ScieniQ Publishers

Advance Medical and Clinical Research

Research Article

# Beyond the Iron Cage: *Institutional Coercion and the Imperative for Transformative Healing Spaces*

**Julian Ungar-Sargon, MD, PhD**

*Borra College of health Science Dominican University IL*

***Corresponding author**
Julian Ungar-Sargon, MD, PhD Borra College of health Science Dominican University IL

**Received**: 23 May 2025
**Accepted**: 27 May 2025
**Published**: 01 June 2025



## Abstract

This paper examines the structural similarities between jails, schools, and hospitals as instruments of state coercion, drawing on Goffman's analysis of total institutions [1], Szasz's critique of psychiatric power [2], and Foucault's genealogy of disciplinary mechanisms [3,4].

Through comparative institutional analysis, we demonstrate how these ostensibly distinct domains operate through parallel techniques of surveillance, normalization, and bodily control that systematically strip individuals of agency while producing docile subjects. Building on contemporary critical scholarship this analysis argues for the urgent need to develop alternative therapeutic spaces that transcend the coercive logic of institutional medicine.

The paper concludes by outlining principles for transformative healing environments that honor human dignity, agency, and the integration of mind, body, and spirit.

**Keywords:** Total institutions, medical coercion, disciplinary power, alternative healing, institutional critique

## Introduction

The modern state exercises its power not only through overt mechanisms of legal violence but through a subtle network of institutions that appear benevolent while functioning as sophisticated instruments of social control. Jails, schools, and hospitals—despite their ostensibly distinct purposes of punishment, education, and healing—share fundamental structural characteristics that reveal their common function as disciplinary apparatus. These institutions operate through what Goffman [1], identified as the logic of "total institutions," systematically dismantling individual identity and autonomy while producing subjects who conform to institutional requirements rather than their own authentic needs.

This institutional analysis becomes particularly urgent when we consider the profound crisis facing contemporary healthcare, where the promise of healing has been subordinated to the imperatives of social control, economic profit, and professional dominance. As Ungar-Sargon's pioneering work demonstrates, the military model of medicine that dominates contemporary healthcare systems perpetuates hierarchical power structures and mechanistic approaches to the human body that fundamentally contradict the relational, holistic nature of authentic healing processes [5].

The convergence of these institutional critiques points toward an essential question: How might we develop healing spaces that transcend the coercive logic of modern institutions while honoring the full complexity of human suffering and recovery? This paper argues that understanding the shared mechanisms of institutional coercion across jails, schools, and hospitals is essential for developing truly transformative alternatives that prioritize human agency, dignity, and authentic healing relationships.

## Historical Origins

The institutional forms that dominate contemporary social life emerged during the late 18th and early 19th centuries as part of broader transformations associated with industrialization, urbanization, and modern state formation. Prior to this period, the management of deviance, education, and healing took place primarily within family and community networks through informal mechanisms of social control and mutual aid. The rise of specialized institutions represented a fundamental shift toward centralized, bureaucratic responses to social problems that had previously been addressed through decentralized, relationship-based approaches [16].

David Rothman's historical analysis demonstrates how the "discovery of the asylum" in early 19th-century America reflected broader anxieties about social disorder generated by rapid economic and demographic change [17]. Reformers promoted institutional solutions—penitentiaries, asylums, and common schools—as rational, scientific alternatives to what they perceived as the chaos and inefficiency of traditional community-based approaches. These institutions promised to address social problems through environmental design, systematic routine, and professional expertise rather than through the unpredictable dynamics of family and community relationships.

The emergence of these institutions was closely linked to the development of new forms of professional expertise that claimed scientific authority over domains previously governed by traditional knowledge and practice. Medical professionals established authority over bodily health, educators claimed expertise in child development and learning, and correctional specialists developed theories of criminal rehabilitation. This profession-

alization process created new categories of social problems that required institutional intervention while simultaneously delegitimizing alternative forms of knowledge and practice [18].

Michel Foucault's genealogical analysis reveals how these institutional developments were not merely responses to pre-existing social problems but actively constituted new forms of power/knowledge that created the very categories of deviance, illness, and ignorance that institutions claimed to address [3,4]. The asylum, the prison, and the school did not simply respond to madness, criminality, and ignorance but participated in defining these categories while establishing institutional authority as the appropriate response to human difference and suffering.

This historical perspective illuminates how contemporary institutional arrangements are not natural or inevitable but represent particular choices about how to organize social life that emerged under specific historical conditions. Understanding this history is essential for imagining alternatives that might recover some of the relationship-based approaches that institutional solutions displaced while addressing their limitations through new forms of community-based care and mutual aid.

## The Architecture of Control

Erving Goffman's seminal analysis in "Asylums" [1], provides the foundational framework for understanding how ostensibly different institutions share fundamental characteristics that enable systematic control over human behavior and identity. Goffman defines total institutions as "places of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life" [1]. While his primary focus was psychiatric hospitals, the analytical framework extends to reveal the disciplinary logic that underlies modern institutional arrangements more broadly.

The defining characteristics of total institutions include: the breakdown of barriers between different spheres of life; the conduct of all activities in the immediate company of others under institutional surveillance; the scheduling of all activities according to institutional rather than individual needs; and the coordination of all activities to fulfill institutional rather than personal goals. These features combine to produce what Goffman terms the "mortification of self"—a systematic process through which institutions strip away the individual's sense of autonomy, dignity, and authentic identity.

This mortification process operates through several interconnected mechanisms. First, institutions establish "role dispossession," removing individuals from their previous social roles and identities. Second, they implement "programming and identity trimming," forcing individuals to conform to standardized institutional routines that ignore individual differences and needs. Third, they create "contaminative exposure," subjecting individuals to degrading procedures that violate personal boundaries and privacy. Finally, they establish "disruption of the relationship between individual actor and his acts," ensuring that individuals cannot maintain continuity between their authentic self-expression and their institutional behavior.

The power of Goffman's analysis lies in its revelation that these mechanisms are not aberrations or unintended consequences but constitutive features of how modern institutions maintain order and control. The apparent benevolence of educational or medical institutions does not alter their fundamental structure as sites where individual agency is systematically dismantled in service of institutional imperatives.

## Disciplinary Power and the Clinical Gaze

Michel Foucault's genealogical analysis of modern institutions provides crucial theoretical tools for understanding how power operates not merely through overt coercion but through the production of knowledge, the organization of space, and the regulation of bodies. In "Discipline and Punish" [3]. Foucault demonstrates how the modern prison system represents a broader transformation in the exercise of power from spectacular punishment to subtle normalization. The panopticon—Jeremy Bentham's architectural design for a prison where guards can observe all prisoners without being seen—becomes a metaphor for the disciplinary mechanisms that permeate modern institutional life.

Foucault's analysis reveals how disciplinary power operates through three primary techniques: hierarchical observation, normalizing judgment, and examination. Hierarchical observation establishes systems of surveillance that make individual behavior constantly visible to institutional authority while rendering that authority invisible. Normalizing judgment creates standards of "normal" behavior against which individuals are constantly measured and found wanting. Examination combines observation and judgment to produce knowledge about individuals that can be used to classify, compare, and control them.

In "The Birth of the Clinic" [4]. Foucault extends this analysis to medical institutions, demonstrating how the "clinical gaze" transforms the sick person from a subject with unique experiences of suffering into an object of medical knowledge. The clinical gaze operates through a process of abstraction that removes the individual from their social context, reduces their complex experience to discrete symptoms, and subordinates their subjective understanding of illness to professional medical authority.

This transformation is not merely epistemological but fundamentally political, establishing the doctor's authority to define reality and determine appropriate responses to human suffering. The clinical encounter becomes a site where the patient's autonomy, dignity, and authentic self-expression are systematically subordinated to medical expertise and institutional requirements.

## Critique of Psychiatric Power

Thomas Szasz's radical critique of psychiatry in "The Myth of Mental Illness" [2], and subsequent works provides essential insights into how medical institutions function as instruments of social control rather than healing. Szasz argues that mental illness is not a medical condition but a moral and social judgment disguised as scientific diagnosis. Psychiatric institutions, rather than treating genuine medical problems, serve to control and punish individuals whose behavior violates social norms.

Szasz's analysis reveals several key mechanisms through which psychiatric power operates. First, the medicalization of deviance transforms social and moral problems into technical medical issues, removing them from the realm of ethical and political discourse. Second, the therapeutic state expands medical authority beyond genuine health issues to encompass broad areas of human behavior and experience. Third, involuntary treatment legitimizes coercive interventions that would be considered assault in any other context but are justified through medical rhetoric.

The power of Szasz's critique extends beyond psychiatry to illuminate how medical authority more broadly functions to legitimate social control. By transforming social problems into medical conditions, healthcare institutions can justify interventions that systematically violate individual autonomy while maintaining an appearance of benevolent concern for public health.

## Paradigmatic Total Institutions

The prison system provides the clearest example of institutional coercion, making visible the mechanisms that operate more subtly in schools and hospitals. Contemporary scholarship on mass incarceration, particularly Angela Davis's "Are Prisons Obsolete?" [6], demonstrates how the carceral system functions not primarily to enhance public safety but to manage

social contradictions generated by economic inequality and racial oppression.

Davis's analysis reveals how prisons operate through several interconnected mechanisms of control. First, they create artificial scarcity through isolation from family, community, and meaningful social relationships. Second, they establish total surveillance through constant monitoring of movement, communication, and behavior. Third, they implement degradation rituals through strip searches, forced medical procedures, and denial of basic privacy and dignity. Fourth, they create temporal disorientation through the disruption of normal life rhythms and the denial of meaningful future planning.

These mechanisms combine to produce what Davis terms "civil death"—a condition in which individuals are systematically stripped of their capacity for autonomous action and authentic self-expression. The apparent purpose of punishment or rehabilitation becomes secondary to the underlying function of producing docile subjects who accept their subordination to institutional authority.

The architecture of prisons makes these mechanisms visible through spatial arrangements that maximize surveillance while minimizing human connection. The panopticon design ensures that inmates can be observed at any time without knowing when they are being watched, creating a state of permanent visibility that induces self-regulation and conformity. Common areas are designed to prevent intimate conversation or collective organizing, while solitary confinement represents the ultimate extension of institutional control over human relationships and mental states.

Modern developments in prison technology have extended these mechanisms through electronic monitoring, biometric identification, and pharmaceutical interventions that allow for more sophisticated forms of bodily control. These innovations do not humanize the prison system but rather perfect its capacity to regulate human behavior while maintaining an appearance of scientific rationality and humane treatment.

## Disciplinary Apparatus

The modern educational system operates through mechanisms that parallel those of prisons while maintaining an ideology of liberation and opportunity. Paulo Freire's "Pedagogy of the Oppressed" [7], provides a foundational critique of how schools function as "banks" where students are treated as empty vessels to be filled with predetermined knowledge rather than active subjects capable of critical thinking and creative expression.

Freire's analysis reveals how the "banking model" of education operates through several key mechanisms. First, it establishes a rigid hierarchy between teachers who possess knowledge and students who lack it, denying the possibility that students might have valuable insights or experiences. Second, it fragments knowledge into discrete subjects and standardized curricula that prevent students from developing integrated understanding of their social reality. Third, it emphasizes passive reception of information rather than critical engagement with ideas, producing students who are capable of reproducing authorized knowledge but incapable of questioning fundamental assumptions.

Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis extend this analysis in "Schooling in Capitalist America" [8], demonstrating how schools function to produce workers who are habituated to hierarchical authority, punctuality, and repetitive tasks rather than citizens capable of democratic participation. The "hidden curriculum" of schooling operates through daily routines that normalize submission to authority, competition with peers, and acceptance of inequality as natural and inevitable.

The architectural design of schools reinforces these disciplinary mechanisms through spatial arrangements that maximize surveillance and control while minimizing opportunities for autonomous activity. Classrooms are designed to focus attention on the teacher while preventing communication between students. Hallways are monitored to ensure that movement between classes follows prescribed routes and schedules. Testing environments create conditions of artificial scarcity and competitive pressure that inhibit collaborative learning and mutual support.

Contemporary developments in educational technology have extended these mechanisms through standardized testing regimes, digital surveillance systems, and pharmaceutical interventions for "learning disabilities" that medicalize resistance to institutional requirements. These innovations do not democratize education but rather perfect the school's capacity to sort and rank students while maintaining an appearance of scientific objectivity and equal opportunity.

Jonathan Kozol's ethnographic work, particularly "Savage Inequalities" [9], reveals how these disciplinary mechanisms operate differentially across race and class lines, with poor students of color subjected to more intensive surveillance and control while affluent students receive education that emphasizes creativity and critical thinking. This differential application of disciplinary power demonstrates how schools function not merely to reproduce existing inequality but to legitimate it through the ideology of meritocracy.

## Medical Coercion

The modern hospital system operates through mechanisms that parallel those of prisons and schools while maintaining an ideology of healing and care. Ivan Illich's "Medical Nemesis" [10], provides a comprehensive critique of how medical institutions have become iatrogenic—producing more illness than they cure through the systematic medicalization of human experience and the creation of dependency on professional intervention.

Illich's analysis reveals how medical institutions operate through several interconnected mechanisms of control. First, they establish monopolistic authority over the definition of health and illness, removing these determinations from individuals and communities. Second, they create artificial scarcity through the professionalization of healing, transforming natural human capacities for self-care and mutual aid into technical problems requiring expert intervention. Third, they implement technological interventions that fragment the human person into discrete organ systems and physiological processes, denying the integrated nature of human experience.

The architecture of hospitals reinforces these mechanisms through spatial arrangements that maximize professional control while minimizing patient autonomy. Patient rooms are designed for efficient surveillance and intervention rather than comfort or privacy. Medical procedures take place in sterile environments that strip away personal identity and social connection. Visiting hours and communication protocols ensure that patients remain isolated from their support networks and dependent on professional caregivers.

My analysis of the military model of medicine illuminates how contemporary healthcare institutions have adopted organizational structures and priorities that fundamentally contradict the relational nature of authentic healing. Drawing on work by Gabriel and Metz, McCallum, Van Way III, and Wintermute, I attempted to demonstrate how military organizational structures have shaped medical practice since the late 19th century, creating hierarchical power structures, mechanistic approaches to the body, standardization over personalization, focus on acute intervention, and profit-driven economics [5].

While acknowledging the contributions of military medicine to trauma care and technological innovation, there are critical limitations to this

model that systematically undermine the healing relationship. The hierarchical command structure reduces patients to passive recipients of professional intervention rather than active participants in their own healing process. The mechanistic approach treats the body as a machine to be repaired rather than a complex living system embedded in relationships and meaning. The emphasis on standardization ignores individual differences and cultural contexts that are essential for effective healing.

Contemporary developments in medical technology have extended these mechanisms through electronic health records that reduce patients to data points, pharmaceutical interventions that medicalize normal human experiences, and diagnostic procedures that transform subjective experiences of suffering into objective medical conditions. These innovations do not humanize medical care but rather perfect the hospital's capacity to control human bodies while maintaining an appearance of scientific rationality and compassionate care.

Nancy Scheper-Hughes's anthropological work, particularly "Death Without Weeping" [11], reveals how medical institutions operate differentially across class and cultural lines, with poor patients subjected to more intensive control and wealthy patients receiving care that emphasizes patient autonomy and choice. This differential application of medical power demonstrates how hospitals function not merely to treat illness but to reproduce social hierarchies through the organization of access to care and the quality of therapeutic relationships.

## Shared Mechanisms of Institutional Control

Despite their ostensibly different purposes, jails, schools, and hospitals operate through remarkably similar mechanisms that reveal their common function as instruments of social control. These shared mechanisms include: surveillance and visibility, temporal regulation, spatial control, identity transformation, and the production of docility.

## Surveillance and Visibility

All three institutional types establish systems of constant observation that make individual behavior visible to institutional authority while rendering that authority invisible or naturalized. In prisons, this operates through guard towers, security cameras, and regular inspections. In schools, it functions through teacher supervision, administrative monitoring, and standardized testing. In hospitals, it works through nursing stations, medical rounds, and diagnostic surveillance.

This visibility serves not merely to gather information but to induce self-regulation and conformity. Individuals learn to monitor their own behavior according to institutional expectations, internalizing surveillance mechanisms that continue to operate even when direct observation is absent. The knowledge that one might be watched at any time creates a state of permanent visibility that shapes behavior according to institutional rather than personal priorities.

## Temporal Regulation

All three institutions establish control over time as a mechanism for regulating behavior and identity. Prisons operate through rigid schedules that determine when individuals eat, sleep, work, and socialize. Schools function through class periods, testing schedules, and academic calendars that fragment learning into discrete units. Hospitals work through visiting hours, medication schedules, and treatment protocols that subordinate individual rhythms to institutional efficiency.

This temporal regulation serves to disconnect individuals from their natural rhythms and social relationships while creating dependency on institutional structure. The ability to determine how time is organized becomes a fundamental mechanism of power that shapes not only behavior but consciousness and identity.

## Spatial Control

All three institutions organize space in ways that maximize institutional control while minimizing individual autonomy and social connection. Prisons design cells and common areas to prevent escape while facilitating surveillance. Schools organize classrooms and hallways to direct movement and attention according to educational priorities. Hospitals arrange patient rooms and treatment areas to enable efficient medical intervention while maintaining professional authority.

This spatial organization serves not merely functional purposes but operates as a form of embodied ideology that shapes how individuals understand their relationship to authority, community, and their own agency. The experience of moving through institutional spaces teaches individuals to accept restrictions on their freedom as natural and necessary.

## Identity Transformation

All three institutions implement systematic processes designed to transform individual identity according to institutional requirements. Prisons create "inmates" who learn to navigate the complex social hierarchies and survival strategies of carceral life. Schools produce "students" who internalize competitive relationships and deference to authority. Hospitals generate "patients" who learn to experience their bodies and suffering through medical categories and professional interpretation.

These identity transformations are not merely external roles but involve fundamental changes in how individuals understand themselves and their capabilities. The institutional identity becomes a lens through which individuals interpret their experiences and possibilities, often long after their direct contact with the institution has ended.

## Production of Docility

All three institutions operate to produce what Foucault terms "docile bodies"—individuals who are skilled and useful but also compliant and non-threatening to institutional authority. This docility is not passive submission but active participation in one's own subordination through the internalization of institutional values and priorities.

The production of docility operates through the combination of all previous mechanisms—surveillance creates self-regulation, temporal control establishes dependency, spatial organization embodies hierarchy, and identity transformation internalizes institutional authority. The result is individuals who experience their compliance not as coercion but as their own choice, making institutional control both more effective and more difficult to resist.

## The Crisis of Contemporary Healthcare

The analysis of institutional coercion becomes particularly urgent when applied to contemporary healthcare, where the promise of healing has been increasingly subordinated to mechanisms of social control, economic exploitation, and professional dominance. Ungar-Sargon's comprehensive critique of the military model of medicine illuminates how contemporary healthcare institutions perpetuate patterns of coercion that fundamentally contradict the relational, holistic nature of authentic healing processes [5]. The transformation of healing into medical intervention represents what Ivan Illich terms "iatrogenesis"—the systematic production of illness through medical practice itself [10]. This iatrogenesis operates through clinical, social, and cultural mechanisms that combine to create dependency on professional intervention while undermining natural healing capacities and community support systems.

Clinical iatrogenesis involves direct harm caused by medical interventions—adverse drug reactions, hospital-acquired infections, surgical complications, and diagnostic errors. However, the problem extends beyond technical failures to include systematic biases embedded in medical training and practice. Ungar-Sargon's analysis of healthcare bias reveals

how Cartesian dualism creates fragmentation in trauma care, leading to misdiagnosis and ineffective treatment, particularly for complex trauma presentations [5].

Social iatrogenesis involves the medicalization of normal human experiences—grief, aging, childbirth, and spiritual crisis—transforming natural life processes into medical conditions requiring professional intervention. This medicalization operates through the expansion of diagnostic categories, the lowering of thresholds for medical intervention, and the creation of new categories of illness that correspond to pharmaceutical products rather than genuine health needs.

Cultural iatrogenesis involves the systematic undermining of individual and community capacities for self-care, mutual aid, and meaning-making in the face of suffering. Medical institutions establish monopolistic authority over the interpretation of bodily experience while delegitimizing alternative forms of healing knowledge and practice. This cultural transformation creates populations that are dependent on professional intervention for problems that were historically addressed through family, community, and spiritual resources.

## The Therapeutic State

The concept of the "therapeutic state," developed by Christopher Lasch and extended by James Nolan, describes how therapeutic discourse has become a primary mechanism through which modern states exercise control over their populations. Medical authority provides legitimation for interventions that would be considered coercive in any other context but are justified through the rhetoric of health, safety, and professional expertise.

This therapeutic authority operates through several interconnected mechanisms. First, it medicalizes social and political problems, transforming issues that require collective action into individual pathologies requiring professional treatment. Second, it establishes experts as the primary arbiters of human experience, delegitimizing individual and community knowledge about suffering and healing. Third, it creates legal frameworks that enable coercive intervention while maintaining an appearance of benevolent concern for public health.

The COVID-19 pandemic provided a dramatic illustration of how medical authority can be mobilized to justify extensive restrictions on individual freedom and social connection. Public health measures that might have been temporary emergency responses became normalized as appropriate mechanisms for managing social risk, revealing the extent to which therapeutic discourse has penetrated political life.

## Economic Dimensions

Contemporary healthcare operates within economic structures that systematically prioritize profit over healing, creating perverse incentives that encourage overtreatment while discouraging genuine care. The commodification of healthcare transforms healing relationships into market transactions while creating artificial scarcity around basic human needs for care and connection.

This economic dimension of medical coercion operates through several mechanisms. Insurance systems create bureaucratic barriers that prevent individuals from accessing care while generating profits for financial intermediaries. Pharmaceutical companies develop and market products that create dependency while treating symptoms rather than underlying causes. Hospital systems optimize for efficiency and profit margins rather than patient outcomes or satisfaction.

The result is a healthcare system that systematically undermines the conditions necessary for authentic healing—time, attention, continuity of relationship, and respect for individual autonomy and dignity—while maintaining an appearance of scientific sophistication and compassionate care.

## Toward Transformative an Alternative Vision

In response to the crisis of contemporary healthcare, we propose a revolutionary alternative that transcends the coercive logic of institutional medicine while honoring the full complexity of human suffering and healing [5]. This alternative vision draws on critiques of Cartesian dualism, the integration of spirituality and music into clinical practice, and the creation of therapeutic encounters that honor the full personhood of patients.

Our approach represents a fundamental departure from the military model of medicine through several key innovations. First, it emphasizes deep listening as the foundation of therapeutic relationship, creating space for patients to access their own healing wisdom rather than imposing professional interpretations. Second, it integrates music and spirituality as essential dimensions of healing that address the unity of mind, body, and spirit. Third, it operates through non-hierarchical relationships that honor the patient's authority over their own experience while providing skilled support for healing processes [5].

## Deep Listening

Central to this new vision is the practice of "deep listening"—a form of therapeutic attention that creates space for individuals to connect with their authentic experience and healing wisdom [5]. Unlike the clinical gaze that abstracts and objectifies, deep listening involves a quality of presence that honors the patient's subjectivity while providing skilled support for self-discovery and healing.

This practice represents a fundamental shift from the diagnostic model that seeks to classify and treat discrete conditions toward a hermeneutic approach that engages with the patient's experience as a "sacred text" requiring careful interpretation and respect. Our hermeneutic framework provides tools for understanding how meaning emerges through the therapeutic encounter rather than being imposed by professional authority [5].

Deep listening operates through several interconnected practices. First, it involves what Martin Buber terms "I-Thou" relationship—encountering the patient as a unique individual rather than a representative of a diagnostic category [12]. Second, it requires what Carl Rogers calls "unconditional positive regard"—accepting the patient's experience without judgment while providing skilled support for healing processes [13]. Third, it emphasizes what Eugene Gendlin terms "felt sense"—attending to the bodily dimensions of experience that often contain essential information about healing needs [14].

This approach recognizes that authentic healing must address the spiritual dimensions of human experience that are systematically excluded from biomedical practice. This integration does not involve imposing particular religious beliefs but rather creating space for individuals to access their own spiritual resources while receiving skilled support for healing processes.

Music serves as a particularly powerful medium for this integration because it engages multiple levels of human experience simultaneously—cognitive, emotional, somatic, and spiritual. Musical improvisation and listening can access healing resources that are not available through verbal intervention alone, while providing a non-invasive means of supporting the body's natural healing processes.

The integration of spirituality and music operates through several mechanisms. First, it provides access to transcendent experiences that can transform the individual's relationship to suffering and limitation. Second, it creates opportunities for non-verbal expression and communication that can access healing resources not available through cognitive processing alone. Third, it honors cultural and religious traditions that may be essential for the individual's healing process but are typically excluded from

medical settings.

## Sacred and Profane Space

Our analysis of sacred and profane space in therapeutic encounters provides essential insights into how the physical and relational environment of healing can either support or undermine therapeutic processes. Drawing on anthropological and theological frameworks, this analysis reveals how the rigid separation of sacred and profane domains creates unnecessary tensions within healthcare settings.

The reconceptualization of therapeutic encounters as "liminal zones" where sacred and profane categories blend and transform offers healthcare practitioners a framework for creating environments that honor both the technical and relational dimensions of healing. This approach requires attention to architectural design, ritual practices, and interpersonal dynamics that create conditions for authentic encounter rather than institutional efficiency.

Sacred space in therapeutic encounters is not created through religious symbols or practices but through the quality of attention and intention that practitioners bring to their work. This sacred dimension emerges through what Ungar-Sargon terms "contemplative practice"—forms of meditation, prayer, and reflective inquiry that cultivate the practitioner's capacity for presence and compassion.

## Distributed Agency in Healing

The application of Actor-Network Theory (ANT) to medical practice provides powerful tools for understanding how healing emerges through dynamic relationships between diverse actors rather than top-down impositions of medical authority. This framework challenges traditional hierarchical structures that dominate modern healthcare by revealing how agency is distributed across networks that include patients, practitioners, technologies, protocols, and physical spaces.

ANT analysis reveals that medical authority emerges not from institutional positions but through dynamic associations between diverse actors. Effective healing requires coordination between human and non-human actors in ways that respect the agency and contributions of all network participants. This perspective transforms the patient from a passive recipient of professional intervention into an active participant whose knowledge and agency are essential for effective healing.

The application of ANT to healing practice operates through several key insights. First, it reveals how healing emerges through "translations" between different forms of knowledge and experience rather than the imposition of professional expertise. Second, it demonstrates how technologies and physical spaces actively shape therapeutic relationships in ways that can either support or undermine healing processes. Third, it shows how effective interventions require the enrollment and coordination of diverse actors whose contributions may not be recognized within traditional medical frameworks.

This distributed understanding of agency has profound implications for the design of healing spaces and therapeutic relationships. Rather than organizing healthcare around professional expertise and institutional efficiency, ANT suggests creating networks that optimize for the emergence of healing through respectful collaboration between diverse actors.

## Critiquing Hierarchical Medical Authority

The ANT framework provides essential tools for critiquing the hierarchical authority structures that dominate contemporary medicine while proposing alternative forms of organization that honor the distributed nature of healing processes. Traditional medical practice operates through command-and-control structures that concentrate authority in professional roles while systematically excluding patient knowledge and agency.

This hierarchical organization creates several problems that undermine effective healing. First, it establishes artificial boundaries between different forms of knowledge—scientific, experiential, cultural, and spiritual—that need to be integrated for effective intervention. Second, it creates power imbalances that inhibit authentic communication and collaboration between patients and practitioners. Third, it organizes healthcare around institutional priorities rather than individual healing needs.

ANT analysis reveals how these hierarchical structures are not natural or inevitable but represent particular choices about how to organize healthcare networks. Alternative forms of organization that distribute authority more equitably while maintaining necessary coordination and expertise are not only possible but may be more effective for supporting healing processes.

## Implications for Healthcare Design

The ANT framework has significant implications for how we design healthcare spaces, protocols, and relationships to support distributed agency and collaborative healing processes. This requires attention to both physical and social dimensions of healthcare networks in ways that optimize for healing rather than institutional efficiency.

Physical design considerations include creating spaces that support privacy and intimacy while enabling flexible use of different therapeutic modalities. This might involve natural lighting, acoustic design that supports both conversation and music, and architectural elements that create a sense of sanctuary rather than institutional efficiency.

Social design considerations include developing protocols that honor patient autonomy while providing skilled professional support, creating roles for community members and family in healing processes, and establishing communication practices that facilitate translation between different forms of knowledge and experience.

## Principles for Transformative Healing Spaces

Drawing on the theoretical frameworks and practical innovations discussed throughout this analysis, we can identify several key principles that should guide the development of transformative healing spaces that transcend the coercive logic of institutional medicine while supporting authentic healing processes.

## Principle 1: Radical Hospitality and Unconditional Welcome

Transformative healing spaces must begin with what Henri Nouwen terms "radical hospitality"—a quality of welcome that honors the full dignity and worth of every individual regardless of their social status, diagnostic category, or ability to pay [15]. This hospitality operates as both a practical commitment and a spiritual discipline that creates conditions for authentic encounter.

Radical hospitality requires attention to how individuals are greeted, how intake processes are organized, and how the physical environment communicates respect and welcome. It also requires ongoing attention to how power dynamics and cultural assumptions may create barriers to authentic encounter for marginalized populations.

## Principle 2: Integration of Multiple Ways of Knowing

Transformative healing spaces must create opportunities for integration between different forms of knowledge—scientific, experiential, cultural, and spiritual—rather than privileging professional expertise over other forms of wisdom. This integration requires both intellectual humility from practitioners and practical mechanisms for incorporating diverse perspectives into healing processes.

This principle operates through practices such as collaborative assessment

processes that honor patient knowledge and experience, treatment planning that incorporates cultural and spiritual resources, and ongoing dialogue that allows for the emergence of new understanding through therapeutic relationships.

## Principle 3: Emphasis on Relationship Rather Than Intervention

Transformative healing spaces must prioritize the development of authentic therapeutic relationships over the application of technical interventions. This emphasis recognizes that healing often emerges through the quality of attention and care that individuals receive rather than through specific medical treatments.

This principle requires adequate time for relationship development, continuity of care that allows relationships to deepen over time, and attention to the practitioner's own healing and spiritual development as essential qualifications for therapeutic work.

## Principle 4: Respect for Individual Autonomy and Self-Determination

Transformative healing spaces must honor the individual's authority over their own healing process while providing skilled support and guidance. This respect for autonomy operates as both an ethical commitment and a practical recognition that effective healing requires the individual's active participation and consent.

This principle requires transparent communication about treatment options and their risks and benefits, collaborative decision-making processes that honor individual preferences and values, and ongoing attention to how institutional pressures may compromise individual autonomy.

## Principle 5: Integration of Community and Environmental Dimensions

Transformative healing spaces must recognize that individual healing cannot be separated from the health of communities and environments in which individuals are embedded. This recognition requires attention to social determinants of health while creating opportunities for community connection and environmental restoration.

This principle operates through practices such as community gardens and food programs that address nutritional needs, support groups that create opportunities for mutual aid and social connection, and advocacy work that addresses systemic sources of suffering and illness.

## Principle 6: Economic Accessibility and Sustainability

Transformative healing spaces must operate through economic models that prioritize healing over profit while ensuring long-term sustainability. This requires creative approaches to funding that reduce dependence on fee-for-service models while ensuring that practitioners can sustain their work over time.

This principle might operate through sliding-scale fee structures, community-supported healthcare models, integration with existing healthcare systems in ways that preserve alternative values and practices, and policy advocacy for healthcare financing that supports relationship-based care.

To illustrate how these principles might operate in practice, it is useful to examine several examples of alternative healing approaches that embody different aspects of the transformative vision outlined above.

## The Sanctuary Model in Trauma Treatment

The Sanctuary Model, developed by Sandra Bloom and colleagues, provides an example of how trauma treatment can be organized around principles of safety, democracy, and healing rather than control and management. This approach recognizes that many individuals seeking mental health services have experienced trauma within institutional settings and require healing environments that actively counteract the effects of institutional violence.

The Sanctuary Model operates through several key commitments: creating physical and emotional safety for all participants; establishing democratic decision-making processes that honor individual voice and choice; focusing on healing and growth rather than symptom management; and addressing the trauma history of both patients and staff as essential for creating effective therapeutic environments.

## Integrative Medicine Centers

Integrative medicine centers provide examples of how biomedical practice can be combined with alternative healing modalities in ways that honor multiple ways of knowing while maintaining scientific rigor. These centers typically offer combinations of conventional medical treatment, nutritional counseling, mind-body practices, and spiritual care in environments designed to support healing rather than institutional efficiency.

Successful integrative medicine centers operate through several key practices: extended appointment times that allow for relationship development; collaborative treatment planning that incorporates patient preferences and values; integration of practitioner teams that include both conventional and alternative providers; and attention to environmental design that creates healing rather than clinical atmospheres.

## Community Health Worker Programs

Community health worker programs provide examples of how healing work can be embedded within communities in ways that honor local knowledge and cultural resources while providing connections to professional healthcare when needed. These programs typically train community members to provide basic health education, social support, and advocacy while serving as bridges between communities and professional healthcare systems.

Effective community health worker programs operate through several key principles: selection and training of workers from within the communities they serve; emphasis on relationship and trust-building rather than service delivery; integration of cultural and spiritual resources with health promotion activities; and advocacy for systemic changes that address social determinants of health.

## Challenges and Resistance

The development of transformative healing spaces faces significant challenges and resistance from existing institutional structures, professional interests, and cultural assumptions that support the status quo. Understanding these challenges is essential for developing strategies that can create sustainable alternatives while avoiding co-optation by existing systems.

## Professional and Economic Resistance

The development of alternative healing approaches faces resistance from professional organizations that benefit from current arrangements and economic interests that profit from existing healthcare systems. Medical licensing requirements, insurance reimbursement policies, and legal liability concerns all create barriers to innovation while protecting existing professional monopolies.

This resistance operates through several mechanisms: professional scope-of-practice regulations that prevent non-physicians from providing certain services; insurance policies that reimburse only conventional treatments while excluding alternative approaches; and legal frameworks that expose alternative practitioners to liability while protecting conventional medical practice.

## Cultural and Ideological Barriers

Alternative healing approaches also face resistance from cultural assumptions and ideological commitments that support the biomedical model while delegitimizing other forms of healing knowledge. These barriers operate through both conscious resistance and unconscious assumptions that shape how individuals understand health, illness, and appropriate responses to suffering.

Cultural resistance operates through several mechanisms: scientific materialism that delegitimizes spiritual and energetic approaches to healing; individualism that focuses on personal responsibility while ignoring social determinants of health; and consumerism that treats healthcare as a commodity rather than a relationship.

## Institutional Inertia and Co-optation

Even when alternative approaches demonstrate effectiveness, they face challenges from institutional inertia that makes change difficult and co-optation that transforms innovative practices into conventional services. Healthcare institutions have developed complex systems for managing change in ways that preserve existing power structures while appearing to embrace innovation.

Co-optation operates through several mechanisms: adoption of alternative practices in ways that strip away their transformative potential; integration of alternative providers into conventional healthcare systems in subordinate roles; and marketing of "integrative" or "holistic" services that maintain conventional authority structures while appearing to embrace alternative approaches.

## Conclusion

This analysis has demonstrated the fundamental similarities between jails, schools, and hospitals as instruments of social control that operate through parallel mechanisms of surveillance, normalization, and bodily control. These institutions share a common logic that systematically strips individuals of agency while producing docile subjects who internalize institutional authority rather than developing authentic self-determination. The recognition of these shared mechanisms becomes particularly urgent when applied to contemporary healthcare, where the promise of healing has been increasingly subordinated to imperatives of social control, economic exploitation, and professional dominance. The military model of medicine that dominates contemporary healthcare systems perpetuates hierarchical power structures and mechanistic approaches to the human body that fundamentally contradict the relational, holistic nature of authentic healing processes.

However, this analysis also points toward hopeful possibilities for transformation through the development of healing spaces that transcend the coercive logic of institutional medicine while honoring the full complexity of human suffering and recovery. The innovative work of practitioners like Ungar-Sargon demonstrates that alternative approaches are not only possible but may be more effective than conventional medical practice for addressing the multidimensional nature of human suffering.

The principles identified throughout this analysis—radical hospitality, integration of multiple ways of knowing, emphasis on relationship rather than intervention, respect for individual autonomy, integration of community and environmental dimensions, and economic accessibility—provide guidance for creating healing spaces that operate according to fundamentally different values and priorities than existing institutional arrangements.

The development of such alternatives requires sustained commitment to both practical innovation and systemic change. Individual practitioners and communities can begin creating alternative healing spaces immediately while working for policy changes that support relationship-based care, economic models that prioritize healing over profit, and cultural transformations that honor diverse approaches to health and healing.

Ultimately, the creation of transformative healing spaces represents not merely a technical challenge but a spiritual and political imperative that calls us to reimagine how human communities can support the flourishing of all their members. The recognition that existing institutions operate as instruments of coercion rather than liberation creates both urgency and opportunity for developing alternatives that honor human dignity, agency, and the fundamental interconnectedness of all life.

The work of transformation begins with individuals and communities who are willing to experiment with new possibilities while maintaining hope that authentic healing is possible even within systems that seem designed to prevent it. Through such experiments, we can begin to create the healing spaces that our communities desperately need while contributing to broader movements for social transformation that address the systemic sources of suffering and illness.

The integration of deep listening, spiritual practice, and collaborative relationship into healing work is not merely a therapeutic technique but a form of resistance to institutional coercion that points toward more just and compassionate ways of organizing human communities. The development of such alternatives requires courage, creativity, and sustained commitment, but it also offers the possibility of contributing to healing not only for individuals but for the social and ecological systems that sustain all life.

## References


1. Goffman E. Asylums (1961). Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates. New York: Anchor Books.
2. Szasz TS (1961). The myth of mental illness: Foundations of a theory of personal conduct. New York: Harper & Row.
3. Foucault M (1975). Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison. New York: Vintage Books.
4. Foucault M (1963). The birth of the clinic: An archaeology of medical perception. New York: Pantheon Books.
5. Ungar-Sargon J (2024). Essays on healing: Toward a new paradigm for healthcare in the 21st century [Internet]. [cited 2025 May 23]. Available from: https://www.jyungar.com/essays-on-healing
6. Davis AY (2003). Are prisons obsolete? New York: Seven Stories Press.
7. Freire P (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
8. Bowles S, Gintis H (1976). Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life. New York: Basic Books.
9. Kozol J (1991). Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools. New York: Crown Publishers.
10. Illich I (1976). Medical nemesis: The expropriation of health. New York: Pantheon Books.
11. Scheper-Hughes N (1992). Death without weeping: The violence of everyday life in Brazil. Berkeley: University of California Press.
12. Buber M (1958). I and thou. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
13. Rogers CR (1961). On becoming a person: A therapist's view of psychotherapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
14. Gendlin ET (1978). Focusing. New York: Bantam Books.
15. Nouwen H (1975). Reaching out: The three movements of the spiritual life. New York: Doubleday.
16. Rothman DJ (1980). Conscience and convenience: The asylum and its alternatives in progressive America. Boston: Little, Brown.
17. Rothman DJ (1971). The discovery of the asylum: Social order and disorder in the new republic. Boston: Little, Brown.

18. Abbott A (1988). The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

**Cite this article:** Julian Ungar-Sargon. (2025) Beyond the Iron Cage: Institutional Coercion and the Imperative for Transformative Healing Spaces . Advance Medical & Clinical Research 6 (1): 108-116.