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This reader is a study guide and a work book for those who are familiar with some ideas, images, or theories of madness or “mental illness” (and perhaps also psychiatry), but feel a lingering skepticism and doubt about what they mean. What are the first images that come to your mind when you think of the word “madness”? If it’s more familiar, go ahead and substitute the word “insanity” or “craziness” for “madness”. What about “mental health”, “mental disorders”, “chemical imbalances”, and “delusions”? Can you think of any other words that seem related to these, but are missing?

It is more important than ever that we all talk about what “mental health” is and how we relate to it. Let’s look at some basic facts. The number of people who are diagnosed with a mental disorder is steadily growing every year, especially when looked at globally.¹ According to the World Health Organization (WHO), over 450 million adults have a diagnosable mental disorder worldwide. They also report that the number of suicides increased by 60% over the last 45 years. Mental disorders apparently account for “8.8% and 16.6% of the total burden of disease due to health conditions in low- and middle-income countries”.² So, something must be done, right? We need “more mental health services”, as many activists and others are apt to say. But what does that mean? Medication? Yoga classes? More hospital beds? Free or affordable therapy?

Calling for “more mental health services” starts to look somewhat questionable when one looks at a number of other facts. In the 1970s, WHO found that those diagnosed with schizophrenia—often called the most debilitating of all mental disorders—fared better in developing countries than in the U.S. In a repeat of this study, they found the same results. A number of follow-up studies found that patients who had weaned themselves off the antipsychotics, which were supposed to “fix their brains” had fared much

---

¹ This is the language we will use throughout the study guide: “diagnosed with” rather than “has” a mental disorder.

better than those who continued to take them. When faced with these facts, simply calling for “more mental health” starts to look unsatisfactory.

We also live in a time when patient-centered groups, and groups of those who identify with unusual experiences typically seen as “crazy” (hearing voices, extreme mood expressions, seeing things, having “strange beliefs”) organize themselves in social groups, study groups, support networks, and antipsychiatry activist groups. The mere existence of such groups already wears upon the more extreme claims made by psychiatry that, for instance, “psychotic” patients will flounder in their undertakings and live solitary lives trapped in a world of fantasy. This uneasy feeling deepens when we see that some such groups have publicly accused psychiatric treatment to be unhelpful, unnecessary, and, in some cases, torturous. Others have argued that psychiatry is operating as nothing more than a police force, incarcerating the unwanted or unsightly from the streets to sedate them or simply hold them in hospitals or asylums out of sight, and, for their less unsightly patients, providing simple drug fixes to the complex problems wrought by political and economic systems.

This is a very personal document for me. I have heard talk about this thing “madness” for as long as I can remember. Multiple members of my family have undergone interventions for their “madness.” Sometimes that meant taking pills; sometimes it meant getting taken away to a hospital or treatment center against their will; other times it meant going to those places willingly; but it always meant that the person diagnosed and the people closest to them had to rethink their life, their personality, and relationships. I too have undergone psychiatric intervention in my life, unwillingly and willingly. The effect these treatments have had on my life is immense. I have also had a number of bizarre or extreme experiences, which, up until recently, I had always been afraid or felt unqualified to talk about, in large part due to my feeling threatened and delegitimated in my experiences with psychiatry and clinical psychology.

This study guide is for those who feel similarly doubtful, uncertain, or uneasy about the way we talk about “madness” or “mental disorders.” It’s for those who have been diagnosed, hospitalized, and drugged and feel like their psychiatrist doesn’t know best, but they aren’t sure how to express that; it’s for those who have seen a family member or friend “treated” for mental illness and were confused or dissatisfied by the process; it’s for those who have never had interface with psychiatry, but feel like madness or mental illness has touched them, and they don’t know what to make of that feeling; it’s also for those who feel like they know enough about mental health, and what to do about it. They won’t find any easy answers here. This guide is not structured so that the reader will walk away with a cohesive ideology or belief; it was made to initiate and facilitate a process of questioning and doubt, and hopefully of discovery.

My hope is that people use this guide either for self study or for aiding in the formation of critical mental health reading groups or film groups. The reader is organized into 10 units. One could either decide to study a little bit from each unit, focus entirely on a unit of particular importance to you or your group, or do the entire thing. At the beginning of each unit, you will find a summary of the themes and questions explored, and, at the end, a couple questions you are invited to use as a note-taking device. Most will have a primary text to introduce the themes and ideas in a general way. This will be followed by a few optional texts, podcast episodes, films, or other media that go deeper into the themes. There will be hyperlinks for all the texts, podcasts, and more on the website www.belliresearchinstitute.com (with the exception of the films, which you will have to find on your own). As a rule, the main text and materials will be shorter and more like a survey of the problem/question of that unit. The optional texts will either be primary documents or somewhat denser secondary texts illuminating one or two aspect of the general theme. In many

4 Some examples include the Hearing Voices Movement, Intervoice, the Icarus Project, Mad Pride, Mind Freedom, Western Mass Recovery Learning Community, and the Freedom Center.
cases, the primary texts are interviews or surveys of a theme.

The units and the optional texts within them are merely suggestions, and, if excluding something, mixing-and-matching, skipping units, or changing the order would help facilitate your understanding, please do it. The SEE, WATCH, and LISTEN sections offer podcast, song, art, and film recommendations for opportunities for learners of different types to use what they feel most comfortable with to approach the questions at hand. A general warning for what is to come: we have not excluded texts which discuss many unpleasant and challenging topics including child abuse, suicide, self-harming, and rape. Please use your own discretion as you continue.

Every section will feature at least one text or work by a person who feels they have passed through/live with “madness” or has had a psychiatric label forced upon them. This is necessarily a difficult category to pin down, as you shall see. I let the writers themselves define what it means to them to be mad, and did not use any diagnostic system or nosological schema (classification system for defining and organizing diseases) to decide who warranted inclusion or not. I see such people as primary authors and thinkers on the path-way to understanding and not as case studies for one to examine at a distance (as if there are the works by the “normal” authors about madness and then ones by crazy people for one to check their ideas against).

I’ve designed the guide in three parts with a particular narrative structure in mind, even though the parts as I’ve conceived them will blur into one-another. The first part is largely negative, in that it is meant to challenge dominant beliefs about mental health. Sometimes this is done through critique, other times it is done through illuminating alternatives to the normal, accepted ideas. The world seems oversaturated with ideas and facts about mental health. This “ever more facts” model serves above all to bury the essential problems related to madness under a mountain of detail. So first, this guide will challenge beliefs already held by most people in American society, and since most of these beliefs come from psychiatry (directly or indirectly), the first half will largely be about psychiatry and the process of labelling and treating someone as “mad” (roughly units 1-5); the second cluster of units (units 6-7) will then offer up unique perspectives on “madness,” will outline some reform and harm reduction efforts of the past and present within psychiatry, and potential alternatives to our practices of “mental health;” the last part (units 8-10), will focus on the experiences of those who have experienced something they’ve called madness, and will look outwards, to try to draw connections and remove the question of madness from its imposed isolation in medicine and draw new lessons from it. The entire guide is permeated through and through with the voices and experiences of the “mad”. Through their voices, I hope that readers will experience a guided, soft, break down, because it is only by breaking down that we can open up space to hear those voices that are desperately calling out for us to listen.

5 This construction allows the student to also reverse the order if they so please, beginning with new and exiting ideas about madness and working backwards into critiques of the normal conceptions in the light of the new experiences and ideas.
UNIT 1.
QUESTIONING OUR ASSUMPTIONS

SUMMARY

Before we even get to stories and theories of madness, of psychiatry, or of “chemical imbalances”, we have to address something more fundamental: people feel very strongly about “mental health”, even (or maybe especially) when they do not have a definition for it. Worse still is that the noble language of “abolishing stigma” has by and large been appropriated by the proponents of the medical model, creating a situation in which all mental health activism is assumed to be part of a movement to make diagnoses and their treatments more acceptable, which is patently not the case. The question we must confront in this section is: why does the average person feel so confident using psychiatric vocabulary when professionals in psychiatry and psychology (not to mention the many other professionals in sociology and anthropology) can’t seem to agree on what mental disorders are, or at least have expressed serious doubts as to their ability to identify them? In order to even begin to have a conversation about madness/mental illness, we need to see that we feel that we know more than we actually can know about madness, and begin from that careful skepticism and admission of that impossibility. In order to plant the seeds of doubt, I thought it would be useful to begin with two discourses that challenge our beliefs: one, the discourse of psychologists and psychiatrists who doubt the validity or foundation of psychiatric labels or practice; and two, some discourses of cultural/historical beliefs that explain so-called “symptoms” in entirely different ways from ours. I want to be careful here to say that I am not suggesting people adopt any cultural practices or beliefs, but more so to show that there are a variety of ways to approach similar looking problems with different outcomes. Cultural beliefs and practices are embedded in a social world and belief system to which outsiders seldom have access, and can, for that reason, be difficult to understand in their total complexity. Making matters even more complicated, much of our information about shamans and spirit healers who hear voices has been written by scholars from the Global North who do not belong to said community, oftentimes working in the context of post-colonialism. At the same time, it can reduce stress when one sees that there are people around the world who see wild visions and hear voices, and do not end up as lifelong mental patients, but as vital members of a community. I suggest you see such beliefs/practices more as inspiration than as something to imitate. I tried to find pieces for this unit and the bibliography that were either written by someone who has a personal connection or history in said community or who worked with a member of that social group.

---

6 I want to be careful here to say that I am not suggesting people adopt any cultural practices or beliefs, but more so to show that there are a variety of ways to approach similar looking problems with different outcomes. Cultural beliefs and practices are embedded in a social world and belief system to which outsiders seldom have access, and can, for that reason, be difficult to understand in their total complexity. Making matters even more complicated, much of our information about shamans and spirit healers who hear voices has been written by scholars from the Global North who do not belong to said community, oftentimes working in the context of post-colonialism. At the same time, it can reduce stress when one sees that there are people around the world who see wild visions and hear voices, and do not end up as lifelong mental patients, but as vital members of a community. I suggest you see such beliefs/practices more as inspiration than as something to imitate. I tried to find pieces for this unit and the bibliography that were either written by someone who has a personal connection or history in said community or who worked with a member of that social group.
voice-hearing experience, as you will see, is the corner-stone and pillar of the classic schizophrenia diagnosis, but yet also the muse of famous writers, the call of the dead whispering to psychics and shamans, and the casual discussions with the imaginary friend of children and adults alike.

The main text by T.M. Luhrmann is a survey of some non-pathologized forms of voice-hearing and of seeing visions, and also of critiques of psychiatry’s reach and influence. Luhrmann herself is certainly neither pro- or anti-psychiatry, but is open to different interpretations of the experiences. The first optional text in this section is a classic: psychologist D.L. Rosenhan’s “On Being Sane in Insane Places.” The text was originally published in Science magazine in 1973, and it summarizes and draws conclusions from two experiments performed by Rosenhan and his associates testing the ability of psychiatrists to successfully diagnose mental illnesses. The “Statement by David Kupfer” was put out following the release of the DSM-5, the most influential American text for making a diagnosis of a mental illness, and warns users that psychiatrists still do not have reliable means to measure mental disorders.

Many people assume that psychiatry and psychology are basically on the same page in terms of their beliefs about brain abnormality and mental disorders. The article by psychologist Mary Boyle demonstrates that this is far from true. And the rebellion against psychiatric concepts is far from a fringe position. This is clear from the statement and table put out by the British Psychological Society, an organization of around 50,000 psychologists, which places nearly all of the largest psychiatric diagnoses in question, particularly in the ways in which they allow one to evade thinking about social factors to distress. In fact, psychiatry is unique among all medical thought in having its concepts and theories come into question so consistently. I can think of no group of respected thinkers in the world who deny the existence of diabetes or cancer, for example, so why do so many medical professionals question or even deny psychiatric labels? I’ve never heard of a group protesting the mere existence of general practitioners, surgeons, or dentists, so how did psychiatry come to face a body of thought called “antipsychiatry”?

The article by Emma Green is largely about the work of Andrew Scull, a historian and cultural theorist of madness and psychiatry. Her article mainly touches on religious and spiritual questions of madness like “are prophets similar to the crazy people of today?” or “what is the difference between a homeless man talking to god and a prophet?”

We’ve also included some images of brain scans or “neuroimaging” as these are such a powerful part of the public faith in ideas and concepts of mental health and illness. This is another case where the experts continually express doubt and argue over the significance of organic/biological “proof”, while the public feels much more secure about its truth value. I’m no neurologist, but just scanning even the positive and hopeful surveys on neuroimaging prevents one from feeling secure in the advances made by present-day technology. The most obvious of the problems with neuroimaging research is that people with the same diagnosis show variant brain activity, and that people without the diagnosis can show similar brain activity to those with them. More fundamental than that is the challenge placed on neuropsychiatry by the theory of brain plasticity, which holds that our brains adapt and change in response to our environment and experiences. In this light, even if there was similar brain activity in two people labeled “schizophrenic”, for instance, it is not at all clear that an abnormal brain “caused” a set of symptoms. Instead, it could be the case that adverse and extreme traumatic experiences caused, over time, a change in brain activity. This is more hopeful, in my view, as it means that experience and circumstance has the capacity to change our supposedly objective biological being.

**READ**

**Main text:**

UNIT 1. Questioning our assumptions

Optional texts:


SEE

1. We have collected images of “disordered brains” from throughout history on our Flikr at www.flickr.com/belliresearch, and also posted them at www.belliresearchinstitute.com. For some criticism and discussion of neuroimaging, you can start with these articles: https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/think-act-be/201605/using-brain-scans-diagnose-mental-disorders or http://blogs.discovermagazine.com/neuroskeptic/2017/01/14/fmri-mental-illness/ and here is a more detailed study https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0896627311010956.

WATCH

1. Crazywise film, by Phil Borges, available to rent on Vimeo here: www.vimeo.com/ondemand/crazywise


LISTEN


3. The “Hearing the Voice” project has a number of podcasts about voice-hearing in different eras, artistic registers, and cultures on their website here: www.hearingthevoice.org/podcasts/hearing-the-voice-lecture-series/ If non-medicalized/non-stigmatized forms of voice-hearing/”hallucinations”interestyou(orsimply
UNIT 1. Questioning our assumptions

hearing different theories on the experience) I recommend listening to some of these.

QUESTIONS

1. How do psychiatrists measure mental disorders? How do we know someone is “disordered”? Rosenhan’s article was published in 1973, but Kupfer’s was published just a few years ago in 2013, and was written to accompany the DSM-V, arguably the most influential book for diagnosing mental illnesses. The first questions psychiatrists’ ability to identify mental illness based off behavior, and the latter based off biological markers. If psychiatrists can reliably use neither of these as a basis for diagnosis, is there another basis? Is it more reliable than these two? Do you believe you would know if you saw a certain kind of person that they had a mental illness?

2. Have you ever called someone “crazy”, and said or thought that they ought to be on medication or in the hospital? Have you or someone else in your life ever acted on these beliefs? This can be a very painful topic for some, so write to the extent you feel comfortable.

3. Luhrmann’s and Green’s articles summarize the history of some non-medicalized forms of voice-hearing and vision-seeing through literary, religious, artistic and other figures. A recent study concluded that continuum beliefs about “psychosis” or “hallucinations” reduce stigma. Previous studies have found that biological explanations of mental illness actually increase stigma, despite the claims of institutional psychiatry and the pharmaceutical industry. What are your thoughts on this? Ignoring whether or not one or the other is “true” for a moment, which one would make you feel more comfortable around someone hearing a voice telling them to die or seeing a vision of God: the idea that they have a brain disease, or believing that you and that person exist on a spectrum at different intensities? Related to this: Consider the variety of ways that the voice hearing experience is talked about in the various articles. Does calling the person hearing voices a “voice-hearer” versus a “schizophrenic” change the way you consider the experience? What connections come to mind?

4. Many people have seen a picture of a “normal” brain with a “disordered” (the “schizophrenic” or “depressed” brain) one next to it. We have found a couple older and more recent ones and put them on our website (www.belliresearchinstitute.com). These often have flashing lights, or different colors in different regions. These representations are not “pictures of the brain”. When you look at images of the brain produced through MRI or MMRI studies, you are looking at syntheses of data across multiple individuals in which the researchers actually choose the colors that represent different regions or activities. How does it make you feel looking at these? Do such images make you feel more confident about the difference between “normal” and “abnormal” neurobiology? Do you personally actually know what these lights and colors represent?

7 This was a small study, but its conclusions are worth pondering. Take a look yourself: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0005791617300782

8 Read more here: http://www.dbdouble.freeuk.com/actastigma.pdf
UNIT 2. 
Diagnosis, Definition, and Basic Problems with “Abnormality”

SUMMARY

Experiences, Ideas and concepts of madness predate psychiatry by hundreds, if not thousands, of years. People throughout history have talked about, theorized about, respected, feared, and treated madness, but, sometime after the French Revolution, around 200 years ago, there came into being a group of doctors (iatros) who began to exclusively study and treat the mind (psyche). Madness and psychiatry as we know it are not essentially related to one another; the latter represents one possible response to what is called “madness.” One of the central powers of psychiatry is the ability to define what madness is, or, in contemporary language, what a “mental illness” is, and also to classify—and thus simplify—their manifestations into a classificatory system (a “nosology”). At this point, you are hopefully feeling a little less certain about the categories around mental health/illness, and perhaps also around normality/abnormality. In this section, I selected articles to deepen that uneasiness, first by looking more closely at the central tool of diagnosis in America, the DSM and its background/historical precedents, as well as documents that question the difference between “normal” and “abnormal” in general. And because the topic is so huge (arguably the crux of psychiatric power lies in its ability to make a reliable diagnosis), we will, in the following unit, look at the relationships between diagnosis/diagnostic systems and racism, sexism, and historical prejudice/beliefs. This is admittedly an unnatural separation, and was done mainly to make this all easier to take in, not to imply that the production of a diagnostic (or “nosological”) classificatory system is at all independent from the structures that define and regulate race, gender, sexuality, or civility.

The main text is an interview with Gary Greenberg, author of The Book of Woe: The Making of the DSM-5 and the Unmaking of Psychiatry, on the history of the DSM, some of the reasons why it is so important, and the many problems with it. It was published right before the DSM-5 came out three weeks later on May 22, 2013. The Madness Radio podcast episode with 9 There are debates as to whether Johann Christian Reil (1759-1813), Philippe Pinel (1745-1826), Emil Kraepelin (1856-1926), or another ought to be considered the first psychiatrist.
Greenberg goes into more detail. If you are solely interested in present-day conceptions of psychiatry and madness, you can simply move on from here into the next unit. Christopher Lane’s interview discusses in a more general way how problems become “mental illnesses” in the DSM. If you enjoyed that, read his article on “Passive Aggression Personality Disorder” for more detail into a specific example of how behaviors can become medicalized through inclusion in the DSM. If you want to reflect on how problems go from being personal, social, or political problems into medical ones, then read Peter Conrad and Deborah Potter’s “From Hyperactive Children to ADHD Adults: Observations on the Expansion of Medical Categories.” His interview on the podcast Office Hours is more consumable, but less nuanced.

And then for something completely different, read Artaud’s “The Man Suicided by Society”. Psychiatric theory proposes a circular logic to explain suicide: one commits suicide because they are mentally ill; one is mentally ill because they committed (or tried to commit) suicide. Artaud escapes the circle with the explanation that Van Gogh did not “commit suicide because he was ill,” but was “suicided” by the world the psychiatrists help make. There is an unfortunate thread throughout Western literature of the romanticization or idealization of “madness”. It’s unfortunate not because it romanticizes what is actually horrific suffering as most people believe, but because it is really just a negative reflection of the “normal world”: the unreason to society’s reason, and thus held frozen by it, akin to how de Sade’s depravities can only be transgressively liberatory for those who buy into the laws of society in the first place. It lacks creativity, and, more importantly, sensitivity to the novel exploration of visions, of revelations, of language, and of suffering that gets contained under this umbrella called “madness.” Artaud, having been the object of many interventions and repressions, was especially sensitive to both the power of madness and the absurdity of forced “treatment” regimes. Emily Dickinson’s poem succinctly illuminates the obscure, shifting lines between sanity and reason, making the difference more so a matter of social acquiescence than bodily health. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.’s speech at Western Michigan University picks up this idea and questions in a general way whether it truly is a virtue to be “adjusted” to a world full of injustice. It’s worth nothing that Malcolm X was labeled as “pre-psychotic paranoid schizophrenic” by the FBI in their private files.

**READ**

**Main text:**


**Optional texts:**


SEE

1. Find some paintings of Van Gogh and Artaud as they relate to an exhibition in France about Artaud’s “The Man Suicided by Society” here: https://hyperallergic.com/117673/artaud-and-van-gogh-against-society/

WATCH

1. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., “Proud to be Maladjusted” Dr. Martin Luther King’s speech at Western Michigan University, Dec 18th, 1963, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZxElYpnixbw

LISTEN


QUESTIONS

1. Why do people get diagnoses? What are some circumstances that might lead one to get a diagnosis, both voluntary and involuntary? What services can one receive only after getting a diagnosis? Why?

2. Through Lane’s and Greenberg’s articles and interviews, you gained some insight into the background workings of the DSM. What do you think about the process through which something gets included into the DSM?

3. Consider Peter Conrad’s term “medicalization” (the transformation of non-medical issues into medical ones). What are the implications of “medicalization?” Does it mean that the issue in question is not essentially medical? Or does it mean that it is medical, but simply hasn’t been discovered yet? Is it a matter of perspective? Power? Money? What is the difference between “medicalization” and “pathologization?” (If there is one)

4. A diagnosis is about placing someone on one side of a normality-abnormality binary, whether that be established via scientific or another discourse. How do you see the binary of normal and abnormal being played out in your own life? Are there ways in which you feel as though you are “abnormal”? If so, how does this affect your life?
SUMMARY

Here, we will think about the various ways in which diagnosis and the creation of a patient interacts with other forms of power. Again, we aren’t implying that there is some abstract thing called Race and then some abstract thing called Psychiatric Power and they meet in some empty field where we can observe them as separate entities. Rather, we are looking at activities—diagnosing and treating as a patient—that are enacted by people with internalized attitudes, assumptions, and prejudices about race and gender, who are situated in systems that operate with racial and gendered categories. This is one of the most contentious themes in the field of psychiatry criticism, so articles abound. Because of the wide range of available routes to use to approach this topic, I have not separated the articles into “main” versus “optional” categories. I’ve also included more materials in this section than in most of the others, so follow your interests and use your judgement.

The Colin King article is a heartbreaking and brutal reflection/memoir (my personal favorite among these articles) about his schizophrenia diagnosis and its relation to blackness. If you read nothing else from his text, read the poem that serves as an introduction to this piece; it is powerful and difficult on its own. The interview with Jonathan Metzl is about his book *The Protest Psychosis: How Schizophrenia Became a Black Disease* on the civil rights era and changes in the diagnostic language of schizophrenia in relation to marriage issues with mostly white women in the 50s and the civil rights movement of the 60s. After reading, listen to the Kendrick Lamar song “the Blacker the Berry”. The Cohen article about the psychiatrization of Māori resistance discusses how psychiatry and diagnosis disproportionately affect indigenous people in New Zealand and lays out some reasons for why this may be that go against typical lines of thought about it. Visit the article in the **SEE** section about the Hiawatha Asylum for Insane Indians for information about the psychiatrization of natives here in the US.

The personal essay by Emily Cutler, the mainstream news editorial by Rachel Rowen Olive and the Mad-
nness Radio episode “Understanding Borderline Trauma” approach the diagnosis of “borderline” and how it—and most other “personality disorders”—disproportionately affects women, and, more specifically, women who have survived trauma. Shannon Sennot’s “Gender Disorder as Gender Oppression” summarizes the opposing viewpoints for including or excluding gender-related disorders from the DSM from a transfeminist approach. Although the article is about whether or not to keep or exclude Gender Identity Disorder (GID) from the DSM-5, which is already published, reading this is still relevant, since it gives one perspective into the historicity of such debates, and conceptual tools with which to analyze the gender and sexuality based diagnoses that are still in the DSM, which I’ve linked to in the SEE section below. The YouTube video by Mic on being transgender and the APA summarizes some of these issues very quickly. The first YouTube video, the special report from 1973, aired right before homosexuality was ousted from the DSM, and interviews several psychiatrists and activists on whether or not homosexuality is a mental disorder. Listening to how professionals and activists discussed it may provide some context and guidance for how “Gender Dysphoria” is discussed today.

**READ**

1. King, Colin. “They diagnosed me a schizophrenic when I was just a Gemini. ‘The other side of madness’”. Published in Man Cheung Chung, K. W. M. (Bill) Fulford, and George Graham, *Reconceiving Schizophrenia*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, Pg 11-27, [https://books.google.com/books?id=53nerzJ1_SLC&pg=PA11&dq=colin%20king%20they%20diagnosed%20me%20as%20schizophrenic&source=bl&ots=392qw1m_QS&sig=y-QiglOOnPRSSwv5yde9jcwRFeY&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwifqc6S75LcAhXp6IMKHbJLAVo6A-EIPzAE#v=onepage&q=colin%20king%20they%20diagnosed%20me%20as%20schizophrenic&f=false](https://books.google.com/books?id=53nerzJ1_SLC&pg=PA11&dq=colin%20king%20they%20diagnosed%20me%20as%20schizophrenic&source=bl&ots=392qw1m_QS&sig=y-QiglOOnPRSSwv5yde9jcwRFeY&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwifqc6S75LcAhXp6IMKHbJLAVo6A-EIPzAE#v=onepage&q=colin%20king%20they%20diagnosed%20me%20as%20schizophrenic&f=false)


**SEE**

1. The International Foundation for Gender Education has collected all the gender and sexuality specific diagnoses in the DSM-V here: [http://www.ifge.org/?q=DSM-5/Sexual_and_Gender_Identity_Disorders](http://www.ifge.org/?q=DSM-5/Sexual_and_Gender_Identity_Disorders)

UNIT 3. You can’t diagnose in a vacuum: how diagnostic systems relate to categories of power

WATCH

1. Hezakya Newz & Music [YouTube username], “1973 SPECIAL REPORT: ‘GAY IS GOOD... OR IS IT’?”, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2QxCxDxO0CE

2. Mic [YouTube username], “Being transgender is not a mental disorder, so why is it still classified as one? | Mic Check,” May 17, 2016, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CogwQjF4ftI

LISTEN


4. Prince Buster’s song “Madness”, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EZC6Ot1MLP0

QUESTIONS

1. After reading Colin King’s story and listening to Kendrick Lamar’s “The Blacker the Berry”, reflect on what the anxieties and fears around blackness they speak of have to do with the diagnosis of mental illness. What are they saying that the diagnosis does in their life? Does it bring them needed services or cause them more pain?

2. Rosenhan talked about “dehumanization” in his conclusions to his experiments. Do any of the authors here describe a process that could be described as “dehumanizing”?

3. It has been pointed out that personality disorders are disproportionately given to women. Why do you think this is?

4. After watching the videos on “Homosexuality”, “Gender Identity Disorder”, and “Gender Dysphoria” in the DSM (and perhaps reading the article on it), what were/are the arguments for keeping or removing them from the DSM?
SUMMARY

This unit will be look at some of the treatments people labeled as mad have had to endure, but it won’t be a simple review of the various tools and spaces associated with psychiatric treatment. There are plenty of books on such treatments. I tried to choose texts here that allow us to reflect on what specific treatments say about those doing the treating and their perception of their patients. It is in the light of such questions that I want you to consider the asylum, the hospital, the shock treatments, the water therapy, the pills and restraints in the history of psychiatry. The questions is: why put thought, research, and money behind these tools and not others? What do these reflect about the power relations between patient and practitioner? What do they say about how the psychiatrist or the public views madness or mental illness? Note that I have separated treatment and another unit specifically on the pharmaceutical industry and how it influences self-perception, since that topic is different.

UNIT 4.
CAPTURED, TREATED, OR CURED

Terry Messman’s interview with Robert Whitaker is an overview of Whitaker’s research for his book Mad in America: Bad Science, Bad Medicine, and the Enduring Mistreatment of the Mentally from 2002, essential reading for those interested in the history of psychiatric treatments in the United States. Pay close attention to both the treatments, and also what they were intended to do, or how they were perceived to work. This will give you insight into how the psychiatrists have seen their patients throughout history. Titicut Follies and Hurry Tomorrow are brutal, and, at times truly horrendous documentaries exposing a state asylum for the criminally insane in the in Massachusetts (right before the “deinstitutionalization” period), and a locked psychiatric ward at Metropolitan State Hospital in Los Angeles, which show quite well the depths of depravity people can fall into when they’ve deprived the other of their humanity. The film depicts quite well how the hospital —through its spatial arrangements— and the staff —through dehumanizing actions and words— are largely responsible for many behaviors deemed “insane”, and especially how circular the logic of the psychiatrist who makes the diagnoses is. I note also that the state (for Titicut)
and the hospital in *Hurry* tried to ban the movies, arguing that the patients were unable to give consent (which they all did), because of their mental defectiveness, thus repeating the dehumanization depicted in the films. I don’t recommend viewing either if you are faint of heart or have experienced violence in an institution yourself.

It doesn’t seem possible to make a madness study guide without including at least one text by Foucault, for one because of how seminal his work on power was and remains, and also because his work *History of Madness* continues to be one of the most discussed books on the topic. This presents, however, a number of difficulties, the main one of which is that *History of Madness* is a dense and complicated tome, with entire books dedicated to discussing its finer points and historical merits. Because of this, including just one chapter out the 800 page book felt inadequate and confusing, so I’ve chosen instead to include an excerpt from his lecture series called “Psychiatric Power” published earlier in *Ethics: Subjectivity and Power*. True to Foucault’s style and interests, the text is more so about the power/knowledge arrangements behind psychiatric treatment than on the treatments themselves. Despite the short length of the excerpt, it is difficult, because many of the terms and concepts go undefined, and it’s really a summary of a larger book.

I’ve included excerpts from Hussein Abdilahi Bulhan’s book on Frantz Fanon (the radical decolonization theory and psychiatrist), *Frantz Fanon and the Psychology of Oppression*. The excerpts are about a sadly understudied phenomenon: how psychiatry operated in the colonies of Africa. This article will also serve as a useful transition into the next unit on pharmaceutical companies and the exportation of Western disease models of distress around the world. “In Our Own Voice” documents the history of psychiatric mistreatment that black Americans have faced through diagnoses and treatments as well as stories of survival and resilience. “Wild Indians” explores the legacy of colonialism by chronicling psychiatric practice at the Hiawatha Asylum for Insane Indians in Canton, South Dakota.

The separation of this section from the one on questions of power and diagnosis was somewhat arbitrary. As I noted there, the power to diagnose is perhaps psychiatry’s original and essential power. While a diagnosis can bring with it a specific range of possible interventions, often the diagnosis itself (and getting the patient to accept it) is a part of the treatment program. The difficulty of distinguishing the power of diagnosis from the treatments which follow becomes obvious when looking at psychiatry’s influence in the colonies, and when thinking about the history of hysteria in Elaine Showalter’s text and in Vanessa Jackson’s. In “Hysteria, Feminism, and Gender,” Showalter demonstrates the effect that concepts of gender and sexuality can have on which treatments will be seen as “natural” or “necessary”. Watch Bielawa’s online opera “Vireo” linked to below for a poetic exploration of the history of treatments for “hysteria” and its connections to witchcraft and femininity.

**READ**

**Main Text:**


**Optional Texts:**


SEE

1. The galleries of psychiatric advertisements and psychiatric history on our Flikr page https://www.flickr.com/photos/belliresearch/

2. The online disability museum’s “Psychiatric Disability” gallery contains materials pertaining to basically all unit of this reader, but perhaps the most for this unit. It’s worth referring back to this resource often: http://www.disabilitymuseum.org/dhm/lib/results.html?browse=1&q=psychiatric+disability&view=gallery

WATCH


4. Cohen, Richard (Director). (1975) Hurry Tomorrow. United States: Halfway House Partnership. (A number of clips from the movie are available for free on YouTube here: https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLABC483D53DC8FED4, most notable is one man’s song about life on the ward: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ytiegty3Ras&index=2&list=PLABC483D53DC8FED4)

LISTEN


QUESTIONS

1. Think about all the different treatments Robert Whitaker talks about in his interview (electroschock, lobotomy, medication, water therapy, etc). What do these various treatments have in common? What is the goal of each? What do they tell us about how psychiatry has thought of the mind and/or the brain?

2. After reading the shorter Foucault, what would you say is the purpose of the asylum? Was it a medical space of healing? A political space for clearing non-criminal abnormal behaviors? Why, in his words, does the psychiatrist subject the patient to his treatments?
3. After reading one of the texts on hysteria or the psychiatric illnesses diagnosed for black Americans, in what way are the treatments described informed by a systemic or societal understanding of the people being diagnosed/treated?
UNIT 5.
REPRESENTING MADNESS, IDENTIFICATION, AND THE ROLE OF PHARMACEUTICALS

SUMMARY

Without implying a sense of finality to our skeptical journey, there is one major hurdle we have yet to encounter before we can honestly and humbly approach the question of madness: the question of pharmaceuticals and the way they affect our self-representation. The labels associated with “depression” and “anxiety” have become immensely popular in the social media landscape and in pop culture, aided in no small part by pharmaceutical companies, and by “anti-stigma” mental health organizations, like NAMI, almost entirely funded by pharmaceutical companies. This is not as controversial or polemical as it may at first appear. The pharmaceutical industry is a massive multi-billion dollar industry that grows ever larger each year. It invests billions into advertisements. We feel no obligation to provide any positive articles or documents attesting to the benefits of medication or self-diagnosis. The market is overflowing with such documents. It can’t be said to be a matter of “being fair to both perspectives” when one side spends billions of dollars on advertising each year. If you want positive information on psychiatric medications, simply turn on your television, your radio, or log into your social media accounts and scroll for a while.

We’ll look at pharmaceuticals and subjectivity mostly through an international lens for a very specific reason: pharmaceutical companies have been attempting to expand their markets into the Global South for the last two decades. This has required a process of creating a consumer market. Normally this involves convincing a group that they need, desire, or would find fulfillment in a consumer product. This becomes more complicated with pharmaceuticals, which require that the person see their affliction and distress as being caused by an internal biological disease or imbalance, a belief not widely shared throughout the world. Thus, we are not only seeing the exportation of drugs around the world, we are also seeing the production of new kinds of people and the loss of old ones mediated through drugs and the explanations behind them (see Ethan Watters’ “The Americanization of Mental Illness”). This is what is meant when
UNIT 5. Representing madness, identification, and the role of pharmaceuticals

China Mills talks of the production of new kinds of “subjectivity” or personhood.

All the while, we ought to be thinking about how we too participate in the self-identification offered by psychiatric/pharmaceutical explanations of ourselves. The spread of depression and anxiety as pop diagnoses indicates not only the success of the pharmaceutical companies endless barrage of advertisements and massive influence, but also that these labels fulfill a kind of need. What need is being fulfilled by psychiatric labels and medication (not the actual psychotropic effects, but the personhood offered by it)? What does it mean that the “anti-stigma” campaigns of NAMI or the NIMH (National Institute for Mental Health) which encourage people to accept that their ailments are caused by imbalances and diseases are being funded by the companies that offer chemical solutions to these issues?

Another question that arises out of this is whether this constitutes a new form of “neo-colonialism”, of “imperialism”, or of “westernization”, in short, of an imposition of the rich countries of the North’s way of thinking about distress on the poorer majority world in the South. This is a difficult question to think in tandem with the self-identification offered by the chemical imbalance theories. If the chemical imbalance theory of distress is universalizing, as it requires that one believes certain symptoms are tied to brain chemistry (otherwise it would be absurd), that means that, implicitly, anyone who thinks otherwise is simply incorrect and in need of education. Most people would not think to push it that far (at least not intentionally), but we need to ask ourselves such questions in a time when millions of children are being put on pharmaceuticals for exactly that reason worldwide (see China Mills’ article on pharmaceutical children).

The New York Times Magazine article by Ethan Watters neatly summarizes nearly all of these issues in a shortened version of his book Crazy Like Us: The Globalization of the American Psyche. The Madness Radio interview with him goes into more detail as well. For a more singular and deep look into how the exportation of Western psychiatry is functioning, read Biehl’s “Life of the Mind”, which focusses on one woman’s experience with psychiatric labels and drugs in Brazil. In addition, Wong Chun’s film Mad World is a sad, sensitive portrayal of how a bipolar diagnosis and the expectations people place in medication affects a man and his family in Hong Kong.

Mills’ “Psychotropic Childhoods” highlights the kinds of identity, or “ways of being a person”, made possible by pharmaceuticals. What does she mean? Putting aside the question of the truth or falsity of the brain disease or chemical imbalance theories, when one takes psychotropic drugs, this changes the way we think about and interact with our bodies. I believe this is where the Laura Delano text and podcast interview can be helpful. There, she describes how, after she accepted that she was diseased, bipolar, and defective, taking the medications given to her was seen as a necessity. The drugs in this sense facilitated and made possible this way of seeing herself. They made physical and made real the belief that her chemistry and biology were defective, reducing the complexity of experience into a pill that says “you are broken (and this will fix it).” Delano’s story is particularly exemplary in that it shows the types of self-identification and self-understanding made possible by medication, and also those made possible by the reactions against them.11 Of course, we are not implying that all usage of drugs is bad, nor would we ever say that no-one should ever take drugs. We are saying, however, that drugs facilitate particular kinds of self-understanding that otherwise would not be possible, and we question whether these identities are empowering or defeating.

READ

Main:


11 We should note that the text “Is It Me or My Meds?” is a chapter of Delano’s story, but it is the one that relates most to this theme.
Optional texts:


SEE

1. I’ve collected pharmaceutical ads spanning over a century on a Flikr page, which you can view here. Some of them have a short interpretive paragraph. https://www.flickr.com/photos/belliresearch/albums

2. Check out this excellent syllabus made for the Anthropology department at the University of Chicago’s class “Illness and Subjectivity”: https://humdev.uchicago.edu/sites/humdev.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/Raikhel/Illness%20and%20subjectivity%20syllabus%20winter%202013.pdf

LISTEN


QUESTIONS

1. Looking at the psychiatric advertisements of the past, what can be gleaned about what they say about the people who are taking the medications?

2. What sorts of “ways of being a human” does psychotropic medication allow? In other words, what are the new ways we can think of ourselves and bodies when we take pharmaceuticals?

WATCH

SUMMARY

This unit will deal primarily with the new approaches and alternatives developed mostly by treatment providers (whether psychiatrists, psychologists, psychotherapists, or something else). The reader will be presented with new models, new theories, and new perspectives for dealing with emotional or mental crises or socially abnormal behavior as well as a broad range of critiques aimed at institutional psychiatry and its biological models. We will begin by looking at the “antipsychiatry” movement, the foundation of the other trends and lines of critique we will look at. While some of the clinics and professionals of the past made decisions with the patients who they worked with (R.D. Laing at Kingsley Hall, Felix Guatarri and others at La Borde, Franco Basaglia in Italy), others took a more theoretical role, either critiquing psychiatry or proposing new alternatives from the outside.

Michel Foucault is sometimes listed as an “antipsychiatrist”, but I don’t think the label applies to him. Antipsychiatry as a label, for me, is reserved specifically for those theorists who mostly, but not always, have worked in a profession aligned with or parallel to psychiatry but came to oppose its treatments, diagnostic system, or normative presuppositions, and do not believe that these elements can be reformed out of psychiatry, and thus present some kind of therapeutic alternative.

The antipsychiatry movement of the 60s was marked by a definite predisposition to psychoanalysis, something which later critical trends do not necessarily share, and an emphasis on family dynamics (sometimes considered intimately and personally, other times seen as a miniature “society”). There are still many authors who identify as “antipsychiatry”, but they differ in many cases from the movements of the 60s: many ex-patients lead these initiatives, there is less emphasis on psychoanalytic alternatives, less analysis of isolated family dynamics, and often no background in psychiatry. There are, in addition, “critical psychiatrists” who are critical of the aforementioned elements of psychiatry, but still practice and want to reform or transform their profession. There
are also the “post-psychiatrists”, who are the most difficult to define, but often describe themselves as having a disposition towards openness and diversity of frameworks, while still operating within the professional framework of psychiatry. According to Phillip Thomas, they also have a proclivity to existential and post-modern philosophy.

For the main text, I have chosen a chapter from a book on radical psychotherapist and philosopher Felix Guattari and his friendship with the philosopher Gilles Deleuze. It may seem like a strange choice, since it’s really a chapter about Guattari’s background, but it introduces most of the characters and places important to the antipsychiatry movement of the 60s, which is the basis of this unit. Guattari worked for a time at La Borde, which, like R.D. Laing’s Kingsley Hall and the hospitals of Franco Basaglia (there was more than one), held democratic meetings with the patients to make decisions, and fostered a non-coercive environment. Unlike Kingsley Hall, there was less emphasis on psychoanalysis and the familialism Guattari is famous for critiquing, and, unlike Basaglia, they offered medication to those who requested it.

In the Americas, one of the most influential and controversial texts to come out of the critical psychiatry circles was Thomas Szasz’ “The Myth of Mental Illness”, which was first published as an essay and then expanded into a book. Szasz is not properly “antipsychiatry” although he is often called that; he maintained rather that he was against the coercive elements of psychiatry as well as its claims of objectivity where he saw none. One of his more insightful statements is that psychiatry is trapped in a paradox: if psychiatric disorders truly had a biological origin in the brain, they would be visible and testable in the same way that neurological disorders are, and would thus become neurological diseases and exit the realm of psychiatry. His later coalitions with scientology and his highly conservative libertarianism made him a right-wing outlier in the antipsychiatry movement. Laing’s piece summarizes some of the rationale behind Kingsley Hall and tells a few stories about happenings there, and the Madness Radio interview with Michael Guy Thompson gives some more insight into the space and some anecdotes. The YouTube video shows Loren Mosher (the first Chief of the Center for Studies of Schizophrenia at the National Institute of Mental Health, 1969-1980; founder of the Schizophrenia Bulletin/Editor-in-Chief) explaining his “Soteria Project”, which is a name for treatment centers that highlight the importance of the patient’s life history, focus on therapeutic solutions and social supports, and hesitate to use pharmaceuticals in the treatment of schizophrenia.

Burstow’s article both introduces and critiques some elements of the trauma-centered approach popular among both reformists and abolitionists of psychiatry. You can get an overview of the trauma-centered research by watching the YouTube video of John Read’s speech on childhood adversity and psychosis. It is a somewhat brief (50 min) review of the scientific literature on the relation between childhood trauma and altered states/“psychosis” and other mental health problems. I’ve included Judi Chamberlin’s interview as the last text here, because it serves as a critique of a lot of the antipsychiatry movement in her adamant insistence that any efforts which do not center the mad/survivors/users/ex-users is still implicitly communicating that the mad cannot speak for themselves or make choices on their own. It also serves as a nice transition into the next unit, where we’ll look at survivor-led movements for transformation. I Never Promised You a Rose Garden is not about “antipsychiatry” per se, but is a semi-fictionalized story about a real psychiatrist, Frieda Fromm-Reichmann who used psychotherapy to work with a woman based off the writer through her “psychosis”.

READ

Main Text:

Optional Texts:


4. Burstow, Bonnie. “Toward a Radical Understanding of Trauma and Trauma Work”, https://www.academia.edu/9756947/toward_a_radical_understanding_of_trauma_and_trauma_work


SEE

1. The website of the Critical Psychiatry Network: http://www.criticalpsychiatry.co.uk/. There are links to articles, persons, and news related to the network.

WATCH


3. Asylum feature film. If you can find it, this is an interesting documentary on one of the alternative houses opened by R.D Laing. Here’s a clip of R.D. Laing talking about Kingsley Hall: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nTEZ_eumRKI


LISTEN


QUESTIONS

1. What, if any, beliefs lie at the core of the trend called “antipsychiatry”? Why did it gain traction in the 1960s?

2. What are the strengths and limitations of the antipsychiatry movement?
SUMMARY

What distinguishes this unit from the one before it is that this unit features texts and documents from present and former patients of psychiatric treatment, who usually identify as either “users,” “ex-users,” “survivors,” or “consumers.” Something else that distinguishes these writers from those in the last section is that they ground their arguments in their own concrete experiences as receivers of “treatment,” and therefore require less background or technical knowledge. The focus will still mostly be on changing the way we approach care and/or treatment, and thus still focuses on the medical, or semi-medical, aspects of mental/emotional difference and/or distress. By this I also include critiques of the medical model that push for a more social, spiritual, or political framework, since they begin by situating themselves against the medical model, or as offering an alternative to it.

One of the dangerous misconceptions of critical mental health is that many automatically assume that this means “reducing stigma” about what is essentially a medical diagnosis. This is not true for everyone. Some of those in this movement call for more attention to trauma-centered care; some desire the abolition of certain psychiatric labels (like the “Campaign for the Abolition of Schizophrenia Label”); some call for a model of care not reliant on the DSM or medical professionals at all; some offer alternatives outside of psychiatric institutions like crisis houses, or peer respite (watch the YouTube video on Afiya in Mass.); while others propose to include newer diagnoses formed in collaboration with those with lived experience as a kind of harm-reduction. All are united, despite major differences, under the same banner as the disability movement: “nothing about us without us.” As we will see in the next section, not everyone who has been labelled “mad” (or who sees themselves as such) wants a relationship, positive or negative, to a medical model at all, but see madness as a spiritual process, a muse, or a part of any variety of framework. To tell such people that they need to “talk about their mental disorder” is to deny them their capacity to define their own experience and is a form of reductive violence.
Judi Chamberlin was a major figure and one of the founders of the modern survivor/ex-patient movement. Perhaps you’ve already read the interview with her from the last section. Her article is a review of the patient-centered movement up until the 1990s. The “Campaign for the Abolition of the Schizophrenia Label” no longer exists, as far as I can tell, but was pushing for exactly that. The Icarus Project toolkit is a wonderful resource with options for those experiencing a crisis or witnessing one, and who don’t want to follow the normal route of calling an authority figure to handle it. They also have many other crisis resources listed at that link. The letter by Will Hall is a more personal plea for a new perspective and new treatment directed at an individual, rather than a larger institution or social group.

I’ve also included a number of websites to some of the larger and more well-known psychiatric survivor groups like the World Network of Users and Survivors of Psychiatry (WNUSP), and Mindfreedom International, as well as texts and journals by psychiatric survivor groups in South Africa and India.

**READ**

**Main text:**


**Optional texts:**


**SEE**

1. Browse the website and read the mission statement of the World Network of Users and Survivors of Psychiatry (WNUSP) here: [http://wnusp.rafus.dk/introduction-to-wnusp.html](http://wnusp.rafus.dk/introduction-to-wnusp.html)

2. Go here to see the brochures made by Mindfreedom International, which sum up the positions and activities of this long-running group fairly well. Click the links on the side if you’re still interested in seeing more. [http://www.mindfreedom.org/brochure](http://www.mindfreedom.org/brochure). Also take a look at their international roster/reports here: [http://www.mindfreedom.org/member-folder/as/act-archives/inter](http://www.mindfreedom.org/member-folder/as/act-archives/inter)

3. “First Aid for Mental Health Crises”, [https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1AFWaYiHsl4Fc75tZl_Jvrv014VU5guTei](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1AFWaYiHsl4Fc75tZl_Jvrv014VU5guTei). This is a printable tool for giving to loved ones, friends, or family that allows you to design your own crisis plan, so that people will know how you’d like to be treated in difficult moments.

4. Look at the “Resources” and “Articles & Info” tabs on the National Empowerment Center website: [https://power2u.org/#](https://power2u.org/#)
5. “Aaina was the only national newsletter in India, speaking the voice of users and survivors from 2001-2007.” Find free PDFs of past issues here: [http://www.baputrusted.com/aaina.html](http://www.baputrusted.com/aaina.html)

6. Here is the website for The Psychiatric Survivor Archives of Toronto, featuring many ex-user accounts from Canada and abroad: [http://www.psychiatricsurvivorarchives.com/](http://www.psychiatricsurvivorarchives.com/)

**WATCH**


**LISTEN**


**QUESTIONS**

1. Why is it important for survivors of trauma and psychiatric treatment to tell their own stories? In what way is memory and history a political issue in medicine?

2. What are the implications of calling oneself a “survivor” versus a “consumer” or a “user”?

3. Why is it important to include survivors in conversations about mental health? What sorts of strategies or ideas stood out to you in the texts?
UNIT 8.
LISTENING TO THE MAD:
INSIGHT OR ANOSOGNOSIA?

SUMMARY

This unit could have just as easily been the first one after the “questioning our assumptions” unit, but, as I stated in the introduction, I decided to begin by thoroughly challenging in depth our presumptions about what it means to be mad before presenting peoples’ own interpretation of what it meant for them to “go mad” or to “be mad.” The title of the unit refers to a psychiatric “symptom,” anosognosia, which indicates that the patient has a “lack of insight into their condition.” I won’t mince words or take a generally challenging position in relation to this so-called symptom. It’s a monstrosity, and a concept only possible after a process of dehumanization and infantilization, which says much more about the people who apply it and their dogged refusal to listen to people they see as different, weak, weird, or incomprehensible. The inclusion of this section already betrays my feelings on the matter. I think the so-called mad are worth listening to. More than that, I believe, with Colin King and many others, that they have more insight into what madness means than anyone who would say they “lack insight.”

In former sections, you’ve read accounts of people labelled mad as they discussed treatments they’ve received, how to organize, and principles around which they gather. Here, the authors will tell their own stories within the narrative structure and framework they’ve chosen to make sense of their lives. In all cases, these narratives differ from the “case study” in which practitioners generally create identical arcs for their patients that looks something like: pre-history to disease expression, crisis, entrance into a medical care paradigm (hospital, clinic, psychoanalyst’s office), description of treatment, and then the prognosis or outcome of treatment. Mad people’s personal histories take on a wide variety of forms, and usually do not revolve around or have as a climax their entrance into psychiatric or therapeutic care. Sometimes, there is no direct interface at all with psychiatry.

While there is some usefulness in looking at statistics, we often place too much emphasis on their importance. While statistics may tell us of the effectiveness...
of a certain treatment, or of negative side-effects of a drug over time, they cannot tell us what these interventions mean to a person with a past, a present, and a future; they cannot tell us anything about what madness means to those experiencing it; and they cannot tell us about why people believe they have the experiences that they have. Listening to people tell their own stories in their own ways gives us access to information that can never be seen through the limits set by scientific research. This unit is thus meant to challenge the idea that the most important insights about madness are to be extracted from scientific research. Understanding the science behind madness does not mean that you understand madness, just as understanding how the brain processes and synthesizes the scenes of a film does not grant one access into the meaning of film.

There is no separation between the survey, general main text, and the optional texts here, because this unit is composed only of personal narratives of struggle, difference, becoming, coping, and healing. I chose the texts included here based on three criteria: that they be representative of a range of styles and stories, I could find them online, and then simply personal taste. This was a necessity given that there are so many narratives available telling so many stories, but it made choosing narratives extremely difficult, since most madness memoirs and stories are very long, and difficult to find online. I recommend looking at the free bibliography made by Gail Hornstein of first person accounts of madness, and choosing ones based off of titles you are interested in and then working out from there. Some of my favorites I couldn’t find include: Bessie Head’s *A Question of Power*; Gerard de Nerval’s *Aurelia*; Sylvia Plath’s *The Bell Jar*; The Diary of Vaslov Nijinsky; Daniel Paul Schreber’s *Memoirs of my Nervous Illness*; Renée’s *An Autobiography of a Schizophrenic Girl*; the novels of Marguerite Duras; the novels and short prose of Robert Walser; and the poetry of Antonin Artaud, Rainer Maria Rilke, and Friedrich Hölderlin. This list includes some works others may hesitate to include on a list of madness memoirs, for instance Rilke and Walser, but if we are using madness as an umbrella term to represent a wide range of unusual experiences, then they certainly fit. Rilke heard voices, and Walser spent nearly 30 years in a psychiatric institution. I’ve also included some artistic works, which I feel tell the story of the artists madness and their perspective on it in the see section.

I should note that I feel more comfortable as a white person identifying which documents in the Western canon fit under the umbrella of “madness”, since, as I’ve emphasized many times throughout this study guide, madness is both a revelatory/liberatory experimentation and a symbol and operative concept of power, which allows one to exclude the other on the grounds that they are too emotional/unreasonable (psychotic). This problem deepens when it is a white curator deciding which works of black Americans, natives, or Africans are “mad” works, since these groups have all in the past and present been excluded for being “unreasonable” or “uncivilized”, unless they explicitly say that their work is within the tradition. Bessie Head is one such exception since she quite readily identifies with madness, and thus I feel it is unproblematic to include her here.

**Read**


**See**


2. "Agnes Richter’s embroidered straitjacket”, *The Museum of Ridiculously Interesting Things*,"
UNIT 8. Listening to the mad: insight or anosognosia?


SUMMARY

Once again, we’ll listen to the voices of the mad, but now with our eyes looking outwards. What could madness mean going forward, distinct from psychiatry? How do we mad people find each other? What do we share in common besides shared trauma or suffering? What do we have to offer each other beyond mutual support? These are some of the questions the authors struggle with and attempt to answer here. If it’s true that, in psychiatry, the “great mystery” schizophrenia is on its way out, and that we are entering an age of highly medicated affective and personality disorders, then the policing regime that purports to locate and handle the mad is undergoing some major changes, especially globally. Such a transitional period is precisely the point at which any group needs to ask what makes it a group, what ties it together and separates it out from other political or social groups. We’ll mostly look at texts from those trying to gather or organize mad people together and reflect on what it is that brings such people together. I’ve chosen pieces from all over to try to represent a spectrum of approaches and interests. With the exception of Mills’, most of these are quick reads, and most of them were written by groups rather than individuals.

For me, some of the biggest questions we face as mad people are: how can we listen to and respect distress without assuming it is a medical issue? How can we truly listen and believe people without relying on medical categories? Guatarri once criticized Franco Basaglia for “not allowing people the right to be crazy” and I think there’s something to that (despite whether or not Basaglia did that). What does it mean to “go crazy” without pathologizing and fixing that state? For me, the answer lies in thinking about madness not in terms of identities, categories, or types but as situated experiences. I too do not want to deny the reality of nor be prevented from “going mad”, but I want that to be understood as a passage through which one can travel in and out of so to facilitate discovery and growth. The mad pride movement is always in the process of creating new conceptions of self, new ways of experiencing and responding to distress, new ways of conceiving of our emotions and thoughts. The
psychiatric survivor activists are often doing the important work of ending coercive practice in psychiatry and assisting those in need in moments of distress. The mad pride movement is sometimes, in addition to that, exploring how the experiences called “mad” both inside and outside its relationship with psychiatry. This is surely an overly simplified and frankly incorrect binary, as the intersections are so deep that it is truly impossible to make any lines between these two tendencies, but I offer this merely as a way to explore new ideas.

Many of the texts still circle around psychiatry and its effects, but each one also shows the beginnings of developments away from it, and attempts to find values and principles that don’t relate directly to it. China Mills’ essay discusses the resistance of mad people and relates it and compares it to colonial resistance, and thinks about when they may be one and the same. The Intervoice values are one of a handful of documents collecting the values and principles of the Hearing Voices Movement. The Icarus Project’s page presents a similar list of values that they organize around. Lucy Costa’s blog post introduces the field of “Mad Studies” and explains its importance. I wanted to include a value statement by a locally based group, represented here by Western Mass Recovery Learning Center. Toronto Mad Pride just released their first issue of “Mad Times”, where they explore why people identify as “mad” from various angles, and some of the limitations.

**READ**

1. Mills, China. “Symptom, seduction, subversion: Reading resistance to psychiatry through a Post-Colonial Lens” [https://www.academia.edu/12350408/Symptom_seduction_subversion_Reading_resistance_to_psychiatry_through_a_post-colonial_lens](https://www.academia.edu/12350408/Symptom_seduction_subversion_Reading_resistance_to_psychiatry_through_a_post-colonial_lens)

2. Intervoice Values, Intervoice, [http://www.intervoiceonline.org/about-intervoice/values-vision](http://www.intervoiceonline.org/about-intervoice/values-vision)


**SEE**


2. In considering how the “mad” think of themselves and tell their own stories, I want to include some links to Outsider Art (or “Art Brut”). Outsider Art is an odd amalgam of artists and works bound together by the fact that the artists are somehow “outside” of the artistic establishment. Importantly though, the first collection of Outsider Art was arguably Hanz Prinzhorn’s collection of art by psychiatric patients. Outsider Art still makes space for and highlights the work of ex-patients, but does not have separate art by non-patients and “psychiatric outsider artists.” Thus, “outsider”, at least in this artistic movement, potentially demonstrates another way to be mad. Images here: [http://museumofthemind.org.uk/gallery/artists](http://museumofthemind.org.uk/gallery/artists) and here: [http://www.spiegel.de/international/zeitgeist/masterpieces-from-the-prinzhorn-collection-by-psychiatric-patients-a-936148.html](http://www.spiegel.de/international/zeitgeist/masterpieces-from-the-prinzhorn-collection-by-psychiatric-patients-a-936148.html)

3. A map of Intervoice and Hearing Voices groups globally: [https://www.google.com/maps/d/u/0/viewer?mid=1ADB_BK8VOAmTQ2AKKkm00NVLgL&ll=9.888182395229562%2C8.789060999999947&z=1](https://www.google.com/maps/d/u/0/viewer?mid=1ADB_BK8VOAmTQ2AKKkm00NVLgL&ll=9.888182395229562%2C8.789060999999947&z=1)

---

12 Here is an archive of web resources on “Outsider Art”: [https://www.interestingideas.com/ouf/outlinks.htm](https://www.interestingideas.com/ouf/outlinks.htm)
4. Here is the website for the local, Twin Cities based Hearing Voices group: http://hearingvoicestwincities.org/

**WATCH**


**LISTEN**

1. The exhibit *Hearing Voices: suffering, inspiration and the everyday* has a number of articles with audio components on their website here, which are a great introduction to the Hearing Voices Network: http://hearingvoicesdu.org/. You can also listen to these if you subscribe to the “Hearing the Voice” podcast.

**QUESTIONS**

1. What are some values and principles shared by the different “mad” approaches?

2. According to these articles, what binds the “mad” together besides a history with or a relationship to psychiatry?

3. How can we validate someone’s emotions or thoughts without pathologizing them? What could it mean to be mad without reference to medicine at all?\(^\text{13}\)

---

\(^\text{13}\) I’m not implying you are wrong if you use medical categories to explain personal experiences, but asking you to participate in this thought experiment, since we are so accustomed to using them.
SUMMARY

Now I want to invite you to let your thoughts flow outwards and start to think about some of those lessons and how you could incorporate them into your life. I decided not to ask any specific questions, but encourage you to write down quotes or reactions to these texts, or any of the previous ones. Personally, I believe that by reading the texts of “mad” people and reflecting on madness we 1) deepen our understanding of emotion and thought, their possibilities and limits; 2) acquire a nuance and sensitivity to difference (different forms of expression, of conception, of living, and of expressing); 3) learn the role that violence and trauma can play in our lives, even long after they occurred; 4) learn from the decisions and mistakes of others who are suffering so that we may suffer gracefully and well; 5) learn how our language about “reason” and “madness” can alter or affect the structure of political belonging. Surely, there are many more, but these stand out to me.

I’ve chosen texts that deeply challenge notions of madness and reason and see it as grounds for insight, growth, and reflection on the world and our political or collective practices. These texts all in some way depart from thinking only with or about “the mad” and export madness to think about the world at large. In other words, these texts all turn around, stop asking “what can science and social theory teach us about the mad?” and start asking “what can the mad teach us about science, society, politics, etc”? Bulhan’s text “Psychology of Liberation”, a chapter from his Frantz Fanon and the Psychology of Oppression, reflects on the importance of considering psychology in relation to the struggle against racism and (neo)colonialism. The entire book is well worth a read, as are the psychiatric works of Fanon it is based on, for an understanding of how psychiatry and psychology relate to the history of colonialism. The Icarus Project’s “Madness and Oppression” booklet is a workbook for tracing a “mad map” as they call it, allowing the user to reflect and trace how their madness is situated in systemic and historical processes far beyond psychiatric reduc-

14 Many of which are being released in English for the first time in 2018!
tionism. Jurelle’s “Mad is a Place” makes a link between black diasporic thinking and art and madness, and poses difficult questions for how to conceive of “mad studies” in this light. Majaca’s “Little Daniel” is a difficult, but instructive example of someone thinking with madness rather than about it to find insights into politics, psychiatry, humanism, and cybernetics. The readers (#5) were made by the Spanish artist and activist Dora García who also helps run a Hearing Voices Cafe in Hamburg, Germany (http://thehearingvoicescafe.doragarcia.org/) and has created a number of works on madness, psychiatry, and voice hearing. I haven’t read every article in the readers, but they feature writers, artists, mad people, and even mental health professionals reflecting on madness, the legacy of antipsychiatry, politics, and outsider art.

**READ**


3. La Marr Jurelle, Bruce, “Mad is a Place; or, the Slave Ship Tows the Ship of Fools” *American Quarterly*, Volume 69, Number 2, June 2017, pp. 303-308, https://www.academia.edu/34168904/Mad_Is_a_Place_or_the_Slave_Ship_Tows_the_Ship_of_Fools


---

15 Some of whom apparently met Basaglia in Italy in the 70s.

16 I’m not sure why some names are blacked out in this text, but the references in the Dora Garcia text in the beginning are to the SPK (Socialist Patients Collective), whom we’ve encountered in the antipsychiatry unit.