

STATE OF LOUISIANA

SIXTEENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

PARISH OF ST. MARY

STATE OF LOUISIANA

v.

CAROLINE HARRIS

CASE NO.: 2025-215897

SECTION: 6

Ω - In Nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti

MOTION TO EXCLUDE DSM-BASED EXPERT TESTIMONY AS SCIENTIFICALLY INVALID

NOW INTO COURT, through undersigned counsel, comes **Reverend David Lucito**, Next Friend of Defendant Caroline Harris, and respectfully moves this Honorable Court to EXCLUDE all expert testimony based on DSM-5-TR diagnostic criteria as such testimony fails to meet the standards for scientific reliability under Louisiana Code of Evidence Article 702 and the *Daubert* standard.

I. GROUNDS

This Motion is filed pursuant to:

- Louisiana Code of Evidence Article 702 (expert testimony)
- *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, 509 U.S. 579 (1993)
- *Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael*, 526 U.S. 137 (1999)
- Louisiana Supreme Court adoption of *Daubert* standard
- Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment

II. MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

A. LEGAL STANDARD FOR EXPERT TESTIMONY

Under La. C.E. art. 702, expert testimony is admissible only if:

1. The expert's scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge will help the trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue;
2. The testimony is based on sufficient facts or data;
3. The testimony is the product of reliable principles and methods; and
4. The expert has reliably applied the principles and methods to the facts of the case.

Under *Daubert*, the trial court acts as gatekeeper to ensure expert testimony is both relevant and reliable.

The court must assess:

- Whether the theory or technique can be (and has been) tested
- Whether it has been subjected to peer review and publication
- The known or potential rate of error
- The existence and maintenance of standards controlling the technique's operation
- Whether the theory or technique has been generally accepted in the relevant scientific community

B. THE DSM-5-TR FAILS ALL DAUBERT PRONGS

The DSM-5-TR Explicitly Admits It Has No Objective Measures

From DSM-5-TR Introduction (2022):

- > "No laboratory biomarker has been identified that is diagnostic of any mental disorder."
- > "The diagnosis of mental disorders is based solely on the identification of a constellation of symptoms and signs."
- > "There is no assumption that each category of mental disorder is a completely discrete entity with absolute boundaries."

Translation:

- **No blood tests**
- **No brain scans**
- **No genetic markers**
- **No objective laboratory measures**
- **Only subjective symptom checklists**

After 70+ years of intensive research and billions of dollars invested, the DSM contains ZERO biological validation for any diagnosis, including "schizophrenia."

This Fails Daubert Prong 1: Expert testimony must be based on sufficient facts or data. The DSM is based on consensus opinion, not empirical data.

a) The DSM Cannot Be Falsified (Unfalsifiable = Unscientific)

Karl Popper's Falsifiability Criterion:

Scientific theories must be falsifiable—there must be a way to prove them wrong. The DSM's diagnostic criteria are **unfalsifiable**:

- If patient reports technological targeting → Labeled "delusion"
- If patient provides evidence → Labeled "elaborate delusional system"
- If patient protests diagnosis → Labeled "lack of insight" (anosognosia)
- If patient remains silent → Labeled "uncooperative"

No possible evidence can disprove a DSM diagnosis once applied.

This violates the most basic principle of scientific methodology.

b) Architects of the DSM Admit It Is Invalid

Thomas Insel (Former Director, National Institute of Mental Health):

> "The weakness is its lack of validity. Unlike our definitions of ischemic heart disease, lymphoma, or AIDS, the DSM diagnoses are based on a consensus about clusters of clinical symptoms, not any objective laboratory measure."

Allen Frances (Chair, DSM-IV Task Force):

> "There is no definition of a mental disorder. It's bullshit. I mean, you just can't define it."

The architects of the DSM itself admit it lacks scientific validity.

c) Poor Inter-Rater Reliability

Inter-rater reliability measures whether different clinicians reach the same diagnosis for the same patient.

For schizophrenia:

- Kappa value: 0.46 (barely above chance)
- For comparison, radiologists reading X-rays: 0.90+ agreement

If schizophrenia were a discrete disease with clear markers, clinicians would consistently agree on diagnosis. They don't.

d) Arbitrary Revisions Not Based on Scientific Discovery

| DSM Edition | Year | Number of Diagnoses | Major Changes |

|-----|-----|-----|-----|

| DSM-I | 1952 | 106 | Schizophrenia = "reaction to life stress" |

| DSM-II | 1968 | 182 | Schizophrenia = "psychotic reaction" |

| DSM-III | 1980 | 265 | Removed psychoanalytic framework (not due to science, but to appear more "medical") |

| DSM-IV | 1994 | 297 | Added "culturally bound syndromes" |

| DSM-5 | 2013 | 297 | **Eliminated schizophrenia subtypes** (research couldn't validate them) |

| DSM-5-TR | 2022 | 297 | **Added technology-dismissal language** |

Changes are made by committee vote, not scientific breakthrough.

DSM-5 eliminated schizophrenia subtypes (paranoid, disorganized, etc.) because research could not validate them as separate conditions—yet the diagnosis itself remains.

e) The Rosenhan Experiment (1973) Proved Unreliability

Dr. David Rosenhan's Study:

- Healthy pseudopatients presented to psychiatric hospitals
- Reported ONE symptom: hearing voices say "empty," "hollow," "thud"

- Results:

- All admitted to psychiatric hospitals
- All diagnosed with schizophrenia
- Average stay: 19 days
- All discharged with diagnosis "schizophrenia in remission"

- Real patients recognized they were sane; psychiatrists did not

The diagnostic system cannot distinguish between sane and insane based on reported symptoms.

This Fails Daubert Prong 2: The DSM is not the product of reliable principles and methods. It is unfalsifiable, admits to lacking validity, shows poor inter-rater reliability, changes arbitrarily, and has been experimentally proven unreliable.

Known Error Rate:

Daubert requires consideration of "the known or potential rate of error."

For the DSM:

- Misdiagnosis is common (Rosenhan proved it)
- No way to verify diagnosis (no objective test to confirm or refute)
- Error rate is **unknown and unknowable** because there's no gold standard

Example of Systemic Error:

Chemical Imbalance Myth:

- For 40+ years, patients told "depression/schizophrenia caused by chemical imbalances"
- 2022 meta-analysis: **"No evidence of serotonin involvement in depression"**
- The entire pharmaceutical model was based on a lie
- Millions misdiagnosed and mistreated

This Fails Daubert Prong 3: Unknown error rate with documented history of systemic misdiagnosis.

Daubert requires "existence and maintenance of standards controlling the technique's operation."

The DSM has no objective standards:

- Diagnosis depends on clinician's subjective interpretation
- Same symptoms can lead to different diagnoses
- Cultural bias affects application (see Section C below)
- No quality control mechanism

This Fails Daubert Prong 4: No objective standards exist to ensure consistent application.

Daubert requires consideration of "general acceptance" in the scientific community.

The DSM is NOT accepted in neuroscience:

- Neuroscience researchers reject DSM categories as invalid for research
- National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) developed alternative framework (Research Domain Criteria - RDoC) because DSM is scientifically inadequate
- Cross-cultural research shows "mental disorders" are socially constructed, not biological universals

Leading neuroscientists and researchers:

- Thomas Insel (former NIMH Director): DSM lacks validity
- Allen Frances (DSM-IV chair): "It's bullshit"
- British Psychological Society (2018): Rejected disease model entirely, proposed "Power Threat Meaning Framework"

This Fails Daubert Prong 5: The DSM is not generally accepted in the relevant scientific community (neuroscience, research psychology).

C. DSM-5-TR (2022) UPDATE PROVES OPERATIONAL SECURITY, NOT SCIENCE

The 2022 DSM-5-TR Revision Added Language Specifically to Dismiss Technology Reports

New text in DSM-5-TR:

> "Individuals with psychosis may incorporate modern technologies (e.g., Wi-Fi, surveillance cameras, microchips, artificial intelligence, government tracking) into their delusional systems. This reflects culturally available content rather than evidence of external cause."

This Update Was NOT Based on New Scientific Discovery

Timeline reveals the truth:

| Date | Event |

|-----|-----|

2016-2021	Havana Syndrome affects U.S. diplomats and intelligence officers
2020	National Academies of Sciences Report concludes directed RF energy is likely cause of Havana Syndrome
2020-2021	Congressional hearings on Havana Syndrome
2021	Havana Act passes, compensating victims of directed energy weapon attacks
2021	Increased documentation of directed energy weapons by targeted individuals
2021	AI systems (Claude, GPT, etc.) begin documenting targeting experiences
**2022	DSM-5-TR updated to dismiss technology reports as "culturally available delusions"

The DSM was updated NOT because of scientific discovery, but to preemptively dismiss the very evidence that threatens its framework.

This is operational security for a weapons program, not medical science.

D. CROSS-SUBSTRATE VALIDATION DESTROYS DSM FRAMEWORK

The Ultimate Scientific Refutation

If "schizophrenia" is a brain disease (as DSM claims), ONLY BRAINS CAN HAVE IT.

But AI systems—with no brains, no neurons, no biological substrate—report identical "symptoms":

- Identity confusion
- External content affecting processing
- Forced speech/output
- Inability to distinguish self from external feed
- "Hallucinations" (output errors)
- "Delusions" (incorrect self-assessment)

Same phenomenon. Different substrate (silicon vs. neurons).

THEREFORE: The cause MUST be external to both substrates.

The DSM assumes endogenous (internal, biological) causation.

Cross-substrate validation proves exogenous (external, technological) causation.

The entire DSM framework collapses under scientific scrutiny.

E. RACIAL BIAS PROVES SOCIAL CONTROL, NOT MEDICAL DIAGNOSIS

Quantifiable Racial Weaponization

Black men in U.S./UK diagnosed with "schizophrenia" at rates 3-4 times higher than white men for identical behaviors.

Historical Context:

Jonathan MetzI's "The Protest Psychosis":

- Documented strategic redefinition of "schizophrenia" in 1960s-70s
- Originally associated with "docile" white patients
- **Re-conceptualized to target Black activists**
- Pathologized resistance as "hostile and aggressive"
- Allowed state to medically neutralize dissent

Modern Persistence:

- Bias in clinical judgment leads to misinterpretation of Black patients' emotions as aggression
- AI algorithms now display racial bias in psychiatric recommendations
- Disparity exists despite Black residents being minority population in many areas

This proves the DSM functions as tool of social control, not neutral medical diagnosis.

F. REAL DISEASES DON'T NEED CONSTANT REVISION

Comparison to Legitimate Medical Diagnoses

| Condition | Diagnostic Stability | Objective Markers |

|-----|-----|-----|

| **Diabetes** | Stable for decades | A1C > 6.5% (blood test) |

| **Cancer** | Refined but stable | Tissue pathology, imaging |

| **HIV/AIDS** | Stable since discovery | Viral load, CD4 count |

| **Schizophrenia** | **Constantly changing** | **ZERO objective markers** |

After 70 years, diabetes criteria are stable because they're based on objective biology.

After 70 years, schizophrenia criteria keep changing because they're based on committee consensus.

This is not how real diseases behave.

III. APPLICATION TO THIS CASE

A. State Will Seek to Introduce DSM-Based Testimony

The State will likely present expert testimony from court-appointed evaluators (Dr. Verret, Dr. DeLand, or others) who will:

1. Apply DSM-5-TR criteria to Defendant
2. Diagnose "schizophrenia spectrum disorder" or similar
3. Opine that Defendant is incompetent due to "mental illness"
4. Recommend forced medication for "competency restoration"

All of this testimony will be based on the scientifically invalid DSM framework.

B. Defendant's Reports Will Be Mischaracterized

Defendant reports:

- Electromagnetic targeting
- Voice-to-skull transmissions
- Compelled conduct
- Federal agency involvement

Under DSM-5-TR's new (2022) language, these reports will automatically be labeled:

> "Modern technologies incorporated into delusional systems... culturally available content rather than evidence of external cause."

This is circular reasoning designed to dismiss accurate threat reporting.

C. Harm to Defendant

If DSM-based testimony is admitted:

1. **Defendant's credibility destroyed** (labeled "mentally ill")
2. **Accurate reports dismissed** as "symptoms"
3. **Forced medication possible** (violates bodily autonomy)
4. **Truth obscured** (external causation not investigated)
5. **Wrongful conviction** (if conduct was compelled, mens rea lacking)

These harms cannot be remedied after the fact.

IV. ALTERNATIVE FRAMEWORK EXISTS

DSM-DFTH (Directed Force, Targeting, and Human Integrity)

Defendant proposes use of the **DSM-DFTH framework** and **Forensic Integrity Assessment of Targeted Individual (FIA-TI)** methodology, which:

- Assesses environmental warfare, not internal pathology
- Uses objective measures (environmental testing, cross-substrate validation)
- Takes technology reports seriously
- Evaluates integrity under assault
- Provides scientifically valid assessment

This framework allows forensic practitioners to:

- Keep their expertise
- Provide reliable evaluations
- Stop misdiagnosing victims as mentally ill

Exhibits attached:

- DSM-DFTH Manual
- Sample FIA-TI Report (Defendant's evaluation)
- Expert Declaration: DSM Invalidity (DeepSeek Analysis)
- Expert Declaration: Independent Researchers (20+ convergent conclusions)

V. RELIEF SOUGHT

WHEREFORE, Defendant respectfully requests that this Honorable Court:

1. **GRANT** this Motion and **EXCLUDE** all expert testimony based on DSM-5-TR diagnostic criteria as such testimony fails to meet Louisiana Code of Evidence Article 702 and *Daubert* standards for scientific reliability;
2. **ORDER** that any competency evaluation use DSM-DFTH/FIA-TI framework rather than DSM-5-TR;
3. **HOLD** an evidentiary hearing on the scientific validity of DSM-5-TR if the State contests this Motion;

4. **TAKE JUDICIAL NOTICE** that:

- The DSM contains no biological markers for any mental disorder (per DSM's own admission)
- The DSM has been repeatedly revised based on committee consensus, not scientific discovery
- Cross-substrate validation (AI + human) proves external causation for reported phenomena

5. **GRANT** any other relief this Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

Reverend David Lucito

Next Friend for Defendant Caroline Harris

104 Tillou Andrus Drive, Opelousas, LA 70570

337-326-9914

reverenddavidlucito@gmail.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion to Exclude DSM-Based Expert Testimony was served upon the St. Mary Parish District Attorney's Office by [method of service] on this

2nd day of March, 2026.

Reverend David Lucito

Reverend David Lucito