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Abstract. This article describes political facets of the institution of psychiatry.

The political facets of the institution of psychiatry have had quite a checkered history. (1) The institution has improved the welfare of the body politic in so far as psychiatric practice has (a) humanely protected those who cannot protect themselves; (b) contributed to the mental, physical, and spiritual growth of those who experience problematic growth; and (c) led to minimization of sociopolitical forces that induce problematic growth. (2) The institution has fostered the maintenance of existing political power relations by inducing a false consciousness allowing the body politic to better tolerate an alien political head that views the body only as a necessary support function. (3) In so far as some psychiatric practices are replete with noxious consequences—e.g., the side-effects of electroconvulsive (ECT) therapy and psychotropic medications—the institution reinforces a political ideology that through short-term pain one can experience long-term gain. This ideology is a handy vehicle for leaders seeking to remain in power during various policy disasters on a continuum from the democratic to the totalitarian. (The expanding notion of "short-term" here qualifies as an example of false consciousness.) (4) The institution has exhibited wild swings in political attributions of responsibility for behaviors deemed statistically or deontologically deviant. Medicalizing such deviancies locates behavioral responsibility with the behaver and often induces the analytic set that psychiatric practice must be applied to the behaver as opposed to the political context in which the behaver exists and the behavior occurs. (5) The institution has been intentionally and cynically used to punish political opponents through applying psychiatric practices that are most replete with noxious consequences—e.g., ECT, psychotropic medications with severe extrapyramidal and anticholinergic side-effects, and incarceration in extremely austere and dangerous environments.