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The psychiatric profession purports to be the sole arbiter on the subject of mental health and “diseases” of the mind. The facts, however, demonstrate otherwise:

1. **Psychiatric “Disorders” Are Not Medical Diseases.** In medicine, strict criteria exist for calling a condition a disease: a predictable group of symptoms and the cause of the symptoms or an understanding of their physiology (function) must be proven and established. Chills and fever are symptoms. Malaria and typhoid are diseases. Diseases are proven to exist by objective evidence and physical tests. Yet, no mental “diseases” have ever been proven to medically exist.

2. **Psychiatrists Deal Exclusively with Mental “Disorders,” Not Proven Diseases.** While mainstream physical medicine treats diseases, psychiatry can only deal with “disorders.” In the absence of a known cause or physiology, a group of symptoms seen in many different patients is called a disorder or syndrome. Harvard Medical School’s Joseph Glenmullen, M.D., says that in psychiatry, “all of its diagnoses are merely syndromes [or disorders], clusters of symptoms presumed to be related, not diseases.” As Dr. Thomas Szasz, Professor of Psychiatry Emeritus, observes, “There is no blood or other biological test to ascertain the presence or absence of a mental illness, as there is for most bodily diseases.”

3. **Psychiatry Has Never Established the Cause of Any “Mental Disorder.”** Leading psychiatric agencies such as the World Psychiatric Association and the U.S. National Institute of Mental Health admit that psychiatrists do not know the causes or cures for any mental disorder or what their “treatments” specifically do to the patient. They have only theories and conflicting opinions about their diagnoses and methods, and are lacking any scientific basis for these. As a past president of the World Psychiatric Association stated, “The time when psychiatrists considered that they could cure the mentally ill is gone. In the future, the mentally ill have to learn to live with their illness.”

4. **The Theory That Mental Disorders Derive from a “Chemical Imbalance” in the Brain Is Unproven Opinion, Not Fact.** One prevailing psychiatric theory (key to psychotropic drug sales) is that mental disorders result from a chemical imbalance in the brain. As with its other theories, there is no biological or other evidence to prove this. Representative of a large group of medical and biochemistry experts, Elliot Valenstein, Ph.D., author of Blaming the Brain says: “There are no tests available for assessing the chemical status of a living person’s brain.”

5. **The Brain Is Not the Real Cause of Life’s Problems.** People do experience problems and upsets in life that may result in mental troubles, sometimes very serious. But to represent that these troubles are caused by incurable “brain diseases” that can only be alleviated with dangerous pills is dishonest, harmful and often deadly. Such drugs are often more potent than a narcotic and capable of driving one to violence or suicide. They mask the real cause of problems in life and debilitate the individual, so denying him or her the opportunity for real recovery and hope for the future.
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Alan I. Leshner, psychiatrist and former head of the National Institute of Drug Abuse once stated: “My belief is that today...you [the physician] should be put in jail if you refuse to prescribe S.S.R.I.s [the new types of antidepressants] for depression. I also believe that five years from now, you should be put in jail if you don’t give crack addicts the medications we’re working on now.”¹

In the many years of working on mental health reform, I have spoken to hundreds of physicians and thousands of patients, while helping to expose numerous psychiatric violations of human rights. However, until recently, the thought had never occurred to me that physicians’ rights might also be under assault. Why should a physician be jailed for refusing to prescribe an antidepressant for depression?

Many primary care physicians have acknowledged there are numerous physical conditions that can cause emotional and behavioral problems, and the vital need to check for them first. It follows then that relying on an antidepressant to suppress emotional symptoms, without first looking for and correcting a possible underlying physical illness, could simply be giving patients a chemical fix, while leaving them with an illness that could worsen.

What if a primary care physician or family practitioner correctly diagnosed and cured such a physical illness and the depression ended without psychoactive drugs? Could that physician then be accused of being unethical, or even be charged and jailed for the “criminal medical negligence” of not prescribing an antidepressant?

Crazy, you say? Couldn’t happen? Well, perhaps. But it seems the day has come when a good physician can be accused of being unethical for practicing ethical medicine. Today, a physician, specialist or otherwise, can be criticized, bullied and treated like a “fringe” dweller for practicing workable, diagnostic medicine.

This publication has been written with physicians in mind, particularly those who would just like to practice non-psychiatric medicine, who are driven by a high and caring purpose in the best Hippocratic tradition, and who want to be left to get on with the job of caring for people’s health to the best of their ability. It is for physicians who are concerned about the fact that millions of children are taking prescribed addictive, speed-like stimulants for a supposed mental disorder, Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD).
There is a pervasive mental health thinking that appears in primary care medicine today. It is largely due to the “success” of psychiatry’s diagnostic system, the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV)*. This system and the mental diseases section of the *International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10)* have been heavily promoted as vitally necessary, mental disorder standards for non-psychiatric physicians.

But there is something else here. Psychiatry’s diagnostic system did not arrive in a spirit of professional respect for the traditions and knowledge of primary care medicine and other medical specialties. There was no letter of introduction saying, “We respect the sanctity and seniority of your relationship with your patients, and your wish to provide the best for them. Here is our diagnostic system, please look it over and first satisfy yourself from your own experience that we are on the right track. This is valid science. We would appreciate your feedback and constructive criticism. By all means holler for help if you need us. Yours in the quest for better health.”

Instead, it arrived in effect saying, “Here is a young child with severe mental problems. Our expert diagnosis is already made, in which case you have to do no more than follow our strict drug prescription instructions and be subject to our expert supervision.” Or put otherwise, it says, “Your patients seem to trust you more than us, so here is how you have to diagnose their mental illness, from which they undoubtedly suffer.”

This is the coercive undercurrent that has indelibly characterized psychiatry since it first assumed custodial duties within asylums 200 years ago. It is manifest in many different ways, and wherever it meddles, it is extremely destructive of certainty, pride, honor, industry, initiative, integrity, peace of mind, well-being and sanity. These are qualities that we must fight to preserve for all patients. And for all physicians.

Sincerely,

Jan Eastgate
President, Citizens Commission on Human Rights International
**IMPORTANT FACTS**

1. “Biological psychiatry” has yet to validate a single psychiatric condition/diagnosis as an abnormality/disease, or as anything neurological, biological, chemically imbalanced or genetic.

2. The U.S. National Institutes of Health Consensus Conference on ADHD (Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder) found no “proof that ADHD is caused by a chemical imbalance.”

3. German child and adolescent psychiatrist Paul Runge says that if ADHD was biologically based, “a real, effective treatment would require a cure which influences only this specific biological disorder.” Such a treatment does not exist.

4. In 2002, a Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe report called for “stricter control” to be “exercised over the diagnosis and treatment” of ADHD and that more research be conducted into alternative forms of treatment such as diet.

5. Through the 1990s, the international production of methylphenidate (Ritalin) increased from 2.8 tons to 15.3 tons and continues to rise.

Matthew Smith was forced by school personnel to take a psychiatric stimulant to help him “focus” better. However, in 2000, at age 14, he died of a heart attack that a coroner attributed to the prescribed stimulant. More and more children are being diagnosed with ADHD, a disease that has never been proven clinically to exist. Widespread marketing has been largely responsible for the increase.
Good Business, Bad Medicine

At age seven, Matthew Smith was diagnosed through his school as having Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). His parents were told that he needed to take a stimulant to help him focus. Initially resistant, Matthew’s parents were told that noncompliance could bring criminal charges for neglecting their son’s educational and emotional needs. “My wife and I were scared of the possibility of losing our children if we didn’t comply,” said Matthew’s father, Lawrence Smith. After being told that there was nothing wrong with the “medication,” that it could only help, Matthew’s parents yielded to the pressure.

On March 21, 2000, while skateboarding, Matthew died from a heart attack. The coroner determined that Matthew’s heart showed clear signs of small blood vessel damage caused by stimulant drugs like amphetamines, and concluded that he had died from the long-term use of the prescribed stimulant.

Despite psychiatric claims to the contrary, this practice of prescribing cocaine-like drugs to the world’s children is far removed from conclusive science. There are an extraordinary number of distorted facts in the majority of the available data. The following information presents an alternative perspective for concerned physicians.

After hearing from the world’s leading ADHD proponents, the U.S. National Institutes of Health (NIH) has concluded that there is no data confirming ADHD as a brain dysfunction. The conference found that, “our knowledge about the cause or causes of ADHD remains largely speculative.” The National Institute for Clinical Excellence in the United Kingdom concurred: “[T]here is still controversy over the causes and diagnostic validity of ADHD.”

Dominick Riccio, Executive Director of the International Center for the Study of Psychiatry and Psychology says, “They would need to show me a direct causal relationship between any brain chemical and the symptoms of ADHD. … They have gone through the dopamine hypothesis. They have gone through the serotonin hypothesis. None of them has a causal relationship.”

Dr. Louria Shulamit, a family practitioner in Israel, makes it clear: “ADHD is a syndrome, not a disease (by definition). As such, it is diagnosed by symptoms. The symptoms of this syndrome are so common that we can conclude that all children—especially boys—fit this diagnosis.”
control of human behavior has not been previously undertaken in our society outside of nursing homes and mental institutions.”

No Chemical Imbalance

Psychiatrists argue that the source of ADHD is a chemical imbalance that requires “medication” in the same way that diabetes requires insulin treatment.

However, Dr. Mark Graff, Chair of Public Affairs of the American Psychiatric Association said that this theory was “probably drug industry derived.” His colleague, Dr. Steven Sharfstein, APA president, was forced under media pressure to admit that there is “no clean cut lab test” to determine a chemical imbalance in the brain.

Elliot Valenstein, Ph. D. says, “There are no tests available for assessing the chemical status of a living person’s brain.”

Nor is there any scientific basis for these claims [of using brain scans for psychiatric diagnosis],” stated psychiatrist M. Douglas Mar. Dr. Michael D. Devous of the Nuclear Medicine Center at the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center agreed, “An accurate diagnosis based on a scan is simply not possible.”

Dr. Mary Ann Block, author of No More ADHD, is adamant: “ADHD is not like diabetes and Ritalin is not like insulin. Diabetes is a real medical condition that can be objectively diagnosed. ADHD is an invented label with no objective, valid means of identification. Insulin is a natural hormone produced by the body and it is essential for life. Ritalin is a chemically derived amphetamine-like drug that is not necessary for life. Diabetes is an insulin deficiency.”

How can millions of children be taking a drug that is pharmacologically very similar to another drug, cocaine, that is not only considered dangerous and addictive, but whose buying, selling and using are also considered a criminal act?”

– Richard DeGrandpre, professor of psychology and author of Ritalin Nation

According to Dr. William Carey, a highly respected pediatrician at the Children’s Hospital of Philadelphia, “The current ADHD formulation, which makes the diagnosis when a certain number of troublesome behaviors are present and other criteria met, overlooks the fact that these behaviors are probably usually normal.”

Thomas Moore, author of Prescriptions for Disaster, warns that the use of drugs like Ritalin is taking “appalling risks” with a generation of kids. The drug is given, he said, for “short-term control of behavior—not to reduce any identifiable hazard to [children’s] health. Such large-scale chemical
Ty C. Colbert, Ph.D., added his voice: “As with all mental disorders, there is no biological test or biological marker for ADHD.”

**Dangerous Drug Effects**

There are numerous health risks and other inconsistencies associated with the prescription of mind-altering drugs for so-called ADHD or other learning disorders.

The *Physician’s Desk Reference Guide* says increased heart rate and blood pressure can result from using Ritalin to “treat” ADHD. In August 2001, the *Journal of the American Medical Association* reiterated that Ritalin acts much like cocaine.

Long-term detrimental side effects may appear after years of remaining on or stopping the drugs. “The adverse effect on growth hormone is so regular and predictable that it can be used as a measure of whether or not [the stimulant] is active in the child’s body.” “Even a child’s sexual maturation is impaired.” Suicide is the major complication of withdrawal from this stimulant and similar amphetamine-like drugs.

According to neurologist and psychiatrist Dr. Sydney Walker III, author of *The Hyperactivity Hoax*, “While studies indicate that the drug (methylphenidate) is probably only a weak carcinogen (cancer causing agent), increasing the future cancer risk of millions of children—even a little bit—is not something to be done lightly. Another recent report warns that [Ritalin] ‘may have persistent, cumulative effects on the myocardium (thick muscle layer that forms most of the heart wall).’”

The United States consumes 85% of the international production of methylphenidate (Ritalin). In 2002, the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly has found high rates of methylphenidate consumption in Belgium, Germany, Iceland, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. In Britain, the stimulant prescription rate for children soared 24,900% over an eleven-year period, while in Australia, there was a 34-fold increase in two decades. Between 1989 and 1996, France reported a 600% increase in the number of children labeled “hyperactive.” Sales of methylphenidate in Mexico have increased 800% since over 8 years. The consumption of Ritalin in Spain increases 8% every year.

“How can millions of children be taking a drug that is pharmacologically very similar to another drug, cocaine, that is not only considered dangerous and addictive, but whose buying, selling, and using are also considered a criminal act?” asks Richard DeGrandpre, professor of psychology and author of *Ritalin Nation*.

In addition to these stimulants, another 1.5 million children and adolescents in the United States are taking Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitor (SSRI) antidepressants. Between 1995 and 1999 in the United States, antidepressant use

“If there is no valid test for ADHD, no data proving ADHD is a brain dysfunction, no long-term studies of the drugs’ effects, and if the drugs do not improve academic performance or social skills and instead can cause compulsive and mood disorders, and lead to illicit drug use, why are millions of children and adults … being labeled ADHD and prescribed these drugs?”

— Dr. Mary Ann Block, author of *No More ADHD*
increased 151% for 7 to 12 year olds and 580% for children under 6. Children as young as 5 years old committed suicide while taking prescription SSRI antidepressants. In Britain, the number of prescriptions for antidepressants has also more than doubled in 10 years.31

In 2003, the British medicines regulatory body warned doctors not to prescribe SSRI antidepressants to under 18 year olds, citing suicide risks. On March 22, 2004, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) issued an advisory to doctors, stating: “Anxiety, agitation, panic attacks, insomnia, irritability, hostility, impulsivity, akathisia (severe restlessness), hypomania, and mania, have been reported in adult and pediatric patients being treated with [SSRI] antidepressants...both psychiatric and non-psychiatric.” 32

After hearings held in September 2004 the FDA ordered in October that a prominent “black box” warning about potential suicide risk be placed on SSRI bottles. British, Japanese, Canadian and European regulatory agencies have also warned of antidepressants causing suicide.

Robert Whitaker, science writer and author of Mad in America, says, “What we have after years of soaring use of psychotropic drugs is a crisis in mental health, an epidemic of mental illness among children. Instead of seeing better mental health with ever more medicating, we see a worsening of mental health.”33

“One of the very hard things for me to deal with,” Lawrence Smith says, “is the fact that Matthew never wanted his medication. How many more 14-year-old Matthew Smiths will have to die before someone puts a stop to this biggest health care fraud ever?”

It was a psychiatrist who prescribed Matthew’s lethal drugs, not “health care.” However, by accepting psychiatry’s system of diagnosis and treatment, general medicine itself may face risk and controversy as the failures of that system become more obvious.

There is yet another significant professional risk. By acceding to, or even merging with, psychiatric thinking, general medical practice and other medical specialties could be associated in the public’s mind with not only the mental health industry’s poor reputation, but also much of psychiatry’s unsavory history. It is a history worth examining.
Malpractice Alert

Violation Of Informed Consent

by Fred A. Baughman Jr., M.D.

Dr. Baughman is a board certified neurologist and child neurologist and a Fellow of the American Academy of Neurology. He has discovered and described real diseases, yet has found no abnormality in children said to have ADD/ADHD and “learning disabilities.”

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, I witnessed the exploding ADHD epidemic. Just as it was my duty to every patient to diagnose actual disease when it was present, it was equally my duty to make clear to them that they had no disease when that was the case—that is, when no abnormality could be found. Moreover, it was my duty to know the scientific literature concerning every real neurological disease, and every purported neurological disease as well.

By contrast, in its 40 years of existence, “biological psychiatry” has yet to validate a single psychiatric condition/diagnosis as an abnormality/disease, or as anything “neurological,” “biological,” “chemically imbalanced” or “genetic.”

With no abnormality in the “ADHD child,” the pseudo-medical label is nothing but stigmatizing, and the unwarranted drug treatment that invariably follows, a physical assault. The “medication” typically prescribed for ADHD and “learning disorders” is a hazardous and addictive amphetamine-like drug.

The following children are no longer hyperactive or inattentive—they are dead. Between 1994 and 2001, I was consulted, medically or legally, formally or informally, in the following death cases:

- Stephanie, 11, prescribed a stimulant and died of cardiac arrhythmia;
- Matthew, 13, prescribed a stimulant and died of cardiomyopathy [disease of heart muscle];
- Macauley, 7, prescribed a stimulant and three other psychiatric drugs, suffered a cardiac arrest;
- Travis, 13, prescribed a stimulant and suffered cardiomyopathy;
- Randy, 9, given a stimulant and several other drugs and died from cardiac arrest;
- Cameron, 12, prescribed a stimulant and died from hypereosinophilic syndrome [abnormal increase in white blood cells].

This is a high price to pay for the “treatment” of a “disease” that does not exist. In calling ADHD an abnormality/disease, without scientific facts, the psychiatrist knowingly lies, and violates the informed consent rights of both patient and parents. This is de facto medical malpractice.

I urge all physicians to remember, “No demonstrable physical or chemical abnormality: no disease!”
IMPORTANT FACTS

1. While medicine has advanced on a scientific path to major discoveries and cures, psychiatry has never evolved scientifically and is no closer to understanding or curing mental problems.

2. In the 1930s and 1940s psychiatry attempted to emulate medicine with physical “treatments” like insulin shock, psychosurgery and electroshock treatment.

3. In the 1950s and 1960s, psychiatry parodied medicine with psychoactive drugs that only suppressed symptoms, and with its pseudoscientific diagnostic system, the DSM.

4. In 1989, the American Psychiatric Association advised members to increase their “profile among non-psychiatric physicians,” using the DSM to “yield dividends through increased referrals.”

5. In 1998, the World Psychiatric Association (WPA) produced a “Mental Disorders in Primary Care” kit to induce primary care physicians to diagnose mental illness.

From 1808, when Johann Reil (inset) coined the word “psychiatry,” to the 1900s when Emil Kraepelin (above) defined a psychiatrist as “An absolute ruler who . . . would be able to intervene ruthlessly in the living conditions of people” to modern day, psychiatrists have tried in vain to emulate medical science. After 300 years of suppressing symptoms with pain and force (such as the “travellizing chair” inset above) they have yet to define insanity, let alone find its cause or cure.
CHAPTER TWO
Psychiatry Versus Medicine

The best way to grasp the psychiatry of today is to understand the psychiatry of yesterday.

Unlike medicine itself, with a history dating at least from ancient Greece, psychiatry is an infant practice. According to Professor Edward Shorter, author of *A History of Psychiatry*, “Before the end of the 18th century, there was no such thing as psychiatry.” Franz G. Alexander and Sheldon T. Selesnick report that in the 1700s and 1800s, the mentally unsound were considered beyond the physical methods of medicine.

It was 1676 when Louis XIII decreed the establishment of *hospitaux généraux* (general hospitals) throughout France, to contain “the debauched, spendthrift fathers, prodigal sons, blasphemers, men who ‘seek to undo themselves,’ [and] libertines.” That decree marked the beginning of the “great confinement of the insane.”

From asylums grew the expertise of the institutional custodian, the direct predecessor to the institutional psychiatrist. The phrase *snake pit* — slang for “mental hospital”— stems from these early custodial days, when the insane were thrown into a serpent-filled hole to shock them back to their senses.

Relegated to the position of asylum work, early “psychiatrists” asserted “a legitimate claim to [medical] guild status on the grounds that running an asylum in a therapeutic manner was an art and science as intricate as chemistry or anatomy.” It is a claim to which psychiatry clung steadfastly for 100 years in the face of damning evidence to the contrary.

Although psychiatry was tolerated as “needed,” medicine saw it as suspect, and ensured it was kept in a marginal position.

In 1858, Rudolf Virchow released his *Cellular Pathology as Based upon Physiological and Pathological Histology*, signaling the birth of modern medicine as a profession based on empirical science. The study of pathology as the phenomenology of disease, combined with the study of bacteriology as the etiology [cause] of infectious disease, placed medicine as the study of bodily disease on the rock-solid foundation of modern science.

As medicine advanced on its sure footed, scientifically based path to major discoveries, psychiatrists developed their own ideas independent of the scientific model.

In 1803, Johann Reil, who later coined the word “psychiatry” (meaning healing of the soul), wrote of the early custodians as “stepping forward at once to improve the lot of the insane.” He referred to them as a “bold race of men” who dared to take on this “gigantic idea” of “wiping the

“We would do well to remember the art of medicine and heed the word of he who wrote the [Hippocratic] Oath....”

— John Dorman, M.D., Physician, Stanford University, Journal of American College Health
Since its earliest days, psychiatry’s methods have been brutally invasive, using different applications of force to physically and mentally overwhelm already disturbed individuals. As far back as the 1700s, those in charge of asylums insisted that their practices were the only “workable methods.” However, these methods never cured, they merely restrained and subdued.

1) Historically, psychiatric treatment has included flogging, chaining patients to the wall or restraining them in a wall camisole or straitjacket (right).

2) Other methods included surprising patients with a sudden drop into cold water, detaining them there for some time while pouring water frequently on the head to produce fear and a “refrigerant” effect (left).

3) The ovary compressor used to subdue hysterical women (right) or 4) locking people up in various devices like this cage-like bed (below) also resulted in the person being cowed and tamed.

from the face of the earth one of the most devastating of pestilences.” In other words, psychiatry’s pioneers believed they could eradicate insanity.42

Reil was the first to label the “psychic method of treatment” as part of medical and surgical methods. However, his “psychic treatments” meant massage, whipping, flogging and opium. John G. Howells, M.D., in World History of Psychiatry, says that Reil’s recommendation of these “methods of cure for mental disease” made a “significant contribution towards the establishing of psychiatry as a medical specialty.”43 In the 1840s, Dr. Thomas S. Kirkbrade, superintendent of the Pennsylvania Hospital for the Insane announced that “recent cases of insanity are commonly very curable.”44

Such “cures” included the “so-called Darwin chair” in which “the insane were rotated until blood oozed from their mouths, ears and noses. Castration and starvation cures were also employed.”45

In 1918, psychiatrist Emil Kraepelin defined a psychiatrist as “An absolute ruler who, guided by our knowledge of today, would be able to intervene ruthlessly in the living conditions of people and would certainly within a few decades achieve a corresponding decrease of insanity.”46

World War I was raging when Kraepelin established a psychiatric research center in Germany “for the purpose of determining the nature of mental diseases and of discovering techniques for effecting their prevention, alleviation, and cure.” Ground had been taken already, he said, “that will enable us to win a victory over the direst afflictions that can beset man.”47

Nearly a century later, American scientist Shepherd Ivory Franz wrote, “We have no facts which at present enable us to locate the mental processes in the brain any better than they were located 50 years ago.”48

After 100 years, and in spite of its confident boasts, psychiatry had come no closer to
A HISTORY OF DANGEROUS TREATMENTS

Psychiatric practices that excise healthy brain tissue, cause irreversible brain damage and destroy basic social skills are claimed to be "workable." They include 1) psychosurgery (above), 2) electroshock (right), 3) insulin shock therapy, (below) and 4) Metrazol shock (below right).

Today little has changed. Psychiatrists' "modern" treatments are still human rights abuses, and yet they continue to insist that their methods are superior. Failing to understand the cause of or achieve a cure for mental trauma they routinely harm troubled individuals.
understanding or curing insanity or any mental problem.

The 1930s and 1940s saw a shift towards physical “treatments.” Elliot S. Valenstein, Ph.D. observed, “Physical treatments also helped psychiatrists gain respectability within the field of medicine and enabled them to compete more successfully with neurologists, who often treated patients with so-called ‘nervous disorders.’”

In the decade between 1928 and 1938, psychiatry introduced such horrors as Metrazol shock, insulin shock, electroshock and psychosurgery. Despite these “breakthroughs,” however, most other physicians continued to hold psychiatrists in particularly low esteem.

In the 1950s and 1960s, psychotropic drugs were designed to alleviate some of the symptoms of mental disorders, making patients less of a “problem” for those responsible for their care. Simultaneously, psychiatry introduced a system for mental disorder diagnosis. Professor Shorter called this era the “second biological psychiatry.” It held that “genetics and brain development” were causes of mental illness and that psychoactive drugs and informal psychotherapy were its remedies.

During the next 30 years, psychoactive drugs rapidly became the mainstay of psychiatric therapy, and the psychiatric industry—fully armed with its own drugs and diagnostic system—was ready to expand. In 1989, an American Psychiatric Association (APA) “Campaign Kit” told APA members, “An increase of psychiatry’s profile among non-psychiatric physicians can do nothing but good. And for today, through heavy marketing of its diagnoses and drugs, psychiatry no longer fights to emulate and gain acceptance from medicine; it has become an integral part of it.
those who are bottom-line oriented, the efforts you spend on building this profile have the potential to yield dividends through increased referrals.”51

In the 1990s, psychiatrists made a concerted effort—primarily through the Collegium Internationale Neuro-psychopharmacologicum (CINP), the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), and the World Psychiatric Association (WPA)—to garner support from physicians. The World Health Organization (WHO) produced a “Mental Disorders in Primary Care” kit that was distributed internationally, to make it easier for primary care physicians to diagnose mental illness.52

Based on the DSM-IV and ICD-10, the kit was primarily designed to increase business for the mental health system. What psychiatry lacked in science was compensated for with marketing.

That marketing includes an unholy alliance with the pharmaceutical industry. Pat Bracken and Phil Thomas, consultant psychiatrists and senior research fellows with the University of Bradford in the United Kingdom, state, “Psychiatry is a major growth area for the pharmaceutical industry. By influencing the way in which psychiatrists frame mental health problems, the industry has developed new (and lucrative) markets for its products.”53

Says Carl Elliott, a bioethicist at the University of Minnesota, “The way to sell drugs is to sell psychiatric illness.”54

**BUILDING THE BUSINESS**

In 1998, psychiatry penetrated the physician’s domain with the release of the World Health Organization’s “Guide to Mental Health in Primary Care” kit, designed to facilitate and promote a medical doctor’s use of psychiatric behavioral checklists for diagnosing mental disorders. Psychiatry’s lack of scientific merit was compensated for by invasive and “hard sell” marketing.

With the selling of mental illness to primary care physicians well in hand, the selling of psychiatric drugs followed. Harvard psychiatrist, Joseph Glenmullen writes, “As they gain momentum, use of the drugs spread beyond the confines of psychiatry and they are prescribed by general practitioners for everyday maladies.”55

Today, through heavy marketing of its diagnoses and drugs, psychiatry no longer fights to emulate and gain acceptance from medicine; it has become an integral part of it.
**IMPORTANT FACTS**

1. The International Classification of Diseases (ICD) and the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) were aimed at rectifying psychiatry's poor reputation among medical professionals.

2. DSM is devoted to the categorization of symptoms only, not diseases. None of the diagnoses are supported by objective evidence of physical disease or mental illness.

3. Elliot Valenstein, Ph.D. says, "There are no tests available for assessing the chemical status of a living person’s brain."^56

4. Following the introduction of neuroleptic drugs in the 1950s, the number of mental disorders exploded from 163 in DSM-II (1968) to 374 in DSM-IV (1994).

5. In 2000, the total annual U.S. sales of antipsychotic drugs were more than $2.5 billion; today sales are over $10 billion (€7.8 billion) and internationally $16 billion (€12.6 billion).

Unlike medical practices, the psychiatric industry has few tests to validate any mental disorder or “disease.” Many are literally voted into existence without scientific basis or proof.
While the appearance of Virchow’s Cellular Pathology as Based upon Physiological and Pathological Histology in 1858 firmly established medicine’s scientific credentials, psychiatry was still fumbling around with brutal treatments and the lack of any systematic approach to mental health until the 1950s. The absence of an equivalent system of diagnosis for mental problems contributed greatly to psychiatry’s poor reputation, both among medical professionals and the population as a whole.

The development of the sixth edition of WHO’s International Classification of Diseases (ICD) in 1948, which incorporated psychiatric disorders for the first time, and the publication of Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) in the United States in 1952, were the first attempts to create a semblance of systematic diagnosis.

Later, with criticism running high due to ambiguities and inaccuracies in DSM-II, psychiatry sought to create a “new and improved” diagnostic system, one that would provide an international foundation of agreement for the entire profession.

According to David Healy, psychiatrist and director of the North Wales Department of Psychological Medicine, the final result, the DSM-III, was a “revolution by committee.” Politically voted in was a system of classification that was drastically different from, and foreign to, anything medicine had seen before. Most notably, the new DSM was devoted to the diagnosis or categorization of symptoms only, not disease. None of the diagnoses were supported by objective scientific evidence.

Psychiatrist David Kaiser states, “Symptoms by definition are the surface presentation of a deeper process. This is self-evident. However, there has been a vast and largely unacknowledged effort on the part of modern (i.e., biologic) psychiatry to equate symptoms with mental illness.” He says he would be a “poor psychiatrist” if the only tool he had for treatment was a prescription pad for medications which may “lessen symptoms,” but which “do not treat mental illness per se.” He is left, “still sitting across from a suffering patient who wants to talk about his unhappiness.”

In their book Making Us Crazy, Professors Herb Kutchins and Stuart A. Kirk state that the transformation of psychiatry’s diagnostic manual is a “story of the struggles of the American Psychiatric Association to gain respectability within medicine and maintain dominance among the many mental health professionals.”
Selling Psychiatric “Illness”

Psychiatrist Stefan Kruszewski from the Pennsylvania Medical Society, “We can manufacture enough diagnostic labels of normal variability of mood and thought that we can continually supply medication to you... But when it comes to manufacturing disease, nobody does it like psychiatry.”

New York Psychiatrist Ron Leifer says that the way in which psychiatrists diagnose is “arrogant fraud” and to claim that DSM is a scientific statement is “damaging to the culture.”

Psychiatrist Matthew Dumont adds that psychiatrists say: “...while this manual provides a classification of mental disorder... no definition adequately specifies precise boundaries for the concept...” [American Psychiatric Association (APA) 1987]. They go on to say: “there is no assumption that each mental disorder is a discrete entity with sharp boundaries between it and other mental disorders or between it and no mental disorder. [APA, 1987].”

Shorter puts it this way: “What is the cause of something like erotomania, the delusional belief that someone else is in love with you? Nobody knows. ... These considerations suggest that in classification it is very easy for psychiatry to lose its way.”

The Myths of Biopsychiatry

Soliciting government research funds through testimony before a U.S. House of Representatives Committee, Steven Miran, Medical Director of the APA, stated that, “Scientific research over the last two decades has shown that severe mental illness and addictive disorders are ... diseases of the brain with a strong genetic and biological basis.”

In contrast, Dr. Healy reports, “There are increasing concerns among the clinical community that not only do neuroscientific developments not reveal anything about the nature of psychiatric disorders but in fact they distract...”
from clinical research. ... There has been astonishing progress in the neurosciences but little or no progress in understanding depression.”

Harvard’s Glenmullen says that despite “absence of any verifiable diseases,” psychopharmacology “has not hesitated to construct ‘disease models’ for psychiatric diagnoses. These models are hypothetical suggestions of what might be the underlying physiology—for example, a serotonin imbalance.”

**Pushing the Psychiatric Envelope**

In June 2000, the Toronto Globe and Mail ran an article headlined, “The Gap Is Closing Between Psychiatry and Family Medicine.” “Psychiatrists are wary of the unfamiliarity family doctors often show with mental health problems.” The article quoted Glenn Thompson, the executive director of the Ontario division of the Canadian Mental Health Association, saying that there’s nothing wrong with the primary care physician being “the likely first port of call,” provided the physician is working with a psychiatrist.

The “mental health problems” to which the article refers are those outlined in the DSM. This contrived system of diagnosis and the inevitable assignment of a psychoactive drug prescription is the singular “expertise” that psychiatry has to offer.

Non-psychiatric medical acceptance of psychiatric thinking and practice may come at a steep price. Say J. Allan Hobson and Jonathan A. Leonard, authors of *Out of Its Mind, Psychiatry in Crisis, A Call for Reform*, “… DSM-IV’s authoritative status and detailed nature tends to promote the idea that rote diagnosis and pill-pushing are acceptable.”

**A BOOMING GROWTH INDUSTRY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of DSM Mental Disorders</th>
<th>DSM Sales for the APA* (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>$22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>DSM 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>DSM IV 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>DSM V 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>Predicted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*APA: American Psychiatric Association, publisher of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM).*
Dr. Thomas Szasz is a professor of psychiatry emeritus at the State University of New York Health Science Center and author of more than 30 books.

Using a poll surveying the nation’s health, Parade magazine concluded that depression is “the third most common disease.” Yet when the respondents were asked, “What is your greatest personal health concern for the future?” they did not even mention depression. They were concerned about cancer and heart disease.

Even though people have accepted the categorization of depression as a disease, they are not afraid of getting depression because they intuitively recognize that it is a personal problem, not a disease. They are afraid of getting cancer and heart disease because they know these are diseases—true medical problems—not just names.

Allen J. Frances, Professor of Psychiatry at Duke University Medical Center and Chair of the DSM-IV Task Force, writes: “DSM-IV is a manual of mental disorders, but it is by no means clear just what is a mental disorder … There could arguably not be a worse term than mental disorder to describe the conditions classified in DSM-IV.” Why, then, does the APA continue to use this term?

The primary function and goal of the DSM is to lend credibility to the claim that certain behaviors, or more correctly, misbehaviors, are mental disorders and that such disorders are, therefore, medical diseases. Thus, pathological gambling enjoys the same status as myocardial infarction (blood clot in heart artery). In effect, the APA maintains that betting is something the patient cannot control; and that, generally, all psychiatric “symptoms” or “disorders” are outside the patient’s control. I reject that claim as patently false.

The ostensible validity of the DSM is reinforced by psychiatry’s claim that mental illnesses are brain diseases—a claim supposedely based on recent discoveries in neuroscience, made possible by imaging techniques for diagnosis and pharmacological agents for treatment. This is not true. There are no objective diagnostic tests to confirm or disconfirm the diagnosis of depression; the diagnosis can and must be made solely on the basis of the patient’s appearance and behavior.

There is no blood or other biological test to ascertain the presence or absence of a mental illness, as there is for most bodily diseases. If such a test were developed, then the condition would cease to be a mental illness and would be classified as a symptom of a bodily disease.”

— Dr. Thomas Szasz, M.D.
Professor of psychiatry emeritus

There is no blood or other biological test to ascertain the presence or absence of a mental illness, as there is for most bodily diseases. If such a test were developed, then the condition would cease to be a mental illness and would be classified as a symptom of a bodily disease.

If schizophrenia, for example, turns out to have a biochemical cause and cure, schizophrenia would no longer be one of the diseases for which a person would be involuntarily committed. In fact, it would then be treated by neurologists, and psychiatrists then have no more to do with it than they do with Glioblastoma [malignant tumor], Parkinsonism, and other diseases of the brain.
The advent of the psychotropic drugs has also given rise to a new biological language in psychiatry. The extent to which this has come to be part of popular culture is in many ways astonishing...This triumph, however, is not without its ambiguities. It can reasonably be asked whether biological language offers more in the line of marketing copy than it offers in terms of clinical meaning.67

— Dr. David Healy,
The Anti-Depressant Era

The cornerstone of psychiatry’s disease model today, is the concept that a brain-based, chemical imbalance underlies mental disease. Researchers have thoroughly discredited this theory.

Jonathon Leo, associate professor of anatomy at Western University of Health Sciences says, “If a psychiatrist says you have a shortage of a chemical, ask for a blood test and watch the psychiatrist’s reaction. The number of people who believe that scientists have proven that depressed people have low serotonin is a glorious testament to the power of marketing.”

Elliot Valenstein, Ph.D. is unequivocal: “[T]here are no tests available for assessing the chemical status of a living person’s brain.”68 A study published in PLoS Medicine said neuroscientific research had failed to confirm any chemical abnormality in the brain.69

A 2004 article on brain scans in the U.S. newspaper The Mercury News, states, “Many doctors warn about using the SPECT (single photon emission computed tomography) brain imaging as a diagnostic tool, saying it is unethical—and potentially dangerous—for doctors to use SPECT to identify emotional, behavioral and psychiatric problems in a patient. The $2,500 evaluation offers no useful or accurate information, they say.”70

Dr. Julian Whitaker, author of the respected Health & Healing newsletter says: “When psychiatrists label a child or adult, they’re labeling people because of symptoms. They do not have any pathological diagnosis; they do not have any laboratory diagnosis; they cannot show any differentiation that would back up the diagnosis of these psychiatric ‘diseases.’ Whereas if you have a heart attack, you can find the lesion; if you have diabetes, your blood sugar is very high; if you have arthritis, it will show on the X-ray. In psychiatry, it’s just crystal-ball, fortune-telling; it’s totally unscientific.”

Dr. Darshak Sanghavi, clinical fellow at Harvard Medical School, wrote: “[D]espite pseudoscientific terms like ‘chemical imbalance,’ nobody really knows what causes mental illness. There’s no blood test or brain scan for major depression. No geneticist can diagnose Schizophrenia.”71

According to Valenstein, “The theories are held on to not only because there is nothing else to take their place, but also because they are useful in promoting drug treatment.”72
IMPORTANT FACTS

1. German psychiatrist Emil Kraepelin first defined “schizophrenia” as *dementia praecox* in the late 1800s. The term “schizophrenia” was coined in 1908 by Swiss psychiatrist Eugen Bleuler.

2. It was later discovered that Kraepelin’s schizophrenic patients suffered from a global medical disease called *encephalitis lethargica* (brain inflammation causing lethargy), which caused mental disturbance.

3. The *DSM-II* admits, “Even if it had tried, the [APA] Committee could not establish agreement about what this disorder is; it could only agree on what to call it.”

4. The drugs prescribed for “schizophrenia” cause violent, manic behavior during both treatment and withdrawal.

5. Successful programs in the United States and Italy have proven that “schizophrenia” can be resolved without psychiatric drugs.
While psychiatry seeps deeper into our everyday world through the spread of the DSM and psychotropic drugs, most people still consider that psychiatry’s main function is to treat patients with severe, life-threatening mental disorders.

Here, the psychiatrist deals with the “disease” first tagged as dementia praecox by Kraepelin in the late 1800s, then as “schizophrenia” by Swiss psychiatrist Eugen Bleuler in 1908. Psychiatrist E. Fuller Torrey reports that Kraepelin “put the final medical seal on irrational behavior by naming it and categorizing it. Irrational behavior could now hold its head up in medical company for it had names. ... His classificatory system continues to dominate psychiatry up to the present, not because it has proven of value ... because it has been the ticket of admission for irrational behavior into medicine.”74

However, Robert Whitaker reports the patients that Kraepelin diagnosed with dementia praecox were suffering from a medical disease, encephalitis lethargica [brain inflammation causing lethargy]: “These patients walked oddly and suffered from facial tics, muscle spasms, and sudden bouts of sleepiness. Their pupils reacted sluggishly to light. They also drooled, had difficulty swallowing, were chronically constipated, and were unable to complete willed physical acts.”75

Psychiatry never reviewed Kraepelin’s material to see that schizophrenia was simply an undiagnosed and untreated physical problem. “Schizophrenia was a concept too vital to the profession’s claim of medical legitimacy. ... The physical symptoms of the disease were quietly dropped. ... What remained, as the foremost distinguishing features, were the mental symptoms: hallucinations, delusions, and bizarre thoughts,” says Whitaker.

Psychiatry remains committed to calling schizophrenia a mental disease despite, after a century of research, the complete absence of objective proof that schizophrenia exists as an actual disease or physical abnormality.
The neuroleptics or antipsychotics prescribed for the condition were first developed by the French to "numb the nervous system during surgery." Psychiatrists learned very early on that neuroleptics cause Parkinsonian and encephalitis lethargica symptoms.77

_Tardive dyskinesia_ (tardive “late” and _dyskinesia_, impairment of voluntary movement of the lips, tongue, jaw, fingers, toes, and other body parts) appeared in 5% of patients within one year of neuroleptic treatment.78 Neuroleptic malignant syndrome, a potentially fatal toxic reaction where patients break into fevers and become confused, agitated, and extremely rigid, was also a known outcome risk. An estimated 100,000 Americans have died from it.79

To counter negative publicity, articles placed in medical journals regularly exaggerated the benefits of the drugs and obscured their risks. Whitaker says that what physicians and the general public learned about new drugs was tailored: “This molding of opinion, of course, played a critical role in the recasting of neuroleptics as safe, antischizophrenic drugs for the mentally ill.”

However, independent research outcomes were worrisome. In an eight-year-study, the WHO found that severely mentally disturbed patients in three economically disadvantaged countries whose treatment plans did not include a heavy reliance on drugs—India, Nigeria and Colombia—did dramatically better than their counterparts in the United States and four other developed countries. Indeed, after five years, “64% of the patients in the poor countries were asymptomatic and functioning well.” In contrast, only 18% of the patients in the prosperous countries were doing well.80 A second follow-up study using the same diagnostic criteria reached the same conclusion.81 Neuroleptics were clearly implicated in the significantly inferior western result.

While Nobel Prize winner John Nash is depicted in the Hollywood film "A Beautiful Mind" as recovering from “schizophrenia” using the latest psychiatric drugs, Nash refutes this fiction. In fact, he had not taken psychiatric medications for 24 years and recovered naturally from his disturbed state.
“The idea was that ‘schizophrenia’ could often be overcome with the help of meaningful relationships, rather than with drugs, and that such treatment would eventually lead to unquestionably healthier lives.”

— Dr. Loren Mosher, former chief of the U.S. National Institute of Mental Health’s Center for Studies of Schizophrenia

Not until 1985 did the APA issue a warning letter to its members about the potentially lethal effects of the drugs, and then only after several highly publicized lawsuits that “found psychiatrists and their institutions negligent for failing to warn patients of this risk, with damages in one case topping $3 million.”

New “atypical” [not usual] drugs for schizophrenia were introduced in the 1990s, promising fewer side effects. However, we know from the numerous FDA and drug regulatory agency warnings that they can cause life-threatening diabetes which has been the subject of thousands of suits. The manufacturer of Zyprexa, for example, paid out $690 million ($550 million) to 10,500 plaintiffs. Antipsychotics place the elderly at increased risk of strokes and death and have a “boxed warning” to emphasize the risk. They also cause agitation, aggressive reaction, akathisia, blood clots, and agranulocytosis, a potentially fatal depletion of white blood cells, in up to 2% of patients.

In the film “A Beautiful Mind,” Nobel Prize winner John Nash is depicted as relying on psychiatry’s latest breakthrough drugs to prevent a relapse of his “schizophrenia.” This is Hollywood fiction, however, as Nash himself disputes the film’s portrayal of him taking “newer medications” at the time of his Nobel Prize award. Nash had not taken any psychiatric drugs for 24 years and had recovered naturally from his disturbed state.

Although omitted from psychiatric history books, it is vital to know that numerous compassionate and workable medical programs for severely disturbed individuals have not relied on heavy drugging.

**Workable Treatments**

The late Dr. Loren Mosher was the chief of the U.S. National Institute of Mental Health’s Center for Studies of Schizophrenia, and later clinical professor of psychiatry at the School of Medicine, University of California, San Diego and director of Soteria Associates in San Diego, California. He opened Soteria House in the 1970s as a place where young persons diagnosed as having “schizophrenia” lived medication-free with a nonprofessional staff trained to listen, to understand them and provide support, safety and validation of their experience. “The idea was that ‘schizophrenia’ could often be overcome with the help of meaningful relationships, rather than with drugs, and that such treatment would eventually lead to unquestionably healthier lives,” he said.

Further “The experiment worked better than expected. At six weeks post-admission both groups had improved significantly and comparably despite Soteria clients having not usually received antipsychotic drugs! At two years post-admission, Soteria-treated subjects were working at significantly higher occupational levels, were significantly more often living independently or with peers, and had fewer readmissions. Interestingly, clients treated at Soteria who received no neuroleptic medication over the entire two years or were thought to be destined to have the worst outcomes, actually did
the best as compared to hospital and drug-treated control subjects.”

In the Institute of Osservanza (Osservance) in Imola, Italy, Dr. Giorgio Antonucci treated dozens of so-called violent schizophrenic women, most of whom had been continuously strapped to their beds (some up to 20 years). Straitjackets had been used, as well as plastic masks to keep patients from biting. Dr. Antonucci began to release the women from their confinement, spending many, many hours each day talking with them and “penetrating their deliriums and anguish.” In every case, Dr. Antonucci listened to stories of years of desperation and institutional suffering. Under Dr. Antonucci’s leadership, all psychiatric “treatments” were abandoned and some of the most oppressive psychiatric wards were dismantled. He ensured that patients were treated compassionately, with respect, and without the use of drugs. In fact, under his guidance, the ward transformed from the most violent in the facility to its calmest. After a few months, his “dangerous” patients were free, walking quietly in the asylum garden. Eventually they were stable and discharged from the hospital after many had been taught how to read and write, and how to work and care for themselves for the first time in their lives. Dr. Antonucci’s superior results also came at a much lower cost.

Such programs constitute permanent testimony to the existence of both genuine answers and hope for the seriously troubled.
Drug-Induced Violence

On June 20, 2001, Texas mother and housewife Andrea Yates filled the bathtub and drowned her five children, ages six months to seven years. For many years, Mrs. Yates, 37, had struggled through hospitalizations, prescribed psychiatric drugs and suicide attempts. On March 12, 2002, the jury rejected her insanity defense and found her guilty of capital murder.

CCHR Texas obtained independent medical assessments of Mrs. Yates’ medical records. Science consultant Edward G. Ezrailson, Ph.D., reported that the cocktail of drugs prescribed to Mrs. Yates caused *involuntary intoxication*. The “overdose” of one antidepressant and “sudden high doses” of another, “worsened her behavior,” he said. This “led to murder.”

The U.S. FDA has since warned that one of the drugs Andrea Yates was taking causes homicidal thoughts.

Author Robert Whitaker’s research found that antipsychotic drugs temporarily dim psychosis but, in the long run, make patients more biologically prone to it. A second paradoxical effect, one that emerged with the more potent neuroleptics, is a side effect called akathisia [a, without; kathisia, sitting; an inability to keep still]. This side effect has been linked to assaultive, violent behavior.

As early as 1975, studies had determined that 50% of all fights in a psychiatric ward could be tied to akathisia. Patients described “violent urges to assault anyone near.”

The FDA and other drug regulatory agencies warn that SSRIs can cause agitation, panic attacks, irritability, hostility, impulsivity, akathisia [severe restlessness] and mania. The FDA has also reported “homicidal ideation” as an adverse event of Effexor XR (extended release). Warnings were issued about the antidepressant Straterra, prescribed for ADHD, causing extreme irritability, aggression and mania.

Withdrawal Effects

In 1996, the National Preferred Medicines Center, Inc. of New Zealand issued a report on “Acute drug withdrawal,” which stated that withdrawal from psychoactive drugs can cause:

1) rebound effects that exacerbate previous symptoms of a “disease,” and 2) new symptoms unrelated to the original condition and unfamiliar to the patient.

Dr. John Zajecka reported in the *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry* that the agitation and irritability experienced by patients withdrawing from one SSRI can cause “aggressiveness and suicidal impulsivity.”

In *The Lancet*, the British medical journal, Dr. Miki Bloch reported on patients who became suicidal and homicidal after stopping an antidepressant, with one man having thoughts of harming “his own children.”

While psychiatrists continue to discount the drug-suicide-violence link as merely “anecdotal,” courts are starting to act where psychiatric associations will not.

On May 25, 2001, an Australian judge blamed a psychiatric antidepressant for turning a peaceful, law-abiding man, David Hawkins, into a violent killer. Judge Barry O’Keefe of the New South Wales Supreme Court said that had Mr. Hawkins not taken the antidepressant, “it is overwhelmingly probable that Mrs. Hawkins would not have been killed…”

In June 2001, a Wyoming jury awarded $8 million to the relatives of a man, Donald Schell, who went on a shooting rampage after taking an antidepressant. The jury determined that the drug was 80% responsible for inducing the killing spree.

Many medical studies report evidence of psychiatric drugs inducing violent or suicidal behavior. The below killers, from the U.S., Australia and Japan, brutally murdered 99 people while undergoing psychiatric drug treatment.
IMPORTANT FACTS

1. Psychiatry has the worst record of insurance fraud of all medical disciplines.²⁹

2. Ten percent of mental health practitioners admit to sexually abusing their patients.

3. One study found that one out of 20 clients who had been sexually abused by their therapist was a minor, the average age being seven for girls and 12 for boys.⁹⁶

4. One survey of more than 530 psychiatrists showed 25% had chosen the field of psychiatry because of their own psychiatric problems.⁹⁷

5. Psychiatrists have the highest suicide and drug abuse rate among physicians.⁹⁸

American psychiatrist Michael DeLain was jailed two years for sexually exploiting a 16-year-old patient; since their inception, psychiatrists have systematically and continually violated the Hippocratic Oath.
Beyond the many valid medical reasons for non-psychiatric physicians to resist the mental health vision of psychiatrists, there is also the matter of preserving their professional integrity and reputation.

While medicine has nurtured an enviable record of achievements and general popular acceptance, the public still links psychiatry to snake pits, straitjackets, and “One Flew Over the Cuckoo’s Nest.” Psychiatry has done little to enhance that perception with its development of such brutal treatments as ECT, psychosurgery, the chemical straitjacket caused by antipsychotic drugs, and its long record of treatment failures.

In the area of fraud, psychiatry is considerably over-represented. The largest health care fraud suit in U.S. history involved mental health, yet it is the smallest sector within the healthcare field.99

According to a veteran California healthcare fraud investigator, one of the simplest ways to detect fraud is to review the drug prescription records of psychiatrists.

**Sex Crimes**

A review of U.S. medical board actions against 761 physicians disciplined for sex-related offenses over a 15-year period found that psychiatry and child psychiatry featured in significantly higher numbers than other branches. While psychiatrists accounted for only 6% of physicians in the country, they comprised 28% of physicians disciplined for sex crimes.100

A 1998 report on patient complaints issued by Sweden’s Social Board (medical board) found that psychiatrists were responsible for nearly half of the mistreatments of patients reported. Some were so gross— involving violence and sexual abuse—that they were referred to prosecutors for further action.101

Between 10% and 25% of mental health practitioners admit to sexually abusing their patients. A U.S. national study of therapist-client sex revealed that therapists abuse more girls than boys. The female victims’ ages ranged from three to 17. For sexually abused boys, the ages ranged from seven to 16 years old.102

Meanwhile, psychiatrists work hard to expand their referral business by influencing primary care medicine to use diagnostic checklists based on the DSM. As ethical practitioners are an essential part of a profession’s standing, it behooves non-psychiatric physicians to consider the likely reputational consequences for medicine itself.
IMPORTANT FACTS

1. In one study, 83% of people referred by clinics and social workers for psychiatric treatment had undiagnosed physical illnesses; in another, 42% of those diagnosed with “psychoses” were later found to be suffering from a medical illness.  

2. According to medical experts, unwanted or overactive or “hyperactive” behavior has many sources ranging from, but not limited to, allergies, food additives, environmental toxins, improper sleep and certain medications.

3. A Journal of Pediatrics study showed that sucrose may cause a 10-times increase in adrenaline in children, resulting in “difficult concentrating, irritability, and anxiety.”
In a survey of physicians in three European countries and in the United States, 72% said qualities that best describe a good physician are compassion, caring, personable and good listening and communication skills. In this way, they felt they could help make their patients healthier and lead better lives.

When asked how to distinguish between a “mental disorder” and a physical illness, 65% said that physical examinations and clinical diagnostic testing should first rule out physical problems.

Psychiatrists rarely physically test and diagnose. A pre-packaged checklist of behaviors is consulted and the “diagnosis” is made. All that remains is to prescribe the psychoactive drug.

Meanwhile, to combat the paucity of interest in psychiatry, the World Psychiatric Association has produced a “Core Curriculum in Psychiatry for Medical Students.”

Its objective is to train all future physicians to identify and treat mental illness. The authors candidly state, “Since most students will not enter psychiatry, the acquisition of appropriate attitudes is of primary importance” and should be taught not just in psychiatry but all other subjects.

In a wish list for mental health reform, Mad in America author Robert Whitaker stated, “At the top of this wish list, though, would be a simple plea for honesty. Stop telling those diagnosed with schizophrenia that they suffer from too much dopamine or serotonin activity and that the drugs put these brain chemicals back into ‘balance.’ That whole spiel is a form of medical fraud, and it is impossible to imagine any other group of patients—ill say, with cancer or cardiovascular disease—being deceived in this way.”

David B. Stein, Ph.D., clinical psychologist and associate professor of psychology says, “Physicians are trained to heal. They really want to help. They often claim that they don’t have an alternative—that the only way to help these [ADHD, learning disordered] children is with drugs. Besides, parents and teachers are constantly at their throats for them to write prescriptions. They want their disruptive kids under control immediately. Some doctors dislike doing this; many wish for an alternative.”

With psychiatric diagnoses and treatments impacting more people’s lives through primary care medicine, the alternatives need to be

“Yes, I believe ‘a’ Hippocratic Oath is relevant—for me in June of 1990 [when I took it]... and every day of my life in this profession in which I am honored to be a member. What is the essence of a Hippocratic Oath? ‘May I care for others as I would have them care for me.’”

— Physician
emphasized. The following alternatives are derived from years of working with health professionals who are qualified to address such medical issues.

1) Check for the Underlying Physical Problem

The California Department of Mental Health Medical Evaluation Field Manual states: “Mental health professionals working within a mental health system have a professional and a legal obligation to recognize the presence of physical disease in their patients. ... Physical diseases may cause a patient’s mental disorder [or] may worsen a mental disorder.”

The Swedish Social Board cited several cases of disciplinary actions against psychiatrists, including one in which a patient was complaining of headaches, dizziness and staggering when he walked. The patient had complained of these symptoms to psychiatric personnel for five years before a medical check-up revealed that he had a brain tumor.

Dr. Thomas Dorman says, “...please remember that the majority of people suffer from organic disease. Clinicians should first of all remember that emotional stress associated with a chronic illness or a painful condition can alter the patient’s temperament. In my practice I have run across countless people with chronic back pain who were labeled neurotic. A typical statement from these poor patients is ‘I thought I really was going crazy.’” Often, he said, the problem may have been “simply an undiagnosed ligament problem in the back.”

2) Help Without Mind-Altering Drugs

German psychiatrist Paul Runge says he’s helped more than 100 children without using psychiatric drugs. He has also helped reduce the dosages of drugs prescribed by other physicians.

Dr. L.M.J. Pelsser of the Research Center for Hyperactivity and ADHD in Middelburg, the Netherlands, found that 62% of children diagnosed with “ADHD” showed significant improvements in behavior as a result of a change in diet over a period of three weeks.

Dr. Mary Ann Block, who has helped thousands of children safely come off or stay off psychiatric drugs, says, “Many doctors don’t do physical exams before prescribing psychiatric drugs ... [Children] see a doctor, but the doctor does not do a physical exam or look for any health or learning problems before giving the child an ADHD diagnosis and a prescription drug. This is not how I was taught to practice medicine. In my medical education, I was taught to do a complete history and physical exam. I was taught to consider something called a ‘differential diagnosis.’ To do this, one must consider all possible underlying causes of the symptoms.”

Dr. Block does allergy testing and develops dietary solutions to “behavioral” problems. She cites a Journal of Pediatrics (1995) study showing that sucrose may cause a 10-times increase in adrenaline, in children, resulting in “difficulty concentrating, irritability, and anxiety.”
3) Psychotropic Drugs May Mask a Child's Physical Problems

According to medical and educational experts, unwanted or overactive behavior comes from many sources ranging from, but not limited to, allergies, food additives, environmental toxins, improper sleep, certain medications, not knowing how to study, going past words not fully understood, and being bored with the curriculum because of exceptional intelligence or creative ability.

Psychiatrist Sydney Walker’s book *The Hyperactivity Hoax* records a variety of reasons for hyperactive behavior: “Children with early-stage brain tumors can develop symptoms of hyperactivity or poor attention. So can lead- or pesticide-poisoned children. So can children with early-onset diabetes, heart disease, worms, viral or bacterial infections, malnutrition, head injuries, genetic disorders, allergies, mercury or manganese exposure, petit mal seizures, and hundreds—yes, hundreds—of other minor, major, or even life-threatening medical problems. Yet all these children are labeled hyperactive or ADD.”

Prescribing psychotropic drugs for a disease that doesn’t exist, Dr. Walker noted, is a tragedy because “masking children’s symptoms merely allows their underlying disorders to continue and, in many cases, to become worse.”

Dr. Walker compared the phenomenon to a patient going to see a physician for a swollen leg and the doctor diagnoses it as a “lump,” gives him or her an aspirin and never determines if the lump is a tumor, an insect bite, or gangrene.

There are far too many workable alternatives to psychiatric drugging to list them all here. Psychiatry on the other hand, would prefer to say there are none and fight to keep it that way. That leaves a medical practitioner with a choice between fact and fiction, between cure and coercion, and between medicine and manipulation.

We have every respect for medicine practiced as medicine, in a spirit of honest, ethical endeavor, and with due consideration to primacy of the patient’s needs and health. However, we have every argument with the seduction and contamination of medicine by medical pretenders whose abject failures threaten to pervert not only the position, honor, humanity and value of medicine, but to wreck the lives of millions of patients who simply came to medicine for help.

Prescribing psychotropic drugs for a disease that doesn’t exist is a tragedy because, “Masking children’s symptoms merely allows their underlying disorders to continue and, in many cases, become worse.”

— Dr. Sydney Walker, author, *The Hyperactivity Hoax*
Recommendations

1. Establish medical facilities that have a full complement of diagnostic equipment for non-psychiatric physicians to use to locate underlying and undiagnosed physical conditions.

2. None of the 374 mental disorders in the DSM/ICD should be eligible for insurance coverage because they have no scientific, physical validation. General practitioners, pediatricians, and neurologists should not use the DSM for diagnosing patients’ conditions.

3. Conduct clinical and financial audits of all government-run and private psychiatric facilities that receive government subsidies or insurance payments, to ensure accountability and the veracity of statistical information on admissions, treatments and deaths.

4. Cut insurance funding for harmful psychiatric treatments of conditions that cannot be medically substantiated and provide additional insurance coverage for non-psychiatric physicians to provide proper diagnostic testing and treatment for persons presenting with mental disturbance.

5. Investigate the impact of psychiatric fraud and malpractice suits on general medicine and non-psychiatric insurance premiums.

6. Legal protections should be put in place to ensure that psychiatrists and psychologists are prohibited from violating the right of any person to exercise all civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights as enshrined in the U.S. Constitution and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and in other relevant instruments.
The Citizens Commission on Human Rights (CCHR) was established in 1969 by the Church of Scientology to investigate and expose psychiatric violations of human rights, and to clean up the field of mental healing. Today, it has more than 250 chapters in over 34 countries. Its board of advisors, called Commissioners, includes doctors, lawyers, educators, artists, business professionals, and civil and human rights representatives.

While it doesn’t provide medical or legal advice, it works closely with and supports medical doctors and medical practice. A key CCHR focus is psychiatry’s fraudulent use of subjective “diagnoses” that lack any scientific or medical merit, but which are used to reap financial benefits in the billions, mostly from the taxpayers or insurance carriers. Based on these false diagnoses, psychiatrists justify and prescribe life-damaging treatments, including mind-altering drugs, which mask a person’s underlying difficulties and prevent his or her recovery.

CCHR’s work aligns with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in particular the following precepts, which psychiatrists violate on a daily basis:

**Article 3:** Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.

**Article 5:** No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

**Article 7:** All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law.

Through psychiatrists’ false diagnoses, stigmatizing labels, easy-seizure commitment laws, brutal, depersonalizing “treatments,” thousands of individuals are harmed and denied their inherent human rights.

CCHR has inspired and caused many hundreds of reforms by testifying before legislative hearings and conducting public hearings into psychiatric abuse, as well as working with media, law enforcement and public officials the world over.
The Citizens Commission on Human Rights (CCHR) invests and exposes psychiatric violations of human rights. It works shoulder-to-shoulder with like-minded groups and individuals who share a common purpose to clean up the field of mental health. We shall continue to do so until psychiatry’s abusive and coercive practices cease and human rights and dignity are returned to all.

The Hon. Raymond N. Haynes
California State Assembly:
“CCHR is renowned for its long-standing work aimed at preventing the inappropriate labeling and drugging of children. ... The contributions that the Citizens Commission on Human Rights International has made to the local, national and international areas on behalf of mental health issues are invaluable and reflect an organization devoted to the highest ideals of mental health services.”

Dr. Julian Whitaker M.D.
Director of the Whitaker Wellness Institute,
Author of Health & Healing
“The efforts of CCHR and the successes they have made is a cultural benefit of great magnitude. They have made great strides; they have been a resource to parents and children who have been terribly abused by psychiatrists and psychologists and the mental health advocates and professionals, and they’re the only group that is standing up for human rights when it comes to the abuses of the psychiatric community. The over-drugging, the labeling, the faulty diagnosis, the lack of scientific protocols, all of the things that no one realizes is going on, CCHR focused on, has brought to the public’s attention and has made headway in stopping the kind of steam-rolling effect of the psychiatric profession.”

Dr. Fred Baughman
Pediatric Neurologist
“I think there are a lot of groups today, that are concerned about the influence of psychiatry in the community and in the schools, but no other group has been as effective in trying to expose the fraudulent diagnosing and drugging in the schools, as has CCHR. They are certainly a highly effective group and a necessary ally of just about anyone who shares these concerns and is trying to remedy these ills.”
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Education is a vital part of any initiative to reverse social decline. CCHR takes this responsibility very seriously. Through the broad dissemination of CCHR’s Internet site, books, newsletters and other publications, more and more patients, families, professionals, lawmakers and countless others are becoming educated on the truth about psychiatry, and that something effective can and should be done about it.

CCHR’s publications—available in 15 languages—show the harmful impact of psychiatry on racism, education, women, justice, drug rehabilitation, morals, the elderly, religion, and many other areas. A list of these includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Real Crisis</th>
<th>Child Drugging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Mental Health Today</td>
<td>Psychiatry Destroying Lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report and recommendations on the lack of science and results within the mental health industry</td>
<td>Report and recommendations on fraudulent psychiatric diagnoses and the enforced drugging of youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massive Fraud</td>
<td>Harming Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry’s Corrupt Industry</td>
<td>Screening and Drugs Ruin Young Minds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report and recommendations on a criminal mental health monopoly</td>
<td>Report and recommendations on harmful mental health assessments, evaluations and programs within our schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric Malpractice</td>
<td>Community Ruin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Subversion of Medicine</td>
<td>Psychiatry’s Coercive ‘Care’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report and recommendations on psychiatry’s destructive impact on health care</td>
<td>Report and recommendations on the failure of community mental health and other coercive psychiatric programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventing Disorders</td>
<td>Harming Artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Drug Profits</td>
<td>Psychiatry Ruins Creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report and recommendations on the unscientific fraud perpetrated by psychiatry</td>
<td>Report and recommendations on psychiatry assaulting the arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizophrenia</td>
<td>Unholy Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry’s For Profit ‘Disease’</td>
<td>Psychiatry versus Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report and recommendations on psychiatric lies and false diagnoses</td>
<td>Report and recommendations on psychiatry’s subversion of religious belief and practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brutal Therapies</td>
<td>Eroding Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmful Psychiatric ‘Treatments’</td>
<td>Psychiatry’s Corruption of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report and recommendations on the destructive practices of electroshock and psychosurgery</td>
<td>Report and recommendations on psychiatry subverting the courts and corrective services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric Rape</td>
<td>Elderly Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaulting Women and Children</td>
<td>Cruel Mental Health Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report and recommendations on widespread sex crimes against patients within the mental health system</td>
<td>Report and recommendations on psychiatry abusing seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadly Restraints</td>
<td>Behind Terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry’s ‘Therapeutic’ Assault</td>
<td>Psychiatry Manipulating Minds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report and recommendations on the violent and dangerous use of restraints in mental health facilities</td>
<td>Report and recommendations on the role of psychiatry in international terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry</td>
<td>Creating Racism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooking Your World on Drugs</td>
<td>Psychiatry’s Betrayal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report and recommendations on psychiatry creating today’s drug crisis</td>
<td>Report and recommendations on psychiatry causing racial conflict and genocide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehab Fraud</td>
<td>Citizens Commission on Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry’s Drug Scam</td>
<td>The International Mental Health Watchdog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report and recommendations on methadone and other disastrous psychiatric drug ‘rehabilitation’ programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WARNING:** No one should stop taking any psychiatric drug without the advice and assistance of a competent, non-psychiatric, medical doctor.
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“It is time for psychiatrists to return to being physicians—not seers, priests, gurus, or pill pushers, but real physicians.”
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