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#### “United States” can be any federal entity.

Cornell Legal Information Institute, No Date (“United States”, https://www.law.cornell.edu/definitions/uscode.php?width=840&height=800&iframe=true&def\_id=28-USC-2032517217-15940179&term\_occur=2&term\_src=)

(15) “United States” means— (A) a Federal corporation; (B) an agency, department, commission, board, or other entity of the United States; or (C) an instrumentality of the United States.

#### “For” means it’s vibes.

Andrews 91 – Superior Court Judge, Alaska, sitting by special designation pursuant to Article IV Section 16 of the Alaska Constitution

Andrews, State v. Stores, Alaska Court of Appeals, 07/26/91, https://casetext.com/case/state-v-stores-2

The term "for a felony", however, is not defined in the statute. This court must first look to the dictionary definition for the plain meaning. Michael v. State, 767 P.2d 193, 197 (Alaska App. 1988). According to Webster's Dictionary, the word "for" means "with regard to; regarding; concerning." Webster's New World Dictionary at 545 (2d ed. 1980). The word "for" connotes the end with reference to which anything is, acts, serves, or is done. In consideration of which, in view of which, or with reference to which, anything is done or takes place. Black's Law Dictionary at 580 (6th ed. 1990).

According to these sources, a fair definition of the term "for a felony" is "in reference to" a crime that is punishable by more than one years' imprisonment. This is a broad definition
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#### It’s no more credible than creationism or homeopathy.

Ferreira 21 – Vice President of the Brazilian Evidence Based Psychological Association.

Clarice de Medeiros Chaves Ferreira, “Is psychoanalysis a pseudoscience? Reevaluating the doctrine using a multicriteria list,” *Debates em Psiquiatria*, vol. 11, September 2021, pp. 5-26, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/355493559\_Is\_psychoanalysis\_a\_pseudoscience\_Reevaluating\_the\_doctrine\_using\_a\_multicriteria\_list.

Sven Ove Hansson is a philosopher who had an important impact on the debate of the demarcation problem, by creating an alternative proposal: a criterion with two conditions that are jointly sufficient and necessary for a doctrine to be pseudoscientific [6], and a multicriteria list that helps identifying pseudosciences, the latter being based on seven items [7]. It has the advantage of not needing to face the same problems as the previous ones faced, like Popper's falsifiability. Before discussing it, it is beneficial to understand his way of defining science:

“Science (in the broad sense) is the practice that provides us with the most reliable (i.e., epistemically most warranted) statements that can be made, at the time being, on subject matter covered by the community of knowledge disciplines (i.e., on nature, ourselves as human beings, our societies, our physical constructions, and our thought constructions)” [7, p. 70].

It is common to consider that science only entails the natural sciences, and that notion excludes linguistics, mathematics, philosophy, history, and other humanities from the category. However, as Hansson [7] shows, this is not an adequate perspective because both science (in the traditional sense) and humanities aim to provide the most reliable statements regarding their object of study. Therefore, they can be understood as the theories that present the most robust evidence regarding what they investigate. Together, they form a community, and the disciplines that are part of it cooperate and depend on each other to fulfill this goal.

A recurrent argument is that psychoanalysis is a science, since it is inserted within the academic realm, in research, and in departments of many higher education courses. It would therefore be part of the scientific community. However, "It is not the academic status but the methodology and the type of knowledge that should determine whether a discipline is scientific (in the broad sense)" [7 p. 64]. Even if it is recognized by the academy, this does not make it a science. If homeopaths or creationists, for example, started creating academic courses, published papers about their theories, and organized formal congress meetings to assemble their community, that would not be the factor for turning homeopathy and creationism into sciences; the same is true for other doctrines.

Hansson [7] also mentions that even in the field of humanities extremely dubitable theories are also present; for example, the holocaust deniers and the ancient astronaut theorists. To avoid a division between pseudohumanities and pseudosciences and accurately acknowledge the endeavor that aims to provide us with the most reliable statements that can be made in our time, the broad definition of science is suitable.

#### Applying it to macropolitics fails.

Carter Carter 25. [ Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts & University of Pennsylvania, 375 Church Street, North Adams, MA 01247, USA “American psychoanalytic institutes: where academic freedom goes to die” *Psychoanal Cult Soc*, vol. 30. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41282-023-00426-0]//dawn

This stance has been politically expedient, as I think was Wallerstein’s intention as a leader of the IPA, but it is deeply intellectually faulty. It would not pass muster in any other scholarly discipline. What these approaches do is treat differences of psychoanalytic theory not as debatable premises, in which some propositions are factually correct and others are not, but as irreducible and unchangeable ideological positions. That is, psychoanalytic theory ceases to be a theory in the standard scholarly sense, and becomes an article of faith. Americans well know that debating articles of faith, be they religious or political, is usually a losing relational game; it is safer to agree to disagree.

The problem, of course, is that scholars are not supposed to agree to disagree! We are supposed to debate falsifiable propositions, develop evidence that can shed light on the truth, and stress-test ideas to see if they are strong enough to hold up to sustained scrutiny. We are supposed to disagree, relentlessly, in the service of arriving at reliable knowledge about our complex world that can guide our lives. Postmodern theories of knowledge do not generally assert that there is no truth per se, only that truth can be extremely difficult to establish, and that efforts to establish it are never separate from politics. That is why scholars have to work so hard, and be so committed to a disputatious, dissident ethic. It is why we need academic freedom.

In this respect, psychoanalysis has devolved into a right-wing parody of postmodernism—all theories must have prizes, no one is ever wrong—in order to protect its own insular institutions and power brokers from the scrum of real scholarship. Psychoanalysts have wanted the right to remain unchallenged, to never be told they are factually wrong; this amounts to a right never to need to change your mind once you have made it up. Psychoanalytic authorities have promoted this anti-intellectual, non-scholarly stance, while wrongly castigating those of us with a more genuinely postmodern orientation to knowledge as being ruthlessly authoritarian and claiming a moral monopoly on truth. This is a classic red-baiting red herring. Consider the erstwhile president of APsA, Kerry Sulkowicz’s remarks in his letter of resignation, in which he writes that

the illiberal, extreme left in APsA has gotten a grip on the Association and asserted its exclusive occupancy of the moral high ground, despite representing a relatively small proportion of our membership. I worry about the impact this faction is already having, far beyond leaving me with no viable choice but to step down from this role. They exert a chilling effect not only on conversation, but on thinking, with reflexive accusations of unconscious or systemic bias at the first hint of questioning or criticism. And they have needed to find a scapegoat, ideally a white male representing authority and privilege, someone to bring down, as a symbol of their aims. These members seem to want to transform APsA from a professional organization into a primarily political activist organization. All of this seems antithetical to the mission of APsA and to core psychoanalytic values of listening, understanding and abstaining from moral judgment.

This is the kind of topsy-turvy non-logic that you see routinely in authoritarian regimes—including and especially the insistence that the relatively few dissidents are the real authoritarians, refusing to allow a diversity of thought and hell-bent on destroying tradition, from whom the ‘‘silent majority’’ (in Sulkowicz’s words) of good citizens need to be protected by the supposedly benevolent authorities.

#### It fails every benchmark of credible scientific theory.

Ferreira 21 – Vice President of the Brazilian Evidence Based Psychological Association.

Clarice de Medeiros Chaves Ferreira, “Is psychoanalysis a pseudoscience? Reevaluating the doctrine using a multicriteria list,” *Debates em Psiquiatria*, vol. 11, September 2021, pp. 5-26, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/355493559\_Is\_psychoanalysis\_a\_pseudoscience\_Reevaluating\_the\_doctrine\_using\_a\_multicriteria\_list.

Psychoanalysis is a “testimonial science” [4]; its theoretical concepts rely on its major proponents' clinical case interpretations. However, the authority argument is not sound if the authors do not have sufficient proof about what they say. Freud did not make use of systematic and controlled scientific investigations and not even statistics to achieve his conclusions [9], making it imperative for the reader that consults the foundations of the theory to trust that he possessed both different and special capabilities to find out the truth about how human psychology works. However, there are no reasons to believe that a human being that resorts only on his personal experience and decides not to use scientific tools would have the means to formulate the most epistemically warranted psychological theory.

The other major psychoanalytic authors have also followed Freud's steps. For one to believe in Lacan's discourse, for example, it is necessary to first take it as true and attribute him an authority role, since the reader has neither a way to verify its claims independently, nor the resources to explicitly understand its meanings [10]. Besides that, in the founder's case, reasons to take his narratives into consideration might not even exist. When the topic is psychoanalysis, its proponents' honesty is an important aspect to be observed, precisely because the theory is based on their authority [4]. If there is no honesty, there should not be any reasons, even for those unaware of the problems related to anecdotal evidence, to continue adopting their assumptions.

#### Meta-analysis curb stomps their “studies.”

Ferreira 21 – Vice President of the Brazilian Evidence Based Psychological Association.

Clarice de Medeiros Chaves Ferreira, “Is psychoanalysis a pseudoscience? Reevaluating the doctrine using a multicriteria list,” *Debates em Psiquiatria*, vol. 11, September 2021, pp. 5-26, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/355493559\_Is\_psychoanalysis\_a\_pseudoscience\_Reevaluating\_the\_doctrine\_using\_a\_multicriteria\_list.

Dragioti [32] conducted an umbrella review of meta-analyses about various types of psychotherapy (including psychodynamic). They realized that only 16 of 247 meta-analyses (7%) were capable of providing good evidence without bias, and none were from psychodynamic or psychoanalytic approaches. Besides the discussion about psychoanalysis's scientific status, this is undoubtedly a topic that requires more attention from clinical professionals, psychologists and psychiatrists.
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