

lant they used it, and if they then used it to excess they then developed countermeans to convert those that were using it to excess, to a life of abstinence.

We occasionally find a society that will reject anything that leads to any kind of ecstatic state or of people ever getting outside of themselves. This was the history of the Pueblo Indians in relation to peyote. When peyote started to spread they refused it and when alcohol started to spread they refused it. There are societies, usually very small ones, that can be organized around one temperamental emphasis of sobriety or excess. But in general man has sought for ways of changing his moods, of making it possible for him to work longer than he could, to stay up longer than he could, to get through a meeting or a tremendous bout of work better than he could have otherwise. When the work is over, whether it is plowing a field or taking a hazardous journey in a canoe or getting through a terrible board meeting, he very often uses the same drug as a relaxant, which suggests that the relationship between these mood changing drugs is not as simple as we have thought they are. In the West Indies, people smoke marihuana to get through a hard day's work and after they have done the hard day's work they smoke another bit of marihuana to relax and enjoy the evening. And there are many people who do this with cigarettes also, of course.

They smoke to keep working and then they smoke to relax, and all of these things fall under this general question of whether that man has any right to use natural or distilled or pharmaceutically produced aids to permit him to live the kind of life that he wants to live, and in most cases we find this combines work and relaxation or religion, work and relaxation.

Senator NELSON. I don't recall that I asked Dr. Freedman to elaborate on this rather sparse statement. It may very well be that he will agree with your elaboration, I don't know. As I read it, he may have been saying that the use of drugs to avoid almost all stresses in life is a serious matter and that he opposed that. You weren't suggesting that it would be healthy for people to avoid all the stresses.

Dr. MEAD. No; I think it is very unhealthy for them to avoid facing stresses of the order of death or even moving and separating from their friends. But I do believe it is worthwhile to avoid the stress that comes when the plumbing breaks down and both cars are broken and you can't find your husband to telephone him, and the child in nursery school, three children in nursery school, you were going to pick up 15 miles somewhere else, if a pill will permit you not to burst into tears under these circumstances but go next door and borrow another car, I think it is a good idea and I don't think we should confuse the inevitable stresses of the complexity of modern life with the great moments in man's existence which he has to face up to.

I think that a good deal of the testimony against psychotropic drugs, and particularly anxiety reducing drugs, is of this sort and confuses the issues.

Senator NELSON. I had the impression, although I have not reread the testimony, that some of the witnesses, at least, were saying about the same thing about the psychotropics as other witnesses have said