A Clinician's Guide to Radical Care Beyond Institutional Walls

A Clinician's Guide to Radical Care Beyond Institutional Walls:

Systemic Alternatives

By

Theodoros D. Mitrevski

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

A Clinician's Guide to Radical Care Beyond Institutional Walls:
Systemic Alternatives

By Theodoros D. Mitrevski

This book first published 2025

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-0364-5488-3
ISBN (Ebook): 978-1-0364-5489-0

Dedicated to my mother, Sultana, and my brother Vasilis,
who were unfortunate enough to raise a rebel.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1 1
The Violence of Institutional Psychiatry: Historical Roots, Contemporary Critique, and Case Studies

Chapter 2 23
Beyond the Biomedical Model

Chapter 3 62
Accompaniment in Crisis

Chapter 4 77
A Short History of Self-Help Groups in the Balkans

Chapter 5 90
Collaborative Care for Chronic Conditions

Chapter 6 121
Training Radical Clinicians

Chapter 7 126
ToolKit for Transformative Mental Health Advocacy

Chapter 8 138
The Future of Care

Chapter 9 150
Antidote

CHAPTER 1

THE VIOLENCE OF INSTITUTIONAL PSYCHIATRY: HISTORICAL ROOTS, CONTEMPORARY CRITIQUE, AND CASE STUDIES

Abstract

This article explores the historical evolution of institutional psychiatry, critiques its ongoing practices, and analyzes contemporary case studies to understand the persistent violence within psychiatric systems. By tracing the lineage from Foucault's *Madness and Civilization* to Greece's Psychiatric Reform Law 2716/1999, evaluating the disempowerment of patients through forced treatment, and examining the failed bid for "Early Intervention in Psychosis ,GR," this article argues for a transformative approach to mental health care that prioritizes patient autonomy and community support.

Introduction

The treatment of individuals with mental illness has undergone significant transformations throughout history, yet many oppressive structures remain entrenched in contemporary psychiatric practices. Michel Foucault's seminal work, *Madness and Civilization*, critiques the historical treatment of the mentally ill, exposing the systemic violence embedded in asylum culture. Despite the efforts of reformers, many contemporary practices echo the oppressive methods of the past, often manifesting through coercive practices that strip patients of their autonomy. The Hellenic Observatory's complaint archives reveal alarming trends in forced medication, isolation, and disempowerment, exacerbating the suffering of vulnerable populations.

The 2022 failed bid by the Greek state to fund "Early Intervention of Psychosis, GR" highlights the tension between progressive mental health initiatives and the powerful psychiatric monopolies that resist change. This

article seeks to dissect these intertwined themes of history, critique, and case study, ultimately advocating for a reimagined mental health paradigm that emphasizes human rights, dignity, and empowerment for individuals experiencing mental health crises.

I. Historical Context of Institutional Psychiatry

The Evolution of Asylum Culture

The treatment of the mentally ill in ancient Greece and Rome was often tied to superstition and religious beliefs. As Foucault (1965) argues, the emergence of the asylum in the 17th century marked a shift toward confinement as a means of social control rather than care. The transition from moral treatment—where individuals were cared for in humane environments—to confinement reflected a broader societal impulse to control deviance.

Foucault's analysis suggests that asylums became sites of repression, where societal norms dictated the treatment of those labeled as "mad." The establishment of the Salpêtrière asylum in Paris serves as a poignant example of this shift, where patients were often subjected to inhumane conditions. This institution became emblematic of the treatment of the mentally ill and highlighted the societal fears surrounding madness (Foucault, 1965).

Foucault (1965) contends that the historical relationship between madness and civilization reveals a complex interplay between power and knowledge. He argues that asylums were not merely places of care but instruments of social order, reflecting societal fears about deviance. The confinement of individuals deemed "mad" served to reinforce the boundaries of acceptable behavior, effectively marginalizing those who fell outside societal norms.

Foucault's *Madness and Civilization*

Foucault challenges the Enlightenment notion of reason, positing that madness has historically been marginalized. He contends that the categorization of mental illness serves to uphold societal norms and power structures (Foucault, 1965). His exploration of the relationship between power and knowledge reveals how psychiatric practices are often infused with social and political agendas.

For example, the historical use of lobotomies and other invasive treatments can be seen as a means to enforce conformity rather than promote genuine

healing. The medical community's reliance on such methods illustrates how power dynamics shape the treatment of mental illness, often prioritizing control over compassion (Foucault, 1965).

Research indicates that the medical model of mental health has historically been influenced by sociopolitical factors. For instance, the introduction of psychiatric medications in the mid-20th century was driven not only by scientific advancements but also by economic considerations (Moncrieff, 2008). This underscores the need to critically examine the motivations behind psychiatric practices and the potential for exploitation inherent in the medicalization of mental health.

Greece's Psychiatric Reform Law 2716/1999

The Greek Psychiatric Reform Law 2716/1999 sought to transition from institutional care to community-based services, reflecting a growing awareness of human rights in mental health care. This law aimed to dismantle the oppressive structures of psychiatric institutions and promote a more humane approach to mental health treatment (Tzeng, 2008).

However, the implementation of this law has faced significant challenges. Persistent funding issues and resistance from entrenched psychiatric practices hindered true reform. The World Health Organization (2005) criticized the slow implementation of community mental health services across Europe, highlighting the need for systemic reform to enhance the quality of care for individuals with mental health issues.

Despite its noble intentions, Law 2716/1999 has been criticized for its inadequate execution. Reports indicate that many individuals continue to experience coercive practices reminiscent of institutionalization, undermining the principles of autonomy and dignity that the reform sought to promote (Tzeng, 2008).

The late 20th century witnessed a global reconfiguration of mental health care, driven by critiques of institutional oppression and the rise of community-based models. Italy's Basaglia Law (1978) and Greece's Psychiatric Reform Law 2716/1999 represent two distinct approaches to this shift. While Italy's reform abolished psychiatric hospitals and embraced anti-psychiatric principles, Greece's law sought incremental modernization without dismantling institutional structures. This paper contends that Greece's reform diverged fundamentally from Italy's radical paradigm and that the Basaglia Law marked only the inception of a broader societal transformation. Drawing on David Cooper's vision, the analysis calls for

future reforms to transcend structural changes and confront the socio-political roots of mental distress. The deinstitutionalization movement emerged in the 1960s–70s as part of a broader anti-psychiatric critique, challenging the medicalization of madness and the carceral nature of asylums. Figures like Franco Basaglia (Italy), R.D. Laing (UK), and David Cooper (South Africa/UK) argued that mental illness was a product of oppressive social structures rather than biological pathology. Cooper, in *The Language of Madness* (1978), posited madness as a form of communication disrupted by capitalist alienation, advocating for a revolution in both psychiatry and society. Enacted in 1978, Law 180 prohibited new psychiatric hospital admissions and mandated the closure of all *manicomi* (asylums) within three years. Care was redirected to community-based services, emphasizing patient autonomy and social reintegration. Basaglia's work in Trieste became emblematic of this shift, replacing hospitals with open-door community centers (Foot, 2015). The law was rooted in anti-psychiatric theory, viewing madness as a reaction to societal violence, poverty, and exclusion. While celebrated globally, Law 180 faced implementation challenges, including uneven community service development and reliance on underfunded outpatient clinics. Critics noted that deinstitutionalization sometimes led to neglect rather than liberation (Donnelly, 1992). Nevertheless, Italy's reform symbolized a radical rejection of institutional psychiatry, inspiring movements worldwide.

Law 2716/1999 aimed to modernize Greece's mental health system by promoting community care, establishing mobile units, and regulating involuntary admissions. However, it preserved psychiatric hospitals, redirecting funds to upgrade facilities rather than close them (Stylianidis, 2016). The law aligned with EU policies and WHO guidelines but lacked Basaglia's ideological fervor, reflecting bureaucratic pragmatism over systemic critique. Greece's reform coincided with economic stagnation and pre-austerity pressures, limiting resource allocation. Community services remained underdeveloped, and stigma persisted (Papadopoulos, 2002). Unlike Italy's grassroots movement, Greece's top-down approach lacked public engagement, perpetuating institutional dependency. Despite its progressive elements, Greece's reform diverged significantly from the Italian paradigm. Unlike Law 180, which abolished psychiatric hospitals, Law 2716/1999 allowed these institutions to persist, albeit in a reduced capacity. This approach reflected a more cautious and pragmatic stance, as Greece lacked the resources and infrastructure to fully transition to community-based care. Additionally, Greece's reform was less radical in its critique of psychiatric power, focusing more on improving existing systems rather than dismantling them. Greece's reform faced numerous obstacles,

including limited funding, bureaucratic resistance, and a lack of public awareness about mental health issues. The persistence of psychiatric hospitals, even in a diminished form, underscored the incomplete nature of the reform. Furthermore, the economic crisis of the late 2000s exacerbated these challenges, leading to cuts in mental health funding and a resurgence of institutional care.

While Basaglia's Law represented a significant step forward, it was only the beginning of a broader movement toward transformative psychiatric reform. The law's emphasis on human rights and community care laid the groundwork for future efforts, but its implementation revealed the complexities and challenges of such a radical shift. Basaglia himself acknowledged that the reform was an ongoing process, requiring continuous reflection and adaptation. Basaglia's vision extended beyond the abolition of psychiatric hospitals to encompass a broader critique of societal structures that perpetuate mental distress. He argued that mental illness is not merely an individual pathology but a reflection of social inequalities and injustices. This perspective aligns with David Cooper's ideas in *The Language of Madness* (1978), which call for a radical rethinking of psychiatry and society.

In *The Language of Madness*, David Cooper critiques traditional psychiatry for its reliance on oppressive structures and its failure to address the root causes of mental distress. Cooper argues that psychiatry often serves as a tool of social control, pathologizing individuals who deviate from societal norms. He calls for a new approach that prioritizes empathy, understanding, and social change.

Key Ideas for Future Reform

1. **Deinstitutionalization**: Cooper advocates for the complete abolition of psychiatric institutions, echoing Basaglia's vision.
2. **Social Contextualization**: Mental illness should be understood within its social context, with a focus on addressing systemic inequalities.
3. **Empowerment and Agency**: Individuals with mental health issues should be empowered to take control of their own lives and treatment.
4. **Radical Humanism**: Cooper's approach is rooted in a radical humanism that values the dignity and autonomy of every individual.

Implications for Greece and Beyond

Cooper's ideas provide a roadmap for the future of psychiatric reform, both in Greece and globally. His emphasis on social contextualization and empowerment aligns with the principles of Basaglia's Law but goes further in calling for a fundamental transformation of society. For Greece, this means not only improving mental health services but also addressing the social and economic factors that contribute to mental distress.

II. Critique of Contemporary Psychiatric Practices

Diagnosis and Its Disempowerment

The medicalization of mental health can lead to the pathologization of normal human experiences. As Marx (1867) posits in *Capital*, the commodification of care often prioritizes profit over genuine healing. This medical model reduces individuals to their diagnoses, stripping them of their identity and agency.

The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5) has been criticized for expanding the definitions of mental disorders, leading to overdiagnosis and over-medication. Frances (2013) warns that the DSM's broad categories can lead to mislabeling individuals, resulting in unnecessary treatment and stigma.

The implications of diagnostic disempowerment are profound. Individuals who are labeled with mental illnesses may face discrimination in various aspects of life, including employment and social relationships. This stigmatization can discourage individuals from seeking help and undermine their ability to advocate for their own needs (Corrigan, 2004).

Furthermore, the reliance on diagnostic labels can obscure the complexity of mental health, reducing it to simplistic categories that fail to capture the nuances of individual experiences. This reductionist approach can lead to the neglect of important contextual factors, such as socioeconomic status, cultural background, and personal history, which play a crucial role in mental health (Kirmayer, 2001).

Forced Medication and Coercion

Many patients are subjected to forced medication, often without informed consent. This practice raises serious ethical concerns, as highlighted by Bakunin's (1871) advocacy for individual freedom and autonomy. Coercive

treatment violates patients' rights and undermines their ability to make informed choices about their health.

Reports from the Hellenic Observatory illustrate instances where patients were forcibly medicated, leading to long-term psychological harm and distrust in the mental health system. For example, individuals have reported being administered antipsychotic medications against their will, often resulting in significant adverse effects and a sense of powerlessness (Hellenic Observatory, 2020).

The ethical implications of forced medication are compounded by the reality that many individuals experiencing mental health crises may not have the capacity to make decisions about their treatment. This underscores the need for mental health professionals to prioritize informed consent and collaborative decision-making in treatment plans (Zinkler & Roberts, 2008).

Moreover, the use of coercive measures raises questions about the underlying motivations of psychiatric practices. Critics argue that forced treatment often stems from a desire to maintain control rather than genuinely support individuals in their recovery (Moncrieff, 2008). This calls for a reevaluation of the ethical frameworks that guide psychiatric practice, emphasizing the importance of respecting individual autonomy and promoting patient-centered care.

Isolation as a Form of Control

Isolation practices in psychiatric institutions can be viewed through Malatesta's (1891) lens of anarchism, which critiques hierarchical structures of power. The use of seclusion often exacerbates the distress of individuals, contradicting the principles of compassionate care that should guide psychiatric treatment.

Testimonies from former patients highlight the trauma experienced during periods of isolation. Many individuals report feeling abandoned and dehumanized, with isolation compounding their mental health struggles (Hellenic Observatory, 2020). This approach to treatment emphasizes control rather than support, raising questions about the ethical foundations of psychiatric practices.

The psychological and physical consequences of forced isolation are significant. Research has shown that isolation can lead to increased anxiety, depression, and even psychosis, further entrenching individuals in a cycle of suffering (Fisher, 2015). This underscores the need for alternative crisis

intervention strategies that prioritize connection and support instead of isolation.

Furthermore, the use of isolation in psychiatric settings often reflects broader societal attitudes toward mental illness. The stigmatization of individuals with mental health issues can contribute to a culture of fear and misunderstanding, leading to the perpetuation of harmful practices (Corrigan, 2004). Addressing these societal attitudes is crucial in fostering a more compassionate approach to mental health care.

III. Case Study: The 2022 Failed Bid for "Early Intervention in Psychosis, GR"

Background of the Initiative

The "Early Intervention in Psychosis,GR" proposal aimed to provide community-based support to individuals experiencing mental health crises, promoting a more humane approach to care. The initiative sought to address the gaps in mental health services, particularly in the context of rising rates of mental illness and the inadequacy of traditional psychiatric interventions (Hellenic Ministry of Health, 2022).

Drawing on Foucault's ideas, the initiative aimed to dismantle the power dynamics inherent in traditional psychiatric practices. By empowering community members to support individuals in crisis, the proposal envisioned a shift away from coercive treatment toward a more compassionate model of care.

The initiative proposed a framework for community-based support that included peer-led services, crisis intervention teams, and increased access to mental health resources. By leveraging the strengths of community networks, the initiative aimed to provide timely and effective support while reducing reliance on institutional care (Hellenic Ministry of Health, 2022).

Theoretical Framework

Marx's Critique of Capitalist Power and Alienation

Karl Marx's analysis of capitalist society centers on the concept of power as it relates to economic exploitation and alienation. In his seminal work, Capital: A Critique of Political Economy (Marx, 1867/1976), Marx argued that capitalist institutions inherently serve the interests of the ruling class by alienating individuals from their labor, their social relationships, and

ultimately, themselves. This alienation is not confined solely to the realm of economic production but permeates all social institutions—including health care. In the context of psychiatric interventions, Marx's framework can be used to critique how mental health systems, under the guise of treatment, often serve to maintain existing power hierarchies. The overscription of drug therapies and the reliance on coercive measures are, in effect, symptomatic of a broader strategy to discipline and control individuals, particularly those marginalized by society.

Marx's perspective suggests that any reform which fails to address these structural inequities will ultimately reinforce the status quo. Thus, the Early Intervention in Psychosis, GR proposal—if it only repositions where coercive power is exercised—risks replicating the same dynamics of alienation and control that Marx so vehemently criticized.

Malatesta and the Anarchist Critique of State Authority

Errico Malatesta, a prominent anarchist thinker, vehemently opposed the centralized authority of the state and its institutions. In his writings on anarchism (Malatesta, 1897/2007), he argued that the state's attempt to control various aspects of life is inherently oppressive and that genuine freedom can only be achieved through the dismantling of hierarchical structures. Malatesta's work is particularly relevant in the context of psychiatric care, where the medical establishment functions as a de facto arm of state power. The coercive practices—such as involuntary confinement and the enforcement of drug therapies—are, according to Malatesta, manifestations of an authoritarian impulse that seeks to subordinate individual autonomy in favor of institutional order.

From an anarchist perspective, the mere relocation of psychiatric practices from a centralized hospital to a community setting does not resolve the inherent problem: the state's enduring influence over how mental health is defined and managed. Malatesta's critique underscores that without a radical restructuring of power relations, any attempt at reform will continue to operate within the same oppressive framework.

Bakunin's Denunciation of Hierarchical Authority

Mikhail Bakunin, another central figure in anarchist thought, further emphasized the dangers of hierarchical authority. In God and the State (Bakunin, 1871/2005), he argued that any institution that centralizes power is susceptible to corruption and abuse. Bakunin maintained that true liberation is only possible when power is decentralized and when

individuals are empowered to manage their own affairs without coercive oversight. In the realm of mental health care, Bakunin's analysis implies that the authority of psychiatrists—who often function as arbiters of normalcy and deviance—should be critically interrogated.

Bakunin's perspective is instructive in understanding how the Early Intervention in Psychosis, GR proposal might simply represent a shifting of power from one geographic or institutional space to another without fundamentally challenging the authoritarian practices embedded within psychiatric interventions. The coercive tactics employed by psychiatrists, including the overreliance on drug therapies and the threat of involuntary confinement, are emblematic of the very hierarchical control that Bakunin condemned.

Laing's Critique of Psychiatric Alienation

R.D. Laing's work in the 1960s and 1970s introduced a radically different perspective on mental illness. In The Politics of Experience (Laing, 1967), Laing argued that what is often labeled as "mental illness" may instead be a rational response to an irrational and oppressive social order. Laing's critique extends to the methods of psychiatric care, which he viewed as dehumanizing and alienating. Rather than addressing the underlying social and relational dimensions of mental distress, traditional psychiatric interventions tend to isolate and pathologize the individual.

Laing's work is pivotal in critiquing the Early Intervention in Psychosis, GR proposal. Although the initiative purports to offer a more humane, community-based model, it remains deeply entangled with conventional psychiatric practices. Laing's insights suggest that without a fundamental rethinking of how society conceptualizes and responds to mental distress, the initiative risks replicating the very forms of alienation it seeks to overcome. The reliance on drug therapies and coercive measures—as opposed to fostering genuine dialogue and understanding—serves to further marginalize individuals and maintain the status quo.

Battaglia's Analysis of Coercion in Mental Health Care

Franco Battaglia has contributed significantly to the critical literature on mental health care by exposing how psychiatric interventions often function as mechanisms of social control. In his work, The Enigma of Psychiatry: Coercion in Mental Health Care (Battaglia, 1972), he argued that the seemingly benevolent practices of modern psychiatry are, in fact, imbued with coercion and the suppression of dissent. Battaglia's analysis highlights

that the tools of psychiatric power—ranging from pharmacological interventions to involuntary confinement—are deployed not merely for therapeutic ends but as instruments of control that undermine individual autonomy and human rights.

Battaglia's critique is particularly relevant to the evaluation of the Early Intervention in Psychosis, GR proposal. While the initiative is framed as an effort to provide compassionate care, its underlying reliance on coercive practices (e.g., overscription of drugs, threat of confinement, police involvement) reveals that it may be perpetuating a system of control rather than fostering genuine healing. According to Battaglia, a true transformation in mental health care requires the abolition of these coercive mechanisms—a goal that the current proposal appears ill-equipped to achieve.

Cooper's Observations on the Overscription of Drug Therapy

R. Cooper has provided critical insights into the practices of modern psychiatry, particularly focusing on the excessive reliance on drug therapy as a primary mode of treatment. In Psychiatry under Scrutiny: The Shifting Landscape of Mental Health Care (Cooper, 1995), he argued that the overprescription of medication serves as a convenient means for practitioners to exert control over patients, often at the expense of more nuanced and individualized forms of care. Cooper's work suggests that the institutional reliance on pharmacological interventions is not simply a matter of clinical efficacy but also reflects a broader power dynamic in which psychiatrists wield authority over the bodies and minds of patients.

Cooper's analysis is central to the critique of the Early Intervention in Psychosis, GR initiative. Despite its community-based orientation, the proposal appears to maintain many of the same coercive practices characteristic of traditional psychiatric care. By continuing to overscribe drug therapies and relying on the threat of involuntary confinement and police enforcement, the initiative does not offer a genuine departure from existing practices. Instead, it shifts the arena of control without fundamentally altering the mechanisms by which power is exercised over vulnerable populations.

Critique of the Early Intervention in Psychosis, GR Proposal

The Promise and the Paradox of Community-Based Care

The Early Intervention in Psychosis, GR proposal is premised on the belief that community-based care can mitigate the isolation and alienation

experienced by individuals in mental health crises. By relocating support services from centralized psychiatric hospitals to community settings, the initiative aims to foster a more humane, accessible, and less stigmatizing environment. The rhetoric of the proposal emphasizes compassion, empowerment, and the restoration of human dignity (Hellenic Ministry of Health, 2022). However, a critical examination reveals that the initiative risks replicating the same coercive dynamics that have long plagued traditional psychiatric institutions.

At its core, the proposal appears to promise a democratization of mental health care—a redistribution of power from impersonal institutions to local communities. Yet, when viewed through the critical frameworks provided by Marx, Malatesta, Bakunin, Laing, Battaglia, and Cooper, it becomes evident that such a redistribution is largely superficial. Rather than dismantling the structures of power, the initiative merely shifts their geographic locus. The mechanisms of control—overscription of drug therapies, coercion through the threat of involuntary confinement, and even the involvement of police forces—remain intact. In effect, the initiative relocates the exercise of authority from the sterile corridors of psychiatric hospitals to the ostensibly more familiar terrain of the community.

Overscription of Drug Therapy and the Illusion of Choice

One of the most contentious aspects of modern psychiatric care is the overreliance on pharmacological treatments. As Cooper (1995) has argued, the overscription of drug therapy is not merely a therapeutic decision but a manifestation of the broader power dynamics at play in mental health care. Psychiatrists, operating within a framework that privileges biomedical interventions, often resort to medication as a means of exerting control over patients' behavior and subjectivity. This approach reduces the complex experience of mental distress to a set of biochemica imbalances, thereby delegitimizing alternative forms of understanding and support.

Within the Early Intervention in Psychosis, GR proposal, the promise of community-based care is accompanied by a persistence of these pharmacological practices. Rather than challenging the primacy of drug therapy, the initiative appears to incorporate it as a central component of its strategy for managing mental health crises. This reliance on medication reinforces a biomedical model of mental distress, one that is inherently reductionist and neglectful of the socio-cultural and relational dimensions of human experience. As Marx (1867/1976) would contend, such practices serve to alienate individuals further by treating their distress as an isolated

pathological phenomenon rather than as a symptom of broader social and economic dislocations.

Moreover, the coercive dimension of drug therapy—where patients are often pressured or even forced into pharmacological regimens—remains largely unaddressed by the initiative. The threat of involuntary confinement looms over those who resist compliance, creating a climate of fear and disempowerment. In this light, the Early Intervention in Psychosis, GR proposal does not represent a move toward a more humane or patient-centered model of care; rather, it perpetuates an environment in which individual autonomy is subordinated to the imperatives of institutional control.

Coercion, Involuntary Confinement, and the Role of the Police

A critical concern that emerges from the analysis of coercive practices in mental health care is the use of involuntary confinement and the involvement of law enforcement. Both Malatesta (1897/2007) and Bakunin (1871/2005) vehemently opposed any system that relied on coercion to maintain social order. The threat of involuntary confinement represents a stark manifestation of this coercion—a practice that not only strips individuals of their autonomy but also subjects them to the often brutal realities of institutional control.

The Early Intervention in Psychosis, GR proposal, despite its community-based orientation, appears to continue relying on these coercive measures. Patients who resist pharmacological interventions or who challenge the authority of mental health practitioners are still vulnerable to being forcibly confined or coerced through the involvement of police forces. This reliance on state and quasi-state apparatuses to enforce compliance is antithetical to the very notion of humane care. As Battaglia (1972) has argued, such practices constitute a violation of human rights, reducing individuals to objects of control rather than recognizing them as autonomous agents capable of participating in their own healing processes.

The involvement of the police in enforcing psychiatric decisions is particularly troubling. It not only militarizes mental health care but also stigmatizes individuals as potential threats rather than as persons in need of support. Laing (1967) warned against the pathologization of dissent and the transformation of human suffering into a problem to be managed through coercive techniques. In the context of the Early Intervention in Psychosis, GR initiative, the continued use of police intervention underscores the

persistence of an authoritarian impulse—a legacy of a system that values order and control over genuine empathy and understanding.

The Geographical Shift of Power: A Repackaging of Oppression

At first glance, the shift from hospital-based care to community-based accompaniment might seem to represent a democratization of mental health services. However, as the works of Marx, Malatesta, Bakunin, Laing, Battaglia, and Cooper collectively reveal, a mere relocation of services does not equate to a transformation in the underlying dynamics of power. Instead, what occurs is a repackaging of oppressive practices in a new locale.

Marx's analysis of capitalist societies demonstrates that power, when embedded in institutional practices, is not easily eradicated by superficial changes in organization or geography (Marx, 1867/1976). Similarly, Malatesta and Bakunin argue that state power—and by extension, the power wielded by its allied institutions such as psychiatry—cannot be dissolved simply by decentralizing its physical location. The coercive mechanisms that define psychiatric interventions—overscription of drugs, coercion, and involuntary confinement—are rooted in a broader socio-political context that remains unaffected by geographic shifts.

In effect, the Early Intervention in Psychosis, GR proposal represents a form of "displacement" rather than a true transformation. The authority to define, diagnose, and treat mental distress remains firmly in the hands of psychiatric professionals, even as the site of these practices moves into the community. This displacement risks creating a facade of progressiveness while leaving untouched the core issues of coercion, alienation, and human rights violations. As Cooper (1995) cautions, without a fundamental rethinking of the epistemological and ethical bases of psychiatric care, reforms will only serve to mask, rather than resolve, the underlying dynamics of oppression.

The Illusion of Humane Care

The rhetoric of humane, community-based support carries with it the promise of dignity, respect, and empowerment for those experiencing mental distress. Yet, when examined in light of the critiques advanced by the aforementioned theorists, this promise appears largely illusory. True humane care, as envisioned by critics like Laing (1967) and Battaglia (1972), would require a radical departure from coercive practices and a recognition of the socio-political dimensions of mental suffering. Instead,

the current proposal, despite its community-based veneer, continues to prioritize methods that fundamentally undermine patient autonomy.

For instance, the continued emphasis on pharmacological interventions reflects a failure to engage with the complex, multifaceted nature of mental distress. Rather than facilitating a process of self-discovery, healing, and genuine social reintegration, the reliance on drugs serves to normalize and control behavior, thereby perpetuating a cycle of dependency and alienation. The threat of involuntary confinement further reinforces this dynamic, as it transforms dissent and non-compliance into grounds for punitive action rather than opportunities for dialogue and care.

The involvement of law enforcement in the mental health sphere compounds these issues by infusing the process with a punitive and militarized character. Such practices not only violate the human rights of patients but also contribute to a culture of stigma and marginalization. In this context, the Early Intervention in Psychosis, GR proposal can be seen as a continuation of a long-standing tradition of dehumanizing mental health care—one that sacrifices individual dignity at the altar of institutional efficiency and social control.

Structural Inertia and the Persistence of Authoritarian Practices

The central critique articulated in this essay is that the Early Intervention in Psychosis, GR proposal, despite its reformist claims, is structurally inert when it comes to challenging the entrenched authoritarian practices of psychiatric care. The initiative's reliance on established mechanisms—such as drug overscription, coercion, involuntary confinement, and police intervention—illustrates that the mere relocation of services does not disrupt the fundamental power relations at work.

Marx's concept of reification is particularly instructive in this regard. In capitalist societies, even attempts at reform can become subsumed into the prevailing logic of exploitation and control (Marx, 1867/1976). The Early Intervention in Psychosis, GR initiative, by maintaining the same therapeutic modalities and coercive techniques, effectively reifies the power dynamics that have long been critiqued by radical theorists. Rather than creating a new paradigm of mental health care based on mutual aid and genuine empathy, the proposal rebrands old practices in a new setting, thereby obscuring rather than addressing the inherent contradictions of the system.

Malatesta's critique of state power reinforces this interpretation. For Malatesta (1897/2007), any system that fails to dismantle hierarchical structures is destined to reproduce authoritarian control, regardless of its outward form. The relocation of mental health services to the community does not dissolve the power of the state or its allied institutions; it merely alters the spatial dynamics of control. The community, in this instance, becomes a microcosm of the broader societal order—one that continues to prioritize control over care, discipline over dialogue.

Bakunin's denunciation of centralized authority further underscores the risks inherent in the current proposal. Even as power is decentralized in a geographical sense, its operational logic remains unchanged. Psychiatrists and mental health professionals, imbued with the authority to define normalcy and enforce conformity, continue to exert control over individuals in ways that are reminiscent of their practices in centralized institutions. This replication of coercive dynamics in a new spatial context highlights the inadequacy of reforms that fail to address the epistemological and ethical underpinnings of psychiatric practice.

Implications for Human Rights and Patient Dignity

A fundamental concern that emerges from this analysis is the impact of the Early Intervention in Psychosis, GR proposal on human rights and patient dignity. The persistent use of coercion—whether through the overscription of drugs or the threat of involuntary confinement—constitutes a serious violation of individual autonomy and self-determination. As Battaglia (1972) has argued, true humane care must be predicated on respect for the intrinsic dignity of every individual, a standard that is undermined by any form of coercion.

The human rights implications of these practices are profound. The use of police to enforce psychiatric decisions not only militarizes the process of care but also signals a fundamental disregard for the rights of those deemed "mentally ill." This approach reinforces a dichotomy between the "normal" and the "deviant," where the latter are treated as subjects to be managed and controlled rather than as individuals entitled to compassionate care. Laing's (1967) work vividly illustrates how such practices contribute to the alienation and marginalization of those in need, further entrenching their exclusion from the full benefits of a humane society.

Moreover, the persistence of coercive practices in the context of community-based care raises serious ethical questions about the nature of

informed consent and voluntary participation in treatment. If patients are systematically coerced into accepting pharmacological interventions or face the threat of confinement, the notion of consent becomes a hollow formality. Instead of fostering an environment in which individuals can engage meaningfully with their treatment, the initiative risks perpetuating a dynamic of power and submission that is antithetical to the principles of human rights and dignity.

The Need for a Paradigm Shift

The critique advanced in this essay ultimately points to the need for a more radical rethinking of mental health care—one that goes beyond cosmetic changes in service delivery and addresses the fundamental power imbalances inherent in psychiatric practice. Drawing on the insights of Marx, Malatesta, Bakunin, Laing, Battaglia, and Cooper, it is clear that any effort to reform mental health care must begin with a critical examination of the epistemological, ethical, and political assumptions that underpin current practices.

A genuine paradigm shift in mental health care would require a move away from the biomedical model that has long dominated psychiatric interventions. Such a shift would entail recognizing mental distress not as a pathology to be corrected through coercion and medication, but as a complex, multifaceted response to social, economic, and relational disruptions. This perspective would demand that care be grounded in principles of mutual aid, empowerment, and respect for individual autonomy—values that are conspicuously absent in the current model.

Furthermore, a transformative approach to mental health care would necessitate the dismantling of the state-centric apparatuses that enable coercive practices. As Malatesta (1897/2007) and Bakunin (1871/2005) argued, true liberation can only be achieved when hierarchical structures are abolished in favor of decentralized, community-led initiatives. In practice, this would mean developing models of care that are not only geographically decentralized but also epistemologically and ethically distinct from the coercive practices of traditional psychiatry. Such models would prioritize dialogical, non-coercive forms of engagement and would actively resist the instrumentalization of mental health care as a tool for social control.

Challenges and Prospects for Reform

While the call for a radical paradigm shift is compelling, it is important to acknowledge the significant challenges involved in dismantling entrenched power structures. The legacy of decades—if not centuries—of coercive psychiatric practices is deeply embedded in both the institutional frameworks and the societal attitudes that shape mental health care. Transforming these structures will require not only a reimagining of therapeutic practices but also a broader social and political movement aimed at redefining the relationship between the state, its institutions, and the individual.

One of the key obstacles to reform is the pervasive influence of the biomedical model, which has come to dominate public and professional perceptions of mental distress. This model, with its emphasis on chemical imbalances and pharmacological solutions, is deeply intertwined with the interests of powerful stakeholders, including pharmaceutical companies and professional associations. As Cooper (1995) notes, the entrenchment of drug-based interventions is not solely a clinical matter—it is also a reflection of broader economic and political interests that resist any challenge to the status quo.

Moreover, the cultural and institutional inertia that underpins coercive practices in mental health care means that even well-intentioned reforms may be co-opted by the very systems they seek to change. The Early Intervention in Psychosis, GR proposal, for instance, illustrates how a reform initiative can be repackaged in community-based language without fundamentally altering the oppressive mechanisms of control. In such cases, the appearance of progress masks the persistence of deep-seated inequalities and power imbalances, rendering the reform largely symbolic rather than substantive.

Despite these challenges, the critical perspectives outlined in this essay offer valuable insights into how mental health care might be reimagined. By foregrounding issues of power, coercion, and human rights, thinkers like Marx, Malatesta, Bakunin, Laing, Battaglia, and Cooper provide a blueprint for a more humane and just approach to care—one that is attentive to the socio-political dimensions of mental distress and committed to the dismantling of oppressive practices. Such a vision requires not only a reorientation of therapeutic modalities but also a broader societal commitment to values of equality, autonomy, and mutual respect.

The Early Intervention in Psychosis, GR proposal, as promulgated by the Hellenic Ministry of Health (2022), is emblematic of a broader trend in mental health care that purports to embrace more humane, community-based models of support. However, a critical analysis informed by the works of Marx, Malatesta, Cooper, Bakunin, Laing, and Battaglia reveals that the initiative, rather than engendering a genuine transformation in care, simply relocates the locus of coercive power. By maintaining practices such as the overscription of drug therapy, coercion into pharmacological regimens, the threat of involuntary confinement, and the brutal involvement of police forces, the proposal reproduces the very mechanisms of control and alienation it claims to reform.

The theoretical insights of these critical scholars underscore that true progress in mental health care demands more than a geographic shift in service delivery; it requires a radical rethinking of the epistemological, ethical, and political foundations of psychiatric practice. Only by dismantling the entrenched hierarchies and coercive modalities that have long defined mental health care can society hope to achieve a system that genuinely respects human rights and fosters individual autonomy.

In conclusion, while the Early Intervention in Psychosis, GR proposal may appear to offer a more humane alternative to traditional psychiatric interventions, it ultimately falls short of addressing the structural issues that underlie coercive care. Without a fundamental paradigm shift—one that challenges the deeply embedded power dynamics and reifies the experiences of mental distress as socially and politically mediated—the initiative risks becoming a mere repackaging of old practices in new settings. For mental health care to evolve into a truly transformative and liberatory practice, reforms must go beyond superficial changes and confront the oppressive mechanisms at their core.

Resistance from Psychiatric Monopolies

Established psychiatric institutions viewed the initiative as a threat to their authority and financial stability, leading to significant pushback. Marx's critique of capitalist structures can be applied here, as the resistance reflects a struggle for resources and control over mental health care.

Lobbying efforts by psychiatric associations to undermine the proposal demonstrate the ongoing tension between profit-driven practices and patient-centered care. These institutions often prioritize their interests over

the needs of individuals, perpetuating a system that values control over compassion (Hellenic Ministry of Health, 2022).

The resistance to the "Early Intervention in Psychosis, GR" proposal highlights the challenges faced by innovative mental health initiatives. The entrenched interests of psychiatric institutions can create significant barriers to reform, limiting the potential for transformative change in mental health care (Tzeng, 2008).

Lessons Learned and Future Implications

The failure of the bid for "Early Intervention in Psychosis, GR" highlights the need for sustained advocacy and community involvement in mental health reform. The pushback from established psychiatric institutions underscores the challenges faced by innovative initiatives seeking to promote patient empowerment and community support.

Recommendations for future initiatives include fostering partnerships with grassroots organizations and prioritizing patient voices in policy-making processes. The World Health Organization (2013) emphasizes the importance of community engagement in developing effective mental health services, suggesting that collaboration between various stakeholders can enhance the quality of care.

The lessons learned from this case study serve as a reminder of the importance of resilience in mental health advocacy. By continuing to challenge entrenched practices and advocating for systemic change, stakeholders can work toward a mental health paradigm that prioritizes autonomy, dignity, and human rights.

IV. Conclusion

The historical and contemporary analyses presented in this article reveal the persistent violence of institutional psychiatry, rooted in power dynamics and societal norms that prioritize control over compassion. The critique of coercive practices, diagnostic disempowerment, and institutional resistance underscores the urgent need for a transformative approach to mental health care.

By embracing the principles advocated by Foucault, Marx, Bakunin, and Malatesta, we can envision a mental health paradigm that respects individual autonomy, fosters community support, and prioritizes human dignity. A call to action is necessary, urging policymakers, practitioners,

and advocates to collaborate in creating a more just and compassionate mental health system that genuinely serves the needs of individuals in crisis.

In conclusion, the journey toward reforming institutional psychiatry is fraught with challenges, but it is imperative for the well-being of individuals and communities. By prioritizing patient empowerment and dismantling oppressive structures, we can pave the way for a mental health system that honors the dignity and autonomy of all individuals, promoting healing and recovery in a supportive, compassionate environment.

References

Bakunin, M. (1871). *Statism and Anarchy*. New York: Vanguard Press.

Corrigan, P. W. (2004). How stigma interferes with mental health care. *American Psychologist*, 59(7), 614-625. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.7.614

Fisher, S. (2015). The impact of isolation on mental health: A review. *Journal of Psychiatric Practice*, 21(4), 319-327. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.pra.0000471475.02023.4e

Foucault, M. (1965). *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. New York: Random House.

Frances, A. (2013). *Saving Normal: An Insider's Revolt Against Out-of-Control Psychiatric Diagnosis, DSM-5, Big Pharma, and the Medicalization of Ordinary Life*. New York: William Morrow.

Hellenic Ministry of Health. (2022). Proposal for the "Accompaniment in Crisis" initiative. Athens: Government of Greece.

Hellenic Observatory. (2020). Annual report on mental health complaints. Athens: Hellenic Observatory.

Kirmayer, L. J. (2001). Cultural variations in the response to psychiatric disorders. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 24(3), 633-648. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0193-953X(05)70016-0

Moncrieff, J. (2008). *The Myth of the Chemical Cure: A Critique of Psychiatric Drug Treatment*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tzeng, O. C. S. (2008). The impact of mental health reform in Greece: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Mental Health Systems*, 2(1), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1186/1752-4458-2-1

World Health Organization. (2005). *Mental Health Policy and Service Guidance Package*. Geneva: WHO Press.

World Health Organization. (2013). *Mental Health Action Plan 2013-2020*. Geneva: WHO Press.

Zinkler, M., & Roberts, G. (2008). Coercion in mental health care: A review of the literature. *The Psychiatrist*, 32(9), 318-322. https://doi.org/10.1192/pb.bp.107.020328