tion of interpretation, interpretation of interpretation of interpretation, etc. Seeley goes further and considers the possibility—in his view, the actuality—of unconscious determinants of a career in the social sciences and of the shape and content of a social science project, such as the one he reported in *Crestwood Heights*.

This is a small illustration of the fact that Seeley's is a "What" book, rather than an "Ah, yes" book. Many books enthrall us because they put into words what we believe but have not quite formulated. They make us exclaim, "Ah, yes! That is just the way it is!" The other type, rarer, more difficult, more nourishing, makes us say, "What! How's that? Say that again!" I certainly never thought of *my* projects as having any relationship to any infantile hang-ups, but now I'm not so sure. Maybe. Partly. I can certainly see where *yours* have.

The Paradox of Neutrality

A major theme in Seeley's own book is suggested by his remark that "sociology reencounters itself in its own subject matter." Elsewhere, he sets forth what he calls "the inexhaustibility theorem." This is the idea that "the subject matter of something cannot be exhausted if the first description both alters, and, in any case, increases the subject matter to be described." One cannot, then, in partaking of the activities that comprise the human "sciences," separate oneself from the content of the activity. Artificial efforts to attain neutrality or objectivity can only lead to alienation. Theorizing is itself a form of action. Such activities then are necessarily meliorist, involve the "advocacy of the generalized underdog," are even utopian and revolutionary, because it is revolutionary and has revolutionary effects to redefine and to appeal to new principles and to introduce new values. The psychiatrist and, one supposes, the sociologist, to the extent that they are engaged in overcoming alienation and are not themselves alienated, *are* revolutionaries, however reluctant.

Seeley's second major theme is the relationships and interpenetrations of psychiatry and sociology, whose practitioners he sees as each a "carer-helper-facilitator," one oriented more to individuals, the other more to groups or publics, both in need of unlinking from traditional scientific norms and canons, each in need of the other's insights. He proposes nothing less than a pushing forward together, in a "beneficial encounter," in search of a common theory.

Like one returning from an art exhibit or a world's fair, I feel impelled to instruct the reader-visitor to Seeley's exposition, to say, "Don't neglect. . . . Don't miss . . . ." Space permits me to point to only a few choice examples, without explication. Don't neglect, then, don't miss:

—his constant touching on the theme that "facts" about human beings are dependent on the act of definition and the underlying interest in the particulars of reality that are defined. ". . . the facts are *constituted* by the passionate commitment." Thus, for example, "social problems" are only that when they are so defined and so limited by the definition;

—his brilliant analyses of criminal and mental-health legislation and his demonstration that crime and mental illness are both functional, during which he casually and astonishingly remarks that ". . . the society punishes those—perhaps always those and only those—whom it has previously offended";

—his plea that we educate our children fairly by teaching them "the facts of life," that is, the truth about power and money;

—his analysis of the motivating function of poverty, in which he says that differential poverty has the structure of slavery and says, with respect to the American drive toward mobility and equalization of opportunity, "Perfected, the scheme resembles one in which it is possible (or easy) for slaves to become slave owners. In sharp contrast are schemes directed to the diminution or extirpation of slavery. And still different, of course, are schemes designed to give 'comforts' to the slaves."

Taken together, the two books can be interpreted as an intricate and sweeping prescription for those of us who are in human science–human service activities, a passport that allows us legitimately to come out of the bleachers and into the arena where the action is, free to act even as we are being acted upon, open to influence from that which we try to influence, understanding in order to liberate and liberating through understanding, returning to our common task, which is to help in the unfolding of secular man's true self.

WILLIAM RYAN
Yale School of Medicine,
New Haven, Connecticut

The LSD Problem

LSD, Man and Society. A Symposium, Middletown, Conn., March 1967. RICHARD C. DEBOLD and RUSSELL C. LEAF, Eds. Wesleyan University Press, Middletown, Conn., 1967. xii + 219 pp., illus. $5.

Along with black power and Vietnam, the use of LSD and related drugs has recently been one of the issues tending most sharply to polarize opinion in younger intellectual circles in the United States. That LSD can be a source of transcendent, if sometimes terrifying, experience is denied by few; the issue is whether such experience tends to be seriously damaging to organism, ego, or society. Controversy over black power and Vietnam hinges on different interpretations of historical-political developments and basic disagreements as to social priorities and national morality. One might assume that controversy over LSD would be more readily dispelled by scientific evidence. This report of a symposium held at Wesleyan University early in 1967 indicates that the then-available evidence established LSD as a dangerous substance but still left room for the play of different value premises in deciding on the circumstances, if any, under which the drug might be used.

The Wesleyan symposium was far-ranging, touching upon social-psychological, therapeutic, religious, and legal aspects of the use of LSD on the one hand, and on the pharmacology, neurophysiological actions, and behavioral effects on the other. Unlike some university symposia on the topic, this one contained no proselytizers for LSD. Several of the participants, notably Barron, Kurland, and Pahnke, express the conviction that LSD may serve important positive functions—for expanding consciousness, in the treatment of alcoholics and certain neurotics, and for the attainment of mystical experience in religious contemplation. Those most categorically opposed to any use of LSD, except in limited clinical circumstances, cite substantial evidence of untoward effects, particularly of drug-induced psychoses, in unsupervised use of the drug. Certainly there has been sufficient evidence of the danger of unsupervised "trips" to support strong condemnation of self-experimentation with LSD, but the precipitation of psychological breakdown under well-controlled and supervised circumstances appears to be relatively rare. Direct long-term effects of the drug are essentially unknown, as is the prevalence and

frequency of its use in various segments of the population.

Many LSD users feel certain that they have had a highly worthwhile experience, that they understand themselves better and are more free and creative as a result, but almost no objective evidence exists to confirm or disconfirm their impressions. Jarvik's brief but well-documented report of the behavioral effects of LSD summarizes roughly 100 papers relating to animal studies (with species ranging from Siamese fighting fish and salamanders to the Asiatic elephant and various monkeys) as well as human studies. Most of the studies of humans deal with subjective reports, but those that involve tests of perceptual, motor, and cognitive functioning generally show impairment of such functioning under LSD. Judgment is certainly seriously impaired during the immediate drug state, but only anecdotal data relate to later consequences.

Unquestionably, research on the hallucinogens has been slowed down by governmental control. Since LSD is not available through normal pharmaceutical channels, control has required the setting up of new procedures for distribution of available supplies. If it should be firmly established that LSD produces genetic damage, perhaps the delays in distribution for research purposes have been a blessing in disguise. If LSD does not appear to cause significant biological damage, one hopes that participants in future symposia on the hallucinogens will have much more adequate research data on long-term consequences for the individual and his career.

Legislation against drug abuse cannot, of course, wait for research. Federal legislation relating to LSD—under the Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965—shows much greater sophistication than federal laws dealing with addicting drugs. Fortunately, the 1965 laws were based upon professional knowledge and opinions and were not designed primarily to be punitive. State laws have more often been based on emotional concerns. In one of the most provocative papers in this collection, Neil Chayet reviews the state and federal legislation and the issues involved in trying to achieve a balance between indivdual rights and protection of the public. Some states, one of them Massachusetts, have by fiat declared LSD a narcotic and have made it a felony not only to be illegally in possession of LSD, but even to be present where a narcotic drug is illegally kept. Most states make possession a misdemeanor; some have no legislation relating to LSD. There is well-nigh unanimous concurrence that LSD is far more dangerous than marijuana, yet marijuana is lumped with the opiates and possessing it is made a felony by federal and most state laws. However absurd the groupings of drugs in legislation relating to this emotion-laden topic, it is discouragingly difficult to achieve redefinitions once the laws are written. Many lawmakers appear to be oblivious of the educational implications of legislation concerning drug abuse.

Neither legal definitions nor repeated statements of the dangers of LSD are likely to turn all intelligent young people away from the drug. Again and again during the discussion periods at the Wesleyan symposium, members of the audience asked, How can LSD use be made safer? If it does have potential positive functions, how can these be achieved without violating the law? These questions are likely to be with us for some time. By presenting what is known, as well as frank, nonmoralistic discussion of issues posed by those for whom LSD has attractions, the Wesleyan symposium makes a valuable contribution.

JOHN A. CLAUSEN
Department of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley

Carnivores of Consequence

Mongooses. Their Natural History and Behaviour. H. E. HINTON and A. M. S. DUNN. University of California Press, Berkeley, 1967. viii + 144 pp., illus. $6.50.

The Biology of the Striped Skunk. B. J. VERTS. University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1967. xiv + 218 pp., illus. $7.95.

These two books, treating in detail representatives of two closely related families of mammals, make fine companion volumes for the biologist's reference library. The striped skunk, *Mephitis mephitis*, is a familiar member of the nearly cosmopolitan family Mustelidae, which includes also the weasels, stoats, ferrets, minks, otters, and others. The strictly Old World family Viverridae contains the civets, genets, linsangs, meerkats, and a variety of mongooses of nearly 20 genera. Who has not heard of the exploits of Kipling's Rikki-tikki-tavi, or of the problems, a few years ago, of Mr. Magoo at the Duluth Zoo? Here is much useful background information on both skunks and mongooses.

Mongooses is by two British authors; Howard Hinton is professor of entomology at the University of Bristol, and Sarah Dunn headmistress of Colston's Girls' School. Their book is largely the result of extensive library research. It attempts to cover generally the natural history and behavior of mongooses, and does a good job of this. In addition, it delves deeply into the legendry and folklore of mongooses in ancient Egypt and India, and it discusses the introduction of the small Indian mongoose to the West Indies and the Hawaiian Islands, where it became established and now is a mixed blessing. In fact, its introduction was "one of the most disastrous attempts ever made at biological control" of rats and other pests. Good photographs illustrate most species, and line drawings depict many details. A bibliography of 259 titles is appended, as well as a complete index.

B. J. Verts, a wildlife ecologist at Oregon State University, writes of only one species and bases his work largely on his own field studies. During the early 1950's, wildlife researchers and epidemiologists were concerned by the increased number of rabies cases involving wildlife species in the Midwest. The incidence in striped skunks exceeded that in all other mammals combined. These circumstances led to the studies here reported, carried out from 1957 to 1965 in northwestern Illinois, which served as the author's doctoral dissertation. Besides a general discussion of the habits and life history of the skunk, there is heavy emphasis on parasites and diseases, particularly rabies, which will be of special interest to veterinarians, ecologists, public health personnel, and others. The author concludes that "rabies cannot be maintained by skunk populations if transmission depends entirely on the biting of noninfected animals by those infected." He speculates on how the disease is maintained during interepizootic periods, and on reasons for the seasonal peak in its prevalence and the different rates of infection in males and females. The book is illustrated by 59 figures, and contains a bibliography of 271 titles and a detailed index.

RICHARD H. MANVILLE
Bird and Mammal Laboratories, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C.