

THE IN A HURRY SERIES

Psychedelics *in a Hurry*

The drugs, the science, and the revival

Max Brocklesby

BOOKSINAHURRY.COM

Contents

The Whole Thing in One Page 4

Why You Should Care 6

The Core Ideas 8

How It Actually Works 21

What People Get Wrong 32

Use It 37

Terms 42

Go Deeper 48

Notes and Sources 49

Bibliography 57

The Whole Thing in One Page

Psychedelics carry two public images, both too neat. In one, they are dangerous relics of the 1960s. In the other, they are suppressed medicines returning to cure depression, trauma and addiction by resetting the brain in an afternoon. The same drug becomes social collapse or salvation. Neither picture explains what the drugs do, why outcomes vary, or why the revival is difficult to turn into ordinary care.

Begin with the category. LSD, psilocybin, mescaline and DMT are classical psychedelics because their characteristic effects depend heavily on serotonin 5-HT_{2A} receptors. MDMA is an entactogen whose main action is to release monoamine transmitters. Ketamine is a dissociative anaesthetic acting principally through glutamate systems. They may share a conference programme, but they are not one pharmacological family. Route, dose, duration and preparation matter. Ayahuasca is not oral DMT with better branding. Its other plants make DMT active and change risk and meaning.

The shared puzzle is context. A capsule can be manufactured to a tight specification. Its effect cannot. Psychedelics alter perception, emotion, self-experience, salience and the confidence attached to thoughts. They can loosen familiar interpretations without supplying a correct replacement. What happens next depends on the person, expectation, room, music, relationship, culture and account offered afterwards. Set and setting are therefore part of the causal system, not stage dressing around a chemical event.

That helps explain the science. Classical psychedelics reliably disturb ordinary coordination across brain systems, but no scan translates colour into revelation or network change into recovery. Cellular and animal work shows plasticity; human studies show altered connectivity and desynchronisation. The therapeutic chain connecting these levels remains incomplete. A brain may become more changeable without changing wisely.

Clinical trials are promising and uneven. Selected participants have received psilocybin for depression, distress associated with serious illness

and alcohol problems, or MDMA-assisted therapy for post-traumatic stress disorder. Some trials report large benefits. Others miss their main endpoint. Most combine drug sessions with screening, preparation, hours of support and follow-up. Blinding often fails because participants can tell that something happened. The comparison estimates what drug assignment adds under those conditions, not what an isolated molecule would do in ordinary life.

The risks follow the same structure. Classical psychedelics usually show low compulsive-use potential and low direct lethal toxicity, but those facts do not prevent panic, dangerous behaviour, cardiovascular strain, prolonged distress, mania, psychosis or persistent perceptual symptoms in a minority. Screening removes many higher-risk people from trials. MDMA and ketamine bring different hazards. A disoriented person beside an authority figure requires strict boundaries.

The same context sensitivity that may help treatment also makes it hard to standardise, blind, price and scale. Australia has allowed tightly restricted psychiatric access to unapproved MDMA and psilocybine. Oregon built a supervised service model rather than a medical approval. American regulators have published dedicated trial guidance after rejecting the first MDMA application. The science is moving, but access programme, clinical trial and approved medicine remain different things.

Psychedelics do not contain a truth, a diagnosis or a cure. They alter the conditions under which a mind constructs experience. The central question is what system directs that alteration, protects the person and converts a temporary state into anything that lasts.

That is the book.

Why You Should Care

A wall can seem to breathe without moving. A remembered event can acquire the force of the present without becoming a newly verified fact. The self can feel less bounded without disappearing. Psychedelics make a familiar room unfamiliar, but the more interesting discovery is how much work went into keeping it familiar in the first place. Ordinary perception feels like a camera pointed at the world. These drugs expose something closer to an ongoing construction: the brain weighing signals, expectations, memories and bodily states to produce the world you experience.

That is fascinating before it is therapeutic. The mind can change its sense of what matters while the furniture stays put. A thought can become compelling without acquiring new evidence. A person can feel that an old interpretation of their life is no longer compulsory. None of this proves that the altered view is better. It does raise an unusually sharp question: could a temporary change in how experience is organised help someone make a lasting change in how they live?

Testing that possibility creates a peculiar problem. A double-blind trial is meant to conceal who received the medicine. Give one group a full psychedelic dose and concealment may not survive the first hour. The participant guesses; the therapist may guess too. Hope, disappointment and professional attention can then diverge between the groups. The experiment still tells us something, but interpreting it requires more care than checking which capsule contained the chemical.

They also force a better conversation about mental-health treatment. Depression, trauma and addiction are often discussed as though a single broken chemical needs correcting. Psychedelic studies do not support an equally simple replacement story. Their strongest claims concern an episode embedded in preparation and support, sometimes followed by weeks or months of change. That model asks whether treatment can create a period in which habits, memories or self-interpretations become easier to revise. It also asks what happens when the period opens and the

surrounding care is poor.

The history matters because the current revival keeps misremembering it. Indigenous peoples across the Americas developed ceremonial and medicinal practices around peyote, mescaline-containing cacti and ayahuasca long before a Western laboratory isolated their compounds. Twentieth-century psychiatrists then pursued several incompatible projects at once: model psychosis, psychotherapy aid, alcoholism treatment, spiritual experience and military or intelligence tool. Researchers produced intriguing findings, weak studies and serious abuses. The counterculture did not single-handedly destroy a mature medical field, and prohibition did not interrupt a clean march towards approval. The collapse mixed politics, law, spectacle, methodological weakness, institutional fear and misconduct.

Now the practical stakes are rising. Clinics, investors, retreat operators, Indigenous communities, regulators and patients do not want the same thing from the revival. One wants an approved product. Another wants a protected sacrament. Another wants relief after standard treatments failed. Another sees a service industry. The language of healing can conceal questions about evidence, consent, ownership, training, cost and who deals with harm after the customer goes home.

The limits must remain visible. A promising average from screened volunteers does not tell a particular person whether to take an illegal or unapproved drug. A trial therapist is not interchangeable with a retreat guide. A low rate of serious events under supervision does not estimate risk in an unknown dose, mixed substance or unstable setting. This book explains the drugs, the evidence and the institutions around them. It does not prescribe an experience.

The reason to care is that psychedelics are becoming a test of whether modern medicine can study an intervention whose meaning helps shape its effect. If it cannot, enthusiasm will outrun knowledge. If it can, the gain may extend beyond one family of drugs: a more honest account of how brains, relationships and treatments work together.

The Core Ideas

A Family with Disputed Borders

The word psychedelic names an experience before it names a mechanism. That is why the category keeps expanding. A substance alters perception, loosens ordinary self-experience or produces visions, and it is invited into the family. Pharmacology is less sociable.

The classical psychedelics are LSD, psilocybin and its active metabolite psilocin, DMT and mescaline. Their chemistry differs, but their characteristic effects depend heavily on activation of serotonin 5-HT_{2A} receptors. Blocking those receptors with a drug such as ketanserin can sharply reduce the subjective effects of LSD or psilocybin. This common dependence gives the classical group a defensible border without implying that every effect, risk or possible benefit is identical.

The differences begin with delivery. Psilocybin is converted in the body to psilocin. LSD is active at tiny masses and often lasts much of a waking day. Inhaled or injected DMT produces a brief, steep alteration, while swallowed DMT is normally broken down before it can have the same effect. Ayahuasca changes that. The brew typically combines a DMT-containing plant with another containing beta-carbolines that inhibit monoamine oxidase, allowing oral DMT to remain active. The second component is pharmacological, cultural and safety-relevant. Calling the brew liquid DMT throws away too much.

Mescaline occurs in peyote and several columnar cacti. It usually requires a much larger mass than LSD and tends to last for many hours. Psilocybin mushrooms contain variable amounts of active compounds, while a clinical capsule can be measured precisely. Natural and synthetic therefore describe origin, not reliability or virtue. A cactus can be misidentified, depleted or prepared inconsistently. A laboratory compound can be pure and still be used badly.

The label on the compound still does not specify the exposure. Route

changes onset and duration; dose changes both intensity and risk; metabolism and other medicines change what reaches the brain. A measured capsule in a screened trial and an unknown mushroom preparation may contain the same named drug while creating different events. Potency is part of the product, not a footnote to it.

MDMA belongs nearby for a different reason. It can increase emotional openness, reduce fear in some settings and support trauma-focused work, but it works largely by releasing serotonin, noradrenaline and dopamine rather than acting as a classical 5-HT_{2A} agonist. Researchers often call it an entactogen, a drug that may facilitate contact with feeling. Ketamine is further away again. It is a dissociative anaesthetic whose principal target is the NMDA glutamate receptor. It can alter self and perception, but it is not a classical psychedelic. Ketamine is approved as an anaesthetic in the United States; its depression use is off-label. The related drug esketamine has specific depression approvals.

Ibogaine, salvinorin A and several newer compounds complicate the map further. They can produce extraordinary changes in consciousness through different receptor systems and bring different hazards. A single umbrella can be useful for conferences, policy and culture, but it becomes dangerous when evidence migrates across it. Low compulsive use associated with psilocybin cannot be assigned automatically to ketamine. A positive MDMA trial does not validate LSD. A safety protocol for a six-hour psilocybin session does not fit a short DMT exposure without alteration.

The first discipline is therefore naming. Which compound, dose, route, preparation and class are under discussion? The classification also changes regulation. A rule written for a long classical psychedelic may overburden a short exposure, while a general low-risk label can miss cardiac or dependence hazards in an adjacent drug. Taxonomy becomes a safety decision once institutions act on it.

“Psychedelics work” is grammatically complete and scientifically unfinished.

Perception Is a Controlled Guess

Look at a white wall. The visual system does not deliver a neutral copy of photons. It extracts edges, estimates lighting, stabilises movement and combines the current signal with a lifetime of learned expectations. Most of the construction is hidden because it works. Psychedelics make the hidden labour visible by changing how strongly different signals constrain one another.

Classical psychedelics bind to 5-HT_{2A} receptors, which are abundant in parts of the cerebral cortex involved in combining information rather than receiving one raw sense. The receptor is especially expressed on certain pyramidal neurons. Activating it changes cellular signalling and the balance of excitation across circuits. That first molecular event is well established. The route from receptor to a particular image, memory or feeling is not.

Human imaging repeatedly finds disruption of ordinary network organisation. Activity within established networks can become less coordinated while regions across usual boundaries fluctuate together more strongly. This measured connectivity is not a photograph of new wiring. A small 2024 study found widespread desynchronisation whose size tracked subjective intensity. The default mode network, a collection of regions often active during self-referential thought, has received disproportionate publicity. Its alteration is relevant, but it is one part of a wider change. There is no single ego centre that a psychedelic switches off.

The word hallucination can also mislead. Classical psychedelics often transform existing textures, colours and forms rather than placing a fully formed object into empty space. They can blend senses, alter time and change the felt ownership of thought. The variation matters because it suggests a distributed disturbance of inference and integration, not one visual defect spreading across the mind.

Predictive-processing accounts offer a useful model. The brain has to infer what produced incomplete and noisy sensory signals. It uses prior expectations to constrain the possibilities, then updates those expectations

when prediction errors deserve enough weight. On one influential account, psychedelics relax the grip of high-level priors. Perception and thought become less tightly governed by the assumptions that normally keep them stable. A face can emerge from patterned fabric. An old interpretation of the self can feel optional. Sensations that would usually be dismissed can become important.

This model explains several features at once, but it remains a model. It does not mean the brain stops predicting, that all priors weaken equally, or that greater entropy is intrinsically healthy. Strong prior beliefs can be oppressive, as in a rigid depressive self-model. They can also be useful, as when a staircase remains a staircase despite changing shadows. Loosening the wrong constraint can produce confusion, paranoia or dangerous certainty.

The acute state also changes salience, the felt importance assigned to an event or thought. A sentence from a therapist may seem unusually consequential. Music can feel architecturally vast. A childhood memory may acquire emotional immediacy. These experiences are real as experiences. Their interpretations are still claims. Feeling that a memory reveals the hidden cause of a life does not verify the memory, and feeling united with the universe does not settle metaphysics.

The science therefore supports a careful conclusion. Psychedelics can alter the organisation of experience by disturbing the usual hierarchy of constraints across brain and mind. The same account applies beyond vision. The sense that a thought is mine, that a body is located here and that time is moving at a familiar rate are also constructed and stabilised. Their alteration shows how much ordinary consciousness depends on coordination rather than one continuous inner observer.

They expose perception as construction. They do not reveal which construction should replace it.

Context Enters the Effect

Two people can take the same measured dose and have experiences different enough to sound like different drugs. One feels curiosity, connection and relief. The other feels trapped in a loop of fear. Dose matters, but it does not close the explanation. Psychedelic effects are unusually sensitive to variables that pharmacology often places outside the medicine.

Set is the person brought to the session: expectations, mood, motives, memories, health, previous drug experience, cultural background and current relationships. Setting is everything surrounding the session: physical space, people, music, rules, language, preparation, authority and what will happen afterwards. The distinction is convenient rather than clean. A clinical room changes expectation. A therapist becomes part of the setting and then enters the participant's set through trust or suspicion.

These labels can become vague enough to explain every outcome after it happens. Good trip, good setting. Bad trip, poor set. That is not science. Useful research has to separate components that can be described, varied and measured.

Expectation is not a fake effect layered on top of a real drug effect. It changes attention, interpretation and reporting while the drug changes the conditions under which those processes operate. A participant told to expect healing enters a different experiment from one told to expect temporary psychosis. Both still receive pharmacology. The causal question is how the influences combine. Preparation length, therapist behaviour, music, lighting, group versus individual format, touch policy and follow-up are distinct interventions. Current trials use them unevenly and often report them poorly, which makes replication harder than a capsule label suggests.

Context is still more than a nuisance variable. In one small depression trial, the strength of the therapeutic alliance was associated with acute experience and later outcome. The finding cannot prove that alliance caused improvement, since people who were improving may also have

rated the relationship more warmly. It does show why treating the person beside the participant as neutral furniture is implausible.

Psychedelics can also increase openness to suggestion in some circumstances. That may help a participant approach material previously avoided. It creates a power problem at the same time. A guide can present an interpretation as insight, encourage a false memory, cross a sexual boundary or make continued belonging depend on agreement. Consent given before a session must govern conduct when the participant is disoriented and less able to negotiate. Warmth without rules is not safety.

Indigenous ceremonial practices make the same causal lesson visible from another direction. Peyote meetings, Mazatec mushroom ceremonies and Amazonian ayahuasca traditions are not interchangeable, and none should be reduced to a generic ancient trip. Their songs, diets, specialists, kinship duties, cosmologies and rules organise attention and meaning. The plant or fungus acts within a social technology developed across generations. Modern clinics borrow selected pieces, such as music, preparation and a protected room, while removing others. That can be legitimate adaptation, but it is not the same practice in medical clothing.

Context continues after the acute effects fade. A person returning to stable housing, trusted care and time for reflection has different possibilities from someone returning to danger, isolation or a waiting list. “Integration” is often used for the work of making sense of the experience and translating it into life, yet the word covers everything from structured psychotherapy to an informal conversation. Its value cannot be assumed merely because the label appears.

The molecule initiates a disturbance. The surrounding system helps decide what the disturbance becomes.

Loosening Can Permit Learning

The most seductive metaphor in the revival is the reset button. It suggests a jammed machine restored to its factory state by one chemical command. Brains do not have factory settings, and recovery rarely consists of returning to an untouched version of the self. Psychedelics may be useful for almost the opposite reason: they can make an established pattern less compulsory for a time.

At the cellular level, several psychedelics can promote changes associated with structural plasticity in cultured neurons and animals. Dendritic growth, synapse-related signalling and altered learning have become central to the modern story. This work matters, but much of it is preclinical. A mouse neuron growing new protrusions does not establish that a human depressive belief has been revised, that the new connection will persist, or that more plasticity is always better.

Human evidence begins at a different level. During an acute session, participants can experience reduced avoidance, intensified emotion, altered autobiographical perspective and a sense that familiar assumptions have become negotiable. Afterwards, some report more psychological flexibility or changed behaviour. Brain imaging sometimes finds effects that outlast the obvious intoxication. These layers may be related. The exact chain is still being built.

One plausible model is a temporary learning window. A rigid pattern ordinarily protects itself by controlling attention and interpretation. A person who expects rejection notices ambiguous evidence as rejection. Someone trapped in addiction may assign overwhelming value to cues linked with use and little value to a distant alternative. If psychedelics reduce the dominance of those patterns, new information can receive more weight. A therapeutic conversation, an emotionally corrective experience or a newly tolerable memory may then be learned differently.

Memory adds a special caution. Recalling an event can make parts of it temporarily open to revision, but psychedelic vividness does not guarantee

accurate reconsolidation. Emotion, suggestion and imagination can be folded into the remembered account. Treatment may change what a memory means without recovering a hidden recording of what happened. That distinction protects useful reinterpretation from manufactured certainty.

The window does not choose the lesson. Plasticity can consolidate fear, grandiosity or dependence on a charismatic guide. An experience can feel transformative and produce no durable change. It can also produce change whose value is mixed. Leaving a damaging relationship may be beneficial; leaving a stable life because a session seemed to issue a command may not be. The strength of conviction after an experience cannot grade its wisdom.

Researchers often measure mystical-type experience, a cluster involving unity, sacredness, altered time and space, positive mood and a claimed ineffability. Higher scores have correlated with better outcomes in several studies. Correlation leaves several possibilities open. The experience may mediate benefit. It may index an adequate dose. Participants who improve may remember the session more positively. Expectancy may raise both scores. Some people may benefit through emotional exposure, cognitive change or bodily relief without describing anything mystical.

This distinction protects the clinical question from becoming a spiritual entrance exam. A patient should not have to achieve ego dissolution to count as treated. Nor should a difficult session be dismissed as therapeutic because suffering is said to prove that deep work occurred. Acute intensity, personal meaning and later function are separate outcomes.

The useful version of the plasticity claim is modest and powerful. Psychedelics may create conditions in which entrenched patterns become easier to revise. What is revised, by whom, towards what end and with what support remain part of the treatment.

What the Comparison Can Tell You

In the 2022 trial of psilocybin for treatment-resistant depression, the comparison group did not receive an empty room and a wish for better luck. It received psychological support too. Participants were randomly assigned to different doses. That arrangement lets researchers ask what adding the larger dose contributes under those conditions. It does not tell them what the dose would do without support, or how much support was necessary.

This distinction matters. When both groups receive the same planned care, a difference between them cannot be dismissed merely because care was present. Randomisation estimates the effect of assignment to one treatment rather than another. For psychedelics, that effect can include the consequences of recognising the drug, altered expectations and changes in how participants and staff behave. It is not a laboratory separation of chemistry from meaning. Nor is it a comparison of the entire package against no treatment.

The 2022 study enrolled 233 people. At three weeks, the 25 milligram group improved by 12 points on the depression scale, against 5.4 points in the 1 milligram group. The estimated additional improvement was therefore 6.6 points, not 12. The scale runs from zero to sixty; the result is a group difference in symptoms, not a count of people cured. Evidence for a sustained advantage at twelve weeks was less convincing. A result can be clinically encouraging without promising the same benefit to every participant or indefinite relief after one session.

Blinding remains the sharper problem. A strong dose can announce itself. An active placebo may create bodily sensations without reproducing the experience. A low psychedelic dose may be recognisable as the control while exerting effects of its own. Once guesses diverge, hope and disappointment can affect symptom ratings and contact with staff. Independent assessors can reduce biased judgement; asking participants what they think they received can reveal the scale of recognition. Neither makes the experience invisible again.

It would be equally mistaken to throw away the experiment. Recognisable treatment does not undo random assignment. It does make the route from assignment to the measured result harder to disentangle. Different comparators and repeated studies can show whether an apparent advantage survives changes in the test. Studies varying the psychological component are needed to discover whether a particular therapy adds benefit or whether less intensive support would suffice.

The endpoint matters too. A primary outcome is chosen before the data arrive, so investigators cannot search among many measures and declare the most flattering one decisive. The 2021 comparison with escitalopram found no significant difference on its primary depression measure at six weeks, although several secondary measures favoured psilocybin. That is neither proof of superiority nor proof of equivalence. It is an unresolved comparison with useful leads.

A trial also has to survive missing participants, uneven follow-up and selective reporting. Someone who leaves because treatment was distressing must not vanish from the account of safety or success. Response, remission and mean symptom change answer different questions; a month of improvement is not a year.

Read the result as a sentence with its essential parts intact: which treatment, compared with what, for whom and for how long? That sentence is less exciting than a cure headline. It is also the part that another clinic might be able to use.

Risk Follows Drug, Person and Setting

Psychedelic risk is often argued through a false choice. One side points to low direct toxicity and limited compulsive use among classical psychedelics. The other points to terrifying experiences and rare lasting harm. Both are describing real parts of a risk profile that cannot be compressed into safe or dangerous.

In screened, supervised studies, common adverse effects of psilocybin and LSD include headache, nausea, anxiety, dizziness, fatigue and temporary

increases in blood pressure or heart rate. Intense fear can occur during the session. Most reported effects resolve, and serious events have been uncommon in modern controlled research. That sentence is narrower than it first appears. Trials exclude many people, control dose and purity, provide monitors and have often measured adverse events inconsistently.

The acute danger is frequently behavioural rather than toxicological. Judgement, balance, time perception and threat assessment can change. A person may run into traffic, fall, wander, combine substances or interpret another person as hostile. An unfamiliar dose outside a controlled setting adds uncertainty about identity, potency and contamination. A low probability of dying from the molecule itself does not make the altered state safe beside water, height, vehicles or weapons.

Persistent problems are harder to count. Hallucinogen persisting perception disorder involves recurrent or continuing visual disturbances after the drug has left the body and can be disabling. It appears uncommon, but confident incidence figures exceed the evidence. Prolonged anxiety, depersonalisation, derealisation, insomnia or destabilising shifts in belief are also reported. Case reports link psychedelics with mania and psychosis, particularly in vulnerable people, while population studies are less simple. Modern trials commonly exclude psychotic disorders, bipolar I disorder and sometimes close family histories. Their safety record therefore cannot answer the question for the people kept outside.

Medical screening has a second purpose. Acute rises in blood pressure and heart rate may be modest for a healthy adult and more consequential with cardiovascular disease. Medicines can alter exposure, blunt effects or create interaction risks, and abrupt withdrawal from psychiatric treatment carries risks of its own. A protocol that requires medication changes is testing that transition as part of the package.

LSD and psilocybin can produce rapid tolerance. A small human study found no comparable fading of DMT's subjective effects across closely spaced doses. Classical psychedelics generally have low addiction potential, but low is not zero. More importantly, dependence is not the only

route to harm. A person can use infrequently and still suffer one catastrophic event, organise a life around repeated revelation, or become financially and emotionally dependent on a retreat community.

The neighbouring drugs require their own ledger. MDMA raises heart rate and temperature and can contribute to hyperthermia, dehydration or dangerous dilution of blood sodium, especially with exertion, heat and poorly managed fluid intake. It has misuse potential and can interact with other serotonergic or cardiovascular medicines. Ketamine can impair coordination and judgement acutely; repeated heavy exposure is associated with dependence, cognitive problems and serious urinary-tract injury. Ayahuasca's monoamine-oxidase inhibition creates interaction concerns that do not apply to plain DMT in the same way. Ibogaine has been linked to dangerous cardiac rhythms and deaths.

Then there is interpersonal risk. During an altered state, a participant may be frightened, suggestible, physically dependent and unsure what happened. Screening cannot substitute for safeguarding. Clear touch policies, two-person monitoring where appropriate, documentation, routes for complaint and long-term follow-up are treatment infrastructure, not bureaucracy attached afterwards.

Risk belongs to the whole event: compound, dose, purity, body, psychiatric history, medicines, place, people and response when something goes wrong.

The Clinic Has to Travel Too

A tablet can be sent to ten thousand pharmacies. A psychedelic session may occupy a room and trained staff for most of a working day, preceded by preparation and followed by further care. The revival's hardest problem is therefore institutional. It must preserve the parts of context that make treatment effective and safe while discovering which parts can be standardised, reduced or replaced.

Different jurisdictions are already running different experiments. In Australia, authorised psychiatrists have been able since July 2023 to access

unapproved MDMA for post-traumatic stress disorder and psilocybin for treatment-resistant depression through a controlled pathway. The products did not thereby become ordinary registered medicines. Oregon licensed supervised psilocybin services under a non-medical service model. Colorado created another natural-medicine framework. These systems differ in diagnosis, prescriber role, facilitator training, product rules and the claims providers may make. Grouping them as legalisation conceals the machinery.

United States regulators supplied another lesson. The first MDMA application reached an advisory committee in 2024 after two positive phase 3 reports. It did not receive approval. In July 2026 the Food and Drug Administration issued final guidance devoted to psychedelic trials, stressing ordinary evidentiary standards alongside unusual problems: functional unblinding, participant vulnerability, safety monitoring, prior exposure and the unresolved contribution of psychological support. Dedicated guidance is evidence that a field has become serious. It is not evidence that the products have cleared the test.

Scaling creates several linked bottlenecks. Trained facilitators must be numerous enough, supervised and accountable. Rooms and monitoring time cost money. The therapy or support model must be defined well enough to teach and audit without forcing every participant through one cultural script. Emergency pathways must cover cardiovascular events, suicidality, mania, psychosis and persistent difficulties. Outcome registries need to detect uncommon harms that trials are too small or short to reveal.

Access then becomes a design question. An intervention requiring many professional hours may reach wealthy self-payers before the people carrying the largest burden of illness. Insurance can demand a standard package before science knows the minimum useful package. Commercial providers may prefer a drug whose intellectual property can be defended and a protocol whose labour can be billed. Public systems may prefer shorter compounds, group delivery or less therapy because capacity is scarce. Those incentives can shape the treatment before comparative

evidence does.

The revival also inherits obligations it did not invent. Peyote is sacred to Native American communities and grows slowly under ecological pressure. Ayahuasca traditions belong to living peoples with their own authority, disputes and economies. A company cannot repay that history by adding an Indigenous pattern to a waiting room. Reciprocity, consent, benefit-sharing, ecological stewardship and protection against false claims require concrete arrangements.

A manufacturer can reproduce the capsule more easily than the conditions around it. Strip away too much care and the treatment may change. Preserve every expensive ritual and it may remain inaccessible. The opening problem returns in a practical form: knowing the compound does not yet tell a health service what it must deliver.

Every model will also produce different evidence. A medicine approval can generate prescribing and safety data. A supervised service system can reveal demand and operational harm without proving a diagnosis-specific effect. Retreats may see broad populations while collecting little comparable follow-up. Learning requires institutions to record what their design is capable of showing.

The decisive test of scale is whether people beyond the original research team can reproduce the benefit without losing the protections. A treatment that works only when delivered by its inventors has not yet become ordinary medicine.

How It Actually Works

Living traditions before the laboratory

Two dried peyote specimens attributed to a cave in Texas still contained mescaline when analysed millennia later. The finding does not tell us what every ancient user believed, but it defeats the idea that Western psychiatry discovered the human relationship with these plants.

Peyote became and remains a sacrament within Native American religious life, now protected in the United States through a specific and contested legal history. Mescaline-containing San Pedro and related cacti have long ceremonial histories in the Andes. In parts of Amazonia, ayahuasca practices combine botanical knowledge, songs, diagnosis, community authority and accounts of relations among humans, animals, ancestors and spirits. Mazatec mushroom ceremonies in Mexico supplied another living tradition later drawn into global publicity.

There was never one Indigenous psychedelic system. Practices differed by people, place and period, and they changed through colonial violence, missionisation, trade, migration and modern tourism. Some were public, some guarded; some centred healing, others divination, social order or religious obligation. The modern word psychedelic was absent, and the Western division between medicine and religion often fits badly.

That difference matters to the revival. A laboratory isolates a molecule so that dose and mechanism can be compared. A ceremonial system may treat plant, specialist, song, ancestry and community as one event. Biomedical research gains precision by separating them. It can lose knowledge about how experience is guided, interpreted and contained. Respect does not require pretending the systems make identical truth claims. It requires recognising that living communities are participants with rights, not a preface to Western discovery.

Mescaline and the first modern category

Western science met the modern psychedelic problem first through peyote and mescaline. During the late nineteenth century, physicians and psychologists obtained cactus material, recorded its visual effects and tried it on themselves or volunteers. The German chemist Arthur Heffter isolated mescaline in 1897 and used self-experiment to identify it as peyote's principal psychoactive compound. Ernst Späth synthesised it in 1919, freeing research from the variable chemistry and supply of cactus buttons.

Mescaline then moved through several identities. It was a physiological

curiosity, a possible model of psychosis, an artist's experiment and a tool for examining perception. Researchers could describe geometric forms, intensified colour, altered space and the strange coexistence of knowing that a perception was drug-produced while still being overwhelmed by it. The drug made a basic psychological fact hard to ignore: insight into an illusion does not necessarily cancel the illusion.

Aldous Huxley's 1954 book *The Doors of Perception* gave mescaline a literary life larger than its medical one. Huxley described ordinary objects acquiring extraordinary significance and connected the state with mystical traditions. The book shaped expectation for later users. It also helped establish a lasting ambiguity. Was the drug producing pathology, revealing a wider mind, or changing the terms under which anything can feel revealed?

Mescaline never became the main engine of clinical research. It required relatively large doses, lasted a long time and soon faced competition from a far more potent laboratory compound. Yet it supplied the category's first durable questions: whether altered perception is an illness model or a method, whether personal meaning counts as data, and whether a molecule can be separated from the culture that teaches a person what its effects mean.

LSD and the accidental laboratory

Albert Hofmann synthesised LSD-25 at Sandoz in 1938 while studying derivatives of ergot, a fungus associated with rye. The compound did not attract immediate interest. In 1943 he returned to it, experienced unusual effects after an accidental exposure and then deliberately took a measured dose. His bicycle journey home became the famous detail, but the scientific consequence mattered more. A substance active at minute quantities had produced a long and elaborate alteration in perception, thought and self-experience.

Sandoz distributed LSD under the name Delysid to researchers and clinicians. The accompanying possibilities were broad: study it as a model of psychosis, use it to understand patients, or administer it as an aid to

psychotherapy. This was not one programme marching towards one indication. Laboratories used different doses, settings, theories and outcome measures. Some gave lower doses repeatedly during therapy, a method often called psycholytic. Others used one or a few high-dose sessions intended to provoke a decisive experience, later called psychedelic therapy.

The name came from the psychiatrist Humphry Osmond, who had studied mescaline and LSD in Saskatchewan. He proposed psychedelic, meaning mind-manifesting, during an exchange with Huxley in 1956 and used it in a scientific address the next year. The term rejected hallucinogen, which implies false perception, and psychotomimetic, which implies imitation of psychosis. It also carried a theory: the drugs bring something of the mind into view.

Osmond and colleagues tested LSD in people with alcoholism and reported striking results. Some patients described a conversion-like experience followed by abstinence. The studies helped launch the therapeutic reputation and show its weakness. Designs varied, controls were limited, follow-up was uneven and clinical enthusiasm shaped interpretation. A large effect reported in a poorly insulated experiment may be a discovery, an exaggeration or both. The answer requires a better trial than the era usually supplied.

Psychiatry, therapy and competing models

By the mid-1960s, many thousands of patients had received LSD or related drugs in clinical or research settings, and a large clinical literature had appeared. The volume can create an illusion of maturity. Much of the work would not meet current standards for randomisation, blinding, diagnosis, adverse-event reporting or prespecified outcomes. That does not make it worthless. It means the archive contains observations, hypotheses and therapeutic cultures rather than one settled verdict.

Three models competed. The psychosis model treated the drug as a reversible disturbance that might illuminate schizophrenia. Similarities

existed in unusual salience, perceptual alteration and disorganised thought, but LSD did not reproduce the long course, negative symptoms or social conditions of schizophrenia. Calling it a model could reveal mechanisms and distort the illness at the same time.

The psycholytic model used moderate doses across multiple sessions to loosen defences and assist analytic therapy. The high-dose psychedelic model pursued a rarer experience of unity, death and rebirth, or radical perspective change. Both depended on the clinician's theory. An analyst found unconscious conflict. A spiritually inclined therapist found transcendence. A behaviourally focused researcher might look for changed drinking. The drug did not adjudicate among them.

Preparation and support emerged partly through hard experience. Researchers learned that sterile rooms, threatening staff and unexpected dosing could increase fear. Guides developed reassuring contact, selected music and a non-directive posture. These practices were not discovered in one controlled experiment. They accumulated as craft knowledge within a field whose main variable could not be hidden from the participant.

The era also produced boundary failures. Therapists sometimes confused intimacy with licence, charismatic authority with competence and dramatic testimony with evidence. Those problems did not disappear when the research restarted. They became easier to overlook because the revival preferred a clean origin story in which modern protocols corrected everything at once.

Intelligence agencies and coercive failure

While clinicians asked whether LSD could support healing, military and intelligence organisations asked whether it could weaken, incapacitate or expose a subject. The CIA's MKULTRA programme became the best-known umbrella. It funded research on drugs and behavioural modification through a web of subprojects, some connected to universities and hospitals. Records were later destroyed, leaving the full extent unrecoverable.

The established facts are severe without embroidery. LSD was administered

covertly to unwitting people in the United States. Other American military testing involved volunteers who were not always told the purpose of the experiment, as well as field interrogations of subjects who did not consent. Follow-up was often poor, secrecy displaced medical duty and individual rights were subordinated to speculative national-security value. A 1977 Senate hearing documented the system after additional financial records surfaced.

These programmes failed scientifically as well as ethically. A person who does not know he has been drugged may become confused or terrified, but confusion is not reliable truth. Expectations, fear and setting made the effects unstable. The same context sensitivity that interested therapists made LSD a poor precision instrument for interrogation.

The abuse belongs inside the scientific history, not beside it as a political oddity. It shows what happens when an altered state is treated as access to a passive mind. Psychedelics can increase dependence on the immediate environment while reducing ordinary control. Under coercion, that is a vulnerability to exploitation, not a route to hidden knowledge.

Counterculture, law and research contraction

LSD escaped the clinic because it was cheap, potent and culturally legible. Timothy Leary and Richard Alpert began research at Harvard, then turned advocacy into a public mission that the university could not contain. Ken Kesey's Acid Tests paired LSD with amplified music and collective spectacle. Underground chemists expanded supply. By the middle of the 1960s, the drug had become linked with youth rebellion, anti-war politics, spiritual experiment and headlines about breakdown.

Public alarm contained real events and inflated claims. Unprepared users did panic, suffer accidents and sometimes require psychiatric care. Newspapers and officials also repeated stories with thin evidence or impossible mechanisms. The debate became a machine for converting any uncertainty into certainty. Advocates treated fear as propaganda. Opponents treated unusual behaviour as proof of permanent brain damage.

Regulation tightened in stages. Sandoz withdrew Delysid from ordinary distribution in the mid-1960s. The United States prohibited possession of LSD in 1968, then placed LSD and several related drugs in Schedule I under the Controlled Substances Act of 1970. International controls followed. Research did not become legally impossible, but licences, supply, funding and institutional approval became harder to obtain. Reputational risk did the rest. A university could pursue another question without inviting police, press and political scrutiny.

The standard morality tale says reckless counterculture destroyed a successful treatment. A rival tale says governments suppressed it because it threatened social control or pharmaceutical profit. Neither fits the mixed record. Early clinical work included serious researchers and remarkable observations. It also included weak controls, inconsistent therapy, exaggerated claims and ethical failures. Political reaction was punitive and often scientifically crude. The field contracted through interaction: cultural conflict made institutions intolerant of methodological weakness, while the weakness gave opponents an easy target.

Some research continued, especially outside the United States, and the knowledge did not vanish. It became scattered among pharmacologists, therapists, religious communities, underground practitioners and a small group preparing for another institutional opening.

What survived and restarted

The return began without a single dramatic breakthrough. In 1986 Rick Doblin founded the Multidisciplinary Association for Psychedelic Studies, initially focused on creating a legal route for MDMA research. Swiss and German investigators resumed tightly controlled human studies. Pharmacologists continued receptor work. Ethics committees and regulators slowly accepted protocols built to look unlike the loose practices of the 1960s.

MDMA followed a distinct path. The chemist Alexander Shulgin introduced it to psychotherapists during the late 1970s, where it was used before

prohibition in 1985 and then continued underground. Its acute profile, often involving reduced fear and increased social closeness rather than classical visual alteration, made it attractive for trauma therapy. The same properties created room for idealisation and boundary abuse. A drug that may strengthen trust makes the trustworthiness of the practitioner more important.

Ketamine supplied another route into the modern conversation. It remained a legal anaesthetic and showed rapid antidepressant effects at subanaesthetic doses. Its mechanism and experience differed from the classical psychedelics, but its success made the idea of a brief altered-state treatment less alien to psychiatry. Esketamine later gained regulatory approval for specified depressive conditions through a supervised medical model. That history is sometimes used as a template, though longer psychedelic sessions and greater contextual sensitivity make the analogy incomplete.

A widely cited turning point came in 2006, when Roland Griffiths and colleagues at Johns Hopkins published a controlled psilocybin study in healthy volunteers. Under supportive conditions, a high dose could produce experiences rated as personally and spiritually significant, with effects reported beyond the session. The study did not prove a treatment. It showed that rigorous contemporary research could examine intense subjective states without either dismissing or endorsing their metaphysical content.

Research centres then multiplied. Better measurement, brain imaging, philanthropic funding and public interest converged. The field's language changed too. Psychedelic-assisted therapy sounded clinical where acid trip sounded chaotic. The new name improved legitimacy and risked hiding continuity with older ambitions.

The clinical revival

The revival first built momentum among people facing severe distress with limited options. Small trials in cancer-related anxiety and depression reported improvements after supported psilocybin sessions. Depression research grew; MDMA moved towards phase 3 trials for PTSD. The prospect was striking: a brief intervention might produce relief that outlasted the drug. Patients, researchers, donors and companies had different reasons to hope it would.

Larger studies made that hope more specific. Depression trials included positive findings, a comparison with escitalopram that missed its primary endpoint, and evidence that an early advantage might diminish. In 2026 the 144-person German EPISODE trial missed its primary test of response at six weeks, though other symptom measures were encouraging. That is an important failure, not a verdict on every psilocybin treatment.

The commercial programme supplied positive news too. In announcements during 2025 and 2026, Compass Pathways reported that two phase 3 trials of its COMP360 psilocybin met their primary endpoints, followed by six-month data. These are developer-reported results, not independent regulatory conclusions. They also measure different things from EPISODE: average symptom-score change is not the proportion crossing a response threshold. Apparent disagreement can partly reflect a different question, as well as a different trial.

MDMA reached the US regulatory gate in 2024. Two phase 3 trials reported substantial additional reductions in PTSD symptoms against placebo with the same manualised therapy. Yet in 2024 the FDA declined the application pending further evidence. Broken blinding, safety collection and study conduct were material concerns. The accompanying therapy also complicated interpretation and reproducibility. A positive paper does not settle the product definition, the integrity of its data or its safety beyond the trial. The regulator examines the submitted evidence and the proposed treatment, not the prestige of its bibliography.

Substance-use research began to move beyond pilots. A 93-person alcohol-use trial found fewer heavy-drinking days with psilocybin than with an active placebo; both groups received twelve weeks of psychotherapy. In a smoking trial published in 2026, 17 of 42 participants assigned psilocybin achieved prolonged, verified abstinence at six months, against four of 40 assigned nicotine patches. Both groups received cognitive behavioural therapy. The study was unblinded and the psilocybin group had more contact time, so the advantage cannot be assigned to chemistry alone. Still, this is stronger evidence than an uncontrolled success story.

The developing picture is neither a miracle interrupted nor a bubble already burst. There are results worth pursuing, failures worth understanding and patients for whom the studies say little. The next advance must show not merely that improvement happens, but when a new treatment improves on the alternatives.

The regulatory and commercial test

By 2026, the revival had produced several systems that look similar from a distance and behave differently up close. Australia permits authorised psychiatrists to obtain unapproved MDMA for PTSD and psilocybine for treatment-resistant depression under specified controls. Oregon licenses psilocybin services that do not require a medical diagnosis and uses trained facilitators rather than a prescribing model. Colorado has developed a regulated natural-medicine framework. Clinical trials operate under another set of rules. Unregulated retreats occupy another world again.

The distinctions determine who may enter, what claims can be made, who supervises, how products are tested and what happens after harm. A state service licence does not establish efficacy for depression. Permission for an authorised psychiatrist to use an unapproved product does not turn it into a generally approved medicine. Decriminalising possession does not create quality control or trained care.

Commercial interest brings useful capital and predictable distortions. Companies can fund large trials, manufacture stable doses and build safety

systems. They also need products, intellectual property and prices that support a business. A naturally occurring molecule may be paired with a proprietary formulation, analogue, delivery device or therapy platform. Shorter-acting compounds appeal partly because each session consumes less staff time. That could improve access and change the treatment's psychological character.

Public medicine faces the labour bill. A dosing day lasting much of a working day, with continuous monitoring, preparation and follow-up, is expensive before the drug is priced. Group models may reduce cost and introduce privacy or social risks. Digital preparation may widen access and weaken alliance. Less support may be enough for some patients and unsafe for others. The field needs trials comparing packages, not faith that the most intensive ritual is sacred or that the cheapest version is equivalent.

It also needs a system for failure. People with persistent anxiety, perceptual disturbance, mania or confusing belief changes require care even when the original session occurred outside a trial. A revival that counts impressive responders and loses difficult cases will manufacture its own evidence.

How we know

Knowledge comes from sources that answer different questions.

Receptor-blocking studies and positron-emission tomography show that 5-HT_{2A} signalling is central to classical psychedelic effects.

Electroencephalography and brain imaging reveal repeatable changes in synchrony and network organisation, but cannot read the content or value of an experience. Cellular and animal experiments support plasticity hypotheses while leaving human therapeutic causation open.

Randomised trials estimate outcomes within selected protocols. Their main weaknesses are functional unblinding, expectancy, small samples, short follow-up, varied psychological support and exclusion of people at higher psychiatric or medical risk. Adverse-event reviews are limited by inconsistent collection and reporting. Naturalistic surveys reach broader users but cannot remove selection, dose uncertainty or concurrent drug use.

The early history rests on laboratory papers, correspondence, company records, participant accounts and institutional archives. Intelligence records are incomplete partly because documents were destroyed. Archaeology can establish ancient contact with psychoactive plants more securely than it can reconstruct belief. Ethnography describes living practices but must not turn one community into a universal model.

The result is uneven confidence. Drug classes and acute receptor dependence are relatively secure. The best clinical use, necessary support, rare long-term risks and scalable delivery remain moving questions.

What People Get Wrong

“They are all the same kind of drug”

The umbrella survives because LSD, psilocybin, MDMA and ketamine can all alter ordinary consciousness and appear in therapeutic research. Their mechanisms, time courses and risks differ. Classical psychedelics depend strongly on 5-HT_{2A} receptors. MDMA releases several monoamine transmitters. Ketamine blocks NMDA receptors and produces dissociation. Ayahuasca adds monoamine-oxidase inhibition to DMT.

The myth persists because one umbrella is useful to campaigners, regulators, investors and journalists. It makes a movement visible and a market countable. The scientific cost appears later, when a favourable result or reassuring safety claim is treated as shared family property.

The mistake matters whenever evidence travels. A low rate of compulsive use for psilocybin says little about repeated ketamine. MDMA's possible value in trauma therapy does not establish a class effect for depression. Even two classical drugs can demand different staffing because one lasts much longer. Begin with the compound, not the cultural shelf on which it has been placed.

“The chemical contains a truth”

Psychedelic experiences can feel more real than ordinary life. A memory may arrive with certainty. Unity may feel discovered rather than produced. The inference is tempting: if the conviction is unusually strong, the content must be unusually true.

The drug changes salience and confidence as well as perception. That makes felt certainty part of the effect, not an independent certificate. A session may reveal an ignored emotion or permit an honest decision. It may also produce a false memory, cosmic theory or grandiose mission. Calling every interpretation hallucination is crude. Calling it revelation is equally unearned.

A clinical setting does not solve the epistemic problem. A therapist can help a participant distinguish emotion, interpretation and evidence, or can reward the interpretation that fits the therapist's school. The more meaningful the session feels, the greater the need for ordinary checks after it.

The useful stance is asymmetric. Take the experience seriously enough to examine it and slowly enough not to obey it. Meaning can be psychologically consequential without becoming factual evidence about childhood, another person's motives or the structure of the universe.

“A stronger trip means a better treatment”

Clinical studies often find associations between intense, mystical-type or emotionally meaningful experiences and later improvement. That does not prove that maximal intensity causes maximal benefit. Higher doses can increase both desired effects and fear, blood-pressure changes or confusion. Participants who improve may rate the session more positively afterwards. Expectancy can influence both the experience and the outcome.

Dose-response may also have a ceiling or an optimum rather than a straight rising line. Beyond some point, additional intensity may add distress, amnesia or physiological burden without adding learning. Trials that compare doses are therefore testing balance, not searching for the largest

tolerable experience.

Treatment is judged by durable function and symptoms, not by the drama of dosing day. Some people may benefit through emotional contact or changed perspective without ego dissolution. Others may have a spectacular session and return to the same patterns. A difficult experience can become useful, but difficulty is not proof that therapy reached hidden depth.

Dose should be treated as one variable in a package, not a spiritual volume control.

“Microdosing has already been proved to improve ordinary life”

Microdosing became popular through reports of better mood, focus, creativity and productivity after repeated doses too small to produce a full psychedelic state. Its commercial appeal is obvious: it promises improvement without losing a working day and turns an occasional experience into a repeatable routine. That appeal arrived before evidence on durable benefit or long-term repeated exposure. Observational reports of benefit cannot cleanly separate the drug from expectations, self-selection and knowing what was taken.

Placebo-controlled research gives a mixed answer. Low doses can produce detectable subjective, physiological and cognitive effects, so dismissing the practice as pure placebo is too strong. The evidence does not establish a dependable general upgrade either. Studies are small, doses vary, participants often guess their condition and positive effects appear on some measures but not others. A 2026 pooled analysis of three controlled psilocybin microdosing trials found a limited advantage on one aspect of divergent thinking and no effect on several other creativity measures.

The dose label creates another problem. A microdose is defined by intention and proportion rather than one standard amount, while mushroom material varies in potency. Repeated use also raises questions different from one supervised full dose. Acute tolerability cannot stand in for long-term safety.

Microdosing is a research question with a lifestyle industry attached, not a proved maintenance treatment.

“The brain scan explains the experience”

Images showing networks dimming, connecting or becoming less synchronised are visually persuasive. They can identify where and when brain activity changes, compare conditions and test mechanistic predictions. They do not translate a pattern of blood flow into grief, sacredness or recovery.

The default mode network became famous as the supposed seat of the ego. Its activity and connectivity do change under psychedelics, but so do broader cortical systems. Results vary by compound, dose, imaging method, task and analysis. A coloured map also hides the inferential steps between neural signal, statistical threshold and headline.

Published brain maps often show group-level results produced after motion correction, modelling and many analytical choices. Similar-looking changes can accompany different mental states, while the same reported experience can arise through different patterns. Inferring one psychological meaning from one highlighted region is the classic error of reverse inference.

The strongest neuroscience links receptor action to changes in large-scale organisation. The weakest version points at one network and declares the self solved. A scan constrains an explanation. It does not finish one.

“Research stopped because the treatments worked too well”

This story flatters both the drugs and the teller. It imagines a successful medicine suppressed by frightened governments or threatened industries. It also removes the need to inspect old protocols: if suppression is the whole explanation, methodological criticism can be dismissed as another political tactic.

That escape is costly. A field asking for medical authority has to show which early claims survive modern controls and which do not. Political reaction and

punitive law did make research far harder. Moral panic distorted evidence. Intelligence-agency abuse and countercultural spectacle damaged the field's legitimacy.

The early science was not an approval-ready programme waiting to be signed. Diagnoses, doses, therapy models and outcomes varied. Many studies lacked randomisation, adequate controls or systematic follow-up. Some clinicians overclaimed and crossed ethical boundaries. Institutions faced a compound problem: weak methods inside an explosive culture under tightening law.

Research contraction had several causes whose relative weight changed by country and year. The correction matters because a revival built on martyrdom may treat scepticism as another attempt at suppression. The proper answer to bad prohibition is better evidence, not immunity from criticism.

“Non-addictive means harmless”

Classical psychedelics generally produce little compulsive use. LSD and psilocybin can also produce rapid tolerance, although DMT differs. Low addiction potential and relatively low direct lethal toxicity are important advantages. Neither settles the risk of the experience.

A person can panic, fall, drive, become dehydrated, misidentify a mushroom, mix substances or act on a delusional interpretation. A minority report persistent perceptual disturbance, anxiety or depersonalisation. Mania or psychosis may emerge in vulnerable people, whose risk remains hard to estimate because modern trials often exclude them. A facilitator can exploit the participant without the participant developing any dependence on the drug.

Risk communication fails when one favourable property becomes the label for the whole event. People hearing non-addictive may infer non-toxic, psychologically gentle or safe without supervision. Clinicians hearing rare serious events may overlook that trial selection and monitoring helped produce the rarity. Probability and severity need separate attention.

The broader umbrella adds hazards that the classical profile cannot cover. MDMA can contribute to overheating and dangerously low blood sodium. Repeated ketamine can produce dependence and urinary injury. Ayahuasca can interact with medicines through monoamine-oxidase inhibition.

The setting can move each column independently. Pharmaceutical purity reduces uncertainty about identity without preventing panic. Supervision can reduce accident risk while introducing dependence on the guide. A familiar ceremony may contain fear through shared rules and still lack medical capacity for a cardiac emergency.

Addiction potential, physiological toxicity, psychological risk, behavioural danger and interpersonal safety are separate columns. None should be used to erase the others.

Use It

Name the compound and class

Whenever a headline says psychedelics, replace the word with the substance studied. Then add dose, route and preparation. Psilocybin in a measured capsule, ayahuasca in a ceremonial brew, street MDMA and intravenous ketamine are not versions of one exposure.

This simple substitution catches a large share of bad inference. It prevents a trial of MDMA-assisted therapy from becoming proof about magic mushrooms. It separates a state-licensed psilocybin service from approval of a medicine. It also exposes hidden risk. Ayahuasca brings monoamine-oxidase inhibition; repeated ketamine brings concerns that a single psilocybin session does not.

Then ask what the product name guarantees. A research capsule may have assay, stability and dose records. A plant preparation can be variable by nature. An illicit tablet may contain another substance entirely. Identity is evidence, not packaging.

Category labels are useful after the contents are visible. Used first, they let

one member borrow the reputation of another.

Separate the molecule from the treatment package

Imagine two clinics advertising the same compound. One has copied a trial's screening, preparation, monitoring and follow-up. The other has copied its comfortable room and playlist. The medicine on the invoice may match. The services do not.

This hypothetical comparison shows what to look for beyond the dose. Who remains with a distressed participant? What are the boundaries around touch and interpretation? What happens if difficulties continue after the session? Those details affect safety and may affect benefit; some also account for much of the price.

A trial with equal support in both groups can estimate the added effect of drug assignment. It cannot show that the support was dispensable. Conversely, an elaborate protocol does not prove that every appointment or ritual was necessary. Comparing versions of care is how the field can learn which parts earn their place.

Ask for a reproducible description, not the reassurance that the provider offers integration. A familiar label can conceal a different treatment.

Split the acute state, the learning window and the later outcome

Psychedelic discussion often compresses three events. The first is intoxication: altered perception, emotion and self-experience over hours. The second is a possible period of changed learning, interpretation or behaviour after the acute effects subside. The third is the outcome weeks or months later.

Keeping them separate prevents spectacle from substituting for health. A participant may report ego dissolution during dosing, increased openness the next week and unchanged depression at three months. Another may

have a modest acute experience and make durable changes afterwards. Each result deserves its own measure.

Also separate a participant's account from a blinded symptom rating, behaviour, employment, substance use or quality of life. These measures can move together and often do not. The outcome chosen decides which kind of change becomes visible.

When a claim uses transformation, ask which event transformed, on what evidence and for how long. Intensity is easiest to photograph and narrate. Durability is what treatment has to earn.

Inspect the comparator and the guess

Read a psychedelic trial from the control group outward. What did the comparison receive: inert placebo, a low psychedelic dose, another psychoactive drug, ordinary care or an established medicine? Did both groups receive the same psychological support? Was the primary endpoint prespecified? Were assessors independent?

Then look for treatment guesses. If nearly everyone correctly identified their condition, the trial remains informative, but its estimate includes expectancy and disappointment that concealment was meant to balance. Secondary outcomes can guide research while carrying less weight than a missed primary outcome, especially when many were tested.

Inspect uncertainty as well as statistical significance. A wide confidence interval may include both a large benefit and a modest one. Compare absolute changes and adverse events rather than allowing one relative percentage to carry the story.

A strong subjective effect creates a design problem, not an automatic disqualification. The honest response is to measure the problem, vary controls and avoid pretending the blind held.

Read the exclusions and follow-up

The safest-looking trial may have achieved safety partly by excluding risk. Check age, cardiovascular disease, bipolar and psychotic disorders, suicidality, pregnancy, interacting medicines and previous psychedelic exposure. The result applies most securely to the people admitted, not everyone carrying the diagnosis in the title.

Follow-up supplies the time boundary. Improvement at one week can matter and still fade. A rare adverse event may not appear in a trial of fifty or even several hundred people. People who withdraw can disappear from a celebratory summary unless the analysis follows them.

The most carefully controlled trial may therefore be least representative of ordinary demand. That is a fair price for answering an early safety question, provided later studies widen the population deliberately rather than letting marketing make the leap.

This lens works in both directions. Exclusion does not prove a drug is dangerous for the omitted group. It proves that the trial cannot establish safety or benefit there.

Follow incentives, training and accountability

Ask who is paid, who holds authority and who remains responsible when the session ends. A drug developer wants an approvable product. A clinic needs a workable staffing model. A facilitator-training company benefits from intensive training requirements. An insurer benefits from a shorter protocol. A retreat sells an experience. An Indigenous community may be protecting a sacrament and a threatened plant rather than seeking a larger market.

Read funding, conflicts, protocol ownership and publication plans. Public and philanthropic funders have priorities too, but transparent incentives are easier to challenge. Ask whether negative outcomes, therapist misconduct and failed follow-up remain measurable after the commercial relationship ends.

None of those interests makes a claim false. Each shapes which questions receive money and which costs stay off the balance sheet. Strong systems publish adverse outcomes, define competence, supervise practitioners, protect complaints and fund care for people who do badly.

The altered state makes accountability more important because the participant may be unusually dependent on other people's judgement. Good intentions cannot carry that load.

The limits

Psychedelic science changes quickly and remains uneven. The strongest evidence concerns a small number of compounds, selected adults, intensive protocols and short-to-medium follow-up. Results from Western academic clinics do not automatically describe older people, adolescents, severe mental illness, unstable housing, different cultures or ordinary recreational use. Legal status and access rules can change faster than a book.

Mechanistic language is especially easy to overread. Receptor involvement is not a complete psychological theory. Plasticity is not recovery. Connectivity is not meaning. An association cannot establish cause; a randomised comparison can estimate a treatment effect without explaining every mechanism behind it.

There is a cultural limit too. Biomedical categories can compare compounds and outcomes with precision. They may misdescribe practices in which plant, ceremony, community and obligation are inseparable. Respecting those traditions does not require accepting every claim, and testing a molecule does not grant ownership of the knowledge around it.

This book cannot determine whether a particular person should receive a psychedelic intervention. That decision belongs within the law and an appropriately qualified clinical assessment, where such care exists.

The one thing to keep

Watch what remains when the drug wears off.

The public argument asks what psychedelics do, as though the drug were a letter carrying one message to every brain. The evidence gives a different object. A compound changes signalling. A mind interprets the disturbance through history and expectation. Other people shape attention and safety. An institution selects the participant, defines the aim, prices the hours and decides what counts as success. Life afterwards either supports the change or absorbs it.

This does not make the molecule unimportant. Without the pharmacology there is no psychedelic session. It makes the molecule insufficient as an explanation. The same principle protects against both panic and worship. A frightening outcome is not proof that the substance is poison in every context. A healing outcome is not proof that the substance carries wisdom.

The durable question is therefore not whether psychedelics are good or bad. It is: what system produced this outcome, and which part of that system has earned the credit or blame?

Once you ask that, the revival looks less like the return of forbidden magic and more like a demanding scientific and institutional experiment. It may produce valuable medicines. It may expose the limits of drug trials built to isolate chemistry from meaning. Its promise depends on enthusiasm surviving contact with results it did not hope to get.

A mind made more open is not thereby pointed in the right direction. The work is building conditions in which change can be tested, chosen and carried safely into ordinary life.

Terms

Psychedelic

A contested name for drugs that markedly alter perception, self-experience and meaning. In strict scientific use it often means classical serotonergic psychedelics; wider clinical culture may include MDMA and ketamine.

Entheogen

A term meaning roughly generating the divine within, used for psychoactive substances in religious or spiritual contexts. It emphasises sacred interpretation and can obscure pharmacological and cultural differences. Many communities prefer more specific traditional names.

Classic psychedelic

One of the serotonergic group typified by LSD, psilocin, DMT and mescaline. Their characteristic effects depend strongly on 5-HT_{2A} receptor activation, though each differs in chemistry and duration.

Serotonergic psychedelic

Another name for a classic psychedelic, stressing action within serotonin signalling. It does not mean the drug merely raises serotonin or that serotonin alone explains the experience.

LSD

Lysergic acid diethylamide, a potent, long-acting classical psychedelic first synthesised in 1938. It became a research tool, therapeutic candidate, countercultural symbol and controlled drug. Potency made distribution and accidental exposure unusually consequential.

Psilocybin

A compound found in several mushroom species and converted in the body to psilocin. Clinical studies usually use a measured synthetic dose rather than variable mushroom material. Product identity matters when evidence is transferred.

Psilocin

The principal active metabolite responsible for psilocybin's classical psychedelic effects. Its relationship to dose, receptor occupancy and subjective intensity has been examined with human brain imaging.

DMT

N,N-dimethyltryptamine, a short-acting classical psychedelic when inhaled or injected. Swallowed DMT is normally broken down rapidly unless monoamine oxidase is inhibited, as in many ayahuasca preparations. Route therefore changes the whole time course.

Ayahuasca

A diverse family of Amazonian brews and practices, often combining a DMT-containing plant with beta-carbolines that inhibit monoamine oxidase. It is a cultural system as well as a preparation.

Mescaline

A classical psychedelic occurring in peyote and several columnar cacti. It became the first psychedelic compound isolated and identified by Western chemistry and generally lasts for many hours.

Peyote

A small, slow-growing cactus containing mescaline and used sacramentally by Native American communities. Its religious status, ecology and supply cannot be reduced to its active chemical.

MDMA

3,4-methylenedioxymethamphetamine, a monoamine-releasing drug studied with psychotherapy for PTSD. It can increase closeness and emotional access but is not a classical 5-HT_{2A} psychedelic. Its risks and trial history remain distinct.

Entactogen

A proposed drug class associated with enhanced contact with emotion and interpersonal closeness. MDMA is the leading example. The term describes characteristic experience more than one exclusive receptor mechanism.

Ketamine

A dissociative anaesthetic and NMDA-receptor antagonist, used off-label for depression in the United States. Repeated heavy exposure can produce dependence and serious urinary injury. Distinct from esketamine.

Dissociative

A drug or state involving altered integration of body, self and surroundings, often with detachment or unreality. Ketamine and PCP are pharmacologically distinct from classical psychedelics.

5-HT_{2A} receptor

A serotonin receptor abundant in parts of the cortex. Its activation is central to classical psychedelic effects, as shown by receptor occupancy and blockade studies, but it does not specify personal content.

Agonist

A substance that activates a receptor or promotes its signalling. Classical psychedelics are 5-HT_{2A} agonists, though biased signalling and actions at other receptors complicate a simple on-switch model.

Set

The participant's condition entering an experience: expectations, mood, motives, memories, health, culture and previous exposure. Set is useful only when its components are described rather than invoked afterwards. It is not a verdict on character.

Setting

The physical, social and symbolic environment of drug administration, including people, room, music, rules and institutional authority. It can alter both experience and the chance of harm.

Expectancy

What a participant anticipates from treatment. Expectancy can change reported symptoms and acute interpretation, especially when strong drug effects reveal allocation and weaken the intended trial blind.

Blinding

Concealing treatment allocation from participants, staff or assessors to reduce expectancy and biased measurement. Psychedelic trials face functional unblinding because the active experience is often recognisable.

Active placebo

A comparison substance chosen to produce noticeable effects without duplicating the treatment's proposed action. It may protect blinding better than an inert capsule while introducing effects of its own. Comparator choice changes the question answered.

Mystical-type experience

A research construct measuring features such as unity, sacredness, altered time, positive mood and ineffability. Scores can correlate with outcomes without proving that mysticism is necessary or causal.

Ego dissolution

A temporary weakening of the ordinary boundary or coherence of self. It can feel liberating, frightening or both. The term describes experience, not the literal disappearance of a brain entity.

Default mode network

A set of interacting brain regions linked with self-referential thought and internally directed cognition. Psychedelics alter its organisation, but it is neither a single ego centre nor the whole mechanism.

Neuroplasticity

The capacity of nervous systems to change structure or function through activity and learning. Psychedelics affect plasticity-related processes, strongly in preclinical work; therapeutic causation in humans remains unsettled.

Microdose

A low dose intended to avoid a full psychedelic experience while producing subtler effects. Controlled evidence finds some measurable changes but no established general improvement in mood, cognition or productivity.

Tolerance

Reduced response after repeated exposure. LSD and psilocybin can produce rapid tolerance and cross-tolerance; DMT differs. Tolerance is neither a measure of addiction nor a guarantee of safety.

HPPD

Hallucinogen persisting perception disorder, involving recurrent or continuing perceptual disturbances after drug effects have ended. It appears uncommon, can be disabling and remains poorly measured and understood.

Integration

Work after an acute experience intended to interpret it and translate it into ordinary life. The term covers varied practices, from formal psychotherapy to discussion, so its contribution requires testing. A label does not standardise the work.

Go Deeper

Michael Pollan, *How to Change Your Mind* (2018)

Begin here for an accessible route through the modern revival, its personalities, early history and Pollan's own encounters with LSD, psilocybin and other substances. He writes as an intelligent outsider rather than a pharmacologist, which makes the book inviting and gives its narrative enthusiasm unusual reach. Read it beside newer trial evidence: publication preceded the first MDMA regulatory rejection, several larger depression studies and the sharper current debate about expectancy, misconduct and scale. Its source notes are useful routes into the older literature, while the memoir sections show how an articulate experience can shape a public field as much as a dataset.

Mike Jay, *Mescaline: A Global History of the First Psychedelic* (2019)

Read this to correct an LSD-centred history. Jay follows mescaline from Indigenous cactus traditions through chemistry, psychiatry, art, religion and popular culture without pretending that Western isolation of a compound created the subject. The book is especially good on how one substance acquired incompatible meanings in different institutions. It is a history rather than a clinical evidence review, and that is its value: it restores the worlds compressed by the word drug. It also shows why cactus ecology, colonial exchange and artistic fashion belong to the history of a molecule that medicine often presents without a place.

Nicolas Langlitz, Neuropsychedelica (2012)

Langlitz studied laboratories rebuilding hallucinogen research after the Decade of the Brain. The result is part history, part anthropology of science and part argument about the uneasy border between materialist neuroscience and spiritual interpretation. It shows how research agendas depend on careers, institutions, instruments and cultural tact, not data alone. The prose is more academic than Pollan or Jay, but it supplies the best antidote to a revival story in which evidence returned by itself. Use it to see laboratories as social institutions that must manage reputation, funding, spirituality and professional risk while claiming to isolate a chemical effect.

David E. Nichols, “Psychedelics” (2016)

This long review in *Pharmacological Reviews* is the technical foundation. Nichols covers chemistry, receptor pharmacology, signalling, animal studies, human effects and the major classical compounds in detail. It is dense, reference-heavy and now older than several important imaging and clinical trials, so it should be treated as a base rather than the last word. Read it when broad claims about the whole class need to be checked against the molecules and mechanisms beneath them. The compound-by-compound detail is demanding, but it prevents the broad cultural category from replacing pharmacology and makes clear where evidence comes from animals, cells or humans in practice.

Notes and Sources

The Whole Thing in One Page and Why You Should Care

The distinction between classical serotonergic psychedelics, entactogens and dissociatives follows modern pharmacological usage rather than the wider commercial umbrella. David E. Nichols's 2016 review remains the main general source for classical compounds. The distinctions among the wider group draw on the compound-specific research and reviews listed below.

The account of functional unblinding and psychological support follows the United States Food and Drug Administration's final guidance, *Psychedelic Drugs: Considerations for Clinical Investigations*, issued in July 2026. The guidance applies ordinary drug-development standards while identifying problems unusually visible in psychedelic trials: participants and staff may infer allocation; prior users may recognise effects; central independent raters may reduce bias; and psychological support is an added treatment variable whose contribution has not been established. The claim that the revival tests medicine's separation of molecule and context is an organising interpretation, not an FDA conclusion.

Regulatory status was checked on 5 September 2026. The FDA had not approved psilocybin or MDMA as medicines. Ketamine is approved as an anaesthetic, not for psychiatric indications; United States depression prescribing is off-label. Esketamine has separate depression approvals. None is approval of the broader psychedelic category.

The Core Ideas

Drug classes and durations

Classical psychedelic pharmacology, including LSD, psilocin, DMT and mescaline, is based on Nichols; Franz X. Vollenweider and Katrin H. Preller's review; and human antagonist and receptor-occupancy studies. Ketanserin substantially attenuates characteristic LSD and psilocybin effects, supporting central 5-HT_{2A} involvement. This does not establish that one receptor explains every subjective or therapeutic effect. Descriptions of duration are intentionally approximate because dose, route, preparation and person alter them.

Ayahuasca is treated as a family of preparations rather than a fixed recipe. Many brews combine a DMT-containing plant with beta-carboline-containing *Banisteriopsis caapi*, whose monoamine-oxidase inhibition permits oral DMT activity. Botanical composition and ceremonial practice vary. MDMA's monoamine-releasing action and ketamine's NMDA-receptor antagonism are separated from classical 5-HT_{2A} pharmacology.

Brain and psychological models

The receptor-to-network account draws on human PET, pharmacological blockade, electroencephalography and functional imaging. Joshua S. Siegel and colleagues reported widespread desynchronisation after a fixed 25 milligram psilocybin dose in 2024. Its magnitude tracked subjective intensity; the study did not establish a dose-response gradient. Earlier studies found altered integrity and communication within and between networks, including the default mode network. Network labels and analysis choices vary, so the manuscript rejects a single-network explanation.

The predictive-processing account is indebted to Robin L. Carhart-Harris and Karl J. Friston's REBUS model. It is presented as an influential explanatory framework, not consensus fact. Evidence that psychedelics promote structural plasticity comes strongly from cellular and animal studies, including Calvin Ly and colleagues. Whether such changes mediate human clinical outcomes, at what dose and over what period, remains unresolved.

Mystical-type experience is a research construct developed through questionnaires rather than proof of a metaphysical event. Associations between acute experience and later outcome appear in several studies but do not establish necessity, sufficiency or independent causation.

Set, setting and psychological support

The set-and-setting discussion draws on historical scholarship, a 2025 systematic review by Clémentine Estric and colleagues, and reporting reviews showing wide variation and incomplete description of psychological interventions. Adam W. Levin and colleagues found therapeutic alliance associated with acute and depression outcomes in a small psilocybin trial. The study's size and observational mediation prevent a strong causal claim.

The safeguarding discussion reflects the FDA guidance's emphasis on participant vulnerability during altered states and its expectation of continuous monitoring by suitably trained personnel in many investigations. References to suggestibility are kept conditional because effects differ by

measure and context. No claim is made that a person under psychedelics becomes mechanically obedient.

Clinical evidence

The depression account uses the prespecified primary outcomes rather than promotional summaries. Robin L. Carhart-Harris and colleagues compared psilocybin therapy with escitalopram in 2021 and found no significant between-group difference on the primary depression score at six weeks, although several secondary outcomes favoured psilocybin. Guy M. Goodwin and colleagues randomised 233 participants to 25, 10 or 1 milligram doses with psychological support. The 2022 report found a three-week mean MADRS change of -12.0 for 25 milligrams and -5.4 for 1 milligram, an adjusted between-group difference of -6.6 points. Sustained response at twelve weeks did not clearly support the early advantage. The manuscript distinguishes within-group improvement from the additional treatment contrast. Charles L. Raison and colleagues reported benefit in major depressive disorder in 2023. Lea Mertens and colleagues reported in 2026 that 25 milligrams did not significantly improve the primary response endpoint in a 144-participant treatment-resistant depression trial; exploratory secondary outcomes and adverse reactions require separate interpretation.

Jennifer M. Mitchell and colleagues reported two positive phase 3 trials of MDMA-assisted therapy for PTSD in 2021 and 2023. The FDA advisory process in 2024 raised concerns about functional unblinding, safety data, protocol and study integrity. The subsequent non-approval is used to distinguish a positive publication from a regulator's judgement of the complete evidence and deliverable treatment package.

Michael P. Bogenschutz and colleagues studied psilocybin-assisted psychotherapy for alcohol use disorder in 93 participants and reported fewer heavy-drinking days than the active-placebo group over the blinded follow-up. Cancer-distress evidence comes principally from small 2016 trials led by Stephen Ross and Roland R. Griffiths. Johnson and colleagues' 2026 smoking trial randomised 82 psychiatrically healthy adult smokers to

psilocybin or nicotine patches, with cognitive behavioural therapy in both groups. The six-month prolonged-abstinence counts were 17/42 and 4/40. Recruitment and follow-up ran from January 2015 to May 2023: 2026 is the publication year, not the observation period. Lack of blinding and unequal contact time limit attribution. These results are not generalised into routine treatments.

The contrast between equally supported randomised groups estimates the effect of assignment to the tested interventions, not the isolated biochemical mechanism. The support itself is not thereby shown necessary, sufficient or dispensable. This distinction follows the trial designs and the FDA's discussion of psychological interventions and functional unblinding.

Compass Pathways' 2025 and 2026 announcements report positive primary mean-MADRS outcomes in COMP005 and COMP006 and later follow-up. They are identified as sponsor reports. EPISODE's primary outcome was a prespecified response threshold on the HAMD-17 scale, so its result cannot be directly compared with mean change on MADRS. No efficacy league table is constructed from these incompatible measures.

Safety and microdosing

Jared T. Hinkle and colleagues' 2024 systematic review and meta-analysis found classic psychedelics generally well tolerated in clinical or research settings, with common transient adverse events and some serious events. The underlying studies varied in adverse-event collection and often involved screened participants. The manuscript therefore does not export that safety record to unsupervised use or excluded populations.

HPPD is described as uncommon and poorly quantified on the basis of Pieter J. Vis and colleagues' 2021 systematic review and related clinical literature. No numerical prevalence is given because case definitions, sampling and exposure histories do not support a stable population estimate. Bipolar caution follows David E. Gard and colleagues' review of published case material, trial exclusions and the unresolved quality of broader observational evidence. Psychosis caution likewise reflects

exclusions, case reports and uncertain transportability. Exclusion is treated as absence of evidence for that population, not proof of harm.

MDMA, ketamine, ayahuasca and ibogaine risks are compound-specific. The brief account uses established pharmacology and public-health reviews rather than transferring the classical-psychedelic profile across the umbrella. The account of ibogaine-associated cardiac risk follows Ruud P. W. Litjens and Tibor M. Brunt's toxicological review.

Microdosing evidence follows Vince Polito and Paul Liknaitzky's 2024 review of nineteen placebo-controlled studies and Luisa Prochazkova and colleagues' 2026 pooled analysis of three double-blind trials. The first found some measurable drug effects but insufficient evidence to decide that microdosing is predominantly placebo. The second found a limited effect on one divergent-thinking measure and no effect on several others. The text rejects both a pure-placebo verdict and a broad enhancement claim. The pooled study appeared online in November 2025 and in a 2026 journal issue; its date is not presented as a new 2026 experiment. Rapid tolerance is attributed principally to LSD and psilocybin rather than the whole class: Strassman and colleagues' small repeated-dose human DMT study did not find significant subjective tolerance.

Historical sequence

Indigenous traditions and mescaline

Chemical analysis of two museum specimens attributed to Shumla Cave No. 5 in Texas supports peyote use several millennia ago; their precise collection provenance is qualified in the original paper. Archaeology establishes contact with the plant more securely than the purpose or belief surrounding it. The wider history of mescaline, Arthur Heffter's isolation of the compound in 1897 and Ernst Späth's 1919 synthesis follows Mike Jay. Living peyote, mushroom, cactus and ayahuasca practices are kept plural. The discussion of Amazonian medicine and the revival draws in part on David M. O'Shaughnessy and Ilana Berlowitz. The statement that growing demand can create ecological pressure on peyote and other psychedelic species follows Anna O. Ermakova and Sam Gandy's 2025 conservation review; it is not a claim that demand is the only threat or that every population is declining.

The manuscript does not claim that contemporary psychedelic-assisted therapy descends directly from one Indigenous practice. It states a narrower relationship: modern biomedical systems isolated compounds from plants embedded in existing knowledge traditions, then borrowed selected contextual practices while changing their purposes and authority.

LSD, early therapy and terminology

Albert Hofmann synthesised LSD-25 at Sandoz in 1938 and identified its psychedelic effects in 1943. Sandoz distributed it as Delysid to clinicians and researchers. The account of psychotomimetic, psycholytic and psychedelic models follows Erika Dyck, Matthew Oram and related historical scholarship. Humphry Osmond proposed psychedelic in correspondence with Aldous Huxley in 1956 and used it publicly in 1957. The exact priority of ideas around the term is less important than its intended contrast with psychosis-imitation language.

Early claims in alcoholism research are treated as suggestive and methodologically weak rather than dismissed. The number of patients and

papers in the period varies by source and definition, so the text uses scale language without a precise aggregate.

MKULTRA and coercive research

The 1977 joint hearing of the United States Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research is the primary source for covert LSD administration, inadequate oversight, poor follow-up, unwitting subjects and incomplete records. It documents an umbrella programme with numerous subprojects and notes that records were destroyed. The manuscript avoids disputed reconstructions beyond the surviving record and does not use the programme to characterise all early psychedelic research.

Counterculture and contraction

The chronology of Harvard, Timothy Leary, Richard Alpert, Ken Kesey, Sandoz withdrawal, national controls and international scheduling follows historical syntheses. The causal account is deliberately plural. Law and politics sharply raised barriers; media panic distorted risk; some research had weak methods; misconduct and advocacy damaged institutional confidence; and alternative research programmes were easier to fund. No single cause is assigned universal weight across countries or years.

Restart, trials and current access

The modern restart includes the founding of the Multidisciplinary Association for Psychedelic Studies in 1986, renewed European human studies, continuing receptor pharmacology, and Roland R. Griffiths and colleagues' 2006 controlled psilocybin study in healthy volunteers. The study's finding of enduring personal or spiritual significance is not described as clinical efficacy.

Current regulatory descriptions were checked against primary agencies. Australia permits specified authorised psychiatrists to access unapproved MDMA for PTSD and psilocybine for treatment-resistant depression under the Authorised Prescriber scheme from 1 July 2023. The Therapeutic Goods

Administration states that these products remain unapproved and are not generally registered medicines. Oregon's supervised psilocybin service system and Colorado's natural-medicine framework are state access models, not federal product approvals.

What People Get Wrong and Use It

The seven corrections synthesise the evidence above. The practical lenses are methods for reading claims, not directions for obtaining or taking a controlled drug. The statement that stronger acute experience does not guarantee better treatment is a correction of causal overreach, not a denial of observed correlations. The guidance to inspect exclusions follows standard external-validity reasoning and is especially important because current trials commonly exclude people at elevated psychiatric or cardiovascular risk.

The final system model is an interpretive synthesis: compound, person, setting, interpretation, follow-through and institution jointly determine the event. The relative contribution of each component remains an empirical question and probably differs across drugs, indications and people.

Bibliography

Primary, regulatory and institutional sources

Australian Government, Therapeutic Goods Administration. *Access MDMA or Psilocybine through the Authorised Prescriber Scheme*. Canberra: Department of Health and Aged Care, current materials checked 5 September 2026.

Colorado Department of Revenue, Natural Medicine Division. *Natural Medicine*. Denver: State of Colorado, current materials checked 5 September 2026.

Oregon Health Authority. *Oregon Psilocybin Services*. Salem: State of Oregon, current materials checked 5 September 2026.

United States Food and Drug Administration. *Psychedelic Drugs: Considerations for Clinical Investigations: Guidance for Industry*. Silver Spring, MD: FDA, July 2026.

United States Food and Drug Administration. *Psychopharmacologic Drugs Advisory Committee Meeting Materials: Midomafetamine Capsules for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder*. Silver Spring, MD: FDA, 4 June 2024.

United States Senate, Select Committee on Intelligence and Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research. *Project MKULTRA, the CIA's Program of Research in Behavioral Modification: Joint Hearing*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1977.

Compass Pathways. "Compass Pathways Announces Six-Month Data from Second Phase 3 Trial Confirming Rapid and Durable Profile." Company announcement, 7 July 2026.

<https://ir.compasspathways.com/News--Events/news/news-details/2026/Compass-Pathways-Announces-Six-Month-Data-from-Second-Phase-3-Trial-Confirming-Rapid-and-Durable-Profile>

Lykos Therapeutics. "Lykos Therapeutics Announces Complete Response Letter for Midomafetamine Capsules for PTSD." Company announcement, 9 August 2024.

<https://news.lykospbc.com/2024-08-09-Lykos-Therapeutics-Announces-Complete-Response-Letter-for-Midomafetamine-Capsules-for-PTSD>

United States Food and Drug Administration. "Keta Med Lab: Warning Letter." 23 June 2026. Used for the distinction between ketamine's approved anaesthetic uses, unapproved psychiatric uses and esketamine's separate approval.

Clinical trials and human studies

Bogenschutz, Michael P., Stephen Ross, Snehal Bhatt, et al. "Percentage of Heavy Drinking Days Following Psilocybin-Assisted Psychotherapy vs Placebo in the Treatment of Adult Patients With Alcohol Use Disorder: A Randomized Clinical Trial." *JAMA Psychiatry* 79, no. 10 (2022): 953-962. DOI: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2022.2096.

Carhart-Harris, Robin L., Bruna Giribaldi, Rosalind Watts, et al. "Trial of Psilocybin versus Escitalopram for Depression." *New England Journal of Medicine*.

Medicine 384, no. 15 (2021): 1402-1411. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa2032994.

Goodwin, Guy M., Scott T. Aaronson, Oscar Alvarez, et al. "Single-Dose Psilocybin for a Treatment-Resistant Episode of Major Depression." *New England Journal of Medicine* 387, no. 18 (2022): 1637-1648. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa2206443.

Griffiths, Roland R., William A. Richards, Una McCann, and Robert Jesse. "Psilocybin Can Occasion Mystical-Type Experiences Having Substantial and Sustained Personal Meaning and Spiritual Significance." *Psychopharmacology* 187, no. 3 (2006): 268-283. DOI: 10.1007/s00213-006-0457-5.

Griffiths, Roland R., Matthew W. Johnson, Michael A. Carducci, et al. "Psilocybin Produces Substantial and Sustained Decreases in Depression and Anxiety in Patients with Life-Threatening Cancer." *Journal of Psychopharmacology* 30, no. 12 (2016): 1181-1197. DOI: 10.1177/0269881116675513.

Johnson, Matthew W., Albert Garcia-Romeu, Mary P. Cosimano, and Roland R. Griffiths. "Pilot Study of the 5-HT_{2A}R Agonist Psilocybin in the Treatment of Tobacco Addiction." *Journal of Psychopharmacology* 28, no. 11 (2014): 983-992. DOI: 10.1177/0269881114548296.

Johnson, Matthew W., et al. "Psilocybin or Nicotine Patch for Smoking Cessation: A Pilot Randomized Clinical Trial." *JAMA Network Open* 9, no. 3 (2026): e260972. DOI: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2026.0972.

Levin, Adam W., Rafaelle Lancelotta, Nathan D. Sepeda, et al. "The Therapeutic Alliance between Study Participants and Intervention Facilitators Is Associated with Acute Effects and Clinical Outcomes in a Psilocybin-Assisted Therapy Trial for Major Depressive Disorder." *PLOS ONE* 19, no. 3 (2024): e0300501. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0300501.

Madsen, Martin K., et al. "Psychedelic Effects of Psilocybin Correlate with Serotonin 2A Receptor Occupancy and Plasma Psilocin Levels." *Neuropsychopharmacology* 44 (2019): 1328-1334. DOI:

10.1038/s41386-019-0324-9.

Mertens, Lea J., Michael Koslowski, Felix Betzler, et al. "Efficacy and Safety of Psilocybin in Treatment-Resistant Major Depression: The EPISODE Randomized Clinical Trial." *JAMA Psychiatry* 83, no. 5 (2026): 448-460. DOI: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2026.0132.

Mitchell, Jennifer M., et al. "MDMA-Assisted Therapy for Severe PTSD: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Phase 3 Study." *Nature Medicine* 27 (2021): 1025-1033. DOI: 10.1038/s41591-021-01336-3.

Mitchell, Jennifer M., et al. "MDMA-Assisted Therapy for Moderate to Severe PTSD: A Randomized, Placebo-Controlled Phase 3 Trial." *Nature Medicine* 29 (2023): 2473-2480. DOI: 10.1038/s41591-023-02565-4.

Preller, Katrin H., Joshua B. Burt, Jie Lisa Ji, et al. "Changes in Global and Thalamic Brain Connectivity in LSD-Induced Altered States of Consciousness Are Attributable to the 5-HT_{2A} Receptor." *eLife* 7 (2018): e35082. DOI: 10.7554/eLife.35082.

Prochazkova, Luisa, Josephine Marschall, Michiel van Elk, et al. "Microdosing Psilocybin and Its Effect on Creativity: Lessons Learned from Three Double-Blind Placebo Controlled Longitudinal Trials." *Neuropharmacology* 284 (2026): 110732. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuropharm.2025.110732.

Raison, Charles L., et al. "Single-Dose Psilocybin Treatment for Major Depressive Disorder: A Randomized Clinical Trial." *JAMA* 330, no. 9 (2023): 843-853. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2023.14530.

Ross, Stephen, Anthony Bossis, Jeffrey Guss, et al. "Rapid and Sustained Symptom Reduction Following Psilocybin Treatment for Anxiety and Depression in Patients with Life-Threatening Cancer." *Journal of Psychopharmacology* 30, no. 12 (2016): 1165-1180. DOI: 10.1177/0269881116675512.

Siegel, Joshua S., et al. "Psilocybin Desynchronizes the Human Brain." *Nature* 632 (2024): 131-138. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-024-07624-5.

Strassman, Rick J., Clifford R. Qualls, and Laura M. Berg. "Differential Tolerance to Biological and Subjective Effects of Four Closely Spaced Doses of N,N-Dimethyltryptamine in Humans." *Biological Psychiatry* 39, no. 9 (1996): 784-795. DOI: 10.1016/0006-3223(95)00200-6.

Reviews, mechanisms and methods

Brennan, William, Alex R. Kelman, and Alexander B. Belser. "A Systematic Review of Reporting Practices in Psychedelic Clinical Trials: Psychological Support, Therapy, and Psychosocial Interventions." *Psychedelic Medicine* 1, no. 4 (2023): 218-229. DOI: 10.1089/psymed.2023.0007.

Carhart-Harris, Robin L., and Karl J. Friston. "REBUS and the Anarchic Brain: Toward a Unified Model of the Brain Action of Psychedelics." *Pharmacological Reviews* 71, no. 3 (2019): 316-344. DOI: 10.1124/pr.118.017160.

Estric, Clémentine, Thomas Duron, Sarah Kabani, and Jorge Lopez-Castroman. "Set and Setting of Psychedelics for Therapeutic Use in Psychiatry: A Systematic Review." *Journal of Psychopharmacology* 39, no. 9 (2025): 910-929. DOI: 10.1177/02698811251338214.

Gard, David E., Mollie M. Pleet, Ellen R. Bradley, et al. "Evaluating the Risk of Psilocybin for the Treatment of Bipolar Depression: A Review of the Research Literature and Published Case Studies." *Journal of Affective Disorders Reports* 6 (2021): 100240. DOI: 10.1016/j.jadr.2021.100240.

Hinkle, Jared T., Marianna Graziosi, Sandeep M. Nayak, and David B. Yaden. "Adverse Events in Studies of Classic Psychedelics: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis." *JAMA Psychiatry* 81, no. 12 (2024): 1225-1235. DOI: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2024.2546.

Litjens, Ruud P. W., and Tibor M. Brunt. "How Toxic Is Ibogaine?" *Clinical Toxicology* 54, no. 4 (2016): 297-302. DOI: 10.3109/15563650.2016.1138226.

Ly, Calvin, Alexandra C. Greb, Lindsay P. Cameron, et al. "Psychedelics Promote Structural and Functional Neural Plasticity." *Cell Reports* 23, no. 11

(2018): 3170-3182. DOI: 10.1016/j.celrep.2018.05.022.

Nichols, David E. "Psychedelics." *Pharmacological Reviews* 68, no. 2 (2016): 264-355. DOI: 10.1124/pr.115.011478.

Polito, Vince, and Paul Liknaitzky. "Is Microdosing a Placebo? A Rapid Review of Low-Dose LSD and Psilocybin Research." *Journal of Psychopharmacology* 38, no. 8 (2024): 701-711. DOI: 10.1177/02698811241254831.

Vollenweider, Franz X., and Katrin H. Preller. "Psychedelic Drugs: Neurobiology and Potential for Treatment of Psychiatric Disorders." *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 21 (2020): 611-624. DOI: 10.1038/s41583-020-0367-2.

Vis, Pieter J., Anneke E. Goudriaan, Bastiaan C. ter Meulen, and Jan Dirk Blom. "On Perception and Consciousness in HPPD: A Systematic Review." *Frontiers in Neuroscience* 15 (2021): 675768. DOI: 10.3389/fnins.2021.675768.

History, culture and Indigenous knowledge

Dyck, Erika. *Psychedelic Psychiatry: LSD from Clinic to Campus*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008.

El-Seedi, Hesham R., Peter A. G. M. De Smet, Olof Beck, Göran Possnert, and Jan G. Bruhn. "Prehistoric Peyote Use: Alkaloid Analysis and Radiocarbon Dating of Archaeological Specimens of *Lophophora* from Texas." *Journal of Ethnopharmacology* 101, nos. 1-3 (2005): 238-242. DOI: 10.1016/j.jep.2005.04.022.

Ermakova, Anna O., and Sam Gandy. "Of Shrub, Cactus, Vine and Toad: Psychedelic Species of Conservation Concern." *Frontiers in Conservation Science* 6 (2025): 1569528. DOI: 10.3389/fcsc.2025.1569528.

Hofmann, Albert. *LSD: My Problem Child*. Translated by Jonathan Ott. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1980.

Huxley, Aldous. *The Doors of Perception*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1954.

Jay, Mike. *Mescaline: A Global History of the First Psychedelic*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019.

Langlitz, Nicolas. *Neuropsychodelia: The Revival of Hallucinogen Research since the Decade of the Brain*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012.

O'Shaughnessy, David M., and Ilana Berlowitz. "Amazonian Medicine and the Psychedelic Revival: Considering the 'Dieta'." *Frontiers in Pharmacology* 12 (2021): 639124. DOI: 10.3389/fphar.2021.639124.

Oram, Matthew. *The Trials of Psychedelic Therapy: LSD Psychotherapy in America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2018.

Pollan, Michael. *How to Change Your Mind: What the New Science of Psychedelics Teaches Us about Consciousness, Dying, Addiction, Depression, and Transcendence*. New York: Penguin Press, 2018.