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Chapter 1

You Have a Constitutional Right to Psychedelics

Academic Freedom, Personal Conscience, and Psychotechnologies

Thomas B. Roberts

The problem: we do not suppress books and the ideas they contain; we do suppress psychedelic mindstates and the ideas they contain.

Censorship is the issue of contention here: intellectual censorship. In this chapter, we’ll spot the single-state fallacy as one psychological and intellectual root of this problem, claim a constitutional right to use psychedelic mindstates, and list some of the ideas that suffer a chilling effect because of our current policies. This chapter does not propose a solution to this situation but challenges policy makers and ethicists in hopes that it will help them build one.

Who has the right to rule on what ideas you may and may not consider? Who has the right to regulate how you choose to use your mind? Not the Congress of the United States, not the Drug Enforcement Administration, not the National Institute of Drug Abuse (NIDA). I contend that you, and I, and everyone else have the legal right to determine the contents of our minds, to select our thinking processes, and to explore and develop our minds as we see fit. But as appealing as this idea seems on the face of things, that simple answer isn’t the position we find ourselves in.

Multistate Theory

A helpful twenty-first-century theory helps explain why this is a problem of censorship (Roberts, 2013, pp. 121–134).

 In addition to our ordinary, awake, default mindbody state, we humans have the ability to achieve and use a repertoire of mindbody states and their resident abilities. Selecting the most efficient state for a particular purpose demonstrates multistate metaintelligence.

 Using mindapps (psychotechnologies for producing mindstates), we can install these states in our minds. Psychedelics are one family of mindapps.

 Psychological and bodily processes vary from mindbody state to mindbody state. In this chapter we are paying particular attention to cognitive processes and ideas that reside in psychedelic states.

Given the fact that humans are multistate beings, policy makers and ethicists must consider those states, their respective contents and abilities, and ways to achieve them. In this chapter, we will consider psychedelic instances of this wider idea. Some mindbody states are dangerous to the people who are in them and to others. Some are immensely beneficial. So psychedelic policy quickly becomes complicated as policy makers try to write policies that maximize benefits and minimize harms.

Making matters even more complex, psychedelics are certainly important for psychotherapy and are receiving most of current attention for that purpose. When psychedelics are used in a medical context, it is appropriate to call them “drugs,” but not in nonmedical contexts. In this chapter we’ll sample their intellectual uses, see how they provide insightful ideas about what it means to be a person, and explore ways they enrich our understanding of human culture. For this purpose, we’ll simply use the common language noun *psychedelics*. Focusing on psychotherapy misses psychedelics’ other major values. Answering this question helps appreciate this quandary:

Which domains do psychedelic fall under?

a) health

b) law

c) science

d) arts

e) religion

f) philosophy

g) humanities

h) business

i) politics

j) education

k) recreation

l) all of the above

Of course, the answer is “all of the above.” To put the question another way: Who owns this topic? Every one of these fields has its legitimate claims. And it’s even more complicated than that. In each of these domains, psychedelics can be both useful and destructive depending on who uses them, how skillfully they are used, and even where they are used.

Set and Setting, Both Personal and Cultural

In trying to understand the tangled and conflicting views toward psychedelics, I find the phrase “set and setting” useful. This phrase goes back at least to 1963 (Leary, Levine, & Metzner, 1963). From a medical perspective, “set” (what is going on in patients’ minds, mind-set) or “setting” (the influence of the location where the patients are when they take a drug) simply doesn’t matter for most medicines. To most medical doctors, when set and setting influenced patients’ reaction to psychedelics (i.e., interfered with it), that just proved that the drugs were unreliable. I find “set and setting” useful not only when we consider the effects on individuals but also on a wider scale as clues to socially established attitudes, official policies, and psychedelic constituencies.

The Freudian Cesspool

Why are psychedelics such a problem, or more properly, such a quagmire of problems? It helps to start by identifying several historical points, then identifying today’s elements of controversy. Psychedelics were born into controversy. In the late 1940s and 1950s when psychedelics were first being investigated, psychology and the mental health professions were split between varieties of psychoanalysis and behavioral psychology. The former (largely Freudian but with other varieties contributing) saw the origins of mental problems other than organic ones as developing from childhood relations, which were largely hidden in each person’s unconscious. From this perspective, rational, realistic thinking occurred only in our normal, awake, conscious mindbody state. In Freudian theory, not only dreams but also all other forms of thinking were flushed down into the Freudian cesspool of fear, lust, and aggression — : the unconscious. Hypnosis, mediation, yoga, and other mindstates resided there, too. Psychedelic experiences belonged in this cesspool.

The Behavioral Black Box

Behavioral psychology, on the other hand, said that who we are was the product of what behaviors we had been rewarded and punished for. Except for physiological problems such as brain tumors or injuries, the interior function of the human brain was “a black box” as behaviorists called it. It was constant, and there was no need and no ability to look “inside.” As stunning as this ignorance seems to us today with our fast-growing knowledge of the neurosciences, that was a powerful belief in the mid-twentieth century. Things that messed up the black box were interpreted as similar to brain damage or tumors, perhaps causing lesions in the brain. When psychedelics came along, this pigeonhole was waiting for them.

The Psychiatric Pharmacopeia

Along came tranquilizers such as Milltown and amphetamines, “uppers” and “energizers,” “Mother’s Little Helper” as the title of a *Rolling Stones* song satirized them. Freudians and behaviorists didn’t take kindly to psychoactive drugs. “They didn’t cure underlying problems,” many psychoanalysts said, “They simply masked the symptoms.” To behaviorists, they mucked up internal processes and interfered with reinforcement and punishment. Like other psychoactive medicines, psychedelics were tarred with the same brush and seemed even worse.

In the 1960s and 1970s, as new psychoactive medicines began to gain a professional foothold in spite of resistance to them, another specifically psychedelic problem arose. In the emerging psychiatric pharmacopeia, each new medicine generally had specific, more or less reliable effects, but not psychedelics. What good was a medicine that had different effects on different people and even different effects with the same person from session to session? This variability contraindicated psychedelics as a take-home prescription medicine and even as an in-session adjuvant. Doctors were used to medicines that anyone could take anywhere at anytime with fairly predictable effects. Being unprepared to see set and setting as two powerful co-causes of the drugs, it is no wonder that doctors and researchers found psychedelics confusing.

The Curse of the 1960s

Added to that, in the 1960s and 1970s, psychedelics, especially lysergic acid diethylamide  (LSD), were associated in the public mind with social turmoil, antiwar demonstrations, black power and civil rights, gays beginning to come out, the ecology movement, communism, women’s equality, hippiedom, weird clothing and music, sexual openness, and anything else people disapproved of. “Why were so many normal, healthy, American youths acting that way?” people asked. “The Mind Destroying Dangers of LSD!” made good press (Davidson, 1967), with lots of graphics for print media and TV. Of course, most American youth in the 1960s simply lived normal lives, got jobs, and became ordinary students and citizens. What’s newsworthy about that? Preachers and politicians love to scare people about something then offer to save them from it. Preachers get souls and congregants; politicians get elected. Without well-known medical uses but with fears amplified by the news media, many states, then Congress, banned psychedelics in the mid-1960s, except, officially, for hard-to-obtain (virtually impossible) research. Even 30 years later, they continued to tighten the vice. The Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 stated in part:

(12) shall ensure that no Federal funds appropriated to the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall be expended for any study or contract relating to the legalization (for a medical use or any other use) of a substance listed in schedule I of [the Controlled Substances Act] and take such actions as necessary to oppose any attempt to legalize the use of a substance (in any form) that—(A) is listed in schedule I of section 812 of this title; and . . .

Psychedelics, marijuana, and heroin are among the Schedule I drugs. Congress in its wisdom voted for ignorance. Furthermore, the effects of psychedelics are so different from those of other psychoactive drugs that applying the same laws and policies to them qualifies as more ignorance but blended with foolishness.

Two Generations of Needless Suffering

With newspapers, radio networks, and TV channels seeking readers, listeners, and viewers rather than accuracy, politicians of the 1960s reacted to media-stoked public hysteria by freezing research into psychedelics’ medical and psychotherapeutic leads. Millions of people who might have been cured weren’t. This continued needless suffering for two generations of alcoholics and addicts, victims of post-traumatic stress disorder, migraine and cluster headaches, anxiety about dying, and a wide range of neurotics and psychotics (Winkelman & Roberts, 2007). This policy shame continues today and provides an adjacent reason ethicists should be involved in today’s policy matters.

Ironically coming from a psychoanalytic tradition that had previously offhandedly-dismissed psychoactive drugs, some Freudianly trained psychoanalysts such as Stanislav Grof discovered how to use LSD as an adjunct to depth psychotherapy (Grof, 1975, 1980). It opened patients’ psychological set (including repressed traumas) as a way to explore both their conscious minds and most especially their unconscious minds. Reframing psychedelics as amplifiers of subjective experience (a sort of microscope for viewing the mind), Grof and others used them to help patients recall traumatic events and treat their dysfunctions. In other cases overpowering mystical experiences showed therapeutic results. Sessa’s chapters in this book detail this advance (Chapters 2 and 3). But by then, news media and drug education programs had solidified politically based positions and hardened social attitudes.

In contrast to their mid-twentieth-century forebears, ironically, by the end of the twentieth century, most new psychiatrists had begun to use psychoactive drugs as the treatments of choice, turning around the historically hostile psychiatric profession. As legal psychoactive drugs became the psychiatric norm, “talking cures” and extended psychotherapeutic interactions with professionals had become professionally déclassé, so day-long psychedelic sessions faced an unlevel professional field too.

So that leaves us now with professional assumptions and lingering social-political policies that are derived from the attitudes of more than a generation ago. In the twenty-first century, however, research is again opening up as the chapters by Sessa (2 and 3), Goldsmith (20), Fadiman (12), and others (4, 5, 9) in this book demonstrate. Expressing today’s more scientifically accurate and medically informed perspective, on March 9, 2014, National Public Radio’s *All Things Considered* featured an 11-minute segment “The Sixties Are Gone, But Psychedelic Research Trip Continues.” But contrasting perspectives are aggravated by contradictory opinions about nearly all aspects of psychedelics, and their intellectual contributions are almost unknown outside segments of the psychedelic community.

A Deep Core of the Problem— Singlestate or Multistate?

Like the first domino in a standing line, when our idea of what it means to have a mind falls over, everything down the line changes. What it means to be a person, what we can do, what we can learn, what we expect of others, what society and culture are—all these may change, and for some (even many) people, psychedelics were the head domino. Historically and for most people most of the time, the first domino of the mind consists of our ordinary, default mindbody state (sometimes called “state of consciousness”) plus sleeping and dreaming. In this “single-state” view of our minds, our ordinary default states reign with unquestioned privilege.

A psychedelic domino can replace the head domino and did for many people. For millions of others, hypnosis, mediation, neurofeedback, martial arts, yoga, dream work, breathing techniques, contemplative prayer, chanting, and similar mindbody psychotechnologies (“mindapps”) became lead dominos. Although being done mostly for medical and psychotherapeutic treatments, advances in the neurosciences may lead to whole new sources of mindapps as described in the chapter “Mindapps and the Neurosingularity Project”(Chapter 14). Psychedelics are so powerful that for many of the 26 million experienced people in the United States (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2010) the single-state view of the mind looked naïve. Millions of others with experiences with other mindapps agreed. They all realized there was more to their minds than the simple default states.

Today’s Constituents, Constraints, and Conflicts

Furthermore, what makes a rational psychedelics policy so difficult is that contradictory facts and informed opinions may both be true for different people, at different times, under different circumstances. By magnifying set and setting, psychedelics may have opposite effects in different situations for different people. Depending on those particulars, informed and even contrasting judgments may both be true some of the time. Here and throughout this chapter, such qualifiers as *may, some, many, sometimes, often, on occasion, depending on circumstances* and similar words and phrases are not mere weasel words; they express an unfortunate, major, realistic difficulty in formulating a rational psychedelics policy—the variable, confusing, and even contradictory effects of set and setting. On occasion, opposites may both be truegenerally speaking.

Adding even more to the confusion, psychedelics have culture-wide uses. Legal and illegal, therapeutic or nontherapeutic, they influence all the topics that appeared as choices in the “Which topic?” question mentioned earlier. Here we’ll survey some psychedelic-informed conflicts about how we see: mind, health, religion, science, law, the arts, humanities, and business. Then we’ll tackle some imaginary case examples of policy questions they raise. Is it possible to formulate policies that will cover this quagmire of diverse situations, varied constituencies, individual differences, disciplinary paradigms, and practical uses?

Healthcare and/or Healthcurse?

As you might expect, the *and/or* in the preceding heading is the operative word. In addition to the dose, the cures or curses depend on who is administering psychedelics, for what purpose, the mind-set of the person taking it, and the situation. Historically psychotherapy was the commonest psychedelic topic, and today it is the overwhelming topic of discussion. Several chapters in this book (e.g., Sessa) and many other books have summarized the psychotherapeutic angles (Grinspoon & Bakalar, 1979; Winkelman & Roberts, 2007).

The position that psychedelics are primarily harmful is characterized by federal agencies, particularly the politically based Drug Enforcement Agency, part of the Department of Justice. In contrast to the DEA’s claims, a thorough survey of reports on adverse reactions, Strassman (1984) found that almost all incidents occurred from self-doses of unknown strength, questionable content, and possible contamination, by people who were unprepared and with likely at-risk sets, and commonly in dubious, stress-producing settings. In a very real sense, these “casualties” result from our current policies that prohibit legal screening, preparation, session guidance, and post-session integration except under strict research protocols. One also cannot know a street drug’s purity and strength. Bioethicists would probably have some cogent remarks about policies that encourage harm.

The NIDA is part of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services but has historically confused illegality with abuse as in “vulnerability for abusing marijuana, sedatives, stimulants, heroin, and psychedelics” (National Institute of Drug Abuse, 2000). Noting a better-informed policy shift in recent years, NIDA and the Food and Drug Administration have allowed psychedelic research to resume provided it meets high scientific and medical standards (www.clinicaltrials.gov).

The news media’s bias for scary drug stories from the 1950s through the 1990s has switched to a more balanced view too with more differentiated attention to differences among psychoactive drugs and an awareness that are used by skilled professionals, some of them have promising psychotherapeutic uses. Most noticeably, this changed attitude showed up in 2006 news reports of psilocybin research at the Johns Hopkins Medical School’s Behavioral Pharmacology Research Unit (Griffiths, Richards, McCann, & Jesse, 2006). Over 300 print articles as well as TV and radio news reported on the research, and follow-on research has been covered too (Council on Spiritual Practices, 2014).

The news media’s coverage of the Johns Hopkins psilocybin studies illustrates what may be a more sophisticated awareness about psychedelics’ implications not only for medicine but also for wider cultural issues. As the title of the 2006 article shows, “Psilocybin Can Occasion Mystical-Type Experiences Having Substantial and Sustained Personal Meaning and Spiritual Significance,” the philosophical topic of meaningfulness and the religious topic of spirituality are part of the current psychedelic story. Even though most current thinking about psychedelic policy has to do with the health-medicine-psychotherapy complex⎯and it should⎯these sightings of psychedelics’ cultural uses should alert policy makers to widen the scope of their concerns.

Religion: Transcendence Trumps Text

In 2011 the *Oxford English Dictionary* defined *entheogen*, “The term is used for psychedelics that are intentionally used spiritually, that is, they generate (*engen*) the experience of god (*theo*) within.” In a very real sense, today’s Entheogenic Reformation extends the Protestant Reformation a giant step (Ellens, 2014; Roberts, 2012). In the latter Reformation, Protestants claimed they needed the Catholic Church less (or even not at all) because the Bible permitted them direct access to the word of God replacing a church that claimed to be the bridge to God. In today’s reformation, entheogenists claim that their sacraments give direct access to the experience of sacredness (sometimes interpreted as God) instead of the word of God in print.

This raises policy questions at every level:

PERSONAL. Do I adjust my beliefs and activities to include entheogens? If so, how?

CHURCH. Is the *Bible*, or other preferred religious text, demoted? Should creeds and observances be changed? Are entheogenists heretics or prophets? Are schisms pending?

LAW. To what extent will the courts and legislators extend the Freedom of Religion beyond the current text based religion to experience-based religions?

Entheogenists today, like their reformist forebears, face similar persecution, but thankfully not so cruel. I haven’t heard of the Drug War drug war burning peyoteists at the stake, torturing ayahuasceros with medieval devices, or burning down the houses of LSD entheogenists. Instead, we jail them with cruelly long sentences, seize their property without charging them with a crime, make them ineligible for governmental benefits, fire them and refuse employment to others, refuse to admit evidence they might give at their trials, expel them from school, deny voting rights, and much more. How much has to happen for this to this qualify as religious persecution?

This clearly is not to say that everyone who claims entheogenic use is being honest. How can policy makers and the courts discriminate when use is authentically spiritual and when people are just posing religion as a shield? Is group membership a criterion? Judaism started with Abraham and Sara, and Christianity with 13 people. Are sacred texts evidence? One belief of the Entheogenic Reformation is to surpass the need for texts. Weekly or other periodic meetings and services, clergy, places of worship, and standard rituals? These do appear in some entheogenic instances, but they seem to be more expressions of their social settings and the cultures than they are necessary formalizations of worship. For many entheogenists, the path to sacred experience (or to God) is through the depths of one’s mind: from this point of view, rituals, beliefs, ethics, and organizations are derived from primary spiritual experiences. For some people these are helpful, but they are secondary sideshows and thus are not necessary (Roberts 2013, pp. 55–79). Can policy makers design a policy that doesn’t require ritual, beliefs, ethics, and organizations? Can they reframe freedom of religion for an entheogenic context? Events in Brazil and to some extent in the United States point to a traditional solution.

In Brazil the ayahuasca churches are adapting standard institutional structures and activities. Watching the growth of ayahuasca-based groups in South America and agreements between the União do Vegetal and the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration, international ayahuasca scholar Beatriz Labate spots an “institutionalization project.” This includes bureaucratization of records, administrative organizations, and establishing leadership roles. Among other manifestations are forming a canon of spiritual processes, codification of lyrics and melodies, the regulation of cultivating, obtaining, and cooking the sacramental tea. The Amazonian UDV, she reports, “is creating a school that will teach courses to its members on growing and handling the species that constitute ayahuasca; the school will supply written curriculum and offer diplomas at completion” (2012). As her subtitle hints, “The UDV–DEA Agreement and the Limits of Freedom of Religion,” when the substance of religion switches from beliefs to experiences, from groups to individuals, from texts to transcendence, where does freedom of religion enter?

Policy makers recognize and governments understand institutional structures, and they provide an established path for recognizing existing churches, but will requiring institutionalization distract from each person’s following his or her individual inner path through his or her own minds to God? Will it even interfere with this process? Are there regulators and lawmakers who are experienced enough with entheogens to make informed freedom-of-religion decisions for the benefit of both church members and the general public? I don’t know of any.

Is Multistate the New Scholarly Normal?

People are curious about their minds; they like to explore them. They enjoy a variety of mindbody states, and many states contain useful skills, others entertaining perspectives, still others new ideas and insights. This chapter looks largely at the last. In their daily lives if not consciously, large parts of the public are rejecting the singlestate fallacy, the erroneous assumption that all worthwhile abilities reside in our ordinary, default mindbody state. An incomplete view of the human mind is bound to produce unrealistic policy, and the single-state fallacy is at the deep core of current drug policy.

New psychotechnologies (mindapps)⎯both drug and nondrug⎯are being invented steadily. Worldwide trade imports and exports them as well as products. As the world culture becomes increasingly multistate, single-state policy will occupy a place of honor between the Flat Earth Exhibit and the Piltdown Man in the Museum of Discarded Ideas.

Particularly with regard to the human mind, psychedelics raise the question, “Can our minds contain worthwhile cognitive processes in mindbody states other than our ordinary, default mindbody state?” As this book illustrates, the answer is a resounding “yes” (Roberts, 2013, 2015). Just as we can install apps in electronic devices to extend their abilities, we can install mindapps to extend our minds’ abilities. Psychedelics are one group of mindapps, and in this chapter we’re looking at some ways they can⎯with the right set and setting⎯extend our cognitive abilities. From a multistate perspective, the fullest human development would have to include accessing useful mindbody states and discovering their useful abilities. This chapter illustrates some discoveries with psychedelic additions to the house of intellect, “Intelligence is the native ability of the creature to achieve its ends by varying the use of its powers” (Barzun, 1961, p. 5). Various powers reside in other mindbody states.

Leaving single-state theory behind, our philosophy of mind needs to expand to include the full range of mindbody states, their resident abilities, and psychedelics and other mindapps as ways to access them (Lemmens, Stokkink, Meijer, Whitmarsh, & Derix, 2015). Likewise, public policy needs to accommodate the full multistate range of our minds and ways to orchestrate our society’s approach to these possibilities. Multistate theory intends multistate policy.

The Psychedelic Intellectual Movement

We now move to the main intellectual claims of this chapter: psychedelics are one method of conceptual research. Conceptual research is the invention, refinement, and application of concepts—paradigms, theories, assumptions, generalizations, conclusions, and so forth. New cognitive processes and the psychotechnologies that install them are a relatively new and obscure conceptual research methodology. It remains for new generations of innovative researchers to develop this direction. The rest of this chapter explores some leads.

 Psychedelics provide additional, useful cognitive skills, but current policy outlaws this method of reaching them.

 Psychedelic experiences provide knowledge about the human mind, inform standard intellectual topics, and enrich culture, but current policy forbids this knowledge.

 Psychedelic experiences make some ideas more credible and others less so, but current policy illegalizes the best evidence (direct personal experience). As a result, these ideas suffer a chilling effect, and the world of ideas is impoverished.

Obviously, psychedelics provide objects to study, experiences to analyze, and topics to investigate. There is nothing really new here⎯worthwhile but ordinary-state scholarship. From *The Pharmacology of LSD* (Hintzen & Passie, 2010) to *Are You Experienced? How Psychedelic Consciousness Transformed Modern Art* (Johnson, 2011) scholars are using the standard scholarly approaches. Other than some little policy adjustments in disciplinary scope, editors’ open mindedness, and the attitudes of single-state colleagues, there’s no really little change from current practices here. I want to suggest a couple of big ones.

Multistate Thinking

When artists, academics, professionals, and business people think about their special topics and try to solve problems, they typically use our ordinary, default mindbody state and its cognitive processes. This state and its resident thinking processes have probably evolved for very good reasons, but that doesn’t mean there aren’t other useful cognitive processes in other mindbody states. Reporting on practical problem solving, Fadiman summarized both anecdotal reports and an experimental study (2011). These included a Nobel Prize, possibly two, thanks to LSD, and workable solutions to 44 professional and business problems, thanks to mescaline.

This impresses me as the most productive lead in psychedelic research and the one least developed. Psychedelic thinking is outside-the-box thinking. Might artists, business people, and academics learn to use psychedelic methods to solve problems? In universities they could become part of graduate training in conceptual research methods, allowing graduate students to develop fresh perspectives on their fields. Among other things, graduate students might be asked to design consilience-friendly projects (see Chapter 14).

Research institutes, policy centers, businesses organizations, and the nonprofit sector need some sort of place to work psychedelically on their problems. Professional organizations, consortia of universities, or even a private business could develop centers to offer this as a professional development service (Roberts, 2013, pp. 193–206). Religious and artistic groups should adapt this approach to fit their members and interests.

Rather than forcing individuals to try this practice on their own and increasing risk as current policy does and to maximize set and setting, psychedelic policy needs to allow, even encourage, the development of safe places and productive procedures to benefit from this path of innovative problem solving. For best results, such centers should probably be embedded in dedicated centers that will provide professional screening, preparation, guidance, and integration.

How Does/Do *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_* Vary from Mindbody State to Mindbody State?

For intellectual fun, insert a topic of your own into the blank.

This is the “Central Multistate Question” (Roberts, 2013, p. 128). By extending single-state studies to multistate, all the questions get reasked in psychology and most of those in the other social sciences and philosophy (Roberts, 2013, 2015). Each of today’s research questions, topics, and agendas multiplies as investigators consider them for each mindbody state, and when mindapps are used as research methods, cognitive studies, social relations, and philosophy will be reinvented. Research policies need to be reinvented too.

Discovering Cognitive Processes—Inventing New Ones

What might account for how mindapps provide new ways to use our minds such as in problem solving? Emergence is a clue. Emergence points out that combinations of things often produce characteristics that their individual parts don’t possess. For example, when the two gasses hydrogen and oxygen combine, water has watery qualities that neither gas does alone. Colloquially, this is often expressed as “the whole is more than the sum of its parts.” When the structures of our brains and their chemistry combine and interplay, they produce mindstates (a.k.a. states of consciousness) that the individual structures don’t possess, and the emergent characteristics are such things as intra-brain communication, cognitive processes, and self-awareness. This is one explanation for what we call “mind,” a collection of emergent properties. When we change the underlying brain chemistry, say with psychedelics or other mindapps, new cognitive processes with their distinct characteristics emerge. Prohibiting this process prohibits the full development of the human mind. Promoting this process promotes mind development.

Inventing Paradigms

Single-state psychology’s assumptions change in multistate psychology. An explicit example of this comes from Benny Shanon’s work with ayahuasca (2002), and this leads me to wonder whether he may have stumbled onto a method for systematically inventing new paradigms. A cognitive psychologist from Israel, he ran across ayahuasca while on a vacation in Brazil and became intrigued with how cognition changed under its influence. Ordinary, single-state cognitive studies didn’t fit his own experiences nor those of the many South Americans, North Americans, and Europeans he interviewed. He identified 11 experiences that point to parameters that single-state cognitive studies miss (2002, pp. 198–206).

• Agenthood—experiencing thoughts as not being one’s own

• Personal identity—personal identification with whatever one is looking at, a sense of unity with the other

• Unity—being oneself at the same time as being someone or something else

• Boundaries—erasing the boundary between inner and outer reality

• Individuation—self-transcendence but with consciousness still maintained

• Calibration—change in perceptions of one’s size, weight, posture, and so on

• Locus of consciousness—consciousness located outside one’s physical body

• Time—variations in time, including its speed or even feelings of eternity

• Self-consciousness—a “residue” of the normal self after other facets of consciousness are completely altered

• Intentionality—no object to which thought is being directed and no content entertained by the mind, often leading to a sense of “the void” or “pure consciousness”

• Connectedness, knowledge, and the conferral of reality—a noetic feeling that one is privy to true knowledge

My point is not that these are either insights or delusions. Taken together, these are some of the building blocks for extending the paradigms in cognitive psychology and the philosophy of mind to become multistate.

More than that, is this a clue to new, wider intellectual technique? What may be important here are not the particulars in the previous list that Shanon discovered, but that he may have stumbled onto a method for constructing new paradigms that may be useful across academia and widely in society. When using psychedelics’ cognitive processes, can other researchers spot anomalies in their fields too? Will these insights help them delineate some otherwise unacknowledged assumptions? Make observations they wouldn’t in their default states? Even formulate new paradigms? Certainly, some of what seems at the time to be insightful discoveries will appear silly from the calmness of the next day’s default rationality, but not all.

Metaintellignce

Choosing mindstates and entering them via their respective mindapps is prior to⎯stands behind⎯using their resident intelligences and abilities. I find it handy to think of this executive cognitive activity as *metaintelligence*; as people increase their multistate repertoires, their metaintelligence increases. As a kind of “thinking about thinking,” multistate metaintelligence is a kind of metacognition.

Consciousness

How does brain activity produce subjective awareness? Where do thoughts come from? Is consciousness a process of emergence, a combination of things that produces characteristics that none of the individual component possesses? Is it a mere epiphenomenal sideshow from our biology? Psychedelic and other mindapps certainly don’t answer this puzzling complex, but they may provide clues. A rule in science is that a broad sample that provides the relevant information is more valid than a narrow sample. Mindapps broaden the sample. They provide experimental techniques in which they are inputs and forms of consciousness are the outputs. Even the I of subjective awareness can become an experimental variable, notably in transpersonal states (Fadiman, Chapter 12 this book; Friedman & Hartelius, 2013). By producing additional varieties of consciousness⎯whatever it is⎯under known, experimentally controlled conditions, mindapps can provide additional samples of consciousness.

Consilience and Mind Design

These topics are covered in Chapter 14 (“Mindapps and the Neurosingularity Project.”) In brief, the human mind is not something to be just described and mapped; it is something to be built. It isn’t a given; every new mindapp extends it. From a multistate perspective, the mind is an endless construction project.

At the very least, when we experience different mindapps, psychedelic and nonpsychedelic, they help us realize that our default, home, mindbody state is a product of its apps too, and its resident theories, ideas, and observations are expressions of that mindapp. Gaining perspective on oneself, one’s mind, and one’s worldview is a rich gift. A wise psychedelic policy will encourage it.

Chilling Effects 1 : Grofian Psychocriticism

What goes for developing new academic thinking skills in the sections just above goes for specific ideas too. We’ll take the humanities as an example because people’s interest in literature, philosophy, languages, and their kin stretch far beyond academia into our general culture. There are particular ways that psychedelic-derived ideas are enriching our culture. As new models of our mind come along, each offers its ideas as ways to understand our culture.

The richest psychedelic model that I know of is Stanislav Grof’s four-layer view of our minds (Grof, 1975) and especially its perinatal level. My reason for mentioning this in a book about policy is not to summarize the model or to portray its psychotherapeutic value but to point out that this theory is culturally rich (Roberts, 2013). In my opinion, it is being neglected because of our cultural bias against its psychedelic origin. Official policy unintentionally promotes this bias.

Coming from a Freudian tradition, Grof’s theory presents a four-level theory of the human mind: (1) abstract and aesthetic, (2) biographical, (3) perinatal, and (4) transpersonal. Grof’s perinatal theory illustrates that psychedelic-derived observations enrich our idea of our minds and how the human mind produces cultural artifacts and activities. In skeleton form the perinatal level contains four stages that parallel birth:

BPM = **B**asic **P**erinatal **M**atrix, a complex of emotions and physical experiences

BPM I = womb experiences, usually good

BPM II = being trapped with contractions but with the cervix closed

BPM III = struggle through the birth canal

BPM IV = emergence

Scholars from a variety of fields have found Grof’s perinatal ideas fruitful.

HISTORY AND THE RHETORIC OF WAR. Referring to the earlier work of psychohistorian de Mause (1975), in 1977 Grof demonstrated that political and military leaders use perinatal imagery to whip up their people into warlike moods. From Alexander the Great to Hitler, perinatal imagery has reached deep into people’s minds by stirring up unconscious memories of their perinatal experiences. In Hitler, we see the BPM I of an imaginary past golden age of the Germanic peoples. Loosing World War I, colonies and land lost, and the economic disaster of the depression activate BPM II feelings of constriction and its concomitant desire for more room (*Lebensraum*), and, of course, the way out of BPM II is the fighting, struggle, and war of BPM III in order to get to the birth of the BPM IV of the glorious 1,000-year Reich. Ryan (2004) spotted perinatal elements in the *Gettysburg Address*, and Churchill used them too. Because the feelings that produce these images come from the deep unconscious, people who use them may do so completely unaware. They just feel right to the speakers and to their publics.

PHILOSOPHY. In “Sartre’s Rite of Passage,” Thomas Riedlinger (1982) analyzes Sartre’s mescaline experience as unresolved BPM II, which flavored his philosophy thereafter. A “cardboard world” of meaningless suffering, a sense of being trapped, a “no-exit hell”—these catch BPM II emotions and ideas. In this book Stokkink’s chapter describes Foucault’s links to psychedelics (Chapter 11). He and coeditors are preparing a broader view of psychedelics’ implications for philosophy beyond perinatal views (Lemmens et al., 2015). Locating Grof’s work within *The Passion of the Western Mind* (1993), Tarnas wrote, “While this perinatal area constituted the critical threshold for the therapeutic transformation, it also proved to be the pivotal area for major philosophical and intellectual issues” (428).

ART CRITICISM. Grof points to H. R. Geiger as a master of BPM II (2014). *LSD Psychotherapy* (Grof, 1980) presents numerous illustrations by Grof and his patients. A particularly powerful series of BPM drawings that documents her inner journey is by Sherana Frances (2001). There are numerous books on psychedelics’ influence on art particularly poster art, but they are not perinatal in their interpretations.

MYTHOLOGY. After he received an early manuscript of Grof’s *Realms*, Joseph Campbell, author of *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, wrote, “I have found so much of my thinking about mythic forms freshly illuminated” (1972, p. 258). Ruck, Staples, and Heinrich trace the origins of early Greek myths and their esoteric meanings to psychoactive plants (2001).

RELIGION. In *The Forgotten Truth: The Primordial Tradition* (1977), Huston Smith recommends Grof’s clinical research for its view of “what the mind is.” He wrote, “. . .Judged both by quantity of data encompassed and by the explanatory power of the hypotheses that make sense of this data, it is the most formidable evidence the psychedelics have thus far produced” (156). Psychedelics help uncover perinatal level springs that flow into multiple streams of social life. In this quotation, we see psychology, philosophy, politics, religion, and science flavored by perinatal experiences (Grof, 1975):

independent of the individual’s cultural and religious background. In my experience everyone who has reached thee levels develops convincing insights into the utmost relevance of the spiritual dimensions in the universal scheme of things. Even hard-core materialists, positively oriented scientists and skeptics and cynics, and uncompromising atheists and intellectual crusaders such as Marxist philosophers suddenly became interested in a spiritual search after they confronted these [perinatal] levels in themselves. (97–98)

This is also a clear instance of an idea⎯humans can develop spiritual interests⎯that gains credibility via psychedelic experience.

CINE CRITICISM. Movies, novels, and TV shows frequently express Grof’s wider four-level theory and its perinatal level, often dwelling on scenes that activate perinatal feelings, especially the struggles of BPM III. I’ve found that these ideas shed light on *Brainstorm* (1986), *Snow White* (2006) and *Pink Floyd: The Wall* (2013). Kackar and I analyzed *Fight Club*: as its title suggests, a very BPM III movie. The same might be done for literary criticism.

These examples provide proof of concept that psychedelics have enriched the humanities. The point here, although true, is not only that psychedelics have generated intriguing ideas and people would like to follow up on them. The point is that current policy, both explicitly expressed in laws, about psychedelics and social attitudes, implicitly unspoken in academic fear, intellectual caution, and public vogue combine ts to produce a chilling effect on these ideas and on this method of inquiry. Where psychedelics are concerned, the supposedly free and open marketplace of ideas is neither free nor open. But it could be.

Chilling Effects 2 :  Brief Communiqués from the Psychedelic Intellectual Frontier

In addition to the humanities’ topics mentioned earlier, the topics in the list that follows all deserve free and open discussion, including access to complete⎯and in many cases the best⎯evidence about them, but current formal policy and social convention often disparage the information by dismissing psychedelics as providing a valid source of information. It is time to recognize that these restricting attitudes violate individual intellectual integrity, disregard personal conscience, weaken academic inquiry, undermine civil rights, block the free flow of ideas, and violate constitutional freedoms. As the chapters in this book and other books show, other ideas that psychedelic shine light on are stifled too. Psychedelic scholarship and science are slowly enriching the fields of inquiry in this list, but for the good of humanity, the speed needs to increase. Clearly, these samples illustrate only the existing body of psychedelic work, and I apologize if I have omitted your favorites.

Implying that the proponents of psychedelic research are simply old, misguided, leftover hippies with addled brains has almost disappeared from informed circles, but a faded ghost still haunts the public mind and the halls of Congress. The evidence is exactly the opposite. The authors in this book and in similar books are intelligent, highly educated, career scientists and scholars, medical doctors and clergy, professors and artists who have sustained their work in professionally hostile environments, under social disapproval, with almost no financial support, shunned by colleagues, rejected by editors, in spite of stress and other personal costs. Their enduring dedication⎯often lifelong⎯expresses their informed professional judgments: psychedelics’ effects are worthy of scrutiny, psychedelic research methods are valuable for insightful scholarship and scientific inquiry, and they deserve a place in academia. People who shape public opinion such as news media and educators, and people who form policies such as legislators and regulators damage the public good when they ignore these best-informed, visionary citizens.

It’s a credible assumption that people’s experiences influence their ideas, and this holds no less for people’s psychedelic experiences. Psychedelically informed people have something to say about:

General Social and Historical Background

Review of the literature (Grinspoon & Bakalar, 1979)

Current news: (Erowid www.erowid.org)

Mystical Experiences

Psychedelic qualifying as genuine (Hood, 2006)

Central role in religion (Hood, 1995)

Prosocial nonpsychedelic effects (Miller & C’ de Baca, 2001)

Immune system booster (Roberts, 2013)

Social Benefits

Altruism (Roberts, 2013, pp. 48–51)

Intercultural understanding (Harner, 1973)

Open-mindedness (MacLean, Johnson, & Griffiths, 2011)

Mind and Psychology

LSD-derived map of mind (Grof, 1975)

Archetypes (Richards, 2002)

Birth memories (Riedlinger & Riedlinger, 1986)

Role in transpersonal psychology (Roberts & Winkelman, 2013)

Mindbody theory (Roberts, 2013)

Mindapps (Roberts, Chapter 14 this book)

Future of psychology (Grof, 2000)

Religion and Religious Studies

Enriching curriculum of religious studies (Roberts, 2014)

Origins of religion (Wasson, Kramrisch, Ott, & Ruck, 1986)

Hebrew Bible (Shanon, 2002, 2008)

Internet resource (www.csp.org)

Increased belief in god and/or increased interest in spirituality (Griffiths et al., 2006)

Understanding religious studies (Vaughan, 1983)

Personal meaningfulness and spiritual significance (Griffiths et al., 2006; Griffiths, Richards, Johnson, McCann, & Jesse, 2008)

As sacred path (Ellens, 2014)

Empirical metaphysics (Smith, 2000)

Transition from a text-based religion to experience-based religion (Roberts, 2014)

Culture and History

Formation of Western civilization (Hillman, 2008)

Ancient Greece and the Near East (Ruck et al., 2001)

Western history, epidemics, witchcraft persecution (Matossian, 1989)

Salem witchcraft trials (Caporeal,1976)

Oracle at Delphi (Hale, de Boer, Chanton, & Spiller, 2003)

Archeology (Rudgley, 1993)

Arts

Intensified sensations leading to aesthetic appreciation (Huxley, 1954)

Folk craft and design of the Sixties, (Gordon, 2008; Jacopetti, 1974, Gordon 2009)

Music (Bromell, 2000;, Henke, Perry, & Miles, 1997)

Rock Posters (Tomlinson & Medeiros, 2001)

Psychedelic, optical, visionary (Rubin, 2010)

Psychocriticism (Grof 2014)

Business Uses and Opportunities

Innovative thinking (Fadiman, 2011;, Roberts, 2013, pp. 135–138)

Role in computer industry (Markoff, 2005)

Founding a corporation (Roberts, 2013, pp. 193–206)

Psychotherapy

General review (Winkelman & Roberts, 2007)

Bibliography 1931–1995. (Passie, 1997)

Psycholytic and peak-experience methods (Grof, 1980)

Overcoming fear of death (Grob & Danforth, this book)

**Current news:**

(Multidisciplinary Association for Psychedelic Studies www.maps.org)

(Heffter Research Institute www.heffter.org)

Neurosciences and Chemistry

*The Pharmacology of LSD* (Hintzen & Passie, 2010)

Slightly explored molecules (Shulgin & Shulgin, 1991, 1997)

Neuropharmacology of Religious Experience (Nichols & Chemal, 2006)

Botany

Worldwide survey (Schultes & Hofmann, 1992)

Plant sources and their history (Ott, 1993)

These examples and others in this book provide proof of concept for psychedelics’ wide ranging intellectual value.

Academic Fear

Although these items show that some welcome progress is being made in the frontiers of psychedelic scholarship, when I lecture, it isn’t unusual for someone afterward to talk with me privately, “I wish I could teach a class like yours (or publish professionally on psychedelics) at X University or Y College.” Additionally, during the winter months I receive e-mails from college seniors who would like to find graduate programs where they can pursue their psychedelic interests academically. Unfortunately, there are very few and almost all are in the health fields. These requests come along so frequently that I’ve collected my suggestions into a paper “Psychedelics: Hints on Looking for Graduate Programs” at my website (niu.academia.edu/ThomasRoberts). Currently, would-be professors in fields other than psychiatry and clinical psychology have to take traditional single-state programs and hope to expand their careers later to include their psychedelic interests. Among the increasing number of adjunct professors whose jobs are temporary and tenuous, there is fear that they won’t be rehired if they come out of the psychedelic closet. In what should be an open and free marketplace of ideas, these scholars are second-class citizens, almost prisoners.

Is this situation one that:

a) universities should willingly allow

b) a free society produces

c) increases individuals’ joy of living

d) professional societies ought to encourage

e) the heirs of the Enlightenment want to inherit

f) helps scientists, humanists, and artists be productive

g) civil libertarians accept

h) improves democracy

i) respects personal freedom and conscience

j) none of the above

Answer: j

How can policy makers strike a rational balance between psychedelics’ dangers and benefits? This is another type of issue that considers powerful and dangerous things like fire, knives, guns, cars, and money. As with these, there is bound to be no solution that holds in every instance or that all people will agree on. Considering the previous evidence and elsewhere, for psychotherapeutic, religious, artistic, and intellectual uses, the burden of proof has shifted to those who advocate restrictive laws on psychedelics.

In fact, the more I think about this topic the more quag I see in this quagmire. For example, we noted earlier that current research and treatment protocols have four stages: selection, preparation, guidance, and integration. Apparently, this works fine for clinical research and treatment, but sidesteps problems for other uses. Each one of these steps will have to be refit for, say, religion, medicine, education, and daily life. It is not at all clear which decisions belong to each individual persons, which are best handled by professional groups, where the roles of organizations fit in, and what belongs to the government or even which level of government and which agencies or commissions are best suited for the tasks of writing policies.

A Constitutional Right to Psychedelics

Well! Is this a crazy enough idea? It’s quite logical if you consider a purpose behind the Bill of Rights. Why are the Freedom of the Press, Freedom of Speech, Freedom of Religion, and Freedom to Assemble parts of the Bill of Rights and not just ordinary laws? They certainly are nice to have. Couldn’t they simply have been granted by law? To answer this, it helps to recognize that the U.S. Constitutionis a sort of official rulebook for the federal government. The “Official Baseball Rules” states “This code of rules governs the playing of baseball games by professional teams of Major League Baseball.” The Constitution is the code of rules of how to run the U.S. government, so to be part of the Constitution, these rights must be important for running the country, not just good things to have.

Why? In addition to being valuable on their own, why are these rights necessary for running the government? For a democracy to work, citizens have to be able to consider laws and ideas, discuss them openly with others, argue for and against them, supply evidence and opinions, and evaluate them using ethical, religious, economic, social justice, and other standards. That is, for a democracy to function, there must be a free and open marketplace of ideas. When the Bill of Rights was passed, these freedoms were the ways for citizens to consider ideas: that’s why the Constitutional guarantees them. A democracy’s health depends on the spread of ideas; the freedoms of speech, press, religion, and assembly spread ideas, so they are part of our official rulebook.

It is a recognized historical observation that over the years constitutional freedoms have been extended beyond the limitations of their original times. Freedom of the press applies to news media that couldn’t even be dreamed of on December 15, 1791, when The Bill was ratified. Who knows how many new American and imported churches are protected by the freedom of religion? New groups organize and assemble to discuss and promote ideas even via the Internet. The right to bear arms now includes more than the right to carry the muskets and pirate-type pistols of the late eighteenth century. Thanks to these extended freedoms, ideas, facts, and opinions that were unknown to the founders are commonplace today, and the free and open marketplace of ideas is an ideal we still strive for. In his introduction to *The Marketplace of Ideas,* Menand succinctly presents this ideal and links it to democracy (2010, pp. 13–14):

As a society, Americans are committed to the principle that the production of knowledge should be uninhibited and access to it should be universal. This is the democratic ideal. We think that where knowledge is concerned, more is always better. We don’t believe that there are things that we would rather not know, or things that only some should know ⎯ just as we don’t believe that there are points of view that should not be expressed, or citizens who are too wrongheaded to vote.

This book documents psychedelics as a source of intellectual knowledge and cognitive processes. Of course, they also provide psychotherapeutically valuable practices (Grof, 1975, 1980; Winkelman & Roberts, 2007), but that is for other chapters. If we apply Menand’s standards, then current psychedelic drug policy is anti-American, anti-democratic, and anti-knowledge. Will policy experts figure out a way to broaden Menand’s ideal to include psychedelic ideas and thinking processes?

Just as constitutional protections extend to new kinds of news media, churches, groups, communication, and products and services, they should also extend to new ideas, to ways to produce them, to their open dissemination, and to evidence for and against both new and existing ideas. Certainly, these extensions meet the original intent of the founders as much as TV and the Mormon Church. In addition to ideas, psychedelics provide additional thinking processes that reside in their mindbody states. Just as print, speech, religion, and assembly carried ideas in the eighteenth century, psychedelics carry ideas today in the twenty-first. The blanket prohibition of psychedelics censors the free flow of ideas and restricts thinking processes, and for these reasons is unconstitutional.

Under the influence of the Enlightenment, when eighteenth-century thinkers recognized that ideas were spread verbally⎯by press, speech, religion, and assembly⎯their account was based on what we now recognize as a single-state assumption of how our minds work. Better informed now, we recognize that additional valuable cognitive abilities reside in other mindbody states. New ideas reside in these states too, so do support for some of our ordinary state’s ideas and challenges to others.

Reopening the Psychedelic Stand in Free Marketplace of Ideas

This book and others like it present some ideas stifled by current drug policy. Because the evidence about these ideas comes from psychedelic experiences, the best evidence requires that some ways⎯hopefully safe ones⎯be provided so that people can consider the best evidence. Thanks to advances in psychedelic research techniques and strengthened clinical skills under professional care, safety⎯although not 100% certain⎯is highly assured (Fadiman, 2011; Johnson, Richards, & Griffiths, 2008; Sessa, this book; Strassman, 1984, 1995). A four-step procedure is widely recognized: (1) screening, (2) preparation, (3) guidance during the session, and (4) integration afterward. For current research and clinical treatment, these look optimal, but within them lie complex policy issues that we will take up after identifying some of the common stifled ideas.

RELIGION EXAMPLE. Suppose Crazy Tom applies to be a volunteer in a psilocybin experiment but is turned away because he is mentally unstable. (This might make him a good candidate for psychotherapy, however.) Then he claims psychedelics are his sacrament and finds a way to buy them. At what point does freedom of religion enter the case? He can point out that the Native American Church and the União do Vegetal are allowed to use, respectively, peyote and ayahuasca. If he is refused legal permission because he is not part of a recognized church, the courts have put themselves into the position of deciding which churches are established for entheogenic purposes in the courts’ opinion. He might still claim that Judaism started with one person, Abraham or two if you include Sarah, Christianity started with 13. So can he recruit 12 friends to join him in founding a new religion? How are policy makers to write clear policy in this case? Furthermore, if one takes the position that text-based religion is giving way to experience-based religion and/or that mystical experiences are founding events that eventually grow into organized religions (Roberts, 2013, 2014), how are policy makers going to incorporate these views?

MEDICAL EXAMPLE. Jane Doe is a wounded soldier who is still in active service. She suffers from PTSD and has seen research that MDMA-assisted psychotherapy has cured similar veterans. She obtains some illegally, takes it on her own or with a friend as sitter, and is cured. Then she is arrested by local police, is dishonorably discharged, and loses her VA benefits. What are the policy issues in this case, and how can they be resolved? Suppose her fiancé, a medical doctor, is the one who has obtained the MDMA for her?

SCHOLARLY EXAMPLE. Eric Mills has submitted a doctoral dissertation in which he claims that psychoactive mushrooms played important cultural roles in the ancient Mediterranean area. His angry dissertation chairman requires him to remove what seems to him scurrilous material. Mills maintains that his chair is acting unprofessionally, is exercising academic censorship of Mills’s opinion. He appeals to the full faculty of his department and to the dean of the Graduate School. Being an empiricist, Mills claims that his thesis is credible and that the best evidence for it requires that the faculty and the Graduate School dean involved in his appeal eat the mushrooms themselves. If they refuse, are they reenacting the apocryphal story of the Cardinals who refused to look through Galileo’s telescope? What policies should universities have? Editors of journals? Professional societies?

PERSONAL FREEDOM EXAMPLE. Carolyn wants to explore and enjoy her own mind with LSD in the privacy of her backyard. Who has the right to make this decision? On what grounds? With what, if any, limitations? Under what conditions, if any? Which are allowable drugs and which are not allowable drugs? Which freedoms, rights, standards, and laws apply, and which don’t? Medicine, religion, and education have organizations that might be involved in decisions in their fields. Who has the right to determine what she can or can’t do with her own mind? I predict that this will be one of the most delightful discussions for ethicists and policy makers.

Summary: Mind Control Policy

Because psychedelics influence sensations, thinking processes, powerful emotions, memory, idea formation and believability, psychedelic policy is mind-control policy. It may constrict or free the way our minds work. When policy makers and ethicists consider cases such as those discussed earlier, their menu of duties includes considering:

1) psychotherapeutic and medical uses

2) entheogenic uses

3) intellectual, scientific, and academic freedoms

4) constitutional rights

5) cognitive liberties (Center for Cognitive Liberties and Ethics, 2014)

6) drugs as mindapps for accessing psychedelic mindbody states, their resident ideas, and thinking processes

7) primarily, experiencing the best evidence themselves

More than that and beyond the scope of this book, the same items need to be addressed for all mindapps and the mindbody states they produce (Cardeña & Winkelman, 2011; Roberts, 2013). This future depends on what policy makers and ethicists decide; they will either constrict the full power of the human mind or promote it.
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