Received: 2 October 2020 | Revised: 3 December 2020 | Accepted: 21 December 2020

DOI: 10.1002/jhbs.22083

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Psychedelic philanthropy: The nonprofit sector and Timothy Leary's 1960s psychedelic movement

Chris Elcock

Saint-Étienne, France

Correspondence
Chris Elcock, Saint-Étienne, France.
Email: christian.elcock@yahoo.fr

Abstract

Little has been written on the financial support behind Timothy Leary's unorthodox research into mind-altering drugs like LSD and psilocybin and his subsequent psychedelic movement. Indeed several individuals and organizations helped the psychedelic cause by directly funding Leary's ventures, offering legal and logistic assistance, and organizing fund-raising campaigns. I argue that classic philanthropic attitudes and wealthy patrons played a major supporting role for Leary's psychedelic movement in the first part of the decade and that the changes in Leary's research objectives and his transition from academic to LSD guru were accompanied by changes in the patterns of support that occurred throughout the 1960s. This paper also connects Leary's legal troubles in the second part of the decade with the rise of the movement to legalize cannabis and points to historical continuity by looking at contemporary endeavors to fund psychedelic research.

KEYWORDS

activism, cannabis, LSD and psychedelics, philanthropy, Timothy Leary

1 | INTRODUCTION

The 1960s are remembered as a decade when Americans experimented with a wide-range of illicit drugs. In particular, psychedelics like LSD, mescaline, psilocybin, peyote, DMT, and cannabis,[1] emerged as a new category of mind-altering substances that could shatter the senses, trigger other-worldly visions, distort notions of time and space, and lead to moments of deep introspection. As these drugs grew in popularity, a movement made up of

intellectuals, artists, and religious figures reasoned that psychedelics had the power to radically transform humanity and promoted them accordingly: if everyone altered their brain chemistries with these drugs, global peace, love, and understanding would naturally ensue (Conners, 2010; Elcock, 2013, 2015; Greenfield, 2006; Higgs, 2006; Lee & Shlain, 1985; Stevens, 1988).

Harvard psychologist Timothy Leary was one of many to experiment and to become enamored with psilocybin mushrooms and LSD. As an academic, he was initially keen to study the effects of these drugs on human personality but he came to realize that they were too important to remain in the academy and that they should be promoted on a much larger scale. His research became increasingly idiosyncratic and Harvard and Leary were forced to part in 1963 following reports of drug use on campus and of unethical drug research on human subjects. After this first public controversy, authorities kept close tabs on him and in December 1965 he was arrested at the Texas-Mexico border for cannabis possession. Scrambling for support, he renewed his efforts to promote these drugs in a more aggressive way by explicitly framing the psychedelic experience as inherently religious to invoke his rights as a practicing Hindu (Lander, 2014), but after two more drug busts justice finally sidelined the notorious proselytizer in 1970.

While the jury is still out on Leary and his legacy, this canonical narrative says little about the role of the people who were taken to his persona and who were so impressed by his psychedelic undertakings that they decided to help him through financial contributions and logistic assistance. Based on publications in magazines and newspapers, letters, memoirs, and personal communications, this paper argues that Leary's movement[2] was helped by typical philanthropic attitudes drawing from a long tradition in American life in spite of the controversies surrounding LSD and its association with the counter-culture in the second part of the 1960s. Americans from various backgrounds reasoned that if the psychedelic experience was such a great asset for humanity, then they should become the protectors and the benefactors of the psychedelic movement. And when the controversial Leary ran into trouble with the law, many stepped in to offer their support and donated to a fund created for his legal expenses.

By examining the role of Leary's supporters this paper seeks to offer an alternative to the two dominant takes on the history of the psychedelic movement (in contrast with the general historical scholarship on the history of LSD and psychedelics, which has been growing exponentially over last few years through increasingly varied approaches and geographical focuses (Aronov, 2019; Dawson, 2018; Hartgosohn, 2020; S. Marks, 2015; Oram, 2018; Richert & Dyck, 2020)). Indeed several historians and commentators have dismissed Leary's movement as an embarrassment and only given it surface treatment in their analyses by zeroing on the controversies surrounding that history, such as the psychedelic movement's extreme and provocative rhetoric.[3] In particular, they have condemned Leary for his reckless promotion of psychedelic drugs and in doing so, they have downplayed his well-documented claims of enlightenment through psychedelic experimentation.

By contrast a revisionist school, partly through the lens of spirituality, has based its interpretations on the premise that psychedelics had the power to induce a complex spiritual experience, which became the cornerstone of Leary's promotion of these drugs (Fuller, 2000; Kent, 2001; Lander, 2011, 2014; Shipley, 2015).[4] While this side of the scholarship has paid a lot more attention to claims of drug-induced enlightenment, I focus instead on the behind-the-scenes history of the psychedelic movement, rather than its well-publicized and sensational aspects, to move away from Leary at the center-stage of this narrative and examine the more discreet and influential players who made this movement possible.

This paper begins with a brief contextualization by looking at psychedelic funding in other research groups and goes on to illustrate the main argument by identifying several key events and periods that were accompanied by changes in the patterns of support for Leary's work. First, his discovery of psilocybin in 1960 and his fascination for the drug led him to share his enthusiasm with several influential New Yorkers, including Beat poet Allen Ginsberg who convinced him that it was an important asset for humanity and that it should be enjoyed by all. In turn, this spurred Leary to successfully court the support of the New York upper class to sponsor his research by channeling funds to Harvard. At the time he was not the controversial and polarizing figure he became in the second part of the 1960s and his research was thought to be a legitimate way of contributing to the "well-being of mankind" (Zunz, 2012a) that deserved adequate support.

Second Leary's first contact with LSD in 1961 made an even greater impression on him and led him to believe that reality was merely a cultural construct. As a result his research became increasingly idiosyncratic and by the time Harvard had moved to oust him and his closest lieutenant Richard Alpert (who subsequently dismissed drugs and became Baba Ram Dass) in 1963 Leary was already setting his sights on experimenting with psychedelics outside the confines of academia. During that period most of the classic patronage dried up but two millionaires and heirs to the Mellon family continued to help Leary and his group by allowing them to settle on their spacious mansion in Millbrook, New York. Their continuing support may come as a surprise given the radicalization of his thought, but then in the larger social history of the 1960s even the radical turn of the civil rights movement in the second part of the decade did not put an end to its philanthropic support (Zunz, 2012a, p. 201).

Finally, Leary and his associates carried on with their freewheeling psychedelic explorations but his 1965 arrest for cannabis possession was a watershed moment that gave him added media coverage and contributed to a major shift away from classic philanthropy. Leary finished discarding what was left of his academic career, appointed himself the "High Priest" of LSD, and from then on systematically touted the drug as a Godsend and a cure-for-all. Meanwhile what had begun as behavioral research into psychedelics funded by wealthy patrons morphed into a grass-roots movement to decriminalize cannabis made up of less-fortuned Americans keen to support Leary and his legal battles with more modest contributions. As a political movement this was considered to be legally off limits for big philanthropy, which has traditionally stayed clear from such ventures and concentrated on the realms of science and education that are deemed to be politically neutral (Zunz, 2012a, p. 5). Yet, this did not stop a handful of New York millionaires from getting involved in the battle—just like some had to cover "Typhoid Mary" Mallon's own legal expenses at the turn of the century (Bartoletti, 2015).

By looking at this undocumented side of Leary's movement, this paper adds to the history of American philanthropy (Bremner, 1988; Crowther-Heyck, 2006; L. J. Friedman & McGarvie, 2002; 2002; Powell & Steinberg, 2006; Zunz, 2006, 2012a) by examining how both wealthy and ordinary Americans dedicated time and money to benefit the psychedelic community, regardless of its illegal or otherwise deviant practices. In this way, it documents a rather unique case of open psychoactive drug activism that transcended class, which may, in a much larger historical framework, be framed as an early attempt to liberalize illicit substance use before the war on drugs of the 1970s. In a similar vein, this article examines the transition from psychedelic funding to marijuana activism and understands the support for Leary's campaign to prove the cannabis laws unconstitutional as a catalyst for a much broader movement to decriminalize and legalize the drug, and contributes to the history of cannabis politics by underscoring its loose connection with big philanthropy (Booth, 2005; J. C. Davis, 2015; Dufton, 2017; Ferrara, 2016; Lee, 2013).

As well this paper builds on the existing historiography of the 1960s. First, it pays particular attention to the way Leary's movement was helped by a funding process that is considered "a quintessential part of being American" (Zunz, 2012a, p. 3) and adds to the scholarship that has argued that this movement was part and parcel of American culture in spite of its apparent criticisms of the American way of life (Elcock, 2015).[5] Second this side of the history of drug use points to a complex and pluralistic psychedelic culture that could include millionaires as much as ordinary Americans and examining this uncanny involvement of the elites and the mobilization to protect Leary becomes another way of rethinking the boundaries separating part of the 1960s counter-culture and the "dominant" or "mainstream" culture it supposedly took issue with.[6] Beyond these contributions this paper points to the contemporary context of the scientific reappraisal of psychedelic drugs in neuroscience and psychiatry (the "psychedelic renaissance" (Hartgosohn, 2020; Langlitz, 2013; Sessa, 2012) and discusses the historical continuity of psychedelic philanthropy.

1.1 | Psychedelic research and patronage

In the 1950s, and before psychedelic drug use became more visible in the second part of the following decade, some medical doctors saw these substances as novel ways of probing the depth of the human mind. LSD appeared to break down mental barriers, ease the process of introspection, and lead to therapeutic renewal. As a result,

psychiatrists reasoned that the drug could be a valid adjunct for psychotherapy and used it to treat mental illness and alcoholism (Dyck, 2008; S. Marks, 2015; Passie, 1997). By the late 1950s LSD had generated a considerable amount of scientific enthusiasm that was amply covered in newspapers and magazines (Siff, 2015). In various parts of the country, medical doctors conducted research as part of their scholarly work for universities. Like most investigations undertaken in behavioral sciences, many of those endeavors were funded by the National Institute for Mental Health.[7] But others realized that certain wealthy philanthropists and non-profit foundations could offer them financial assistance.

The private funding of psychedelic science may seem surprising on the surface, given the controversies that occurred in the 1960s, but less so if we look at the trends in patronage in the postwar period and the intellectual and scientific shifts that accompanied them. At the time behavioral sciences laid great emphasis on problem-solving and psychedelics seemed to offer a great deal to tackle various social ills (Stafford, 1967). Historian Hunter Crowther-Heyck has disputed the notion that patrons resented politically controversial topics related to race, class, gender, and religion. For instance, federal and private patronage supported projects that were instrumental in the *Brown vs Board of Education* Supreme Court decision, launching the war on poverty and challenging ideas of sexuality, race, and gender (Crowther-Heyck, 2006, p. 427), and other historians have tempered the hegemonic influence of the Cold War on the funding of research topics in the social sciences (Solovey & Cravens, 2012).

But even then qualifying psychedelics as controversial substances in those early years is debatable. On the one hand, psychedelic research did break away with the behavioral sciences that were increasingly adopting a rigorously empirical "natural science" model for social sciences to gather support (Crowther-Heyck, 2006, p. 426); psychedelic scientists relied instead on subjective accounts of psychedelic experiences to underscore the efficacy of their therapies (Oram, 2012). On the other hand, perhaps LSD was just another substance among the battery of drugs available to Americans in the golden era of psychopharmacology (Healy, 2002; H. Marks, 1997).

Some of these funds were channeled to major organizations dedicated to the study of these substances outside academia. In 1961, the International Foundation for Advanced Study (IFAS) was founded in Menlo Park, California. It gathered a team of researchers to look into the potential of psychedelics and had Charles Savage as medical director from 1962 to 1964. In 1965, Savage became director of research at the Spring Grove State Hospital in Baltimore where seminal psychedelic research was conducted (Oram, 2018, p. 109)[8] and maintained his involvement with the IFAS. On October 8, 1965, he wrote to Nina Ridenour, secretary to the Ittleson Family Foundation, a philanthropic organization in New York City that had been interested in curbing mental illness since 1932. He acknowledged their financial contribution "at a time when support for this study was difficult to obtain" and added: "Even more important to me than the money was the moral support which you provided."[9]

Savage seemed to have realized that philanthropists could be powerful allies for psychedelic research and tried to further court the Ittleson Foundation by sending them a letter describing his ongoing work and suggesting that additional funds would be most welcome. In tune with the objectives of the Foundation, Savage was careful to underline the potential of this study for the greater benefit of society: "It appears that we have developed useful techniques for the brief psychotherapy of chronic neurotics and alcoholics." He also felt that it was "timely to expand the range of therapy to such social problems as addiction and delinquency."[10]On February 15, 1966, Savage scheduled an LSD session for Ridenour to observe on closed-circuit TV on February 24, 1966, so that she could get a better idea of their work.[11]

Other scientific organizations investigating the potential of LSD for mind research enjoyed even better fortunes. In 1963, British expatriate and M.D. John Beresford founded the Agora Scientific Trust in New York City and co-directed it with philosopher Jean Houston. Among the research advisers was *Playboy* executive Victor Lownes (who dispensed the drug to The Beatles' dentist and to filmmaker Roman Polanski) but more importantly, the group could count on the support of Nassau millionaire Howard Teague who, as psychologist Stanley Krippner recalls, had a life-changing psychedelic experience and wished to see these substances used legally.[12] According to Michael Hollingshead, another British expatriate famous for introducing Leary to LSD, Teague bankrolled the organization by helping it acquire property and furniture "in a very open and generous way."(Hollingshead, 1973)

What drove these patrons to give to psychedelic research is not always clear but it is nonetheless possible to suggest four general types of motivations. The first obvious reason was scientific. Psychedelics were promising adjuncts for psychiatry and might be able to alleviate social problems like alcoholism, mental illness, and prison recidivism (Doblin, 1998; Tenenbaum, 1961). Second, libertarian-minded benefactors moved in when authorities tried to ban psychedelics and to sideline Leary because they saw the attacks as a violation of academic and religious freedom.[13] Third, LSD was still an obscure drug in the early 1960s and some philanthropists may have become interested in these mysterious and exotic substances and supported psychedelic research to boost their cultural capital (Ulibarri, 2000; Versterlund, 2006).[14] Finally, those who underwent a life-changing spiritual experience with psychedelics felt that these drugs were so important that they needed to be widely promoted. Where scholars have acknowledged the importance of religion in shaping social movements, charity, and voluntary associations (see, e.g., Hustinx et al., 2015; Lam, 2002; Rossinow, 1998) a religious revelation (Huxley, 2004; Nordstrom & Pilgrim, 1980; Shipley, 2015; H. Smith, 1964; Zaehner, 1957),[15] rather than belonging to a religious congregation, could prompt philanthropists to support psychedelic research.

1.2 | Leary and the Harvard years (1960–1963)

In the early years of the 1960s Leary was also conducting psychedelic drug research, which became increasingly idiosyncratic as the years went by. At Harvard University's Center for Research in Personality, he saw fit to surround himself with fellow academics as well as lay people and he liberally dispensed psychedelics to Allen Ginsberg, jazz musician Charles Mingus, and poet Robert Lowell, to name but a few. Spurred by Ginsberg's own idealistic enthusiasm, he shunned Aldous Huxley's caution to refrain from promoting psychedelics as magic bullets, particularly after his seminal 1961 LSD experience, after which he concluded that reality was nothing but a cultural consensus (Higgs, 2006, pp. 41–46).

While most researchers into LSD and psychedelics were far more conservative in their approaches to these drugs, psychedelic idealism was neither confined to Leary, nor was his desire to share these substances with non-scientists. Saskatchewan-based MDs Humphry Osmond and Duncan Blewett were thrilled by the possibilities for personal transformation and Osmond and UCLA psychiatrist Sidney Cohen famously initiated Huxley and Henry and Clare Booth Luce respectively (Dyck, 1997; Novak, 1997). But this paled in comparison to Leary's iconoclastic brand of psychedelic research that was intent on revealing the transformative power of these drugs regardless of the scientific method—even though his treatment model did not differ greatly from the accepted methods of the time—and to his ultimate goal of making the world a better place.

Perhaps more importantly Leary and Alpert were both charismatic figures who were able to draw considerable support from a broad range of Americans. In their respective biographies of Leary Robert Greenfield and John Higgs both describe him as seductive, manipulative, and narcissistic—though Higgs' account is generally more balanced and occasionally more sympathetic (Greenfield, 2006; Higgs, 2006). What is less documented is the background of Richard Alpert, who was born into immense wealth thanks to the fortune his father had made in the railroad industry, and the influence he had at Harvard. As Beat poet Gerd Stern remembers, "Richard was probably the most magnetic and the most successful lecturer in psychology ever to teach at Harvard. Psychology 1, or whatever it was that he taught, always needed the largest auditorium, and there was never even standing room available. The guy is a snakeoil salesman of the first order. I mean, he can go on any subject and persuade you that this is absolutely it" (Stern, 2001). More to the point Alpert was described by former Harvard graduate student Ralph Metzner as a "money magnet" because of his ability to attract research grants before his involvement with psychedelics, which in turn enabled him to employ several graduate students (Dass et al., 2010).

As the word got around that Leary was conducting mind-altering drug sessions around Harvard and in New York City, a wide pool of supporters became interested in his enterprise and felt that his experiments warranted funding. From 1961 to 1963 he and his associates organized drug sessions with incarcerated inmates with the

stated aim of reforming them from within to ultimately set them free and gradually empty the prisons of the country.[16] His prison rehabilitation program certainly appeared controversial on the surface; yet, it was surprisingly in tune with the kind of problem-centered and interdisciplinary research projects the patronage system of the time sought to fund. As Crowther-Heyck puts it, "One important consequence of this belief was the idea that research should focus on solving problems with tangible, testable, real-world implications in addition to having significance for theory" (Crowther-Heyck, 2006, p. 433).[17] At the time both the federal government and the non-profit sector were indeed concerned about crime and their respective funding schemes were supporting the Mobilization for Youth initiative to fight juvenile delinquency on New York City's Lower East Side (Zunz, 2012a, pp. 212, 213). Hence patrons supported Leary's work not necessarily out of psychedelic conviction but because it might be able to tackle a major social issue in a highly innovative and radical way.

This project became partly funded by the Uris Brothers Foundation, created by real estate tycoons Harold and Percy Uris. The grant, which was renewed in 1962, covered clerical expenses and the salaries of former inmates working in the community.[18] The connection between Leary and Uris appears to have been made possible by real estate agent Bernard Friedman, who was drawn to Leary's enterprise as a result of a psilocybin session the latter had conducted for him. Friedman believed that the mushrooms had helped him become "freer, more relaxed" as a writer and he wanted to repay Leary in any way he could. So he spoke with the supervisor of the Foundation and Harvard graduate who was keen to contribute $5,000 to his *alma mater* (B. H. Friedman, 2006).[19] Wall Street stock-brokers also felt that Leary's work could benefit society. In May 1963, Arthur Tomaselli of Arthur Wiesenberger & Company sent them $100 drawn on the Morgan Guaranty Trust Company and acknowledged their "noble cause."[20]

His greatest backers, however, came from the Hitchcock family that boasted a long tradition of philanthropy. Peggy and her brother Billy—a stockbroker at Lehman Brothers—were the grandchildren of founder of Gulf Oil William Larimer Hitchcock, the nephews of the famous philanthropist Andrew W. Mellon, and the children of Tommy Hitchcock Jr., considered one of the greatest polo players ever. They helped him further his crusade by offering financial, logistic, and legal assistance.[21] Peggy became the secretary to Leary's International Foundation for Internal Freedom (IF-IF), an eclectic organization dedicated to the study of psychedelics.

This was but one of the many acts of generosity coming from the Hitchcock family, who soon became critical allies for Leary's venture. Peggy and Billy's brother Tommy sympathized with Leary's cause by donating $2400 toward his research,[22] but his direct involvement remained discreet. Peggy, on the other hand, appeared to be thrilled by the possibilities offered by these drugs and by Leary's psychedelic mission. As the secretary to IF-IF, she sent several letters to members of her family with materials pertaining to psychedelic research, which shows that she was looking to broaden IF-IF's support base by sparking their interest in these drugs. For instance, she told her uncle Jack and aunt Ray Walton, daughter of William Larrimer Mellon and philanthropist, that she was terribly excited by her involvement in psychedelic drug research and by the new scientific possibilities to study consciousness, and underscored the value of such substances for the human race.

Crucially, she also mentioned that the current scientific climate threatened psychedelic research and that it was urgent and critical to lobby the government to ease the situation: "The present need for funds is the result of a ridiculous development, the confusion in Food and Drug Administration regulations following the thalidomide scandal last summer. Virtually all so-called experimental drugs such as LSD-25, as well as numerous others of different sorts, are no longer available for research, due to new FDA restrictions."[23] Her enthusiasm was genuine, according to Leary. Notwithstanding utopian fancies, she understood that LSD could have great value for society: "I know Peggy was very excited at the possibility of LSD knocking out junk habit."[24]

Leary and his associates realized that charity could be a strong source of income and reasoned that they needed to be more attractive for donors like the Hitchcocks. In October 1963, the IF-IF was granted tax-exempt status, retroactive to the beginning of the year. This was an important asset to help the organization secure additional funds and in the process this brand of psychedelic philanthropy furthered a much longer tradition of tax-exemption that is such a fundamental part of the non-profit sector.[25] In two letters, Alpert informed some of the

contributors, which included Peggy Hitchcock, of the news and thanked them again for their generosity: "Your gift, made at a time when our need was so great and when we could not definitely assure tax exemption, was doubly welcome. I am happy that from a tax point of view this confidence has been justified."[26]

But in spite of Peggy's generosity, Leary could not always easily have access to some of the funds for his research, likely because Leary was flouting academic conventions and because the university was uneasy about a psychologist (rather than a psychiatrist) dabbling with strange mind-altering drugs. In November 1962 she contributed $3000 toward his "Behavior Change Program" through the Laboratory of Social Relations of the Harvard Faculty of Arts and Science. As arrangements were made to channel these funds to Leary, the Laboratory requested certain provisions which suggested that the university was beginning to treat his research with suspicion. It informed him that they were "not willing to administer funds for their research involving the drug psilocybin unless a suitable committee could be formed to advise on the research and help control the various public repercussions of their activities." As the Laboratory believed that those conditions were not met, it informed Leary that he should request a transfer of the funds out of the laboratory and into an external organization.[27]

It is easy to see why Harvard was pulling the plug on his research, just like medical doctor Thomas Szasz had seen his staff dwindle because of his controversial views on psychiatry around the same time. Initially, Leary seemed like a promising psychologist who had a bright career ahead of him. His interest in psychedelics did raise a few eyebrows, but then the university also had a long tradition of academic freedom, so he was free to experiment with psilocybin. Things changed in spring 1962, however, when the *Boston Herald* tabloid reproduced a damning piece revealing that Leary and Alpert's colleagues were concerned by their lack of scientific rigor and suggesting that these drugs were trickling out of their lab and onto the campus (Gordon, 1962, as referenced in Siff, 2015, pp. 124 and 125). The publicity certainly piqued the curiosity of several students but more importantly the Harvard drug scandal was the first of the kind to make the nationwide news. In 1963, Leary's and Alpert's contracts were not renewed.

Though the university's concern for its reputation explains in part why it sought to impose restrictions on Leary's research, his gradual resentment of academic science can also be attributed to the inherent complexity of the psychedelic experience. Those investigating LSD as an adjunct to psychotherapy relied on the subjective experiences of their patients, rather than on hard, objective, and measurable data. In the aftermath of the thalidomide scandal that had witnessed the drug cause terrible birth defects, which Peggy Hitchcock mentioned in the letter to her aunt, the 1962 Kefauver Harris Amendment of the FDA introduced the requirement to prove the scientific efficacy of a drug before it could be used, which created further constraints for psychedelic research. As historian Matthew Oram has argued, this crippled research to a point where only a handful of government-sanctioned studies were underway by the late 1960s.[28]

It is no surprise, then, that the idiosyncratic Leary preferred to move away from the university and continue his research outside academia. This prompted a gradual metamorphosis whereby he "abandoned the role of the conventional, academic, scientist, and became, without knowing it, a *shaman*, an activist change-agent" (Leary, 1982). Philanthropists did not terminate their funding, however. They reasoned that Leary's research was important, regardless of the epistemological questions surrounding psychedelic science.

1.3 | Millbrook and the study of spirituality (1963–1965)

After leaving Harvard Leary wondered where the IF-IF could set up shop and, partly thanks to Peggy Hitchcock's handsome 20,000 dollar donation (Leary, 1990), they initially found sanctuary in Mexico and subsequently in the Caribbean. But in the end, local authorities were unimpressed by a bunch of eccentric Americans using mind-altering drugs (Higgs, 2006, pp. 54–58) and they were forced to temporarily move back to Boston. Before the Hitchcocks offered their assistance once again, Leary was courting the help of another wealthy figure. Early in 1964 Bostonian and Romania-born Elisabeth Amelung expressed her interest in supporting the IF-IF by inviting

them to settle on her 55-acre estate. She had experimented with the psychedelic peyote cactus and organic gardening with an experimental commune in Romania.[29]

But Leary soon learned that the Hitchcocks had just bought a 2500-acre estate in upstate New York for tax purposes—it functioned as a cattle ranch so it was also good investment. His group settled down on their property in Millbrook and Leary created the Castalia Foundation to study psychedelics in an even more eclectic setting and with reasonable operating costs—the rent was a dollar a year (Greenfield, 2006, pp. 206, 207). Billy joined and sponsored Castalia and the other two semi-religious institutions that sprouted on his estate. Bill Haines ran the Sri Ram Ashram and former psychologist Art Kleps, who authored a zany psychedelic *Boo Hoo Bible* (Kleps, 1971),[30] directed the iconoclastic Neo-American Church. One observer saw this move as a classic case of philanthropy, claiming that Kleps' unusual Church was fortunate to have such a wealthy protector, who gave it "a kind of establishment gloss as well as a home."[31]

As historian of religion Robert Fuller aptly sums up, the Millbrook scene does not elicit easy interpretation. "For about four years Millbrook was a monastery, school, research laboratory, religious commune, and opium den all rolled into one" (Fuller, 2000, p. 69). What is clear however is that in the post-Harvard setting any idea of rigorously empirical science had gone out of the window. But the transition from behavioral sciences to this unorthodox pursuit of psychedelic-induced spirituality did not occur suddenly and had precedents in Leary's time at Harvard (Lander, 2011, p. 67). In April 1962 he and graduate student Walter Pahnke had studied the effects of psilocybin on a group of divinity students in an attempt to show that the drug could trigger a mystical experience.[32] This naturally paved the way for more emphasis on the religious import of the psychedelic experience, which eventually culminated in Leary's transformation into a religious figure extolling the benefits of LSD in the second part of the 1960s.

With Leary's academic career over and all the negative publicity, the New York elite naturally stayed clear from him and his research, which makes Billy Hitchcock's own involvement all the more intriguing. Kleps, for one, was unsure of his motivations: "Youthful folly? Courage of Psychedelian conviction? Sympathy and generosity? Boredom? Innocence? Arrogance? Curiosity? Lecherous anticipation of variegated choirs of marijuana goddesses? The hypnotic spell of Timothy Leary?" (Kleps, 2005b). Some of the Millbrook residents like Hollingshead never trusted him and thought that it was strange, if not downright suspicious, that a millionaire who was part of the "establishment" could have such an interest in the psychedelic revolution. He sometimes took part in the psychedelic group sessions with Leary and his associates, but unlike everybody around him, he tended not to verbalize his experiences and never came forward with any metaphysical insights on his trips.[33] Hollingshead notwithstanding, other figures of the psychedelic movement saw Hitchcock as a fraud. The less-known Lisa Bieberman ran a series of bulletins for the "Psychedelic Information Center" in Cambridge, Massachusetts—she took part in Leary's venture from 1962 onward, but ended up criticizing Leary and Kleps for their public mismanagement of the psychedelic movement.[34] In her writings, she referred to the case of Tord Svenson who had been ordained "Keeper of the Divine Toad" by Kleps and had helped him financially and physically in many occurrences. But when he was arrested for possession of cannabis and peyote, neither Kleps nor Hitchcock budged to assist him with the legal procedures. She also accused Leary and Kleps of extorting money from their supporters when they requested contributions to cover the legal expenses of bail charges ($35,000) levied against the Millbrook residents in various drug-related arrests:

> Billy Hitchcock has already paid the $35,000 bail charges; his pockets are not empty. He has forty million dollars. He owns and operates the estate for his personal amusement. What he feels like paying for, to keep the carnival going, is paid; what he doesn't feel like paying for, isn't paid. Tord Svenson, for instance, was considered dispensable—in the long run anyone is dispensable except Billy Hitchcock, and whomever he relies upon to keep his scene exiting, which at the moment seems to mean Leary and Kleps.[35]

Others, on the other hand, thought that he was genuinely interested in reforming America. For instance, New York psychedelic painter Isaac Abrams still thinks today that "Billy believed in the psychedelic experience."[36] Others still thought that he was simply looking for an unusual form of excitement. Gerd Stern, who collaborated with Leary for artistic undertakings, contends that "Billy like his sister Peggy was intrigued and became involved in the revolving group of exciting personalities who comprised the culture of Millbrook."[37] In any event, he was a major backer for Leary's venture, who undoubtedly enjoyed fueling this unusual scene at the crossroads of science, religion, and debauchery.

As for Billy's sister Peggy, self-described as a "trust fund baby" who was bored by her upper-class environment, it is much clearer that she was fascinated by psychedelics and enamored by Leary. She had first tried mescaline in 1961 and then heard about his research into mind-altering drugs courtesy of the influential theater producer Van Wolfe (Dass et al., 2010, p. 42). Peggy admired Leary's spirit of adventure and enterprise and soon fell in love with him. For a womanizer like Leary the feeling was not mutual but they nonetheless became close friends and occasional lovers. In spite of the money and energy she gave to Leary's mission she was surprised that he never really openly solicited her for greater funding: "He never asked me for money. I think he felt he had to make it on his own […]. Perhaps he also had a cultural bias because I was a woman with whom he was involved and he would not feel comfortable asking me for money" (Dass et al., 2010, p. 58)

Theology professor Walter Houston Clark was another prominent contributor, who was likely driven by a combination of Christian charity and the strong impression the psychedelic experience made upon him. He gave $150 toward Leary's research after spending time with him at Millbrook in 1964[38] and he was rumored to be much wealthier than he appeared, but with the reputation of being stingy. Yet, when Kleps was arrested in Florida for possession of LSD, Clark gave $200 for his bail. On another occasion, Kleps was visited by a young couple that was touring the United States listening to gurus and experimenting with psychedelics. In his own words, they "were ragged and appeared to be poor," but turned out to have substantial income from trust funds, and ultimately "out-contributed Billy Hitchcock … by about 20-to-1 in the years that followed" (Kleps, 2005d)

The less-known Charlie Rumsey got involved in Leary's movement. For Kleps, his role in New York's psychedelic scene seen has been underestimated: "Psychedelianism will truly have triumphed on the day when the sun's early light dawns in Central Park on a statue of Charlie" (Kleps, 2005e) Rumsey was an old friend of Hitchcock's and a lawyer who came from an equally wealthy background and had ancestral connections with the Harriman family that had built its fortune with the railroad industry and that was also involved in philanthropy. He led an eccentric and flamboyant life and liked to entertain in his New York apartment. For those in the know, however, he became an important LSD supplier for the wealthy and guided many LSD users toward the Millbrook commune. And when Leary ran into trouble with the law, he was one of the many New York jet setters to help the defrocked Harvard professor—by becoming secretary to the Timothy Leary Defense Fund.

1.4 | From charity to activism: The Timothy Leary defense fund

In December 1965 Leary was arrested on the Texas-Mexico border for carrying less than an ounce of cannabis. Facing a 30-year prison sentence, he decided to take his case to the US Supreme Court and argue that the 1937 Marihuana Tax Act was unconstitutional. In March 1966, Billy Hitchcock provided Leary's bail money and then set up the Timothy Leary Defense Fund (TLDF) to cover the legal expenses of the upcoming trial. The TLDF published a call for donations in the *New York Times* (Lander, 2014, p. 147) and sent letters all over the country, hoping to gather enough financial support.

As a result one of the psychedelic movement's major sources of income began to shift away from the wealthy philanthropists to a more grass-roots form of campaigning, which involved collecting more modest contributions from less-fortuned Americans. Up until his first arrest, patrons had been supporting Leary's research that many saw as idiosyncratic, but not illegitimate. When they moved to defend him and to contribute to his Defense Fund,

they decided to condone his use of cannabis and shifted away from a longer tradition of "scientific philanthropy" (Bremmer, 1988) to promote a form of pro-drug activism that lacked the moral sanction of scientific research. Additionally, Leary's cause converged with the Committee to Legalize Marijuana (LeMar) initiated by Ginsberg and poet Ed Sanders in December 1964, and which argued against the prohibition of cannabis on libertarian and medical grounds (Ed Sanders, 2011).[39] What had started as a charity-based scientific enterprise morphed into a social movement that was in tune with the climate of the middle of the decade.

To be sure, Leary's high-profile exit from Harvard was a source of publicity that helped gather support. For artist Martin Carey, "The '50s were such a dull, sleepy time, and school was dull and boring and inoffensive.' The people who had trouble in school were usually more intelligent, so they got bored." Hearing about a drug scandal in an Ivy-league institution—it "was like a light shining into all that boredom" (Graboi, 1991)[40] Yet, Leary's crusade would not have been the same without the backing of the New York jet set, rather than the so-called "Flower Children" of the second part of the 1960s, and the TLDF secured funds through a letter-writing campaign that was hardly unconventional. Historian Lisa McGirr has studied the history of conservative activism in Orange County, California (where Leary was, incidentally, arrested again in 1968 for cannabis possession) by examining the grass-roots role of ordinary middle-class suburbanites who pressed for a conservative agenda, which also included writing letters (McGirr, 2001). Just as McGirr lamented the disproportionate focus on the liberal and progressive movements of the 1960s at the time of her publication, a more balanced take on one of the most controversial movements of the decade reveals classic tactics and backers, rather than just radical and provocative statements and actions.

In the larger history of the psychedelic movement, Leary's 30-year conviction for cannabis possession and his subsequent defense is critical to understand the latter part of the decade. Notwithstanding the convergence with LeMar, it also saw him complete the transition from academic psychologist to High Priest of LSD that had begun in the aftermath of the drug scandals at Harvard. This was not just the result of a discussion with the famous Canadian media analyst Marshall McLuhan, who had advised him to make his discourse fashionable and appealing to gather popular support. As his lawyer pondered how to defend his case, Isaac Abrams, who happened to be visiting at Millbrook, came up with a brilliant idea: "Well, American Indians take peyote as a sacrament. Maybe this is a similar thing." The attorney was thrilled. "And the next thing you know, they were calling it a sacrament."[41] By presenting cannabis as such, it opened up a new legal strategy: Leary, as an alleged practicing Hindu, could invoke his right to use the drug as part of his religion.[42]

So the language of "rights" became one of Leary's favorite angles of defense (Elcock, 2015). This contrasted with the rhetoric deployed by another psychedelic icon. Novelist Ken Kesey, famous for writing *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* and for organizing seminal psychedelic parties on the West coast, had also been arrested for cannabis possession on April 13, 1965 in his home in La Honda, California. A Ken Kesey Defense Fund (KKDF) was set up to cover the legal expenses, because the high bail had drained his resources. Although the KKDF courted contributors by invoking the duty to protect the rights guaranteed by their American citizenship, Kesey himself preferred to mention the broader atmosphere of protest that reigned throughout the country:

> I think people all over the country are getting fed up with the way officers of the law have been treating 'outsiders' recently. They're sick of the way police brutally beat young civil rights workers in the South, sick of the methods used by police during the recent demonstrations on the Berkeley campus of the University of California and fed up with the way police officers have been harassing creative groups such as we have here in La Honda […].[43]

While the legacy and impact of the KKDF is hard to assess due to the lack of primary material available, it appears that the TLDF drew a wide range of support from all over the country. Students, computer programmers, biologists, teachers, postal clerks, or physicists gave to the cause out of libertarian convictions[44] or out of disgust at the harsh sentence passed.[45] Others requested further information on the legality and pharmacology of

psychedelic drugs and cannabis, and expressed interest in the idea of reforming drug laws.[46] Others still wished to remain anonymous, but contributed financially and gave lists of names to contact on their behalf.[47] Anthropology professor Omer C. Stewart, who had previously testified as an expert witness in cases involving peyote, was another donor who did not want to see his name appear on the list of public figures supporting Leary, but agreed to support the Fund confidentially.[48] Although the TLDF was based in New York City, the organization was eager to expand and set up chapters in other cities. In Washington, D.C., several supporters formed the Psychedelic Information Center of Washington, which ran newsletters to raise monies or simply collect donations for the Fund.[49]

The TLDF also sent letters to progressive groups, hoping for support from more typical organizations to defend Leary's rights. The Bruin Humanist Forum, a University of California at Los Angeles chapter of the Humanist Union of North America, expressed its sympathy for Leary's cause and supported him by disseminating information about cannabis and LSD, and was also interested in the broader issues: "We are eager to help in the fight to legalize marijuana."[50]

In an attempt to connect pro-drug activism with the trademark protest movements of the 1960s, the Defense Fund tried the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) that had previously assisted several progressive causes of the 1960s. In 1961 the Southern California chapter had for instance put pressure on the Board of Education to fight school segregation and overcrowding in Los Angeles (Theoharis, 2006) and in 1966 Native American Indians and the nascent Red Power movement likewise found its legal support in 1966 when activists were arrested as a result of their involvement in the "fish-ins" in Washington State to protest against the violation of a 19th-century treaty guarantying their rights to fish in the area (S. L. Smith, 2012).

But when the right to consume illicit drugs arrived on the agenda, the reactions were mostly negative, if not openly hostile. Many ACLU members simply requested to have their names removed from the mailing list and wondered how the TLDF had gotten them in the first place. One member of the Union admitted that Leary's conviction was an extreme sentence, but he felt that he would never have to do more than three years and that at any rate Leary was "largely responsible for the present widespread, uncontrolled use of LSD, especially by young people with well-documented disastrous results in many cases."[51] Another member argued that Leary had repeatedly broken the law and led others down that path and that for that reason he "would gladly do anything [he] could to uphold Timothy Leary's conviction."[52] Another still was brief and blunt: she declined the offer to contribute to the TLDF but on the other hand she was willing to send funds to ensure his imprisonment.[53] Such antagonistic reactions were even stronger than the kind of "liberal anticommunism" that plagued the organization (Kutulas, 2006), so for once Leary was not far off the mark when he wrote around the same time that mind-altering drugs were so reviled in America that they were "a symbol more powerful than sex or communism"(Leary, 1995).

Unfortunately for Leary the TLDF closed on May 27, 1966, due to lack of funds.[54] Despite the many contributions, administrative and legal expenses were too high to be effectively met. Additionally, Leary and his crew were raided in their Millbrook home on April 17 and many were arrested for drug possession. Posting all those bails was a critical blow to the Fund. The three religious leaders, Leary, Kleps, and Haines co-authored the "Call to Alms for the Battle of Millbrook," in which they requested donations for the Millbrook Defense Fund (Kleps, 1971, p. 63), and contributions continued to come in, but at an average of $10 per day.[55]

1.5 | The legacy of the TLDF

In spite of its shortcomings the TLDF became a catalyst for the broader campaign to legalize cannabis use. The support Leary received for his defense was not surprising in that marijuana activism had been going on for a few years in New York and was burgeoning in California, where Los Angeles attorney Al Mathews was mounting a challenge with the Anonymous Committee for the Abolition of the Prohibition Against Marijuana by collecting

signatures for a petition. They put forth pharmacological arguments that criticized the legality of alcohol and tobacco, when cannabis seemed less harmful and potentially therapeutic.[56]

Leary's strategy inspired some cannabis users to challenge the legislation in a similar way. In September 1966 Mark Fox wrote to the TLDF to request information about Leary's defense because he was awaiting trial in Arizona for possession. Like Leary, Fox was keen to invoke the language of rights to defend himself: "I expect to admit to smoking marijuana but will try to show that it is my right as provided by the U.S. constitution."[57] Howard Ingram was in an even worse situation in California, facing trial for selling the drug to a minor and possession of cannabis and LSD with the intent to sell. He wanted to take his case to the Supreme Court, if he could gather enough support, and was keen on monitoring the Leary case, in hope that his defense would set a legal precedent.[58]

The convergence of psychedelic voluntary associations and the pro-cannabis movement was even more apparent when LeMar received a copy of the TLDF's Declaration of Principle through their attorney, which they signed and returned. The state of their finances did not permit them to contribute to the campaign, but they promised to help by requesting forms to be sent out to the LeMar mailing list across the country.[59] But even more fittingly Mike Lynch wrote to Leary in the fall of 1966 to tell him that he would like to start a LeMar chapter at the Arizona State University and requested "all the historical, legal, social, and scientific information [about] marijuana and LSD."[60]

The psychedelic movement and the TLDF appeared to spur the larger psychedelic counter-culture to jump to the defense of its fellow drug users. The support was often morally justified by the fact that defendants were sometimes entrapped by undercover law-enforcement officers and then faced harsh penalties for use or distribution of the drug. Sometime in spring 1967, Jim Ewan, who was serving as "Boo Hoo" for the Neo-American Church chapter at Wichita State University in Kansas, was entrapped by two FDA agents and charged with possession, sale, and delivery of LSD, and possession of cannabis. A defense fund was set up and calls for legal and financial support were made in the pages of the *East Village Other*. The New York underground newspaper—very sympathetic to psychedelia—stressed the importance of fighting for the case from a religious perspective, just like Leary was doing: "If the psychedelic churches are to hope for any legal acceptance of their use of these sacraments, they should realize the importance of this case, the best test case at present" (*East Village Other*, 1967).

Similar organizations were established throughout the entire country. In Chicago, the Drug Reform Union made plans to offer drug users legal aid and bail money "so that the busted person can obtain legal advice and bail to get him out of jail as fast as possible" (*Daily Illini*, 1969) In 1967 Kleps was arrested in Florida and Lisa Bieberman raised $1000 for his bail through her LSD Loan Fund—"only to have him retreat into Millbrook and refuse to appear for trial, thus causing [her] to lose most or possibly all of the bail money."[61] The LSD Loan Fund also lent one psychedelic drug user $150 to help him with his legal expenses, following his arrest for possession of peyote and cannabis in North Carolina.[62] As well, the magazine *Innerspace*, which was created as a national platform for the psychedelic culture, requested financial assistance for a cannabis user who was arrested in Capitola, California in February 1966 for possession.[63] The magazine offered information about the Jade Companions of the Flowered Dance, which was set up in New York City (with three centers in Manhattan and Brooklyn) to assist psychedelic drug users who had been arrested for drug-related violations of the law: for a $5 annual membership, one had free legal consultation and access to a bail fund in cases of psychedelic drug possession. A similar organization had been established in Washington, DC before the Jade Companions.[64]

As these instances suggest, understanding the rise of this unusual form of humanitarian idealism requires paying attention to the legal status of LSD and other psychedelics. New York State provided penalties for possession and distribution of LSD as early as 1965. The drug was banned on October 6, 1966 in California and the federal government made it a Schedule I drug in 1970, which left psychedelic drug users potentially facing lengthy prison terms. Bails and defense funds were set up to give LSD users a chance to fight for their case in court and became the logical consequence of the new legislation. But in spite of their efforts, the war on drugs of the 1970s dealt a significant blow to these psychedelic enthusiasts.

However, this psychedelic activism was not just the result of a more punitive legislation. A full-blown psychedelic experience was often interpreted as a spiritual revelation and spurred several psychedelic drug users to act not only for the psychedelic community in its largest sense, but also for what they saw as a great benefit to humankind. As with more orthodox forms of religion in the United States, psychedelic spirituality extended beyond simple spiritual practices and into the secular sphere through acts of charity. In this way, psychedelic philanthropy differed from many other forms of charities and voluntary associations, because the desire to improve society was not motivated by the belonging to a religious congregation, but in many cases by a revelatory drug experience.

1.6 | Psychedelic philanthropy beyond the 1960s

In the following decades, LSD and psychedelic drug consumption carried on in the United States, albeit without the idealism of the 1960s. Psychedelic research was virtually non-existent due to the new legislation (Spring Grove was the outstanding exception) and philanthropic attitudes toward these drugs seemed to have disappeared. In the 1990s, however, the rise of the neurosciences rekindled the scientific interest in psychedelics and led to a form of "psychedelic renaissance," which was accompanied by a scientific philanthropy that echoed the enthusiasm of the early 1960s.

Anthropologist of science Nicolas Langlitz has since chronicled this renaissance and has shown that wealthy patrons have been instrumental in facilitating the process. In particular, John Gilmore, a wealthy Silicon Valley libertarian committed to defending civil rights, gave millions of dollars in an attempt to make psychedelics available for medical applications. This, he felt, could ultimately end the war on drugs. And the late Bob Wallace of Microsoft was another major donor to the contemporary psychedelic cause. He almost single-handedly sponsored the research undertaken by the Heffter Institute that promotes research into psychedelics. But unlike Gilmore, he was ready to bankroll both the basic scientific research and the Institute's infrastructure. Most donors longed to see these substances used to treat patients and gave accordingly. But Wallace was well-aware that the process was much longer and frustrating and he donated to the cause while hoping that clinical trials would someday follow suit (Langlitz, 2013, pp. 69–77).

Other international organizations like the Multidisciplinary Association for Psychedelic Studies (MAPS) also illustrate how psychedelic philanthropy survived the 1960s. In 2014, for instance, MAPS issued a press release acknowledging donors who had contributed toward scientific investigations into the potential of psychedelic drugs. The organization received $1.9 million from the late Precious Moments artist and psychedelic enthusiast Timothy Butcher who, in the words of a close friend, "believed strongly in the work MAPS is doing."[65] In one newsletter, the organization thanked several people who gave funds for research but one name stood out: "We also gratefully acknowledge the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, who made a grant of $10,000 to honor Richard Rockefeller and his commitment to philanthropy, or 'love of humanity.'"[66] This of course echoed the financial contributions coming from the heirs to the Mellon family half a century ago and shows that what might have seemed like an unusual cause to support for such a big name in the realm of philanthropy back then was in fact not an isolated case.

There is also historical continuity in the way some psychedelic drug users are organizing to protect what they see as their rights to alter their consciousness regardless of the legislation. In particular, the International Centre for Ethnobotanical Education, Research and Service (ICEERS) created an Ayahuasca Defense Fund (ADF)[67] in 2015 to offer legal advice and support for people (lawyers and expert witnesses) who have been arrested for possessing the DMT containing brew that originates from the Amazon basin. Unlike the TLDF, however, the ADF is much better organized and international in scope and it can cite centuries of indigenous ayahuasca use as proof of its safety and efficacy. Hence the ADF has successfully assisted dozens of defendants in Spain, Chile, the United States, and the United Kingdom, and is constantly looking for financial support to further its cause (Oberhaus, 2017).

Meanwhile, cannabis activism is scoring important victories in the United States and North America and it seems like it is only a matter of time before the plant becomes legal on a federal level. In the process, marijuana has already become a multi-million industry attracting investors from all over the country—a remarkable feat which would have seemed like a pipe dream in the 1960s. But an even larger look at the funding patterns behind the entire category of psychedelics reveals that a similar shift might be underway. The UK-based Compass Pathways, which was created in 2016, has come under fire for using private funds in an attempt to develop a for-profit model of psilocybin therapy and the more obscure Eleusis has recently patented a form of LSD therapy for Alzheimer's disease (E. Davis, 2018). This has prompted some prominent members of the global psychedelic community to release a statement emphasizing the need to conduct psychedelic research with "intellectual and scientific integrity, service, open science and open practices, and non-interference" (Jesse, 2018).

Whether this for-profit model will prevail at a time when post-prohibition scenarios are becoming increasingly plausible is a matter of speculation, but the controversy and uproar suggests that the kind of idealism that had permeated Leary's research into psychedelics has survived the 1960s and is here to stay. A non-profit organization like MAPS, however, epitomizes the continuity of a charity-based and idealistic psychedelic research coupled with a discourse that underscores the value psychedelic drugs possess for humanity, while the global psychedelic community is singling out controversial organizations like Compass Pathways and Eleusis for their unethical for-profit motives.

2 | CONCLUSION

In spite of their flawed and controversial nature, then, Leary and his movement were instrumental in framing psychedelics as revered life-changing tools that should be made available to everyone and that attracted like-minded donors. Where many takes on the history of Leary's psychedelic movement have emphasized his irresponsible promotion of psychedelic drugs, this paper has instead examined how conventional philanthropic attitudes were able to support him and other research groups. Some patrons underwent life-changing psychedelic experiences akin to a spiritual awakening and decided that psychedelics were important substances that deserved adequate promotion. Others realized that these chemicals could benefit society and they furthered a long tradition of scientific philanthropy. Still, others were drawn to the excitement and prestige of becoming the benefactors and protectors of the psychedelic movement. Finally, many psychedelic enthusiasts perceived the attacks on psychedelic research as a violation of academic freedom and defended them on libertarian grounds. The support Leary drew for his research should not really come as a surprise if we look at the major aims behind private patronage in postwar America, which could indeed include behavioral research into a category of vision-inducing drugs that went on to become controversially associated with deviance and dissent.

Though Leary's movement and his high-profile crusade to challenge the existing drug laws stood out, many similar groups felt they were part of a large community of illicit substance users and realized that they needed to organize to inform and protect their fellow members who wished to carry on their psychedelic lifestyles regardless of the legislation. Paying attention to these groups shifts attention away from notions of drug use as escapism and subversion of authority and points to more complex patterns of social bonding within the drug culture. As David Farber has contended in his work on the American counter-culture, "historians need to write more about the men and women who tried, often with qualified success, to build a new culture in the late 1960s and early 1970s" (Farber, 2013, p. 3) and focus away from the famous counter-cultural events that fuel the declensionist (or "rise and fall") theory of 1960s historiography. A history of the funding and support behind the psychedelic movement indeed reveals that many Americans did not see LSD in terms of hedonism, but rather as a useful tool that could benefit humanity and chose to fund psychedelic research and help the psychedelic movement accordingly.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank Erika Dyck, Lindsey Banco, and the blind reviewers of the journals that assessed this paper for their helpful and insightful comments as well as *Social History of Alcohol and Drugs for their editorial support*. Primary research for this paper was gracefully supported by Erika Dyck's Canada Research Chair funds and minor revisions of this paper were funded by generous support from Emilia Sanabria's European Research Council Starting Grant no. 757589.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The author declares that there are no conflict of interests.

ENDNOTES

[1]Marijuana is often defined as a minor psychedelic, even though this classification is debatable. In this paper, I have chosen to include it in that category of illicit drugs because both LSD and cannabis were linked by their ability to spur Americans to give money for research and activism. Although psychedelics are indelibly associated with the 1960s, heroin and amphetamines were equally prevalent. See for instance the relevant sections in Schneider (2008), Rasmussen (2009).

[2]Here Leary's movement is framed at the crossroads of scientific research, religion, and politics. Leary was initially interested in the study of psychedelics but he soon displayed a tangible religious discourse that could also be understood as a political crusade. Certainly, the campaign to save Leary from the hammer of justice was political in nature.

[3]As examples of this critical school, see Jonnes (1996), Marwick (1998), Paglia (2003), Heath and Potter (2006), DeGroot (2008). These contributions come from a pool of conservative, libertarian, and liberal authors, which suggests that the repudiation of Leary's psychedelic movement does not stem from political bias.

[4]An exception to this trend is Hartogsohn's recent focus on Leary's popularization of the concept of set and setting, albeit from the perspective of science history in Hartgosohn (2020).

[5]It strengthens this brand of historiography by highlighting the "American" characteristics of the psychedelic movement, rather than its radical and revolutionary aspects that have attracted the bulk of scholarly attention.

[6]For elements of discussions on this conceptual problem, see Roberts (1978), Henderson (2011), Bennett (2012). As well, several historians have illustrated how the borders separating mainstream culture and counter-culture are porous. See Frank (1998), Farber (2013), Kaiser and McCray (2016), J. C. Davis (2017).

[7]For a list of the government-funded research into psychedelics, see U.S. Senate, 89th Congress, 2nd Session (1966); as referenced in Oram (2012). In the context of the Cold War the Central Intelligence Agency also bankrolled some of this study, hoping to find the ultimate truth-serum or a weapon that could incapacitate an entire country. See J. Marks (1988).

[8]The research into the therapeutic potential of psychedelics at the Spring Grove State Hospital was funded by the National Institute of Mental Health, the Maryland State Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, the Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation, and the Public Health Service. In the words of Oram, it was "the longest, largest, most sophisticated, and most successful such program ever undertaken in the United States" (Oram, 2018, p. 109).

[9]Charles Savage to Nina Ridenour, October 8, 1965, folder "Correspondence, Jun.-Dec., 1965," box 3 of 13, series 2 "Correspondence, 1964-1968," MSP 70, Charles Savage papers, Archives, and Special Collections, Purdue University Libraries (hereafter cited as "Savage papers").

[10]Charles Savage to the Ittleson Family Foundation, October 8, 1965, folder "Correspondence, Jun.-Dec., 1965," box 3 of 13, series 2 "Correspondence, 1964-1968," Savage papers.

[11]Charles Savage to Nina Ridenour, February 15, 1966, folder "Correspondence, Jan.-Jun., 1966; Correspondence, Mar., 1966; Correspondence, Feb. 15, 1966," box 3 of 13, series 2 "Correspondence, 1964-1968," Savage papers.

[12]Stanley Krippner to author, e-mail, October 10, 2016 (in author's possession).

[13]This echoed the way some MDs defended Thomas Szasz when he was banned from teaching in 1962 because of his unorthodox views on psychiatry.

[14]A focus on cultural capital and drug use would make for an interesting enquiry into the dynamics of drug cultures. A good illustration of this phenomenon is Henri Luce and his wife Clare Boothe who both enjoyed sampling LSD in the company of Aldous Huxley and philosopher Christopher Isherwood, but who would prefer that the masses stay clear of it.

[15]The moral validity of drug-induced mysticism has been debated for over half a century. Rather than engage in these discussions, I build on part of the illicit drug scholarship that has paid more attention to the motivations for and the

meaning ascribed to drug experiences. See for instance Carstairs (2002), Goodman et al. (2007), Hunt et al. (2010), and Shortall (2014).

[16]For a critical assessment of this study, see Doblin, "Dr. Leary's Concord Prison Experiment."

[17]Qualifying Leary's work of "interdisciplinary" is debatable, in spite of the heterogeneous nature of his fellow researchers.

[18]"Newsletter #1," February 1962, 14, box 33, folder 19, Timothy Leary papers, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library (hereafter "Leary papers").

[19]Friedman subsequently left Uris to become a full-time writer, in large part as a result of his experimentation with psilocybin.

[20]Arthur Tomaselli to Freedom Center, Inc., March 19, 1963, box 57, folder 1, Leary papers.

[21]As Crowther-Heyck thoughtfully notes, patronage is a good word to refer to "the provision of support for research," whether "material, financial, and social, […] because there was and is more to providing support for a researcher or a field than writing checks" (Crowther-Heyck, 2006, pp. 421, 422, note 4).

[22]Richard Alpert to Tommy Hitchcock, January 22, 1965, box 63, folder 5, Leary papers.

[23]Peggy Hitchcock to Ray and Jack Walten, May 27, 1963, box 53, folder 30, Leary papers.

[24]Allen Eager interview by Timothy Leary, February 1967, 2, box 82, folder 21, Leary papers. Hitchcock was privy to the problem of addiction as she had briefly dated saxophonist Allen Eager who had a heroin habit. See Dass et al. (2010).

[25]For a discussion on the topic, see Zunz (2012b).

[26]Richard Alpert to Peggy Hitchcock and to Mayme Kramer, both October 8, 1963, box 47, folder 4, Leary papers.

[27]Robert F. Bales to E.G. Kraetzer, November 28, 1962, 1, box 47, folder 1, Leary papers.

[28]For a larger discussion on this, see Oram (2012).

[29]Timothy Leary to IF-IF members, March 19, 1964, box 61, folder 9, Leary papers.

[30]For Kleps' recollections of the Millbrook years, see his memoir Kleps (2005a).

[31]Joseph Martin ansd John Quinn, "U.S.A. vs LSD: Meet the Big Boo Hoo, High Hallucinogeneral," *Daily News*, January 31, 1968, 40, folder "Neo-American Church," box 10, Peter Stafford Papers, Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Columbia University in the City of New York (hereafter "Stafford Papers").

[32]For a follow-up on this experiment, see Doblin (1991).

[33]On one occasion he was told to ask a question he wanted to be answered by the psychedelic experience and wondered: "How can I make more money on the stock market?" (Kleps, 2005c).

[34]In 1966 Bieberman became the first person in New England to be arrested under the U.S. Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics Act for shipping LSD through the mail (Kruskall, 1966).

[35]Lisa Bieberman, "Psychedelic Information Center Bulletin," February 16, 1968, 2, folder "Drugs Crackdown," box 4, Stafford Papers.

[36]Isaac Abrams to author, e-mail, September 13, 2013 (in author's possession).

[37]Gerd Stern to author, e-mail, September 12, 2013 (in author's possession).

[38]Walter Houston Clark to Timothy Leary, October 11, 1964, box 62, folder 7.

[39]See Dufton's *Grass Roots* for an account of the early days of the marijuana movement.

[40]Interview by Graboi in Nina Graboi, *One Foot in the Future: A Women's Spiritual Journey* (Santa Cruz, CA: Areal Press, 1991), 250.

[41]Isaac Abrams interview by author, May 22, 2013, mp3 (in author's possession). For a legal history of Leary's attempt to beat those charges, see Lander, "'Legalize Spiritual Discovery.'"

[42]To support his case, he found the help of the anthropology professor and Hindu convert Aghenanda Bharati, who had just published a book on the Tantric tradition in which he discussed the use of psychedelics in a religious context. John W. Spellman to Allen Ginsberg, April 25, 1966, box 116, folder 8, Leary papers. For more on the history of peyote and a discussion on Native American ritual use, see Dawson (2018).

[43]Ken Kesey Defense Fund, Box 6, folder 8, Leary papers.

[44]Chris Farny to Timothy Leary Defense Fund, March 23, 1966, box 155, folder 10, Leary papers.

[45]Richard W. Taylor to Timothy Leary Defense Fund, April 4, 1966, box 115, folder 13, Leary papers.

[46]Andrew. B. Campbell to Timothy Leary Defense Fund, n.d., box 115, folder 13, Leary papers.

[47]Robert J. Dummel to Timothy Leary Defense Fund, April 14, 1966, box 115, folder 13, Leary papers.

[48]Omer C. Stewart to Timothy Leary Defense Fund, April 16, 1966, box 115, folder 13, Leary papers. In 1964, the Supreme Court of California ruled that Native American Indians could legally use the cactus as a sacrament.

[49]One of the supporters included a sympathetic clergyman who had tried LSD in the early 1960s under medical supervision and subsequently experimented with the drug to find his Christian faith reinvigorated as a result. Michael Augustine Itkin to IF-IF, May 23, 1963, folder 2, box 54, Leary papers; Michael F. Itkin to the Timothy Leary Defense Fund, May 19, 1966, box 116, folder 2, Leary papers.

[50]Richard A. Harshman to Timothy Leary Defense Fund, n.d., box 118, folder 8, Leary papers.

[51]Virgil L. Highland to Timothy Leary Defense Fund, May 5, 1966, box 116, folder 9, Leary papers.

[52]George S. Brooks to Timothy Leary Defense Fund, May 10, 1966, box 116, folder 9, Leary papers.

[53]Beatrice S. Frank to Timothy Leary Defense Fund, May 5, 1966, box 116, folder 9, Leary papers.

[54]Sally Sherwin to J. Morris, June 16, 1966, box 116, folder 6, Leary papers.

[55]Sally Sherwin to Martin Garbus, June 16, 1966, box 116, folder 6, Leary papers.

[56]Al Matthews, "Statement," n.d., 1, box 115, folder 10, Leary papers.

[57]Mark Fox to Tim Leary Defense Fund, September 21, 1966, 1, box 74, folder 4, Leary papers.

[58]Howard G. Ingram Jr. to Timothy Leary, circa early March 1967, box 74, folder 9, Leary papers.

[59]Desta Brown to William Mellon Hitchcock, April 9, 1966, box 116, folder 14, Leary papers.

[60]Mike Lynch to Timothy Leary, circa October 1966, box 75, folder 1, Leary papers.

[61]Lisa Bieberman, "Psychedelic Information Center Bulletin," no. 12, June 1967, 2, folder "Drugs Crackdown," box 4, Stafford Papers.

[62]Lisa Bieberman, "Psychedelic Information Center Bulletin," no. 3, December 1965, 2, folder "Psychedelic Information Center," box 29, Stafford Papers.

[63]Robert S. Conrich, "The Editor Game," *Innerspace*, 1966, folder "Innerspace," box 21, Stafford Papers.

[64]"Jade Companions of the Flowered Dance," *Innerspace*, 1966, folder "Innerspace," box 21, Stafford Papers.

[65]MAPS Press Release, April 29, 2014, http://www.maps.org/maps-media/media/5066-press-release-precious-moments-artist-timothy-butcher-leaves-1-9-million (accessed January 1, 2017).

[66]MAPS Newsletter, September 17, 2013, http://www.maps.org/maps-media/update/4621-newsletter-september-17-2013 (accessed January 1, 2017).

[67]https://www.iceers.org/adf/ (accessed January 2, 2020).

ORCID

Chris Elcock http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6722-9414

REFERENCES

Aronov, M. (2019). (Micro-) 'psychedelic' experiences: From the 1960s creativity at the workplace to the 21st century neuro-newspeak. *Éthnologie française*, *176*(4), 701–718.

Bartoletti, S. C. (2015). *Terrible Typhoid Mary: A true story of the deadliest cook in America* (pp. 109–110). Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Bennett, A. (2012). Pour une réévaluation du concept de contre-culture. *Traduction de Jedediah Sklower*, *9*(1), 19–31.

Booth, M. (2005). *Cannabis: A history*. Picador.

Bremmer, R. H. (1988). Scientific philanthropy. In *American philanthropy* (pp. 85–99). University of Chicago Press.

Bremner, R. H. (1988). *American philanthropy*. University of Chicago Press.

Carstairs, C. (2002). Becoming a 'Hype': Heroin consumption, subcultural formation and the politics of resistance in Canada, 1945-1961. *Contemporary Drug Problems*, *29*(1), 91–116.

Conners, P. (2010). *White hand society: The psychedelic partnership of Timothy Leary and Allen Ginsberg*. City Lights Books.

Crowther-Heyck, H. (2006). Patrons of the revolution: Ideals and institutions in postwar behavioral science. *Isis*, *97*(3), 420–446.

Daily Illini. (1969). LSD rescue service soon? *Daily Illini* (October 25). p. 3.

Dass, R., Metzner, R., & Bravo, G. (2010). *Birth of a psychedelic culture: Conversations about Leary, the Harvard experiments, Millbrook and the sixties* (p. 6). Synergetic Press.
Davis E. (2018, September 25). Capitalism on psychedelics: The mainstreaming of an underground. *Chacruna*. https://chacruna.net/capitalism-psychedelics-mainstreaming-underground/
Davis, J. C. (2015). The business of getting high: Head shops, countercultural capitalism, and the marijuana legalization movement. *The Sixties*, *8*(1), 27–49.
Davis, J. C. (2017). *From headshops to whole foods: The rise and fall of activist entrepreneurs*. Columbia University Press.
Dawson, A. S. (2018). *The Peyote effect: From the inquisition to the war on drugs*. University of California Press.
DeGroot, G. (2008). *The sixties unplugged: A kaleidoscopic history of a disorderly decade* (pp. 208-215). Pan.
Doblin, R. (1991). Pahnke's 'Good Friday Experiment': A long-term follow-up and methodological critique. *The Journal of Transpersonal Psychology*, *23*(1), 1–28.
Doblin, R. (1998). Dr. Leary's Concord prison experiment: A 34-year follow-up study. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, *30*(4), 419–426.
Dufton, E. (2017). *Grass roots: The rise and fall and rise of marijuana in America*. Basic Books.
Dyck, E. (2008). *Psychedelic Psychiatry: LSD from Clinic to Campus*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
East Village Other. (1967). Boo Hoo Busted. *East Village Other*, 2 (13), 18.
Ed Sanders. (2011). *Fug you: An informal history of the peace eye bookstore, the fuck you press, the fugs, and counterculture in the lower east side* (pp. 115–116). Da Capo.
Elcock, C. (2013). From acid revolution to entheogenic evolution: Psychedelic philosophy in the sixties and beyond. *Journal of American Culture*, *36*(4), 296–311.
Elcock, C. (2015). The Fifth Freedom: The politics of psychedelic patriotism. *Journal for the Study of Radicalism*, *9*(2), 17–40.
Farber, D. (2013). Building the counterculture, creating right livelihoods: The counterculture at work. *The Sixties*, *6*(1), 1–24.
Ferrara, M. S. (2016). *Sacred bliss: A spiritual history of cannabis*. Rowman & Littlefield.
Frank, T. (1998). *The conquest of cool: Business culture, counterculture, and the rise of hip consumerism*. University Of Chicago Press.
Friedman, B. H. (2006). *Tripping: A memoir* (p. 11). Provincetown Arts Press.
Friedman, L. J., & McGarvie, M. D. (Eds.). (2002). *Charity, philanthropy, and civility in American history*. Cambridge University Press.
Fuller, R. C. (2000). Psychedelics and the metaphysical illumination. In Stairways to Heaven: Drugs in American religious history (pp. 51-89). Westview Press.
Goodman, J., Sheratt, A., & Lovejoy, P. (Eds.). (2007). *Consuming habits: Drugs in history and anthropology*. Routledge.
Gordon, N. (1962, March 16). Hallucination drug fought at Harvard. *Boston Herald*.
Graboi, N. (1991). *One foot in the future: A women's spiritual journey* (p. 250). Areal Press.
Greenfield, R. (2006). *Timothy Leary: A biography*. Harcourt, Inc.
Hartgosohn, I. (2020). *American trip: Set, setting, and the psychedelic experience in the twentieth century*. The MIT Press.
Healy, D. (2002). *The creation of psychopharmacology*. Harvard University Press.
Heath, J., & Potter, A. (2006). *The rebel sell: How the counterculture became consumer culture* (pp. 62-63). Capstone.
Henderson, S. (2011). *Making the scene: Yorkville and hip Toronto in the 1960s* (p. 5). University of Toronto Press.
Higgs, J. (2006). *I Have America Surrounded: The Life of Timothy Leary*. Barricade Books.
Hollingshead, M. (1973). The exile's re-return. In The man who turned on the world. Blond & Briggs. http://www.psychedelic-library.org/hollings.htm
Hunt, G., Moloney, M., & Evans, K. (2010). *Youth, drugs, and nightlife*. Routledge.
Hustinx, L., Essen, J. V., Haers, J., & Mels, S. (Eds.). (2015). *Religion and volunteering: Complex, contested and ambiguous relationships*. Springer.
Huxley, A. (2004). *The doors of perception and Heaven and Heaven and Hell*. Perennial Classics.
Jesse, R. (2018, April 5). Cooperation over competition! Statement on open science and open praxis with psilocybin, MDMA, and similar substances. *Chacruna*. https://chacruna.net/cooperation-over-competition-statement-on-open-science-for-psychedelic-medicines-and-practices/
Jonnes, J. (1996). *Hep-cats, narcs, and pipe-dreams: A history of America's romance with illegal drugs* (Vol. 239). Scribner.
Kaiser, D., & McCray, P. (Eds.). (2016). *Groovy science: Knowledge, innovation, and American counterculture*. The University of Chicago Press.
Kent, S. A. (2001). Religion, drugs, and the question of political engagement. In From slogans to mantras: Social protest and religious conversion in the late Vietnam war era (pp. 13–16). University of Syracuse Press.
Kleps, A. (1971). *The Boo Hoo Bible: The Neo-American Church Catechism*. Toad Books.
Kleps, A. (2005a. *Millbrook: A narrative*. Original Kleptonian Neo-American Church. http://okneoac.org/millbrook/
Kleps, A. (2005b). A word of explanation. In *Millbrook: A Narrative*. Original Kleptonian Neo-American Church.

Kleps, A. (2005c). The Boss. In *Millbrook: A narrative*. Original Kleptonian Neo-American Church.
Kleps, A. (2005d). Chapter 13: "Freemen!". In *Millbrook: A narrative*. Original Kleptonian Neo-American Church.
Kleps, A. (2005e). Chapter 38: “Sir Launcelot and Knights to the Rescue". In *Millbrook: A narrative*. Original Kleptonian Neo-American Church.
Kruskall, S. I. (1966, June 1). Lisa Bieberman held on charge of mailing LSD. *Harvard Crimson*.
Kutulas, J. (2006). *The American Civil Liberties Union & the making of modern liberalism, 1930-1960* (p. 212). University of North Carolina Press.
Lam, P.-Y. (2002). As the flocks gather: How religion affects voluntary association participation. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *41*(3), 405–422.
Lander, D. R. (2011). Start your own religion: New York state's acid churches. *Nova Religio*, *14*(3), 64–80.
Lander, D. R. (2014). ‘Legalize spiritual discovery’: The trials of Dr. Timothy Leary. In B. C. Labate, & C. Cavnar (Eds.), Prohibition, religious freedom, and human rights: Regulating traditional drug use (pp. 165–187). Springer.
Langlitz, N. (2013). *Neuropsychedelia: The revival of Hallucinogen research since the decade of the brain*. University of California Press.
Leary, T. (1982). *Changing my mind, among others: Lifetime writings* (p. 173). Prentice-Hall, Inc.
Leary, T. (1990). *Flashbacks: A personal and cultural history of an era* (p. 183). Jeremy P. Tarcher.
Leary, T. (1995). *High priest* (p. 79). Ronin.
Lee, M. A. (2013). *Smoke signals: A social history of marijuana—Medical, recreational and scientific*. Scribner.
Lee, M. A., & Shlain, B. (1985). *Acid dreams: The complete social history of LSD: The CIA, the sixties, and beyond*. Grove Weidenfeld.
Marks, H. (1997). *The progress of experiment: Science and therapeutic reform in the United States, 1900-1990*. Cambridge University Press.
Marks, J. (1988). Intelligence or ‘witches’ potion. In The search for the “Manchurian Candidate”: The CIA and mind control: The secret story of behavioural sciences (pp. 54-130). W. W. Norton.
Marks, S. (2015). From experimental psychosis to resolving traumatic pasts. psychedelic research in communist Czechoslovakia, 1954-1974. *Cahiers du monde russe*, *56*(1), 53–75.
Marwick, A. (1998). *The sixties: Cultural revolution in Britain, France, Italy, and the United States, c.1958-c.1974* (pp. 310–312). Oxford University Press.
McGirr, L. (2001). *Suburban warriors: The origins of the New American right*. Princeton University Press.
Nordstrom, L., & Pilgrim, R. (1980). The wayward mysticism of Alan Watts. *Philosophy East and West*, *30*(3), 381-401.
Novak, S. J. (1997). LSD before Leary: Sidney Cohen's critique of 1950s psychedelic drug research. *Isis*, *88*(1), 87–110.
Oberhaus D. (2017, May 3). *Meet the lawyers defending the right to use Ayahuasca around the globe*. Vice. https://www.vice.com/en_uk/article/jpzkbx/meet-the-lawyers-defending-the-right-to-use-ayahuasca-around-the-globe
Oram, M. (2012). Efficacy and enlightenment: LSD psychotherapy and the drug amendments of 1962. *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*, *69*(2), 235.
Oram, M. (2018). *The trials of psychedelic therapy: LSD psychotherapy in America*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
Paglia, C. (2003). Cults and cosmic consciousness: Religious vision in the American 1960s. *Arion*, *10*(3), 84.
Passie, T. (1997). *Psycholytic and psychedelic therapy research, 1931-1995: A complete international bibliography*. Laurentius Publishers.
Powell, W. W., & Steinberg, R. (Eds.). (2006). *The non-profit sector: A research handbook*. Yale University Press.
Rasmussen, N. (2009). *On speed: The many lives of amphetamine*. New York University Press.
Richert, L., & Dyck, E. (2020). Psychedelic crossings: American mental health and LSD in the 1970s. *Medical Humanities*, *46*, 184-191.
Roberts, K. A. (1978). Toward a generic concept of counter-culture. *Sociological Focus*, *11*(2), 111-126.
Rossinow, D. (1998). *The politics of authenticity: Liberalism, Christianity, and the new left in America*. Columbia University Press.
Schneider, E. C. (2008). *Smack: Heroin and the American city*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
Sessa, B. (2012). *The Psychedelic Renaissance: Reassessing the role of psychedelic drugs in 21st century psychiatry and society*. Muswell Hill.
Shipley, M. (2015). *Psychedelic mysticism: Transforming consciousness, religious experiences, and voluntary peasants in postwar America*. Lexington Books.
Shortall, S. (2014). Psychedelic drugs and the problem of experience. *Past & Present*, *222*(Suppl. 9), 187–206.
Siff, S. (2015). *Acid hype: American news media and the psychedelic experience*. University of Illinois Press.
Smith, H. (1964). Do drugs have religious importance? In D. Solomon (Ed.), LSD: The consciousness expanding drug (pp. 155-169). Putnam.
Smith, S. L. (2012). *Hippies, Indians, and the fight for red power* (p. 23). Oxford University Press.

Solovey, M., & Cravens, H. (2012). *Cold war social science: Knowledge production, liberal democracy, and human nature*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Stafford, P. G. (1967). *LSD, the problem-solving psychedelic*. Award Books.

Stern, G. (2001). From Beat Scene Poet to Psychedelic Multimedia Artist in San Francisco and Beyond, 1948-1978, interview by Victoria Morris Byerly (Vol. 90). Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

Stevens, J. (1988). *Storming Heaven: LSD and the American dream*. Perennial Library.

Tenenbaum, B. (1961). Group therapy with LSD-25. (A preliminary report). *Diseases of the Nervous System*, *22*, 459–462.

Theoharis, J. (2006). 'Alabama on Avalon': Rethinking the Watts uprising and the character of Black protest in Los Angeles. In P. E. Joseph, *The Black Power Movement: Rethinking the civil rights-Black power era*, (pp. 27–54). Routledge.

Ulibarri, C. A. (2000). Rational philanthropy and cultural capital. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, *24*(2), 135–146.

U.S. Senate, 89th Congress, 2nd Session. (1966). *Organization and Coordination of Federal Drug Research and Regulatory Programs: LSD, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations* (pp. 18–25). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Versterlund, L. (2006). Why do people give? In W. W. Powell, & R. Steinberg (Eds.), *The non-profit sector: A research handbook* (p. 568). Yale University Press.

Zaehner, R. C. (1957). *Mysticism: Sacred and profane*. Oxford University Press.

Zunz, O. (2012a). *Philanthropy in America: A history* (p. 3). Princeton University Press.

Zunz, O. (2012b). The regulatory compromise. In *Philanthropy in America: A history* (pp. 76–103). Princeton University Press.

How to cite this article: Elcock C. Psychedelic philanthropy: The nonprofit sector and Timothy Leary's 1960s psychedelic movement. *J Hist Behav Sci*. 2021;1–20. https://doi.org/10.1002/jhbs.22083