

CHAPTER 1



Origins and Overview of the Professional Life of Alfred Ray Lindesmith

THIS IS WHAT YOU SHALL DO . . . Practice humility in all things. Write the truth even if for only a small audience . . . Stand up for the stupid and crazy. Take off your hat to no man.

—Edward Abbey
Confessions of a Barbarian (1994)

This book is not a standard biography including all aspects of the personal life of its subject. Rather this is a focused analysis of how Alfred Lindesmith's background, temperament, education, and professional life led him on a lifelong quest for more rational and humane drug control policies. Thus, much more attention is given to Lindesmith's teachers, colleagues, and to government officials than his involvement with family and friends, although it is with his family where this story begins.

Norman Brown (1959) argued that like Martin Luther, Lutheranism emphasized human amelioration, whereby "intellectual work should be directed toward the relief of

man's estate" (Brown 1959: xi). For Alfred Lindesmith his affiliations with his German-American roots, the lasting impact of Lutheranism, and the stalwart values bequeathed to him by his family made an indelible mark upon his life and career. Alfred Ray Lindesmith was a native Minnesotan, born in the township of Clinton Falls in Steele County on August 3, 1905. His father, David Ray Lindesmith, had family roots in the colonial period.

These ancestors had a reputation for public service, hard labor, and courage and were celebrated for their long record of military service extending back to the American Revolution. Orlando Lindesmith, Alfred's grandfather, served with Ulysses S. Grant during the Civil War, fought at the battles of Champion's Hill and Vicksburg, and returned home to operate a profitable stone quarry near Owatonna until his death in 1904. His son David, Alfred's father, eventually shut down the business when cement replaced stone as the building material of choice, and concentrated his efforts on the adjacent family farm (E. Lindesmith n.d.). Overall, the family was well-off relative to most in the community.

The youngest of three children, along with Emery born in 1902 and Ellen born in 1904, Alfred grew up on a farm owned by his father. Alfred's mother, Louise Lindesmith (nee Priebe) was a native of Posen, Germany, who had immigrated at the age of three to the United States. Born in 1882, she married David Lindesmith in 1900 at the age of seventeen, and had given birth to all her four children within the next five years. Her second child, Perry, died soon after birth. In spite of her tender years, Louise Lindesmith was a powerful moral force in her family and had a pronounced effect on her youngest child Alfred. She manifested the typical attributes of most German-American immigrants, advocating self-reliance and hard work, was concerned with Americanization, yet favored strong ties with German Lutheranism. The Lindesmith household was religiously austere, where instruction in Lutheran catechism was emphasized and biblical studies were continual. Tutoring was usually carried out in German and Alfred Lindesmith retained this knowledge of the language throughout his life. He used his skills

in German to satisfy a college language requirement and later to qualify as a cryptographer for the U.S. Army Air Corps (Schuessler 1994).

The value of an education was a central tenet of the Lindesmith parental influence (Lindesmith 1994, Folder 1, Appendix 2). Both sons, after they had completed high school in Owatonna, enrolled at Carleton College in Northfield, where they graduated, Emery in 1923 and Alfred, as a Phi Beta Kappa, in 1927. Although the Lindesmiths could have been considered a prosperous, commercial, and land-owning family, the financial burden of two sons enrolled in a private college testifies to the strong convictions that the family had about scholarship and upward social mobility.

While accumulating an impressive academic record in mathematics and education, Alfred Lindesmith found time to star in track, wrestling, and football. His exploits on the football field, at guard, earned him the designation as the “most outstanding” at that position in the conference during his senior season in 1926 (Carleton College 1927). His love of sports never faded and for a time he considered coaching football on the college level.

After taking his B.A. in education from Carleton, Lindesmith obtained a teaching and coaching position at the public high school in Sleepy Eye, Minnesota for the 1927–1928 school year. Following the close of school, Lindesmith took a full year off from teaching to enter Columbia University Teacher’s College in New York City. Enrolling for summer courses in 1928 he began an M.A. program focusing on English and completed his studies the following summer of 1929. Lindesmith then took a job at Central State Teacher’s College at Stevens Point, Wisconsin as an instructor of English and football coach. He stayed only one year at Stevens Point. The accidental death of a player on the practice field apparently influenced his decision to resign, seeking another position at Council Bluffs, Iowa with the Abraham Lincoln High School. There was no mention of athletic activities during the year of 1930–1931 at Lincoln High, but Lindesmith’s life did brighten with his marriage to Gertrude Wollaeger. The following spring, Gert and Lindy, as they

came to be called, were expecting what was to be the couple's only child, their daughter Karen, born November 20, 1931.

Lindesmith at the University of Chicago

By the time Karen had arrived, the family was off to Illinois, where Lindesmith entered the Ph.D. program in sociology at the University of Chicago. We can only speculate why Alfred Lindesmith chose sociology. We do know that in 1931 the Chicago department was at its apogee, with an illustrious faculty of sociological stars including Robert Park, Louis Wirth, Ernest Burgess, Ellsworth Faris, Herbert Blumer, W.F. Ogburn, and the celebrated criminologist Edwin Sutherland (Faris 1970). These luminaries were poised to train a second generation of Chicago School sociologists including Arnold Rose, Gregg Stone, Anselm Strauss, Joseph Gusfield, Erving Goffman, and Howard Becker, among others, all of whom entered the graduate program after Lindesmith's departure in 1937 (Bulmer 1984). Since Lindesmith's parents made money for education a priority in their budget, the move to Chicago seemed logical.

There is no indication of why Lindesmith made such a career move, particularly at a time of economic peril for the nation and when he had recently undertaken the weighty responsibilities of a wife and newborn child. The events in Stevens Point stand out as a possible factor. Lindesmith realized that his ambition to coach football had faded with the death of that player in the fall of 1929. It was an event that he rarely mentioned (R. Lindesmith 1994). Nor is there any evidence of why Lindesmith chose the discipline of sociology.

In any event, Lindesmith's entry in the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago was either a fabulous stroke of luck or a very well calculated strategy for success. He was fortunate to attract the notice of Herbert Blumer who was to oversee his dissertation, and to strike up a long-term friendship with Edwin Sutherland who was in the process of becoming the best known of all twentieth century American criminologists. Sutherland's 1937 book, *The Pro-*

fessional Thief, and his subsequent work, *White Collar Crime* (1949), solidified his reputation as a leading criminologist. This was the sort of sociology and the research viewpoint that ironically informed Lindesmith's future controversial stance on addiction and drug policy and contributed to his solitary role in policymaking. We will demonstrate in the following chapter that the sociology of Blumer and Sutherland set the tone for Lindesmith's future professional activities and pitted him against strong political forces in the federal government that had no interest in understanding the drug addict.

Lindesmith is Introduced to the Federal Bureau of Narcotics

The ultimate product of Lindesmith's labors at the University of Chicago was his dissertation on opiate addiction. The conclusions that Lindesmith drew from this research caused a quiet panic in some government circles, particularly at the Federal Bureau of Narcotics. The FBN assumed a defensive posture when Lindesmith's views on drug policy and addiction theory were published in a series of journal articles extracted from his dissertation (Lindesmith 1940b, 1940c, 1941). Apparently, the FBN had become aware of Lindesmith's project after he had solicited information from the Department of Justice and the Bureau of Prisons regarding addicts held under their care (Hudspeth 1936). Lindesmith later commented that "one [FBN] agent told the University, at a time when I was still without tenure, that I was a member of a criminal organization" (Arts and Science 1980). This was due to Lindesmith's association with the World Narcotics Organization and the White Cross, two groups that advocated the reform of American drug laws (*Lindesmith Papers* 1994, Folders 5 and 7, Appendix 2).

The Federal Bureau of Narcotic's commissioner, Harry J. Anslinger, was aware of the subject of Lindesmith's study and apparently understood the dissertation's conclusion. Lindesmith's approach, soliciting the addict's point of view, directly contradicted FBN policy. This work that was to

become *Opiate Addiction*, focused Lindesmith's future academic career and political activity for the next five decades. Although unpublished until 1947, his dissertation was recognized by Sutherland as evidence of Lindesmith's potential as a scholar. Sutherland also credited his younger colleague with convincing him to use analytic induction in some of his most important subsequent work, particularly in the formulation of his famous "differential association" theory of crime (Gaylord and Galliher 1988).

Lindesmith Moves to Indiana University

Despite experiencing political harassment from the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, Lindesmith's career progressed. Having left the University of Chicago in 1935 to head Indiana University's sociology department, Sutherland sponsored Lindesmith for an instructor's position at Indiana in the fall of 1936. Since Lindesmith had completed his dissertation he turned his attention to publication. He found time to pursue the problem of addiction, publishing three articles before he was promoted to assistant professor in 1938 (Lindesmith and Levine 1937a; Lindesmith and Levine 1937b; Lindesmith 1938). His most important writing used the viewpoint and information obtained through the field research from his still unpublished dissertation (Lindesmith 1937). In this research Lindesmith developed his famous and enduring theory of addiction. He followed this in 1939 with "A Critique of Current Theories of Drug Addiction" for the *Bulletin of the Society for Social Research* (Lindesmith 1939), which refuted the psycho-pathological view of addicts. Next he published the brief, but powerful article, "Dope Fiend Mythology," which pressed the same point (Lindesmith 1940b).

Although most of this writing was drawn from the data collected for the yet unpublished dissertation, Lindesmith was successful in opening a new viewpoint on addiction as a sickness and the addict as a patient. While prior to Lindesmith's publications sociologists had not concerned themselves with addiction theory, the ideas in these articles

employed a combination of the theoretical and methodological elements developed at the University of Chicago and the symbolic interactionist canons as conceived by Blumer.

Thus began a string of articles written by Lindesmith that were published in prominent sociological journals. All were critical in some way of the policy line and image of addicts that Anslinger had endeavored to construct. Titles included "History of the Opiate Problem in the United States" (Lindesmith 1940a) which emphasized the link between prohibition and the black market; "The Drug Addict As Psychopath," (Lindesmith 1940c); and "The Drug Addict: Criminal or Patient," (Lindesmith 1941). All directly contradicted everything that the FBN had labored to build in the mind of the American public to legitimate criminalization of addiction.

Despite Lindesmith's conflicts with the FBN, his fortunes were not affected at Indiana University. He was granted a sabbatical leave for the 1942–1943 academic year and wrote a timely essay for *Sociology and Social Research* which expressed "The Need for a Sociology of Militarism" (Lindesmith 1943). It analyzed the class origins of military officer corps in several armies, including Germany. His sabbatical leave was cut short in February 1943 by a military leave of absence that extended through September of 1945. Lindesmith was commissioned in the U.S. Army Air Corps as a second lieutenant. His childhood instruction in German and educational background fitted him well for an intelligence position and he was employed in Washington, D.C. as a War Department cryptographer (*Lindesmith Papers* 1994). He remarked later that a good deal of the time during his military service he had little to do, often falling asleep at his desk. Besides doing some infrequent and routine tasks, Lindesmith passed the time reading or just sitting at his desk waiting for messages to decode (Galliher 1994). He found time to write articles for the *American People's Encyclopedia*, which published popular versions of previous writing. One piece was on Lombroso (Lindesmith 1944a) and another on the role of organized crime in the narcotics traffic (Lindesmith 1944b). But despite the spare

time, he produced no other sociological work during the years 1943–1945.

Following the peace in 1945, Lindesmith returned to Indiana University and in the next year was promoted to associate professor. The *American Journal of Sociology* published his “Teachers in the Army Air Forces” (Lindesmith 1946a), along with another piece written for the *Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology* examining the cognitive properties of human addiction, titled “Can Chimpanzees Become Morphine Addicts?” (Lindesmith 1946b). The latter piece was the basis for much of the reasoning that emerged in the opening chapters of Lindesmith’s co-authored textbook *Social Psychology* (Lindesmith and Strauss 1949), and was retained in some form throughout all of the book’s seven editions. The end of the war had changed very little regarding Lindesmith’s opinion of narcotics policy in the United States and a renewed conflict with Anslinger seemed to be only a matter of time. It inevitably came as a result of an article by Lindesmith published in the *Federal Probation Quarterly*, “Handling the Opiate Problem” (Lindesmith 1948). The article was critical of FBN policies, stating that prohibitive measures were useless in stopping addiction and were responsible for the illicit market in drugs, that addicts needed treatment as opposed to incarceration, and that treatment would reduce the crime surrounding addiction.

Due to his own efforts, Lindesmith experienced a sustained run of professional good fortune in the early post-war period. His promotion to associate professor was a reality (1946), he had realized the long-awaited publication of his dissertation (Lindesmith 1947), and also published, with Anselm Strauss, the first of seven editions of their highly influential textbook, *Social Psychology* (1949). Lindesmith took a sabbatical leave in 1948–1949.

Professional Isolation and Personal Tragedy

But the year 1949 also marked for Lindesmith a period of sadness and isolation. That year his daughter Karen de-

veloped serious, chronic health problems and her condition eventually required her withdrawal from Carleton College following her sophomore year. Edwin Sutherland died suddenly in 1950 while walking from his home to campus in Bloomington. Anselm Strauss left the Indiana department that same year. Approximately a decade later close friend Albert Cohen resigned. Moreover, Lindesmith experienced an increasing isolation in his own profession. Sociology had been moving away from the critical viewpoint that Lindesmith and Sutherland had adopted, to a more value-free and structural-functionalist approach. The new leadership of the profession was deeply concerned with attaining greater scientific status. The emergence of quantitative, deductive hypothesis testing was widely recognized as the only valid manner to carry out this scientific inquiry (Vaughan, Sjoberg, and Reynolds 1993). Lindesmith's theoretical and political positions were not typically viewed as truly scientific, nor was his personal aversion to statistical analysis. In addition, Lindesmith's criticism of governmental policy must have seemed strange, or even disloyal, to many people at a time when conformity was a necessary safeguard against political censure.

It is true, however, that Lindesmith had prominent friends in the field, including Chicago trained sociologists Howard S. Becker and Erving Goffman, as well as Anselm Strauss with whom he coauthored the *Social Psychology* textbook. There were also other prominent, sympathetic scholars including UCLA sociologists' Harold Garfinkle and Donald Cressey. Cressey was a former Lindesmith student at Indiana and an especially critical source of support having written a highly influential book on embezzlement using qualitative data and analytic induction (Cressey 1953). But it must also be said that none of these sympathetic friends were available to join Lindesmith during the 1930s and 1940s in his conflict with the FBN, primarily because many were not yet a part of the profession.

In addition, in the Indiana University sociology department there was some movement toward a greater emphasis on quantitative research. During the 1960s the department

hired several sociologists specializing in statistical analysis, which reflected the direction of the discipline but which left Lindesmith feeling disenchanting. In 1969 the *American Sociologist* solicited examples of Ph.D. examinations from several prominent graduate programs including Cornell, Washington, Michigan, Princeton, and Indiana. Most of these exams provided ample evidence of an overriding emphasis on quantitative and statistical techniques, including a question on Indiana's methodology exam requiring identification of nineteen statistical terms, with only the twentieth being ethnomethodology.

During the 1960s the not uncommon view among Indiana graduate students was that Lindesmith was becoming increasingly marginal to the department (Slatin 1997). Irving Zeitlin, his colleague from 1965 to 1969, agreed (1997), as did Austin Turk who was on the Indiana faculty for twelve years (1997). Turk especially appreciated Lindesmith's "views on quantophobia and abstracted empiricism" (1997). Yet there is no consensus on this marginalization, and another Indiana colleague, Richard Hall (1997), recalled that Lindesmith was *socially* at the center of the department. Lindesmith had been successful in the stock market and he and his wife built a spacious home where they often hosted departmental parties. In addition he often played golf on the Indiana University course with various faculty friends. Turk (1997) recalled that "he prided himself on playing golf every month of the year, and invented colored balls so he could find them in the snow."

Like many of his colleagues, Lindesmith was a lifelong supporter of the Democratic Party. Galliher was his student from 1962 to 1967 and remembers him as having a ready wit; he was earthy and down to earth. He was outgoing, jovial, slow to anger, and rarely criticized others. Even so, colleague John Gagnon has observed (1997) that there was "a deep solitariness" about Lindesmith. While he was cheerful and friendly with everyone, and his office door was always open, Lindesmith, like many people, kept certain parts of his personal life private. Gagnon, for example, for a long time knew nothing of Karen Lindesmith's chronic illness,

even though the Lindesmiths had loaned the Gagnons the down payment for their first home after moving to Bloomington. This is consistent with Robert Cushing's (1998) memory of Lindesmith during the 1960s while he was a graduate student in the Indiana University sociology department: "I played golf with him a lot, but I never met his wife or visited his home or had any opportunity to pursue a discussion of his personal life."

While Lindesmith had critics in the department (Gallagher 1994), there is no evidence of the department ever failing to support him. One way of explaining this support is that by the 1950s a social role in the department had been created for Lindesmith as a result of the long friendship of Sutherland as well as the continuing support from university president Herman Wells. Lindesmith was friendly, well liked, and well connected. This reservoir of good will and respect for his contributions is reflected in long-term colleague Karl Schuessler's recollections that (1997):

in 1948 when Sutherland stepped down as department chair five of us asked Lindesmith to consider taking over the position. The group asking him included Frank Westie, Albert Cohen, Anselm Strauss, Erwin Smigel and me. Gert even volunteered to do some of the paper shuffling for him, but he still refused. He certainly was not a careerist.

According to Turk (1997) Lindesmith "didn't care much about the 'department building' concerns predominant among his colleagues in those years." During the 1950s Lindesmith's writing and publishing waned, and his remaining energies seemed to be focused on policy reform and away from disciplinary concerns. Perhaps as a result, Lindesmith attracted fewer graduate students than might have otherwise been expected. Turk (1997) recalled that "the general understanding in the department among both faculty and graduate students was that supervision of doctoral dissertations was not something expected of him." In addition, perhaps his kindness and accommodation to colleagues limited his advocacy for graduate students. William Chambliss

(1996) recalled spending nearly a year getting his MA thesis approved under Lindesmith's direction. The problem was that Lindesmith refused to put any pressure on other committee members to limit their requests for changes, and as a result of this experience, Chambliss later asked another faculty member to direct his Ph.D. dissertation.

But the dearth of graduate student advisees was not a result of a lack of openness or concern. In 1958 Chambliss was advised to do graduate work at Indiana University by Donald Cressey, with whom he had taken several courses while an undergraduate at UCLA. Chambliss walked into Lindesmith's office late one weekday afternoon without an introduction or an appointment. Chambliss recalled:

We talked for three hours about criminology and he asked me what I thought about what was happening in the field. At this point he didn't even know that I had applied to the department or why I was there. Although I was considering other graduate programs, based on this wonderful conversation I decided to go to Indiana University (Chambliss 1996).

But Lindesmith did not consider himself to be an adequate classroom teacher. "When Lindesmith first arrived at Indiana University he went to Sutherland and admitted that he thought he was a terrible classroom teacher. Sutherland simply said, 'Don't worry about it, I am too'" (Chambliss 1996). Yet Lindesmith's door was always open to graduate students and his real strength was one-on-one instruction where he would ask the student a series of questions. In his office he would discuss sociology, criminology, or drug laws with students for hours, frequently smoking cigars and flicking ashes into a nearby trash can. From time to time the trash can would ignite and Lindesmith would then stomp out the flames with one foot in the container. He would also sometimes invite graduate students to his home to meet former drug addicts whom he had known in Chicago when they were passing through town.

Until about 1960 he taught the required graduate methods seminar, which was:

very provocative, organized as it was around the philosophy of science. It dealt with the philosophy and logic of science and how you can avoid tautology in constructing theory, using George Herbert Mead and social psychology (Chambliss 1996).

By the early 1960s this required methods course was being taught by others in the department reflecting the profession's increasingly statistical emphasis. Lindesmith probably did not mind losing the methods course since this was not his major research concern. As the Indiana sociology department moved away from his interests he undoubtedly realized that someone with quantitative interests would be better suited to the required methods course to fit in with the rest of the curriculum.

Lindesmith never put on airs or held himself above the graduate students and would tell anyone about the "terrific round of golf he had just shot or any of a large repertoire of very bad jokes" (Chambliss 1996). Chambliss recalled that (1996):

In 1959 he invited me to accompany him to the annual meetings of the Society for the Study of Social Problems. He gave me a ride and also shared his room with me. He explained that he had to make a speech one night and that his wife had insisted that he buy a new suit for the occasion. Bear in mind that he always looked somewhat rumpled. It turned out that his wife had insisted on the new suit because he was the newly elected president of the association and this speech was his presidential address. He got dressed in his new suit and then realized that he had an hour to spare and so took a short nap in his suit. An hour later he left the room rumpled as usual.

Lindesmith created a minor scandal in his Bloomington neighborhood by his practice of shooting squirrels with an air rifle to keep them away from the bird feeder in his yard. He was however, a consistently kindly person whose most

stinging comment was that a senior sociologist at the University of Chicago who had forced Anselm Strauss from a faculty position there was a "pin head." Lindesmith was at peace with himself and others.

Yet the 1950s were difficult for Lindesmith because his addiction theory as well as his viewpoint on drug policy were virtually ignored. However, Lindesmith was not deterred from speaking out on addiction and testified before a U.S. Senate committee (United States Senate 1956). Although acting nearly alone, behavior such as this and under these circumstances clearly demonstrated that Lindesmith was dedicated to the ideal of the academic who combined scholarly work with practical reform efforts and who actively sought solutions to irrational public policies. These acts also clearly defined Lindesmith as an intellectual who was willing to take his case to the public, since the federal government ignored his advice and many of his colleagues in the discipline disregarded his research.

Lindesmith was informed by President Wells that he had been awarded a Fulbright scholarship in the fall of 1952 for a year of study abroad at the Indore Christian College of Agra University in India, for which Lindesmith would use his scheduled sabbatical leave (Wells 1952). In the same year Lindesmith was promoted to full professor. In 1965 he was given the special distinction of university professor, awarded to only a handful of Indiana faculty. Surely this support from the department and from the university made it easier for Lindesmith to continue his professional activities throughout the years although some of his work was questioned by the profession.

The trends in the profession that tended to isolate Lindesmith also had profound effects on the University of Chicago, where the elder generation of faculty members was fading. Potential replacements for them more often than not included names such as Paul Lazarsfeld and Robert Merton from Columbia University. Even among the host of graduates from the Chicago program proposed to replace men such as Wirth (who would die in the early 1950s), Blumer (who moved to the University of California-Berkeley in

1952), and Burgess and Ogburn (who were nearing retirement), no list included Lindesmith's name. Despite his close relationship with Blumer and his position as full professor in a highly ranked sociology program, Lindesmith was not considered (Abbott and Graziano 1995).

Lindesmith's professional exile began to abate toward the end of the decade. His successful textbook *Social Psychology* had gone into a second, revised edition (1956) and served to keep his name before social psychologists, sociologists, and their students. Recognition of Lindesmith's standing in the profession seemed to be somewhat affirmed when he was elected president of the fledgling Society for the Study of Social Problems in 1959–60 (*Lindesmith Papers* 1994; Indiana University 1975). In addition, Lindesmith was awarded a Senior Research Fellowship at the University of Chicago School of Law, where he took several courses and found time to begin the work that eventually led to his subsequent book *The Addict and the Law* (1965). Lindesmith took a leave for the 1957–58 academic year to accept this honor.

Lindesmith's Success as a Public Intellectual

In retrospect, the necessary forces for change seemed to be forming on the horizon with the election of John F. Kennedy to the presidency in 1960. Kennedy's inaugural pronouncement informed the world, including the United States government, that the "torch had been passed" to a new generation of leaders. For ordinary working people a sense of excitement grew at the prospect of needed change and of youthful energy succeeding to power in the western world. Yet during the one thousand days leading up to his death, President Kennedy, with his brother Robert as Attorney General, accomplished only modest change. One move was the forced retirement of Harry Anslinger and the organization of a White House Conference on Drug Abuse, both events taking place in 1962. For Lindesmith, Anslinger's ouster must have been a lightning strike and attested to the

fact that even Washington outsiders like the Kennedys recognized that the commissioner posed a formidable obstacle to change. In the past Anslinger's mere presence hobbled any possibility of reform. Unfortunately, Attorney General Robert Kennedy was satisfied to appoint Deputy FBN Director Henry Giordano to succeed Anslinger.

If the professional ranks of sociology had not previously recognized Lindesmith's increasing influence, they did so following his developing involvement in national policy discussions. There was also the mounting reputation of his comrades in the symbolic interactionist camp. Close friends and colleagues like Becker, Blumer, Strauss, and Goffman, and symbolic interactionists in general, were addressing relevant issues of the day that were exploding on the national scene. Questions of health care (Becker, Geer, Hughes, Strauss 1961), human relations (Goffman 1961; 1963), prejudice and civil rights (Blumer 1958), and narcotics (Becker 1963) were being addressed by symbolic interactionists who were critical of "scientific sociology" and who instead encouraged greater public discourse on these issues.

The early years of the 1960s marked the ascendance of interactionists and the decline of systems theories, such as structural-functionalism, primarily because of the former's ready applicability to social problems, championed by the Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP) and its founders Al and Betty Lee (Galliher and Galliher 1995). The sociology of the immediate post-World War II years, which was epitomized by Parsons' value-free, systems approach, that had stagnated much of critical sociology, began to wane (Galliher and Galliher 1995). Although deductive-statistical sociology was useful to government and the private sector as a research tool, it was becoming clear by the early 1960s that this approach served to subordinate sociologists to the role of technicians, leaving policymaking to politicians, bureaucrats, and managers. Lindesmith was never satisfied with this arrangement and his unorthodox methodology of "analytic induction" and critical stance on government drug policies suited him perfectly for the professional evolution that overtook sociology in the 1960s.

Lindesmith's writing also reflected the changes of this period, when with John Gagnon he publicly criticized the functionalist approach, particularly Merton's (1938) concept of anomie and substituted his interactionist viewpoint (Lindesmith and Gagnon 1964). In this piece, "Anomie and Drug Addiction", Lindesmith and Gagnon challenged the functionalism of Merton and his concept of anomie as it applied to opiate addicts. Lindesmith brought particular pressure to bear on Merton's view of deviance, and his supposedly "value-free," scientific approach, as one that permanently marginalized the addicted person. The problem with Merton's formulation was that the claim of addicts' retreatism assumed social withdrawal when in reality addiction required great social effort for mere survival. Merton's characterization of the addict as rejecting both social means and ends probably inflamed Lindesmith's sensitivities, formed as far back as his dissertation fieldwork in the 1930s. "Anomie and Drug Addiction" is a direct challenge to the dominant sociological paradigm, something that Lindesmith had not focused on before. In that sense it demonstrated his growing sense of optimism about new directions in the discipline.

Lindesmith's mounting reputation continued to win him new friends and solidify unusual alliances. One of these was a friendship that developed between Lindesmith and the Beat poet Allen Ginsberg. Ginsberg had been active for a number of years in a reform movement aimed at reversing the course of national drug policy. A number of Ginsberg's letters found among Lindesmith's papers indicate that the two men had worked together in mobilizing many national figures in the drug reform movement. This group included LSD guru and Harvard professor Dr. Timothy Leary, Washington attorney Rufus King, and a number of writers, editors, and publishers (Ginsberg 1961a). Existing correspondence indicates that Ginsberg may have secured for Lindesmith an invitation to the 1962 White House Conference on Narcotic Addiction (Ginsberg 1961b). Their friendship was an odd combination of a socially circumspect academic and an iconoclastic Beat hipster.

The Indiana colleagues of Lindesmith remember the profound impact that Ginsberg and his friends had on the life of this unassuming midwestern sociology professor when they visited Bloomington in 1966. Following this stopover, a Ginsberg letter asked about the “fallout from our visit,” referring to a poetry reading that Ginsberg had given on the Indiana University campus, that included some explicit references to drug use and homosexuality (Ginsberg 1966). Reportedly, some state officials became alarmed and the Indiana State Police were notified that Ginsberg, and his traveling companion Peter Orlovsky, had been transporting and using LSD in his hand-painted Volkswagen bus, and that there was an outstanding warrant for Ginsberg’s arrest in New Jersey. Nevertheless, Lindesmith was tolerant of his friend and ignored the possibility that this association might place him in jeopardy. Like Ginsberg and Leary, Lindesmith was totally opposed to the “crime control approach to dealing with problems of drug use, but did not defend a totally permissive attitude about anybody and everybody being encouraged to experiment with drugs” (Turk 1997). If anything, the following chapters will show that the corpus of Lindesmith’s written work continually emphasized the horrors of drug addiction.

Lindesmith’s triumphs during these years are best measured by his increasing reputation in the professional communities of criminology, sociology, and addiction theory. The popularity of his work as a reference began a steady upward climb, which peaked in 1977 just two years after his retirement (*Social Science Citation Index* 1966–1993). Much of his enhanced academic standing stemmed from publication of *The Addict and the Law* (1965). It was the crowning work of his career, making use of research he had done for *Opiate Addiction*. It employed a detailed study of U.S. narcotics policy and demonstrated that those policies encouraged a lucrative black market in narcotics, had a dehumanizing effect on addicts, and sought to punish instead of treating their illness.

The Later Years, Retirement, and Death

Following the publication and positive reception of *The Addict and the Law*, Lindesmith enjoyed a period of unprecedented recognition and acclaim. His designation as a “University Professor” in July of 1965, acknowledged him as a respected and exceptional scholar on the Indiana University campus. Although his political connections in Washington were severed after the departure of Lyndon Johnson in 1969, the academic community of sociology, and criminology in particular, continued to honor him. The following is a list of Lindesmith’s positions and honors:

Instructor of Sociology, Indiana University, 1936.

Member, World Narcotics Reform Organization, 1937.

Promoted to Assistant Professor, Indiana University, 1938.

Elected Vice-President Ohio Valley Sociological Society, 1940.

Book Review Editor, *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 1940–1942.

Commissioned 2nd Lieutenant, United States Army Air Corps, Division of Military Intelligence (G-2), Cryptography Section, February 1943 to September 1945.

Promoted to Associate Professor, Indiana University, 1946.

Consultant to the Addiction Research Center, 1949.

Promoted to Professor, Indiana University, 1952.

Fulbright International Scholar, 1953.

Witness, Senate Subcommittee Hearings to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, Kefauver Committee, 1956.

Elected President, “Society for the Study of Social Problems” (SSSP) 1958–1959.

Senior Research Fellow, University of Chicago Law & Behavioral Science Program, 1959.

Book Review Editor, *Social Problems*, 1960.

Participant, White House Council on Narcotic Use in the United States, 1962.

Advisory Board of the National Association for the Prevention of Addiction to Narcotics, 1963.

Vice-President (1964–65) and President (1965–66) of Indiana University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP).

Named “University Professor” by Indiana University Chancellor Herman Wells, July 1, 1965.

Advisor to the Indiana State Mental Health Planning Task Force, 1966.

Recipient, Carleton College Alumni Achievement Award, 1967.

Chair of the American Sociological Association, Criminology Section, 1968.

Elected President Indiana University Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa, 1968.

Recipient Edwin H. Sutherland Award, American Society Criminology (ASC), 1970.

Consultant to the Smithsonian Institute, 1978.

Recipient George Herbert Mead Award for Career Contributions, “Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction” (SSSI), August 29, 1980.

Fellow of the American Society of Criminology (ASC), November 6, 1980.

Senior Justice Fellow, American University-Washington D.C., May 11, 1981.

Lindesmith’s complete bibliography is found in Appendix One.

A growing clinical interest in addiction and substance abuse grew out of the drug culture of the mid-1960s and the expanding use of alcohol. Prominent among much of that