THE COURT: All right. We're on the record in U.S.A. 1 2 versus Quaintance, CR-06538. MR. MARTINEZ: Louis Martinez and Amanda Gould for 3 the United States. 4 5 THE COURT: Good morning. MR. ROBERT: Marc Robert on behalf of Daniel 6 Quaintance. 7 8 MR. ALMANZA: Good morning, Your Honor. Steve 9 Almanza on behalf of Mary Quaintance. I'm filling in for 10 Mario Esparza, who had a family emergency. 11 THE COURT: All right, thank you. 12 MS. SEDILLO: Good morning, Your Honor. Bernadette 13 Sedillo on behalf of Joseph Butts. 14 THE COURT: All right. We're here on Danuel Dean Quaintance's motion to dismiss. 15 16 MR. ROBERT: A couple of things before we start. 17 THE COURT: All right. 18 MR. ROBERT: If it please the Court. The government 19 brought to the attention of the Court last week that two of my witnesses -- all of my witnesses are present in the courtroom 20 21 right now -- might be in a position of incriminating 22 themselves should they testify. The Court appointed counsel for each of them. Mr. Singer has had an opportunity to 23 consult with counsel, Miss Dibble will consult with Miss 24

It's my intention to

Robins shortly, as I understand.

generally inquire from each of them of their membership in the of Church of Cognizance and to describe for the Court, if you will, the spiritual journey by which they got to that membership and their beliefs and their, well, like I say, how they got there. It's not my intention to ask them questions about whether they presently use marijuana, in an answer to which question could expose them to prosecution, at least for misdemeanor possession. It's my contention that any such questioning would be irrelevant except as to establish if somebody is intoxicated as they sit in the witness chair. so I'm asking Your Honor to consider in limine the idea that these witnesses, Miss Dibble and Mr. Singer should not be questioned about things like their use of cannabis or distribution of cannabis, or anything that might cause them to be exposed to criminal liability, because I don't think it's relevant to what we're here to talk about.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

We're here to talk about whether or not Mr.

Quaintance, Miss Quaintance and Mr. Butts hold a sincere religious belief. I believe that Mr. Singer will give his testimony about their involvement with the church. And their spiritual connection to the church is relevant, but I don't think it's relevant to talk about those other matters that might expose them to criminal liability.

THE COURT: Any response, Mr. Martinez?

MR. MARTINEZ: Yes, Your Honor. The issue is

sincerity in religion, Your Honor. Part of the sincerity, part of whether or not the beliefs of the Quaintances are religious revolve around whether or not this possession and transportation of marijuana was done as a result of commerce, as a result of making a profit. It's our contention that their beliefs are not sincere and they are not a religion, and that their attempt to possess in such large amounts of marijuana was an attempt to sell the marijuana and to move it in commerce, which goes against the sincerity. I believe it is not sincere and, therefore, we were going to be asking Mr. Singer about commerce, about marijuana, about the sale of marijuana, about the acquisition of vehicles to be moved, in which marijuana would be moved. We would be asking him about the use of marijuana.

He also talks about sacrament. We're going to ask him about the use of the sacrament, the use of the sacrament as deity. Those are all issues fully related to the matter at hand. And, therefore, we believe we should be allowed to question Mr. Singer on these matters. They're totally relevant and they're totally pertinent as to the issue of religion and sincerity.

THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Robert?

MR. ROBERT: I disagree with counsel's assessment of the relevance and suggest that each of these witnesses would have the opportunity to selectively invoke the Fifth

Amendment, which is permissible as long as that selective invocation does not distort the truthfulness or the truth of the testimony that is relevant. And so I would ask Your Honor to at least keep an open mind about whether or not each of these witnesses should be permitted to invoke the privilege as to those things. Whether or not they sincerely believe in the things that they've declared in the statement that I've already provided to the government, in which I expect them to testify to, doesn't depend on whether they used cannabis last week or last month or last year. And certainly no questions -- they're not charged with conspiracy, they're not accused of having any involvement in the things that Mr. Martinez described, and so I think it's nothing more than a fishing expedition on the part of the government and certainly irrelevant to the things that they're here to talk about, which include the legitimacy and sincerity of what they believe.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I see your point but I'll just listen to the testimony and see where we go. It's difficult for me to conclusively decide the issue of relevance without putting it all into context. So I understand your point and we'll just see how it plays out.

MR. ROBERT: The other thing I wanted to raise with the Court is the question of the testimony of the expert that the government has indicated an intention to call, Dr. Bagne.

It's my understanding that Dr. Bagne, who is a Zoroastrian priest, is going to testify that my client's beliefs don't comport with his. It strikes me as being a little bit like what the situation might be if an Evangelical were to come here to describe why Catholics aren't entitled to the Evangelical's view of the afterlife. I think what will develop is that there are a number of different sects or segments of belief systems derived from ancient Zoroastrian traditions. This fellow, I guess, is going to testify that what Mr. Quaintance has espoused is not what he believes. But that doesn't matter, and it's certainly not relevant to the question of what Mr. Quaintance believes, or his practice, is a sincere religious practice. It doesn't make sense for a person not one sect, to criticize the beliefs of a person from a different sect, if you will. And that's essentially what we have going on with Dr. Bagne. I think his testimony is irrelevant and I ask that he not be permitted to testify.

THE COURT: Again, I'll allow him to testify. I'll just see how it plays out. I think it's my job to evaluate the testimony, and so we'll proceed with all the testimony and I'll render my decision based on the law and the facts.

MR. ROBERT: Thank you.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Are we ready to proceed?

MR. MARTINEZ: Yes, the government is ready.

MR. ROBERT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Robert.

MR. ROBERT: Shall we start with witnesses, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Let's go ahead. I've read the briefs, so if there's anything you want to say before you begin with the testimony you're welcome to do so. I don't think I need to hear anything unless you just have something you want to say that's not in the briefs. Otherwise I'm ready to hear the testimony.

MR. MARTINEZ: The government invokes the rule.

THE COURT: All right. The government has invoked the rule, which means that any individuals who are in the courtroom who may be witnesses will have to wait outside of the courtroom and we'll call you when your testimony will be necessary. And, of course, I'll ask counsel to keep an eye on who enters the courtroom to make sure we don't have any witnesses in the courtroom.

MR. ROBERT: Your Honor, I have an interesting question.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ROBERT: A fellow I have standing up is a guy named Brian Krum. And I think one thing that we need to make clear today, and I've talked with Mr. Martinez about this, the whole RIFRA equation consists of two parts; the first is sincere religious practice and substantial burden.

Substantial burden the government has already conceded.

The second part, if we get to that point, is going to address the notion of a compelling government interest and whether or not what's happening is the least intrusive means of accomplishing that. Mr. Krum may be a witness if it comes down to the second part of the hearing, but he's not going to be testifying at this point. He's expressed an interest in being here and, in abundance of caution, I would put it to the Court, and maybe to the government, as to whether or not he should leave. We may not get to that hearing, and if we do it's going to deal with separate issues. I'd ask that he be allowed to stay but I'll leave it to the Court.

THE COURT: All right. Let me ask what the government's position is?

MR. MARTINEZ: I think out of an over abundance of caution, I ask that he be treated as any other witness.

Transcripts will be available later for his perusal, so I think it would be best to treat him as a potential witness in future.

THE COURT: All right. It's my view that the rule having been invoked, I think the witness will have to wait outside of the courtroom.

Please come forward. Before you take your seat, however --

MR. ROBERT: Your Honor, I'll call Dr. Deborah

Pruitt.

THE COURT: All right.

DEBORAH PRUITT

after having been first duly sworn under oath, was questioned and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROBERT:

- Q. Please tell us your name?
- A. Deborah Pruitt.
 - Q. Dr. Pruitt, what do you do for a living?
- A. I am a cultural anthropologist and I'm employed, I'm a tenured professor at Laney College in Oakland, California, and also am associate at the Western Institute for Social Research in Berkeley, California.
- Q. Would you briefly describe for the Court your educational background?
- A. I earned my doctorate at the University of California at Berkeley in 1993. Part of that educational process included my field research, and I spent two years living in Jamaica where I worked mostly with government and nongovernmental organizations in community development and spent time with local groups, two of which were Rastafarian groups that had started schools for their children, and some Dutch and Jamaican government development projects in the rural areas.

1 I have conducted research in community development and organizations, and public policy around those issues. 2 have published my research on women and family law in Jamaica 3 4 on the impact of tourism as a policy for development in 5 Jamaica, and on ethics and relevance in teaching anthropology and working on some pieces on ethics and cultural pluralism in 6 7 the professions, in teaching dental professions and medical 8 professions. And now I'm currently working on a piece on 9 religious use of drugs to publish. 10

- Q. You indicated that you got your doctorate in 1993 from the University of California, Berkeley?
 - A. Right.

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And your Master's?
- A. From there also.
 - Q. And when was that?
 - A. I was awarded that in '87.
- 17 Q. And your undergraduate degree?
 - A. At the University of Maryland, in anthropology, in '86, was when it was. It seems like a long time ago now.
 - Q. All right. Would you tell us a little bit about the work that you've done in the anthropology of religion?
 - A. Well, it really came primarily as a result of teaching, and as I've been teaching anthropology, I teach a course called magic, witchcraft and religion, which is the essentially the anthropology of religion. It's a general

introductory course where we survey religious practices across the world and explore all of the questions of what is religion, what counts as religion, how do we decide that, who's deciding that. And so, and then the various practices and beliefs that people hold throughout the world that fall in the category of something that most people call religion. So through that I've surveyed the literature in anthropology and sociology and philosophy, and religious studies, to thoroughly understand the cross-cultural and pan-historical accounts of religion.

- Q. Could you be a little more specific about your survey of the literature and talk to us a little bit about the breadth of the research that you've done to prepare you to teach this course?
- A. Well, the easiest way for me to think about this is the way that I sort of teach the subject, which is, we begin with the general discussion of religion. And I have to keep sort of putting quotes around that word because that very concept, we deconstruct that term in the very concept of religion and what it is. If you're looking at trying to understand the human experience as anthropologists do, then we have to understand how people all over the world, in various cultures, understand who they are and how to live in the world. And so as we think of religion in our culture, that's one component of that. But we then have to understand what

that really means in the very different definition of reality in the very different culture.

So we spend the first -- the literature that I work with is the anthropological literature that explores how one understands themself in relation to the world and the cosmos and their society. And that often gets labeled as religion.

And so then we move through various aspects of what gets counted in this area. So myth and symbolism and how people, the symbolic ways that people encode their understanding of who they are and how they should live.

Ritual, as the, as the practice of what people believe about who they are and how they should live, and how to connect with the mystical forces that they understand to be definitive of the world, and who they are.

We look, you know, at the literature that I've covered is around various specific cultural practices, so the use of magic and religious groups that focus on the use of magic, such as Wicca and neo-pagans, as well as Trogan Islanders, and people in the South Pacific, and the way they understand magic, and the relationship of mystical forces and how to connect with them. Then various methods for connecting with spiritual forces. So the use of magic, divination, spirit trances of various sorts, spirit possession and vodou.

Then the psychoactive substances that people call drugs, shamanic journey, that's sometimes a product of a

psychoactive substance, but often use of rattling or drumming to enter an altered state of consciousness, and so on.

And then, of course, looking at the sort of relationship between a scientific understanding of the world, I'm sort of shifting gears here now, expanding a span of literature that I work with, science and religion and what the different ways of understanding reality are and how they are related, are distinct and what science has to say about religion and religious experience, and theology in these areas. And then examination of new religious movements, revitalization movements and religious change; globalization, the impact of globalization. That's a very fast survey of a broad range of literature on this topic.

- Q. In the course of your investigations in this regard, have you also examined in the literature, not only religious practices currently worldwide, but also religious practices back in time --
 - A. Sure.

- Q. -- is that a part of the research that you've done?
- A. Yes. As an anthropologist, you know, most people may understand cultural anthropology as a study of different cultures, so it's comparative cross-culturally, so it's comparative historically. So, of course, any one individual is limited to what they can actually do in one lifetime. But it also, you know, involves a historical perspective, and I

have looked at that to some extent in certain religious groups and social societies, and certain topics; and the area of psychoactive substances is one of those.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Let's talk a little bit about that, and tell us if you could, specifically the sorts of academic research or inquiries you've made with regard to that subject, the use of psychoactive substances related to practice. You said that you're working on a piece for publication at this time, could you tell us a little bit about that?
- Well, one of the things that is interesting when you look at indigenous societies, it's very easy to understand when you're seeing the practices that involve psychosubstances and shamanic use of those things, then it's easy to assume that this has been a longstanding practice. But there are areas of societies where those practices have been lost or have been eliminated through state organizations, and so So, where you see most of the historical evidence of the use of these substances that is no longer in place in those societies, is in various aspects of Hindu religions, some Buddhist religion groups, and in ancient Christianity and Judaism, and early Christianity, I should say. And the Greek religion, the allegation rights. So in early Greek and Roman, and that area of the world, saw -- there's much historical evidence of the use of psychoactive substances that is no longer a dominant practice in their society. So you have to

look back at it historically to understand it.

Q. All right.

MR. ROBERT: Your Honor, I would offer Dr. Pruitt as an expert in the anthropology of religion, and also, more specifically, the anthropological aspects of the use of psychoactive substance.

- Q. They're also called entheogens in this context, aren't they?
 - A. Right.
 - Q. In religious practice.
- A. Can I just say something about the word entheogen?

 It was introduced as --

THE COURT: Hold on one moment, please.

MS. GOULD: We have no objection to that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, Dr. Pruitt will be, her testimony will be admitted offered as expert testimony in anthropology, religion, and psychoactive --

- Q. (By Mr. Robert) Tell us about the word entheogens, which I learned only after starting to work on this case.
- A. Well, it refers to, in connection with the spirit within, and a Greek word. And it's used specifically for this, these, this practice, for the use of substances for a spiritual pursuit. And I think folks have widely adopted it because it helps to make the distinction between the use of the word drugs, which is used very broadly to refer to things

that are coming from pharmaceutical companies, as well as 1 things that come from natural plants and things that are 2 considered legal or illegal, and so on. So the word entheogen 3 is used specifically for the practice, the spiritual practice 5 that --Q. All right. Well, let's start -- let me do one thing. 6 7 MR. ROBERT: May I approach, Your Honor? THE COURT: 8 You may. 9 Q. (By Mr. Robert) Is this your curriculum vitae? 10 Α. Yes. 11 (Defendant's Exhibit 1 was marked.) 12 MR. ROBERT: I would offer Dr. Pruitt's CV as Defendant's Exhibit 1. 13 14 THE COURT: Any objection? 15 MS. GOULD: No objection. 16 THE COURT: All right, Defendant's Exhibit 1 is 17 admitted. 18 (By Mr. Robert) Let's start big, broadly. From your 19 perspective in understanding that the law may take a different approach to this particular question, what is a religion? 20 21 Α. It is the big question. All right, from my 22 perspective, it is used, that word is used in many different 23 ways and it's really important to be aware of that so that 24 we're, and we can use the word religion to refer to

institutions, you know, beliefs and practices that are

embodied in institutions and in text. And I think, because of most of our cultural background, that's the way most of us tend to think about religion, in various concrete and established organization.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

When one explores what's really going on in various cultures around the world, it becomes really clear that that is a very culturally specific way of understanding religion. And so I, at times I talk about not even using the word religion because, in fact, one of the scholars that I rely on, anthropologist Dorothy Lee, has written quite eloquently about how many cultures don't even have a word for what we call religion, because in a culture that's way of life is a spiritual communion, it's the way of being in the world, or at least it's the desired way of being in the world. So that the offering made with planting corn is what many of us might call a religious act because it's done in a manner of attention toward some spiritual forte, yet it's in the cornfield at the moment of planting corn and it's part of growing food to survive.

- Q. I think I know what you mean by offering, but give me an example of that.
- A. Well, maybe another example that was in my mind this morning is a piece of film I show of potato mounding ritual in the Peruvian Andes as they, every year, you know, growing potatoes, they have to go out and dig the dirt mound, the dirt

around the potatoes as they grow. And during that, maybe it's right after, there's a dance. The women come and bring food into the fields, they put flowers in their hair, and there's a dance through the potato field. There are, coca leaves are chewed, which is the origin of what is called cocaine in this country, but the leaf, the plant itself is considered sacred. And the leaves are chewed and then liquid is sprayed into the air as an offering to the gods as a way of maintaining the connection with the spirit forces that support the growth of the potatoes and the life of the people. So it's a subsistence activity, it's a farming activity. It's imbued with a spiritual intention, a spiritual connection.

1.6

That's the way most people around the world understand that life happens, the way that life is maintained and sustained. So plants and various things around them are a part of what's given in nature for life and for survival. So the relationship with those plants and with the spirits is a continuous one.

So these are cultures that often don't have a word like religion. So it's not a distinct, separate activity of life. Our society tends to be fairly segmented and disintegrated in that regard. I often talk to my students about the fact when you go to college and take classes and you take an economics class, and you take a political science class, you might take an anthropology class, and all of these

are very distinct subject areas. And then maybe you go to church on Sunday, and that's very distinct from what you're doing at school. And then maybe you have a job that's very distinct from what you're doing in school, distinct from your family, and so on. So that sort of disintegrated way of living is fairly unique in the world. And so when we think of religion as a separate practice or a separate entity, that's not common. And so the word religion can become almost, it can become a way of obscuring, using those ideas become a way of obscuring the reality, the reality of other people.

Am I going too far here?

- Q. I don't know. What I would ask you --
- A. So it's back to a definition of religion.
- Q. That's my next question.

A. I intend to, if I have to define it, use a very simple definition of the order of something like a system of beliefs and practices that address the relationship between people and mystical forces. Even the use of the word mystical forces can be problematic sometimes, because I think most of us, when you see, regardless of whether you're watching a potato-mounding ritual that might not look like a religious act to some people, you see a way of relating to the world and the cosmos that appreciates that there's something larger than the immediate people in what's happening. And that's what I'm referring to as mystical forces. And I think generally what

people would say, that's apparent in all cultures and is present in all cultures.

- Q. I'm sorry. When you say it's apparent, it is apparent in all cultures, tell us a little bit about what you mean by that statement.
- A. Well, the word an animism is used in anthropology to refer to the understanding of the world is imbued spirit, that there is something non-material going on here. And that is a universal, it's a cultural universal, every culture has seen the world that way, experienced the world that way. And so it's that relationship that I think, in understanding and managing that relationship between the material and the spirit realm, I think is what most people would understand is something religious going on.
- Q. Did you say that every culture that we know or studied or aware of, has had some sort of cosmology, some sort of a --
- A. An understanding that there are spirits in the world, that there's something non-material.
- Q. When you say mystical forces, I think I've seen it referred to in literature as supernatural forces; is that sort of the same notion?
- A. Yeah. I just, if I can parse the word here, I don't use the word supernatural because it tends to reinforce a western notion of there's nature and then there's something

not nature, something supernatural. And the indigenous peoples of the world understand this is a more continuous experience. So I will not keep drawing that distinction.

- Q. Okay. I think I understand that. So in an attempt to understand the relationship between humans and the mystical force, do all religions within that broad construct have a supreme being?
- A. No. Well, I say no, it's, again, it may be a problem of words here, the way cultures conceptualized what is in the spiritual realm varies tremendously. And I've actually read different things on this, some that say that there are cultures that don't even have, don't even spend much effort conceptualizing it, and so don't have much of a story about that. And then I've also read scholars who say that there is a fairly universal notion that there is some power, some power that's greater than people. But a spiritual being implies a particular -- I, to me implies a particular way of, of understanding that, that can, that is fairly narrow and culturally defined.
- Q. Well, obviously, for our culture and in a predominantly Christian nation, there is a God. And in some, again, there are various manifestations of Christianity, in some case there are three deities, the God, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and these are entities to whom we pray and ask for help and offer offerings. And I'm wondering about

cultures in which that's not necessarily the case, where there is not a person who's anthropogenic, who is not like us, who's not an entity that's identifiable and prayable to, if you will?

- A. Well, that's the more common. Let's say the not having a particular identity, personification of that, and so is probably more common than not.
 - Q. I'm sorry, more common than not, not to have?
- A. I'm sorry, I wasn't very clear there. The manner of embodying spirit as a sort of anthropomorphic agent or entity is more uncommon, I think, than common. And when I say that, I'm referring to the record of cultures, not necessarily the numbers of people in the world who believe this way or that way. So there are, while there's a universal understanding that there are spiritual forces, they're not always considered human-like or even have entity. They may be elements of nature, forces of nature. And this is very common with the native peoples in this area, not necessarily entities as in gods and goddesses in the same manner. This is where it takes a real stretch to actually, you know, step out of ones own cultural way of thinking about this and really imagine a different way.

There are cultures where those spirits are malevalent forces and life is a continuous struggle to negotiate your way through this sort of malevalent field of forces out there, but

they aren't necessarily sort of person agents in the way that Christianity embodies a god.

- Q. All right. You prepared a report for me, didn't you?
- A. Yes.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And I gave a copy of it to the lawyers for the government so they could take a look at it. They'll probably have some questions for you about it, but you mentioned something that I want to talk a little bit about, that's the difference between a faith-based religious construct and what you call an experience-based religious construct. Could you tell us a little bit about what you mean by those terms?
- Α. I found that to be a very helpful distinction. My students find it a very helpful distinction also. are -- well, maybe it helps to start with, I grew up in a Christian church. I see that as very much a faith-based It is, the truth of the religion is passed on through, through text scriptures, and specialists, the priest and I use that term generally to refer to all ministers and full-time specialists that pass on the knowledge and lead the community in the spiritual path. I'm not saying there's never a spiritual experience in that religion, but the emphasis is different in a religion that's based on experience, where the pursuit is to have a direct experience of those spirit forces as opposed to hearing about it as it was experienced by someone a thousand years ago when the spirit visited them or

mediated the message through a priest, or so on. And these are the people that are sometimes called the mystics. So in Islam the mystic tradition, the experience-based tradition are the Sufis. In Judaism it's the kabalist. In Christianity I think there are various groups that have sort of, you know, the Gnostics, the current Gnostics and Zoroastrians, and many of them are, I think, trying to connect with that tradition through, from Christianity.

Q. Which tradition, Doctor, the experience?

- A. The experience tradition. The neo-pagans and Wiccans and folks who are practicing magic and creating rituals that are designed to create a direct experience of this numinous, the numinous in life, are those kinds of experienced-based practices, as opposed to the more faith-based that have a -- Here's the key difference. The knowledge of the faith is passed on. In experience base practices it is a matter of, as attained the knowledge oneself, having a direct experience of it.
- Q. Now in an experience-based sort of approach to spirituality, is there not also someone who acts as a guide, as a teacher, to direct the practitioner of that religion to the appropriate methods of attaining that personal experience of the spiritual?
- A. Very much so. Elders, more experienced, become important teachers and guides because it's a -- I wouldn't

actually say it could be a dangerous pursuit, when one leaves the ordinary state of reality and is willing to enter into non-ordinary states of reality, then, you know, if you don't have experience there, then you may not know what to do about that experience or how to come back. So this is where the leadership, the guidance of all, all of those apprentice, more experienced practitioners.

- Q. Okay. Let's talk a little bit about that and the ways in which it occurred. Leaving the ordinary realm of reality, how does one do that in, an example, if you can give us one, of an experiential spiritual situation?
- A. There are multiple ways that that can happen, and it may involve an intense meditative practice. It might involve sensory deprivation, such as the Plains Indians' vision questing where they would leave their community and go out into the wilderness for three days and nights, and no food and no water. It can be a ritual structure that creates a rhythmic pattern of drumming or rattling that creates an altered state of consciousness, the gray actually interstata.
 - Q. Is that a meditative sort of thing as well?
- A. Yes, it depends on how you define meditation. Yeah, but a trans-like state, and I want to use the word altered state because trans is a very loosely used word. So then you can have the spirit possession of vodou. The, I'm thinking of the emboly, the transstate, the transstates of, I'm sorry, I

can't recall the name of this ceremony, but where they stab themselves with swords. It often involves a great deal of bodily challenge in some of those cases, I should say. So I'm trying to think if I'm leaving anything out. Sleep deprivation, pain, self-inflicted pain. The Christian self-flaggelation of old times is one of those; and then psychoactive substances.

- Q. Just out of curiosity, is the Native American sweat lodge a form of this sort of thing that you're talking about, the altered state?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. I want to go back to something you touched on a just little bit ago because it relates to another area that I wanted to talk to you about. You mentioned the Gnostics. And in my imperfect understanding of such things, relatively recent discoveries suggest the existence of a group of people back in the time of Jesus that called themselves Gnostics, and they maintained a separate set of Gospels, I think they're actually being called that. And it seemed to -- well, it didn't seem to, it talked about the fairly significant divergence of forms of Christianity. Talk to us a little bit about that specifically and generally, more generally the ways in which even a single belief system can branch off into different directions.
 - A. Well, yeah, we're very familiar with that. The early

Christian period was marked by many different communities of Christians, people who had either direct or known for hundreds of years after Christ's death had, you know, indirect experience of his teachings and the, his life, and formulated communities of religious belief and practice around their ideas of that. And there were hundreds of them that, you know, saw it slightly differently, had somewhat different interpretation of his message. And it was a slow process of certain groups establishing preeminence. And then these other groups were either marginalized, some incorporated, and some persecuted, until, you know, a much less diverse sort of notion of Christianity. Though, we still see this today with Catholic Christianity and Protestant Christianity, and the many different segments of Protestant Christianity. -- I mean, I think we just take that for granted, that there are different interpretations of the same belief system, or at least different interpretations of the same text and the same history.

1.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. All right. How would the adherence to one of those sects or one of those belief symptom branches view the adherence to another one of those beliefs as to branches?
- A. Well, I'm sure that varies between the different groups. Some have very hostile reactions to some of the other beliefs, other groups that believe differently than they do. Others tend to be more tolerant. I think you could say that

maybe Christianity has gone through that historical process of 1 fairly hostile, quite a bit of hostility around different 2 beliefs. And now, I think there's a fairly tolerant attitude 3 4 that -- well, the Baptists see it differently than the Presbyterians; okay. But we're all Christians. So there is a 5 way that people have managed to sort of diminish the 6 differences, and most probably choose to see the commonality. 7 8 But I think we can also see a fair amount of friction that some don't see what others are doing as legitimate Christianity and take that on. I think when you get arguments 1.0 around the use of birth control or abortion, and things like 11 that, you can start to see the way some religious groups 12 believe that those practices are okay, and others don't, you 13 14 can have tremendous conflict.

Q. Well, in fact, the sincere believers in a manifestation of Christianity that calls for being born again, for example, would look at the people who are equally sincere, equally established but don't buy into that particular aspect of it, and the first group would think that the second group was going to hell.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Right. Yes, I experienced that actually in religion, uh-huh.
- Q. All right. Well, is it possible to quantify the number of different variations, even of one dominant religious theme, such as Christianity, over the course of time?

A. I can't say it would be impossible. I can't give you that. You, I'm sure a historical analysis might generate something like that. What you'll immediately run into is, well, do we call these people different or do we call them somewhat the same? Where do you make those distinctions, especially when you're looking historically. And that gets into the issue of who, how one is deciding what counts as religious or whether it's religious enough, or whether it counts as this religion of that, or not. At some point it seems that that's for the individual to declare. So if you can't go back 500 years and ask them, -- you know, we could generate a number like that, but then we'd have a lot of academic arguments about whether that number was legitimate.

- Q. Do you suppose it would be a large number?
- A. With respect --
- Q. Of different sorts of variations of religions?
- A. With respect to Christianity specifically?
- Q. Yes.

A. Yes. Well, just look at the history of the United States where you start with the Puritans, and then you get the Shakers and the Quakers, and, you know, boom. It happened very rapidly in the United States, you know, the Adventists and the Mormons, very quickly got a diversity of Christian groups because they did not agree with the interpretations of a particular text that they all considered to be the truth.

- 1 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

- Q. Let's then go to a discussion of psychoactive substances, entheogens, and help us to understand, historically or currently, around the world, these substances are used in aid of spiritual pursuits. And then we'll talk a little bit about what types of substances are used.
 - A. And so the first part, you want to know where?
 - Q. Well, where is a good start.
- A. All over the world. I think it's fairly safe to say that where plant or animate substances have existed, that generate a psychotropic effect, they have been incorporated into the culture of the people that live in that area.
 - Q. Can you give us an example?
- Α. Of course, you asked me that and my mind goes blank. I mean all through the Americas, tobacco, the indigenous people using tobacco. The peyote among the people in Central America and New Mexico. It being used by the Yanomamo in South America. The use of ayahuasca among many South American groups, Ichivato and many, many Psilocybin mushrooms used in Mesoamerica. The ancient Arawaks in the Caribbean used the The ancient Maya had used substance, psychoactive coyaba. substances. The Hindu use of soma; Aztec, what we call morning glory seeds, oloiuhqui; Eleusinian Mystery rites. aboriginal, Australian aboriginal, the pituri; the Fang of Equitorial Africa. It's really, you know, Hindu use of bong, or what is probably cannabis, what we call cannabis.

Q. You say probably; why?

- A. Well, it's an analysis of the linguistic terms and the various symbols of the plants and, you know, art and cultural artifacts that make that interpretation, the logical interpretation. But it's not a, you know, I can't go out to, go out to a group of Hindus and -- I'm not sure, I can't say that I understand Fang to be interpreted, bong to be interpreted as cannabis.
 - Q. But there are other interpretations as well?
- A. On that particular word, I'm not sure. I don't think so.
- Q. That's fine. Are there other religious traditions in which cannabis plays an entheogenical role?
- A. Well, again, I think that historically, throughout that region, it was used in early Christianity and early -- there are many references in the Bible that are interpreted to be used the use of cannabis. So in Judaism and in Hebrew culture, and then the early Christianity, and the Hindu culture, all throughout that region, experienced it.
- Q. Do you suppose you would get an argument from some people who practice those religions as to whether or not cannabis ever played a role in Christianity?
- A. Well, sure. You can get in an argument over any aspect of religion. I think that it's partly because of the loss of that in the mainstream tradition. So where there's a

particular, you know, ideology that says this is not a good practice or it's not part of our practice, then they would not want to see it, might not want to see it as part of the ancient practice.

Q. Revisionist history?

2.0

- A. It seems that way to me.
- Q. Okay. What's the point, why do it at all? Why use psychoactive substances in the pursuit of the mystical, as you've described it?
- A. I think that people discovered it was a very powerful means of access to a spiritual reality that is, transends what our ordinary, everyday experience is. And what I understand, and this is cross-cultural, not just talking about cannabis now, but the use of plants in this manner is always talked about as spirit powers themself, and teachers, and healers. So there is an access to spiritual knowledge and healing this way that is very clearly experienced by people all over the world. And why wouldn't they? I mean that would be a real question in my mind, why would they not?
- Q. Well, let me ask you, maybe it's rhetorical, but in ancient culture, without current levels of science, how would -- if a society stumbled upon a plant preparation of some sort that seemed to have salutary effects on health, or curative properties as to some maladies, how would ancient cultures likely look at that plant in that preparation, how

would they perceive it, as something medicinal or something spiritual?

- A. I don't think they would make a distinction. I think it would be understood to be -- this goes back to my earlier conversation about these, this continuity, and that we make a distinction between health, you know, a body health and then our spiritual health is handled in church. Indigenous people don't make that distinction. So the plant would be considered sacred. It has these healing properties. And health is achieved through spirit as well as body.
- Q. All right. Okay. So there's one, I suppose, example of how that happens. If a plant has a healing property and therefore would be considered as consonant with the spiritual world, what about something that changes, alters your state, as you said earlier?
- A. It has healing properties because it does that. It, again, this goes to, I think, an understanding of the self that, you know, is as, maybe made up of, of different elements, but they're all connected. So you go to a healer in most places in the world and they will do what they can. And what they can is going to be, use all their knowledge of medicinal properties of plants and all their knowledge of the spirit powers that can help you. And so they may be combining one plant, they may be different plants or other substances, well, pretty much derived from plants or animals.

So, you know, I forgot to mention the section of my work of the whole discussion of healing in spirituality. And healers don't -- I mean this is one of the concerns about our health system in this country, that it tends to isolate the body. We're going through a bit of change here. The body has been isolated as a, you know, sort of biological entity, and healing and curing is attempted on the body. And traditional healers all over the world know that's never going to be effective, it has to incorporate all of the person. It's got to incorporate the spiritual element as well.

- Q. That's an interesting notion, that all our technology is still a little bit behind the curve.
- A. Well, it's very powerful in its way. And it has, it has a particular application, and it's not the whole answer.
 - Q. Okay.

- A. Medical doctors are getting that, they're using meditation and this practices.
- Q. Okay. So not trying to ignore that, but if I understand what you said earlier, that it's not just about healing or a specific aspect of healing that these entheogenic plants can be used, but even the extent to which an alteration of the psychological state itself as a vehicle to an understanding of the spiritual realm?
 - A. And healing, uh-huh.
 - Q. And you always come back to that.

- A. Because they're not separate.
- Q. Okay.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

· 21

22

23

24

- Α. Yes. That shift in consciousness, that shift -well, there are two things going on here, one is that in some cultures it's the healer that uses the substance, not the sick person. In some cultures it is both; okay. So I'm talking about, now we're talking about a physical ailment of some Again, these distinctions sometimes are crazy. But the physical ailment is understood to be a manifestation of a spiritual problem. And not only, I mean there, these folks are smart; okay. They understand that there are physical problems that, you know, you've got an infection, you know. We'll go to the doctor down the road, they have some antibiotics for you. Come back, we'll do a ceremony. Because you have to address the whole person.
- Q. Let me ask it a different way. Is it common in these cultures to use entheogens to have a person who's not suffering from any particular physical malady, nothing that they're trying to cure, to seek a transcendent spiritual experience using entheogens?
 - A. Definitely.
 - Q. Talk to us a little bit about that aspect.
- A. Well, yes, you make a distinction of physical malady here because there is the pursuit of spiritual knowledge and spiritual healing for oneself and for ones community. That is

often the purpose, the intention for use of the substance.

There are -- not everyone in every society might pursue this, but many people might, or some. Some people don't like it, don't want to bother, not unlike our society where some people don't want to walk a spiritual path and other people do. So there are -- but certainly it is an interest in spiritual well-being that would encourage people to pursue whatever means they have for doing, for achieving that. And these substances are understood to be sacred gifts that have the power to bring you in, it's the goal to try to attempt the community with spirit.

- Q. Okay. One of the things you talked about in your report was that the anthropological research demonstrates that there is a clear divide between the spiritual use of psychoactive substances and when you probably risk, call the recreation use of those things. Could you talk to us a little bit about that research and that distinction?
- A. Well, I think that distinction is helpful. My students have taught me that sometimes that distinction may not be so absolute, so I'll get to that in a minute, which I think is important. But that the spiritual use of these substances is distinguished by what anthropologists and religious scholars call set and setting. The two elements really are key to what distinguishes spiritual use from recreational use. It's the intention, and the meaning and

intention for spiritual connection and healing and knowledge that drives the use, as well as the setting, which means in pretty much all cases a ritual setting, a structured sort of controlled experience. I should change that to say controlled setting because the experience is not controlled.

Q. Okay. Intention and setting?

1.

2.

1.0

- A. Yes. And can I say why? I just think this is interesting. In many discussions, over many years, with students on this topic, they've challenged me on that distinction and says, and say, "Well, you can have a spiritual experience even if you start out for recreation." And so it may be that that is the way some people come to a spiritual awareness, and it can be life-changing, which would speak to the power of these substances and what their real existence is.
- Q. All right. Also in your report you talk a little bit about the notion of cults and the development of new religious ideas. We talked a little bit about the different branches of early Christianity, but I think until like the fourth century, Christianity was persecuted generally regardless of what branch you were. Talk to us a little bit about the notion of developing religions and how they're perceived by the then established religious environment.
- A. Yeah. It may even be a small group that's established a set of beliefs, and if someone begins espousing

something different or see a different vision of that, they become ostrasized and marginalized, and in many cases they are the ones that go off and form a new group. So I don't use the word cult because most anthropoligists these days won't, because it tends to carry a very pejorative meaning. It used to be a sort of academic term that had very specific meanings, but it's now just generally used to refer to a non-mainstream group that's considered a little crazy, whacked out or something.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

So I tend to use the word new religious movement to refer to these groups that are continually emerging, which to me speaks of a very strong human desire to feel the sense of connection, to find a path for establishing and maintaining a spiritual connection and understanding in life. they're, by definition, new movements are in contrast to what is established, so they are understood as somewhat threatening. And anyone who's invested in the order, as it stands, you know, this is the way we know things are, then they generally can be very intolerant of someone who's saying "No, I've got a different view;" and this is why Christ was crucified; right? I mean, as I understand it, he was put to death for sedition. So what was a radical movement at the time, and was considered outrageous, and to the extent where they killed the man for what he was saying, now is considered mainstream religion. So maybe the lesson there is, it only

takes a couple thousand years. But then, you know, someone who comes along with a different prophetic message or a message that in any way speaks contrary to what is considered the established way, which I think is embodied in these institutions that have a lot of brick and mortar, and a lot professionals whose lives are committed to that, would, would, I think, fairly, you know, unsurprisingly, be fairly intolerant of those groups.

- Q. All right. Dr. Pruitt, in your report you include a list, a bibliography, if you will. What do those citations refer to?
- A. Well, this represents some of the top scholars in their field, in particular the subject of the use of psychoactive substances for spiritual purposes. And, of course, a few general references to anthropologists who talk about religion and, cross-culturally, the question of what is religion and, and how one understands what religion is, and how it works in human societies. So they span several decades of research and represent scholars from all the top academic institutions in this country.
- Q. Are these references to things that you, yourself, have read and relied on in coming to the understandings and conclusions that you've talked with us about today?
- A. Yes. And, I mean, this is true for all academic scholars, but it's, you know, it's -- anthropology is a social

science and one reviews literature and the debates in the 1 field, and my presentation of these resources is my assessment 2 3 of what is a general agreement or represents the most prevalent points of view and interpretations, if you will. 4 5 (Defendant's Exhibit 2 was marked.) Dr. Pruitt, I've marked something as Defendant's 6 Q. 7 Exhibit 2. Could you tell me if that is your report? 8 Α. Yes. 9 MR. ROBERT: Your Honor, I would offer Defendant's 10 Exhibit 2 into evidence, and particularly for the value that it has in identifying those resources that the doctor's relied 11 12 on, in addition to the things that are contained in it. 13 THE COURT: Any objection? 14 MS. GOULD: No objection, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: All right. Defendant's Exhibit 2 is admitted without objection. 16 17 MR. ROBERT: And I seem to have stickers that are old 18 and this may not want to stay on very long, so if that's the 19 case I --May I have just a moment, please, Your Honor? 20 21 THE COURT: You may. 22 MR. ROBERT: I pass the witness, Your Honor.

suggest that maybe we try to come back before 1:30. Would it

I have, I have something at noon but I'm going to

THE COURT: I think at this time we'll take our lunch

23

24

work for everyone to try to get back here? We'll try for 1 1:00, I may be a few minutes late, let's try for 1:00. Does 2 3 that seem reasonable? MR. MARTINEZ: Yes, Your Honor. 5 MS. GOULD: Yes, Your Honor. 6 MR. ROBERT: Yes, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: All right, we'll be in recess then until 8 1:00 o'clock. ġ (Whereupon Court was in recess for the lunch break.) 10 THE COURT: All right, we're back on the record in 11 U.S.A. versus Quaintance. Everybody ready to proceed? 12 MR. MARTINEZ: The government is, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: All right. 14 CROSS-EXAMINATION 15 BY MS. GOULD: 16 Ο. Good afternoon, Doctor. To start, I have a series of questions that I prepared in advance. Have you ever been an 17 18 expert in a criminal case before? 19 Ά. No. 20 Q. Have you ever volunteered to be an expert in a criminal case before? 21 I just realized, well, I have written a declaration 22 A. 23 in a case just recently.

What type of case was that case?

It was a similar case to this.

24

25

Q.

Α.

- Q. A similar case. Were you paid to write that declaration?

 A. Yes.
 - Q. Are you being paid for your testimony today?
 - A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

- Q. So the subject matter in that case was whether or not marijuana -- Can you just flesh it out for us a little bit?
- 8 A. It was very similar.
 - Q. Was it also for the Church of Cognizance or a branch of them?
 - A. No.
 - Q. Do you advocate the legalization of marijuana?
- 13 A. No.
- Q. Are you a member of the church of Cognizance, or any church similar to them?
- 16 A. No.
 - Q. Could you tell us what church you are a member of?
- A. I'm not a member of any church.
- Q. Now, with regards to this case, how much time have
 you spent with the Quaintances and Mr. Butts in studying what
 they proclaim to be their religion?
- A. None. I only met them today at the break, the lunch break.
- Q. Okay. Have you ever viewed their websites or read the writings of Mr. Danuel Quaintance?

- I looked briefly at the website when Mr. Robert 1 called me about the case, and he mentioned the name of the 2 3 church, and I briefly looked at the website, but I didn't study or didn't read any of the documents. 4 So you haven't visited the place where they live? 5 Q. 6 Α. No. 7 Q. Which they also refer to as where they worship.
 - A. No.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Have you interviewed anybody else who proclaims to be a member of this so-called religion?
 - A. No.
- Q. Now, you mention in your report on the religious use of psychoactive substances, which is what's been introduced, I think, as defense Exhibit Number 2 that you prepared for this hearing about entheogens, I hope I'm pronouncing it right.

 Now this is where, if I understand your writings correctly, a psychoactive substance is used to commune with the spirit world or bring unity with spirit world; is that right?
 - A. Uh-huh.
 - Q. Now have you ever studied -THE COURT: I didn't hear the answer.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Have you ever studied a religion that claims that their psychoactive substance is also their deity rather than merely a way in which that they can confer with their deity?

- A. Yes; actually that's not uncommon. I realize now that the way I worded it in this report, it could, you know, mislead and exclude that possibility. But the way that I hear people talk about this is that the plant itself is considered the teacher. It's part of, again, this is part of the understanding of the spiritual nature of reality and so the spirit of the plant is part of what is revered, as is all spirit. So the plant is understood to have the capacity to teach.
 - Q. Now let me ask you this, you say that it's part of what is revered; have you ever heard of it being all that is revered, not just a part of a greater whole?
 - A. I haven't noticed that kind of distinction.
 - Q. I take it from some of the things that you've said today that you're familiar with the Zoroastrian faith?
 - A. Somewhat.

- Q. Are you aware of the fact that Zoroastrians, at least of modern days Zoroastrians, do not condone the use of marijuana in the practice of their religion?
- A. Well, it's become clear to me that some people who declare themself as Zoroastrian don't, and evidently some people who declare themselves as neo-Zoroastrians, such as the defendant here do, so I guess there's some variation in that.
- Q. Now, it's my understanding that Zoroastrians worship a god, but that god is also separate from their sacrament, so

they worship the god and then have a sacrament separate from it. Is that your understanding of how Zoroastrians operate?

- A. I'm just not sure I can really answer that. I don't feel like I'm really qualified to assess how Zoroastrians today worship and how they distinguish that, the sacrament versus the god.
- Q. Now to those people who worship god as an unearthly form, that would be what keeps the god separate from the sacrament; isn't that right?
 - A. I'm not sure I understand.
- Q. In other words, and I forget the terms that you used in order to describe it, anthropo --
 - A. Anthropomorphic.

- Q. -- pomorphic god, would be separate from an earthly thing that one could touch and ingest; is that correct?
- A. Well, yeah, I would say probably the way -- see, the way Westerners think about this, which most of us probably, we're here, we've lived in Western culture long enough to be very Western-minded, would be that there is this distinction between deity and material world. What I -- what I see in many cultures is that that distinction is not necessarily understood that way, that there is not such a distinction. That the -- there's, I said the word continuity before, I think that will work. You know, when places are considered sacred, they're spiritual places, they're a spirit, so a

plant can be as well.

- Q. Now do you know if this proclaimed religion operates on that level or a different level? Do you have any idea?
- A. I don't have enough knowledge about this particular church to make any assessment of that.
- Q. Do you see a difference, in your studies of different religions, between spiritual use of psychoactive or entheogenic substances and the large-scale distribution of those substances for profit?
 - A. Are you asking do I see a distinction between those?
 - Q. Yes.
- A. Well, the way it's framed, I understand the distinction that you're making, yes.
- Q. Now, going to your study of Rastafarianism in Jamaica, you previously stated that you lived there for two years. Of course, our understanding in the United States of what Rastafarianism is, it's a religion that advocates the use of marijuana to enable members to more closely confer with their god, Jaw, if I know correctly. Is that a correct assessment of what Rastafarianism is?
- A. I would say that's part, that could be considered part of it. I would define it as a spiritual philosophy grounded in an Afrocentric reinterpretation of the Bible that is based on valuing that heritage, and understood as the children of God, and marijuana is considered a sacrament. So

it does offer a vehicle for a closer connection with Jaw.

- Q. So they do have some Biblical -- they operate through the Bible then?
 - A. Yes.

1.3

- Q. Okay. So are they Christians also?
- A. They're Rastas. This is where, again, it's important to realize that it's a reinterpretation of the Bible, so it has many commonalities of Christianity and it's a distinct, a distinct religion.
- Q. Now, do they believe that marijuana -- and is there a god named Jaw?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Do they believe that marijuana and Jaw are one and the same, or do they use marijuana in an effort to be closer to their god, Jaw?
- A. I'm trying to see if I have enough information to answer. It's funny. Whether or not they would consider them one and the same, I don't feel I can answer that, I'd have to ask a Rasta, and I imagine you might get some different answers from different individuals. Part of the nature of the, of that tradition is it's very individualistic, but we could have a reason and inquire into that. I think that, yeah, I should leave it at that. I don't think I can speak for them on that.
 - Q. Are Rastafarians required to smoke marijuana to

worship Jaw or practice Rastafarianism?

- A. Well, the word required would assume that there was an authority that could impose that expectation, that requirement. That doesn't fit. It's a practice that's part of becoming Rasta. You wouldn't, you wouldn't identify as Rasta, I think, if you had not, if you did not appreciate the role of marijuana. So nobody is forcing anybody to do anything in Rasta as part of the nature of it, or can't require anything of anyone, but it's certainly, I think, part of that and that identity resolves it. It doesn't mean every Rasta smokes marijuana.
- Q. The thing about the religion in this case is that they've put in their pleadings and stated in their writings that marijuana is both a sacrament and a deity to them, which seems that one could not practice that religion without partaking in marijuana. Would you agree with that statement?
- A. I couldn't answer that. I -- no, I don't know that it would mean that.
- Q. Now, just working off of your base on what you know about what Rastafarians still, do Rastafarians believe that their members should advocate selling marijuana to others who are non-believers in order to make a living?
 - A. Not that I know of.
- Q. In your direct testimony you talked a lot about different cultures, and that in relation to witchcraft and

religion and magic, and to the extent that you know what you do about the Church of the Cognizance, what culture would you say they are a member of or a part of?

- A. I'm smiling because this leads into a very large discussion about what culture is, and ethnicity, and variability in culture, and I don't know that the Court wants to go there. But to answer that question I'd have to say they would have to say what culture they identify with.
- Q. I guess maybe to narrow the question down or may make it more broad; of course we're dealing with people who were both born in the United States, one of them was born in California, the other in Missouri, if I remember correctly, Nebraska, and all within the last 40 to 50 years seem to have grown up in the United States here. How many different cultures could possibly exist in the realm of that time period with the place where they were born and where they've existed there in Arizona?
- A. Well, but where one grew up may not necessarily be the totality of their cultural identity today. So I certainly am not culturally the same as I was when I came out of high school, for instance. So, and culture, and cultural influence, and cultural identity is very complex and multiplex, if you will. There are multiple elements to that and can incorporate various experiences and changes across one's life. So I'm really not trying to glib on the question,

it's a very complex area of anthropology to understand someone's cultural identity. And so it's not just, "Oh, I see, they grew up here and they look like this, so I know their culture;" you really don't.

2.0

- Q. Would you say that there's a certain sub-culture in North America, here in the United States, that could be referred to as like the drug culture?
- A. I don't know, I haven't studied it so I don't know if I would identify. What would you mean? I don't know who they are.
- Q. I'm just wondering where you have people who really form their life around a certain substance, or maybe many substances, that our country would consider to be drugs, for lack of a better word; right, where a lot of people consider them to be entheogens, where they form their life around partaking of that, selling it. They're imbued in the idea that such substances should be legalized.
- A. Well, I can see where that term could be used to refer to those qualities that you just described, but to me it wouldn't provide a very accurate understanding of someone's culture.
- Q. Okay. Have you found in your study of religions that use entheogens, that all members use the substance to confer with God? And to clarify that, do most of those religions use these substances to confer with God, ordinarily have a right

of passage of sorts, or do all of the members just use it regardless of age or status within the society in which the religion operates?

- A. I am pausing because you're talking about a large variety of cultures. There are traditions -- I think there were several questions in what you asked me, so can you break it down?
- Q. Sure. Okay. Of those religions that use entheogens, are there any where all of the members use the psychoactive substance, meaning from little kids up to highest priest, or however you want to phrase it?
- A. I don't know of any, but I don't know that there aren't.
- Q. So is there ordinarily a sort of rite of passage that people go through to be able to use the psychoactive substance to relate to the higher power, or God?
- A. I wouldn't say there's a single summary of that. I mean, it can vary. That may be the case. It may be just a matter of personal choice, so some members of the society or the community partake here or interact in that others don't.

 I -- and I can't say that there's a lot of information in the anthropological records to suggest what the answer to that is. But I know enough about different cultures to know it's very hard to come up with those kinds of summaries, conclusions.

1	Q. Would you find it unusual for a religion to give
2	psychoactive substances to small children, I mean,
3	three-four-year-old children?
4	A. I don't know of any that do.
5	MS. GOULD: Your Honor, may I approach the witness?
6	THE COURT: You may.
7	Q. I'm going to show you what I'm marking right now as
8	government's Exhibit Number 1.
9	(Government's Exhibit 1 was marked.)
10	MR. ROBERT: May I see the exhibit?
11	MS. GOULD: Oh, I'm sorry.
12	Q. (By Ms. Gould) Do you recognize that from having
13	been on their website, at all?
14	A. No, no, I haven't seen this before.
15	Q. That's a page from the Church of the Cognizance
16	website. And based on the text that's around it, it seems to,
17	and of course the picture, which seems to show small children,
18	seems to advocate the giving of marijuana to small children,
19	so.
20	MR. ROBERT: Is that a question?
21	Q. (By Ms. Gould) I'm just wondering if you had ever
22	seen anything like that before, or are aware of that with
23	regards to this religion?
24	A. No.
25	Q. Thank you. Doctor, would you say that most religions

address fundamental questions about the purpose of life, or death?

- A. The way people think about religion generally includes that. The notion of purpose of life and death does not -- I don't know that that's such that that is always a concern. It's more about the nature of life. And that may sound like a fine distinction.
- Q. But there is at least some sort of guidance to members of religions as to what a purpose may be or what happens when you die, that kind of thing?
- A. It's common, yes. Or more like, you know, what should, what's the nature of life and how does one live a good life, or how does one live in harmony with the ancestors, is often the concern. How does one live in harmony with spirit, because that's the good life.
- Q. And I think you've already really kind of said this with your last sentence, and even in your previous testimony, but do most religions embody the idea of a spirit and what happens to your spirit when you die?
- A. It's common, but not all cultures answer that. Not all cultures have much of a story around that, interestingly, I think. You know, I always thought that was kind of universal. But more readings, I found out that there were more cultures that don't necessarily think that there is much that happens after you die. I don't have much to tell you

about that.

- Q. Is there any sort of maybe overreaching idea that spirits are present amongst us or -- I don't even know how to ask it -- or guiding us in some way?
- A. Not only guiding, but again, this goes to the concept called animisim, A-N-I-M-I-S-M, in anthropology, which is the term used to refer to the fact that people universally understand the world to be imbued with spirit.
- Q. Do most religions believe that there is another time, place, mode or temperality that may be inhabited by spirits, souls, forces, deities, or other inchoate or intangible entities?
 - A. I'd say, again, commonly, yes.
- Q. Do most religions provide a particular way to act, or a way of life, that is, for lack of better words, moral or ethical?
- A. You know, interestingly, that one is not as universal as people often think. There's a, that moralistic code is not prevalent in many religions.
- Q. Would you say that that's the great majority or minority? Is there a way for you to split that up for us?
- A. I think of that -- I would say probably less common. See, the dilemma I have here is that when I think cross-culturally I'm thinking across thousands of different cultures, some of which may involve a few thousand people,

some of which may involve tens of thousands, and hundreds of thousands. And so there's that comparison, and then there's the question of numbers of people influenced by these various things. So, certainly, the major religions, like Christianity and Islam, and so on, involved and influenced many, many, many people, whereas some of the other practice religious or cultural groups that I think of may influence few. So I'd say probably the majority of religions have not carried a highly moralistic code in them. But the religions that do, have become major world religions and influence large numbers of people.

- Q. Now, do you think that many religions impose duties upon people, but not because of the religion, because it's deemed that a higher power or spirit requires them to set aside self-interest, thus imposing a duty?
- A. The question is, as I understand it, does the religion require them to set aside self-interest in order to serve the religious?
 - Q. Or the god, the spirit, the deity?
- A. Again, I don't know that the anthropological record would bear that out as a consistent feature.
- Q. Okay. Do you think that most sets of beliefs, I guess we could say in place of religion, provide people with the answers to many, if not the most, of the problems and concerns that confront humans on a daily basis?

- A. Where they are highly articulated belief systems, yes. The majority of human societies and human experience, I should say, has been small-scale forging groups that don't have a very articulated belief system, and people, in terms of religion, and so these things are negotiated culturally.
 - Q. Do most religions have what would be considered a teacher, a seer, or a prophet who is considered to be divine, enlightened, gifted or blessed?
 - A. Again I -- No, I'd say cross-culturally that's not a predominant feature. Only when you've used the word religion to refer to this highly sort of articulated and organized institution.
 - Q. Now, Doctor, let me ask you this. Is it your opinion that most religions in the world today don't have, aren't, as a result of say developed countries then, where people actually have writings or shrines and mosques, or an infrastructure?
 - A. Well, let me see. There are few indigenous peoples left living without the influence of Christianity or one of the other major religions. Does that go to your question?
 - Q. Yes.

A. But there are some. And there are people -- most people around the world have found ways to what we call synchrotize their indigenous ways with whatever has been imposed upon them, or introduced to them from the outside.

- Q. Would you say that most religions have gathering places? This doesn't necessarily need to be a building, such as a church, a mosque, a temple, a pyramid, synagogue or shrine, but also could include natural places such as springs, rivers, forest, plains, or mountains?
- A. What I would say is that for ritual to occur, it always occurs in a sacred place. It can be an ordinary, everyday place that's made sacred for the event.
- Q. Because of the nature of our discussion, I had a question regarding whether or not there were, in most religions, certain writings. Is it your opinion that there are lots of indigenous folks who didn't have writings so, therefore, they wouldn't have religious writings?
 - A. Correct.

- Q. Would you say that there are a number of non-indigenous religions that do have writings?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Would you put that category that has, that's not indigenous, in that most of them have writings or most of them do not have writings, category? Maybe this will help to think about it. Right now, in the world today, there are recognized around 5,000, as of distinct ethnolinguistic groups, distinct cultures, people. That's about half what it was probably a couple hundred years ago. So the societies that developed writing systems and that became large-scale state societies,

and meshed, and then began to expand and take over these indigenous peoples and bring their systems of writings and their beliefs, and so on, were much, much fewer than the society, the number of societies that did not offer it that way, or that were indigenous?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Today, I'd say that, you know, everywhere has been A. colonized and almost everywhere has been missionized, so the indigenous people are, their identity may still be, you know, of those 5,000, there still may be thousands of them that identify as in their indigenous culture. And they may have gone to school and learned to read and write and, you know, some of them converted to Christianity, and still practicing some of their ancient traditions, and so on. And so the -there's such a blending of that old, with the more recent, you know, what the anthropologists call civilizations, which just refers to societies that have writing systems and centralized bureaucratic governments, that you could, you could probably argue that most everyone in the world, with the exception of a few tribal, a few foraging groups and tribal groups in South America and in -- I'm trying to think how many you could count in Africa, a few, that aren't, those being some of the only ones that haven't been largely, you know, significantly influenced by Western thinking and writing, and so on. wander off the question too far?

Q. No. Thank you. Do most of the religions, and I

guess we'll just include everybody here, have people who lead others because they're enlightened, experienced, educated or trained within the religion or within the society in which they operate?

A. The most -- I keep trying to find a way to bring a huge conversation into a small answer. All cultures that we know of, through whatever time we can account for, have had people that were recognized to have a special ability and interest in working in the spirit realm, and mediating between the spirit realm and the material world. And the word that often gets used to refer to those people are shamans; okay. And that's, so that's been fairly universal, at least the way we define it now.

As societies became more complex, and I don't mean that just like, oh, people finally evolved to get more civilized, but where societies establish agriculture and began to create specialists that could do things other than get food and provide for their families, and so on, then you have this elaboration of religious specialists that we would call priests, and so on, that become the leaders of the community. They tend to become attached to particular sets of ideas and beliefs and become the church leader or the religious leader. And so they're very common now. And they're not the most common of -- their, the degree of leadership tends to depend on the degree of complexity of the society technologically and

in terms of social specialization. So many, many, many societies and, historically, most societies do not have full-time religious leaders, more and more developed that -- I may have lost where you wanted me to go with the question.

Q. I think you answered it. Thank you.

Now we talked a little bit about the gathering places, you know, the places where rituals always occur, usually in a sacred place; do most religions have ritual ceremonies, protocols, which may include statements, acts or movements that relate to the intake of the sacrament, whatever the sacrament may be?

- A. So you're saying, then, religions that use sacraments, --
 - O. Correct.

- A. -- do they have these kinds of specialized ceremonies?
 - Q. Correct.
- A. I would say it's -- you got to be careful about what we have in our minds when we say ceremony because it might not be a very elaborated ceremony. I think that the setting went on talking about it may be a large ritual that involved many people of the community and have very formalized procedures. It may also be as simple as healer with an individual and the, but having a special intention and way of taking a substance for its purpose.

Q. So would you feel safe in saying that ordinarily there will be a ritual, or some sort of protocol, not necessarily a formal ceremony, involved with the intake of sacrament where religions do that? Sacrament meaning, in this case, psychoactive substance?

- A. Again, I think the word sacrament only comes into play in certain kinds of religions; right. That notion of it has a, and that word to me is associated with a kind of formal, organized, institutional religion, and I, I think the word sacred substance is more generally applicable. And so then, so it's again important to not overimpose an idea of what ritual looks like. I hope you all don't regret inviting an anthropologist here, because I keep bringing up the question, now we can talk about what is ritual and, you know, does it have to, you know, what elements does something have to have in order to count as ritual, and it may be very simple indeed.
- Q. Would it be unusual for there not to be something like that incorporated with the entheogens?
- A. Well, I think the, you know, the intention is part of the ritual in a sense. When you are taking a substance for the intention of spiritual enlightenment and healing, that's part of how the ritual setting. And the level of elaboration of ritual, I think, cross-culturally tends to vary depending on the nature of the substance. So that when you're talking

about peyote or ayahuasca, that tends to entail highly hallucinogenic experience, those circumstances tend to be more controlled because there's more risk associated with them.

Madness and death are possible.

So the leaders, the elders, the shamans, the ones with more experience, create the setting to make it safe for people to have their own experience of the spirits and their own spiritual growth and healing. The other substances, I think, are less dangerous and, therefore, may entail less elaborated rituals.

You know, when the Peruvian farmers are chewing the coca leaf and spitting out the spray to the spirits, that's not a highly constructed situation, it's not a very dangerous one.

- Q. This might be more helpful. In doing this experiencing of the entheogens, is it usually associated with some sort of holy, sacred or important day, for instance, or a harvesting ceremony, or a particular week or month?
- A. No, not necessarily. It might be. You know, there might be important dates or seasonal events, and so on, that are marked, but it might be a daily thing. It might be a frequent thing.
- Q. Going back to talking about the highly hallucinogenic use of ayahuasca, and peyote, you had mentioned in your earlier testimony that ordinarily there are, people that are

using that are supervised or counseled by a sort of teacher, 1 2 3 4 A. 5 6 experienced. 7 Q. 8 9 10 Α. 11. things, are very quite common. 12 13 Q. 14 speaking, is also may be their society? 15 16 Α. 17 religions, people are, you know, identified through their 18 clothing. But that, I wouldn't say it's the more common 19 20 across cultures.

or I'm not sure what the phrase was that you used, so that they may not lose their way; is that a common being? Yeah, I would say that you would not want to go into this realm without some guidance from someone more Do you find that it's common amongst people and their religions that certain foods may be prohibited, or certain liquids on certain days, during certain times? It's not uncommon, and I wouldn't even attach that to religion per se. Culturally prescribed food and drink, Is it common for people to wear certain clothing that may be prescribed by their religion, which on the level we're Where clothing exists it is -- I mean it is not, it's not uncommon that for highly elaborated institutional

- Would you say that it's a popular concept to attempt Q. to convert others to your own views and persuade others of how correct they are?
 - Essentially it's fairly Α.

21

22

23

24

25

uncommon cross-culturally. It's is really particular to the,

particular to the proselytizing religions of Christianity and Islam. Even the other major religions such as Buddhism and Judaism, and so on, don't really proselytize and try to convert. In other cultures, indigenous cultures, very much understand their ways to be their ways and they really aren't very concerned with trying to convert other people to them.

1.6

- Q. Could that be, though, because they're so isolated, I mean really amongst themselves?
- A. No. I think because most people haven't been very isolated for thousands of years and they're very much in contact with people around them. And they very much understand themselves as culturally distinct from people around them, they're not trying to convert from the people around there.
- Q. In light of our discussion -- this is a hard question to phrase but I'll try. We've been talking about the use of all of these different entheogens, and entheogens in relation to different religions cross-culturally around the world, and although most of these things work for most cultures, those cultures still have rules in place to control the situation, do they not?
- A. Generally, I'd say, yeah, what comes to my mind immediately is the Yanomamo and how habitually they use ebene, E-B-E-N-E. And Rastafarians are quite, the role of their use of marijuana, it's understood to be healing. I guess what I

want to say is, there's variability on the level of control of it or the specificity of its use.

- Q. I guess to broaden the question maybe just a little bit, are there usually dictates by the societies in which these religions operate that proscribe certain behavior on one level or another?
- A. Well, there -- all cultures have, by definition, they have notions of how you should behave, and norms of behavior, and values, and so on; so in general, yes.
- Q. Okay. Do you find that those norms and values are often associated with a religion on some level?
- A. Often the way we understand those things, as we call that part of their religion.
 - Q. Okay.

- A. And I think one of the things that's come to mind as you're asking about this, is that the concern about the use of plants or psychoactive substances, I think, is different. If there is concern, it's concern about honoring the sacredness and not, not losing the value of what it has to offer rather than a control of fear, you know, a kind of -- we don't want people to have this or have access to this, it's not about rules out of fear about what people are going to do, it's more of any rules or mores of behavior around it are more out of respect.
 - Q. Somebody told me the other day about a myth related

to a certain monster in South Texas when they grew up, thinking that this monster would sometimes land on top of your house, and had big wings, and could snatch babies out of your hands. Looking at myths, and other such things as that, do you think that those things are often created over time to control the behavior of people who live in those areas?

- A. That's not the way I understand myth. When I talk about myth, I'm talking about the stories that people tell that explain who they are and how things came to be. And they're considered sacred stories, and they are, they come from the source, whatever way that culture understands that and describes it in their myth of the stories. And if you look at a set of myths in a culture, there are going to be stories that sort of describe how you should act and what you shouldn't be doing, and so on, but I don't think of it as these stories were created to control the way people behave. I think the way people understand and experience their stories is, these are the stories that have been passed to us because they're truth for us.
- Q. Okay. Let me see if I can put this a different way. Every society, though, has rules and laws that people are expected to follow; correct?
- A. Well, I wouldn't use the word laws, I think that's particular kinds of societies; they have norms.
 - Q. Okay, norms. And people are expected to follow by

1.3

those norms; right?

- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And if they don't there may be consequences to those actions; correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Now you earlier stated, in direct examination, that you had studied interpretations that said that marijuana has a role in the Bible, and I just wanted to ask you what the source is for your statement that that's true.
- A. Let me see, I can't remember if I included that in my report. This may be something I read after I had written this, because I was really concerned to find credible sources there and not just some of the general kinds of claims made. And it's not in this bibliography. I know I was reading a piece from a, I think I might have it here, a professor from a university. Carl Rock, from Boston University, is one source that has argued that the linguistic evidence supports the use of cannabis.
- Q. Now is he using other sources upon which he's relying that you would find to be credible sources?
 - A. I don't have all of that data.
 - Q. Okay.

MS. GOULD: May I have a minute, Your Honor?

THE COURT: You may.

MS. GOULD: Your Honor, at this time the government

would move to admit its Exhibit Number 1 into evidence. And we're done with our questioning for the time being.

THE COURT: Your response, Mr. Robert, to government's Exhibit Number 1.

MR. ROBERT: Well, this photograph is not representative of the practice of Mr. Quaintance and his Church of Cognizance. I'm told that this photograph comes from a fellow in Hawaii, who is also what they call EC or enlightened cognizanti, and who is affiliated with the Church of Cognizance. I'm further told that this photograph is not a picture of anything that happened at any kind of a Church of Cognizance event. It does appear on the website, and so to the extent that it doesn't represent what happens with the Church of Cognizance, I have to object as to its being irrelevant.

Why Mr. Jeffries put it on the website, I can't begin to say, but it is there, so, you know, I can see arguments both ways. But I object to it. It's not relevant and it's certainly not relevant as to what Danuel and Mary Quaintance do in their religious practice.

The other picture is a photograph of the plant and it says "Give thanks and praises for the earth," I don't have any objection to that.

THE COURT: Your response, Miss Gould.

MS. GOULD: Yes, Your Honor. We got this picture by

following a link out of the Quaintances' website. It's a church that proclaims also to be a branch of the Church of the Cognizance. And so if it's linked to their website, it leads the viewer to believe that this is, indeed, part of what they proclaim and part of what they believe. I believe it should be allowed as relevant evidence to show that they have this on their website. I mean, if they're going to now say that they don't support children of this age smoking marijuana, they might want to reconsider what links they have on their website and what brother, sister churches they have that are linked to their website, Your Honor. It's on there and it's clearly linked.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this, Miss Gould; is there any problem that you see with the fact that the witness that you tendered this through had no knowledge of the exhibit?

MS. GOULD: Your Honor, we can always offer it again later if it's necessary, if the Court finds that we don't have a big enough foundation at this point.

THE COURT: Why don't you do that, because I don't think the foundation has been laid?

MS. GOULD: Okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: Anything further?

MR. ROBERT: A little redirect, Your Honor.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROBERT:

Q. Doctor, you referred a little bit during your testimony on cross-examination to synchrotism; what is that?

- A. Well, it's a term that we use in anthropology to refer to the combining of a religious practice or beliefs between two or more traditions. So vodou in Haiti, for instance, is considered a synchrotic religion, it's a combination of African vodou traditions with Cathologism.
- Q. If a person studying diligently. Various religious traditions, decides that there's a piece of Catholocism that he likes, and a piece of vodouism that he likes, and a piece of Sufi that he likes, and a little bit of Zoroastrism, first of all, would that be within the definition of synchrotic that you just discussed now?
- A. Yes, and not unlike what a lot of people, at least in California are doing. I mean, this is kind of the New Age, this is, when I talk about new religious movements and religion and change in my courses, this is what we talk about. A lot that people are, you know, this is part of this post modern world we live in where we are not bound to a tradition we grew up in and we're able to, you know, choose things that we think make sense. And, I mean, we, in general, it's an option available. And many Americans are doing that. Books have been written on this as the character of American religiosity today.
 - Q. That's interesting, because one of the things that

you and Miss Gould talked about on cross-examination is this sort of cultural disconnect and the notion that, well, gosh you're an American, you need to have an American religion kind of thing. And you mentioned California; of course, you're from there, and you're from the Bay Area, I think?

A. Yes.

- Q. And how uncommon is it in California, or anywhere else in this country, for Americans to adopt Eastern religious traditions, for example?
- A. It's very common. It's very common, and I can't give you numbers, I didn't pull just some data on that for today. But I certainly, I mean it's not uncommon across the U.S., it's not just a phenomena of California, that people would like to make those stories. But we've got, you know, we've got ashrams all over the country, and Buddhist mediation centers all over the country. There are, I think it's quite common. And often people are doing just what you said, finding the elements that speak to them from one or more traditions and creating their own practice.
- Q. If a person were to do that, let's say in the aspect of Catholocism, again, using that example, and then several other things, as I mentioned, and this is synchrotized into a new sort of spiritual framework for the individual that's done it; first of all, would you consider it to be a religion?
 - A. I would consider it to be their spiritual -- this is

where the word religion gets a little problematic to me -- but, yes, it would certainly be a legitimate spiritual practice.

- Q. And how do you suppose the orthodox, if that's too loaded of a word probably, but the conventional practicing Catholic would view this sort of --
 - A. That's harassing, probably.

.3

- Q. You talked a little bit about, actually in various contexts with Miss Gould, about the notions of formality in different ways. And then you talked, in part, about the notion of formality in a setting, for instance, sacramental setting, and she asked you questions about, you know, isn't it common for religions to be, most religions, I think was the phrase that she used, to have a sort of a sacred formal setting before the consumption of sacramental substances. Are there religions for which such formality in place is not required?
- A. Yeah, I -- What do you mean, formality in terms of the way it's done?
- Q. Well, for example, I mean, you were probably raised in a fairly conventional, I think we talked about this, a conventional Christian upbringing, as was I, where communion was on, at a certain point during the mass, at a certain place, with the invocation of certain words.
 - A. Uh-huh.

And I guess my question is, it sort of relates to the 1 Ο. question that you discussed with Miss Gould, are there 2 religions in which such formality, and place, and ritual, are 3 not part of the sacramental process? 4 5 Α. Yes. And I think you talked a little bit, in your response Q. to Miss Gould, about the notion of intention in that 7 8 connection?

A. Uh-huh.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. In the context of, for want of a better phrase, the requisite formality for sacramental practice. Can you tell me what you mean by the word intention in that context?
- A. Well, I think it's the simple notion that what one's intention is will affect what happens. So if I want to get high and have fun, that's one intention. If I wanted to attain spiritual insight, that's a different intention. And so having the intention of spiritual insight or spiritual communion with healing, all of the above, is the, is the way scholars have understood what characterizes the spiritual use of psychoactive substances.
- Q. In your conversation with Miss Gould you also talked about the notion of the entheogenic plant as teacher?
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. I think we also talked about that a little bit on direct examination. Is -- and you also said, I'm trying to

pull together a couple of threads that you discussed on cross, and one of them was, in addition to that, the notion that it is actually sort of unusual among, across the spectrum of religions, for proselytation to be present?

A. Uh-huh.

- Q. Where, where an entheogen is considered to be a teacher?
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Would it be weird or unusual for the practitioner of that religion to espouse its use by others for the purpose of attaining a heightened spiritual awareness?
 - A. No.
- Q. One of the things you just said was, "If I wanted to get high, just to have fun, that's one thing. If I'm doing it sacramentally, that's another." Is it possible for a person to go into that kind of an event with one intention and come out of it with another?
- A. I'm convinced of that now, yes. When I started working in this area I felt that those were really clear, separate intentions and experiences. And I really feel that I've gathered a fair amount of data over the last seven years to convince me that that's very common.
- Q. In fact, are there -- what parallels can you think of in a more conventional religious setting to that sort of a thing, nothing entheogenic, comparable?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Right; to say that some experience you were having Α. suddenly became spiritual?

Q. Yes.

Well, I think that that happens for people sometimes Α. when they're out in nature, when they're out in the natural world and they have, that they have what they can come back and call a spiritual experience and it can change their life. I think it can happen in relationships sometimes. And I, of course, you know, people become converted all the time, I mean they can be at a church or a, I don't know, one of these, like Billy Graham rallies, or something like that, and then be moved to go up to the stage and be saved. considered a legitimate conversion and experience that may not have been their intention when they went there. They might have been curious, that's why they went. So I think that profound experiences of unity are what people understand as a spiritual experience. And I think that happens to people out on the mountain top as well as with a substance such as cannabis.

- Ο. Or a church?
- Α. Or a church.
- Q. Just to clarify a couple of things that you and Miss Gould discussed. Are there religious traditions that don't concern themselves with where, what happens to your spiritual essence when you die?

A. Yes.

- Q. And a sort of a related question when she talked about other --
- A. Can I correct that statement? I think it would be more accurate to say there are cultures that do not have a religious explanation for what happens to you when you die.
- Q. In those cultures are there religious traditions? Actually, I think you said all cultures have some kind of religious tradition.
 - A. Well, if you're using the term broadly, yeah.
- Q. Well, I guess the question then comes back to what Miss Gould asked you, which is, is it -- I can't remember the phrase that she used -- either is it common, or in most religions, have a theology which includes a description of where a person's spiritual essence goes once their mortal remains are?
- A. I think it's common that society's cultures address that.
 - Q. Do all religions?
 - A. No, they don't.
- Q. Do all religions believe or manifest a belief in a place, for instance, heaven, hell, purgatory?
 - A. No, not at all.
- Q. You and Miss Gould discussed the notion of writings within a religious tradition. Obviously, in the Christian

tradition the Bible, and various other writings, are reported. Similarly, with Judaism and Islam, there are central writings. Is it necessary for a thing to be called a religion to have its own set of writings?

- A. Not to me, not from the point of view of anthropology, not at all.
- Q. And returning to the notion of synchrotic processes, are there religions that borrow writings from other religious traditions?
 - A. That borrow writings?
 - Q. Yes, as part of their own tradition.
 - A. Certainly.

- Q. One of the things that Miss Gould asked you about related to the strictures that society imposes on the practices of religion, and I think in particular the point of her question was the entheogenic practice of religions; could you talk a little bit about that as far as how common is it for a society, a civil society, to put restrictions on a religious practice that includes the use of cannabis, for example?
- A. When you say civil society, what are you referring to?
 - Q. Government.
- A. How common is it for a government to impose restrictions on the use of psychoactive substances?

Q. That's, obviously goes without saying, here. That's why we're in this room.

A. Well, yeah, I think that it's fairly recent. When you use the word government, that means a very specific kind of thing. In anthropology it refers to a society that has a centralized system of power and control over the society. And those societies have existed for about the last 5,000 years. And not all societies have existed that way. Tribal societies — I hope this isn't too much of a digression — the process that's going on in Afghanistan right now is an example of the effort to get the state in control of what are really indigenous tribal entities that do not historically succumb to an external centralized power; okay.

The Maya state was, used entheogens as part of the indigenous, as part of the central part of their religious practices spiritual of the culture. So that state didn't impose restrictions. I don't know exactly whether there were restrictions on who participates, and when and in what ways, but there were certainly a recognition of the power, you know, in the state. And it was a, it was a religious state.

I think that, you know, what I'm trying to say is that most cultures that use these substances have existed prior to or outside of state organizations. Where the state begins to amass control over large numbers of people that, it may have distinct traditions, I think is when you begin to see

this kind of control over the religion and the practice.

- Q. It occurs to me, though, I asked the wrong question, but you answered the right one. It seems to me that the right question is, well, can you say, well, over what period of time does the anthropological record, or the archeaological record, or I guess the two have to correspond in some ways, demonstrate the use of psychoactive substances in religious practice, 2,000, 5,000, 20,000 years?
- A. We're talking thousands of years. I'm just wary of giving a precise number.
- Q. That's fine, and I'm not looking for one. So thousands of years. And I guess the real question should have been, how recently dud those things start to become prohibited?
- A. I mean, so many substances that are prohibited now in the U.S. were only prohibited in the 1970's. I mean these substances are considered sacred most elsewhere. So I don't know the history in Europe as to when prohibition on some of these substances occurred, and so on. I think that it's a quite recent, it has to be post-Reformation, you can consider it, and maybe it's part of the whole Reformation process. I'm sorry, not Reformation, the, what am I referring to here, the Renaissance, the, you know, the period of the witch burnings, the persecution of any non-Christian, any non -- you know, when the definition of what is counting as Christian began to

eliminate anything not considered doctrine in Europe.

- Q. You said that you had had only an opportunity to talk with Mr. Quaintance over lunch?
 - A. Very briefly.

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

- Q. Did you talk with him at all about things of interest to anthropology, of the anthropology of religion?
- A. Just got a little. He told me a little bit about the, what he learned about the healing aspect of the seeds of cannabis.
- Q. Based on your own research, did he seem to know what he was talking about?
- A. Yes. There are areas of this that I would consider him more scholarly informed than I am, because he's been focusing on that particular area. And as an anthropologist, I'm always working across many different topics and trying to encompass this global understanding, so I can't specialize in everything. I think he's extremely knowledgeable in these areas.
 - Q. All right. Thank you.
 - THE COURT: I take it you have re-cross?
 - MS. GOULD: Yes, I do.
 - THE COURT: Very briefly.
- MS. GOULD: Thank you. Actually I can cover it in
 - just one question.
 - THE COURT: All right.

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. GOULD:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Doctor, would you say that when somebody proclaims to be a Christian, whether they're a Methodist, a Lutheran, a Catholic, an Apostle, Baptist, when somebody says they're a Christian, at the very root of that, you would understand that they follow the teachings of Christ; is that right?
- A. I understand that to be the meaning of the word Christian. I don't know, however, individual --
- Q. If somebody comes up to you and they say, "I am a Christian," in your mind, as an anthropologist, that means that they follow the tenants and teachings of Christ; is that right?
 - A. That they're claiming that they do, yes.

MS. GOULD: Okay. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Can I just say a word to the Court?

THE COURT: Well, I don't think so, not at this

point.

May this witness be excused?

MR. ROBERT: I'm inclined to try, since I should get the last word, to ask a question to elicit the last --

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. ROBERT: With the Court's permission.

FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROBERT:

- Q. Is there anything, briefly, that you didn't have an opportunity to finish your response to the last question?
- A. No, I think that I just wanted to say that these questions are challenging in that they involve trying to summarize a very diverse, very, a very diverse group of societies. So when you're trying to characterize what's true about the human species is very challenging. So I hope that the answers have been, I've tried to make them clear and not at all ambiguous. But I know that's part of the nature of my profession.
- Q. Let me ask you one thing about the one question that Miss Gould asked you. Is it the case, in the universe of possibilities and the way people live their lives, that, for somebody to claim to be a Christian, which ideally would mean somebody that follows the teachings of Christ, who, by all outward appearances, does not do so?
 - A. There is no question in my mind about that.

MR. ROBERT: Thank you. The witness can be excused.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you for your testimony today Dr. Pruitt. It's certainly something we don't hear in this courtroom every day. Thank you.

All right, you may call your next witness.

MR. ROBERT: Richard Mack. I will go get him.

MR. MARTINEZ: Your Honor, I don't know who Richard Mack is. We weren't told who Richard Mack or what--