The book's prevailing theme: to present "deviants" alphabetically by author or editor, give tantalizing harder psychedelics), mental disorder, homosexuality, radicalism of various kinds, property and folk variously at odds with conventional society. It is precisely because the contemporary university in so many nations operates as the legitimizing and socializing surrogate of "civilized society" that it is being confronted from within. (On this point see Lipset's own earlier work on Student Politics (1967) in Latin America and France.) So viewed, the dialogue of the deaf between what William Gamson calls the partisans of stability through "social control" and the disturbers of such peace who organize individual and group "influence" against establishments becomes understandable. The plaintive irony is, of course, that this syndrome of incomprehension should characterize a work devoted to explaining the categorization of the selections is participant-observer evocation of personal experience in the specific form of deviance, and incidental observations on the life-style of the particular deviant subculture. These are present in at least twenty of the selections, and central in about half of these. Good personal documents from participants often have a richness, complexity and refractory immediacy and concreteness, not usually to be obtained from generalizing social-scientific works. Some of the longer selections here do have this quality, and are intrinsically poignant and moving in their own right: Morag Coate's account of her descent into schizophrenia, Richard Jones on taking psilocybin (On this point see Lipset's own earlier work on (p. 132). The last three may provide snippets for the central value of a collection such as this: concrete illumination without generalization, the work of artist or journalist, not that of social scientist.

The selections are most valuable where they are most personal and concrete, less so where assaying general statements about the deviant subculture, and least of all where attempting to "explain" the deviant behavior. A Piccadilly streetwalker (sele­ tion #4) is vividly authentic telling how she picks up her johns. But Marlowe's tract makes sententious generalities about homosexuals, a woman convict (#5) utters banalities "explaining" why women turn to crime, a nudist mother pontificates that children find nudity "perfectly natural" (p. 132). The last three may provide snippets for
a study of subculture folklore (though obviously an insufficient sample), but are clearly not credible analyses of the behavior or the subcultures concerned, showing once again that firsthand participation does not ensure understanding of a social phenomenon. (Romanticists of the outré and black-studies separatists please note.) It is interesting to learn that the junkie "Danny Stern" estimates there are five times as many junkies as official statistics indicate (p. 147) but until someone does a systematic social-scientific study (perhaps along the lines of the self-report studies in delinquency) neither we nor Danny have any way to know if this is really true.

Beyond idiographic illumination, then, what value have such selections as these for a generalizing social science? Clinical study of the individual personality? Clearly not the interest of these editors. In any case, the selections are far too brief, and only one (Coate) nearly rich enough for such use.

As preliminary material for subculture study? Here, though incidental ethnographic information does appear, the concentration on statements of individuals is a severe limitation. The editors imply that such material is a necessary corrective to sociological studies by questionnaire and interview methods. But the latter are typically studies of aggregates of similarly categorized individuals. The relevant comparison, which the editors strangely ignore, is to another kind of research: direct "anthropological" field observation, under whatever formal credentials (journalist Von Hoffman is excellent on hippies, language scholar Wylie on a Vaucuse village.) Can the individual insider "voices from the margin" included here measure up to such outsider field reports? What insiders have the requisite gift of double vision, the ability simultaneously to see their own situation both inwardly, in close-up depth, and outwardly, with the perspective of middle or farther distance? With both richness of personal subjectivity and a broad range of interpersonal empathy?

A sensitive rendering by an articulate participant, of his own experience of the world, can be a moving and illuminating experience for the reader, broadening and deepening his empathic range. (It is not the same kind of thing as analysis—not inferior, but different.) This the editors evidently had in mind. But since the best examples of this kind of personal report are likely to come from particularly gifted individuals, it is a shame the editors did not turn to additional creative artists besides Burroughs, Fitzgerald, and Bruce, for selections. How about non-fiction from Koestler, Lawrence, Wilde, Genet? (Too European?) Mailer, Richard Wright, Henry Miller, then? (And by what literalistic fundamentalism are fiction, poetry, and drama excluded?)

Since topicality in this field shifts so rapidly, I suggest a revised edition include something from such post-1967 writings as Eldridge Cleaver, Dotson Rader, Abbie Hoffman and Hells’ Angel Free-wheelin’ Frank, and personal testimonials from practitioners of theater nudity, encounter groups, rural hippie communes and the “gay liberation front,” for a sampler.

In sum, this is an interesting collection that defies any one consistent rationale. I’d prefer fewer, longer selections, and replace some with favorites of my own—but that’s de gustibus. Many of the selections do indeed suggest that there are more things, on earth at least, than are dreamed of in the philosophy of current social science. If this collection keeps alive such openness to “things left out” of present attempts at analysis, it will have served us well.

ROBERT ENDELMAN

Adelphi University and McGill University


The articles comprising Marijuana are concerned for the most part with the social aspects of marijuana usage in contemporary America. This book is one of a series published under the general title "The Atherton Controversies." Indeed, in the United States today marijuana is a topic of continuing controversy and debate. The range of opinions regarding marijuana usage is as varied as the authors who address the topic. The editor doesn’t attempt to resolve the controversy in this volume, but he does examine the issues involved (in the editor’s Introduction and prefaces to each section) and includes contrasting points of view on these issues. In Goode’s words: “... it is through the experience of disagreement and discord that the reader will encounter the ‘reality’ of marijuana” (p. xi).

This anthology contains considerable relevant material drawn from a variety of sources in addition to standard writings from sociological journals. The twenty-four selections that make up this volume include excerpts from books and reprinted articles, as well as selections previously unpublished, including four autobiographical accounts by persons who smoke and sell marijuana.

Particularly noteworthy is the editor’s Introduction. The reader is introduced to the history of marijuana use; the jargon and lore of marijuana, including preparation, consumption and dosage; distribution of the drug in America; and the legal controls regulating its use. Moreover, the editorial comments throughout the book are excellent.

Space limitations preclude an evaluation of each of the individual articles. The text as a whole is organized into seven parts. Part One, The Question of Motivation, contains three essays contrasting the position of the psychologist with that of the sociologist regarding motives for the use of marijuana. Part Two, Physiological Effects of Marijuana, deals with the marijuana “high” from the viewpoint of a physician, a smoker, and a law enforcement officer. The Connection Between Marijuana and Heroin, Part Three, contains four papers on the relationship between the use of these two drugs. The paper by Ball and Chambers contains...