Paper 53: The Glass -- Treatment-Resistant Illness as a Spin Glass Phase

Edwards-Anderson Model of the Disordered Coherence State

AIIT-THRESI Research Initiative | March 30, 2026

Abstract

The Wike Coherence framework describes the ordered phase (gamma < gamma_c) thoroughly but leaves the disordered phase (gamma > gamma_c) largely uncharacterized -- simply "C is low." This paper fills that gap. Treatment-resistant mental illness is an Edwards-Anderson spin glass: frustrated neural couplings J_ij of mixed sign create an exponentially complex landscape of metastable states. The Edwards-Anderson order parameter q_EA (mood autocorrelation plateau) is a measurable predictor of treatment resistance. Standard antidepressants (uniform field) fail for spin glasses because they shift all valleys equally without restructuring the landscape. Ketamine works by thermal quench through T_g (melting the glass). Psychedelics work by slow annealing above T_g. EMDR works for PTSD (few deep valleys from fast Kibble-Zurek quench) but not depression (many shallow valleys from slow quench). Parisi replica symmetry breaking explains why every patient's illness is structurally unique.

1. The Hamiltonian

Define N neural circuit variables sigma_i in {-1, +1} representing the state of circuit i (-1 = aversive/avoidant, +1 = approach/engaged). The Edwards-Anderson Hamiltonian:

```
H = -sum_{<i,j>} J_ij * sigma_i * sigma_j - sum_i h_i * sigma_i
```

where:

• J_ij = synaptic coupling between circuits i and j (distribution P(J) with mean J_0, variance Delta_J^2)

• h_i = external field on circuit i (therapeutic intervention, environmental input)

The critical distinction: J_ij are NOT all the same sign.

Healthy development: predominantly ferromagnetic (J > 0). Circuits reinforce coherently.

Trauma: introduces antiferromagnetic (J < 0) couplings -- contradictory associations.

Example: A child whose caregiver is both comfort and abuse develops J_{attachment, fear} < 0. Being close triggers fear. Being distant triggers attachment distress. This IS frustration in the spin glass sense.

2. Frustration

A plaquette of three circuits with bonds J_12 > 0, J_23 > 0, J_13 < 0 cannot simultaneously satisfy all interactions. The frustration parameter:

```
Phi_P = sign(product of J_ij around plaquette P)
```

Phi_P = -1: frustrated. The frustration density:

```
f = (1/N_P) * sum_P (1 - Phi_P) / 2
```

Healthy system: f ~ 0. Treatment-resistant illness: f is extensive.

3. The Edwards-Anderson Order Parameter as a Clinical Measure

```
q_EA = (1/N) * sum_i <sigma_i(t_1) * sigma_i(t_2)>
```

for large time separation |t_1 - t_2|.

Clinical measurement: Let m_i(t) be the normalized score on mood dimension i (PHQ-9 item, behavioral measure) at time t. Take the autocorrelation:

```
A(tau) = (1/N) * sum_i <m_i(t) * m_i(t + tau)>_t
```

The plateau value at large tau IS q_EA.

```
| q_EA | Phase | Clinical Presentation |
|---|---|---|
| ~0 | Paramagnetic | Healthy flexibility or acute crisis |
| 0 < q_EA < 1 | Partial glass | Some dimensions stuck, others flexible |
| ~1 | Full glass | Identical presentation every visit. Same ruminations, same avoidance, same affect. |
```

Testable prediction: Measure q_EA from daily mood questionnaire time series (e.g., PHQ-9 items over 4 weeks) BEFORE initiating treatment. Patients with q_EA > q_c are in the glass phase and will be treatment-resistant to standard antidepressants.

4. Why Standard Antidepressants Fail

An SSRI applies a roughly uniform field h to serotonergic circuits:

```
H -> H - h * sum_i sigma_i
```

For a simple ferromagnet (ordinary depression = uniform low-energy state), a uniform field lifts the system out of the down-state. Single minimum shifts smoothly with h.

For a spin glass, the free energy landscape has EXPONENTIALLY many minima (the Parisi ultrametric tree). A uniform field shifts ALL valleys but does not change their relative depths. The barriers between valleys scale as:

```
Gamma ~ exp(-N^psi / T)
```

where psi ~ 1/3 (SK model barrier exponent).

The SSRI changes the floor level of the valley the patient is stuck in -- they may feel slightly less bad -- but does not enable transitions to genuinely different configurations.

This is "partial response" in treatment-resistant patients: modest symptom reduction without qualitative change in the pattern of illness.

5. Why Ketamine Works: Thermal Quench Through T_g

Ketamine (NMDA antagonist) at subanesthetic doses:

NMDA blockade + glutamate surge -> massive increase in neural noise -> effective temperature T_eff rises far above glass transition T_g.

```
T_eff(t) = T_0 + Delta_T * f(t)
```

At T > T_g: spin glass melts to paramagnetic phase. Ergodicity restored. System explores full configuration space.

During the dissociative window (~40-60 min): neural system is in the liquid phase.

As drug clears: T_eff drops below T_g. System re-freezes, but into a DIFFERENT configuration -- one that may have lower frustration because:

1. Re-cooling rate is finite -> time to anneal
2. BDNF + synaptogenesis elevated -> some J_ij values being rewritten

Prediction: Ketamine alone = transient remission (glass re-forms). Ketamine + therapy during neuroplasticity window = durable results (J_ij restructured while glass is melted).

This matches clinical data: Zarate et al. (2006) showed rapid but transient effect; ketamine-assisted psychotherapy trials show more durable outcomes.

6. Why Psychedelics Work: Slow Annealing Above T_g

Psilocybin, LSD increase effective neural temperature by increasing entropy (Carhart-Harris et al., 2012: increased entropy in neural dynamics under psychedelics).

Distinction from ketamine: psychedelics don't quench to T -> infinity. They raise T_eff just above T_g and HOLD for hours (4-6h psilocybin, 8-12h LSD).

This is slow annealing. The Geman-Geman theorem:

```
T(t) >= Delta_max / log(1 + t)
```

For convergence to global minimum with probability 1.

Extended duration above T_g -> system explores many valleys. Gradual return to baseline = slow cooling. The "mystical experience" = finding a substantially lower-energy configuration.

Prediction: Therapeutic efficacy correlates with integral [T_eff(t) - T_g]_+ dt -- total thermal dose above glass transition. Testable via EEG Lempel-Ziv complexity as proxy for T_eff.

7. Why EMDR Works for PTSD but Not Depression

From Paper 52 (Kibble-Zurek):

PTSD (fast quench): Few deep valleys, localized frustration. EMDR applies a local oscillating field:

```
h_i(t) = h_0 * cos(omega*t)   for i in {trauma circuits}
```

Resonantly pumps energy into specific valleys. Few barriers, localized -> EMDR addresses them one by one. Efficient.

Depression (slow quench): Many shallow valleys, diffuse frustration. EMDR targets one valley but leaves 2^N others untouched. Patient resolves specific issue, overall glass unchanged.

Property	PTSD	Treatment-Resistant Depression
Number of valleys	Few (~polynomial)	Many (~exponential)
Valley depth	Deep	Shallow
Frustration	Localized	Diffuse
q_EA structure	Simple ultrametric tree	Complex ultrametric tree
First-line treatment	EMDR (local surgery)	Global intervention (psychedelics, ketamine)

8. Replica Symmetry Breaking and Individual Variation

The Parisi solution: the order parameter is not a single number q_EA but a FUNCTION q(x) for x in [0,1] describing the hierarchical overlap structure.

This IS the clinical reality that every patient's depression is different. Two patients with identical PHQ-9 scores (same "magnetization") have completely different ultrametric structures -- different frozen circuits, different hierarchies of metastable states.

This is why personalized medicine is necessary and why population-level drug trials show such high variance.

The Parisi function q(x) is extractable from data: it is the distribution P(q) of overlaps between the patient's state at different times.

P(q) structure	Phase	Clinical meaning
Delta function at q = 0	Paramagnetic	Healthy
Delta function at q_EA	Replica symmetric glass	Simple frozen state
Continuous distribution	Full RSB	Complex hierarchical freezing

The nature of P(q) determines the appropriate treatment modality.

9. Connection to Wike Coherence Framework

The coherence parameter maps directly:

```
C = 1 - q_EA
```

- Ergodic (q_EA = 0): C = 1, maximum coherence
- Glass (q_EA -> 1): C -> 0, coherence vanishes

The disordered phase (gamma > gamma_c) IS the spin glass phase. But now we have the full Parisi structure, not just "C is low."

The decoherence rate gamma maps to the glass transition via:

```
gamma_c corresponds to T_g
gamma > gamma_c -> T < T_g (frozen in glass)
gamma < gamma_c -> T > T_g (ergodic)
```

(Note the inversion: higher decoherence = lower effective temperature in the glass analogy, because more noise = more frozen frustration.)

10. Connection to Paper 52 (Kibble-Zurek)

The spin glass framework and the KZM framework are complementary:

- **KZM** tells you HOW MANY defects form and WHERE (fast vs. slow quench)
- **Spin glass** tells you what the LANDSCAPE looks like after the quench

Together: acute trauma (fast quench) -> few deep frustrated plaquettes (PTSD glass with simple ultrametric structure). Chronic stress (slow quench) -> many shallow frustrated plaquettes (depression glass with complex RSB).

11. Testable Predictions

1. **q_EA predicts treatment resistance BEFORE treatment** -- prospective study: measure 4-week PHQ-9 autocorrelation, then initiate SSRI, compare responders vs. non-responders
2. **EEG Lempel-Ziv complexity increases during ketamine** -- proxy for T_eff > T_g
3. **q_EA decreases in discrete steps during EMDR for PTSD** -- each session removes a defect
4. **q_EA decreases continuously during psychedelic-assisted therapy** -- glass melts globally
5. **P(q) distribution structure distinguishes PTSD from depression** -- simple vs. complex RSB

12. References

1. Edwards, S.F. & Anderson, P.W. (1975). J. Phys. F, 5(5), 965.
2. Parisi, G. (1979). Phys. Rev. Lett., 43(23), 1754.
3. Zarate, C.A. et al. (2006). Arch. Gen. Psychiatry, 63(8), 856-864.
4. Carhart-Harris, R.L. et al. (2012). PNAS, 109(6), 2138-2143.
5. Geman, S. & Geman, D. (1984). IEEE Trans. PAMI, 6(6), 721-741.
6. Goldberger, A.L. et al. (2002). PNAS, 99(suppl_1), 2466-2472.
7. Kauffman, S.A. (1993). The Origins of Order. Oxford University Press.

AIIT-THRESI | Paper 53 | March 30, 2026

Rhet Dillard Wike | Council Hill, Oklahoma

Co-Authored-By: Claude Opus 4.6 <noreply@anthropic.com>