



Heads and Freaks: Patterns and Meanings of Drug Use Among Hippies

Author(s): Fred Davis and Laura Munoz

Source: *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, Vol. 9, No. 2, Special Issue on Recreational Drug Use (Jun., 1968), pp. 156-164

Published by: [American Sociological Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2948334>

Accessed: 17/07/2014 10:11

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Sociological Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Heads and Freaks: Patterns and Meanings of Drug Use Among Hippies*

FRED DAVIS WITH LAURA MUNOZ

University of California Medical Center, San Francisco

An emerging social typology among Haight-Ashbury hippies is the as yet largely implicit distinction drawn by them between "heads" and "freaks." At the simple denotative level the former refers to regular users of LSD, the latter to those who regularly "shoot speed" (inject Methedrine). These terms have, however, acquired great referential elasticity and connote different hippie life-styles along with their associated philosophical and attitudinal outlooks. From the vantage-point of this broadened socio-linguistic context, the terms reflect both differential sources of social recruitment to the "head" and "freak" drug use patterns as well as a prominent value tension within the hippie subculture between contemplative, inwardly-directed forms of "mind-expansion" and more hedonistically oriented forms of sensual excess.

REGARDLESS of whether the phenomenon is viewed in terms of a bohemian subculture, a social movement, a geographically based deviant community or some combination of these, there is substantial agreement among those who have studied hippies (Berger, 1967; Davis, 1967; Didion, 1967; Simon and Trout, 1967; von Hoffman, 1967) that drugs (or "dope," the term preferred by hippies)¹ play an im-

portant part in their lives. This generalization applies to nearly all segments of the hippie community for the reasons given below.

First, the patent empirical fact of widespread and frequent drug use *per se*² is easily ascertainable through even a brief stay in San Francisco's Haight-Ashbury, New York's East Village, Los Angeles' Fairfax, Vancouver's Fourth Avenue or wherever else hippie colonies have sprung up.³ Second—and this importantly distin-

* We wish to acknowledge the substantial contribution of David A. Farmer, University of California, Davis, to this paper, both in its inception and through his valuable criticisms of an earlier draft. We also wish to thank Howard S. Becker for his comments and to express our profound indebtedness to Professor Frederick H. Meyers, University of California Medical Center, San Francisco, for having given us so unstintingly of his expertise in matters related to drugs, drug use and drug abuse. Partial support for the field study from which the paper derives was provided by the Academic Senate Research Committee, University of California, San Francisco Division, and the Center for the Study of Law and Society, University of California, Berkeley.

¹ As with earlier expressive social movements of a religious tendency, it is characteristic of hippies to employ, and thereby semantically reconstruct for initiates, a discredited term of pungent reference where, on purely denotative grounds, a more "acceptable" one would do as well or even better. The frequent public resort to sexual and scatological profanity by hippies (see Berger, 1967), most of whom were raised in homes where the use of such words would, to say the least, be frowned upon, is further evidence of this all but conscious tendency to linguistically celebrate the rejected and despised so as to cast

them in a new moral light. Compare the remarks of Kenneth Burke (1954:125-147) on "organized bad taste."

² This, of course, is not to say that drug use (and abuse) is not widespread among Americans generally. Rather, the obvious point is that the alcohol, tranquilizers, barbiturates, stimulants and common pain-relievers used in conventional society have not, despite the known injurious effects of some of them, been officially declared illegal or detrimental to health and morals as have the drugs favored by hippies. Hence, they are, except in extreme instances of abuse, treated as part of the everyday, taken-for-granted world of pharmaceutical products and household remedies to which little, if any, stigma is attached. Hippies, naturally, are forever pointing this out in their continuing campaign for drug law reform. "Why condemn us, when so many of you are constantly turning to drugs for almost every conceivable contingency of daily life? What makes your drug 'abuse' any better than ours?"

³ Exception must be made for a small number of hippie communes and settlements, most of them in rural areas, where, according to reports in the underground press, the use of all mind and mood-altering drugs is disapproved of.

guishes hippie drug use from that of other drug-using subcultures—there are pronounced ideological overtones associated with it. Not only is it frequently asserted by many hippies that there is “nothing wrong” with certain of the drugs favored by them (chiefly marijuana and LSD, along with a number of other hallucinogens), or that their use is less harmful than alcohol or tobacco,⁴ but that these drugs are positively beneficial, either as a pleasant relaxant, as with marijuana, or as a means for gaining insight with which to redirect the course of one’s life along inwardly more satisfying and self-fulfilling lines (LSD). Among other manifestations, this spirit of ideological advocacy expresses itself in the conviction of some hippies that their ultimate social mission is to “turn the world on”—i.e., make everyone aware of the potential virtues of LSD for ushering in an era of universal peace, freedom, brotherhood and love. The last, and perhaps most crucial, circumstance for making drug use important in the lives of hippies is the simple and stark matter of the drugs’ illegality. As contemporary deviance theory of the symbolic interactionist persuasion has shown in so many differing connections (Becker, 1963; Davis, 1961; Freidson, 1965; Goffman, 1963; Kitsuse, 1961; Lemert, 1962), the act by a community of successfully labeling a particular practice deviant and/or illegal almost invariably constrains the “deviant” to structure much of his identity and activity (Strauss, 1959) in terms of such imputations of deviance and law-breaking. Thus, the omnipresent threats of police harassment, of arrest and incarceration, as well as of a more diffuse social ostracism are “facts of life” which the hippie who uses drugs only occasionally must contend with fully as much as the regular user.

Beyond these rather global observations, all further generalizations concerning hippie drug use must be qualified carefully and treated as tentative. For not only are the actual patterns of drug use quite varied among individual hippies and different hip-

pie sub-groups, but the patterns themselves are constantly undergoing change as the subculture evolves and gains greater experience with drugs (Becker, 1967). Further compounding the hazards of facile generalization are the following:

1. The apparent readiness of many hippies to experiment—if only once “to see what it’s like”—with almost any drug or drug-like substance, be it Hawaiian wood rose seeds, opium or some esoteric, pharmacologically sophisticated psycho-active compound.
2. The periodic appearance on the hippie drug market of new drugs, usually of the hallucinogenic variety, which, like new fashions generally, excite a great flurry of initial interest and enthusiasm until they are either discredited, superseded or partially assimilated into a more “balanced” schedule of drug use. Thus, in the past year alone, for example, at least three new hallucinogenic type drugs have made much heralded, though short-lived, appearances in the Haight-Ashbury: STP (dimethoxymethyl-amphetamine), MDA (methylenedioxy-amphetamine) and PCP, the “peace pill” (phencyclidine).
3. The vagaries, uncertainties, deceptions and misrepresentations of the illegal drug market as such. Not only is it hard for a buyer to be sure that he is getting the drug he thinks he is getting—indeed, that he is getting any drug at all and not some placebo—but dosages, strengths and purity of compounding, even when not knowingly misrepresented by dealers, are likely to be unknown or poorly understood by dealer and buyer alike.⁵ Thus, the ubiquitous possibility of an untoward

⁵ A useful discussion of the hippie drug market—manufacture of drugs, distribution, pricing, types of drug dealers, relations with buyers, etc.—would require a lengthy paper in itself. Two points in particular, however, deserve mention here for the special interest they hold for sociologists. 1) Much as in the legitimate drug trade, new drugs like STP and MDA are introduced selectively at first by manufacturers’ and/or distributors’ “detail men” making free samples available to the drug cognoscenti and opinion leaders in the hippie community (cf. Coleman et al., 1966). If favorably received in these élite circles, the drug is then put on the street market for “open” sale. 2) In line with the anti-hoarding sentiments of hippies, it is regarded as bad form not to share a “good thing,” especially when one has a surplus on hand. It is not uncommon then, for hippie drug dealers, particularly non-commercial ones who only trade causally to earn a bit of extra cash, to give away gratis a fair portion of their stock to friends and favorites.

⁴ As far as tobacco is concerned, the point is largely gratuitous. Our impression is that a great many hippies are heavy cigarette smokers.

reaction in which the user, or a whole aggregate of users, becomes violently ill or severely disoriented.

4. The fact, to be discussed later, that the very same drug (LSD, for example) can, depending on the intent of the user, his mood, the setting and the group context, be used to achieve very different drug experiences and subjective states. Though this "choice of drug experience" is never fully within the control of even the experienced user (see 3, above), it does exist, and thus facilitates differential use by different users as well as by the same user at different times.

Obliquely, these circumstances point to what is perhaps the chief obstacle to making firm generalizations concerning hippie drug use, namely, that the subculture is not (at least as yet) of a piece, that it includes many disparate social elements and ideational tendencies (Davis, 1967; Simon and Trout, 1967) and that, to the extent that drug use constitutes something of a core element in it, this must be seen in the context of these varying and constantly shifting socio-ideational subconfigurations. As has been characteristic of almost any expressive social movement in its formative stages (cf. Blumer, 1946), this diversity in the midst of a search for common definition is reflected in the frequent discussions among hippies on who is a "real" hippie, who a "plastic" hippie, and what "genuine" hipness consists of. Moral, behavioral and attitudinal boundaries of inclusion and exclusion are constantly being assessed and redrawn. But, in the absence of any recognized leadership group capable of issuing *ex cathedra* pronouncements on these matters, one man's, or one underground paper's, definition is as good as the next's. These ongoing discussions, debates and polemics extend, of course, to the place and use of drugs in the "new community," as hippie spokesmen like to refer to themselves. Some take a very permissive and inclusive stance, others a more restrictive one, and still others shift their ground from one encounter to the next. Inconclusive as this dialogue may be from an organizational standpoint, it nonetheless is important for the influences, albeit variable, it exerts on drug practices and attitudes within the subculture.

With these reservations in mind we wish

to sketch here a rough sociological atlas, as it were, of patterns and meanings of drug use among San Francisco's Haight-Ashbury hippies, at least insofar as these manifested themselves through the summer and well into the fall of 1967. The data were gathered by the methods of ethnographic field work as part of a broader study of the interaction of Haight-Ashbury's hippie community with the larger San Francisco community. Although informed by a close-in familiarity with the hippie community, the data are, strictly speaking, impressionistic inasmuch as time, resources and certain situational peculiarities connected with doing research among hippies⁶ militated against any exhaustive study of drug use *per se*.

LSD AND METHEDRINE

Since much of what follows deals with social psychological aspects of the use of the above two drugs, a few preliminary words are in order concerning the drugs themselves, their direct pharmacological effects, average dosages, modes of administration and frequency of use. No detailed description can be attempted here (see Blum, 1964; Kramer et al., 1967); rather, our aim is merely to touch on a few matters pertinent for the subsequent discus-

⁶ Above and beyond understandable sensitivities relating to illegal drug use, many hippies resent and deplore conventional modes of sociological inquiry—questionnaires, schedules, formal interviews, etc.—directed at them. These, they state, reduce the respondent to a "thing," a mere statistical instance in an artificially constructed class of events, thereby denying him his individuality and possibilities for creative being. In line with certain prominent strains in the hippie ethos, the feeling is that it is never humane or just to relate to another in these terms. Tied in with these sentiments is the not wholly unfounded conviction of certain, more sophisticated hippies that social science investigators who do research among them are interested primarily in furthering their own careers; they "take" from the "new community" and return nothing to it by way of aid or comfort. Much as these attitudes make for difficulties in conducting research among hippies, they have the virtue of posing in a sharp and decidedly concrete manner a number of largely unexamined ethical, and epistemological, issues underlying social science research on human groups. (See Bruyn 1966; Seeley, 1967; Sjoberg, 1967.)

sion of types of drug users. Inasmuch as we shall not be discussing marijuana, suffice it to say here that it is very widely used by all segments of the hippie community and constitutes the drug staple of the subculture. (Hashish, the purified and condensed forms of cannabis, though much preferred by those who have tried it, appears in the Haight-Ashbury only rarely and commands an exceedingly high price.)

The hallucinogenic LSD (lysergic acid diethylamide), one of a growing family of such drugs, is marketed in the Haight-Ashbury in tablet form. The shape, color and general appearance of tablets will vary considerably, from "well made" to "extremely crude," as new batches are produced by different illegal manufacturers. Taken orally, an average dose, usually one tablet, contains approximately 185 micrograms of LSD. Some users, though, are known to ingest considerably more than this amount, i.e., up to 1,000–1,250 micrograms, when they wish to "turn on." Street prices vary from about \$2.50 per tablet in times of plentiful supply to \$5.00 and \$6.00 when supply is short. Typical users in the Haight-Ashbury "take a trip" once a week or thereabouts on the average; again, however, there is a considerable number who "drop acid" much more frequently, perhaps every three or four days, while still others resort to the drug only occasionally or episodically. The characteristic psychopharmacologic effects of the drug are described by Smith (1967:3) as follows:

When someone ingests an average dose of LSD, (150–250 micrograms) nothing happens for the first 30 or 45 minutes, and then after the sympathetic response the first thing the individual usually notices is a change in the way he perceives things. . . . Frequently . . . he notices that the walls and other objects become a bit wavy or seem to move. Then he might notice colors . . . about the room are looking much brighter or more intense than they usually do and, in fact, as time goes on these colors can seem exquisitely intense and more beautiful than any colors he has seen before. Also, it is common for individuals to see a halo effect around lights, also a rainbow effect. . . . There is another kind of rather remarkable perceptual change, referred to as a synesthesia. By this I mean the translocation of one type of sensory experience

into another, so that if one is listening to music, for example, one can sometimes feel the vibrations of the music in one's body, or one can sometimes see the actual notes moving, or the colors that he is seeing will beat in rhythm with the music.

More pronounced effects of an emotional, meditative or ratiocinative kind can, but need not, follow in the wake of these alterations in sense perception. In any case, the direct effects of the drug last on the average for an eight to twelve hour span.

Methedrine (generic name, methamphetamine) is a stimulant belonging to the sympathomimetic group of drugs. Its appearance is that of a fluffy white powder, referred to commonly as "crystals." In the Haight-Ashbury it is sold mainly in spoonful amounts (1–2 grams, approximately) and packaged in small transparent envelopes, prices ranging from \$15.00 to \$20.00 an envelope. Frequently, a user or small dealer in need of cash will repackage the powder and sell it in smaller amounts. Until a few years ago most users of Methedrine took it orally in capsule form. Among Haight-Ashbury hippies, however, the primary and preferred mode of administration is intravenous injection. Hence, the paraphernalia employed is almost identical to that of the heroin user: hypodermic needle, syringe, spoon for diluting the powder in tap water, and candle for heating the mixture. Because needles and associated equipment are often unsterilized or poorly sterilized, cases of serum hepatitis are quite common among Methedrine users. The physiological effects of the drug are elevated blood pressure, increased pulse rate, dilation of pupils and blurred vision—these accompanied by such behavioral states as euphoria, heightened spontaneous activity, wakefulness, loss of appetite and, following extended use, suspicion and acute apprehensiveness ("paranoia").

Although there is some disagreement among experts on whether regular use of Methedrine leads to addiction as, for example, in the case of heroin, it is well-established that a fair proportion of users become extremely dependent on the drug. Thus, whereas the episodic user will inject 25–50 milligrams for a "high," those who get badly "strung out" on a two to three

week Methedrine binge will by the end be "shooting" as frequently as six times a day for a total daily intake of some 1,000 to 2,000 milligrams (1 to 2 grams). Needless to say, were it not for the steep increase in body tolerance levels built up through continuous use of the drug, such high daily dosages might well prove lethal.

HEADS AND FREAKS

A suitable starting point for our ethnographic sketch is those terms and references used by hippies themselves to distinguish certain types of drug users and patterns of drug use. Chief among these is the contrast drawn between "heads" and "freaks," sometimes explicitly, though more often implicitly with reference to a particular drug user or drug practice. While a whole penumbra of allusive imagery surrounds these terms, a "head" essentially is thought to be someone who uses drugs—and, here, it is mainly the hallucinogens that the speaker has in mind—for purposes of mind expansion, insight and the enhancement of personality attributes, i.e., he uses drugs to discover where "his head is at." For the "head," therefore, the drug experience is conceived of, much as during the first years of LSD experimentation by psychiatrists and psycho-pharmacologists (ca. 1956–1963), as a *means* for self-realization or self-fulfillment, and not as an end in itself. The term, "head," is, of course, not new with hippies. It has a long history among drug users generally, for whom it signified a regular, experienced user of any illegal drug—e.g., pot "head," meth "head," smack (heroin) "head." Although still sometimes used in this non-discriminating way by hippies, what is novel about their usage of "head" is the extent to which it has become exclusively associated with certain of the more rarified facets of the LSD experience.

By contrast, the term "freak" refers usually to someone in search of drug kicks as such, especially if his craving carries him to the point of drug abuse where his health, sanity and relations with intimates are jeopardized. Though used primarily in the context of Methedrine abuse ("speed freak"), the reference is frequently

broadened to include all those whose use of any drug (be it Methedrine, LSD, marijuana or even alcohol) is so excessive and of such purely hedonistic bent as to cause them to "freak out," e.g., become ill or disoriented, behave violently or erratically, give evidence of a "paranoid" state of mind.

Whereas the primary connotative imagery of "head" and "freak" derives mainly from the subculture's experience with drugs, the terms themselves—given their evocative associations—have in a short course of time acquired great referential elasticity. Thus "head," for example, is extended to include any person (hip, "straight," or otherwise) who manifests great spontaneity, openness of manner, and a canny sensitivity to his own and other's moods and feelings. Indeed, hippies will claim that it is not strictly necessary to use hallucinogenic drugs—helpful though this is for many—to become a "head" and that, moreover, there are many persons in the straight world, in particular children, who are "really heads," but don't know it. Parenthetically, it might be noted that the concept of a *secret union* of attitude and sensibility, including even those ignorant of their inner grace, is a familiar attribute of expressive social movements of the deviant type; among other purposes, it helps to subjectively legitimate the proselytizing impulses of the movement. Homosexuals, too, are known to construct such quasi-conspiratorial versions of the world.

Similarly, the term "freak," while much less fertile in its connotative imagery than "head," is also extended to persons and situations outside the immediate context of drug use. Hence, anyone who is too aggressive or violent, who seems "hung up" on some idea, activity or interactional disposition, might be called a "freak." Accordingly, abnormal phases (e.g., high anxiety states, obsessiveness, intemperateness) in the life of one customarily thought a "head" will also be spoken of as "freaking" or "freaking out."

The two terms, therefore, have acquired a quality of ideal-typicality about them in the hippie subculture and have, at minimum, come to designate certain familiar

social types (cf., Strong, 1946). At this level of indigenous typifications, they can be seen to reflect certain ongoing value tensions in the subculture: a reflecting turning inward versus hedonism, Apollonian contentment versus Dionysian excess, a millennial vision of society versus an apocalyptic one. And that these generic extensions of the terms derive so intimately from drug experiences afford additional evidence of the symbolic centrality of drugs in the hippie subculture.⁷

SOME SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF HEADS AND FREAKS

In the more restrictive, strict drug-using sense, who, then, are "heads" (LSD or "acid" users) and who "freaks" (Methedrine or "speed shooters")? Lacking accurate demographic data on the subject, our impression is that "heads" are found more often among the older, more established and less transient segments of the Haight-Ashbury hippie community, i.e., persons of both sexes in their mid-to-late twenties who, while not exactly holding down full time jobs of the conventional sort, are more or less engaged in some regular line of vocational activity: artists, craftsmen, clerks in the hippie shops, some hippie merchants, writers with the underground press, graduate students, and sometimes mail carriers, to mention a few. It is mainly from this segment that such spokesmen and leaders as the "new community" has produced have come. By comparison, "freaks" are found more often among the more anomic and transient elements of the community, in particular those strata where "hipness" begins to shade off into such quasi-criminal and thrill-seeking conglomerates as the Hell's Angels and other motorcyclists (known locally as "bikeies"), many of whom now frequent the Haight-Ashbury and have taken up residence in and around the area. Some observers even attribute the growing use of Methedrine to the fact that it and closely

related stimulants (e.g., Benzedrine, Dexedrine) were popular with West Coast motorcycle gangs well before the origins of the hippie community in the Haight-Ashbury. Unlike "acid," which is widely used by both males and females, "speed" appears to be predominantly a male drug.⁸

As these observations would suggest, it is our further impression that "heads" are by and large persons of middle and upper-middle class social origins whereas "freaks" are much more likely to be of working class background. Despite, therefore, the strong legal and moral proscriptions against both LSD and Methedrine, their differential use by hippies reflects, at one level at least, the basic contrast in expressive styles extant in the American class structure; put crudely, LSD equals self-exploration/self-improvement equals middle class, while Methedrine equals body stimulation/release of aggressive impulses equals working class.

These characterizations, however, afford but a gross approximation of drug use patterns in the Haight-Ashbury. The actual demography of use is complicated considerably by a variety of changing situational and attitudinal currents, some of which were alluded to earlier. Two additional matters especially deserve mention here. The first is the existence of a large, socially heterogeneous class of mixed drug users: persons who are neither "heads" nor "freaks" in any precise sense, but who regularly sample both LSD and Methedrine, as well as other drugs. Shifting intermittently or episodically from one to another, they may, save for continued smoking of marijuana, even undergo extended periods of drug abstinence. Of such users it can, perhaps, best be said that the very absence of any consistent pattern is the pattern. Secondly, it should be noted that this non-pattern pattern of drug use (this secondary anomie within a more inclusive deviant life scheme) has grown more pronounced in

⁷ Similarly, hippie art, poetry and folk-rock music are after appraised frequently in terms of their "druggy" qualities, i.e., how nearly they evoke the moods and sensations associated with drug experiences.

⁸ Some preliminary survey data gathered by Professor Frederick H. Meyers of the University of California Medical Center, San Francisco suggest, however, that the ratio of female Methedrine users (and abusers) among hippies is significantly higher than is commonly thought to be the case.

the Haight-Ashbury in recent months. Whereas prior to the summer of 1967 a newly arrived hippie would in all probability have been socialized into the LSD users' culture of "tripping," "mind-blowing" and meditation—"heads" then clearly constituted the socially, as well as numerically, dominant hippie group in the area—this kind of outcome became a good deal less certain following the publicity, confusion, congestion and increased social heterogeneity of recruits that attended the summer influx of youth from across the country (Davis, 1967). Not only did many of the settled hippies move away from the area in the wake of this massive intrusion, but new styles and tastes in drug use, notably "speed shooting," quickly established themselves. With the inundation and dispersal of the older "head" group, it became largely a matter of sheer fortuitousness whether a novice hippie turned to "acid" or "speed," to some other drug or a combination of several. Whose "pad" he "crashed" on arrival or who befriended him the first time he set foot on Haight Street could have as much to do with his subsequent pattern of drug use as anything else. This was conspicuously so in the instance of younger recruits, many of them runaways from home in the 14–17 age group, who, except perhaps for marijuana smoking, were completely naive to and inexperienced in drug use.

THE PRESTIGE GRADIENT OF DRUG USE

Nonetheless, to the extent that the hippie subculture has managed to conserve elements of a core identity and to develop something of a common stance vis-à-vis "straight" society, it is still the "head" pattern of drug use that is ideationally, if not necessarily numerically, dominant within it. Thus, to be spoken of as a "head" is complimentary, whereas to be termed a "freak" or "speed freak" is, except in certain special contexts, derogating. Similarly, the underground press is forever extolling the virtues of "acid"; but, apart from an occasional piece of somewhat patronizing tone in which the author tries to "understand" what "gives" with Methedrine users (Strauss, 1967), it almost in-

variably condemns "speed." Numerous posters on display in the Haight Street print and funny button shops announce in bold captions "SPEED KILLS."

The perceived dichotomy between mind-expansion and body-stimulation represented by the two drugs is sometimes reconceptualized to apply to LSD users alone so as to draw a distinction between those who use the drug mainly for purposes of "tripping" as against "true" or "real" "heads" who purport to use it for achieving insight and effecting personality changes within themselves. While dosage levels of the drug seem to play some part in determining whether a "tripping" or "mind-expanding" experience will ensue—the larger the dose, the more likely the latter or, alternatively, a "bum trip," i.e., a panic reaction with severe disorientation—the intent and setting of the user also appear to have an important bearing on the outcome. Quiet surroundings, a contemplative mood and interesting objects upon which to focus (e.g., a mandala, a candle flame) are felt to be conducive to a mind-expanding experience; moving street scenes, an extroverted mood and the intense visual and auditory stimuli of the typical folk-rock dance and light show are thought conducive to "tripping." In any event, he who uses LSD only to "trip" (i.e., to intensify and refract his sensate experience of the environment) is regarded at best, with a certain amused tolerance by "righteous acid heads." The latter, therefore, frequently counsel beginning users of LSD to move beyond mere "tripping" to where they can realize the higher meditative, revelatory and religious potentials of the drug. In this connection, a number of hippie groups, particularly those involved in the Eastern religions, advocate dispensing with LSD and other hallucinogens altogether following realization of these higher states; once the "doors of consciousness" have been opened, it is stated, it is no longer necessary to use drugs for recapturing the experience—newly discovered powers of meditation alone will suffice. Be that as it may, because the "head"—as both a certain kind of drug user and certain kind of human being—has emerged as the model citizen of the hippie movement, there are

many who aspire to the status and aim to follow the true path can lead them there.

CONCLUSION

In sum, drug use among Haight-Ashbury hippies reveals a number of contrary tendencies, the chief being the emergent social and symbolic contrast of the "head" and "freak" patterns—a contrast which, as we have seen, encompasses cultural elements well beyond the immediate realm of drug use *per se*. While the two patterns can, through several analytical levels removed, be traced back ultimately to certain historically persistent, subterranean expressive value strains in American society-at-large (see Matza, 1964), their surfacing and intimate co-existence within the hippie subculture serve to aggravate already difficult problems of member socialization, group integration and ideology that confront the community (Davis, 1967). Stated otherwise, the process of community formation is hindered, not wholly, or even primarily, by outside forces of repression—for, these will often solidify a social movement—but through the generation of anomie from within as well. If illegal and socially condemned drug use did not play so large a part in the subculture, these divisive tendencies could, perhaps, be better contained. As is, however, the pervasiveness of illegal drug use constantly opens up the subculture to a gamut of socially disparate, unassimilable elements and assorted predators, few of whom share the ethos of love, expressive freedom and disengagement from narrow materialistic pursuits that animated, and still animates, many within the movement. And, since it is highly unlikely that the drugs favored by hippies (again, possibly excepting marijuana) will soon be made legal, this situation is likely to get worse before it gets better.

As to the drug use patterns themselves, it can only be a matter of conjecture as to which—"head" or "freak"—if either, will come eventually to clearly prevail in the hippie community. Although the "head" pattern appears on the face of it to resonate more deeply with those broader philosophical and ideational themes that dis-

tinguish the movement,⁹ it has, in the Haight-Ashbury at least, already lost much ground to the more exclusively hedonistic "freak" pattern. Should it continue to do so, what did have the earmarks of a culturally significant expressive social movement on the American scene could easily dissolve into little more than the sociologist's familiar "drug users' deviant subculture."

REFERENCES

- Becker, Howard S.
 1963 *Outsiders*. New York: Free Press.
 1967 "History, culture and subjective experience: an exploration of the social bases of drug-induced experiences." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 8 (September):163-176.
- Berger, Bennett M.
 1967 "Hippie morality—more old than new." *Trans-action* 5 (December):19-27.
- Blum, Richard H. and Associates.
 1964 *Utopiates: The Use and Users of LSD-25*. New York: Atherton.
- Blumer, Herbert.
 1946 "Collective behavior." Pp. 199-221 in Alfred McClung Lee (ed.) *New Outline of the Principles of Sociology*. New York: Barnes and Noble.
- Burke, Kenneth.
 1954 *Permanence and Change*. Los Altos, California: Hermes.
- Bruyn Severyn T.
 1966 *The Human Perspective in Sociology*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Coleman, James S., Elihu Katz and Herbert Menzel.

⁹ In this connection, a case could be made, and is by some hippies, that much which is distinctive about the hippie subculture (e.g., its music, aversion to physical violence, return to nature, communal sharing, etc.) are the product of the "acid" experience rather than psycho-cultural determinants of it. That is to say, the direct psychopharmacologic effects of LSD (see pp. 7-8) are such as to lead people to selectively reconstitute their inner world of memory, feeling, percept, attitude, etc. in a new and *particularistic* way—in this instance a kind of Apollonian reconstruction of social reality. If true this opens up the interesting, and frightening, Huxleyan possibility of drugs not merely regulating culture but, in an important sense, generating it as well. Also, if true, this would call for certain qualifications in Becker's (1967) proposed thesis that it is the users' subculture, and not the direct effects of the drug *per se*, which largely determine the meaning and ideational content of the drug induced experience.

- 1966 *Medical Innovation, a Diffusion Study*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Davis, Fred.
1961 "Deviance disavowal." *Social Problems* 9 (Fall):120-132.
1967 "Why all of us may be hippies someday." *Trans-action* 5 (December): 10-18.
- Didion, Joan.
1967 "The hippie generation." *Saturday Evening Post* (September 23).
- Freidson, Eliot.
1965 "Disability as social deviance." Pp. 71-99 in Marvin B. Sussman (ed.), *Sociology and Rehabilitation*. Washington: American Sociological Association.
- Goffman, Erving.
1963 *Stigma*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Kitsuse, John I.
1962 "Societal reaction to deviant behavior." *Social Problems* 9 (Winter):247-256.
- Kramer, John C., Vitezslav S. Fischman and Don C. Littlefield.
1967 "Amphetamine abuse." *JAMA* 201 (July 31):305-309.
- Lemert, Edwin.
1962 "Paranoia and the dynamics of exclusion." *Sociometry* 25 (March):2-20.
- Matza, David.
1964 "Position and behavior patterns of youth." In Robert E. L. Faris (ed.), *Handbook of Modern Sociology*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Seeley, John.
1967 *The Americanization of the Unconscious*. Philadelphia and New York: International Science Press.
- Simon Geoffrey and Grafton Trout.
1967 "Hippies in college—from teeny-boppers to drug freaks." *Trans-action* 5 (December):27-32.
- Sjoberg, Gideon (ed.).
1967 *Ethics, Politics and Social Research*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman.
- Smith, David E.
1967 "Lysergic acid diethylamide: an historical perspective." *Journal of Psychedelic Drugs* 1 (Summer):2-7.
- Strauss, Anselm L.
1959 *Mirrors and Masks*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.
- Strauss, Rick.
1967 "Confessions of a speedfreak." *Los Angeles Oracle* 1 (July).
- Strong, Samuel M.
1946 "Negro-white relations as reflected in social types." *American Journal of Sociology* 52 (July):23-30.
- van Hoffman, Nicholas.
1967 "Dope scene—big business in the Haight." *San Francisco Chronicle* (October 31).

A San Francisco Bay Area "Speed" Scene

JAMES T. CAREY AND JERRY MANDEL

University of California, Berkeley

This study explores the physical, psychological and social effects of massive doses of amphetamines among a group of heavy users in Berkeley, California, their round of life, and the effect of the law on these social relations. Data were gathered through interviews with users, reports of key informants and participant observation. The findings suggest that the behavior reported is a result of the interaction of three factors: the chemical effect of the drug, the setting within which it is used, and the impact of the law.

SOCIAL scientists, medical researchers and law enforcement personnel have noted the wave of illegal drug use that has been building in the United States since the early 1960's. (Goddard, 1962; Kramer, 1967; Larrick, 1964; Sandusk, 1966; Seevers, 1965). One unique feature of this development is its middle class character. Numerous middle class youth who use and have access to mind altering drugs not only

make a free choice to violate the law, but also choose the drugs they will experiment with and later use regularly.

Once they choose to alter their minds, the personal and social consequences of drug-taking depends largely on the chemical impact of the drug as well as the broader context—such as laws against drug use and the attitudes of peers and authorities—in which drug-taking occurs.