Dr Petros Levounis
President of the American Psychiatric Association
Professor and Chair of the Department of Psychiatry
Rutgers New Jersey Medical School

12 March, 2024

Dr Levounis,

1. This letter is written to you as President of the American Psychiatric Association (APA), as Chair of the Department of Psychiatry at Rutgers New Jersey Medical School (Rutgers) and as a prominent member of the Profession, concerned, I presume, with the standards and reputation of the profession and who does not wish to see it used as once it was in the USSR (see, as an example: *"A Question of Madness*[1]*"* by Zhores A. Medvedev, Roy Aleksandrovich Medvedev) and other places.

2. DSMIV defined a delusion as:

"A false belief based on an incorrect inference about external reality that is firmly sustained despite what almost everyone else believes and despite what constitutes incontrovertible and obvious proof or evidence to the contrary. The belief is not one ordinarily accepted by other members of the person's culture or subculture (e.g. not an article of religious faith)"

(i) It is a very carefully considered definition. It is apparent to me, as it should be to any thinking person that that Definition was drafted with due attention to the freedom of thought and to preventing the abuse of psychiatry.

3. DSMV bears a very different definition (Page 87, the section, entitled: *"Delusions"*):

"Delusions are fixed beliefs that are not amenable to change in light of conflicting evidence. Their content may include a variety of themes (e.g., persecutory, referential, somatic, religious, grandiose)."

[1] https://www.google.co.uk/books/edition/A_Question_of_Madness/wAFzuxRgG5kC?hl=en

It continues:

"The distinction between a delusion and a strongly held idea is sometimes difficult to make and depends in part on the degree of conviction with which the belief is held despite clear or reasonable contradictory evidence regarding its veracity."

(i) It is a very different definition. It is poorer and more open to abuse and misunderstanding.

4. I would like to know whether the Definition in DSMV builds on and accepts. In its entirety, the Definition of DSMIV (stated at No.2, above) or whether it rejects and alters certain parts of the Definition of DSMIV.

(i) If it accepts, in its entirety, the Definition of DSMIV, please ensure that DSMV is corrected to reflect that fact and that future editions do not lend themselves to similar misinterpretations.

(ii) If the Definition has evolved, please describe fully the evolution, explain its necessity and state what risks you thought you addressed by such an evolution and what risks you think it might have created.

5. At this juncture, I only make the following observation:

(i) DSMV's definition, if it is an evolved form of DSMIV's definition, creates a situation where a person can be declared to be delusional because people say their evidence that he is wrong is strong. It may not be but, if the standard has changed, that now can be done.

(a) You would have moved from an objective to a subjective standard. In such matters (nothing less than freedom of thought), that can cause serious consequences.

(ii) Those declaring that person to be delusional can simply assert that, as far as they can see, their evidence is clear and reasonable.

(a) If the Definition has altered, prepare publically to support the detention of political dissidents and other people in places whose regimes you do not support, on grounds that they are delusional and supported by your definition. Or prepare for your Organisations ns profession to be viewed, understandably, with suspicion. For that would certainly be the result of such a decision. If you require me further to explain that point, I should be pleased to oblige.

(b) If the definition has changed, a thousand abuses that once were not possible may now flourish

under the new Definition.

6. Belo, I have set out my case in the abstract. The attached documents treat the case in the particular and also constitute evidence, much of it incontestable, all of it cogent. I require from you the following:

(i) A statement as to whether you think I have been properly diagnosed (keep in mind *"Sentencing Assessment [EXCISED]"* and *"Sentencing Assessment [EXCISED]2"* which plainly show psychiatrists refusing to explain why I am wrong, *"Document2"*, which explains why the diagnoses that have been made are wrong and *"Document of April 2021"*, which explains some of the conclusions I have reached and why) and

(ii) to fact-check or have fact-checked the documents I have attached and to test them for intellectual or logical robustness. You may use the APA, your Faculty, Rutgers and even involve other institutions, including academic institutions to do so. Please inform me of any steps you take.

7. I invite you to attend my Multidisciplinary Team Meeting (MDT) on 21 March. You will have the opportunity to listen to the Team, including one of the diagnosing psychiatrists, to see how they respond to my questions and, if you wish, to put questions to them. You may invite other people to attend the Meeting with you. You may attend by MS Teams.

(i) Please let me know, as soon as possible, the time you can attend (between 13:00 and 16:00 GMT (UTC)). I shall try to have the MDT scheduled for a time of your convenience.

8. I invite you to attend my Tribunal Hearing, the date has not been set but probably will be some time in the next four (4) weeks. You will have the opportunity to observe the process. If you wish, I might put some questions to you as a witness. If you do not, you are free to attend purely as an observer. You may invite other people to attend the Hearing with you. You may attend by MS Teams.

(i) Please let me know, as soon as possible, dates and times you can attend (between 10:00 and 14:00 GMT (UTC)). I shall try to have the Tribunal arrange the Hearing according to those dates and times.

9. It was recently put to me that since I cannot think of why I should be the target of such a campaign, the campaign must not exist and my refusal to accept that shows I am delusional. The implication is that if I have proof that something is very likely happening but cannot

explain why it is happening, I should reject the idea that it is happening. Do you accept that logic?

My Case

10. If you observe a consequential flaw in my reasoning, the evidence provided or anything else, please let me know in the plainest and most direct manner: I should be most grateful to you. I am interested in the discovery of the truth. I have not the slightest interest in the preservation of erroneous views or faulty logic, especially if they issue from me.

(i) If you have any question(s) or require illumination of any point, further evidence or anything else whatsoever, please do not hesitate to let me know: I should be pleased to oblige.

11. This letter reports grave human rights abuses and misconduct. It serves as commentary and introduction to the accompanying documents, which must also be read.

12. Since 2014, I have been the target of an incessant Campaign, as part of which I have unjustly been detained, since the start of 2015, on the basis of false diagnoses and false opinions that I am dangerous.

(i) The diagnoses are false because they fail to meet the conditions demanded by the definition of the disorder with which I have been diagnosed. It is as if doctors diagnosed severe and advanced cancer but were unable to show a tumour.

(ii) The opinions are false because they are not compatible with the evidence and, as with the diagnoses, no one, including the practitioners who have offered them, has been able to defend them and to answer reasonable questions relating to those opinions.

13. My case is particularly disturbing because, while it is by now apparent that that such a Campaign is and has been in progress since 2014 (the evidence is ineluctable), the reasons for my being targeted are unclear: I am an ordinary law-abiding person who was simply living his life, causing no discomfort or inconvenience to anyone.

14. While, in other cases for which people and organisations have chosen to militate, there have been discernible reasons. It was considered that those reasons were not acceptable, but the reasons were known. The following examples illustrate this point. They are not to be taken to be a statement one way or another, regarding the issues cited:

(i) Regarding the situation in Ukraine, those who criticise Russia say that Ukraine has the right to decide whether or not it wishes to join NATO. The issue is clear: Ukraine wished to join NATO and Russia considered this to be a serious threat to Russia's security.

(ii) Mr Navalny is in prison, following convictions for certain crimes. Those who militate for him say he did not commit those crimes and that he has been imprisoned because he is opposed to the Government of Russia.

(iii) In Nazi Germany, Jews, gypsies, trade unionists, communists, the disabled, etc. were persecuted because that is what they were (jews, gypsies, etc.). Everyone understood this.

15. In considering the cases cited above, and most of the issues about which people are active, it is immediately apparent that, whatever one's opinion of the matter, there were certain rules and the people in question knew what to do in order to avoid the problems they encountered. These are problems with rules; some say those rules were wrong.

16. My case is one of disorder and of no rules, not even bad rules: a person does not know what can get him in trouble: you can find yourself in the gravest difficulties imaginable, with all the resources of the state used against you, even though you have done nothing wrong, have broken no rule, good or bad, and are just an ordinary person, quietly going about your life.

(i) If you can imagine a reason for the Campaign against me, divulge it.

(ii) If you can show that I am wrong and that there was never such a campaign, do so.

(iii) But if you cannot do so and you do nothing, you have chosen to be indifferent to a terrifying situation: where there are no rules, where no one can tell what will get him or her in the sort of trouble I describe and have proved: incessantly and over a period of almost a decade to be persecuted, harassed, detained unjustly and to have perpetrated against you the gravest and most egregious crimes and breaches of the most fundamental human rights.

17. I repeat that this letter is merely introduction and commentary to the attached documents: they must be read. I recommend that, of those documents, the following and their supporting documents be read first:

(i) *The Duplicity of Leaders - and what it Has Cost Us*

(ii) *The Report of April, 2021*: Describes the Campaign.

(iii) *Draft-Solicitors Regulators and Tribunal 2023*

(iv) *Sentencing Assessment [EXCISED] and Sentencing Assessment Bloye [EXCISED]2*: Proves that the diagnoses and the opinions that I am dangerous are false and that practitioners have failed to defend them

(v) *Diagnosis and Risk:* Shows I am not dangerous and that my detention cannot be justified on such grounds.

(vi) *Denial of essential Primary Medical Care, Interception of Communications and Cover-ups:* Describes grave mistreatment, in 2021, that endangered my life. It also provides further proof of the Campaign and that my communications have been intercepted by a third party that is able to issue instructions to hospital staff and to have those instructions followed.

(vii) *DRAFT - Disruption of and Interference with Internet Services*: Further proof of the Campaign, how expansive it is and that my communications and devices have been interfered with.

(viii) *NMC Refusal to Observe the Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001*: Further proof of the Campaign and its reach.

(ix) *Unlawful Confinement*: Describes harassment.

(x) *NMC Complaint against [EXCISED] Et al:* Further description and proof of the Campaign.

(xi) *NMC Complaint against [EXCISED]:* Further description and proof of the Campaign.

(xii) *Conspiracy Theories, Misinformation and Disinformation – why mine are unlikely to be any of these Diagnosis and Risk:* Self-explanatory.

(xiii) *Facts to Be Checked*

18. Please have the documents I have sent you fact-checked. If you are unable to do so, please let me know, I should then provide you with a list of fact-checkers from which you may select the names of those you consider to be reliable. I should then approach them and ask them to check the facts for us. If you envisage any problems with regards to this suggestion, please let me know.

(i) There being such a large quantity of documents, I earlier prepared the attached Document,

entitled: *Facts to be Checked*, as a suggestion of the fewest facts that should be checked. More than a year has passed since the preparation of that Document. In that time there have been many developments whose implication must be grave. I have treated those developments in the attached documents. They too require checking.

19. Finally: There is no question that there has been a great deal of misconduct, wherever I have turned up, and that people have inexplicably refused to carry out their duties.

(i) Where, as in my case, no evidence is produced showing it not to be the case, is it a delusion for a person who finds himself in such a situation to decide that more than ten years of that sort of thing must outrage the laws of probability and is therefore very likely proof of such a campaign as I have described?

[EXCISED]