# PH4143: Towards a Just Psychiatry — Reclaiming Suffering, Moral Truth, and Diagnostic Justice

Chrysovalantis – Angelos Latsidis
Deree – The American College of Greece
Dr. E. Vintiadis

## Core Premise #1: Suffering Is Not Pathology

⟶ **Claim**:
Not all emotional suffering indicates dysfunction. Some forms of psychic distress—especially when intense, disruptive, or socially inappropriate—reflect confrontation with existential, moral, or symbolic realities. Psychiatry's tendency to interpret suffering through narrow thresholds and functional metrics results in misclassification of meaning-bearing states.

---

⟶ **Problem Addressed**:
The DSM-5 and related diagnostic tools define mental disorders via duration, intensity, and impairment criteria. This structure lacks sensitivity to whether the symptom is morally proportionate, symbolically coherent, or narratively intelligible. The consequence: psychiatry increasingly treats the tragic, the ecstatic, and the uncontainable as signs of disease.

---

⟶ **Analytical Justification**:
**1.** Nietzsche: Suffering is the cost of becoming.
"One must still have chaos in oneself to be able to give birth to a dancing star."
(Thus Spoke Zarathustra)

- Intense emotional states (despair, rage, shame) may reflect transitions in value systems or violations of existential coherence—not pathology.
- Psychiatric models suppress this "chaos" in favor of adaptation—prioritizing stability over transformation.

---

**2.** Jung: Symptoms are unconscious truths seeking recognition.
"The symptom is a cry from the soul that has not been heard."
(CW 16: The Practice of Psychotherapy)

- Psychiatric classification often converts this cry into a code (e.g., MDD, BPD), stripping it of symbolic function.
- Jungian analysis sees many symptoms not as dysfunctions to eliminate, but symbolic fragments that must be metabolized into the conscious self.

---

**3.** Dionysian suffering is destabilizing, but not disordered.

- The clinic privileges Apollonian traits: order, clarity, control.
- Dionysian dimensions—collapse, excess, emotional rupture—are often medicalized, not interpreted.
- Yet such states may reflect adaptive refusal: the psyche resisting premature integration or unjust normalization.

"The craving for health and clarity at any cost reveals not strength, but decadence."
(Nietzsche, Twilight of the Idols)

---

**4**. Unmet symbolic suffering becomes shadow.

- Jung's concept of the shadow refers to denied or disowned aspects of the psyche.
- Psychiatry often becomes the social superego: disavowing the "ugly," "unregulated," or "inappropriate" emotional states that don't fit normative ideals.
- This results in projection onto patients—pathologizing what has simply not yet been metabolized.

---

⟶ **Clinical Consequence**:

- Misinterpretation of suffering leads to overdiagnosis and premature pharmacological suppression
- Shame and alienation increase when patients sense their emotional truths are not legible within the clinical frame
- "High-conflict," "treatment-resistant," or "non-compliant" patients often represent Dionysian distress forced into Apollonian regimes

---

⟶ **Empirical Evidence**:
"*Many individuals who meet diagnostic criteria for depression are in fact responding to contextual loss, not dysfunction.*"
(Horwitz & Wakefield, 2007, The Loss of Sadness, p. 6)

"*Suffering becomes pathological only when it loses its anchoring in reality*."
(Herman, 1992, Trauma and Recovery, p. 59).

"*In pathologizing suffering, we risk colluding with the very forces that caused it*"
(Johnstone & Boyle, 2018, Power Threat Meaning Framework, Executive Summary).

## Core Premise #2: Consciousness Is Relational

⟶ **Claim**:
Mental states do not arise in isolation. Consciousness is shaped by relational context, interpersonal attunement, and cultural norms. Psychiatry that diagnoses suffering as if it emerges from a self-contained psyche commits a category error.

---

⟶ **Problem Addressed**:
Most psychiatric models assume a bounded, individualist self. Symptoms are evaluated in isolation from relational context, which marginalizes grief, protest, and dissociation that originate in failure of recognition, not personal pathology.

---

⟶ **Analytical Justification**:
1. The self is not universal; it is culturally and relationally constructed.
"*Western people usually conceive the self as a bounded whole... others as relational*"(Markus & Kitayama, 1991).
2. Mentalization and emotional regulation are co-constructed.
"*Mentalization is not an individual trait but a relational achievement"(*Fonagy & Target, 1997).
3. Emotion itself is socially structured.
"*Feelings are not substances in the blood, but practices organized by stories we enact*"(Rosaldo, 1984).

The patient's affective life reflects violations of moral expectation, not internal imbalance. Without relational attunement, psychiatry reifies cultural bias as clinical fact.

---

⟶ **Clinical Consequences**:
Patients from collectivist, trauma-saturated, or misattuned backgrounds are disproportionately misdiagnosed.Symptoms of abandonment, moral injury, or emotional invisibility are mistaken for internal disorders. Detachment from moral history produces diagnostic error and therapeutic misalignment.

---

⟶ **Conclusion**:
Psychiatry must shift its analytic unit from the isolated brain to the relational field. Suffering cannot be understood outside of broken recognition, unresolved betrayal, or enduring misattunement.

---

## Core Premise #3: Trauma is Moral AND Relational

⟶ **Claim**:
Therapeutic insight without moral recognition is structurally incomplete. Effective clinical practice requires not only emotional processing but also naming the relational and ethical violations that contributed. **Accountability**—symbolic or real—as a therapeutic mechanism, **is needed**.

---

⟶ **Problem Addressed**:
Contemporary therapy emphasizes emotional regulation, reframing, and cognitive restructuring but often omits moral attribution. Patients are asked to "understand their feelings" without acknowledging the reality of betrayal or abandonment.

---

⟶ **Analytical Justification**:
1. *"Trauma is not the story of something that happened back then, but the story of what is happening inside the person as a result."* (van der Kolk, 2014, p. 21)
That inner story is morally structured: it <u>carries an unresolved accusation</u> to the outside world. If therapy avoids moral dimension, it reinforces the patient's original invalidation.

---

2. Without recognition of wrongdoing, ***the self cannot localize meaning.***
"The perceived acknowledgment of injustice from others was the best predictor of recovery in trauma survivors."
(Maercker & Müller, 2004, Journal of Traumatic Stress, 17(3), p. 234)
In other words, symbolic accountability from another—especially a clinician—helps restore moral time and reorients the patient in relation to their suffering. Without it, trauma remains suspended

---

⟶ **Clinical Consequences**: • Therapists must learn to mirror moral weight without becoming adversarial.

- The task is not to declare guilt but to affirm proportion and scale: "Yes, that was wrong," or "You were failed," becomes a critical organizing statement.
- Therapy that fails to morally situate suffering increases the risk of confusion, retraumatization, and diagnostic misattribution. Blame, when rightly scaled, is not regression. It is orientation.

## Core Premise #4: Labels Must Be Temporary And Situated in the Present, not in Childhood

⟶ **Claim**:
Psychiatric diagnoses must remain provisional and constantly contextualizable.
Functionality must not be reduced to just childhood repetition.

---

⟶ **Problem Addressed**:
**1.** Diagnosis alters the self through **looping effects**: "The classification of people changes the people who are classified." (*Hacking, 1995, p. 352*)

**2**. Distress is seen merely as **caused historically** e.g. childhood trauma (Rose, 2006) rather than as **morally immediate.**

---

⟶ **Analytical Justification**:
***1.*** *Apollonian* distortion of diagnosis:
Psychiatry's tendency toward diagnostic permanence reflects an Apollonian impulse for order and clarity, contradicting the inherently dynamic (Dionysian) nature of psychological life.

**2**. Misuse of historical (psychoanalytic) interpretation.
Psychiatry frequently reduces present suffering to repetitions of unresolved past trauma, undermining the present moral coherence and adaptability of symptoms.

**3**. Label permanence distorts measurement:
When diagnoses are treated as stable entities, recovery is either seen as a contradiction or unlikely.

---

⟶ **Clinical Consequences**:
Rigid diagnostic labels lead to therapeutic inflexibility, patient identity foreclosure, and clinicians disregarding genuine transformations due to outdated interpretations.

---

⟶ **Counterargument & Response**:

- Counter: "Diagnostic stability ensures clinical consistency and resource management."
- Response: Stability aids administration but must not override existential accuracy.

---

## Core Premise #5: The Therapist Is Not Neutral

⟶ **Claim**:
Therapeutic neutrality in contexts of trauma and moral injury often replicates original relational harms. Therapy inherently operates as an ethical tribunal; therapists must actively engage as morally attuned witnesses, not passive observers.

---

⟶ **Problem Addressed**:
Mainstream psychotherapy emphasizes neutrality to prevent bias, yet trauma research consistently indicates neutrality can reinforce patients' experiences of disbelief, abandonment, and invalidation (Herman, 1992; Maercker & Müller, 2004).

---

⟶ **Analytical Justification**:
*1. Clinic as Court of Recognition*:
Therapy should shift from internal pathology ("What's wrong with you?") to moral inquiry ("What wrong was done to you, and by whom?"), reframing the therapeutic encounter as ethical witnessing rather than neutral diagnosis.

*2. Neutrality as epistemic complicity*:
Neutral stance risks ethical abdication and re-enacts original relational injuries.
"A too-neutral analyst recapitulates the original betrayal." (Ferenczi, 1932)

*3. Recognition as intervention*:
Explicit acknowledgment of injustice significantly predicts trauma recovery outcomes (Maercker & Müller, 2004). Recognizing harm is a therapeutic act, not mere validation.

*4. Moral stance vs. moral position*:
Ethical therapy demands scalable moral discernment—acknowledging harm proportionately without uncritical alignment or neutrality (Benjamin, 1995).

---

⟶ **Counterarg.**: "Moral engagement risks therapist bias."
**Response**: Neutrality itself is biased toward emotional detachment.
⟶ **Clinical Consequences**:
Neutral therapeutic stances perpetuate epistemic injustice and reduce interventions to superficial symptom management.
⟶ **Conclusion**:
The clinic must be recognized as an **ethical space**, where suffering is firstly interpreted as *disrupted moral meaning.*