or by attempting to build on common knowledge or interests. Eventually the expressive lore of a group becomes self-generating, and it is not necessary for questioning to occur for the culture to continue. As a culture develops, it increasingly becomes a focus for group reference and action. A member who attempts to enter an existent group must remain in the background until a substantial portion of the group's cultural traditions has been mastered.

From this, the following axiom may be proposed: *Knowledge and acceptance of a group's idioculture is a necessary and sufficient condition distinguishing members of a group from nonmembers.* Bales has noted that "[m]ost groups develop a subculture that is protective for their members, and is allergic, in some respects, to the culture as a whole. . . . They [the members] draw a boundary around themselves and resist intrusion."[8] In the countercultural Manson Family, this boundary maintenance function was of critical impor-

tance, and Manson tested potential recruits by observing their reactions to bizarre sexual orgies[9] or by asking them to die for him.[10] This boundary maintenance function was accentuated by the creation of bizarre names for members, which effectively isolated them from their previous lives[11] and labelled them as members of the Family of Infinite Soul[12] (e.g., Ouish, Snake, Sadie Mae Glutz, and Squeaky).

Groups are characterized by lore that is a collective representation of members. Some groups, including the Manson Family and fraternal lodges, have severe penalties for disclosing seemingly trivial information, although penalties for central information are far greater. Revelation is said to alter the nature of the social ties among members and their sense of community.

A corollary of the above axiom is based on this secrecy: *The greater the perceived difference between the public image implicated by an item in a group's idioculture and the group's desired public image, the more the group will attempt to shield that information from its public.* This corollary predicts the hostile reaction to tattletales, informers, and, generally, those who threaten the group's desired public image.

Exposing secret information reveals a lack of commitment to group norms and, thus, to the group. After one member revealed incriminating information in jailblock conversations, she recognized the repercussions of her actions:

> I've failed again. I've given up sacred information to outsiders and betrayed my own people. I'm going to be fingered from both sides. The world will never understand me. They will hate me. . . . They will never trust me again.[13]

One Family member was given a hamburger laced with a deadly dose of LSD when it was feared that she would testify inappropriately.[14]

IDIOCULTURAL CREATION IN THE MANSON FAMILY

Folklore is not created through random thoughts or actions, but is the outcome of social forces. Five elements are central to the explanation of the presence and salience of a group tradition—that it be known, usable, functional, appropriate in terms of the group's status hierarchy, and triggered by an experienced event. Each of

these processes is congruent with folklore theory, and each applies to the folk culture of the Manson Family.

Known Culture

The first criterion of whether a potential cultural element will become part of an idioculture is that the item or its component elements be known by at least one group member. This background information is the ***known culture*** of the group, and is the reservoir from which lore is generated. For example, studies of occupational folklore find that workers generate their folklore from their shared environment.[15] Typically the larger the proportion of members who are aware of the components of a potential item of folklore, the more likely will the item eventually be accepted and incorporated into the idioculture.

Members of the Manson Family, notably Manson himself, had access to a wide range of information. In prison Manson became aware of such diverse sources of cultural knowledge as pimping, magic, warlockry, Masonic lore, the Bible, the Beatles' lyrics, scientology, ego games (he borrowed from Berne's *Games People Play*) and science fiction (notably Heinlein's *Stranger in a Strange Land*).[16] Susan Atkins noted that prison lore was the source of her Family nickname Sadie Mae Glutz; Glutz is prison argot for a guard.[17] Creativity poses no problem for this view since new items are described as novel combinations of previously familiar elements.[18] The form into which the Manson Family shaped their beliefs and traditions was novel, but the substance was familiar.

Often the core of a group's identity is those cultural elements that differentiate members from nonmembers, particularly in intense groups. The special understandings that Family members had of the Beatles' *White Album* indicated to group members that they were different from outsiders. The lyrics of the album fit remarkably well into the Manson Family's world view:

> The central doctrine of Charlie's new teaching was Helter Skelter—Armageddon, the Last War on the Face of the Earth, the battle between blacks and whites in which the entire white race [except the Family] would be annihilated. . . .
>
> That wasn't all the Beatles knew, either, Charlie added. They knew that Jesus Christ had returned to earth and was somewhere near Los Angeles. . . . It was all there in the music, he'd say; just listen to the music. Didn't they have a song about "Sexy Sadie" that described Susan Atkins to a tee, long after Charlie had christened

her Sadie Mae Glutz? Didn't they tell blackie it was time for him to rise up, when in their song "Blackbird" they said: "Blackbird singing in the dead of night. . ./All your life/You were only waiting for this moment to arise. . .?"

And there was more, much more. The proof that the Beatles knew about Charlie, knew that he was in Los Angeles and were urging him to speak out, to sing the truth to the world, was in their song, "Honey Pie":

> Oh honey pie my position is tragic
> Come and show me the magic
> Of your Hollywood song. . .[19]

Manson correctly assumed that outsiders were not aware of the meanings that he divined, and that he and his group were unique because of their insight.

Usable Culture

The second criterion is that a potential cultural element be usable; in other words, it must be mentionable in group interaction. Some potential folklore, although known, may not be usable because of sacred/tabooed implications. References to bodily functions and explicit sexuality are frequently tabooed topics, although not in the Manson family.

The usability of expressive lore is not the result of objective criteria, but of social meanings deriving from group beliefs. Taboos are culturally specific, and a group's belief structure influences the expressibility of a particular item. Personality, religious tenets, and political ideology affect the probability that a remark or action will be defined as permissible.

Lore may become part of a group's idioculture if most members can express it within the group. Further, an element of a group's lore will be significant to the group to the extent that those outside of the group do not find this element usable.[20] Those elements of an idioculture that are inappropriate for outsiders are particularly likely to become central if the group sees itself as in opposition to the normative expectations of "Society." Cultural items usable among Family members were improper for members of "straight" society. Awareness of the rites of satanism is not sufficient—one must be willing to perform them.

The value of fear was stressed by Manson and was incorporated into Family lore. While most groups attempt to repress or conquer fear, the Family revelled in it. Manson applauded a state of mind

he termed *coyotenoia*, in honor of the animal he felt was afraid of everything and, thus, totally aware.[21] Children were honored in the Family because of their supposed total state of fear and awareness. Manson considered children to be kings or gods because of their freedom from social restrictions: "We want lots of babies. . . . They're the kings of this world—completely uninhibited and free from all the garbage of society. We can let them grow up free—free from the plastic world."[22] Breaking the "fear force" was an important theme for the Family, and it provoked other elements that were unusable among most groups, e.g., picking up live rattlesnakes or filming "snuff" (death) movies in which murder was carefully simulated.

The Family's open sexuality allowed for the expression of folk traditions unacceptable in most other groups. The legend of the "Gobble Miracle" is one dramatic example:

> Zonked on lysergic acid, Manson was being blown by a hysteria-prone young adept named Bo. . . . During the gobble the girl went nuts and, all in one incision, bit in twain Manson's virility. Then, through the miracle of magic, Manson, they claim, at once healed his tragic amputation.[23]

The theme of this legend is traditional, with several component motifs: S176.1 "Mutilation: emasculation;" D2161 "Magic healing power."[24] Hoffman includes in his erotic motif index: D2161.3.10.1 "Penis miraculously regrown."[25] Despite the traditionality of this tale, its form and meaning are localized.

The "sacrilege" of members of the group comparing Charles Manson to Jesus Christ is only possible in a group in which Christian religious propriety is not required. As a result, the Family held a ritual recreation of the crucifixion, modified to meet their needs:

> Not far from the Spahn Ranch the Family discovered an almost secret clearing guarded by a natural surrounding wall of large boulders. On one side of the clearing was a hill. The Hill of Martyrdom. For upon this hilly boulder-shrouded secret clearing was performed perhaps the world's first outdoor LSD crucifixion ceremony.
>
> There they snuffed Charlie, in role as Jesus, strapping . . . him to an actual rustic cross, while others, acting as tormentors and apostles, jeered or weeped. One chosen female was Mother Mary cloaked and weeping at the foot of the cross.[26]

While the Manson Family permitted a wide range of normally unex-

pressible thoughts to be expressed; in all groups, norms affect the traditions that can be promulgated and spread.

Functional Culture

The third influence on the development of an idioculture, and the one most widely recognized by folklorists, is the functional needs of the group as a social unit and of individual members. Potential group-cultural elements which are known and usable may still not become part of a group's idioculture if they are not perceived as being supportive of the needs of the group and its members—needs which may include group polarization or conflict.[27]

The idioculture of the Manson Family provides support for the supposition that lore serves functional ends. One of Manson's conscious goals was to keep the group together,[28] despite forces hostile to its continued existence. These centrifugal forces included police pressure, insolvency, and ridicule by nonmembers and outside disrupters. As a result, personnel turnover in the Family was substantial in the two years before the Tate-LaBianca murders.

Free and open sexuality drew members to the group. Manson informed Lynette "Squeaky" Fromme at her initiation: "I am the god of fuck."[29] The four-female-to-one-male ratio and the submission of the females drew male members, whom Manson required to protect the group and to execute his apocalyptic vision. The messianic belief system of Manson and his group encouraged members to believe that they were the "chosen people." Manson and other group members compared themselves to Jesus and his Disciples, and defined society as the Romans.[30] One member was known as Apostle Paul and another was Mary Magdalene.

Like many groups with apocalyptic visions, the Family believed that they were to be saved. This belief in their salvation required continued membership for those who accepted this world view:

> The next day or the day after that (at least sometime very soon), Los Angeles and all the other pig cities would be in flames. It would be the Apocalypse, the deserved judgment on the whole sick establishment that hated us and all the other free children, the establishment that had cheated Charlie out of his genius. While the rich piggies lay butchered on their own manicured front lawns, we would have found safety. Charlie would have led us through a secret Devil's Hole into the Bottomless Pit: an underground paradise beneath Death Valley where water from a lake would give everlasting life and you could eat fruit from twelve magical trees—a different one for

> each month of the year. That would be Charlie's gift to us, his children, his Family.[31]

This belief contains traditional mythological motifs, but has a future reference rather than a past one.

Appropriate Culture

Some potential idiocultural elements, while functional for satisfying group goals or personal needs, will not become incorporated into group lore because they undermine the group structure by not supporting power and status relationships in the group. Potential folkloric elements that are consistent with the group's social relations are termed the *appropriate culture* of the group.

This recognition of the relationship of group structure and folklore content is particularly evident in regard to nicknames. Many nicknames are evaluative,[32] and fit the target's status or role. Thus, the diminutive stature of Charles Manson (5'2") is striking, yet group members tactfully refrained from assigning him a "serious" diminutive nickname, such as "Shorty."[33] The nickname "JC" fit Manson's group position, whereas "Shorty" would not have fit. It is also significant that Paul Watkins, for a time Charlie's right-hand man, was nicknamed the "Apostle Paul" or "daddy's boy."[34]

A highly stratified group such as the Manson Family is particularly prone to create and retain idiocultural elements that reinforce power relationships. A substantial portion of the idioculture of the Family was directly supportive of Manson's position. The belief that he had already experienced his final death in Death Valley and that he had the ability to outstare a rattlesnake were both supportive of Manson's divinely-based leadership. One member reports: "I once saw him walking through a gully full of rattlesnakes, gliding among them and gouching them gently on the tails. None of them struck."[35] Manson's position even affected the artifacts of the family:

> One thing we girls made that was special . . . was a multi-colored vest for Charlie. . . . The unspoken idea was that your contribution represented how much you loved Charlie. As the last touch, we used our own hair and wove a hair lining and hair tassels for it.[36]

Quasi-religious legends spread about Manson's powers—including the Gobble Miracle, discussed above, and a Christ-motif legend:

> Evidently Brooks Posten was able to go into a trance on command and Charlie commanded him to die. So he died. He went into a trance that lasted three or by some accounts five days. As he lay wasting on a couch in the living room the girls would clean up after his natural functions and even Charlie would try to pull him out of it but he couldn't. So on the fifth day, lo! Charlie commanded that his very own sacred embroidered grey corduroy vest [presumably the one described above] be placed beneath Brooks as a symbolic diaper. Horrified with the prospect of Jesus' very own vest being used as a diaper, Brooks revivified himself from his trance. Or so it is told.[37]

A thematically similar legend concerned Manson breathing life into a dead bird, and breaking windows and destroying building through the power of his voice. Manson, his followers said, could make old men young again.[38]

The customs relating to the role of women also supported the structure of the group. The rule that the female members (roughly 75% of the group) could not speak to the infants in order to prevent the infants being contaminated, reinforced the women's low status. Similarly, the Family's lack of acceptance of another member who proclaimed himself to be Jesus Christ[39] prompted that individual to withdraw from the group—indicating the rejection of inappropriate cultural elements and those who propose them.

Triggering Event

The four factors I have described are constraints on folklore creation and usage. If a potential item of folklore is not known, usable, functional, or appropriate, it will not become traditional. In addition, a performance mechanism is necessary to account for which of many *potential* items enter a group's cultural repertoire. The concept of a triggering event is postulated to explain the creation or selection of cultural items. Verbal art, the content of which can subsequently become traditional, is grounded in the particular circumstances of a group. This "triggering event" can be any action or recognition which produces a response, and it is analogous to the concept of a precipitating factor for collective behavior.[40] Although in theory anything may produce a cultural tradition, some events, thoughts, and situations recur and these are particularly likely to generate artful communication. In addition, triggering events which members define as particularly notable or unusual are especially likely to stimulate cultural creation.[41]

Apparently Manson's first acid trip was an impetus for his Jesus identity.[42] Although other LSD users have had similar experiences, Manson could transform a personal vision into traditional lore because the belief was known, usable, functional, and appropriate for his group. The birth of Susan Atkins' child Zezo Ze-ce Zadfrak proved to be a salient triggering event for the Family, and the event acquired legendary overtones:

> When Sadie announced to the happy family that she was about to give birth, Charlie sent Sadie to boil some water. He sent Katie to fetch a razor. Upon the arrival of the water and razor, even with labor coming on, Charlie proceeded to shave, thus giving a lesson in cool and calm to his idolators. This was almost like a koan to the family, this "breaking the fear force"—as they termed it. It was a breech delivery. When first the arm and then the body of little Zezo emerged from the laboring mother, Manson, according to legend, seized the moment by halting the singing, tearing from his Spanish guitar a guitar string and tying off the umbilical cord with it.[43]

The birth, being a notable event, produced several cultural elements for the Family—the child's name and the legend-memorate associated with the event.

FOLKLORE AND GROUP CULTURE

All groups develop a folk culture, and in intense groups such as the Manson Family, these traditions are of particular significance. Further, the culture which is created is not random, but is responsive to the social setting. Group culture is emergent from interaction and cannot adequately be analyzed separately from its performance context. This approach recognizes those stable, structural features of group life which control the development of folklore content, but integrates them with the processual properties of interaction.

An objection can be raised to this argument: by focusing on creation, I ignore *tradition*. While one might respond by arguing that tradition is not a necessary component of folklore, such a perspective needlessly downgrades content at the expense of style. I argue that "folklore" is an analytic construct of the investigator (an "etic" category) and not an informant's category. As such, whether a particular interactional gambit will become "traditional" can only be

known retrospectively by whether it is adopted by the population in which it is created and whether it is spread by that population to those outside the original audience. *At the time of creation,* traditional content is similar to interaction which has no lasting impact on the group.

This analysis is intended to be exploratory. Research from printed sources needs to be supplemented with other accounts based upon intensive interviewing and ethnographic field work. Further, the focus on the group as an isolated culture-producing unit needs to be extended through research on the interlocking relationships among groups, and on how these relationships affect folklore content. My goal in this article has been to indicate features that connect one group's social structure and interaction to the culture produced, but more attention needs to be given to the position of the group in the larger society's social structure. The relationships among culture, interaction, and social structure are central to our discipline. Because of their interests and training, folklorists seem particularly able to explore the connections among aesthetic, behavioral, and structural concerns.

University of Minnesota
Minneapolis

NOTES

[1] See Roger D. Abrahams, "Towards a Sociological Theory of Folklore: Performing Services," *Western Folklore* 37 (1978): 164.

[2] In groups without extensive written traditions, such as small groups, culture and folklore can be used interchangeably. It is essential to recall the distinction between culture and social structure—that culture refers to the products of interaction, whereas social structure refers to the relationships between individuals. We are excluding from consideration here the position of material culture in folk groups.

[3] Gary Alan Fine, "Small Groups and Culture Creation: The Idioculture of Little League Baseball Teams," *American Sociological Review* 44 (1979): 733-745.

[4] Philip Nusbaum, "A Conversational Approach to Occupational Folklore: Conversation, Work, Play, and the Workplace," *Folklore Forum* 11 (1978): 18; see also Dell Hymes, "Folklore's Nature and

the Sun's Myth," *Journal of American Folklore* 88 (1975): 353-54.

[5] Holly Cutting-Baker, Sandra Gross, Amy Kotkin, and Steve Zeitlin, *Family Folklore* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1976); Lois Karen Baldwin, "Down on Bugger Run: Family Group and the Social Base of Folklore," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1975; Thomas A. Leemon, *Rites of Passage in a Student Culture: A Study of the Dynamics of Transition* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1972); James P. Leary, "Folklore and Photography in a Male Group," in *Saying Cheese: Studies in Folklore and Visual Communication,* ed. Steven Ohrn and Michael E. Bell, Bibliographic and Special Series, no. 13 (Bloomington: Folklore Forum, 1975), pp. 45-50; Jay Mechling, "The Magic of the Boy Scout Campfire," *Journal of American Folklore* 93 (1980): 35-56; Ralph Linton, "Totemism and the A.E.F.," *American Anthropologist* 26 (1924): 296-300; Elliott Oring, "Totemism and the A.E.F. Revisted," *Southern Folklore Quarterly* 41 (1977): 73-80.

[6] Five major sources exist on the Manson Family: two books written by former Family members, which are autobiographies composed in prison by newly born-again Christians (Charles [Tex] Watson, *Will You Die For Me?* [Old Tappan, N.J.: Fleming H. Revell, 1978]; Susan Atkins, *Child of Satan, Child of God* [New York: Bantam, 1978]); a book by the Los Angeles District Attorney who prosecuted the Family and had access to the police investigative reports and other official documents and interviews (Vincent Bugliosi, *Helter Skelter* [New York: Bantam, 1975]); and a book written by a counter-culture journalist, based on interviews with those in Manson's social world (Ed Sanders, *The Family* [New York: Avon, 1972]). The fifth account is a brief, academically-informed participant observation of the Family by physicians with access to the drug culture (David E. Smith and Alan J. Rose, "The Group Marriage Commune: A Case Study," *Journal of Psychedelic Drugs* 3 [1970]: 115-19). Each of these has a bias, and I have no illusions about quality control. However, these accounts are internally consistent and generally consistent with each other. I shall not cite evidence contradicted by other sources, and shall use, whenever possible, accounts found in more than one source.

[7] Abrahams, "Towards a Sociological Theory," p. 165.

[8] Robert Freed Bales, *Personality and Interpersonal Behavior* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970), pp. 153-54.

[9] Watson, *Will You Die*, p. 70; Atkins, *Child of Satan*, p. 84.

[10] Watson, *Will You Die*, p. 12.

[11] Ibid., p. 60.
[12] Atkins, *Child of Satan,* p. 88.
[13] Ibid., p. 148.
[14] Bugliosi, *Helter Skelter,* p. 475.
[15] Robert S. McCarl, Jr., "Jump Story: An Examination of an Occupational Narrative," *Folklore Forum* 11 (1978): 1-17; Nusbaum, "A Conversational Approach;" see also Alan Dundes, "Who are the Folk," in *Frontiers of Folklore,* ed. William R. Bascom (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1977), p. 27.
[16] Bugliosi, *Helter Skelter,* pp. 196-97; Sanders, *The Family,* pp. 25, 30, 32; Watson, *Will You Die,* pp. 24, 72, 93.
[17] Atkins, *Child of Satan,* pp. 87-88.
[18] Donald O. Hebb, "What Psychology is About," *American Psychologist* 29 (1974): 71-87.
[19] Watson, *Will You Die,* pp. 93-95. Helter Skelter is British slang for an amusement park roller coaster.
[20] Abrahams, "Towards a Sociological Theory," p. 169; see also Mechling, "The Magic of the Boy Scout Campfire."
[21] Sanders, *The Family,* p. 121.
[22] Atkins, *Child of Satan,* p. 89.
[23] Sanders, *The Family,* pp. 136-37.
[24] Stith Thompson, *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature,* 6 vols. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1955-58).
[25] Frank Hoffmann, *Analytical Survey of Anglo-American Traditional Erotica* (Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green University Popular Press, 1973), p. 194.
[26] Sanders, *The Family,* pp. 102-103.
[27] Mechling, "The Magic of the Boy Scout Campfire," p. 43; Bruce A. Cox, "What is Hopi Gossip About?: Information Management and Hopi Factions," *Man* 5 (1970): 88-89.
[28] Sanders, *The Family,* p. 97.
[29] Ibid., p. 36.
[30] Ibid., pp. 37, 76, 142; Bugliosi, *Helter Skelter,* pp. 129,311,317; Atkins, *Child of Satan,* pp. 81, 85; Watson, *Will You Die,* pp. 12, 26.
[31] Watson, *Will You Die,* p. 13.
[32] Jane Morgan, Christopher O'Neill, and Rom Harré, *Nicknames: Their Origins and Social Consequences* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979), pp. 46-68.
[33] Nusbaum notes (personal communication) that "derogatory" nicknames may be used affectionately. The point is that the high

status target has considerable leeway in deciding if others may name him in that way.

[34] Sanders, *The Family*, p. 120.

[35] Watson, *Will You Die,* p. 68.

[36] Atkins, *Child of Satan,* p. 96.

[37] Sanders, *The Family,* p. 136. Sanders' literary method of presenting this material is unfortunate; one would prefer a pure text with informants cited. Sanders' method, however, may be likened to the anthropologist who alters the words of informants to fit the style of writing or native language. Sanders indicates that the legend was collected from several persons, and the outline is probably authentic, even if the details may be composites.

[38] Bugliosi, *Helter Skelter*, pp. 256, 570, 588.

[39] Sanders, *The Family,* p. 62.

[40] Neil J. Smelser, *Theory of Collective Behavior* (New York: Free Press, 1963), pp. 16-17.

[41] George Gmelch, "Baseball Magic," *Trans-action* 8 (1971): 39-41, 54.

[42] Sanders, *The Family,* p. 37; Watson, *Will You Die*, p. 61.

[43] Sanders, *The Family,* p. 111.