

If you carry the Protestant Puritan ethic far enough people take the attitude that everyone should develop enough character so that they never need anything to support them, except vitamins, and it is even doubtful if they should have too many of them because maybe if you depended on vitamins your character wouldn't develop properly. We have had all through this country since the 1960's emphasis on eating the right foods and which means changing your character, and somewhat of a questioning of these synthetic vitamins instead of exercising the moral choice of eating the right food.

All things come into play in the discussion of psychotropic drugs. We have drugs that can act as a sedative, that can relax, that can stimulate, that can energize, and that have enormously altered the population of our mental institutions. Some of these drugs have made it possible to treat people in outpatient situations, to send home very large numbers of people who would have had to stay in institutions and, at the same time, that these particular benefits are well known, we have the operation of these three ethics coming into play, questioning whether there ought to be drugs that make it possible for people not to worry as much or not to lie awake or not to be as tense as they would otherwise be.

And whenever the word "drug," of course, is used crosses over very dangerously in public opinion—and public opinion includes all of us also in our particular predispositions—it crosses over to the use of those drugs which we originally identified as hard drugs, and today, marihuana which is being linked with hard drugs by an act of cultural creation just as smoking cigarettes was once linked to prostitution as it was years ago when people knew that a woman who smoked a cigarette was either a prostitute or would become one. Obviously women who were not prostitutes and didn't want to become prostitutes, didn't smoke cigarettes and the first cigarette which someone persuaded a girl to take was a realistic introduction to a downward path. We put marihuana in the same situation.

Senator JAVITS. Dr. Mead, would you mind one question, if the Chair would allow it; just one?

Dr. MEAD. Any time.

Senator JAVITS. Just one question on marihuana because it happens to intrude in another committee of which I am the ranking minority member. You speak as if the scientific basis for discounting marihuana, according to what the kids say, as being nothing worse than alcohol or tobacco.

Dr. MEAD. Not nearly as bad.

Senator JAVITS. Perhaps even better. However, many people still leave it up in the air. It is not scientifically proved that maybe it is a threshold drug to addiction, et cetera. Would you care to substantiate your statement, which, if you stand by it, is very important, on that subject. Would you say there is not adequate scientific proof to dismiss marihuana as a threshold, addictive of similar drug comparable to hashish, heroin, and so on?

Dr. MEAD. Senator, I would separate hashish and heroin very sharply.

On the question of the use of *cannabis* in various forms we have cross-cultural evidence, we have cultures that have used it for a very long time. There is some evidence that if people use it to excess for 20 years, which mean that they spend their time smoking instead of