

verbal, metaintellectual agent." Clearly, the escape represented by these drugs involves abdication of the intellect.

The emergence of LSD into the public consciousness as either a threat or a boon to mankind is neither the worst nor the best of happenings, as humans learn to alter their own behavior artificially. It is, however, a good example of what the future can be expected to produce and there is more to come.

As scientists involved in drug phenomena, we are in somewhat the same dilemma which faced the nuclear physicists who split the atom. We have their example before us, and we should profit by it. No amount of breast beating and cries of "mea culpa" will put the stopper back in the pill bottle, any more than it put the old-fashioned atom together again.

The judicious use of mind-changing drugs may require a simultaneous awareness by the investigator in the laboratory and the political and social activists in the community. The fact that this has been a rare happenstance in the past makes it no less imperative.

Science and humanism can and will march together in the future; for, as Lord Horder write in *The Appeal of the Common Man*, "Surely, science was made for man, not man for science."

To make medicine a complete science in the service of man we must see that it infiltrates this important and now more clearly perceived sphere—as yet largely neglected—of social need.

This sphere lies between that in which the diseases of the individual patient are presented and treated by the individual doctor and the sphere in which the preservation of the public health is achieved by the methods of the State health officer.

The manipulation and control of human behavior by drugs cannot, in the future, be left to investigators isolated in the laboratory. The people have already proved that drugs developed in the laboratory are self-prescribed by the general population. Neither science nor law has yet learned to control this situation; and, as a result, the National Institute of Mental Health is faced with a double responsibility.

Mr. GORDON. Doctor, what do you mean by the statement: "People have already proved that drugs developed in the laboratory are self-prescribed by the general population"?

Dr. YOLLES. Well, LSD is a good case in point, though there are others. These drugs were developed in the laboratory for laboratory use. They were research drugs. Their efficacy in effecting changes in behavior were being investigated but they escaped from the laboratories is the best way I can put it. Clandestine laboratories were developed to produce LSD. It was used illegally throughout the country by segments of the population.

The same is true for the informal or illegal use of the stimulant drugs; amphetamines, for example. We have a clear example of this in Sweden where the drugs were introduced for strictly medical purposes as central stimulants but were soon picked up and used illegally throughout the country for production of what is called a "high."

The primary purpose of the NIMH is to support the search for new knowledge—in the field of drugs as in many others. It has also, however, been charged by the Congress with a major responsibility to assist in the control of the abuse of drugs, today, at the same time that it helps to develop the drugs of tomorrow.