

conspicuously influenced by the complimentary European Catholic tradition based on a distribution between a pleasure seeking majority and a spiritually ascetic minority.

Meanwhile, as our American economy was shaped by the presence of the open frontier and what looked like unlimited resources, a third ethic has grown, the peculiarly American belief that it is better to alter the environment than to continue to cope with unsatisfactory circumstances, that it is moral to take advantage of every possible external aid to the good life, that unnecessary and avoidable pain should be prevented, and that any continued attempt to cope—by altering or exercising one's character with things that could be fixed instead, is at best unenterprising rather than virtuous. Our definition of coping is altering the environment, or our social situation, using something external to the self, a new technique, money, medicine, budgetary arrangements, to attain a better, more human, way of living. Several of these who testified at previous hearings have emphasized that the psychotropic drugs are taken not as a form of escape, but as a new way of coping with life situations. Within this frame of reference Americans approve any dietary supplement, medicine, drug or stimulant, which increases their efficiency.

Physicians in responding to advertising or salesmanship carry these three attitudes in different proportions just as their patients do. Copy writers—also Americans—vary also in which they invoke.

The situation has become further complicated today because the young—instead of surreptitiously tasting the wicked joys reserved for adults—coffee, tobacco and alcohol, which they will later be permitted to use—or righteously forswear—have chosen a different drug—marijuana, which the elders have not used and do not crave. The attempt to restrict the use of this youth choice has resulted in graver social consequences than those associated with prohibition in the 1920's, and with our moralistic attempts to treat the use of hard drugs by adults punitively, instead of medically and socially. By associating marijuana with hard addictive drugs, with youthful premature experimentation, and with the presence of new mood regulating psychotropic drugs—like the amphetamines—we have produced an exceedingly dangerous situation, dangerous to the relationships between youth and age, to the moral fibre of society which permits indulgence to the old and denies indulgence to the young, and which by the handling of all aspects of the drug traffic, steadily involves a larger portion of the population in crime, as criminals and the victims of criminal activities. Speedy legalization of marihuana would break part of this chain, but only the substitution of medical measures for punitive measures can hope to cope with it.

The special emphasis that has been given in these hearings on psychotropic drugs can only be fully explained in the light of these contemporary cultural attitudes. Psychotropic drugs, because they alter mood, because they stimulate or tranquilize, get into the moral category of "drugs," which are considered to be reprehensible basically escapist and liable to undermine our civilization based upon the acceptance of deferred gratification and pain. European comment, coming as it does out of a continuing economics of scarcity, has reinforced the criticism of American use of psychotropic drugs. The over prescription and over use of psychotropic drugs, presenting as it does, dangers of side effects, of conflicts with other medication or sometimes with foods, and involving disproportionately high expenditures, by individuals, in some cases by industries, and where there is governmental underwriting of medical expenses, by taxpayers, *are the same as the problems that arise from other drugs.* They seem different because they have come to symbolize these conflicts between good and evil, between emphasis on production and emphasis upon consumption, between deferring gratification, and enjoying the present moment.

I will now turn to the way in which these drugs, like other drugs less surrounded with moralistic implications, are related to our present confused health network. We are dependent upon the pharmaceutical companies for the initial research which developed the thousands of possible chemical substances, from which new drugs are eventually developed. Because of the nature of competition within these industries, there is an emphasis on rapid high returns. As presently constituted, society is deeply dependent upon this initial experimentation. But for traditional separation of appropriate motives for industry, politics and government create a series of oppositions, in which the pharmaceutical industries are cast in the role of conscienceless profit seekers, their advertisers and salesmen as ruthless exploiters of popular—as opposed to scientific motives—