

ORWELL'S WARNING:

**THE  
GREATEST**



**AMERIKAN  
PARADOX**

ERIK BLAIRE

ORWELL'S WARNING:  
*The Greatest Amerikan Paradox*

Erik Blaire

Written, Designed, and Published by Erik Blaire.

write2me@erikblaire.info  
www.erikblaire.info

*ISBN# 978-0-578-03893-3*  
*Copyright © 2009 by Erik Blaire*  
*All rights reserved.*

George Orwell's *1984* is the expression of a mood, and it is a warning. The mood it expresses is that of near despair about the future of man, and the warning is that unless the course of history changes, men all over the world will lose their most human qualities, will become soulless automatons, and will *not even be aware of it*.

—Erich Fromm, From the 1961 “After word”  
of *Nineteen Eighty Four* (1949)



According to the FBI's website the *former #1 most wanted fugitive*, Usama bin Laden, was wanted in connection with the deaths of over 200 Americans *outside* the USA. If you help or protect *any* "terrorist" you are considered to be a terrorist by our Federal government. Yet modern *allopathy* (medicine) BOTH kills over 780,000 Americans a year, making it the officially documented *#1 killer of Americans* from 2003 to 2004, AND is *government protected*. What does this make those who currently govern?



## CONTENTS:

---

Preface: What is Allopathy?	1
Introduction: Who was George Orwell?	9
Chapter 1: Schizophrenia.	25
Chapter 2: Obedience.	45
Chapter 3: Disobedience.	55
Chapter 4: Paranoia.	67
<i>Figure A: Euro-English.</i>	91
<i>Figure B: The Psycho from 1874 to 1986.</i>	92
<i>Bibliography.</i>	94
<i>Acknowledgements.</i>	96
<i>Index.</i>	97

## PREFACE: WHAT IS ALLOPATHY?

---

“Nearly all men die of their medicines, not of their diseases.”

—Moliere (1622-73)

The word “allopathic” is a synonym for “Orwellian.” Allopathy illustrates “doublespeak” perfectly: To define something as the opposite of what it really is. According to *www.medterms.com*, allopathic medicine uses treatments which *produce disease symptoms different from the symptoms of the original disease being treated*. This contradicts the First Rule of the Hippocratic Oath: “Do no harm,” which is the foundation of real medicine. In reality, however, Allopathic procedures cause disease symptoms which are both different *and identical* to the original disease. For example, Prozac is mainly prescribed to treat *depression*, while the side effects of Prozac include *depression*. Does that make any kind of “medical” sense? Why would anyone accept a treatment that *causes the very problem being treated*? The purpose of allopa-

thy, therefore, is actually the *opposite* of what most people are told and believe.

This may explain why the word *allopathy* does **not** appear—between *allocate* and *allot*—in my 2004 Webster's Dictionary (*New Edition*), while its opposite, *homeopathy*, does.<sup>1</sup> This is a simple tactic used by *The Party* in Orwell's *1984*: Remove the *word* from sight and you remove the *truth* from awareness.

Here are five definitions of allopathy according to five different medical sources:

... that system ... in which diseases are treated by producing a condition *incompatible with or antagonistic to the condition* ...

... A method of treating disease with remedies that produce effects antagonistic to those caused by the disease itself.

... Conventional medical treatment of disease symptoms that uses substances or techniques to *oppose or suppress the symptoms*.

... a system of medical therapy in which a disease or an abnormal condition is treated by *creating an environment that is antagonistic to the disease* ...

... method of medical treatment in which drugs are administered to *antagonize the disease*.<sup>2</sup>

The purpose of allopathy is to *oppose, suppress, and antagonize* disease. The purpose of allopathy is **not** to heal or cure anything, evidenced by the utter

lack of any claims to “heal” and “cure” in any of those definitions. What is the point of antagonizing a disease if the procedure *also antagonizes the immune system?*

Could that be the real purpose?

I’m not saying that your doctor is necessarily ill-intentioned. Your allopath may really have your best interest at heart. But based on personal experience and a lot of research, many *are* ill-intentioned.<sup>3</sup> Many don’t seem to (want to) notice that what they claim to be doing doesn’t quite match the results of their behavior. As they gradually sell out, seduced and blinded by the Mighty Allopathic *Profit*—obedient to the Federal government, corporations, and insurance companies—they render themselves little more than over-priced chemical pez-dispensers.

Consider the root or *etymology* of the word:

... *Allos* **other** + ... *pathos* **suffering**<sup>4</sup>

As pork is the “other white-meat,” allopathy is the “other suffering.” First you suffer from your original infliction, then an allopath comes along and inflicts a second (the other) suffering that *opposes*, *suppresses*, *antagonizes*, and *mimics* (replaces?) the first.

Turning to a 1956 edition of Webster’s we find allopathy *is* included:

That method of medical practice which seeks to *cure* disease by the production of a condition of the system either different from, opposite to, or incompatible with, the condition essential to the disease ...<sup>5</sup>

Not only is allopathy defined, it actually contains the word “cure.” But the *condition* that is *opposite to* and *incompatible with* the disease is called “health.” Allopathic methods do not “produce” health; they produce an-*other*, *second* suffering. What is peculiar about this dictionary, however, is that it contains an appendix of *medical terms*, and “allopathy” is missing, but “homeopathy” is not.

Webster’s of 1986 also defines allopathy:

... a system of medical practice that aims to *combat* disease by use of remedies producing effects different from those produced by the special disease treated.<sup>6</sup>

In 1956 allopaths sought to “cure” disease, but in 1986 they aimed to “combat” disease. Something happened between 1956 and 1986 to compel allopathic authorities to shift their focus from *cure* to *combat*, and to declare all our bodies as allopathic battlegrounds in the name of *The Profit*. Their modern weapons of choice produce *effects different from the symptoms* (except when they are *identical*). They aim to “combat” the symptoms of disease with the toxic “effects” of their weapons. And what happens to every battleground during war? It is flooded with *suffering*, and it is *destroyed*.

From only a hand-full of definitions we have learned that the root of allopathy is suffering; that in the 1950’s allopaths still spoke of *curing*, but by the 1980’s the word “cure” disappeared to be replaced by the word “combat”; and by at least 2004 the word “allopath” itself disappeared from the dictionary. This

brief history lesson reeks a distinctly Orwellian stench. Since the purpose of medicine **is** to heal and cure, allopathy **cannot** really be the practice of medicine. It is the practice of “allopathic corporatism,” or “organized quackery.”

Former Italian Prime Minister/Dictator, Benito Mussolini said: “Fascism should more properly be called corporatism since it is the merger of state and corporate power.” If real doctors *heal people of disease*, and allopathic corporatists *mimic, replace, and manage disease*, then allopathy is medical fascism. The purpose (from the top down) is to grow and manage diseases for power and profit by using people as Petri dishes. By managing and controlling diseases, they thereby manage and control the dishes. If allopathy actually solved medical problems then it wouldn’t be an expanding “booming” business today. Diseases would be decreasing, *not* increasing, and thus its financial foundation would dwindle.

If you are having doubts, just consider *three* important facts: First, the death rate of newborns in America has climbed sharply over recent years. CNN reported in 2006: “*U.S. has second worst newborn death rate in modern world ....*”<sup>7</sup> In 2006 we had the second worst infant death rate in the developed world. What does this say about our medical system? Perhaps Americans should learn from the Japanese; their doctors lowered Japan’s infant death rate by boycotting vaccines for newborns. As a result: Sudden Infant Death Syndrome (SIDS) *disappeared*, only to return again—for whatever insane reason—after the inoculation of newborns resumed.<sup>8</sup>

Second, consider that a few years earlier a small team of MD's and one PhD spent two years tallying all the documented (thus admitted) cases of injuries and deaths caused by modern medicine. The result: Our *government protected* religion of Allopathy turns out to be the *number one killer of Americans*:

Until now ... [no] one had ever analyzed and combined ALL of the published literature dealing with injuries and deaths caused by government-protected medicine. That has now changed. ... the total number of deaths caused by conventional medicine is an astounding 783,936 per year. It is now evident that the American medical system is the leading cause of death and injury in the US. (By contrast, the number of deaths attributable to heart disease in 2001 was 699,697, while the number of deaths attributable to cancer was 553,251.5)<sup>9</sup>

Third, moving back a couple of decades to 1984 we find the first seminar of The New Medical Foundation, in Chicago, IL. At this seminar nine speakers—all highly respected and reputable doctors, such as Henry Heimlich, MD, the inventor of the *Heimlich maneuver*—addressed major problems in modern medicine, such as the inaccuracy of modern medical testing, the ineffectiveness of many medical treatments, corruption, and so on.

The first speaker, Robert Mendelsohn, MD, former President of the National Health Federation, former National Director of Project Head Starts Medical Consultation Service, and Chairman of the Medical Licensing Committee of the State of Illinois, posed the

question: *How Much Science Is There in Modern Medicine?* In answering this question he stated very clearly that the problem with modern medicine involves *ethics*, not *technology* or *money*. He stated that medical training produces a strange way of thinking and talking (as we have just reviewed). And he offered this as an example of the consequence of this *strange Allopathic way to think and speak*:

Whenever doctors strike, throughout the world, the same result occurs: *The mortality rate drops*. ...[One occurred] in Los Angeles, where, according to Professor Milton Reimer of UCLA's School of Public Health, the mortality rate during that strike dropped by 17 percent. ... [Another] strike was in Columbia, South America, where the mortality rate dropped by 37 percent.<sup>10</sup>

His favorite strike was in Israel. During the 85 day period in which doctors stopped *seeking The Profit* (this excluded ER workers), the mortality rate was cut in half. Losing so much business, the concerned morticians looked into it and found that the last time their business "... dropped that low was 20 years previously at the time of the last doctors strike."<sup>11</sup>

... [W]hy would a sane patient choose a treatment that can kill the patient?<sup>12</sup>

—Mendelsohn (1926-88)

---

<sup>1</sup> MWD. This is the *collegiate* New Edition, aimed at a *younger* generation—the first to practice *forgetting* the word? (See next chapter)

<sup>2</sup> <http://medical-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/allopathy>  
Bold and italics added.

<sup>3</sup> See *The Nail and the Allopath* (the introduction to OW2) at:  
[www.erikblaire.info](http://www.erikblaire.info)

<sup>4</sup> ODEE. WNTCD has “... *pathos*, from *paschein*, to suffer ...”

<sup>5</sup> WNTCD, Italics added.

<sup>6</sup> WTNID, Italics added. See also: [www.whale.to/a/allopathy1.html](http://www.whale.to/a/allopathy1.html)

<sup>7</sup> Green, Jeff, *CNN.com*, May 10, 2006, Posted: 12:02 p.m. EDT.

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.whale.to/vaccine/scheibner9.html>

<sup>9</sup> Carolyn Dean, MD, ND, Martin Feldman, MD, Gary Null, PhD, Debora Rasio, MD, *Death by Medicine*, 2003/4.  
<http://www.webdc.com/pdfs/deathbymedicine.pdf>

<sup>10</sup> Mendelsohn, p. 11, italics added. Also listen to *Dead Doctors Don't Lie* by Joel Wallach, MD. According to Wallach the average life span of doctors is *lower* than the average life span of society as a whole.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13.

## INTRODUCTION: WHO WAS GEORGE ORWELL?

---

“We have now sunk to a depth at which the restatement of the obvious is the first duty of intelligent men.”

—George Orwell

George Orwell was a British writer and journalist. Born in Bengal, India in 1903, he graduated from Eton, a leading school in England in 1921, and then served five years as a British Imperial Police Officer in Burma, India. With the intent of becoming a writer, on New Years Day, 1928, he resigned from the Imperial Service in shame over Britain’s treatment of the Burmese people. “Donning ragged clothes ...” he sought to sedate his guilt by giving up the standard of living he associated with British authority, and set out to write about poverty by living among the poor and destitute of Paris and London.<sup>1</sup> His first book, *Down and Out in Paris and London*, was published in 1933, the year Hitler took power, and over the next few years other books followed. Then in 1937 he went to report on the Spanish Civil War (the beginning of

WWII), and what he experienced came to dominate his point of view and his writing for the rest of his life.

He went there to report on the war, but took up arms and joined one of many militia groups defending the Soviet and US supported Spanish government against the German and Italian invaders, and survived a gunshot wound to the throat. Shortly after defeating the invaders, however, the Spanish government proceeded to hunt down members of those groups that had been fighting to defend Spain, now publicly declared traitors and allies of the invaders. While many of the men he knew were imprisoned, murdered, or simply vanished, he spent many days hiding from the police who were hunting him like an animal, until he finally made it out of the country.<sup>2</sup>

What came to disturb him the most was not simply the lies and betrayal by the very government he fought to defend, but the fact that the media back in England eagerly picked up and spread those same lies. This experience revealed to him that “belief” in a group was something that could not only be influenced, but could actually be “controlled.” In *Looking Back on the Spanish War*, Orwell recalled the twisted Siamese world of reality and fantasy portrayed by the mass media in both Spain and England:

... in Spain, for the first time, I saw newspaper reports which did not bear any relation to the facts, not even the relationship which is implied in an ordinary lie. I saw great battles reported where there had been no fighting, and complete silence where hundreds of men had been

killed. I saw troops who fought bravely denounced as cowards and traitors, and others who had never seen a shot fired hailed as the heroes of imaginary victories; and I saw newspapers in London retelling these lies and eager intellectuals building emotional superstructures over events that had never happened. I saw, in fact, history being written not in terms of what happened but of what ought to have happened according to various “party lines.” This kind of thing is frightening to me, because it often gives me the feeling that the very concept of objective truth is fading out of the world.<sup>3</sup>

This experience—his personal discovery that what a group believes can actually be controlled and manipulated—became the basis of his two final and most famous books: *Animal Farm* (1945) and *Nineteen Eighty Four* (1949). Both are serious political documents exposing the growing threat of modern power addiction.

He died in 1950 bedridden from tuberculosis.

*Animal Farm* is a fable of the Russian Revolution, the central event of the 20th century. It's considered central because it epitomized western civilization's long-held romantic quest to create a classless Utopian society. The story is very simple, with farm animals representing the main participants of the revolution: Farm animals gradually grow so sick and tired of the abuse and neglect of the farmer that they revolt against him, take over the farm, and set up their own government. Because pigs are very intelligent they become the “managers” of the farm. Eventually they enshrine seven commandments on the

wall of the Great Barn. The animals are to live by those seven commandments from that point forward to preserve the precious fruits of all their hard work and sacrifice. However, as the pigs gain more and more power and control, the treatment of the animals gradually grows even more horrific than it was under the farmer. What's more, the very history of their revolt itself is gradually rewritten into something completely different from what really happened. (The third stage, or "purge," of this re-writing of Russian history took place during the Spanish War.) Each rule is gradually amended. For example: "No animal shall drink alcohol" becomes "No animal shall drink alcohol *to excess*," as the pigs begin to drink. Step by step, the animals would react to seeing the pigs doing what had been forbidden with surprise. Then they would compare what they *remembered had initially been written* with what they currently found on the wall, and each time the writing contradicted their memory. Eventually, robbed of the ability to discern what really happened in the past, they were robbed of the ability to deal with what was happening in the present. Eventually all the rules were abandoned except the seventh slogan amended:

**All animals are created equal, *but some are more equal than others.***

The lesson of the fable is twofold: 1) to warn that in overthrowing tyranny, the product of one's efforts can become the very basis of something worse than what was overthrown; and 2) that *language-control* means

*belief- or consciousness-control*, and therefore *history-control*. While most people could see the obvious danger of Hitler, Orwell was afraid that the English, being pro-Russia at that time, were less likely to see the danger of Stalin's brand of tyranny. For example, Hitler *burned* books (obvious/overt), while Stalin had books (dictionaries?) gradually *rewritten* over time (sneaky/covert). So Orwell wrote *Animal Farm* to illustrate the danger that lies right in front of everyone's noses.

But how far can such ideas be carried out? How many times can tyrannical authorities be overthrown and replaced by something that, little by little, gradually grows even worse? What would such a society be like? Many people argue that tyranny doesn't actually get worse as time passes, and that in every age people just *believe* things are getting worse. Such people ignore that such distinct changes in human behavior as the emergence of male domination, for example, can be pinpointed (roughly) in time and space (@ 7000 years before present, in the Volga basin, what is now South Russia). We can also pinpoint (again roughly) the more recent emergence of collective sadistic brutality (@ 3000 years before present, in Assyria, what is now Iraq). They also must ignore the fact that the means of waging human conflict itself has "progressed" from sticks, stones, and simple metals thousands of years ago, to wielding the very power of the sun itself today. There is plenty of irrefutable evidence that the human drive to use, control, and destroy one another is "progressing" in power and complexity.

Orwell understood this, so he ran this dual lesson of *Animal Farm* through a feedback loop in his imagination, over and over, and the product was *Nineteen Eighty Four* (1949). *1984* is a frightening portrait of Oceania, a three-faced (*secular, religious, and insane*) society as seen through the eyes of notorious thought criminal Winston Smith. Reality, as Winston is expected to know it, is whatever the Inner Party of the Ingsoc religion says it is *in the present moment*. With a silly-putty-like past, life under surveillance 24\7 by the Thought Police, and individuality forbidden under silent threat of torture and death, the “normalized” citizen is reduced to a fear-ridden, shape-shifting reflection of those ever changing, contradictory words of authoritative truth. It's a world in which the ability to “discriminate” is forbidden, so vital distinctions between things such as laws, norms, and even medical diseases has faded out. History as we understand it, as something “objective” to be discovered out there in the world, does not exist in Oceania; like warfare and the average citizen's identity, history is something to be created, destroyed, and re-created again and again, forever in “... an endless present in which the Party is always right.”<sup>4</sup>

It is vital to keep in mind that Orwell did not intend for *1984* to be taken literally. In a letter to Francis A. Henson, he wrote: “My ... novel is ... intended ... as a show-up of the perversions to which a centralized economy is liable and which have already been partly realized in Communism and Fascism. I do not believe that the kind of society I describe *will* arrive, but I

believe (allowing that the book is a satire) that something resembling it *could* arrive. I believe also that totalitarian ideas have taken root in the minds of intellectuals everywhere, and I have tried to draw these ideas out to their logical consequences. The scene of the book is laid in Britain in order to emphasize that the English-speaking races are not better than anyone else and that totalitarianism, *if not fought against*, could triumph anywhere.”<sup>5</sup>

The reason *1984* is so convincing to so many is that Orwell cast features of the real world in a work of “polemic” fiction. He selected key features of society as he saw them (features most others want to ignore) and exaggerated them to make them vivid and easy for us to see. A primary point is that a society must develop these fundamentals *prior* to becoming a nightmare. They are a prerequisite.

In 1946, a couple of years before writing *1984*, Orwell put it this way:

... I do suggest that we shall get nowhere unless we start by recognizing that political behavior is largely non-rational, that the world is suffering from some kind of mental disease which must be diagnosed before it can be cured.... It is not easy to find a direct economic explanation of the behavior of the people who now rule the world. The desire for pure power seems to be much more dominant than the desire for wealth. ... And if it has reached new levels of lunacy in our own age, as I think it has, then the question becomes: *What is the special quality in modern life that makes a major human motive out of the impulse to bully others?*<sup>6</sup>

In his imaginary land of Oceania there is *one* insane, secular, religious party with *two* primary goals, *three* sacred principles, and *four* official slogans. The Party's two main goals are "... to conquer the whole surface of the earth and to extinguish once and for all the possibility of independent thought."<sup>7</sup> To simplify, let's focus on just one of the goals: To extinguish forbidden or unorthodox thought. To accomplish this goal, every citizen must practice the three sacred principles of the Ingsoc religion: Newspeak, Doublethink, and the mutability of the past, a.k.a. the Memory Hole.<sup>8</sup> And to help perfect the practice of these principles there are *four* official slogans. Let's briefly review Orwell's sacred principles one by one and make a brief comparison with America, the epitome of what is "*modern*."

**1. Newspeak** is the official language of Oceania, and the Ingsoc religion. Newspeakers (members of Ingsoc) are necessarily ruled through constant surveillance, runaway emotions, and Party controlled language. Its grammar is specifically designed to contradict the grammar of Basic English (BE) and to gradually alter and replace Oldspeak (BE). The purpose of Newspeak is to narrow down the very range of thoughts a citizen can have, and to completely eliminate a citizen's capacity to think clearly on selected "forbidden" subjects. (Like "allopathy" being absent from the dictionary?) There's *one* official slogan that is *never written—only spoken*—between Inner Party members and specialists involved in the workings of Newspeak:

**Newspeak is Ingsoc.  
Ingsoc is Newspeak.**

This means that the official secular religion and its official language are one and the same thing. The name “Ing-soc,” for example, is a Newspeak term for the Oldspeak phrase “English Socialism,” and illustrates one principle of Newspeak: a reduction of spoken syllables, while changing the E to the next vowel “I” helps us forget the Oldspeak word “English.” (See Figure A, page 91, for an entertaining illustration.) The same slogan expressed in long form or BE looks more like this:

**Who controls information in the present  
controls society’s view of the past; who  
controls society’s view of the past controls  
the way society changes into the future.**

In modern America we essentially have *one* monolithic Party hiding behind its *two* distinct personalities, which *only appear* to be struggling with one another over control of the National Body. The new way to speak is called “Political Correctness,” and the secular religion that pushes it, “American Socialism,” can be shortened to “Am-soc,” while changing the A to the next vowel gives us:

**PC is Emsoc/Emsoc is PC.**

I will continue to use the “A”, however, to remind us what it stands for.

**2. Doublethink** is the official state of mind of the Oceanic orthodoxy. Doublethink "... means the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them."<sup>9</sup> In a number of earlier essays Orwell referred to this mental behavior by its common term "schizophrenia," which is widely and mistakenly believed to be a medical condition. In 1984 he described it a few times, even going into great detail:

*Doublethink* lies at the very heart of Ingsoc, since the essential act of the Party is to use conscious deception while retaining the firmness of purpose that goes with complete honesty. To tell deliberate lies while genuinely believing in them, to forget any fact that has become inconvenient, and then, when it becomes necessary again, to draw it back from oblivion for just so long as it is needed, to deny the existence of objective reality and all the while to take account of the reality which one denies – all this is indispensably necessary.<sup>10</sup>

This peculiar linking-together of opposites ... is one of the chief distinguishing marks of Oceanic society. The official ideology abounds with contradictions even where there is no practical reason for them.... These contradictions are not accidental, nor do they result from ordinary hypocrisy: they are the deliberate exercises in *doublethink*. For it is only by reconciling contradictions that power can be retained indefinitely. ... If equality is to be forever averted – if the High ... are to keep their places permanently – then the prevailing mental condition must be controlled insanity.<sup>11</sup>

To help Party members perfect their doublethinking there are *three* public slogans written on the shiny white face of the Ministry of Truth:

**War is Peace.  
Freedom is Slavery.  
Ignorance is Strength.**

We can easily find paradoxical behavior in modern America today. Simply open your eyes and look around, or type the terms “doublethink,” “newspeak,” and the popular American “doublespeak” into different search engines to find a wealth of interesting reading on the internet. Here, I’ll just introduce you to three of America’s most important paradoxes: *politics, violence, and religion.*

For it is only by reconciling contradictions that power can be retained indefinitely. ... If equality is to be forever averted ... then the prevailing mental condition must be controlled insanity.

First, According to historian and former Librarian of Congress, Daniel Boorstin, in his book *Hidden History* (1987): “No nation has ever believed so firmly that its political life was based on a perfect theory. And yet no nation has ever been less interested in political philosophy or produced less in the way of theory. If we can explain this paradox, we shall have a *key* to much that is characteristic ... in our institutions.”<sup>12</sup> We Americans hold a solid belief in the superiority of our political theory, while in reality, we

possess no such theory. Boorstin summarizes his explanation in a word: “*givenness*.” He says it's some how just given to us. It just appears. (*And that's precisely how it works in Oceania.*)<sup>13</sup>

Second, according to Professor of History, Hugh Davis Graham, in his paper *The Paradox of American Violence* (1976), “Any paradox must contain two ostensibly contradictory assertions—in this case, that the American past has been filled with violence, and that the stability and continuity of America’s vital public institutions have been extraordinary.”<sup>14</sup> He then asks, “How can we account for this?” In trying to explain how America could have more “internal” or “social” violence than most other developed societies while having the most stable institutions, Professor Graham made reference to Boorstin's explanation of America's political paradox. In doing so he implies that they are inseparable, and therefore just like Boorstin, fails to explain it.

Third, according to historian and political writer Garry Wills, in his book *Under God: Religion and American Politics* (1990): “The secular state came from the zeal of religion itself.”<sup>15</sup> That is, the state not founded on a specific religious denomination was actually the product of overwhelming wide-spread religious enthusiasm (the concept of *separation of Church and State* emerged later). It made religion stronger. Politics and religion have *never* been separate. Secular *is* religious; it’s just inverted, as *concave* is to *convex*. (And again, just like in 1984.)

If the American paradoxes of politics and violence are inseparable, and the paradox of religion is in-

separable from politics, then couldn't we consider all three as different faces of a single underlying state of contradiction? Either way, what can this possibly mean for American “freedom”?

**3. The Memory Hole** refers to two different but related things: First, it is the nick-name given to metal tubes that suck away written material to be incinerated in basement furnaces. Second, it is the consequence of the collective practice of strategic acts of amnesia while doublethinking. While it is certainly possible to forget without doublethinking, it's absolutely impossible to effectively doublethink without great skill in manipulating one's own memory. The memory hole is indispensably necessary to keep Oceania's “central secret”:

... [There] is one question ... It is: *why* should human equality be averted? ... Here we reach the *central secret* ... the original motive, the never-questioned instinct that first led to the seizure of power and brought *doublethink*, the Thought Police, continuous warfare, and all the other necessary paraphernalia into existence afterwards. This motive really consists...<sup>16</sup>

And that is where Winston Smith stopped reading *The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism*, startled, because there was an unexpected knock at his door. I can't help but wonder: Did Orwell have something in mind when writing about the *central secret of Oceania*? Or is that just part of the fiction? We'll come back to this in the last chapter.

**Thoughtcrime** is the *anti-principle*. It is forever silent and hidden beneath the sacred principles, and is semantically similar to biblical *leprosy*, medieval *sin*, and modern *mental illness*. It is all forbidden thoughts, emotions, and behaviors—not forbidden by law, for there were no laws in Oceania—but *silently* forbidden (by the rule of norm). Thoughtcrime is essentially any botch up, however slight, in practicing the three sacred principles (The Trinity) of the Ingsoc religion.

Americans have recently sanctioned increased punishments for *emotioncrime*. If you commit a violent crime, you get punished if you're caught. If you commit this crime while feeling “hate,” then your punishment becomes more severe. (Exactly *who* decides, and just *how* do they decide, what you're really feeling?) Think for a moment. What kind of people have emotions and thoughts wedged apart from one another? They're called psychotic—usually “schizo-phrenic” or “split-minded.” In average healthy people emotions and thoughts are quite integrated and inseparable. If Americans are willing to punish forbidden emotions, then Americans are willing to punish forbidden thinking. Emotioncrime **is** thoughtcrime.

The purpose of these combined principles and the secular religion they compose is to actually freeze the course of history, to engineer a permanent state of emergency by 2050.<sup>17</sup> And this is made possible by reconciling contradictions, just like the American paradoxes of politics, violence, and religion. It is to be a world in which the Good Party is forever locked in

never-ending warfare with the Evil terrorist network known as *The Brotherhood*, led by arch terrorist Emanuel Goldstein. This appears to be strikingly to our current situation, in which Good America is officially (since 09-11-2001) in a perpetual *War on Terror* with the Evil terrorist network known as *Al Qaeda*, led by arch terrorist Osama bin Laden.<sup>18</sup> And both sides of The Great Oceanic War are pitted against each other by the same background authorities of The Party—like a puppet master playing with two puppets.

The kind of society that Orwell feared was looming on the future's horizon was secular and religious, as well as insane. It is a portrait painted from a specific point of view: an Oceanic lunatic/thoughtcriminal. In America, Winston Smith would be called a paranoid “schizophrenic.”

What, then, does it really mean to be *schizo- (split-) phrenic (minded)?*

---

<sup>1</sup> EB, Vol. 8, 1020.

<sup>2</sup> Oxley, 68.

<sup>3</sup> Orwell, 1981, 197.

<sup>4</sup> Orwell, 1949, 128.

<sup>5</sup> Orwell, 1968, Vol. 4, 502.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid*, 249, italics added.

<sup>7</sup> Orwell, 1949, 159.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid*, 25.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid*, 176.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid*, 176-77.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid*, 178.

<sup>12</sup> P. 76, italics added.

<sup>13</sup> Boorstin describes American political ideas as having “magical elusiveness and flexibility.” (p.79) Orwell portrays the Oceanic mind practicing control over itself “as complete as that of a contortionist over his body.” (p. 175)

<sup>14</sup> P. 76.

<sup>15</sup> P. 352, italics added.

<sup>16</sup> Orwell, 1949, 178-79.

<sup>17</sup> This is the plan as revealed to Winston Smith in *The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism* by Emmanuel Goldstein (a.k.a. “The Book”), given to him by O’Brien, a secret agent of the Thought Police. The target year for the great freeze, 2050, is mentioned in the appendix to *1984: The Principles of Newspeak*.

<sup>18</sup> Usama bin Laden, The Most Wanted Terrorist, is wanted by the FBI (since 1999) for 200 deaths by two bombings in East Africa. Osama bin Laden is wanted (in mass media *programming*) in connection with 3000 deaths *inside* the USA. Osama is not listed on the FBI’s website, and there is no mention of 911 in Usama’s bio. Making things more interesting, FBI Director Robert S. Mueller III stated in a Congressional Testimony on March 4, 2003 (available on the FBI website): “While Osama Bin Ladin maintains worldwide name recognition as the leader of Al-Qaeda, KSM [Khalid Shaikh Mohammed] is the operational mastermind.” KSM, who was educated in North Carolina, was arrested three days before this testimony. His wording is important: Osama maintains *name recognition* as the leader, but KSM is the mastermind behind Al-Qaeda. “Name recognition” is a reference to the effect of mass media programming. If Osama is connected to the 911 massacre, then where is his bio in the *Most Wanted* list? If Osama is Usama then why is 911 *not* mentioned in Usama’s bio?

I recommend approaching the duality USAma vs. Osama the same as approaching USA vs. US. There are two different bin Ladens in the same way there are two different Constitutions and two different citizenships. The original Constitution of The United States of America, and the Bill of Rights, protect the freedoms of capital “C” Citizens (1: Freedom of Speech, 2: The Right to Bear Arms, etc.). When Citizens accept a Social Servitude Number (SSN), they forfeit their Citizenship (and all associated freedoms) in favor of small “c” citizenship under the Federal US Constitution. Small “c” citizens have no rights, they have *privileges*. Privileges can be granted or taken away on a Federal whim. Most importantly, citizens are always encouraged to *believe they are still Citizens with “freedom” and “rights.”* Failing to perceive and understand the differences between USAma vs. Osama, and USA vs. US, is to be firmly embedded in *The System* (a.k.a. *The Matrix*). Osama bin Laden is to Amsoc what Emmanuel Goldstein is to Ingsoc – *invented to be fought*.

Visit [www.USAvsUS.info](http://www.USAvsUS.info) Also see *The U.S. of A. v. U.S. The Loss of Legal Memory of the American State (2006)* by Richard Dwight Kegley, T. J. Hendersson, & Ed Wahler. You can find it at: [www.USofAvUS.com](http://www.USofAvUS.com)

## CHAPTER ONE: SCHIZOPHRENIA

---

In our age there is no such thing as “keeping out of politics.” All issues are political issues, and politics itself is a mass of lies, evasions, folly, hatred and schizophrenia.<sup>1</sup>

—George Orwell, *Politics and the English Language* (1946)

Imagine, if you would, an average American. We'll call him “Ed.” Ed is in his mid-thirties, works in an office, and is currently standing at the paper shredder. He's holding a stack of paper in one arm while feeding the paper shredder with his other. Suddenly, he drops the stack of paper all over the floor and just stands there, rigid, mouth hanging open and eyes as wide as silver dollars. Staring into nowhere in particular, he begins babbling faintly and incoherently to himself. He giggles slightly with a faint smile, and then he looks around with an intense expression of perplexed distress. Ed's coworkers, who are standing all around him, have become quite concerned and a bit upset with what they are seeing and hearing. “What's wrong with Ed?” they whisper to each other.

“What’s wrong, Ed?” one of them asks him. Ed looks past his concerned coworker and babbles on, muttering something about “destroying” and “saving” the whole world. Because these are common themes found in the word-salad spouted by many a so-called “psychotic,” Ed’s coworkers quickly call a special kind of authority to have Ed taken away. And as expected, Ed puts up a fight, resisting, claiming that the “others” are conspiring against him as he’s taken away to be confined, labeled a “schizophrenic,” electro-shocked, and forced to “do drugs.”

What was wrong with Ed? Can you blame his coworkers for having him confined? Would you have done anything differently? Is it just a matter of “common sense”? That is just the way you deal with people like that? Is it silly to ask such questions? Before you settle into your familiar and comfortable answer, first try to see it from Ed’s point of view. To do so we will need to consider two vital things, the first of which is two sided: First, on the one hand, like millions of other Americans, throughout his life Ed has been waiting faithfully for the imminent destruction of the world. On the other hand, also like millions of other Americans, he has spent many years working hard to save the planet for all future generations. Because these two groups are not mutually exclusive, they overlap, meaning millions of Americans do both. In other words, for many years now, Ed has been alternating back and forth like a binary (on/off) switch between being conscious of one, and then the other, and then back again, and so on. And today, Monday morning, while it was fresh in his

memory, Ed was pondering the Apocalyptic (End of the World) sermon he had heard the day before, and as the phrase “the gnashing of teeth” passed through his mind, his eyes fell upon the teeth-like-blades gnashing and shredding the papers he was feeding them. They were left over flyers that were posted all around work to increase worker motivation and participation in the national “Save the Planet” campaign. So, for the *very first time*, Ed had become conscious of *both concepts at the same time*. He breached a powerful paradox and therefore has understandably come grinding to a painful and disillusioned halt. He has entered the first stage of disillusionment.

The second vital thing, again like millions of other Americans, is that Ed has been raised since a small child to hold solid the conviction that he has certain guaranteed rights, such as freedom of speech and belief. After all, he’s an “American”! Now start with his disorientated state born from realizing for the very first time that he has been working hard for many years to save the planet while waiting for it to be destroyed at any moment. Then add to this powerful dilemma the fact that he finds himself suddenly being taken away to be confined for what he was saying and believing—*by people who openly claim to value freedom of speech and belief*. How can we really consider Ed’s reaction irrational? It certainly resembles a conspiracy, doesn’t it? How would you react if people who claim to believe in the freedoms of speech and belief suddenly locked you up for the things you say and believe? And in the middle of such a disori-

enting dilemma? That's not just a paradox, but a *double* paradox that poor Ed is trapped in. Breaching the first paradox instantly placed him in the second. Wouldn't anyone react in a similar, even predictable way under such conditions? Is it by some strange coincidence, then, that the official psychiatric criteria used to justify confining people for their deviant behavior, speech, and beliefs just happens to resemble this predictable reaction? Of all the things we can conceivably say about it, the simplest and most accurate is that it's an excellent illustration of the greatest of America's many paradoxes—the paradox of American *freedom*. Depending on social circumstances at any particular moment, *Americans both believe as well as don't believe in their freedoms*.

Of the many “symptoms” that will be listed in Ed's psychiatric records, *talking to himself* is a classic. In itself, it's a superior illustration of the paradox of American freedom—a second illustration embedded within the first. Though primarily enforced in the upper and middle classes, all “orthodox” or “normal” Americans avoid talking to themselves (at least publicly) because they *imagine* others will *imagine* them “mad.” Like many orthodox beliefs, this is the opposite of what is true. In child psychology it's called *monologging*, and is the second of three primary stages in which the individual develops the use of language: babbling, monologging, and communication. It's vital, because it develops the individual's ability to think and act *independently*. As each individual enters the third stage, however, monologging gradually becomes shunned, taboo, silently

forbidden, and imagined as abnormal rather than normal. Most people stop monologging voluntarily; they stop engaging in an activity that develops their ability to think and act independently, and they do it while believing that they have the right to be individuals.

Monologging is also an excellent illustration of something else of great significance. I find that if I sit somewhere monologging as people pass by, they give me all sorts of funny looks and stares. And yet, I find that I can also control their reactions toward me by using the proper “prop.” If people see me monologging in the presence of our modern god, then as if by magic, their attitudes change to acceptance! It’s not made of wood, stone, or metal, it’s made of plastic and electronics, and it’s considered a more valid recipient of your vocalized thoughts than your own living brain tissue. In other words, you can’t feed your own vocalized thoughts back into your own auditory neural pathway, setting up an amplifying feedback loop that can develop your autonomy, but it is perfectly fine to talk to a machine (a tape recorder). It doesn’t have to be turned “on” either. It doesn’t even need batteries! *People just need to see it!*

Who says the modern and secular don’t kneel to their deities any more? They simply lost the awareness that they still do.

Getting back to Ed, it is another unwavering orthodox or normal belief that any person in such a crisis (or conceptual breach of paradox) is both *ill and dangerous*; and just like our belief about monologging, this one is most often the *opposite* of what is

true. For example, *anyone* with access to a public library can consult encyclopedias and read for themselves:

**Schizophrenia**, any [one] of a group of severe mental disorders that generally have in common disturbances of feeling, thought, and relations to the outside world.<sup>2</sup>

Schizophrenia is the *single largest cause of admissions* to mental hospitals ...<sup>3</sup>

Of all mental illnesses [it] ... is the *most feared* ...<sup>4</sup>

... [And yet,] the majority of mental patients are *not dangerous* ... a prison-like regimen is not necessary to contain them.<sup>5</sup>

... [What's more] the cause or causes of schizophrenia remain elusive and *no specific neuropathology has ever been identified*. ... In consequence, as with other diagnoses which *cannot be verified with laboratory tests*, usage of the term is liable to vary from place to place. Indeed ... American and Russian psychiatrists [have been] using the term much more freely and loosely than psychiatrists elsewhere.<sup>6</sup>

Ed was feared and confined, but he was certainly not dangerous. He was not dangerous for the same reason most people who are confined for being “psychotic” are not dangerous—they haven’t committed the crimes they are most often imagined as having committed. A dangerous innocent person is like a

square circle. If you can believe that innocent people are dangerous, then you should have no problem what-so-ever believing that circles can have corners. And because it is a simple fact that most killers are “normal,” you have a far greater chance of having your throat slit by someone defined as healthy (using psychiatric standards) than by someone “psychotic.” So the real question is: Why are these innocent people feared more than the majority of violent people? Or better yet, why do most people believe the opposite of what is true?

In Ed’s case I think it’s safe to assume that some of his co-workers were engaged in the same paradox and were in no way emotionally prepared to breach it. Another reason is that most normal people faithfully expose themselves daily to paper and video “programming” (we even call it “programming”) that forever presents a simple Pavlovian link between the mental states of *psycho-sis* (literally “a giving of life to”) and the behavior of serial killers (“a taking of life from”) that is voluntarily accepted as reality. The link between psychosis and killing is about as objective as the link between *black skin* and *car theft*. In short, as Pavlov conditioned his dogs to *salivate* to the *sound* of bell, the economic elite of Western civilization have conditioned the public to *fear* people pinned with the term *psycho* and its variants. It’s automatic if you don’t pay attention. After all, most people don’t stop to consider that mind control can be very subtle, catchy, entertaining, and quite addictive.

Has it ever occurred to you that we actually distinguish between *normal* and *ab-normal* murder? Imag-

ine two people: (A) and (B). Both (A) and (B) hear voices telling them to kill. Both obeyed the voices because the pressure they felt was too powerful to resist. Why should (A) be confined in prison, while (B) is confined in an asylum where he will also be electrocuted and drugged, even though they committed the same crime? The only difference between them is *where* the voices were experienced. (A) heard voices from *outside* himself telling him to kill someone as an initiation to a street gang, while (B) heard voices from within himself. Both had the capacity to kill, and both were *told* to kill. Both said that the pressure to kill was too great to resist. The idea that (A) is fit to stand trial while (B) is unfit is not a decision about (B's) incapacity or inability to stand trial as is generally assumed, but merely a decision that (B) simply shouldn't. Being a puppet to *external* pressure is normal, useful, and profitable; but being a puppet to *internal* pressure is not. The main point, however, is that (B) doesn't even have to commit a crime. Ed, for example, will be confined, electrocuted, and drugged for being strange, while a person who raped a child will simply be confined (unless he's a priest, then it's a slap on the wrist).

Of course, a minority of people who deviate from orthodox normalcy are dangerous. Consider John Hinckley, Jr. He shot former President Ronald Regan, former White House Press Secretary James Brady, and some others for some outlandish reason involving his love for actress Jodie Foster, whom he had never actually met. I've come across a number of references to Hinckley, such as in the movie *A Time*

*to Kill* in which a psychiatrist takes the stand in court and refers to Hinckley as a schizophrenic to illustrate some pseudo-point; the problem is that this is only a half-truth. At Hinckley's trial, of *four* medical experts who provided their testimonies as to whether he *was* or was *not* schizophrenic, one stated that he *was*; another stated that he was *not*; a third stated that CAT scans were "absolutely necessary" to confirm a diagnosis that he *was*; and a fourth stated that to base a diagnosis on the use of a CAT scan is "simply impossible, period."<sup>7</sup>

If the medical experts who were called upon to diagnose the would-be assassin of the President of the United States cannot diagnose schizophrenia, what reason is there to think that anyone else can? After all, isn't a disease that has *never* been verified by a laboratory test a *contradiction in terms*? Not to mention the absurdity of: "usage of the term varies from place to place." These psychiatrists were trained to *see* patterns and to *categorize* them, and that's precisely what they did. They see and hear patterns that they label *symptoms*, while they *imagine* (their own handbook, the DSM IV, actually says "conceptualize") the clinical entities that are promptly recorded in, and officially authenticated by the clinical presentation. "Clinical" is a word that sounds objective and scientific, yet it really means the *opposite* of how it sounds: a lack of objective evidence. As one American psychiatrist put it, "Bodily illness is in the patients' body; mental illness is in his record." What's more, when a person is diagnosed as mentally ill, the original "presentation" is reused again and again by

others to ensure that the individual remains ill *in the same way*; otherwise, inevitable contradictory diagnoses multiply. Isn't that what happens when different people look at the same inkblot? They each see something different. Hinckley's trial is an excellent example of this, even though only half the reality about *schizophrenia* enters the *popular consciousness* via media programming.

What they mean in the last quote by "using the term *freely* and *loosely*" is that it is just like tossing around a Frisbee. Try repeating that last quote with *diabetes* instead of *schizophrenia*. Imagine doctors throwing the term *tuberculosis* around wherever and whenever they *didn't* find it in a lab test, but saw and heard it, and so diagnosed it anyway. Isn't that just silly? It's almost as ridiculous as this incredibly "loose" usage in an article titled "Fasting: An Old Cure for Fat, a New Testament for Schizophrenia."

... [Russian] experiments with food abstinence ... have been carried on at the prestigious Psychiatric Institute in Moscow. There, Professor Uri Nikolayev was the first to try fasting as a potential cure for schizophrenia. ... [He] has seen a 65 percent improvement rate among his more than 7000 patients [*translation: starving political prisoners into submission*].<sup>8</sup>

What has feelings, thoughts, and relations to the outside world: *people* or *abstract disorders*? Again, isn't that silly? The same "disorder" is listed *twice* in the same definition; that is to say, the disorder and the disturbance are one and the same thing. For

example, Ed was in a severely disturbed state of thought, feeling, and relation to his coworkers and the world. His disturbance could be *seen* and *heard* by everyone. Along comes that special authority, which alone is capable of stripping an innocent person of their “guaranteed” rights with a clinical glance, and a stroke of his mighty pen. He sees Ed’s disordered patterns of behavior, speech, and belief, calls them *symptoms*, while throwing in an extra “of a severe disorder” which he “conceptualizes” in his mind, and “symbolizes” in his clinical presentation. The disorder that is imagined is really a warehouse-like “category” in which are put people when they experience similar disturbed thoughts, feelings, and relations to the outside world.

Although *real* disease can not be found, Ed’s brain chemistry is searched, and voila: it’s *imbalanced* or *abnormal!* “It’s a sign—it indicates schizophrenia!” the authority proclaims. But does it really? Imagine a young woman, who being recently married and eagerly believing she was pregnant, went to her doctor and was accidentally given someone else’s diagnosis that she has “cancer of the uterus” and “will soon die.” Now let’s examine her brain chemistry and 1) ignoring her point of view, and 2) promptly locking her up, strapping her down, and drugging her for the things she suddenly began babbling and raving about. Guess what we would find? Abnormal brain chemistry. In other words, a normal person’s brain chemistry can be sharply altered not only by the things done to the person, but also by the very *words* used to describe them.

When people are cut off from communication with other people ... there is a strong tendency to develop hallucinations ... *not altogether dissimilar from*\* those of schizophrenia.<sup>9</sup>

If depriving a person from contact with others (by locking them up in a small space, for example, while also depriving them of all means of expression, entertainment, distraction, and even *movement* by strapping them to a table) can produce schizophrenia-like symptoms, then what's the difference between the innocent people who act like schizophrenics and are said to deserve this inhumane treatment, and the innocent people who act like schizophrenics because they're forced to by this treatment? Said differently, if the standard treatment of people called schizophrenics can cause schizophrenic-like symptoms, and in both cases, the only way to identify them is to look and listen, then *schizophrenics are made by their treatments*.

Important recent advances in the understanding of the neural mechanisms involved in schizophrenia have come from discoveries of the mode of action of drugs used in its treatment.<sup>10</sup>

If the neuropathology, and hence neural mechanisms, of schizophrenia cannot be verified with laboratory tests, how on earth can knowledge about

---

\* The phrase "*not altogether dissimilar from*" is a Newspeak tactic to avoid the more simple and honest phrase "*similar to*."

them possibly come from the effects of drugs that they decided to give them *anyway*? How could giving Hinckley some Haldol for example, possibly clarify the obstinate, medieval-like tangle of psychiatric disagreement over whether he was or was not a witch—I mean, schizophrenic? (Pardon me.)

“A few years ago two Israeli psychiatrists took Haldol ... and they reported that they were *unable to work, think, to even answer a telephone.*”<sup>11</sup> And these just happen to be symptoms of mental illness, undeniable proof that they are what the orthodox *holds* them to be. Thus the purpose of giving Hinckley the Haldol would be to produce the symptoms that in turn produce agreement among observers—which itself is the necessary foundation for many unnecessary but profitable industries.

I’m not saying that every drug psychiatrists pass out is poison. I’d take a valium from a psychiatrist. But I would *not* take Haldol, Stelazine, Lithium, Prolixin, Thorazine, or Prozac, just to name a few. Promoters of Lithium, for example, have described it as turning down the dial of life so that things don’t seem as important any more.<sup>12</sup> It controls their symptoms—their thoughts, speech, and behavior. Taken regularly over long periods, these drugs cause many morbid side effects and experiences that the coerced are told are actually symptoms of their illnesses. For it is an inescapable fact that many who are coerced to take these drugs, yet absolutely refuse to do so, are eventually able to work out their “issues” without them. Those who continue to take the neurotoxins increasingly develop neurological

damage such as *tardive dyskinesia/dementia*, “... an often permanently disfiguring muscular disorder ... which severely hinders your ability to think and feel.”<sup>13</sup> I call it “Schrodinger’s Cat Syndrome,” or the state of being half-alive/half-dead. For example, here is a woman named Kristen describing the combined effects of Stelazine and Prolixin:

... I thought I was going to die. I couldn’t walk. I felt a disinclination to live. I could not get out of bed. My arms were like metal and the bed was like a magnet. My tongue was all rolled up in my mouth. My toes were in spasms. I couldn’t move. I peed my bed.<sup>14</sup>

Her psychiatrist accepted these as symptoms of one of the zillion potential variations of schizophrenia, or a mixture of it *and* the drugs. Despite his insistence, she stopped seeing him and taking the neuroleptic toxins, worked out her personal crisis and *became a therapist!*

After reaching this officially declared impossibility of a goal, she came to realize: “The mental health system has ripped me off twice, first as a patient and then as a counselor. I thought I could work within the system. I was wrong. You can’t show any human emotion because they’re mental health trained. They look for symptoms in everything and everybody ...”<sup>15</sup> She even goes so far as to describe a paradox:

The patient is [officially considered] paranoid if he or she thinks therapists talk about them. But we do. You do talk about them when they’re gone.

*You all get together and talk about how paranoid they are that they think you're talking about them. It's crazy.*<sup>16</sup>

People who work in asylums help to make the segregated paranoid, while at the same time being responsible for entering “paranoid” into the clinical records, and all while in a half- or mono-conscious state—the state of mind that Ed and Kristin slipped out of.

Consider the most severe symptom of schizophrenia according to psychiatrist Eugene Bleuler, who personally coined the term, from the very text of 1911 in which he officially introduced it:

The most serious of all schizophrenic symptoms is the suicidal drive. I am taking this opportunity to state clearly that our present-day social system *demands great cruelty* from the psychiatrist ... People [in asylums] are being forced to continue a life that *has become unbearable* for them ... However, it is even worse when life is made increasingly intolerable for these patients by using every means to subject them to constant surveillance. ... I am convinced that in schizophrenia it is this very surveillance which *awakens, increases, and maintains the suicidal drive.*<sup>17</sup>

Even Eugene Bleuler admits that the segregated are treated with great cruelty (while blaming society for demanding it), forced to live an unbearable existence, and driven constantly into suicide. Now take just one wild guess as to “why” they constantly subject schizo-

phrenics to suicide-inducing surveillance? Schizophrenics are “known” to commit suicide, so they obviously must be kept under constant surveillance. This surveillance then pushes them to the edge of suicide, which makes necessary even more surveillance, which drives them closer to suicide, and on and on and on. Around and around and around they ride this not very merry-go-round of amnesia-ridden, inquisition-like, allopathic manufactory of chronic insanity.

There are many powerful studies that illustrate this vividly, such as D. Rosenhan’s aptly titled, *On Being Sane in Insane Places* (1973), what psychotherapist Seth Farber has described as...

... the most dramatic of a number of studies demonstrating that *there is ... nothing scientific about psychiatric diagnosis*. ... In Rosenhan’s study, ‘normal’ people, that is to say, individuals who worked as professionals (teachers, lawyers, psychologists, and so forth) and who had no previous history of psychiatric hospitalization pretended they were hearing sounds in order to be admitted into psychiatric wards; once inside the wards, they acted as they normally would. *Not a single one of the staff ... suspected that these were, in fact, ‘normal’ people*. Rosenhan wrote that “having once been labeled schizophrenic, there is nothing the pseudo-patient can do to overcome the tag. The tag profoundly colors others’ perception of him and his behavior.” Indeed, Rosenhan found from an examination of the staff

notes and case reports that the patient's behavior and past history were interpreted in such a way as to confirm the diagnosis of 'schizophrenia'.<sup>18</sup>

So saying that "schizophrenia" is the leading cause of involuntary "confinement" is analogous to saying that "witchcraft" was the single greatest cause of involuntary "witch burnings." But the greatest psychiatric symptom of silliness is that just as priests "vote" on what *is* and *is not* a "sin," so also psychiatrists "vote" on what *is* and *is not* an "illness."

The schizophrenic is beset with strange beliefs (\*delusions). ... Schizophrenia is *only correctly diagnosed when these beliefs are unshakable* and totally out of keeping with the ideas and philosophies of the sufferer's own class and culture.<sup>19</sup>

[\*] ... A delusion is a *fixed, idiosyncratic belief, unusual* in the culture to which the person belongs. Unlike normal beliefs, which are subject to amendment or correction, a delusion is held to despite evidence or arguments brought against it.<sup>20</sup>

A man named Roger Bannister once held a strange belief that was "unshakable," totally "out of keeping" with thousands of years of civilized belief, and therefore definitely out of keeping in his class and culture. "For thousands of years, people held the belief that it was impossible for a human being to run a mile in less than four minutes. But in 1954, Roger Bannister *broke this imposing belief barrier.*"<sup>21</sup> Roger can easily

be classified as “schizophrenic,” except for one vital thing. Roger’s thoughts, feelings, and beliefs diverged sharply from everyone else in history, but he didn’t *disease others emotionally* in doing so. That’s the crucial difference. Upon Ed’s breaking of his belief barrier, his coworkers reached an *emotional threshold of tolerance*—they became diseased emotionally, triggering a conditioned reaction-formation that involved Ed’s coworkers’ temporary suspension of their beliefs in certain freedoms, so that Ed could be taken away and officially stamped diseased mentally.

What if, for example, Roger had broken his cultural belief barrier within a culture that held the belief, for whatever reason, that only a person in league with evil powers could do what *everyone knew* was impossible? Then his fellow citizens would first become quite upset with him, and then they’d deal with him accordingly. They might burn him alive, thus proving that he was a witch, or they might lock him up, depriving him of contact with others, thus inducing schizophrenic symptoms that must be controlled by symptom-making-drugs and suicide-inducing surveillance—thus proving that he was a schizoid. Roger was very lucky that most Americans don’t hold such a belief.

What is “subject to amendment or correction,” then? Is it the *belief* or the *person* to which the belief belongs? To amend or correct a belief means changing a person’s point-of-view, and doesn’t that mean changing the person? So a more accurate translation would be “unlike *normal people*, who are subject to amendment or correction, *idiosyncratic* people persist

in their strange beliefs, despite what normal people consider to be adequate evidence or arguments brought against those beliefs.” According to those definitions, a normal person is expected to cave in like a house of cards under a flurry of arguments. A person is normal if they can be re-aligned with others the same way one realigns a tire on a car. Said simply, you are as free to be as unique as the people observing you are stable.

- <sup>1</sup> Orwell, 1981, p. 167.
- <sup>2</sup> EB, Vol. 10, p. 520, bold added.
- <sup>3</sup> EB, Vol. 23, p. 961, bold added.
- <sup>4</sup> OCM, p. 697, bold added.
- <sup>5</sup> Ibid, p. 54, bold added.
- <sup>6</sup> Ibid, p. 698, italics & bold added.
- <sup>7</sup> Szasz, 1990, p. 218.
- <sup>8</sup> Szasz, 1976, pp. 117-18.
- <sup>9</sup> OCM, p. 393, italics added.
- <sup>10</sup> Ibid, p. 699.
- <sup>11</sup> Farber, 1993, p.105, italics added.
- <sup>12</sup> Ibid, p. 131.
- <sup>13</sup> Ibid, p. 201.
- <sup>14</sup> Ibid, p. 37.
- <sup>15</sup> Ibid, p. 41.
- <sup>16</sup> Ibid, p. 42, italics added.
- <sup>17</sup> Szasz, 1976, p. 25-26, italics added.
- <sup>18</sup> Farber, p. 124, italics added.
- <sup>19</sup> OCM, p. 473, italics added.
- <sup>20</sup> Ibid, p. 184, italics added.
- <sup>21</sup> Robbins, p. 81, italics added.

## CHAPTER TWO: OBEDIENCE

---

When it was invented in 1911, schizophrenia was said to be incurable. Since then, it has allegedly been cured with insulin coma ... electric shock, lobotomy and neuroleptic drugs. In 1988, still another cure was announced: the transplantation of embryonic brain tissue into the brain of the schizophrenic patient. This emperor, as I have remarked elsewhere, has so many beautiful robes that it is unthinkable that he should not exist.<sup>1</sup>

— Thomas Szasz, *The Untamed Tongue.*  
*A Dissenting Dictionary* (1990)

I must confess that I am guilty of neglecting many things. Here, however, I will only address one issue of primary importance. You may at some point have been asking, “Why do people accept their diagnoses as “mentally ill” if they’re *not* ill? This is an excellent question, and I’m glad you asked it.

For many centuries millions of people were unable to separate “I suffer” from “I’m guilty.” Likewise, today millions of people confuse “I suffer” with “I’m ill.” (Metaphorical illness is the *neo-guilt* of the “modern.”) To see this, imagine two giant circus tents. In the first tent we throw all the people who suffer from mental illness, while the second tent is home to all the people who suffer from everything else in life (non-medical) that causes suffering. As time passes,

the first tent gradually increases its size and number of occupants, while the second tent gradually decreases its size and number of occupants. More and more, problems in human relationships and life in general are sacrificed into the sacred psychiatric circle of segregation. This is very easy thanks to the psychiatric tradition of voting on what is or is not illness.

We could alternately ask why so many heretics were so eager to confess that they were indeed infested with the taint of heresy, and therefore sought priestly “Inquisitional” guidance and salvation. Does the existence of the Inquisition and millions of heretics confessing that they are heretics make heresy an objective condition? Obviously not. Then does the existence of Psychiatry and millions of mentally ill confessing that they are mentally ill make their clinically *unverifiable* condition *objective*? Again, obviously not. People are willing to play the role of The Sick for the same reason people were willing to play the role of The Guilty: to escape from their suffering and responsibility (and thus, their freedom) to take care of themselves—*they want to submit to authority*.

Two famous obedience experiments show that many people, while believing that they’re fully able, turn out to be *unable* to disobey. In the first experiment there are two subjects, (A) who plays the role of teacher, and (B) who plays the role of learner, while both are separated by a partition. (B) is hooked up to an electric-shock generator that has a series of switches ranging from 15 volts to 450 volts. (A) is

given instructions to read a series of multiple choice questions or word-pairings to (B), who will answer either correctly or incorrectly. Upon each wrong answer (A) is to shock (B), and then move on to the next greater shock. (A) is led to falsely believe the purpose of the experiment is to study (B)'s ability to learn by being shocked. The real purpose, however, is to see how far (A) will go before refusing to continue. "Before the experiment was carried out, people were asked to predict their own performance. ... They all said virtually the same thing: almost no one would go to the end."<sup>2</sup>

According to an encyclopedia from the local public library: "... the results were *very different*. Despite the fact that many subjects experienced stress, despite the fact that many protested to the experimenter, a substantial proportion continued to the last shock on the generator. Many subjects obeyed the experimenter no matter how vehement the pleading of the person being shocked, no matter how painful the shocks seemed to be, and no matter how much the victim pleaded to be let out. This was seen time and again, and has been observed in several universities where the experiment has been repeated."<sup>3</sup>

Of one group of forty subjects, for example, only fourteen (35 percent) broke off the experiment. Five refused to go beyond 300 volts, nine more disobeyed between 300 and 375 volts.<sup>4</sup> Sixty-five percent (almost two-thirds) obeyed all the way to 450 volts after claiming that they wouldn't. Were they all lying? Did they simply change their minds? Or did they learn something new about themselves?

Two results from these experiments defied the initial expectations of the experimenters. They were expecting that most people would break off the experiment fairly early as conscience would dictate. They were certainly not expecting the overwhelming "...strength of obedient tendencies manifested ..." in all subjects obeying all the way to 300 volts, let alone the majority obeying all the way to 450 volts.<sup>5</sup> The second thing they were not expecting was that "... the degree of tension reached extremes that are rarely seen in socio-psychological laboratory studies."<sup>6</sup> For example, someone present during one experiment stated:

I observed a mature and initially poised businessman enter the laboratory smiling and confident. Within 20 minutes he was reduced to a twitching, stuttering wreck, who was rapidly approaching a point of nervous collapse. He constantly pulled on his earlobe, and twisted his hands. At one point he pushed his fist into his forehead and muttered: '*Oh God, let's stop it.*' And yet he continued to respond to every word of the experimenter, and obeyed to the end.<sup>7</sup>

A particularly unsettling behavior witnessed was *laughing fits*. Just as 14 out of 40 subjects disobeyed at some point, 14 out of 40 at some point like-wise "... showed definite signs of nervous laughter and smiling. The laughter seemed entirely out of place, even bizarre. Full blown, uncontrollable seizures were observed for 3 subjects. ... [Afterwards,] these subjects took pains to point out that they were not

sadistic types and that the laughter did not mean they enjoyed shocking the victim.”<sup>8</sup>

What can it mean to say, “I’m not really enjoying myself when I’m smiling and laughing”?

The truly disturbing thing about this is that the experimenters (“authorities” who represent “science”) had no means what-so-ever of enforcing their will. These people were in no danger of “punishment” of any kind for disobeying, and they knew it. *And yet they obeyed, just the same.* It was as if they were “trapped” between contradictory demands, and therefore sort of “split” in two directions. On the one hand, there was the fellow human being who was being shocked, kicking at the wall, and pleading desperately to be released. On the other hand, there was the impotent authority figure who could only respond to the resisting subjects with statements such as these:

Prod #1: Please continue, *or* Please go on.

Prod #2: The experiment requires that you continue.

Prod #3: It is absolutely essential that you continue.

Prod #4: You have no other choice; you *must* go on.<sup>9</sup>

And so on ...

The fact that most subjects manifested so much distress can be taken as evidence that they could relate to the person being shocked. (I’m not going to

touch the laughing fits, at least not here.) But why should the *mere presence* of a statement spouting authority be enough to induce obedience? Why continue if there was nothing *outside* them forcing them to? What about the inside? Could they really be unconsciously *longing* to obey while consciously performing the opposite (just like the orthodoxy of 1984)? Are you beginning to see how easily many people could “be ill” if authorities of medical science tell them that they are, while a group of significant others (family, coworkers, etc.) support the claim as well?

The results of this experiment illustrate something directly relevant to poor Ed. The experiment was designed and intended to study obedience, but it revealed a bit more than they were looking for (and perhaps were willing to face). They not only discovered that obedience could in fact be increased and decreased by altering the *external factors* in the setting (just like my using a prop while monologging), but that these factors could induce people “... to sweat, tremble, stutter, bite their lips, groan, and dig their fingernails into their flesh.”<sup>10</sup> They also unexpectedly induced *laughing fits* that alternated with *nervous distress*, just as so many people seem to alternate between *mania* and *depression*—so called “bi-polar” (two-sided) disorder. Though the context was an artificially constructed situation, it cast an individual between contradicting obligations with unexpected results. And because society is permeated with contradictory obligations overlapping every which way, why shouldn’t we expect that everyday

situations could occasionally induce similar reactions? What's more, doctors examining these subjects without knowledge of the vital role played by the context in creating their responses would find no biological disease, but they could find chemical imbalances (chemicals that simply differ from their expectations), and could easily conclude them "mentally" ill. They could be searched throughout their nervous systems to the end of the world, and like Ed, they couldn't be properly understood unless the overall context, including the paradoxical relations and obligations between people were also taken into consideration.

The second experiment, though simpler than the first, illustrates the same point. Motivated by the results of experiments like the first, "... psychologist Solomon E. Asch set out to create an experimental situation in which the individual's initial correct judgment in an ambiguous situation would conflict with the judgments expressed by other members of a group, so that the individual forced to be a minority of one could be studied."<sup>11</sup> Imagine a group of people sitting and facing a poster with four lines on it. The group is asked to judge which of the first three lines is closest in length to the fourth. Just as the individual being shocked was acting in the first experiment, the group surrounding the one being studied agreed beforehand to "perform" an incorrect answer to see if the subject would testify to the evidence of their own eyes, or to the group. The experimenters found that the "... great majority of subjects would yield to the group, and a lesser

majority of them would quickly come to *believe* the group, over the obvious evidence of their own eyesight.”<sup>12</sup>

Now imagine asking each of these subjects before the experiment: “Do you really value your American freedom to voice your individual opinion?” What do you think they would say? I have no doubt that each and every one of them would say “Absolutely!” or “Of Course!” And yet, the majority of them would be lying (whether conscious of it or not). So why would they say this? Keep in mind that the subject in question—the length of a line on a poster—has neither political, religious, nor any other flavor of relevance. Perhaps they have to agree with the majority, because they’re “normal” or “orthodox” members of Amsoc. After all, doesn’t being orthodox mean that one holds an unwavering belief (or performance of such a belief) in a majority’s point of view? To lose this belief (or stop performing it) might place the individual at risk of being handled as the ab-orthodox/un-normal usually are. Whether belief is enchanted (medieval, traditional, holy) or dis-enchanted (modern, secular, clinical) is of secondary importance.

I have one final example—perhaps the finest example I’ve come across—of Americans frantically seeking escape from their freedom. It was presented by one of America’s most influential self-improvement gurus, Anthony Robbins, in his national bestseller, *Awaken the Giant Within* (1991). He calls this event an illustration of the power of belief, but I think he’s slightly mistaken. Because beliefs are instrumental—a means to an end—they depend on the *desire* of the person to

hold said belief. That is, this event illustrates *not* the power of the belief itself, but of these people's *desire* to believe; of their desire to *play the role* of The Sick:

At a football game in Monterey Park, a Los Angeles suburb, several people experienced the symptoms of food poisoning. The examining physician deduced that the cause was a certain soft drink from the dispensing machines ... An announcement was made over the loudspeaker requesting that no one patronize the dispensing machine, saying some people had become ill and describing the symptoms. Pandemonium immediately broke out in the stands as people retched and fainted in droves. *Even a few people who had not even gone near the machine became ill!* Ambulances from local hospitals did a booming business that day ... When it was discovered that the dispensing machine was *not* the culprit, people immediately and "miraculously" recovered.<sup>13</sup>

*It was a miracle!*

None of these of people were ill, but they were more than willing to act ill. Were they so alienated from their own bodies that they couldn't really tell how they actually felt? Were they simply over taken by a tidal wave like belief? Or did they hold deep inside themselves a longing that found release when given the opportunity to play a sort of game? After all, don't millions of Americans glorify and worship both professional pretenders (actors) and professional players (athletes)? Then shouldn't we expect such people to *imitate* those they worship and glorify when

given the opportunity? They seized an opportunity to pass responsibility for their care to someone else (giving up *responsibility* **is** giving up *freedom*).

We have seen that a majority of people, while claiming to believe in their own independence, submit to authority none-the-less when under mere *vocal* pressure to do so. Their desire to submit outweighs their desire to exercise their liberty. We have likewise seen that a great majority (well over 50 percent) of people in a group will voluntarily see the world through the eyes of the group, and give false testimony contradicting the evidence of their own eyes, while a lesser majority (over 50 percent, but less than group one) actually come to believe it. And most importantly, we've seen that a whole herd of sheep can indeed act as though they're ill and believe they're ill—*without being ill at all!*

---

<sup>1</sup> P. 216-17.

<sup>2</sup> OCM, p. 567.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid, italics added.

<sup>4</sup> Fromm, p. 72-73.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid, p. 73.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid, p. 72, italics removed.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, p. 73-74.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, p. 72-73.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid, p. 72.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> Cohen, p. 68.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid, p. 68-69.

<sup>13</sup> P. 77, italics added.

## CHAPTER THREE: DISOBEDIENCE

---

The reason so many of us seem to be walking contradictions is simply that we never recognize inconsistencies for what they are. ...

There's nothing wrong with you; you don't need to be "fixed." (And I suggest you avoid anyone who uses these metaphors to describe you!) The resources you need to change anything in your life are *within you right now*.<sup>1</sup>

— Anthony Robbins, *Awaken  
the Giant Within* (1991)

What would you do if you were diagnosed with "cancer" and told you that you had no hope of surviving it? Would you obey that doctor's instructions? Or would you seek another opinion? What if you went to a handful of doctors who all said the same thing? Would you then decide to obey? And most importantly, would *you* value *your* right to decide for yourself what to do?

What if they all told you that you were going to deteriorate, and that you had *no right* to choose? What would you do?

In asking such questions, we are now considering the precious, life-saving value of *disobedience*. To illustrate this value, let's start with a brief com-

parison of two different groups of people—one presented by Doctor Andrew Weil, the other by Psychotherapist Seth Farber. All of these people were diagnosed with crippling and fatal conditions, and all “disobeyed” conventional medical and psychiatric (allopathic) authorities, and did exactly what they were all told again and again was “impossible.” Then we shall dwell on the most extreme example of group two, Leonard Frank, as well as the pseudo-medical criteria used by the Ministry of Psychiatry to justify imprisoning him for nine months, electrocuting him thirty-five times, as well as giving him fifty induced comas—and still with only temporary success of “controlling his symptoms.”

Doctors of The American Medical Association (AMA) diagnosed the people of the first group as having *biologically verifiable* diseases, such as cancer, that they would either be disabled and/or dead very soon, and that there really wasn’t anything they could do about it. *But the patients had the legal right to decide for themselves what to do.* Since then, with the help and guidance Doctor Weil, a lot of persistence and hard work—literally a rearranging of their whole lives—they all either greatly improved or completely healed their conditions; they all did what is known to be impossible by the priests of modern allopathic medicine.

Psychiatrists of The American Psychiatric Association (APA) diagnosed the people of the second group as having *biologically un~~verifiable~~* diseases, such as schizophrenia, that they would all eventually be totally disabled, and that they *had no legal right to*

*decide what to do about it.* Yet, they managed to escape APA by first playing the role of “confessing schizophrenic” (example: “Yes sir, I *do* know that I *am* a decrepit little schizophrenic, and I definitely *do* need and want psychiatric care and salvation!”) Once authorities were convinced of the victims’ firm state of obedience, that they would continue taking their “meds” if released, they were released. They then fled for their lives. Since then, with the help and guidance of Psychotherapist Farber, they too have all improved or “healed” their troubled situations; they all did what is “forbidden,” and thus known to be impossible by the priests of modern allopathic medicine.

Why are people who have *objective* conditions *granted* basic human rights, while people who have *metaphorical* conditions are *denied* basic human rights? All of these people were diagnosed as being hopeless cases, and yet they all achieved what was declared impossible by the allopathic orthodoxies of AMA and APA. Because all freedom-loving people take it for granted that anyone should have the right to accept or refuse medical treatment as they see fit, let us now review the case of Leonard Roy Frank to see what clues we can discern.

To give you Leonard’s story in a nutshell, in the 1950’s he graduated from college, spent a couple of years in the army because of the draft, and then had a string of real-estate jobs, which he felt had become drab, lifeless, and provided him no satisfaction. In Leonard’s own words: “Like so many people with my background in that area, I was striving to ‘make it’. In terms of my goals in life, I was a fifties ‘yuppie’.”<sup>2</sup>

By 1959, when he was twenty-seven years old, he began to undergo a change. He started to see life a little differently, and began developing new interests. As he put it: "... I became aware of the absurdity of my situation ..."<sup>3</sup> Losing all interest in real-estate, he eventually lost his job, which he saw as a perfect opportunity to take advantage of what he had been raised to believe was his constitutional right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of his happiness. He decided to take a vacation from purely "thing" oriented activities and dove into prolonged private study of less tangible subjects that he found of most interest and importance. He did this until 1962, when his parents finally gave up visiting and pleading with him to return to being his former "empty shell" of a self, and had him committed. They couldn't stand his prolonged lapse from his conformance to the *norm*; a stereotype that he felt he had become; the character or image they respected. Because he wasn't being as they wanted him to be, there must be something wrong with him, or so they felt. And that's all that is really required—a more economically viable family member who can sign a form.

In his interview with Farber in 1991, Leonard explained: "They said I was a 'psychotic', more specifically a 'paranoid schizophrenic', a term psychiatrists reserve for the most dangerous 'crazies', the serial murderers and people out of touch with 'reality'. My psychiatric records, which I obtained 12 years later in 1974, reported some of the 'symptoms' they used to justify locking me up and hanging that label on me."<sup>4</sup> And as mentioned already, please keep firmly

in mind that for earning this label, he was imprisoned for nine months, electrocuted thirty-five times, and given fifty induced comas. These symptoms, he went on to list ...

... included: not working, withdrawal, growing a beard, becoming a vegetarian, "bizarre behavior", "negativism", "strong beliefs", "piercing eyes", and "religious preoccupations". The medical examiner's initial report said that I was living the "life of a beatnik – to a certain extent."<sup>5</sup>

Compare this with some of the criteria used by the Thoughtpolice to segregate lunatics/thoughtcriminals in Orwell's *1984*, published in 1949:

The smallest thing could give you away. A nervous tic, an unconscious look of anxiety, a habit of muttering to yourself – anything that carried with it the suggestion of abnormality, of having something to hide. ... to wear an improper expression on your face ... was itself a punishable offense. ... *facecrime*, it was called.<sup>6</sup>

... to do anything that suggested a taste for *solitude* ... was always slightly dangerous. ... *ownlife*, it was called, meaning individualism and eccentricity.<sup>7</sup>

Now with a leading psychiatrist and segregationist, Henry Maudsley, in 1873:

What are the bodily and mental marks of the insane temperament? [In some examples] ... there are tics, grimaces, or other sporadic movements of muscles of

face, eyelids, or lips ... Stammering and defects of pronunciation ... In other cases there are peculiarities of the eyes, which ... have a vacillating movement, and a vacantly-abstracted, or half-fearful, half-suspicious, and distrustful look.<sup>8</sup>

Finally, consider the 15<sup>th</sup> Edition of *The Encyclopedia Britannica* of 1989 (after fetal brain tissue was first transplanted into the brain of a schizophrenic):

The general appearance and cooperation of the individual (*e.g.*, neatness of clothing, evidence of personal hygiene, facial expressions, tone of voice, posture, presence of **tics** or other abnormal movements) provide evidence of contact with the environment and of possible neural disease. Signs of irritability, suspiciousness, hostility, suicidal depression, inattentiveness, or indifference are especially significant. Poverty of speech may signal depression; a continuous flow of words with punning or flight of ideas can mean manic excitement; senility is associated with repetitive and garrulous conversation, while speech is incoherent and rambling in delirium; strange new words ... or high-sounding, apparently meaningless sentences often are observable in schizophrenia.<sup>9</sup>

Isn't it striking how similar they all are, even though they span from 1873 to 1989? It doesn't take a rocket scientist to see that these are simply lists of deviant behavior. For example, how can *appearance and cooperation* be an indicator of neural disease if a neurologist (a doctor of the nervous system) can't find

said disease because psychiatrists had to take a vote in order to know that it *was* a disease? Couldn't a *lack of cooperation* mean that the person simply doesn't want to? Perhaps the psychiatrist is being somewhat of a jackass. *Poverty of speech* may signal depression, or it may simply mean the person doesn't feel like talking (perhaps because someone present is acting like a jackass). What about things such as a *flow of words, punning, strange new words, or apparently meaningless sentences*? Do these really refer to the observed, or can they simply reflect something about the observer? Strange or new to whom? These descriptions actually list *facecrime, voicecrime, posturecrime, and even movementcrime* as disease symptoms instead of what they really are: *deviance* from subjective expectations. How can *irritability, hostility, depression, inattentiveness, and indifference* be considered as somehow separate from the immense context that is the person's life, relationships, and experiences? And speaking of the *observer vs. the observed*, the silliest sign of disease is without doubt *suspiciousness*. If a person is suspicious of others, it could be a sign that they're paranoid, yet if the person is perceived by others as being suspicious, then it's *still* a sign of *their* neural disease. *No matter who perceives whom as suspicious, it's always a symptom of the deviant's metaphorical disease of the mind.*

Don't *you* find this whole matter rather suspicious?

Another superior illustration of pseudo-medical “robe-like” criteria is to consider the changing definitions of the terms *psychopath* and *psychosis* during

roughly the same period (from 1874 to 1986) according to Oxford's and Webster's dictionaries (see Figure B, page 92). One can see from the usage of psychosis in 1874 (which, by the way, is a quote by Henry Maudsley) that psychotics were actually *punished for being psychotic!* (So naughty Ed would have been disciplined for accidentally slipping into full consciousness of his paradox?) One can also see that both terms could be summarized in 1956 with a single line, but thirty years later they had both expanded (like a fungus) into lengthy paragraphs of pseudo-medically objectified deviance. And most revealing is the fact that the psychopath was originally recognized as simply *morally irresponsible*, which was known earlier as a *sinner*—as in *one affected with sin*. This would make *one affected with psychopathy* an objectified sinner, a secular heathen, or a thoughtcriminal.

As admitted by Lord Lawton L.J. of the British Court of Appeal in May of 1973:

Lord Denning M.R. and Orr L.J. have pointed out that *there is no definition of 'mental illness'*. The words are ordinary words of the English language. They have no particular medical significance. They have no particular legal significance. How should the court construe them?<sup>10</sup>

The amazing thing about this admission is that after openly admitting the lack of medical and legal significance, he then asked how they could apply it legally *anyway*. This deserves repeating: A judge

points out that a medical definition that is used to strip people of their legal rights has neither medical nor legal relevance, and then (as though he thought to himself: “Oops! Wasn't supposed to say that!”) avoids the next most logical question: “So why are we applying it?” or “What's it really all about?” Instead, he heads straight for “How can we contradict ourselves, and apply it anyway?”

Because Leonard was diagnosed with the rarest and most severe form of *non-organic* psychosis, it will only help to contrast his infliction with the most severe form of *organic* psychosis, *Alzheimer's*. *Alzheimer's* is a *physical* deterioration of the brain, and therefore takes the person's thoughts, speech, and behavior along with it. Leonard's deterioration, on the other hand, being *non-organic*, was only *metaphorical*. His “deterioration” from his former social status diseased his parents emotionally, threatened their stability, and thereby produced his disease of the mind.

Consider APA's reversal between 1987 and 1994:

The distinction made between organic and non-organic psychoses ... is strongly supported on clinical grounds. ... Since most forms of mental disorders fall into the latter category ... psychiatrists are unable to rely on laboratory tests to ... confirm their diagnoses.<sup>11</sup>

The term *organic mental disorder* is no longer used in DSM-IV [The Diagnostic & Statistical Manual] because it incorrectly implies that "nonorganic" mental disorders do not have a biological basis.<sup>12</sup>

Are they kidding? There really is no longer any fundamental difference between Alzheimer's and facecrime? Because we may accept as obvious that a person's speech and behavior is related to what's going on in their nervous system, we may then also accept as obvious that when said speech and behavior is suddenly declared to be "disorderly," then they are still related to what is going on in the nervous system. This is *not nor has it ever been the issue*. The point is, and always has been, that non-organic conditions are unrelated to the nervous system in that there *does not exist a single, reproducible laboratory test that can confirm their clinical existence*.

The first paragraph from *The Oxford Companion to the Mind* (1987) admits the simple difference between *neurological testing* (Alzheimer's) and *psychiatric voting* (facecrime). But the second, from APA's own handbook seven years later, suddenly abandons this reality. As of 1994, APA adopted the *belief* that if they ignore this difference, it will simply not exist any longer. But alas, the difference remains in the world, it's just forbidden to enter psychiatric consciousness. And by adopting this position, APA officially parallels the priestly segregation of biblical *leprosy*, which was one category including both *diseases of the skin* that made people multiple colors, and *ritual impurities*, which was whatever they voted on. (See *The Oxford Companion to the Bible*.)

By the way, according to Dr. Joel Wallach, in 1957 people discovered how to prevent Alzheimer's in pigs using nutrition. Since then there has been a great

decline in Alzheimer's in farm and zoo animals, while at the same time, every other American who reached the age of seventy in the 1990's developed it.<sup>13</sup> You see, *animals* with diseases are *not* profitable, but *people* with diseases are *very* profitable.

Or am I just being paranoid?

<sup>1</sup> Pgs. 127 & 129.

<sup>2</sup> Farber, p. 191. Listen to Leonard Frank at [www.youtube.com](http://www.youtube.com)

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, italics added.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> P. 54, bold and italics added.

<sup>7</sup> P. 70, italics added.

<sup>8</sup> Porter, p. 95, bold added.

<sup>9</sup> V. 24, p. 843-44, bold added.

<sup>10</sup> Porter, p. 193, italics added.

<sup>11</sup> OCM, p. 466, 471.

<sup>12</sup> DSM-IV, p. 123.

<sup>13</sup> Wallach, 1995.

## CHAPTER FOUR: PARANOIA

---

... [P]aranoiac delusions bear a disconcerting, embarrassing resemblance to the beliefs held and propagated by founders of religions, by political leaders, and by some artists. ... There must, it seems, be some as yet unformulated relationship between the psychology of paranoia and that of prophets and leaders.<sup>1</sup>

—*The Oxford Companion to the Mind* (1987)

The paranoiac explores, in game-theoretic fashion, the possibilities of all encounters. ... Otherwise put, the paranoid schizophrenic is routinely engaged in interpreting the world in terms of a game-theoretic model.<sup>2</sup>

—S. M. Lyman & M. B. Scott, *A Sociology of the Absurd*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. (1989)

How is it possible for an innocent American, living here in the “land of the free” to not only be imprisoned, but also tortured with eighty five electrocutions and artificial comas for things such as *withdrawal*, having *religious preoccupations*, and *not working*? Perspective developing clues can be found by pondering the symptoms themselves. We’ll limit our review to the three just mentioned.

**Withdrawal:** Do Americans have the right to be alone? Yes they do—unless, however, they don’t.

Said differently, just as Thoughtpolice incarcerate people in Oceania for things like *ownlife* (which is not openly declared forbidden), so also Deviancepolice incarcerate people in America for things like *withdrawal* (which is like-wise not declared forbidden). And if a person is raised since a small child to hold the solid conviction in his guaranteed freedom to live his life as he sees fit (as Leonard was), then when he withdraws into ownlife, and is then suddenly thrust into the paradox of American freedom, his intense, predictable reaction will only strengthen the paradox—it will be used to justify the application of symptom-inducing treatments, such as neurotoxic drugs and suicide-inducing surveillance.

In the beginning we saw, as the encyclopedia put it, that “when people are cut off from communication with other people there is a strong tendency to develop hallucinations similar to those of schizophrenia.” Whether being cut off is voluntary or not makes little difference. The point is that withdrawal is both a *symptom* and a *cause* of schizophrenia. If you withdraw from others, then you might act like a schizophrenic; if you have schizophrenia, it might make you withdraw from others. How on earth can withdrawal be both a *source* and a *product* of schizophrenia? In the spirit of the revealing quotes above, let’s try comparing our paranoiac with not just any “artist,” but a grandmaster:

“Nothing can be accomplished without solitude ...”<sup>3</sup>

—Pablo Picasso

If Picasso, the most influential artist of the twentieth century (as well as millions of other creative people) highly recommends *solitude* for personal development; if as one of Picasso's many biographers, Hans Jaffe, stated: "... solitude was the *root* of Picasso's independence; it also accounts for the fact that in his ... work he *followed no rules*, was *bound by no routine*. For him art was always an *adventure ...*,"<sup>4</sup> then *why* do psychiatrists call "withdrawal" a "symptom" of an illness? (Of course, withdrawal could mean simply sitting quietly in the corner, ignoring everyone and everything. Some people call this *catatonia*, while others call it *meditation* or *trance*.) Leonard's description of his "psycho-sis" in his own words sounds remarkably like an adventure that follows no rules and is bound by no routine, except that Leonard's involved books instead of paint:

... I started borrowing books from the library and buying new books. There was no pre-arranged course of study; it just seemed like one book led to another, one discovery led to another. Soon I was busy re-thinking everything; what was happening to me was that I was busy being born. ...

It was very exciting! The entire process seemed so natural. What guidance I needed came from within myself. I don't remember even seeking it; it was just there, somehow anticipating my needs before I experienced them. It was as though I was floating along a river of enchantment and excitement, never knowing what to expect as I approached each bend ... From

books and from deep inside myself either intuitively or by way of dreams, new ideas – or at least that were new to me – tumbled into my mind, but I never felt lost or confused. I simply mulled them over, selected out the best ones and began applying them in my own life.

In short order, I got away from being materialistic and became more idealistic and spiritual.<sup>5</sup>

Picasso lived for many years in virtual poverty (his famous *Blue Period*) when he composed paintings that at the time were not worth any substantial amount, but eventually came to be worth great fortunes. Leonard Frank may not be a master of the creative process, but then again, on the one hand he was never given the chance; on the other, does he really have to be a “master” of creativity? So he decided to switch from the real-estate business to a personal creative exploration and study of books—where’s the disease?

According to Jungian psychoanalyst and psychiatrist Anthony Storr, “The majority of poets, novelists, composers, ... painters and sculptors, are bound to spend a great deal of their time alone ... Current wisdom, especially that propagated by the various schools of psycho-analysis, assumes that ... interpersonal relationships of an intimate kind are the chief, if not the only, source of human happiness. Yet the lives of creative individuals often seem to run counter to this assumption. ... This is true of Descartes, Newton, Locke, Pascal, Spinoza, Kant, Leibniz, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Kierkegaard, and Wittgenstein.”<sup>6</sup>

Withdrawal is silently forbidden in a very similar way that monologging is. This should in no way surprise us since both monologging and withdrawal can be powerful *roots of independence*. They both help to develop the ability to think and act independently. Then again, what else should we expect of an *auto-catalysis*—a self-generating process—something that is both the source as well as the product of itself? Should we then be surprised to find that this is the basic meaning of both the traditional translation of the Jewish and Christian deity’s name *Yahweh* (“I am that I am”/self-generation), as well as the *image* of his enemy, the Serpent (symbolized universally as a snake emerging from His own mouth by *speaking Himself into existence*/self-generation)? And this convenient little coincidence brings us to Leonard’s ...

**Religious preoccupations:** Imagine a person suddenly developing “objective and scientific” preoccupations while living in a culture that is utterly devoted to “subjective and religious” matters. This person would be perceived as aberrant by others just as Leonard was in the reverse situation here in America. I don’t care if you’re a devout theist or a militant atheist. It makes no difference. When people can be told what mental/emotional/spiritual events can take place within the privacy of their own bodies, they can be described in many ways, but “free” is certainly *not* one of them. Saying that an experience is un-normal or ab-orthodox in the absence of disease can simply mean that it’s *forbidden*.

Observers of Leonard found him, like most psychiatric prisoners, to be “incomprehensible.” This gives us another fine opportunity to compare the modern with the ancient. Just as the ancient priest (as well as the shaman and medicine man of primary cultures around the world today) would *project the sins* of the community into the candidate for segregation, and then cast him from the community, so does the modern psychiatrist. Because the psychiatrist enjoys a certain social status, prestige, power over others, etcetera, he chooses to avoid the obvious honesty of “I can’t understand this person.” Instead, he projects this inability, his deficiency (objectified sin) into the candidate for segregation while announcing, “He is incomprehensible” (as if it were a thing in the person), and then casts him from the community. Only a god can say, “Because I can’t understand this person, then *no one else can!*” As Dr. Weil put it, “A high priest of technological medicine, enthroned in his temple, had uttered the equivalent of a shamanic curse, for doctors in our culture are invested with the very same power others project onto shamans and priests.”<sup>7</sup>

What’s most ridiculous, however, about the psychiatric assault on people’s religious interests and experiences is that the year following Leonard’s release, 1963, AMA suddenly adopted the belief that religion should *assist in treating disease*. By the following year, 1964, “... there were forty-two state medical associations which had approved formation of Committees on Medicine and Religion.”<sup>8</sup> In other words, AMA underwent its own religious trans-

formation and officially bonded with the god of the Bible. So APA was persecuting people for under going “spiritual renewal” while AMA was “finding religion” and joining in “clinical matrimony” with Yahweh.

**Not working:** Was Leonard really refusing to work, or do they really mean that he wasn’t selling his labor for an immediate profit? It is the simple difference between work which made him feel alive as opposed to work that came to suck the life right out of him. While most of us may be inclined to believe that it is an individual’s personal decision concerning what type of work is best for him or her, it really depends on certain social factors; on whether or not it *dis-eases others emotionally*. As Leonard put it to Farber in his 1991 interview: Even “... today, many people ... would think that the very fact that I wasn’t working, when I could have been *if* I wanted to, indicates that there was something very wrong with me. Once you stop working, or stop going to school, you’re almost immediately going to raise suspicions about yourself. The underlying assumption is that ... either you’re physically sick, which was ruled out in my case, or ‘mentally sick’.”<sup>9</sup>

The same year Farber interviewed Leonard, Anthony Robbins stated, in his national best seller *Awaken the Giant Within* (1991):

I often ask people who complain about their jobs, “Why did you go to work today?” Their answer usually is, “Because I had to.” You and I need to remember one thing: there is virtually nothing that we *have* to

do in this country. *You certainly don't have to go to work.* Not here! And you certainly don't *have* to work at a particular location on a particular day. Not in America! ... You can decide to do something else, something new, today. Right now you can make a decision ...<sup>10</sup>

*That is precisely what Leonard did!* Here we have a pristine snapshot of The Greatest Amerikan Paradox. Leonard made the very decision Robbins encourages millions of Americans to make, and suffered greatly for it. He was raised to hold solid the belief (shared by Robbins) in certain basic, unalterable rights, and then lost those rights in a manner that contradicted those rights. In fact, anyone can read in an encyclopedia that historically, only 25 percent of the asylum population was made up of the *privately* committed, like Ed and Leonard, while 75 percent was composed of “paupers,” or those who were not working:

... One major reason for the asylum's lack of [therapeutic] success was that the problems which confronted ... [its' managers] were *not specifically medical*, but had a large social component. The problems of lunacy were closely related to the problems of *pauperism*, as 75 percent of the insane came under the poor law authorities.<sup>11</sup>

In plain English, this means that a huge population of poor people (who were actually forced into poverty in the first place) was legally removed from public sight by declaring them insane. When we say that people do not get locked up in America for things like

“not working,” what is implicit is that said people are “normal” or “orthodox”; when people who lose this status are locked up for not working, it doesn’t count because they’re not really people any more.

Leonard went on to summarize: “In short, if you’re earning a living—if you’re playing the game—almost anything goes; if you’re not, almost nothing does. People dropping out of the game is very frightening to those remaining in it. People dropping out without sanctions would set a bad example from the standpoint of the stick-it-outs. If the dropouts aren’t punished, similarly inclined people might be encouraged to follow their example, and soon the game might have to be called for lack of players ...”<sup>12</sup>

Speaking of modeling a deviant, consider again Roger Bannister—one with sanctions. The most significant aspect of Roger’s breaking the four-minute mile, according to Robbins, lies in what it did for others. By providing people with an example of “doing the impossible,” within only a couple of years, 337 other people modeled Roger and likewise did what was for thousands of years known to be impossible.<sup>13</sup> To prevent Leonard from being a silently forbidden example that others might model, therefore, psychiatrists *erased his memory*. This made it much easier to “control his symptoms” and to gradually “re-align him like a tire” with others as psychiatrists imagined he had originally been. As he told Farber: “These so-called treatments literally wiped out all my memory for the two-year period preceding the last procedure. The period of self-conversion, except for its early stages, was erased from my mind in a brainwashing

procedure tyrants from all ages would have envied. ... My memory had been so devastated by the shocking that afterwards I was surprised to find out that John F. Kennedy was President of the United States, although he had been elected two years earlier. ... I realized that my high school and college were all but gone; educationally, I was at about an eighth grade level. ... I had been reduced—more or less—to the person the evaluating psychiatrist thought that I had been.... That was their standard of ‘success’.”<sup>14</sup> He then added: “Returning to consciousness that last time was the *worst, most painful experience of my life*. The only reason why it stuck in my memory was that there was no succeeding shocks to blot it out.”<sup>15</sup>

Realize that just as APA assaults many people for having religious preoccupations, while AMA has become preoccupied with religion—so also AMA considers electrocution, stabbing (lobotomy), and comas as medical *emergencies*, while APA strategically applies these things as psychiatric *treatments*. Stabbing a brain or inducing a coma to heal a disorderly mind is no different than prescribing a hefty dose of arsenic to cure a long bout of insomnia.

Was Leonard a potential religious/political leader on an artistic learning adventure, or simply a paranoid? Was he really subjected to the psychiatric inquisition for things like “growing a beard,” having “piercing eyes,” and “becoming a vegetarian,” or were these just tell-tale signs that there might be silently forbidden changes occurring inside him?

Leonard Frank was not imprisoned in 1962 because he was “ill,” for even if he was, being “ill” does

not in any way explain his incarceration. He was not imprisoned for being dangerous, because he wasn't. And he was not imprisoned simply because of the list of psychiatric absurdities he found in *their* records of him.

So why was he really incarcerated?

One simple solution is to recognize that Leonard was violating the Biblical commandment to honor the will of his parents, then got punished. After all, if American parents could actually have their children imprisoned for disobeying biblical commandments, wouldn't the conscious reason need to be something quite different in order to maintain the "normal" or "orthodox" belief in individual freedom—something objectively unverifiable such as the former *possession of the soul* or today's *disorder of the mind*?

Going a little deeper, we can propose that Leonard was confined to preserve the stability of his parents—specifically his father. His father's self-image depended on all that he possessed, and prominent among this mass of things was his son's admirable conformance to the ideal economically dictated standard: The Norm. His very stability was dependent on his control of his property, including his son. As Leonard continued to "deviate" ("deteriorate") his father gradually approached his emotional threshold of tolerance. The longer Leonard continued *doing his own thing*, the stronger his father's *dependency on his control of his son* clashed with his modern *belief in his own independence*. Eventually something had to collapse: His father's *modern belief*, or Leonard's *new independence*.

Consider this relationship as described by *Noyes' Modern Clinical Psychiatry* (1973):

If *behavior has been disturbed* and promises to *threaten later social acceptance*, prompt admission for hospital treatment is indicated.<sup>16</sup>

The phrase “threaten social acceptance” is a clear admission of a non-medical problem. A more accurate and straightforward translation would be: “If behavior has been disturbing to others and is certain to threaten the stability of others, then prompt confinement in the psychiatric readjustment center to induce amnesia and realign with others is necessary.” The segregate is responsible for the emotional stability of others, while said others are responsible for the body of the segregate. This is one reason why the segregate’s nonorganic infliction—according to a definition possessing neither legal nor medical significance—is called a *functional* disorder, meaning that either he is *not functioning as others expect*, or his presence *hinders the functioning of others*.

To expand this line of thought, consider the deviance of the American colonists from the control of their father, The Father of all Anglo-Americans, King George III. Like Leonard, the American colonists had developed a taste for individual initiative and independence, and also like Leonard, they *exercised their liberty*. And just like Leonard’s father, King George attempted to regain control of His distant disobedient children, but unlike Mr. Frank, *George failed*, and gradually proceeded to *lose his stability*

and his mind. In the movie, *The Madness of King George*, for example, which begins in 1788, the King shares with one of his close subjects: “I have had no peace of mind since we lost America.” Afterward, after running through the palace late one night during his first manic flight of rambling non-sense, and then a fit of verbal abuse of the queen, she caringly asked him, “Do you think that you are mad?” He then calmed, and answered softly:

I don't know. I don't know. Madness isn't such a torment. Madness isn't half-blind. Madmen can't stand; they skip; they dance. I talk. Talk, and talk, and talk. I hear the words; I have to speak them; to empty my head of the words. Something has happened. Something is not right.

Offering some insight into His dilemma, an encyclopedia states: “Much of his reign was spent in conflict with the Whig oligarchy in Parliament.... Ironically, He became the American colonists' principal symbol of English oppression, although Whig policy was really responsible.”<sup>17</sup> If the encyclopedia is correct, and He was innocent of the extent of oppression His rebelling children perceived in Him, then would it not seem reasonable that He found absolutely no reason to lose His children's obedience, and thus His control? Keep in mind that the king is “The” representative of *All Mighty God* in English society. He represents *The Infallible!* So when His children suddenly revolt for reasons that are not actually His doing (while possibly remaining in the dark as to why

they blame Him), might this strain His emotional tolerance and stability? Put simply, what the King firmly believed was impossible, was contradicted by what actually happened. He gradually lost control of his children, and then gradually lost control of His mind. (No doubt I am greatly oversimplifying it, but the gist is accurate.)

This partial explanation works well for most deviants. For example, Ed might need one act of electrocution to the brain to induce amnesia, as his condition was a single realization event occurring just before his “possession” by secular witch burners. A single zap or two, forced drugging, and intimidation into role playing (with a high probability of his eager submission to the All-Knowing Psychiatrists, enthroned in their Allopathic Temple, speaking Psychiatreese, uttering their secular-shamanic curses), would probably be sufficient to realign him with others as he had been previously. If not, they merely continue with their flurry of arguments until he caves in like a “normal” house of cards. Leonard, on the other hand, spent two whole years in spontaneous “deviant” learning, and therefore required a lot more effort, time, and amnesia to wipe it out.

*Why?* What silently forbidden thoughts or ideas could have been gestating in his mind? What might he have been learning that could possibly justify such an assault? What sort of mental/emotional /spiritual events was he host to that was such a desperate secret (Orwell’s “central” secret?) that he had to be sacrificed to keep it unknown? Just as we compared some of Leonard’s psychiatric *criteria* with

that of Orwell's Thoughtpolice, let's now consider briefly some key selections from the *interrogation* of Winston by O'Brien, an agent of the Thoughtpolice:

Even now, I am well aware, you are clinging to your disease under the impression that it is a virtue.<sup>18</sup>

You would not make the act of submission which is the price of sanity. You preferred to be a lunatic, a minority of one.<sup>19</sup>

Winston was aware of some heavy piece of apparatus being pushed into place behind his head. ... Two soft pads, which felt slightly moist, clamped themselves against Winston's temples. ... A terrific, painless\* blow had flattened him out. Also something had happened inside his head. ... [S]omewhere or other there was a large patch of emptiness, as though a piece had been taken out of his brain.<sup>20</sup>

You could grasp the mechanics of the society you lived in, but not its underlying motives. Do you remember writing in your diary, 'I understand *how*; I do not understand *why*'? *It was when you thought about 'why' that you doubted your own sanity.*<sup>21</sup>

Winston, like Leonard, considered his inquisitive outlook a good thing, but O'Brien, like psychiatrists,

---

\* I do not understand *why* Orwell would present so much misery and suffering in *1984*, and then portray the process of wiping out Winston Smith's memory as "painless." If *you* can, please enlighten me: write2me@erikblaire.info. Thanks.

regarded it as something to be extinguished—a rare, minority-of-one virtuous disease of asking “why?” When King George was mad, for example, madness was widely known as the *English disease* (because it followed the English wherever they went) and also as “... ‘a *disease of the learned*’. ... Idleness and solitude [a.k.a. *not working* and *withdrawal*] were both to be avoided on the grounds that they provided a *fertile breeding-ground for the imagination*.”<sup>22</sup> Leonard and Winston both had very active imaginations. They wondered deeply about the “underlying motives” of their respective societies, and both were forced in a similar way to stop their yearning to understand.

Since it is often much easier for people to see in other cultures what they have difficulty seeing in their own, we’ll adopt a *foreign* factual analogy as a foundation for approaching and understanding the potential power of this most rare and dangerous of all deviances—and why some seem so desperate to eliminate it. Said differently, just as Orwell fleshed his fiction over a factual skeleton, we’ll try to imagine what he may have had in mind behind Oceania’s *central secret* by also fleshing a hypothetical situation over a fascinating historical puzzle as our factual skeleton. Psychologist Julian Jaynes of Princeton University has framed this puzzle for us nicely with a simple question:

How could ... [the Inca] empire whose armies had triumphed over the civilizations of half a continent be captured by a small band of 150 Spaniards in the early evening of November 16, 1532? <sup>23</sup>

How indeed? How did Francisco Pizarro conquer the mightiest empire of South America in a single evening with only a boat load of 150 men? “The unsuspecting meekness of the surrender ...” Jaynes added, “... has long been the most fascinating problem of the European invasions of America. The fact that it occurred is clear, but the record as to *why* is grimy with supposition ...”<sup>24</sup>

(Uh-oh, there’s that word again.)

This is what Pizarro did: First he *predicted* a lunar eclipse, and then staged a timed *performance* in front of the head Inca—the God-King of the Sun!—making it seem as though his god, Yahweh, actually *caused* it. He made the moon vanish! Or so it seemed. Since the Inca did *not* know eclipse prediction, Pizarro was able to instantly wipe out the will of the most powerful empire of South America by striking terror in them with a simple staged trick. After all, if the mightiest of all the Inca became terrified, fear would spread like falling dominoes. Just consider how it must have seemed from the point of view of the Inca. In their eyes ...

... these rough, milk-skinned men with hair drooling from their chins instead of from their scalps so that their heads looked upside down, clothed in metal, with avertive eyes, riding strange llamalike creatures with silver hoofs, having arrived like gods in gigantic huampus tiered like Mochican temples over the sea which to the Inca was unsailable ...<sup>25</sup>

... *had just made the moon disappear!*

As a result of being catatonic with fear of such power...

... the Inca and his lords were captured like helpless automatons. And as its people mechanically watched, this shipload of ... men stripped the gold sheathing of the holy city, melted down its golden images and all the treasures of the Golden Enclosure, ... murdered its living god and its princes, raped its unprotesting women, and ... sailed away with the yellow metal into the subjective conscious value system from which they had come.<sup>26</sup>

The key words in Jaynes question are “early evening” because Christopher Columbus had pulled the very same deception when he was stranded in Jamaica twenty eight years earlier, in the early evening of February 26, 1504.<sup>27</sup> Columbus used this trick to terrify the Jamaicans into providing him and his men with a steady food supply. The Jamaicans had voluntarily been feeding them already. But the selfish abusiveness of his men drove the Jamaicans to withhold food, and this just made them even more unruly and mutinous. Put simply, Columbus and his men got themselves into a life or death situation, and then Columbus cleverly saved them from starvation. Once Columbus returned to Spain, bragging about how easy and effective it was to gain such control over the natives’ emotions and bodies, wouldn’t the Spaniards decide to make it a rule (if they hadn’t already) to schedule invasions of other cultures to coincide with eclipses whenever possible?

Now let's allow our forbidden imaginations to wander for a moment, and pretend that Columbus enjoyed so much his power over and control of the natives (and the climate) that he decided against repairing his damaged boat. Instead, he and his followers would stay to build an empire of his own: Columbusdom. He didn't want to be subject to the dominion of someone else any longer; *he wanted to be The King*. So Columbus and his immediate descendants would gradually form their own kingdom, whose very growth and stability would be utterly dependent on their control of the natives; while said servitude being dependent on eliminating any and all possibility of the natives ever learning to *discriminate* (to make the vital distinction) between *eclipse prediction* (the secret trick) and *performing* as the *cause* (the public perception).

To understand how he might accomplish this, we must first realize that life in powerful, complex societies is governed by two distinct sets of rules. One set of rules governs *outer* behavior, while the other set of rules governs *inner* behavior—legal vs. normal—and each has its own form of processing center—prison vs. asylum. Laws are “declared” and “written,” so we are quite *conscious* of them. Norms, on the other hand, are *not* declared and written; they're all those silent little rules of behavior that everyone “just knows” without really knowing *that* they know. People obey norms without paying much attention to them; we're only conscious of them when they are violated. People become diseased emotionally when norms are breached, while the breacher is

imagined as a leper, witch, heretic, mentally ill, or whatever is fashionable in that particular time and place. What's crucial to understand is that these rules may contradict each other. For example, laws may protect certain behavior, while norms may forbid that same behavior *under certain conditions*. (Ed, for example, spoke the truth in saying that millions of Americans are working hard to save the planet while waiting for it to be destroyed at any moment, but he violated a norm in doing so. This was evidenced by his observers' loss of emotional stability. This loss of stability over-rode the law that protects freedom of speech, resulting in Ed's losing his right to speak his mind.

The first thing Columbus would do, then, would be to maintain and strictly enforce an *unspoken* rule *forbidding discussion* of the secret subject of the eclipse. After all, to speak of it would necessarily entail being conscious of it, so he would eliminate the subject from social discourse in order to eliminate it from his citizens' awareness. (As the word *allopathy* is missing from the dictionary?). At the same time he would brand/label/stereotype anyone who even attempted to discuss the secret subject as the *Dreadful Jamaican* (analogous to the American Psycho or the Oceanic Thoughtcriminal). Anyone violating such a rule would be immediately turned in (without breaking any laws) and savagely punished, maybe even killed for his silently forbidden speech. By enforcing this dual-rule-system, everyone would gradually forget all about what happened and how—except, of course, the dominating elite. And as they

strove more and more to eliminate any chance of losing their control of others (on which their independence was utterly dependent), their goal would be to eliminate within their slaves the very ability and willingness to think too independently. So behaviors such as *talking to oneself* and *being alone too long* would gradually become taboo, as those behaviors would provide a fertile breeding ground for the imagination. What's more, with the elimination of solitude, everyone would then unconsciously keep each other under constant surveillance, as no one would really be alone long enough for their minds to wonder very far. To paraphrase historian and philosopher Michel Foucault, "the normalcy police would be everywhere."

The crowning achievement, however, would be a system that practically ran itself. On top of enforcing unconscious taboos on things that develop mental independence, people would gradually be encouraged to be consciously convinced of their right to speak their free and independent minds. This way everyone would believe in their *protected* individual freedom to speak of any sudden *realizations* (such as eclipse prediction, for example) that might suddenly pop into their minds (as happened to Ed). At the same time, the socially conditioned *fear of* and *reaction to* the Dreadful Jamaican would automatically have them removed from the eyes and ears of the public—at least until ways of inducing amnesia were devised, along with speech and thought controlling chemicals, allowing said deviants to be gradually realigned with others as reasonable facsimiles of normalcy.

Because the subjects that lie at the crux of the secret matter (at the intersection between Law and Norm) are consciously avoided by the obedient orthodoxy of Columbusdom, it wouldn't really matter what anyone said otherwise, as all orthodox discourse always steers wide and clear of the forbidden—the secret subjects would be simply *unthinkable*. Given enough time, say a few centuries, such a social experiment could come to epitomize the very quest for power, control, progress, and hence “Modernity.”

But how might this situation seem from the point of view of the Dreadful Jamaican? I see two basic alternatives: Either he sees the interplay between the two sets of rules, or he doesn't. If he doesn't, then he may find himself sacrificed into a madness manufacturing contradiction. If he does, to paraphrase psychiatrist R. D. Laing, he might say, “I see that we're playing The Game. If they see that I see that we're playing The Game, they will punish me. So I'll play a game of pretending not to see that we're playing The Game.” Realizing that trying to verbalize it is sheer folly, he'd fall on the only alternative available (save begging someone to electrocute him into amnesia). His only valid path would be to *very* carefully use metaphor, analogy, and facts, so he would probably first turn to books just like Leonard, and perhaps eventually, little by little, compose his warning for others in writing just like Orwell.

Never forget that the simple difference between *predicting* an eclipse and *performing as its cause* is the same basic difference as that between the *reality* of Leonard and the *category* the orthodoxy is conscious of. And since the category is always a subjective matter—meaning that as the *time*, the *place*, and the *observers* change, so does the mask of the so-called condition—*anyone*, under just the right circumstances, *can find themselves trapped in The Greatest Amerikan Paradox*.

- <sup>1</sup> P. 577.
- <sup>2</sup> P. 107.
- <sup>3</sup> Jaffe, p. 9.
- <sup>4</sup> Ibid, italics added.
- <sup>5</sup> Farber, p. 191-92.
- <sup>6</sup> Storr, p. ix.
- <sup>7</sup> Weil, p. 63.
- <sup>8</sup> O'Hair, p. 240-41, italics added.
- <sup>9</sup> Farber, p. 193, italics added.
- <sup>10</sup> P. 35, italics added, bold removed.
- <sup>11</sup> OCM, p. 53, italics added.
- <sup>12</sup> Farber, p. 193-94.
- <sup>13</sup> Robbins, p. 81.
- <sup>14</sup> Farber, p. 195-96.
- <sup>15</sup> Ibid, p. 197, italics added.
- <sup>16</sup> Szasz, 1976, p. 88.
- <sup>17</sup> NADE, p.498
- <sup>18</sup> Orwell, 1949, p. 203.
- <sup>19</sup> Ibid, p. 205.
- <sup>20</sup> Ibid, p. 211-12.
- <sup>21</sup> Ibid, p. 215, italics added.
- <sup>22</sup> OCM, p. 372, italics added.
- <sup>23</sup> Jaynes, p. 160.
- <sup>24</sup> Ibid, italics added.
- <sup>25</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>26</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>27</sup> Calvin, p. 4-5.

## FIGURE A: EURO-ENGLISH

---

The European Union commissioners have announced that an agreement has been reached to adopt English as the preferred language for European communications, rather than German, which was the other possibility. As part of the negotiations, Her Majesty's Government conceded that English spelling had some room for improvement and has accepted a five-year phased plan for what will be known as EuroEnglish (Euro for short).

In the first year, "s" will be used instead of the soft "c." Certainly sivil servants will resieve this news with joy. Also, the hard "c" will be replased with "k." Not only will this klear up konfusion, but typewriters kan have one less letter.

There will be growing publik enthusiasm in the sekond year, when the troublesome "ph" will be replaced by "f." This will make words like "fotograf" 20 persent shorter.

In the third year, publik akseptanse of the new spelling kan be expekted to reach the stage where more komplikatated changes are possible. Governments will enkorage the removal of double letters, which have always ben a deterrent to akurate speling. Also, al wil agre that the horrible mes of silent "e"s in the languag is disgrasful, and they would go.

By the fourth year, people wil be reseptiv to steps such as replasing "th" by "z" and "w" by "v." During ze fifz year, ze unesesary "o" kan be dropd from vords kontaining "ou" and similar changes vud of kors be aplid to ozer kombinations of leters.

After ze fifz yer, ve vil hav a reli sensibl riten styl. Zer vil be no mor trubls or difikultis and evrivun vil find it ezi tu understand ech ozer. Ze drem vil finali kum tru.

— Author Unknown

## FIGURE B: THE PSYCHO + -PATH/-SIS

---

### **Oxford's and Webster's Dictionaries on: *The psychopath: 1885 to 1986***

1885 ... 'The psychopath ... is a type which has only recently come under the notice of medical science ... Beside his own person and his own interests, nothing is sacred to the psychopath'. ... [OED, 1961]

1896 ... They are 'psychopathics'—a term which Prof. James, of Harvard University, employs to denote an inborn aptitude to immoral actions in any direction. [OED, 1961]

[1933] One affected with psychopathy; a mentally deranged person. [OED, 1961]

[1956] One who is morally irresponsible. [Webster's, 1956]

[1986] 1: a mentally ill or unstable person : one with a poorly balanced personality structure : ECCENTRIC 2 : *psychopathic personality*\* ...

[\*] *psychopathic personality* ... 1 : a disorder of behavior toward other individuals or toward society in which reality is usually perceived except for an individual's social responsibilities or moral obligations, which is often manifested hedonistically (as by criminal acts, drug addiction, sexual perversion, or activity leading to immediate gratification especially when it is believed that punishment can be avoided), by passive indifference (as by shiftlessness, untrustworthiness, or vagabondism), or in contrast by fanatical pseudo-social zealotry, and which is usually a more or less permanent way of life refractory to treatment and hence often considered a constitutional disorder 2 : an individual having a psychopathic personality. [Webster's, 1986, italics added.]

**Oxford's and Webster's Dictionaries on:  
*Psychosis: 1874 to 1986***

1874 ... No wonder that the criminal psychosis, which is the mental side of the neurosis, is for the most part an intractable malady, punishment being of no avail to produce a permanent reformation. [OED, 1961]

1879 ... Pathologists call it a psychosis, as if it were a lesion of the unknown psyche. [OED, 1961]

1907... Feelings, moods, emotional consciousnesses or psychoses [OED, 1961]

[1933] 1. Pathology Any kind of mental affection or derangement; especially one which cannot be ascribed to organic lesion or neurosis (of NEUROSIS 1). ... 2. Psychology A change in the psychic state; an activity or movement of the psychic organism, as distinguished from neurosis (NEUROSIS 2). ... [OED, 1961]

[1956] ... In psychiatry and psychology, any disease or disorder of the mind; any form of insanity. [Webster's, 1956]

[1986] ... 1 : profound disorganization of mind, personality, or behavior that results from an individual's inability to tolerate the demands of his social environment whether because of the enormity of the imposed stress or because of primary inadequacy or acquired debility of his organism especially in regard to the central nervous system or because of combinations of these factors and that may be manifested by disorders of perception, thinking, or affect symptoms of neurosis, by criminality, or by any combination of these--distinguished from neurosis; compare INSANITY 2 : extreme mental unrest of an individual or of a social group especially in regard to situational factors of grave import ... syn see INSANITY [Webster's, 1986]

## BIBLIOGRAPHY:

---

- Boorstin, D. J. 1989. *Hidden History. Exploring Our Secret Past.* New York: Vintage.
- Calvin, W. H. 1991. *How the Shaman Stole the Moon.* New York: Bantam.
- Cohen, E. D. 1988. *The Mind of the Bible Believer.* Buffalo, NY: Prometheus.
- DSM *Diagnostic And Statistical Manual Of Mental Disorders.* 4th Ed. Washington, DC: APA. 1994.
- EB Goetz, P. W., & McHenry, R. Eds. *The New Encyclopedia Britannica.* 15th Ed. 1988.
- Farber, S. 1993. *Madness, Heresy, and the Rumor of Angels.* Peru, Illinois: Open Court.
- Fromm, E. 1973. *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness.* New York: Henry Holt.
- Graham, H. D. "The Paradox of American Violence." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* Vol. 391, September, 1970.
- Jaffe, H. L. C. 1983. *Picasso.* New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc.
- Jaynes, J. 1976. *The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- NADE *The New American Desk Encyclopedia.* 3rd Ed. New York: Signet / Penguin. 1993.
- OCM Gregory, R. L., Ed. *The Oxford Companion to the Mind.* New York: Oxford U. P. 1987.
- ODEE Onions, C. T., Ed., *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology,* New York: Oxford U. P., 1991.

- O'Hair, M. M. 1986. *An Atheist Speaks*. Austin, Texas: American Atheist Press.
- Orwell, G. 1949. *Nineteen Eighty Four*. New York: Plume / HBJ
1968. *In Front of Your Nose. 1945-1950. The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*. Vol. 4. Sonia Orwell & Ian Angus, Eds. Orlando, FL. HBJ
1981. *A Collection of Essays*. New York: Harcourt Brace & Co.
- Oxley, B. T. 1969. *George Orwell*. New York, NY: Arco.
- Porter, R. Ed. 1993. *The Faber Book of Madness*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Robbins, A. 1992. *Awaken the Giant Within*. New York: Fireside / Simon & Schuster.
- Storr, A. 1988. *Solitude. A Return to the Self*. New York: Ballantine.
- Szasz, T. 1976. *Schizophrenia. The Sacred Symbol Of Psychiatry*. New York: Syracuse U. P.
1990. *The Untamed Tongue. A Dissenting Dictionary*. La Salle, Illinois: Open Court
- Wallach, J. 1995. *Dead Doctors Don't Lie*. (Audio tape) Contact Brent Adams: 1.800.706.2669
- Weil, A. 1995. *Spontaneous Healing*. New York: Fawcett Columbine.
- Wills, G. 1990. *Under God. Religion and American Politics*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- WNTCD Whitehall, H., Ed., *Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary*, New York, S.R. W. Publishing Co., Inc., 1956
- WTNID *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*, Chicago, IL, Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc, 1986

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

---

I would like to thank my family, friends, and everyone else across the country who provided me with their opinions, suggestions, and general feedback on the manuscript, and particularly my mother for her gracious financial investment. I would especially like to thank Leonard Frank for reviewing the chapters relevant to his story (chapters 3 and 4); Marco Ladu for pointing out a vital mistake “just in time”; and Jan Irvin of Gnostic Media Research and Publishing, for granting me my first interview (Pod-cast # 75 @ [www.gnosticmedia.com](http://www.gnosticmedia.com)). And most of all, I would like to thank Eric Blair (a.k.a. George Orwell) for being the writer that he was, and a major source of my inspiration.

All writers are vain, selfish and lazy, and at the very bottom of their motivations there lies a mystery. Writing a book is a horrible, exhausting struggle, like a bout of some painful illness. One would never undertake such a thing if one were not driven on by some demon whom one can neither resist nor understand.

—George Orwell, *Why I Write* (1946)

## INDEX:

---

- 2050, 22  
911, 24
- Abnormal brain chemistry, 35  
Al Qaeda, 23  
allopathy, v, 1- 8, 16, 34, 40, 51, 55-57, 72, 86  
allopathy lowers mortality rates, 7  
allopathy as #1 killer, 6  
American Medical Association, 56, 57, 72, 76  
American Psychiatric Association, 56-57, 63-64, 73, 76  
amnesia, 21, 40, 78, 80, 87-88, *see memory hole*  
*Animal Farm*, 11, 13, 14  
Apocalyptic, 27  
asylum, 32, 74, 85  
authority, 4, 9, 13, 23, 26, 35, 46, 49, 50, 54, 56-57, 74  
auto-catalysis, 71  
automaton, iii, 84  
Awaken the Giant Within, 52, 73
- Bannister, Roger, 41, 75  
Bible, 64, 73  
Bleuler, Eugene, 39  
Boorstin, Daniel, 19, 20, 24  
Brady, James, 32  
Britannica, The Encyclopedia, 60
- central secret, 21, 82-88  
CNN, 5, 8  
Columbus, Christopher, 84  
Columbusdom, 85, 88  
coma, 45, 56, 59, 67, 76  
communism, 14  
conspiracy, 27, 82-88  
corporatism, 5  
corruption, 7  
cure, 3, 4, 5, 34, 45, 76
- death, 5, 6, 14, 84  
dependency vs independence, 77  
depression, 2, 50, 60, 61  
Descartes, René, 70  
dictionary, 2-5, 8, 16, 34, 43, 45, 62-63, 78, 86  
disillusionment, 27  
disobedience, 46-47, 48, 55-65, 78  
disorder of the mind, 77, 93  
doublespeak, 1, 19, *see newspeak and doublethink*  
doublethink, 16-17, 18, 19, 21  
Dreadful Jamaican, 86-88  
drugs, 1-3, 26, 36-38, 42, 45, 68, 92  
DSM-IV *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, 4<sup>th</sup> Ed., 63, 65  
dual-rule-system, 86
- eclipse, 83, 85-87, 89  
electric-shock, 46  
electrocution, 76, 80  
electro-shock, 26  
emotioncrime, 22

English disease, 82  
 English Socialism, 17, *see Ingsoc*  
 experiment, 47-52, 88

facecrime, 59, 61, 64  
 Farber, Seth, 40, 56  
 fascism, 5, 14  
 forbidden, 12, 14, 16, 22, 29, 57, 64,  
 68, 71, 75-76, 80, 85-86, 88  
 Foster, Jodie, 32  
 Foucault, Michel, 87  
 Frank, Leonard Roy, 56, 65, 70, 76,  
 96  
 freedom, 19, 21, 24, 27, 28, 46, 52-  
 54, 57, 68, 77, 86, 87  
 freedom, *Americans escaping from*,  
 52-54  
 Freedom is Slavery, 19  
 freedom of speech, 27, 86  
 Fromm, Erich, iii, 54  
 functional disorder, 78

Goldstein, Emanuel, 23  
 Graham, Hugh Davis, 20

Hahnemann, C. F. S., 1  
 Haldol, 37  
 heal, 3, 5, 76  
 health, 4, 38  
 Heimlich, Dr. Henry, 6  
 Henson, Francis A., 14  
 Hidden History, 19  
 Hinckley, Jr., John, 32  
 Hippocratic Oath, 1  
 historical puzzle, 82  
 history, iii, 5, 11-14, 20, 22, 24, 40,  
 42  
 history, *freezing of*, 22, 24

Hitler, Adolph, 9, 13  
 homeopathy, 1, 2, 4

Inca, 82, 83, 84  
 Ingsoc, 14, 16, 17, 18, 22, *see*  
*Newspeak*  
 inoculation, 6  
 interrogation, 81  
 Israeli psychiatrists, 37

Jaffe, Hans, 69  
 Jamaica, 84  
 Jaynes, Julian, 82

Kant, Immanuel, 70  
 Kennedy, John F., 76  
 Kierkegaard, Søren, 70  
 King George III, 78

Laden, Osama bin, v, 23, 24  
 Laden, USAm bin, v, 24  
 Laing, R. D., 88  
 laughing fits, 48, 50  
 Law, 88  
 laws, 14, 22, 86  
 Lawton L.J., Lord, 62  
 Leibniz, Gottfried, 70  
 leprosy, 22, 64  
 Lithium, 37  
 lobotomy, 45, 76  
 Locke, John, 70

male domination, *emergence of*, 13  
 Maudsley, Henry, 59, 62  
 medicine, v, 1-2, 5-8, 56, 57, 72, *see*  
*allopathy*  
 memory, 12, 21, 27, 75, 81  
 Memory Hole, 16, 21

- memory wiped, 75
- Mendelsohn, Dr. Robert, 7, 8
- mental illness, 30, 33, 37, 45, 50, 62
- mental illness, *as neo-guilt.*, 45
- mental illness, *equivlant to thoughtcrime*, 22
- Ministry of Truth, 19
- modern, v, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 16, 17, 19, 22, 29, 45, 52, 56, 57, 72, 77, 78
- modernity, 88
- monologging, 28, 29, 50, 71, 87
- murder, normal vs. abnormal, 31
- Mussolini, Benito, 5
- New Medical Foundation, 6
- Newspeak, 16-17, 24, 36, 59, 61, 64, 67-69, 71, 76, 82, 87
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, 70
- Nikolayev, Uri, 34
- Nineteen Eighty Four*, iii, 2, 11, 14-15, 18, 20, 24, 50, 59, 81
- Norm, 77, 88
- normal, 28-29, 31, 35, 40-42, 52, 71, 75, 77, 80, 85
- normalcy, 32, 87
- norms, 14, 85
- obedience, 3, 32, 45-54, 55, 57, 79, 85, 88
- Oceania, 14, 16, 20-22, 68, 82
- Oceania, *principles of*, 16, 22
- Oceania, *slogans of*, 12, 16, 17, 19
- Oldspeak, 16, 17, *see Newspeak*
- On Being Sane in Insane Places, 40
- Orwell, George, iii, 1, 2, 5, 9, 10, 13-16, 18, 21, 23-25, 43, 59, 80-82, 88, 90, 96
- ownlife, 59, 68
- paradox, 19, 20, 22, 27, 28, 29, 31, 38, 51, 62, 68
- paranoia, 23, 38, 39, 58, 61, 65, 67-89
- Pascal, Blaise, 70
- paupers, 74
- Petri dishes, *people used as*, 5
- Picasso, Pablo, 68
- Pizarro, Francisco, 83
- Political Correctness, 17, *see Newspeak*
- political philosophy, 19
- political theory, 19
- politics, 11, 15, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 34, 52, 67, 76
- possession of the soul, 77
- Prolixin, 37
- Prozac, 2, 37, *see drugs*
- Psychiatreese, 80
- psychiatric voting, 46, 64
- psychiatry, 28, 30-31, 33, 37, 38, 39, 40-41, 46, 56-58, 59, 61, 63-64, 69, 72, 75-78, 80-81, 88, 93
- psychopath, 61, 92
- psychosis, 22, 26, 30, 31, 58, 61, 63-64, 69, 93
- psychosis, *organic vs non-organic*, 63-64, 93
- quackery, organized, 5
- Regan, Ronald, 32
- religion, 6, 14, 16-17, 19, 20, 22, 72, 76, *see Ingsoc*
- religious preoccupations, 59, 67, 76
- ritual impurities, 64
- Robbins, Anthony, 52, 55, 73
- Rosenhan, D., 40

sadistic brutality, *emergence of*, 13  
 schizophrenia, v, 22, 23, 25-43, 45,  
 56, 58, 60, 67-68  
 schizophrenia, *and CAT scans*, 33  
 schizophrenia, *and suicide*, 39  
 Schopenhauer, Arthur, 70  
 Separation of Church and State,  
 20  
 sin, 22  
 solitude, 59, 68-69, 82, 87  
 Spaniards, 82, 84  
 Spanish Civil War, 9  
 Spinoza, Baruch, 70  
 Stalin, Joseph, 13  
 Stelazine, 37  
 Storr, Anthony, 70  
 submission, 46, 54  
 suffering, 3-5, 15, 45-46, 81  
 suspicion, 60-61  
 Szasz, Thomas, 45  
  
 tardive dyskinesia/dementia, 38  
 The Brotherhood, 23  
 The Game, 88  
 The Greatest Amerikan Paradox,  
 74, 89  
  
 The Madness of King George, 79  
 The New-guilt, 45  
 The Party, 2, 16, 23  
 The Profit, 4, 7  
 The Theory and Practice of  
 Oligarchical Collectivism, 21,  
 24  
 thoughtcrime, 22, 23, 62  
 Thoughtpolice, 59, 68, 81  
  
 USAmA vs. Osama, 24  
  
 vaccines, 6  
 violence, 19, 20, 22  
  
 Wallach, Dr. Joel, 64  
 War on Terror, 23  
 Weil, Dr. Andrew, 56  
 Whig oligarchy, 79  
 Wills, Gary, 20  
 witch, 37, 41, 42, 80, 86  
 withdrawal, 59, 67-69, 71, 82  
 Wittgenstein, Ludwig, 70  
  
 Yahweh, 71, 73, 83