**Don Weitz**

**Recording #2**

[Q=interviewer; DW=Don Weitz]

DW: So first we subtitled it “The Outspoken Voice of Psychiatric Inmates.” So we started consciously using the word “inmates” and then we even had a prison issue which focused on a lot of the abuses going on in prisons, that was a great issue, I thought. That was our second issue. But the first one was, uh, we had the big picture of the phoenix bird, which Cathy McPherson found somewhere, I think. With the wings way outstretched and right on top of a smouldering, what looks like a smouldering fire.

Q: Yep.

DW: Going up, so, yeah, on every cover we decided to use, that actually became our logo.

Q: Yeah.

DW: And *The Outspoken Voice of Psychiatric Inmates*. And we kept that up, we kept using that for the first year and a half until the movement issue, first movement issue in which we started to talk about what different groups were doing in Canada and the U.S., that was in ‘81. And we changed the subtitle to *The Voice of the Psychiatrized*. Once again, Carla thought of the term “psychiatrized,” which I hadn’t used, I didn’t even know there was an English called that, that there was such a word. But she says, “Yes, there is” and of course she’s usually right, I won’t say always right, but–so that fit. And, um, first three issues, general issue, we talked, we had a special on boarding houses in Parkdale, which Pat Capponi wrote. She’s now, uh, a commissioner in on the advocacy commission. We had something on Valium, written by, um, Ruth Cooperstock, who was at that time a researcher at the addiction river research foundation. I mean, not all the articles are written by survivors, but we controlled the content.

Q: Right.

DW: Most of them were. So we did make exceptions in certain areas we weren’t too knowledgeable about. We weren’t, we would ask somebody whom we felt comfortable with and respected to write something—

Q: Right.

DW: —but we never, um, I have to say, we never published or would publish anything that a Canadian shrink said and the only American shrinks that ever got published in *Phoenix* were, uh, Peter Breggin and, um, an interview with Lee Coleman. So these are dissident psychiatrists who supported the movement objectives, uh, who were very supportive of human rights struggles so we made those exceptions, but outside of that we wouldn’t publish anything by a psychiatrist except maybe to quote something back to him.

But, so the first issue was general introduction, um, the second was the prisoner issue, the third was the special on shock, which is a great issue, I thought, and the fourth issue was, oh, was a women’s issue, our first women’s issue. So right away we thought we’d have theme issues where most of contents of the magazine would reflect some theme. That wasn’t always followed but most of the time it was, I’d say about two thirds of the time we had theme issues. And, and as you know, our last issue, in 1980, 1990, which you edited, was on gays and lesbians and I think was the most creative, I think. As a matter of fact, that was the first time that, that any magazine as far as I know had devoted, had focused on the psychiatric abuse of people as gays and lesbians. So, we did break ground there.

We were breaking ground. See, we decided with the magazine that we wanted to be very credible. That was very important. We wanted to be different. We could’ve started a newsletter and done it cheaper. We had, the only funding we got for the first year, uh, was a PLURA, a PLURA grant. That stands for Presbyterian, Lutheran, Unitarian, Roman Catholic and Anglican.

*[05:00 mins]*

Anyway, that was a, a multi-denominational church group that gave out seed money to, you know, for something that they felt, so, so that was good that PLURA gave us a $5400 grant. Well, didn’t take long for us to use that up. None of us got paid. So that money went to pay for the printing, for just basic office supplies, the paper and stuff. No one got paid, no one got paid actually for the first, we didn’t get any grant until the first grant four years later, 1984. Yeah. Anyway. So, I think our major objective was to publish, by publishing to help empower survivors like ourselves who hadn’t been published or couldn’t get published and that’s what we did.

We got, we reached out to the psychiatric wards, to the institutions, to prisons, to some extent. We got people sending us stuff from inside, we published poetry, we published a lot of letters. I think we could have done a better job in letters but we didn’t publish–I, I always felt that that was so important, to publish people’s letters, ‘cause they’re likely to be more personal and more revealing. We did what we could, but.

Q: When did this start to be a national—?

DW: Oh god, Irit, I don’t know.

Q: How did that happen?

DW: That’s another thing. See, amazing people heard about it, I mean it was mainly in Ontario first, of course, first of all. I would say near the end perhaps of the second year, by the second year, we had people writing, hearing about us from different provinces in Canada. Um, not a lot. And in the United States, some of the sister groups, like Network Against Psychiatric Assault, Judi’s group, Judi Chamberlin’s, in Boston, there was a group in New York, now they heard about us, they asked for subscriptions and they started to subscribe. I can’t, I’m a little bit hazy on the subscriptions. I didn’t handle the circulation of subscriptions, but I do know, our, our first, let’s see. We published 250 copies. I think we, our print run for the first issue was 250. That number keeps–250 for this issue. And then it seemed we exploded exponentially. Um I think it was word of mouth, we had no advertising policy.

Q: Mm-hm.

DW: We had actually, I think, not more than a hundred subscriptions after the first year. Which wasn’t bad.

Q: Quite a few more than that by the end, though, eh?

DW: By the end, by the time you were involved, you know, you can say quite a bit about it.

Q: I don’t remember numbers.

DW: We had up to 1200.

Q: Yeah.

DW: Yeah. But a fifth of those were free. So we had about 200, 250 free subscriptions.

Q: Which went to people in prison or in psychiatric institutions?

DW: Exactly. That was always the policy. That we would offer any prisoner or psychiatric inmate, anybody in a regular prison or psychiatric prison who wanted a subscription who wrote us could get one free.

Q: Right on.

DW: We always felt. So sure we lost money but we felt that wasn’t why we were doing this—

Q: Yeah.

DW: We didn’t feel that we were losing money.

Q: Yeah.

DW: We thought we were reaching out and doing good. And that that was the only right to do that, um, to let people, uh, to reach out to brothers and sisters and to help to give them a voice and I think, um, you know, it was just an empowering thing to do and I think I would still support that.

*[10:00 mins]*

To any magazine controlled by survivors or newsletter that is serious about networking and being a voice for people locked up and treated, or abused, is that you have to provide that free. Because most people couldn’t afford it anyway.

Q: Yeah.

DW: And our first, I think we charged a buck and half, that was our first, we actually got on the newsstands. We never charged more than a dollar. I think the first year was a dollar and a half and then we raised it the second year to $1.75. Gradually, very small increments. But then eventually we raised the price, the newsstand price if anyone wanted a single copy to two and a half dollars. For double issues, for example, we put out a special double issue on the charter of rights, how that affects, um, psychiatric survivors, we had a double issue on electroshock, in 1984, we had a double issue of course on gays and lesbians, that was our last issue. But, and, I think our cover price was four dollars, which we thought was quite justifiable at the end. But we didn’t want to, we didn’t want to make the price too steep because we wanted it to be very accessible. And it was.

Q: Yeah.

DW: The phoenix bird didn’t keep rising after ‘90 unfortunately because so many people burned out. No one was paid except for maybe part-time, like Maggie Tallman, whom we both know very well, haven’t heard from Maggie in about a year now, it’s about time I tried–she handled, as you know, our advertising, what it was, handled all the circulation and the books. She had business skills and she gave like yourself thousands of hours of time. We couldn’t pay. We only paid her, I think, once or twice. I was only paid once or twice. She worked so hard and managed to spread the word, kept track of all our subscriptions, helped with the grants. I can’t begin to tell you that she really helped keep *Phoenix* flying.

Q: Yeah.

DW: Like yourself. But she handled the business end and without her I think we could’ve folded much earlier.

Q: I think so too.

DW: Don’t you?

Q: Oh, absolutely. She held it together in a lot of ways.

DW: Amazing.

Q: Yeah.

DW: So we had two very powerful, at least two very powerful people in the collective [?], yourself and Maggie.

Q: What about you?

DW: Uhh, I was just, you know, my shit-disturbing—

Q: No, you were contributing, you know, half of each issue, you were doing lots and lots—

DW: Oh, no, no, no, well, I was trying to get others to write too—

Q: I know, well, they did but you were doing lots of important stuff.

DW: Yeah. I was doing some, I thought was very important stuff. I, I got very involved in the shock issue. I still am but not to the extent that I was, I get very emotional about it. Um, I had to write it, I did write about it, I got good support from Leonard Frank, Carla, another shock survivor, even though I’d never had electroshock I felt because of my experience with the insulin I could identify a lot with that type of brutality that people had to endure. I started to, uh, yes, so we had columns. We had a shock column called “Shockwaves” and that’s one other thing with the magazine that even though we never exceeded, I think our circulation was maybe up to 2000 at the most, people shared the magazine and the subscriptions never exceeded 1200, word was, that magazine somehow a lot of people heard about it.

Q: It was very well known.

DW: Yes. I just wish more people had subscribed because, but we never became totally self-sufficient, I mean they were using, profs were using our magazine, they were listing us in their references, for god’s sake, for articles, our stuff was very well researched.

[audio break]

Okay we had a letters section called “Write On,” we had profiles section, for the first two or three issues, we didn’t keep that up, about people, uh, like remember Kendra Russell, Steve Stapleton, survivors that had helped start groups in the west, Saskatchewan, Steve I hope he’s okay now, but he’s been through a hell of a lot of rough times in his life, but he was one of the few to speak out and he started a group called By Ourselves. So we did a profile piece about Steve. We did, we, Kendra Russell was interviewed by Connie Neil, another shock survivor, I’m glad to say is still around. But she got very active she was also part of the early, I think—

*[15:00 mins]*

Wait what am I talking about? Connie Neil was one of the original–that’s right. My gosh. She was one of the original collective, that’s right. Anyway, she did, she liked to, in–so. And, um, we had a section on drugs called “Phoenix Pharmacy,” we had one on shock, as I said, “Shockwaves,” we added one, like different sections, like sort of like topsy as we started to feel our way through the stuff that people wanted to get published in this and we got the letters and we said, listen, there’s so much on shock why don’t we do a section on shock, there’s so much legal stuff. Well, Carla looked after that to a great extent at first ‘cause she’s a lawyer now but she was a student lawyer at that time. And we started something called “Rights and Wrongs” where we talked about stuff that was happening in the courts and outside the courts that involved human rights and legal rights issues, like the mental health acts and how people were being screwed as they are still screwed today by the law and by lawyers and by the governments. And then we talked about victories, few as they were. But we always tried to, whenever we heard of a victory or some survivor who was in court or outside of court that started to fight, we always mentioned or we tried to keep on top of that, we tried to at least mention that or get the person himself or herself or the lawyer to talk, or to write about the victory. Um, Kathleen Ruff I remember did our first piece, it was excellent, on,on the WLG and the warrant of the lieutenant governor, because for a while she was co-host of this TV show called “Ombudsman.” And she was just great and she told us about how this guy had been locked up in a psychiatric institution for seventeen years. For stealing a purse. That was the case of Emerson Bonnar.

Q: Yeah.

DW: So she wrote about that. And, and, and I think that encouraged us to do more of that kind of stuff. She was not a psychiatric survivor herself, nevertheless she was an advocate for people who’d been discriminated against so we published her piece. We had books, book reviews called “The Bookworm Turns” and I don’t know how that happened, who, maybe Carla or somebody came up with that, I think somebody else came up with that term, but. And we had one on, “Mad News,” where we talked about the movement, stuff going on in the movement itself, we called it “Mad News.” We borrowed that phrase to some extent from the *Madness Network News*, the sister magazine, which actually inspired us, too because *Madness Network News* was the first in-your-face, anti-psychiatry, survivor-controlled magazine in North America.

Q: Yeah.

DW: Right?

Q: [inaudible]

DW: And it closed in 1986.

Q: What about *The Cuckoo’s Nest*?

DW: Shut down in ‘86–*The Cuckoo’s Nest* also. Okay, *The Cuckoo’s Nest* was a newsletter started here in Toronto mainly by Pat Capponi, I’m not sure, one or two others, I know Dave Litman (sp?), who still works at Park.

You know, *The Cuckoo’s Nest* was a, that started about the same time and I remember, yeah, mainly about people, by people in the west end, who had just come out of Queen Street mainly. Now, that was—

Q: And there was stuff about what was going on in Queen Street, too.

DW: In Queen Street.

Q: The death registry and stuff.

DW: Absolutely. Uh, the death, right, the people who had died, whether from drugs or some other. Pat, Pat Capponi did a very good thing and helped to start that and it was not as political as *Phoenix* but then it had a bit more modest, I think more modest, it had a narrower focus than the magazine.

Q: Mm-hm.

DW: But it did, uh, I think, uh, perform a very valuable service for other survivors in being free, was, I don’t think it cost anything. As I say it talked mainly about what was going on in the west end and Queen Street and stuff that needed to be talked about. I think they, I think *The Cuckoo’s Nest* also started to talk about drugs, they published stuff on that, they published stuff on—

Q: On boarding homes.

DW: —boarding homes. Housing was very big with them.

Q: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

DW: Yeah. I think they lasted for three or four years.

Q: ‘Kay.

DW: They, uh, put the spotlight where it should have been.

*[20:00 mins]*

On the abuses that survivors, about the discrimination against psychiatric survivors trying to find a decent place to live. And not having enough. The roaches, the lice. Unfortunately, still going on in some places, I’m sure here in Toronto but at that time, the massive violations, the massive building and fire violations in buildings where survivors were forced to stay when they came out of Queen Street. Now they were very, I think that was so, I think that that was a very important publication.

By the time I was involved with *Phoenix*, in 1980, I had pretty much decided that, or the early ‘80s anyway, that the psychiatric system cannot be justified on humanitarian grounds, that it was inherently inhumane and oppressive.

Q: Mm-hm.

DW: It couldn’t be salvaged. It couldn’t be saved as such, it’s not worth saving.

Q: Mm-hm.

DW: So. We’re open to alternatives.

Q: Yeah.

DW: Survivor-controlled alternatives. Pat–and that included getting rid, my agenda was getting rid of all the psychiatric institutions—

Q: Yes.

DW: Which unfortunately still exist, as we know.

Q: Right, right.

DW: So when you hear about one closed, it’s only for economic reasons, well that’s fine. But, I was against the psychiatrists, all of them, who perpetuate this abuse and oppression, and I was against all psychiatric institutions, which are largely controlled by psychiatrists.

Q: Right. And Pat didn’t feel the same way.

DW: No. Pat thought that yes, there were abuses, Pat and I agreed on this, if I can remember, yes, there are abuses, no doubt. Good to expose them. But she wasn’t, she didn’t want to get rid of the whole system. She didn’t see the system—and I haven’t talked with her in the last few years about this issue as such, so maybe she’s changed I don’t know—she didn’t see the system as inherently, well I have to use the word, evil.

Q: Right.

DW: I did.

Q: Right.

DW: And I still do.

Q: Yes. Were you involved in COPS and CAPO [?]? And can you tell me about those groups?

DW: Yes, I was involved with COPS. Oh, COPS was not survivor-controlled, Irit, that was a mixed bag. I had mixed feelings about it, I tell you. I was not naive by that time. Okay, that was ‘81, ‘80, okay, Carla was a member.

Q: Pat Black.

DW: People from ARCH, the Advocacy Research Centre for the Handicapped, Pat Black, from Friends and Advocates, which still exists as a, based on a partnership model, you know. Pat herself is not a survivor, as we know, but a very, pretty much an enlightened, warm, very human person who happened I think part of her background is social work—

Q: Yeah. She’s a strong ally of the movement, anyway.

DW: Strong ally, fine. So, this was going, okay that a coalition of sort of progressive mental health professionals—

Q: Didn’t it stand for Coalition on Psychiatric Services?

DW: It was called Coalition on Psychiatric Services, I hated that term, because of the term psychiatric, the word psychiatric. And the acronym is COPS, for god’s sake. Anyway. I didn’t like it, I told them that at first but I was just one, one voice, I was outvoted, which wasn’t the first time, won’t be the last. There was about eight or nine of us and we came together over the Alviani death, Aldo Alviani, we had a special issue,our third issue, our shock issue, we had a story on the death of 19-year-old Aldo Alviani, Carly got very involved in it, very knowledgeable about it. There was an inquest and all of us thought he was over-drugged, that his death was caused by deliberate over-drugging at Queen Street and we listed, we got a hold of all the drugs he got, which is enough to kill three or four horses, and we published it, namely Haldol. Haldol. Every fifteen minutes that guy got 15 mg of Haldol for a 24-hour period. God. He was never charged. Again. So there was the inquest. Surprise, surprise, a cover-up. This got some even, even, one or two in the *Star* of all places, got a little concerned about how it was that a 19-year-old died within two or three days of admission to Queen Street. Anyway, it was over the death and inquest some, about a year later, into the death of Aldo Alviani, that some of the progressive mental health professionals joined forces in the form of a coalition, which met about once every two or three weeks to protest, to try to monitor inquests, that was what they were gonna do. That was one of the things.

*[25:00 mins]*

To keep, to monitor the government’s mental health, uh, to monitor, um, yeah, abuses. To monitor. I wanted, I was pushing for more assertive speaking out against the government. Delays for funding for survivors, for example, their silence on abuses, their silence on the inherently biased process going on during coroner’s inquests into the deaths of psychiatric inmates where the doctors were rarely if ever reprimanded or censured. See, everybody got off. In the Alviani inquest, oh, it was a therapeutic misadventure, that, that was their phrase. In other words, a medical mistake. It was not a mistake and we all knew it. In the coalition. The coalition, yes, they did speak up, two or three other deaths, Penny Rosenbaum’s death, the Davis inquest, all of these are young people who died, 20 years old, 30 years old, 25 years old, over-drugged, every case.

I said, “Look, enough’s enough.” Why don’t we push for public investigation. That should be our mandate. Never mind monitoring bullshit. Yes, it goes so far. Let’s really flush it out. Let’s get a public investigation going. One still hasn’t been called, an independent public investigation into any institution here. Except the union, the travelling roadshow. John Marshall wrote a book about that but that was OPSU [?] mental health, uh, mental health nurses, psychiatric nurses-driven. That was not really independent, that was a union-controlled thing, the travelling roadshow, which was really a PR, uh, thing for the, uh, for OPSU [?], as you know.

Q: Yeah.

DW: We still haven’t had–so, “No, no, no Don, I don’t think we should do that, I think we would come over as intemperate or something.” I mean, come on. During this period, we had evidence of assault in the form of lack of informed consent. Carla and others wrote up this, you know, COPS organized and carried out, with the help of Houselink, the first public survey in Toronto of psychiatric survivors about informed consent.

Q: Uh-huh.

DW: They get a hold of over 200 psychiatric survivors and say, well tell us were you ever told this and this and this about psychiatric drugs? And a different section on shock, it was mainly, and surprise, surprise, most, 80 to 90 percent were not informed. This was in ‘81, the drugs were prescribed for them. Clear violation.

Q: Yeah.

DW: We had the ammunition. It’s still in the files at ARCH

Q: No one in the group wanted to fight.

DW: No. I said, well here we’ve got the ammunition. Let’s fight. Let’s go with it.

Q: They didn’t wanna do it.

DW: Just circulate it, just publish it, see they weren’t as political, they, I’m not taking it–okay, my criticism of COPS was that they didn’t want to get, they didn’t want to get as politically active as I thought they should. With the ammunition and knowledge they had, with the knowledge they had—

Q: Yeah, yeah.

DW: See, Irit?

Q: Yeah, I see.

DW: *Phoenix* was much more political—

Q: Yeah.

DW: —than COPS was.

Q: Yeah. ‘Course

DW: But don’t forget, if they wanted, we had Palmer on that coalition. We had some very high-profile people. Pat Black was quite well respected, she still is I imagine. Uh, somebody from ARCH, was it David Baker or somebody else, I can’t remember. No, there was Carla and somebody else from ARCH, I don’t know his name, I think David sort of subbed every so often. See I got a little pissed off at ARCH too at that time, even though it’s done some very good test cases for people with disabilities, that’s what it set out to, that’s what its mandate is, but I get a little pissed off with these so-called advo–with some of the advocates, they call themselves advocates, that word trying to carry a short stick or somehow lost their voice, and I said that’s not acceptable. But, hey. It was a very frustrating time for me for two years. I even co-chaired once with Pat and I was always, um, sort of the bad guy. Pat was the nice guy. I mean, the nice person.

*[30:00 mins]*

She was, uh, but Pat, uh, and I agreed about, you know, that we should keep getting the word but it was just a matter of tactics I think I mean I just want to be more assertive.

Anyway, COPS ended, sort of self-destructed if that’s the word. It stopped after about two or three years, no about three years. I got off after a year and a half because I got so frustrated with its timid tactics.

[audio break]

You know and after that COPS experience well, I have to tell you. I didn’t want to sit on the same committee as, or be in, be, I didn’t want to be in a committee with professionals, mental health professionals.

Q: Yeah.

DW: Uh, or where one was, or where half of them weren’t not survivors. I just couldn’t. I can’t feel that we’re doing anything because there’s too many compromises.

Q: Yeah.

DW: And I’m not willing to compromise and, certainly not about, well, I just, there were just too many compromises.

Q: Yeah.

DW: And.

Q: Yeah.

DW: *Phoenix Rising*, about its death.

Q: Yes.

DW: Very painful to have to stop publishing after ten years, as you know. Despite all the fantastic work you did, Maggie, Carla, there were a lot of people, over 25 people, put a big chunk of their lives into that magazine. But I am–okay, I learned a couple things. More than two lessons. One: that, um, we didn’t fundraise.

Q: [chuckle]

DW: We didn’t–Maggie, we did some of that, but we should have spent some money even though it would have been another sacrifice, just to get some money to help raise funds to keep us going.

Q: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

DW: Maggie was doing some and I was trying but we couldn’t, we were too spread out.

Q: Yeah.

DW: So she burned out, like the rest of us at different points.

Q: Yeah.

DW: So we had to have a fundraiser or somebody who’s good at that.

Q: Mm-hm.

DW: Now that needs money.

Q: Yeah.

DW: But we didn’t have it. But beg, borrow, or steal, you gotta have a fundraiser. Separate. That’s all the person does for your magazine.

Q: Okay.

DW: The other thing is that, um, we didn’t have an advertising policy. If we’d had an advertising policy, we would’ve gotten ads that we could’ve lived with. But we, Maggie was doing some of that and she’d always used to ask me, “Don, what’s the policy this time?” I said, “I don’t know. We have to discuss it first, among the others.” We never had one. Now every magazine, to my knowledge, generally has some advertising policy. But then again, you know, where are we going to advertise it, what can we accept, well we accepted so few ads. But we weren’t open as much as we could have been. So that might have helped with the magazine. But were so concerned, Irit, with not accepting, you know, we didn’t accept any ads from cigarette companies or anything or beer companies or from any capitalistic kinds of, so we did lose money that way. The other thing is that, um, I don’t, um, I don’t know, um, I guess that’s about–oh, and the other thing is that if I were getting involved with a magazine again, I would not have wanted to see [?] part of the group. We were part of On Our Own at first. I think by necessity because, look, On Our Own was our publisher.

Q: Mm-hm.

DW: But we had, because a lot of people in On Our Own it turned out after six or seven years resented the strong tones or what some of them called strident and very anti-psychiatry and I said, well, that’s too bad and we all said it because we’d all been there and we’d all been oppressed and some of our brothers and sisters in On Our Own felt that we were too much against the drugs, can you imagine that? These are the very who were, some of there were walking around like zombies.

Q: Yeah.

DW: Or didn’t want to admit that they were, had been oppressed or had been over-drugged. Well now that we were speaking out. So, now, a lot of them couldn’t accept our very assertive, our very anti-psychiatry stance. I remember many people would come to me or call me up at different hours and say, “Don, when are you gonna stop being so mad?” I said, “Probably when I’m dead.” I said, “I will always be mad at the, at, at people that oppress you and me in the name of treatment. I will always be.”

Q: Yeah.

DW: “And so, so I don’t have anything to apologize for and this magazine has nothing to apologize for because nobody’s doing what we’re doing.”

*[35:00 mins]*

And then the end of the conversation. And that would be brought up at board meetings. And when we split, I remember that split, that was a very painful split, as you know, Irit.

Q: Yes, I know.

DW: They, they forced us out—

Q: I know.

DW: —of the office. And I’ll tell you something, I, I only wish we had done it ourselves, made our own decisions but the point is that some of us felt that On Our Own was conferring some legitimacy on the magazine. But we had already—or helped us with our financial support—but we had already established our legitimacy so in a sense I wish we had broken or cut the umbilical cord much earlier. And my, I think any group I think when you start a magazine I think it should be very clear that when you’re talking about psychiatric survivors or some other group that’s been seriously oppressed, you are your own bosses, you do it totally independent. And yes, you have to get a fundraiser.

Q: Okay.

DW: But that’s all I wanted to say about, and the only other thing I think is that I think we made a big contribution to the movement, I think we helped to, a lot of survivors both in and out of the institutions feel like human beings, that they, that, I think that we helped to validate, we helped to, you know, helped to give that support, to people who needed it, and with its, um, and if there’s ever an anthology, so, people will see the kind of stuff that we had.

Q: Yeah.

DW: And, uh, by the way, people can still get back issues.

Q: I’ll make a note of that.

DW: [laughs] Anyway—

Q: Okay.

DW: —I think that’s about it. Unless you—

Q: Let me ask you a very general question: what do you think is happening with the movement right now?

DW: Oh, yes. I don’t know where it’s going, Irit. I keep hearing, well, there’s part of it in Europe, there’s something going, um, to tell you the truth, Irit, I don’t think I have a handle on it.

Q: Yeah. Do you think that, that—?

DW: There’s just too many splits.

Q: Yeah. So like in Canada, there’s kind of—?

DW: Oh, there’s this mental health network that you know more about than I do, but the very term mental health network has got me worried because I think they buy the medical model to a great extent.

Q: They do. They do.

DW: Well, I don’t. I never did. And I don’t think you do either but you certainly know how to speak and have spoken for yourself, I don’t have to say that. But as long as people buy the medical model and promote it and say there’s good drugs and there’s some bad drugs or try to justify psychiatric hospitals, I got nothing to say to them except that I don’t share their views, I have to say. And I think that’s a serious mistake. Um, I, um, I think that people in the movement who call themselves “consumers,” what they do is betray or reflect a very middle-of-the-road, uh, very soft position, which, and I won’t use the word being co-opted but many are–have been co-opted by government officials, co-opted by the so-called progressive wing of the mental health, of the psychiatric system—

Q: Yeah.

*[end of recording]*