

THE CAUSE OF VARIOUS PSYCHOSES

In the following analysis, for psychosis to be in effect, id domination would prevail.*

Bipolar disorder- An individual experiences a deep rooted problem (or possibly a combination of problems) which induces a substantial level of depression. For those who are ego dominated, they attempt to solve the problem, or failing that, find a means of contending with the depression which is induced by the problem(s). However, if the id dominates, on an unconscious level there would be another way of contending with this intense and deep rooted depression which would unfortunately culminate in the psychosis of bipolar disorder.

A superficial analogy to elucidate upon the “mechanism” that will momentarily be described is as follows. On an unconscious level, what is one primary means of dealing with anxiety? The implementation of defence mechanisms. Although this does *not* constitute any form of psychosis, the *reality* of the world is being slightly altered in order to reduce anxiety and more effectively contend with this anxiety. In regards to bipolar disorder, deep rooted anxiety is contended with by proceeding to the other end of the extreme. What the *precise and exact* means entail is unknown. Perhaps a temporary rationalization is introduced which indicates that the source of anxiety will eventually be worked out. If this were the case, they would then feel an intense sense of euphoria which would obviously be contrary to their prior sense of depression. However, this mechanism would constitute a manifestation of the unconscious mind in a similar way that regression, projection, or repression are unconscious manifestations. Although, euphoria is induced, eventually the reality of their situation is once again realized and they revert to their state of intense depression. If this overall “mechanism” was continuously in effect, their emotional condition would be in a state of flux.

Split/multiple personality- The initial stages of this psychosis would be an individual in their daily life realizing the *genuine* need to “wear two hats”. A hypothetical scenario will serve to illustrate. Let’s assume there is a woman who is working in a male dominated field. Her male co-workers constantly patronize her and refuse to give her any measure of professional respect. Eventually, she comes to the realization that the only way to contend with this is to develop an acerbic, abrasive, and emotionally tough stance in her dealings at work. This idea becomes thoroughly ingrained in her. However, she also has a child at home who is suffering from some type of behavioural disorder. She has been instructed that in order to effectively deal with this child, she must always remain calm, gentle, and tender, even if the child seems to be getting completely out of hand. Since she is concerned with being a good mother, she knows the need to make these qualities an integral part of her behaviour at home. Therefore, she is forced to “wear two hats”. Therefore, an *integral part of her psychological makeup* is to behave in two distinct and diverse ways. Given the provision that she is ego dominated, there shouldn’t be any problems with her overall mental health. However, if the id were to prevail, and she experienced some type of extreme stress, various personalities may “emerge” in her behaviour. This is simply because the concept of behaving in distinct and separate ways is *already* an integral part of her psychological make-up. However, I would be oblivious as to what factor would establish the precise *nature* of the various emerging personalities.

* The id is a psychiatric term which the interested lay reader will have to find the meaning to in a psychiatric text.

Audio/visual hallucinations- Within the sphere of the unconscious, there exists “thoughts and concepts” (or whatever label a psychiatrist or psychoanalyst wishes to apply to that which exists within the unconscious) which are *completely and entirely* unacceptable if they were to “find a foothold” (in a manner of speaking) *anywhere* within the domain of the conscious mind. Ego domination will prevent such an occurrence. However, id domination will not. It is with this particular psychosis that in conjunction with the id and ego playing their role, the superego would also come into play. Depending on the nature of these “thoughts and concepts” even id domination will not suffice to have them enter the realm of conscious thought as the superego will counteract the id. However, if the “thoughts and concepts” strongly exist, they will find expression. The superego will not allow them to exist as “normal” thoughts within the parameters of conscious thinking, but they will find expression via visual, or audio hallucinations. Whether it is an audio or visual hallucination would probably be contingent upon the exact nature of the “thought/concept”. An example may serve to illustrate. (If you are a Mormon who happens to be reading this, please stop reading now. Furthermore, if Mormons learn of what I am about to write, I hope you will accept my apologies for offending you. This is not my intent. At the same time, I cannot halt the progress of science merely to refrain from causing offence. Furthermore, although I will fully respect your right to believe, hopefully you will respect my right not to believe.)

The founder of the Mormon religion claims that Jesus appeared to him and told him to found a new religion. The “thought” would have existed on an unconscious level that he was so special that it was up to him to found a new religion. However, the superego would not allow such an “arrogant and conceited” thought to exist within the domain of conscious thought. Furthermore, a purely audio hallucination would not have sufficed to cause him to believe that Jesus was speaking to him. Since this “thought” was overwhelmingly strong, it found expression via a visual/audio hallucination. Specifically, the id will “allow” the “thought” to exist on an unconscious level, but the superego will not “allow” the “thought” to find expression in the conscious mind.

Delusions of grandeur- The underlying basis of this psychosis is *extremely* low self esteem. At some stage, the feelings engendered by the magnitude of low self esteem become so intense, that a *special type* of mechanism becomes established (for those who lack ego domination). The individual believes himself to be some prominent person from history. The person whom he believes himself to be would be someone whom he personally admires (in one respect or another). If he believes himself to be this person, this would be a type of defence mechanism for contending with the intense anxiety from his low self esteem. (This defence mechanism should not be confused with projection, reaction formation, etc. The latter are “normal” mechanisms which everybody experiences. The former is not.)

Paranoia- In some facet of a person’s life, there may be the *genuine* feeling that people are out to “get him” (in one respect or another) which is based in *actual fact* (not a delusion). As an example, there may be an employee who is *naturally* incompetent, yet suffers from a disability. Management wishes to fire him, yet they are apprehensive about a law suit stemming from his disability. In their minds, they are striving to ascertain the best means of dismissing him. In one respect or another, the employee becomes cognizant of this. When he enters a room, managers

suddenly stop talking, they won't invite him to a business lunch, he's given tasks which are designed to cause him to fail, etc. This person has a *genuine* belief that (some) others are out to get him (assuming he's unaware of his own incompetence). If he focuses on this belief and it becomes too strong, the belief may be extended to everyone when the id prevails.

Obsessive compulsive disorder- This does not fall within the parameters of psychosis, but rather neurosis. The underlying cause is an inappropriate psychological fixation on "something". The individual focuses on the *consequences* of failing to do something. The possibility of these consequences actually becoming a reality are so hideous, that there is an overwhelming compulsion to repeat an act over and over and over. *Focusing* (with some generous "assistance" from the id) on the idea of germs causing a serious infection induces a repetitive and unending washing of the hands. If one once heard a thud while driving, one eventually focuses on the hideous thought that someone was run over. Therefore, one *constantly* stops to check for the possibility. Furthermore, since this idea has become psychologically *entrenched*, the behaviour is continuous and unending, regardless of how many times it becomes evident that no one was run over.

Autism- Although I have written a paper on (what I believe to be) the cause and cure for autism, I don't intend to include my work here. The explanation is as follows.

For a period of time, I implemented a concerted effort to disseminate the scientific (that is, physical science) information on my web site to the scientific community. However, after 800 e-mails, there was virtually no response. When I learned of C.A.N. (Cure Autism Now), I sent a very brief e-mail via their web site stating that I had developed a theory as to the cause and a cure of/for autism. I stated that although I did not want any money from their organization, I would discuss under what conditions I would release the information with somebody from their organization. The next day, I received an e-mail from a particular person at their organization expressing an interest in my proposal. I then sent a very long e-mail explaining the extreme difficulties in publishing *certain types* of scientific material. I further explained what I had done with my web site pertaining to physical science and the complete lack of response. I then stated the following. I would re-open my web site (I had taken it down at the time I e-mailed them as I was spending my money for nothing) and I would include my theory pertaining to autism. Furthermore, I was explicit in that I did not want one penny from their organization. However, if I was to spend my own money to re-open my site, I wanted an assurance from more than one person at their organization that my work would be read. Therefore, I was not asking for any money. The *sole singular* thing I asked for, was an assurance that my work would be read. They never answered me.

If I had a child who was suffering from some disease and I met someone who asked me for money in order to provide a cure, I would be naturally suspicious. However, if they (a) explained the difficulty in publishing certain types of scientific material; (b) told me of the complete lack of response about their other work; (c) was explicit in not wanting money from me but *only* asking for an assurance that the work would be read, they would, beyond any doubt, receive that. Yet, for whatever "mysterious" reason, they never answered me.

The situation became even worse some time after that. I finally wrote up my paper and put it on this web site. I then E-mailed various autism organizations about it. At every stage, I

was explicit that I was not asking for any money. Despite this, there was never any interest in my work.

Since this is the view of autism organization, they can procure a cure from whatever source they deem to be “viable”. Here is the E-mail I sent to Cure Autism Now.

To: (name deleted)@cureautismnow.org

Subject: A theory which would be of interest to your organization.

Ms.(name deleted),

I have a theory of what causes autism as well as postulating a cure for the disorder. I am fully cognizant of the fact that you are immediately suspicious of me and/or my possible motivations. In your mind, if I have such a theory why not send it to a journal?

The succinct answer to this question is as follows. With certain types of scientific material, publication is phenomenally difficult. Consequently, it is imperative that you find the right “venue” for the dissemination of your work. Instead of providing a lengthy argument to substantiate this, I shall provide some tangible examples from the history of science and why these examples are germane to my work (i.e. the difficulty in publishing).

1. In 1964, a physicist by the name of George Zweig attempted to publish a physics theory. However, despite his concerted efforts, he could not sufficiently placate the referee. In the end, he was never published. However, that’s not where opposition to him ended. He once applied for a faculty position. A major and well respected speaker for theoretical physics single handedly blocked his appointment claiming that his theory was the work of a charlatan. Today, this theory is so rudimentary that it is taught to first year physics students. However, in 1964, it was too new, different, and radical to be published.

There is a correlating factor with my theory of autism. It specifically pertains to the cure. Within psychiatry, there are three primary methods of treating psychological disorders. Psychotherapy, behaviour therapy, and approaching a psychological disorder from a biological perspective. Almost all psychiatrists within the community would ask, which one of these approaches does your cure conform to? It doesn’t conform to any of them. Therefore my theory is unorthodox and would encounter resistance. (To further illustrate this, keep the following in mind. Freud was the founder of psychoanalysis. His first book on the subject was The Interpretation of Dreams. The initial printing was a meager 600 copies. It took eight years to sell those initial 600 copies.)

What the psychiatric community would not wish to give due consideration to is the following. Autism is a very unique disorder. Therefore, the efficacy of existing therapeutic techniques would be close to zero. Even with the administration of drugs, they must first be tested to ensure that they’re safe for humans. Drug trials are initiated upon animals. Is there such a thing as an autistic animal? Obviously not. Therefore, we will require a very unique approach to cure autism. However, it is doubtful that many within the mental health community (and this certainly includes the referee of a psychiatric journal) would wish to give due consideration to this fact. This is one reason why my work would never be published.

2. Many years ago, my high school teacher told me the following story. A friend of his was doing his Ph.D. in geography with a specialization in how a flowing river erodes the land. He

implemented one year of direct research in Australia. One of the members of his examining committee was the world's leading expert in this area. The candidate's research contradicted what had been published in text books for twenty years and the expert's own conclusions. They wouldn't grant him his Ph.D. despite the fact that he implemented direct research.

Regrettably, in science ego can potentially take precedence over good science. Autism may be like cancer (in relation to researchers). Although nobody else has a cure, there may be prominent people within the field. In my theory of the cause, I have postulated a psychological cause, not a biological cause. If a prominent researcher has attained a reputation by pursuing a research agenda of a biological cause, this would bias the objective viewing of my own theory from those within the psychiatric community. Furthermore, the prominent individual may attempt to impede the dissemination of my work, merely because of ego and/or a desire to perpetuate his own research funding.

There are other reasons why my theory would never be published. Firstly, right off the bat, it simply sounds too good to be true. In science, we do not develop complete answers overnight. It requires years of painstaking research to make progress at tiny increments of time. My paper would be called The Cause and Cure of/for Autism. If someone could conclusively identify the cause of autism, this, unto itself would be a phenomenal breakthrough. But to come up with a cure as well simply sounds too good. It would automatically be dismissed as crackpot as this seemingly contradicts the "methodology" of science. Secondly, nobody has heard of me as I have not published anything as of yet. Thirdly, if I were to send my material to a journal, the return address would be my home address, not a research institution since I am not affiliated with an institution. Any one of these factors (outlined in this paragraph) would be sufficient to make publication phenomenally difficult. All of them combined render publication a virtual impossibility.

You yourself may be concerned about what I stated in the last paragraph. Therefore, let me tell you about some truthful historical precedence. At the beginning of the twentieth century, there was a man who published a theory of his. This paper single handedly revolutionized his field. Secondly, nobody had previously heard of him prior to this paper. Thirdly, he had no institutional affiliation as he was working as a patent clerk at the time of his publication. Do you know who this man was? Albert Einstein.

Although I do not mean to be so conceited as to compare myself to Einstein, keep the following in mind. Even though my work may sound too good to be true, it is possible that someone like myself could single handedly give your organization what you have been seeking. In other words, although (from an objective perspective) what I'm telling you may sound too good to be true, Einstein showed that it is possible. The question is, will you be open minded enough to give my work a fair chance? (The psychiatric community certainly won't.)

Finally, there is a third impediment towards publication which does not exist in any other field. There are difference (sic) among psychology, psychiatry, and psychoanalysis. On this point, all I will state about my theory is the following. A psychologist will never agree with it because of his theoretical perspective. An open minded psychiatrist would be required to effectively assess it.

As I stated in my initial E-mail to you, I don't require a single penny from your organization. In order to explain what I would like to do, here is a modicum of background about me.

Last year, I opened up my own web site comprised of scientific theories that I've developed in the physical sciences. For the various reasons previously cited, it had no chance of being published within the journals. In the end I sent out 600 E-mails to professors at various universities about my work. They all ignored it since they won't touch anything that doesn't come through the journals. What frustrated me the most, was that some of my work had direct importance to some of the scientists' research, and they still ignored it. Finally, I took my web site down as I was unnecessarily paying money to keep it up.

I will be happy to spend my own money to reopen my web site. Only this time, I will include my paper on autism. What I require from you is the following. What assurance do I have that my work will be read and given due consideration by your organization? I don't intend to throw my own money away if you, like everybody else, simply intend to ignore my work because it's not coming through the journals. Furthermore, I don't think it's feasible for me to simply E-mail (or send it through the regular mail) to you for its dissemination. This is for the simple reason that others throughout the country (or world) should be able to easily view it if it is viewed as meritorious. This is most easily done via the web.

This E-mail can be brought down to the following points.

1. I have a theory of/for the cure autism. (sic)
2. For the reasons outlined, it will never be published.
3. I will reopen my web site with this paper on it. Furthermore, I will write the paper in such a manner that it is comprehensible to the layman (or more specifically the people within your organization). It will not require a psychiatrist to read and comprehend it. However, I will not throw my own money away if your organization will ignore me the way every other scientist did.

Therefore, I am requesting that more than one official from your organization convince me that my theory will be read and that the financial expenditure for my web site will not be in complete vain.

Sincerely,
(name deleted)

P.S. I would like to offer this word of caution if, for some reason, you decide to ignore this. Another scientist heard about one of my theories in the physical sciences. Within a short period of time, he recognized that if it could hold up to scrutiny, it would constitute a revolution for its field. He then informed me of the following. Somebody wrote (either a paper or book) in which he concluded that contemporary scientific journals are not designed for revolutions. They're designed for various scientists to make incremental progress over a period of time. If you decide to ignore me, my theory will never see the light of day as I have never attempted to work through the journals (it has no chance of being published for the various reasons outlined).

As already stated, C.A.N completely ignored this E-mail and never answered me.

The following has absolutely nothing to do with this paper (or for that matter, psychiatry). However, given the fact that I have written my position on what I will *not* do as a

result of the response (or lack thereof), I will take this opportunity to state what else I will not do within science given the lack of a response. The following is exclusively meant for those within the physical sciences.

If a “miracle” finally transpires and my work in the physical sciences is finally recognized by the scientific community, many physicists and astronomers will presumably wish to engage me in an intense discourse pertaining to various aspects of my work. However, when I was E-mailing you about my work, you all ignored me. Therefore, there is no reason why I should proceed to converse with any of you now.

My position in not working through the journals was fully justified. In the physical sciences, the most important theory (in my opinion) at this web site is the origins of the universe. However, it’s unpublishable for two reasons. Firstly, it’s too unorthodox. Secondly (and far more importantly), it is not a “self contained” theory. This is because there is a serious anomaly pertaining to gravity. My theory of gravity is *completely* unpublishable (even though this theory holds the solution to the missing matter) as it is even *more* unorthodox than my cosmological theory. The most viable way of inducing serious consideration of my work pertaining to gravity is to overturn the Heisenberg uncertainty principle, thereby compelling the scientific community to seek alternatives to quantum field theory. However, even my analysis of the Heisenberg uncertainty principle is unpublishable as the overturning of this principle would precipitate the single greatest crisis in the history of physics (too much of contemporary physics *relies* on the Heisenberg uncertainty principle). Even my analysis of special relativity would never be published. How many referees are amenable to the possibility that special relativity is not 100% correct and in need of some degree of modification?

The failure of the refereeing process can (somewhat) be illustrated by a response from John Gribbin. I was eager to get in touch with him as I was certain that he would read one of my papers. In the books that he has written for the lay public, he has consistently demonstrated an *overwhelming* interest in the electron two-slit interference pattern. When I “stumbled” across his E-mail, I contacted him immediately. I informed him about my analysis of the two-slit pattern and why the refereeing process would inevitably fail me. This was his response.

Your fears are unfounded. As Feynman also said, “if it disagrees with experiment, then it is wrong.” Publish and try the test of experiment!

A better analogy is with GR -- it doesn’t overturn Newtonian gravity, but goes further. Any better quantum theory must include existing ideas (tested by experiment) within itself.

John

Look at his last sentence. New theories do not *have to* contain previous scientific concepts (notwithstanding the belief of most of you). In science, even rigorously proven theories are subject to possible overthrow. From all outward appearances, Gribbin does not recognize this. I am under the impression that Gribbin worked for a time as an editor at a journal. It goes without saying, many of my theories would never be published in a journal in which he was an editor. Furthermore, given the closed-mindedness of too many scientists/referees, they wouldn’t be published in *any* main stream physics journal. Therefore, my position in opening up my own web site and attempting to disseminate my work in that

manner was absolutely correct. Yet when I attempted to disseminate my work, almost all of you ignored me.

In a similar way that there is resentment on my part towards C.A.N., I have a deep resentment towards the scientific community. None of you had an obligation towards me. But you did have an obligation towards science. Although the referring process is fundamentally reliable, there are times when it is a complete and abject failure. Consequently, on a rare basis, it *must* be circumvented. But none of you will recognize this simple fact.

The resentment is exacerbated by another fact as it pertains to this site. For various reasons that are far too lengthy to explain, it became clear to me that no single person would be able to recognize my abilities in the fields where I profess to have expertise. Therefore, it was up to me to find a way to broadly disseminate my theories. My work in psychiatry should have been published as a book. However, since an editor was not going to be able to recognize the value of my work, I would have to publish it myself. Therefore, my plan was as follows. I would disseminate my work in the physical sciences and (hopefully) reach some stage of financial stability. At that stage, I would publish a book of my psychiatric theories on my own. I also *knew* that a book of this nature would do *phenomenally* well commercially and make me extremely affluent. However, courtesy of the scientific community (in the physical sciences), that will never transpire. Not only will I *not* make a penny from my theories in psychiatry, on the contrary I'm *paying* my own money to keep up a web site and advertise it to the general public. The potential money (earned from such a book) does not concern me per se. It is more of a question of the *principle* behind it. Since I possess knowledge which would be in extraordinarily high demand, principles dictate that I should have received just compensation.

Obviously, I am a pariah within the scientific community. Therefore, that position will be maintained. Since none of you had anything to say to me, I have nothing to say to any of you. Do not E-mail me, ask me to give a colloquium, or expect my attendance at a conference. Even if there is something wrong with the material in the physical sciences at this site, I probably will not change it since I am absolutely fed up with the scientific community and your closed minded attitudes. As an example of this, I initially attempted to disseminate my work directly to the public (exclusively) via my theory of homosexuality. I offered my E-mail in that paper as I also stated that if there were homosexuals who *wanted* to be cured, I could do that. A lesbian (who claimed to be a therapist) E-mailed me back claiming there was a serious anomaly in my theory. I could have answered her and explained the anomaly. However, her E-mail was meant to be vindictive and derisive. It did not constitute constructive criticism. Therefore, although I prefer to maintain a policy of answering my E-mails (assuming there are not too many of them) I didn't bother to answer her. Similarly, I am sufficiently resentful towards the scientific community that I probably will not change my theories even if it is pointed out that there are (alleged) anomalies in my theories. As an example, diagram three in my paper on the Heisenberg uncertainty principle is not entirely correct. It is not completely commensurate with the equations. The electron should be initially propagating *downwards* when it emerges from the gun, not upwards (as drawn). I considered redoing the diagram and scanning it back in. However, after my frustrations with the scientific community, I simply couldn't be bothered. What it comes down to is the following. If I am convinced that I can answer any question(s) regarding minor anomalies pertaining to my theories in the physical sciences (just like I could answer the anomaly that a lesbian pointed out), I don't intend to render a modification in order to please a

small handful of scientists (why should I bother to placate the likes of you?). I will only proceed with a change if there is a significant anomaly which seems to be concerning the majority of you.

I only intend on maintaining an “open line” of communication with one professor in California. He was the *sole* person who read my work and sent an E-mail back to me about it. Therefore, my door will always be open to him.

As for the rest of you, if you desire answers pertaining to my work, I suggest the following. Obtain those answers from the one source which Gribbin and the rest of you trust. The one flawless system which is infallible and above reproach. The first and only perfect institution known in the history of mankind. The one system which never has, and never will make an error. The referring process for scientific journals.