

SC
1773
15

PSYCHEDELIC DRUG USAGE: PSYCHOLOGICAL AND SOCIO-POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS

BY

GARY FISHER, Ph.D.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

In the Task Force report on Narcotics and Drug Abuse of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Blum (1967) points out the large credibility gap developed by those agencies which have been responsible for educating the young on the effects of dangerous drugs. He states,

"Review of some of the texts and pamphlet materials that have been employed in the past, and casual interviews with students, suggest that much of this material may be out of date and blatantly incorrect, but also conducive to ridicule and consequent counter-reactions among the now often well-informed youngsters. Demands not to use marijuana based on arguments against sin or self-indulgence may not be appropriate to sophisticated secular and metropolitan areas. Arguments against use based on claims of dramatically deleterious effect which are contrary to what is known cannot command respect."

Blum goes on to point out that if a persuasive approach is going to be used with an interested and informed target group then opinion and data which address themselves to both sides of an argument are most likely to be taken seriously. Educational attempts to control extra-medical drug use must present a rational approach which is based on objective, realistic and scientific appraisal of the numerous variables which contribute to any specific results from drug usage. The evaluation of such educational programs must of course be studied, and the educator must be in constant contact with changing conditions resulting in additional information so that he will not fall behind the degree of sophistication of his charge.

The 1967 Commission on Narcotics

and Drug Abuse stated that public and professional education in the field of narcotic and drug abuse was totally inadequate. Concerning drug use and abuse, they felt that misconceptions, misinformation and persistent fallacies continued to prevail. The Commission was critical of the federal government in that measures have not been taken to correct this state of affairs which has existed for a considerable period of time.

Complexities in Effects

That an individual's response to a particular drug is a function of at least his physiology, his psychology, and the socio-cultural situation of which he is a part is now well recognized by many scientists working in the drug field (e.g., Barber, 1967; Mogar, 1966; Savage, Terrill & Jackson, 1962). Reviewing the placebo effect in medical research gives some hint of the importance of the psychological factors to drug reactions. In the practice of medicine, Honigfeld (1964) estimates that between 20% and 40% of prescriptions written by physicians are intended to have a placebo effect rather than some specific physiological one. When one reviews the untoward effects of placebos, including rashes, anxiety states, nausea, diarrhea, mental aberrations of all variety, it is amazing that legislation has not been passed making the possession of a placebo illegal!

No innate conflict exists between what is beneficial for an individual and what is beneficial for his society in that if one is creatively developing his potentials, he inherently cannot do this at the expense of his society because his society is part of his environment, whose actualization makes it possible for him to

actualize himself. Because the individual and his environment (society) are *one* unit, what is good for him is good for his environment, and what is good for his environment is good for him. This concept is organismic in that individual and society are seen as contributing to each others' fulfillment.

If society is perpetuating practices which are alien to complete experiential and unified being, then the individual will suffer. Equally true is the fact that if an individual is indulging in practices which are limiting his complete functioning in fulfilling his capabilities, then society will suffer.

Therapeutic Uses

The proponents of psychedelics point out that the vast body of research that has been carried out to explore the therapeutic efficacy of the psychedelics has demonstrated their effectiveness as a psychotherapeutic tool. They point out that if these drugs are used under proper medical supervision and adequate control, subjects are likely to have experiences which are psychologically meaningful to them and which have long term effects. When used properly, Savage and Stoloroff (1965) claim that the hazards "can be reduced to negligible consideration." This attitude is shared by many other investigators (e.g., Blewett and Chwelos, 1958; Hoffer, 1965; Mogar, 1966).

The lack of epidemiological research with regard to illicit psychedelic usage has been pointed out by many people investigating the effects of these drugs. It is currently popular even for the proponents of LSD to state that they only favor the use of these materials under medical or otherwise properly professionally supervised settings. It must be pointed out that there is no evidence that the untoward effects of LSD under lay or non-supervision is any greater than that under medical and/or professional supervision. It is true that individuals

have been hospitalized for psychoses and other dysfunctional behavior following use of psychedelics, but the *rate* of untoward effects for non-professionally supervised drug experiences is as yet unknown.

That the standard American analytic psychiatric-medical model is not harmonious to the production of the psychedelic experience is recognized by many professionals who have had experience with the psychedelics. It has even been suggested that the typically trained psychiatrist is the least appropriate person to be administering the psychedelics. The hippie community has taken the Eastern "guru" (spiritual guide) model and the affinity of Eastern religion and the psychedelic experience has been widely discussed (eg., Brickman, 1967; Huxley, 1954, 1962; Van Dusen, 1961). *The Tibetan Book of the Dead*, a religious book used by Tibetan Buddhists with those who are dying, has been adapted for use in LSD sessions (Leary, Alpert and Metzner, 1964).

Many of the more mature and responsible individuals within the hippie movement recognize the abuse of these materials by young people and attempt to train them in the productive use of psychedelics in the role of guru, taking the role of therapist when dealing with those who have subsequent untoward effects. It has been suggested that a new "discipline" is needed, that of the one who "sits" with the one who is taking LSD. Laura Huxley (1968) has suggested that the determination of this individual is more important than the determination of the one who takes the drug.

Hoffer (1965) in a long review of LSD concluded

"so far there have been no therapeutic studies in which LSD has been used as a psychedelic agent where similar success rates were not found. It is odd that there have been no negative papers."

It is interesting to observe that some

of the early workers with LSD were only aware of its psychotomimetic effect — that is, its ability to produce psychosis-like states. Hoffer and Osmond who initiated much of the work described their early rationale as follows:

"We hoped that a frightful experience which modeled the worst in natural *delirium tremens* could persuade our alcoholic patients not to drink any more, and so avoid *delirium tremens*. But by 1957 it was apparent that even though many of our patients were helped by LSD, it was not its psychotomimetic activity which was responsible. In spite of our best efforts to produce such an experience, some of our subjects escaped into a psychedelic experience." (Hoffer, 1965)

Osmond and Huxley coined the word psychedelic meaning "mind-manifesting" simply because they discovered that people were having transcendental experiences and discovering insights through expansion of their consciousness.

In the treatment of intractable neurotics, encouraging results have been reported. In a group of 36 subjects, all of whom had failed to respond to other forms of treatment and who were candidates for leukotomy because of such extreme tension, 14 had complete recoveries and 7 were improved with treatment (Sandison, 1954; Sandison, Spencer and Whitelaw, 1954). In a larger series of 94 neurotic subjects who had not responded to a variety of earlier treatments, 65% were improved after LSD treatment (Sandison and Whitelaw, 1957).

In the review of LSD treatment of alcoholics by ten different investigators, of a total of 245 subjects for which followup data were available, 70% were considered improved. In a larger sample of over 1,000 alcoholic subjects, Hoffer and his co-workers concluded that LSD was twice as effective as any other treatment program (Mogar, 1966).

Some work has been done with incarcerated felons with promising results

(Leary, Metzner & Weil, 1965). Subjects were 32 inmates in Concord State Prison who met with one clinical psychologist bi-weekly for six weeks. Two of the twelve sessions were group drug (psilocybin) experiences, with the therapist taking the drug with the inmates. Other meetings were devoted to discussing materials emerging from the drug sessions. The criterion for success was decrease in recidivism. Expectancy rates for recidivism with this group was that 64% would return within six months after parole. However, at six month followup, 30% of those on parole had returned, 6 for technical violations and 2 for new offenses. These results are very dramatic when compared with other rehabilitation programs conducted in prison studies. In addition, it is interesting to note that although almost all prisoners were semi-literate more than half of them had mystical experiences. (In this writer's work with autistic and schizophrenic children, he was amazed to discover mystical experiences occurring with this group and also amazed to learn of their ability to communicate verbally such experiences even though these children did not typically speak.)

Two studies differ markedly with respect to the manner in which a number of variables, thought to be influential in determining response to LSD, were handled. The first study by McGlothlin, Cohen and McGlothlin (1967) examined the effects of LSD when given to non-motivated subjects in a neutral and atherapeutic environment whereas the study by Savage, Fadiman, Mogar and Allen (1966) studied the effects of highly motivated subjects in an environment maximized to produce beneficial effects.

In the McGlothlin study the subjects were not motivated to take LSD, did not know if they were actually going to be getting LSD in the experiment, did not have any particular set established or

expectations about the effects LSD would have. In addition, the experimenters played a neutral role both in that they did not suggest to the subject that he was going to have any particular response and in that they did not have any preconceived notions about what the actual response of the subject would be. Of the many experiments reported on the usefulness of LSD, perhaps this research is one of the best examples of dispassioned interest on the part of the investigators.

The subjects were normal graduate male students who had responded to an advertisement for paid experimental subjects. No mention of psychedelic drugs was made in the advertisement. Of the 155 subjects, 73% had only casual knowledge of LSD, and 15% had never heard of it (The research was begun in 1964, before LSD became popularly known.) These students were told they might or might not receive LSD and 14% expressed enthusiasm over the possibility of receiving the drug, 23% expressed concern over the safety of the drug, and 63% were simply curious as to what the effects might be, having no expectation of lasting effects, either beneficial or detrimental. A total of 72 subjects, equally divided into three groups, were used. One group received 20 mg. of amphetamine, another group received 25 mcg. of LSD and the third group received 200 mcg. of LSD. Of the 24 receiving the high dose of LSD only one subject was terminated because of an untoward reaction to the drug.

At a six-month followup, half of the LSD subjects reported a greater understanding of self and others and a greater introspection and reflectiveness. A third of the LSD subjects reported that they were less easily disturbed by frustrating situations, that they had a greater tolerance toward those with opposing viewpoints, and had a tendency not to take themselves so seriously.

In addition, 70% of these subjects stated that the experience was a dramatic and interesting one, whereas only 8% stated that they found it unpleasant and disturbing. Fifty-nine percent reported positive, lasting effects after six months with 17% claiming pronounced lasting, positive effects on personality functioning.

These investigators gave a plethora of psychological measures before and six months after the LSD experience and concluded that these individuals who place emphasis on structure and control, "generally had no taste for the experience and tend to respond minimally if exposed. Those who respond intensely tend to prefer a more unstructured, spontaneous, inward-turning (though not socially introverted) lives and scored somewhat higher on tests of esthetic sensitivity and imaginativeness. They also tend to be less aggressive, less competitive, and less conforming."

What is noteworthy about this research is that when these subjects took LSD in a neutral environment with no particular set or expectation in terms of response to the drug, a considerable proportion had beneficial effects whereas a very small percentage had an unpleasant effect. Only one subject was terminated from the experiment because of his untoward reaction which was described as an unrealistic, grandiose reaction which slowly subsided. Consequently, it would appear that when normal subjects, without any particular expectation, take LSD the likelihood of their having beneficial effects is fairly good and the likelihood of having lasting untoward effects is extremely small.

In sharp contrast to the methodology of the McGlothlin study is the study of Savage, Fadiman, Mogar, and Allen (1966). These subjects were highly motivated to take LSD as evidenced by the fact that each had to write an extensive autobiography which was then used as a basis for weekly interviews of up to eight weeks; each was required to par-

ticipate in extensive, psychological testing; each was given carbon dioxide therapy at the end of each interview hour; and each had to pay the medical costs of treatment. Even after such extensive preparation, only 60% of the patients were actually chosen to be given the drug. Of 77 individuals receiving LSD, two thirds were described as being typical of an outpatient psychiatric clinic case load, whereas one third seemed "relatively normal in terms of defense structure and superficial adjustment to life, but complained of lack of purpose, lack of meaning in life, or a sense of lack of fulfillment." The dosage level used was somewhat comparable to that employed by McClothlin in that dosage was from 200 to 300 mcg. of LSD with 200 to 300 mg. of mescaline sulphate "one hour later if necessary."

At six months' interval, the subjects were re-evaluated on the psychological instruments as well as evaluated on a number of other ratings. On global staff ratings, 46% of the subjects were considered to be moderately or markedly improved, 37% were considered minimally improved, whereas 17% were considered unchanged and only one was considered worse.

On a scale consisting of 433 questions concerning behavior change, 75% of the patients were rated as improved in the following areas: the ability to utilize dream material; attending and involving oneself in leisure and entertainment areas for its own sake rather than as distraction; greater interest in work itself with less need for status and recognition for one's work; improved relations in marriage as exemplified by fewer quarrels, greater communication, greater shared interests and activities, and general satisfaction with the marriage; greater self-confidence; and greater capacity to tolerate and integrate negative and positive feelings; increased ability to relate to family members with more shar-

ing and open communication with these members; more enjoyment and interest in one's work; greater ability to modify one's own behavior on the basis of observation of that behavior; improvement in friendship patterns and general relations with non-intimates.

In addition, between 60% and 75% of these patients were rated as improved on the following sub-scales: personal habits, health, religious activities, sexual patterns and fear. Six percent of the sample was rated as worse on the following sub-scales: health, eating habits and preferences, fears, and marriage. These untoward reactions revolved around greater fatigue and mild indigestion, weight gain or weight loss, greater awareness of fears, and three patients had difficulty in their marriages.

A difference between the McClothlin and the Savage studies is that in the former study there were very little differences on psychological measures between pre-drug and post-drug scores whereas in the latter study there was considerable improvement in psychological adjustment as reflected on the psychological tests between pre-drug and post-drug scores.

A comparison of these two studies would indicate more beneficial results from LSD when the subjects are highly motivated for psychedelic treatment and where the total setting is one of positive expectation that the psychedelic treatment will be beneficial. In addition, in spite of Savage's subjects' being psychiatric cases, only a very small percentage reported the occurrence of dysfunctional behavior following psychedelic treatment.

With respect to the dangers of psychedelic treatment, Savage stated:

"The issue of safety has been debated for nearly a decade without resolution. Our own feeling is that LSD used properly is an important addition to therapy and that LSD misused is a very dangerous drug and that long-term adverse reactions have occurred

and will occur in persons taking it. We make a sharp distinction between psychedelic therapy and ingesting LSD, mescaline, or related substances. Used with ordinary caution, by persons trained in their use, we find the substances safe and valuable in the framework described here."

The induction of a "psychosis" is readily stated as one of the harmful effects of LSD. Recently papers commenting on naturally occurring psychedelic experiences in non-drug induced psychosis have appeared (e.g., Bowers & Freedman, 1966; Laing, 1967; Mogar, in press). That a psychosis can be used productively and meaningfully has been known by those in the arts and religion (e.g., Dostoevsky, 1944; Henri, 1923; Hesse, 1929.) It is not an uncommon observation by those who have had numerous drug experiences that the most "productive" sessions, i.e., those most effective in subsequently changing their lives, were those sessions which were psychotomimetic—i.e., hell ("bummers" in current hippie parlance). Often these hellish experiences are but mere prophetic revelations detailing the end stage of a path that one is vigorously pursuing. Thus the motivation for change is intense.

The Politics of Drugs

Effects of Marijuana: Research studies investigating the physiological addition to marijuana have found that it is not addicting (Chopra & Chopra, 1957; Siler, 1933; Williams, 1946). There are apparently no long-term physical effects resulting from the use of marijuana in the United States (Friedman and Rothmore, 1946). It would also appear that bhang, the mild form of cannabis used in eastern countries, is also "harmless although excessive use will cause susceptibility to disease" (Walton, 1938). One worker felt that cannabis could cause a psychotic reaction but that this was quite rare. (Bromberg, 1934; Bromberg, 1939).

In Eastern countries, excessive use of

the much stronger preparations of cannabis apparently can cause psychosis and overall physical and mental deterioration. However, with the use of marijuana in this country it is the general consensus that there is not a cannabis psychosis syndrome and that the use of marijuana will not cause a psychotic reaction in a well integrated personality (Allentuck and Bowman, 1942).

With respect to the effects of marijuana, Dr. James H. Fox, Acting Chief of the Center for Studies of Narcotics and Drug Abuse of the National Institute of Mental Health, has said of marijuana

"It does not lead to mental degeneracy, it doesn't disturb the brain cells as far as we know; it is not habit forming as it is used here in the United States, that is does not therefore fall within the general category of drugs, as in the terms of the World Health Organization, that would lead one to believe that it is an addicting drug. I don't believe that it is." (Ginsberg & Fox, 1966).

The 1962 White House Conference on Narcotic and Drug Abuse stated:

"It is the opinion of the panel that the hazards of marijuana per se have been exaggerated and that long criminal sentences imposed on an occasional user or possessor are in poor social perspective."

The report of the President's Crime Commission in 1967 made a strong recommendation for revising marijuana laws and in addition made a strong recommendation that a comprehensive research program should be undertaken as to the effects of marijuana.

To the question of whether or not he thought marijuana should be legalized Fox stated that he felt that it should not, on two grounds. One, was that an official from Lebanon told him that they were concerned about marijuana addictive possibilities in the Near East and secondly, that he didn't know what was good about it. Fox, as chief of a research center on drugs should be aware that no one has been able to demonstrate

scientifically whether marijuana has substantial beneficial effects because research to investigate the possible effects has been prohibited. If marijuana is a mild psychedelic, and if the bulk of evidence demonstrates that the stronger psychedelics are beneficial there is some logic in postulating that there could be benefits derived from the mild psychedelic, marijuana.

Ginsberg (1966) is rather poetic about the usefulness of marijuana. He states: "Although most scientific authors who present their reputable evidence for the harmlessness of marijuana make no claim for its surprising usefulness, I do make that claim. Marijuana is a useful catalyst for specific optical and aural aesthetic perceptions. I apprehended the structure of certain pieces of jazz and classical music in a new manner under the influence of marijuana, and these apprehensions have remained valid in years of normal consciousness. I first discovered how to see Klee's Magic Squares as the painter intended them (as optically three-dimensional space structures) while high on marijuana. I perceived ("dug") for the first time Cezanne's 'petit sensation' of space achieved on a two-dimensional canvas (by means of advancing and receding colors, organization of triangles, cubes, etc. as the painter describes in his letters) while looking at *The Bathers* high on marijuana. And I saw anew many of nature's panoramas and landscapes that I'd stared at blindly without even noticing before; through the use of marijuana, awe and detail were made conscious. These perceptions are permanent — any deep aesthetic experience leaves a trace, and an idea of what to look for that can be checked back later."

This description of this effect of marijuana is, of course, very similar to those many descriptions of such experiences as reported by numerous subjects with the stronger psychedelic agents.

The Popular Press, Legislators and Public Opinion

In 1965 Savage and Stolaroff, lamenting the popular press' coverage of LSD,

cite 11 articles on LSD which appeared in national magazines in which a sensationalistic attitude was taken emphasizing the dangers and harmfulness of these drugs.

Savage and Stolaroff point out that this type of press coverage left

"the reader unaware that there had been numerous studies of these agents as treatments for neurotic disturbances, and that encouraging success has resulted from their use. These substances show such promise for deepening the understanding of mental phenomena, clarifying the many complex theories of personality, dynamics and behavior, and permitting rapid solution of emotional difficulties."

Ginsberg (1966) points up the tremendous influence of the press in forming public opinion and points out some of the sequelae which he considers to be a consequence of the type of newspaper reporting that is done.

A famous incident is that of the five year old Brooklyn girl who ate a sugar cube of LSD which she found in the ice-box of her home. The *New York Post*, April 6, 1966, headlined "Girl Eats LSD and Goes Wild." The story emphasized the dangerous effects of LSD stating several people had died as result of LSD both from committing suicide because of the hallucinations produced by the drugs and others because of the toxic effects of the drugs. In fact, no known deaths have occurred from toxicity from LSD. In fact, the suicide rate as related to LSD use is extremely low.

A systematic study of LSD induced suicide by Cohen (1960), who collected information from 44 investigators on some 5,000 patients and experimental subjects who received LSD or mescaline on some 25,000 occasions, reported that on the patient sample the attempted suicide rate was 1.2 per 1,000 cases and for completed suicides 0.4 per 1,000 cases.

For the experimental subjects there were no attempted or completed suicides.

Thus, the newspaper was rather grossly inaccurate in reporting the facts. In addition, the *Post's* story of this incident one day later continued with the title, "LSD Girl Clinging to Life." The story stated "the blonde little Brooklyn girl was reported still in very critical condition 18 hours after doctors pumped her stomach and treated her for convulsions." Quoting a hospital aide, the story said "right now it is at the grave or serious stage, very critical. Silent, in an apparent coma, her face pale and drawn, glucose was being fed intravenously into her right arm, both wrists were tied to the crib bars with gauze so she could not thrash about."

Ginsberg reports that when he made inquiries to the *New York Post* in an attempt to find out who wrote the story was told that "the city editor wanted it souped up a little bit. I know it's not true, but who cares. It's just a news story, what are you getting so mad about, Ginsberg?" (Ginsberg & Fox, 1966). After the blatant initial news drama subsided, the facts of the case appeared to be that the child after being admitted to the hospital, was placed on the critical list because physicians had not previously had a case of a child who had taken LSD. She was kept under close observation to study any untoward effects. Apparently, no untoward effects occurred and she was released. Ginsberg claims that on the basis of this type of reporting law enforcement agencies brought pressure on legislatures to pass prohibitive legislation concerning these drugs and that public support is engendered for this type of legislation.

That the man in the street takes an uncritical eye toward what he is told does not place pressure on the media to report accurately and objectively. Said somewhat more simply, the reader is as

guilty as the promulgator of the lie. As long as man's unconsciousness is excited by man's inhumanity to man, stories emphasizing that inhumanity will continue to be given top billing.

That a great body of literature reporting on the psycho-therapeutic effectiveness of psychedelic drugs is available is totally ignored. That the individuals who are in charge of the education of children obtain their information from the popular press is unfortunately true. Few counselors, health educators, and teachers take the trouble to discover the original articles in the professional periodicals reporting the results of research on psychedelic drugs.

McGlothlin (in press) does not feel that collection of additional evidence on the relative harmlessness of marijuana would be effective in changing laws. He feels that a modification of the marijuana laws would depend much more on a change in public attitude and that this public attitude is very much dependent on the type of information that is reported in the popular press.

Blum and Funkhauser (1965) conducted a series of interviews with 50 California state legislators in 1964 who were sitting on committees which process drug legislation. The conclusions of that study were:

"Drug abuse is considered to be a major social threat by the majority of California legislators. Holding key positions of knowledge and power with respect to drug issues, their reaction to this threat, reflected in present law and practice, is to try to influence human conduct through punishment and confinement, measures which are thought to contain rather than to solve the problem. Treatment is considered, but for the most part is limited to within-institution programs. Many lawmakers feel that the present approach is inadequate and a few think it inhumane. Although many proposals for new legislation called for more of the same, in the sense that harsher laws and stronger controls are advocated, a minority of legislators are actively interested in new

approaches. Their willingness to explore and innovate is not reflected, according to the reports of all the legislators, in the opinions of the electorate.

"The public is generally said to be strongly in favor of punishment and confinement and, in their own eyes, a good many legislators are more liberal than the people they represent. Present positions on legislative alternatives in the handling of drugs and users vary according to the drug under discussion. About LSD, for example, many have no present convictions and are quite open to informed proposals. The hard core one-third will stand by the present tight control laws. With marijuana, a far milder drug than LSD, but one about which public opinion is strong (and incorrect) present punitive positions are already firm; and for reasons of conviction or political savvy, most legislators would oppose any effort to make marijuana use legal. Concomitantly, most law makers are quite ready to remove the drunk from police purview provided that they are convinced that a treatment program would work and not be too costly.

"For those considering new approaches, the choice of sources for information is a matter of real importance. We find that on matters of drugs it is to the medical man, especially to organized medicine, and to the various law enforcement associations and bureaus that the legislators would turn. Only a few spontaneously consider academic people: psychologists, sociologists and psychiatrists. Nevertheless, about half of the legislators in our sample had respect for the potential value of research of human behavior."

Politicians generally enact legislation which they feel will increase their popular support. In 1966 legislation was enacted in California against LSD and other hallucinogens. Politicians obviously feel that the public is very much against the widespread use of such drugs and obviously these opinions are influenced almost primarily by the popular media. Studies do not seem to be available detailing the attitude of the public with regard to the basis and treatment of drug dependency.

The Harris Survey (1966) on public

explanations of crime revealed that most individuals saw crime as being the product of early environment, broken homes, poor upbringing, and untoward social conditions. Only 8% of those interviewed spoke in motivational terms, that is, that people commit crimes for the pleasure gained or that they were innately bad. Of interest is that 76% of those sampled favored working with young people as a means to crime reduction whereas only 16% proposed greater police activity. In addition 77% favored rehabilitation approach to those involved in criminal acts whereas 11% wanted these people to be punished. If these data have any relevance for public attitude toward drug abuse, it would seem that the public is taking a more humanitarian and rehabilitative attitude rather than a strictly punitive one.

That the press emphasizes the dangers of psychedelic drugs as a service to the community is an argument typically offered. The popular press does not, however, emphasize the association between violence, destructiveness and the use of the drug, alcohol. Many studies demonstrate the relationship between ingestion of alcohol and subsequent destructive behavior.

Of the 49,000 traffic deaths and 10,000 homicides recorded in United States during 1966 alcohol is estimated to have been a factor in half the cases. Selzer and Weiss (1966) found 65% of 72 drivers responsible for fatal automobile accidents were drinking and 40% were alcoholics. McCarroll and Haddon (1962) report similar data. Moore (1966) reported that of 508 homicides that he studied one or both parties had been drinking in 64% of the cases. Cole, Fisher and Cole (in press) found that in 112 female murderers, alcohol and narcotics had been involved in 50% and 10% respectively of the homicides. Gillies (1965) reported the same involvement of alcohol in homicides in Scotland.

McClothlin (in press) in commenting on the attempt by the Bureau of Narcotics to link criminal activities with the use of marijuana, stated that if the relationship between criminal activity and alcohol for 1966 were detailed in the same way as the relationship between marijuana and crime, this information would fill the United Nations Bulletin on narcotics for the next eight years. If newspapers detailed the association between the use of alcohol and destructive behavior in human beings they would have no room for any other news.

Ginsberg, in 1966, had observed that the politics of marijuana in the late 1930's were being reenacted with LSD in the late 1960's. In his book, *The Murderers*, Anslinger, the former chief of the Narcotics Bureau, stated:

"Much of the irrational juvenile violence and killing—is traceable directly to hemp intoxication. I knew that action had to be taken to get the proper control legislation passed. By 1937, under my direction, the Bureau launched two important steps. First the legislation planned to seek from Congress a new law that would place marijuana and its distribution directly under federal control. Second, on radio and at major forums such as that presented annually by the *New York Herald Tribune*, I told the story of this evil weed of the fields and river beds and roadsides. I wrote articles for magazines; our agents gave hundreds of lectures to parents and educators, social and civic leaders. In network broadcasts I reported on the growing list of crimes of murder and rape. I described the nature of marijuana and its close connection to hashish, I continued to hammer at the facts."

And in another Bureau report (1938) this statement appears:

"The Narcotics section recognizes the great danger of marijuana due to its definite impairment of the mentality and the fact that its continuous use leads directly to the insane asylum."

In sharp contrast to these statements is Anslinger's answer to Representative John Dingle's question at the Hearing

before the committee on Ways and Means of the United States House of Representatives, where Dingle asked, "I am wondering if the marijuana addict graduates into a heroin, opium or cocaine user?" to which Anslinger replied, "No, sir, I have not heard of a case of that kind . . . I think it is an entirely different class. The marijuana addict does not go in that direction." (1937).

Lindesmith (1965) details at great length the unceasing harassment by the Federal Bureau of Narcotics of all those people—lawyers, judges, criminologists, sociologists, physicians—who have taken a position toward narcotic addiction other than the criminal and punitive position espoused by the Bureau.

Cannabis was considered for international control at the International Opium Conference in 1912 at the suggestion of the United States and since World War II the United Nations has assumed responsibility for the international control of drugs. An expert committee on addiction-producing drugs was organized under the World Health Organization (WHO). In 1955 WHO was requested to prepare a scientific evaluation of cannabis. The WHO document stated that cannabis was a dangerous drug from every point of view including physical, mental, social and criminological. This has remained the primary document for the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, which is under the Economic and Social Council.

The United Nations publishes the "Bulletin on Narcotics" and supposedly reports the results of research of factual observations on the use and effects of various drugs. In each issue it is stated that opinions expressed in articles are not necessarily those of the United Nations. However, in 1961 the Commission's position on cannabis was questioned by a representative from the Netherlands who noted that several articles had appeared quoting responsible

professional persons to the effect that cannabis "addiction" was "no worse than alcoholism." (1961). In answer to this the Commission reaffirmed its position that cannabis abuse was a form of drug addiction and that any publicity to the contrary was misleading and dangerous. In 1965 the Commission again took cognizance of the raised questions of the harmfulness of cannabis and stated:

"The representative of the United States (Anslinger) found reason once again to deplore the publication of the United Nations Bulletin on Narcotics of an article which could be used for propaganda against controlling cannabis." (1965).

Anslinger was apparently disturbed because an article questioned the relationship between criminal action and cannabis and it was argued that future articles should not run counter to the aims pursued by the Commission. With respect to research on cannabis, the Commission stated:

"While research would continue on certain technical aspects, such research could not, so far as the Commission was concerned, alter the basic fact that the use of cannabis was harmful and that the drug should accordingly continue to be controlled with the strictness envisaged by the Narcotics Treaty, including the 1961 Convention. — This subject should no longer appear on the (Commission) agenda as the 'question' of cannabis. There could be no question but that cannabis presented a danger to society, although more and more people were attempting to cast doubt upon the necessity of controlling the substance." (1965).

While the Bureau of Narcotics voraciously pursues the marijuana user because he is such a threat and danger to the safety of society, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement on Narcotics and Drug Abuse has made the following statement:

"Marijuana is equated in law with the opiates, but the abuse characteristics of the two have almost nothing in common. The opiates produce dependence. Marijuana does not. The withdrawal sickness appears when the

use of opiates is discontinued. No such symptoms are associated with marijuana. The desired dose of opiates tends to increase over time, but this is not true of marijuana. Both can lead to psychic dependence, but so can any substance that alters the state of consciousness." (1967).

With respect to the relationship between marijuana and crime and violence, the Commission notes:

"The Medical Society of the County of New York has stated flatly that there is no evidence that marijuana use is associated with crimes of violence in this country. There are many similar statements by other responsible authorities. The 1962 Report of the President's Ad Hoc Panel on Drug Abuse found the evidence inadequate to substantiate the reputation of marijuana for inciting people to anti-social acts. The famous Mayors' Committee on Marijuana, appointed by Mayor LaGuardia to study the marijuana situation in New York City, did not observe any aggression in subjects to whom marijuana was given. In addition, there are several studies of persons who are both confessed marijuana users and convicted criminals, and these reached the conclusion that a positive relation between use and crime cannot be established. One likely hypothesis is that, given the accepted tendency of marijuana to release inhibitions, the effect of the drug will depend on the individual and the circumstances. It might, but certainly will not necessarily or inevitably, lead to aggressive behavior or crime. The response will depend more on the individual than on the drug. This hypothesis is consistent with the evidence that marijuana does not alter the basic personality structure." (1967).

The Commission goes on to state that there is no evidence that marijuana used *per se* leads to use of addicting drugs, points out the fact that basic research on marijuana "has been almost non-existent" but does point out the social cultural aspects of marijuana and heroin use. The California arrest data show 18,000 marijuana arrests in 1966 compared to 7,000 in 1964, whereas the number of heroin and other narcotic arrests was about the

same (2600) for both years (1966). The Commission recommends that the National Institute of Mental Health should devise and execute a plan of research covering all aspects of marijuana use.

Drugs and Values

The drug that a culture uses is intimately connected with the values that are dominant in that culture. In the East, the drug of choice is marijuana; in the West, the drug of choice is alcohol. In Eastern religions and philosophy, the introspective, the meditative and individual path to enlightenment and release from the cares of the earth is emphasized. Marijuana typically produces a quiet state of reverie in which contemplation and meditation is facilitated. It does not typically induce socialization and active interaction. Religion and philosophy, of course, have to do with giving meaning to life experiences. In the West, within the Christian Judaic tradition, an emphasis on "work" is emphasized and subsequently activity, ambition and achievement are the hallmarks of morality. "Works" here is used in the Christian sense of acting out one's goodness. Alcohol, as opposed to marijuana, typically induces activity, acting out — and, rather than acting out goodness, aggressive, dysfunctional, and anti-social acts are common. In Western culture, aggressiveness and competitiveness are highly valued.

Carstairs (1954) has observed that in India alcohol was used by the aggressive Rajputs, and marijuana by the passive Brahmins and that this choice was a function of basic differences in the cultural values. In commenting on Huxley's description of the effects of mescaline in *Doors of Perception*, Carstairs believes Huxley to be unrealistic to think that the westerner would substitute mescaline for alcohol in that the effects produced by mescaline do not coincide with the basic values and desires of the cultural members. Peyote and mescaline have been

available for a considerable period of time in the United States and no legal measures were taken to prevent their sale or distribution. The very disturbing effect of the hippies on the American society is related to these phenomena. Perhaps it is not drug taking which is so offensive to the members of our society but rather the values that have evolved from the use of these drugs. The abandonment of the values of the materialistically oriented achieving society is what has constituted the threat to the Establishment.

When the hippies proclaim that when all of man's activities which are oriented toward achieving goals which have their basis in a materialistic value system rather than a humanitarian one, are destructive, meaningless and unfulfilling, anger and resentment are quickly engendered. The current hippie slogan of "drop out" simply means dropping out of activities which support the current normative value system. The proponents of the drop out ethic apparently feel that this action will more effectively change the current value system rather than working within the Establishment to effect the change in that value system. Brickman (1967) in commenting on the relationship between the psychedelic experience and the ethic of non-violence in the hippie, writes:

"The psychedelic episode forces an acknowledgment of the phenomena of his own death and he accepts it. This drastic emotional experience then leads to a symbolic rebirth and a development of a new self, which affirming death, no longer needs to externalize destructiveness. A new non-violent subculture is then created on the foundation of an intensively subjective emotional experience of extinction of the dualistic death-denying self."

Blumer (1967) in studying California juvenile drug users, primarily from lower class minority groups, found that the aggressive, undisciplined behavior problem juvenile preferred alcohol whereas

the marijuana user was not aggressive. The juveniles who used marijuana did not engage in delinquent behavior.

The Future:

Man, throughout his history, has utilized drugs for the multi-various reasons described earlier by Barber (1967). Huxley (1954) speaks of the "immemorial connection between religion and the taking of drugs." He states:

"The urge to transcend self-conscious selfhood is . . . a principal appetite of the soul. When men and women fail to transcend themselves by means of worship, good works and spiritual exercises, they are apt to resort to religious surrogates . . . The practices studied can be observed in every region of the earth, among primitives no less than among those who have reached a high pitch of civilization. We are, therefore, dealing not with exceptional facts, which might justifiably be overlooked, but with a general, and in the widest sense of the word, a human phenomenon, a kind of phenomenon which cannot be disregarded by anyone who is trying to discover what religion is, and what are the deep needs which it must satisfy." The best statement of the integration and effective utilization of psychedelics

for the growth and evolution of both the individual and his society is given in Huxley's *Island* (1961).

Ginsberg complained that Dr. Goddard, the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, had made the statement that the claim that people have religious experience with psychedelic agents was "pure bunk."

Fox, in defending Goddard, claimed Goddard had been misquoted and "what he said in truth was that those who say individuals who take LSD—expand their mind—this is pure bunk because there is no evidence to substantiate it." (Ginsberg & Fox, 1966). That the Commissioner of the FDA and that the Chief of the Research Division which supposedly conducts scientific studies on these materials can state that there is no evidence to substantiate that consciousness expansion occurs with psychedelic agents when the professional literature abounds with such evidence and when thousands of people who take psychedelics know that their consciousness is expanded leaves a credibility gulch so wide as to be almost unbridgeable.

REFERENCES

- Abramson, H. A. (Ed.) *The use of LSD and psychotherapy*, New York: Josiah Macey Foundation, 1960.
- Allentuck, S. and Bowman, K. M. "The psychiatric aspects of marijuana intoxication." *Am. J. Psychiat.*, 1942, 99, 248-251.
- Anslinger, H. J. and Oursler, W. *The Murderers: The Story of the Narcotic Group*, New York: Farrar, Strauss, and Cudahy, 1961.
- Barber, B. *Drugs and Society*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.
- Blewett, D. B. and Chwelos, N. *Handbook for the therapeutic use of LSD-25: Individual and Group Procedures*. Mimeographed, Regina, Saskatchewan, 1958.
- Blum, R. H. *Task Force Report: Narcotics and Drug Abuse*. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Washington, D.C., 1967.
- Blum, R. H. and Funkhauser, Mary Lou, *Legis-*
- lators on social scientists and a social issue: a report and commentary on some discussions with law makers about drug abuse*, Stanford University: Institute for the study of human problems, 1965.
- Blumer, H. *The World of Juvenile-Drug Use*. ADD Center Project, Final Report, University of California Press, Berkeley, California, 1967.
- Bowers, M. B. and Freedman, D. X. "Psychedelic experiences in acute psychosis." *Arch Gen Psychiat.*, 1966; 15, 240-248.
- Brickman, H. R. "The Psychedelic 'Hip Scene': Return of the Death Instinct." Paper presented to the 8th Western Divisional Meeting, American Psychiatric Association, Los Angeles, October, 1967.
- Bromberg, W. "Marijuana, a Psychiatric Study." *J.A.M.A.*, 1939, 113, 4-12.
- Bromberg, W. "Marijuana Intoxication." *Am. J. Psychiat.*, 1934, 91, 303-330.
- California Criminal Statistics, *Drug Arrests in*

- California, 1966, Department of Justice, State of California Printing Office, Sacramento, 1966.
- Carstairs, G. M., Daru and Dhang, "Cultural Factors and Choice of Intoxicants." *Quart. J. Studies on Alcohol*, 1954, 15, 220-237.
- Chopra, I. C. and Chopra, R. N. "The Use of Cannabis Drugs in India." *Bulletin on Narcotics*, 1957, 9, 4-29.
- Cohen, S. "LSD: Side Effects and Complications." *J. Nerv. Ment. Dis.*, 1960, 130, 30-40.
- Cole, K. E., Fisher, G. and Cole, S. S. "Women Who Kill: A Socio-Psychological Study." *Arch. Gen. Psychiat.*, in press.
- Commission on Narcotic Drugs, Report of the 16th Session, E/3512, E/CN. 7/411, April-May 1961, United Nations.
- Commission on Narcotic Drugs, Report of the 20th Session, Nov. 29-Dec. 21, 1965, C/4140, E/CN. 7/488 United Nations.
- Doestevsky, F. "Notes from Underground" in *White Nights and Other Tales*. New York: MacMillan, 1944.
- Fisher, G., and Castile, D. "Interim report on research project: an investigation to determine therapeutic effectiveness of LSD-25 and Psilocybin on hospitalized severely emotionally disturbed children." Unpublished manuscript, Fairview State Hospital, Costa Mesa, Calif., Feb. 10, 1963.
- Freedman, A. M., Ebin, E. V. and Wilson, E. A. "Autistic Schizophrenic Children: an experiment in the use of D-lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD-25)." *Arch. Gen. Psychiat.*, 1962, 6, 203-213.
- Freidman, H. L. and Rothmore, M. J. "Marijuana, Factor and Personality Evaluation and Army Mental Adjustment." *J. Clin. Psychopathol.*, 1946, 7 and 8, 765-782 and 221-236.
- Gillies, H. "Murder in West Scotland." *Brit. J. Psychiat.*, 1965, 111, 1087.
- Ginsberg, A. "The Great Marijuana Hoax." *The Atlantic*, November, 1966, 104-112.
- Ginsberg, A. and Fox, J. H. "Seminar on Marijuana and LSD Controls." National Student Association Convention, University of Illinois, Aug. 24, 1966.
- Harris Survey, San Francisco *Examiner*, July, 1966.
- Hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, 75th Congress, First Session, April-May, 1937, Hemp Marijuana Hearings, p. 24.
- Henri, R. *The Art Spirit*. Philadelphia: Lippen-cott, 1923.
- Hesse, J. *Steppenwolf*. New York: F. Unger, 1929.
- Hoffer, A. "D-lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD): review of its present status." *Clin. Pharmacol. Therap.*, 1965, 6, 183-255.
- Honigfeld, G. "Non Specific Factors in Treatment; I, Review of Placebo Reactors; II, Review of Social Psychological Factors," *Dis. Nerv. Syst.*, 1964, 25, 145-156 and 225-239.
- Huxley, A. *The Doors of Perception*, New York: Harper, 1954.
- Huxley, A. *Island*, Toronto: Clarke, Irwin, 1962.
- Huxley, Laura. *This Timeless Moment*. New York: Farrar, Strauss, 1968.
- Krippner, S. "Consciousness expansion and the extensional world." *ETC: A review of general semantics*, 1965, 22, 463-474.
- Laing, R. A. *The Politics of Experience*. New York: Pantheon, 1967.
- Leary, T. et al. "A new behavior change program using psilocybin." *Psychotherapy; Theory, Research, and Practice*, 1965, 2, 61-72.
- Leary, T., Alpert, R., and Metzner, R. *The Psychedelic Experience*. New York: University Books, 1964.
- Lennard, H. L. "Proposed Program of Research and Socio Pharmacology." Unpublished paper presented at symposium on Psycho biological approaches to Social Behavior, Harvard Medical School, April, 18-20, 1963.
- Lindesmith, A. R. *The Addict and the Law*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1965.
- Mayors' Committee on Marijuana. New York City, Cattell Press, Lancaster, Pa., 1944.
- McCarroll, J. and Haddon, W. Jr. "A controlled study of fatal automobile accidents, New York City." *J. Chron. Dis.*, 1962, 15, 811-826.
- McClothlin, W. H. "Toward a Rational View of Marijuana" in Simmons, J. L. (Ed.), *Marijuana*. Los Angeles: Brandon House, in press.
- McClothlin, W., Cohen, S. and McClothlin, M. S., "Long-lasting effects of LSD on normals." *Arch. Gen. Psychiat.*, 1967, 17, 521-532.
- Mender, L. and Faretera, G. N., Cobrinik, L. "LSD and UML treatment of hospitalized disturbed children." *Recent Adv. in Biol. Psychiat.*, 1963, 5, 84-92.
- Mender, L., Goldschmidt, L., and Sanker, S. D. V. "Treatment of autistic, schizophrenic children with LSD-25 and UML-491." *Recent Adv. in Biol. Psychiat.*, 1962, 4, 170-177.

- Mogar, R. E. "The Psychedelic Drugs and Human Potentialities" in Otto, H. A. (Ed.) *Exploratives in Human Potentialities*, Springfield, Illinois: C. C. Thomas, 1966.
- Mogar, R. E. "Psychedelic States and Schizophrenia." *J. Existential Psychiat.*, in press, and in Aaronson, B. and Osmond, N. *Psychedelics: Their Uses and Implications*. New York: Doubleday, in press.
- Moore, R. A. "Legal responsibility and chronic alcoholism," *Am. J. Psychiat.*, 1966, 122, 748-756.
- New York Post*, April 6, 1966.
- President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1967.
- Rolo, A., Krinsky, L. W., Abramson, H. A., Goldfarm, L. "Preliminary method for study of LSD with children." *Internat. J. Neuropsych.*, 1965, 1, 552-555.
- Sandison, R. A., "Psychological Aspects of the LSD treatment of the neuroses," *J. Ment. Sci.*, 1954, 100, 508-515.
- Sandison, R. A., Spencer, A. and Whitelaw, J. D. A. "The therapeutic value of LSD in mental illness." *J. Ment. Sci.*, 1954, 100, 419-507.
- Sandison, R. A. and Whitelaw, J. D. A. "Further Studies in the therapeutic value of LSD on mental illness." *J. Men. Sci.*, 1957, 103, 332-343.
- Savage, C., Fadiman, J., Mogar, R., and Allen, Mary Hughes. *Internat. J. Neuropsych.*, 1966, 2, 241-254.
- Savage, C. and Stolaroff, N. A. "Clarifying the Confusion regarding LSD-25." *J. Nerv. Ment. Dis.*, 1965, 140, 218-221.
- Selzer, M. L. and Weiss, S. "Alcoholism and Traffic Fatality: Study in Futility." *Am. J. Psychiat.*, 1966, 122, 762-767.
- Siler, J. F. "Marijuana Smoking in Panama." *The Military Surgeon*, 1933, 73, 269-280.
- Simmons, J. Q., Leiken, F. J., Lovas, Q. I., Schaffer, B., and Perloff, B. "Modification of autistic behavior with LSD-25." *Am. J. Psychiat.*, 1966, 122, 1201-1211.
- Traffic in Opium and other dangerous drugs*. Report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, 1938.
- Van Dusen, W. "LSD and the enlightenment of Zen." *Psychologia*, 1961, 4, 11-16.
- Walton, R. P. *Marijuana: America's new drug problem*. Lippencott, New York, 1938.
- White House Conference on Narcotic and Drug Abuse, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1963.
- Williams, E. G. "Studies on Marijuana and Pyrexyl Compound." *Public Hlth. Rep.*, 1946, 61, 1059-1083.
- Wolfe, P. O. *Marijuana in Latin America: The Threat it Constitutes*. Linacre Press, Washington, D.C., 1949.
- Wolfe, P. O. "The Physical and Mental Effects of Cannabis," *World Health Organization*, APD/56, E/CN.7/L 91, March 17, 1955.