

Sarah Gordon

Offering Sanctuary

Michal Heiman's New Community of Women

What does it take to work toward representational justice?

Sarah Lewis¹

Inscribed into the very idea of justice... is the necessity of spectators.

Sharon Stiwinski²

In 1855, a young woman with long hair and broad, plaintive eyes resided at the Surrey County Lunatic Asylum in London. The details of her admittance and diagnosis are lost to history, but her visage is captured in a photograph taken by Dr. Hugh Welch Diamond, Resident Medical Superintendent of the female department of the Surrey Asylum from 1848 to 1858. The woman wears an asylum-issued dress, sits with hands folded in her lap, and gazes directly at the photographer². Twenty-five years after this anonymous young woman was photographed by Dr. Diamond, on January 20, 1880, Maria Dominica D'Alberto entered the San Servolo Asylum in Venice. D'Alberto, a widowed mother of two, was diagnosed with pellagra, a vitamin deficiency common among Italian peasants of this era, and described by doctors as melancholic and perhaps even suicidal. Though D'Alberto died in May 1890, after a lengthy hospitalization, her countenance survives in an 1880 photograph taken by Oreste Bertani, a photographer hired to document the asylum. D'Alberto sits with her hands folded in her lap, her head wrapped in a shawl, and her gaze directed downward².

The two photographs, having remained in virtual anonymity for more than a century, have recently been brought to light by Tel Aviv-based artist Michal Heiman through a remarkable personal and artistic journey. In 2012, while undertaking research for a previous project, Heiman encountered the Diamond photograph of the anonymous woman in historian Sander L. Gilman's 1976 book, *The Face of Madness: Hugh W. Diamond and the Origin of Psychiatric Photography*.³ In it, Heiman recognized a younger version of herself. It was like looking in a mirror warped by time: her very own hands on her lap, occupying the Surrey County Asylum 157 years earlier. Referring to the picture as "Plate 34," based on its place in Gilman's book, Heiman began examining her connection to the photograph through her artistic process, researching nineteenth-century asylums, and exploring their archives. In 2017, part of her project was exhibited at the Herzliya Museum of Contemporary Art under the title "AP—Artist Proof, Asylum (The Dress, 1855-2017)" and curated by Aya Lurie.⁴ Five years after recognizing herself in Plate 34, Heiman visited the San Servolo Asylum. While viewing its collection of more than 13,000 photographic plates documenting the institution and its residents, Heiman encountered her own gaze in that of Maria Dominica D'Alberto.

Inspired by these moments of recognition, Heiman has created a new project, “Radical Link: A New Community of Women, 1855-2020.” She revisits the Surrey County and San Servolo asylums, bringing along a group of fellow travelers, and explores various strategies for re-entry into these asylums; she engages several subjects to perform the role of asylum guards and speaks directly to visitors of her exhibition in order to elicit their participation. In doing so, she produces her most generous and radical work to date, offering sanctuary to both the women photographed by Diamond and Bertani and the individuals whom Heiman herself photographs, films, and engages in the museum’s gallery.

Heiman’s work has always been both political and personal. Echoing the 1960s, second-wave feminist rallying cry, “the personal is political,” Heiman has explored the “right of return,” deeply charged in the Israeli-Palestinian context, through her own return to herself and a critical examination of psychoanalytic theory and practice.⁵ She has spent decades examining her own life through psychoanalysis and importing diagnostic and psychoanalytic methods into her artistic endeavors. Her projects that have addressed these issues include: the *Michal Heiman Tests (M.H.Ts) 1-4* (1997-2012), modeled after the Thematic Aperception Test (TAT); *Attacks on Linking* (2007-08), referring to British psychoanalyst Wilfred R. Bion’s theory; and *What’s on your Mind* (2003), echoing the most basic psychoanalytic inquiry.⁶ Heiman often brings her own image and psyche into her work, as she does, for example, in her self-portraits dating back to 1978 and her series *I Was There* (2001-05). In *I Was There*, Heiman inserted her own face and body into photographs of and by other female artists, in order to experiment with becoming the photographic subject.

Heiman’s encounters with Plate 34 and Maria Dominica D’Alberto go a step further, however, merging her own identity with the individuals in the photographs. As Heiman states: “When I look at the photograph, there is no doubt that it’s me.”⁷ She describes her experience as having fallen through a mirror to London of 1855, and then again to Venice of 1880. This dissociative free fall through time forms the basis of her current project. Though Heiman recognizes the impossibility of it, she simultaneously insists on its truth. She feels compelled to examine the implications of this repeated return, the slippage in time and space.

Driven by her self-identification with Plate 34 and Maria Dominica D’Alberto, Heiman has made what seems an unlikely move: returning to the nineteenth-century asylum. Such bold time travel is not unprecedented in Heiman’s oeuvre. In her *I Was There* series, the act of inserting her portrait into earlier works of art permitted Heiman to enter what literature professor Michal Ben-Naftali describes as “the coexistence of multiple consciousnesses that are joined together beyond time.”⁸ In other words, Heiman projected her own lived experience onto that of another time and place. In “Radical Link,” Heiman continues and expands this project, engaging in acts of great effort, resilience, and care. To fully comprehend “Radical Link,” one must begin with the nineteenth-century mental asylum. When the Surrey Asylum (now the Springfield University Hospital) opened in 1841, the

treatment of insanity was shifting from the use of severe physical restraint—patients shackled and treated as prisoners—to a new method of “moral management” that encouraged humane treatment, reliance on scientific principles, and understanding of the asylum as a refuge.⁹ Indeed, in public asylums such as Surrey County, material conditions were sometimes considered to offer improvements over the home lives of their impoverished patients.¹⁰ However, the lofty goals of humanity and refuge were hampered by insufficient scientific knowledge, and many recent scholars have described the nineteenth-century asylum as a repressive regime of social control and class domination.¹¹

In her seminal book, *The Female Malady* (1985), feminist literary critic Elaine Showalter wrote that in the shift from punishment to care, “paternal surveillance and religious ideals replaced physical coercion, fear, and force;” and mental illness or “madness” was managed through the tightly controlled arrangement of space, activities, and routines.¹² Patients were commonly committed involuntarily by relatives and, because they were institutionalized against their will, regularly attempted escape and suicide. Though restraints were used more sparingly than in previous decades, partial straitjackets, mittens, bed straps, and force-feeding were not uncommon, in addition to the regulation of movement and isolation.¹³ Legal and human rights scholar Orna Ben-Naftali—whose essay is included in this volume and who has been photographed by Heiman for “Radical Link”²—writes that, “the modern asylum remained a juridical space of incarceration where people, under horrible conditions, were judged (categorized; supervised; diagnosed) and... exiled from their life and stripped of their humanity.”¹⁴ Historian Sharrona Pearl and Showalter argue that the systems of surveillance and “moral treatment” were just as powerful, and perhaps even more absolute forms of restraint and domination than the shackles that predated them.¹⁵

At the same time, as Showalter argues, over the course of the nineteenth century, the gender that symbolized insanity has shifted from male to female, so much so that Showalter can describe madness in the nineteenth century (and even until the 1970s) as the “female malady.” By 1850, more women than men resided in public asylums, surgical clinics, water-cure establishments, and rest-cure homes, while the asylum caretakers and supervisors became increasingly male. As Showalter writes, the rise of the Victorian madwoman was a self-fulfilling prophecy, born of a society that treated women as “childlike, irrational, and sexually unstable... legally powerless and economically marginal.”¹⁶

Significantly, the camera became a tool of asylum surveillance and, as Showalter demonstrates, photography was “part of the fundamental cultural framework in which ideas about femininity and insanity were constructed.”¹⁷ Dr. Diamond, known today as the “father of psychiatric photography,” began photographing the approximately 500 women under his supervision in 1852.¹⁸ He believed that these photographs would serve as clerical records, taxonomic documents of the women’s states of “internal derangement,” and effective tools for treatment.¹⁹ Considering their status as patients in a public asylum, the women

photographed were likely not asked for consent nor given the opportunity to refuse.²⁰ Yet, when Heiman looks at Diamond's photograph in Plate 34, she writes, "in the photographs, she objects—she refuses." In Plate 34 and in images of other Diamond patients, Heiman sees a self-expression that denies the camera and the institution and their attempts to dehumanize and categorize the asylum-bound women.

This objection to the constraints of institutional control is the original spark behind Heiman's project.²¹ Her second inspiration is the dress worn by the asylum residents. In the Surrey County photographs, as in most of Diamond's asylum pictures, the female sitters wear a checkered dress; in some cases, they are also covered with a shawl and/or a bonnet²². These pieces of clothing are crucial to the photographs: often, improvements in a patient's medical health were determined and described through changes in clothing, hands, and hair.²² John Conolly, the asylum doctor who introduced and popularized the principle of non-restraint in British asylums and published commentary on Diamond's photographs, wrote that "dress is women's weakness, and in the treatment of lunacy it should be an instrument of control, and therefore recovery."²³ This reveals the insistence on control and domination that persisted beyond the use of physical restraints, and the significant role that clothing played in this effort. Thus, the dress was the first element of identity Heiman re-created in order to return to the asylum—to break down the barriers of time and place separating her from this previous self.

Heiman began her "Radical Link" project by producing her own version of the checkered dress, the identifying article of clothing for women in the Surrey County Asylum. She photographed and filmed around 150 individuals, including herself, in the same dress: family members, human rights activists and attorneys, migrant workers, writers, professors of law and history, asylum seekers, Knesset members, psychoanalysts, an Israeli ambassador to the United Nations, doctors, security guards, poets, and curators. These individuals—mostly women but with about 30 men and some identifying as gender fluid—hail from Israel-Palestine, the Philippines, Sudan, Colombia, India, Russia, Eritrea, England, and the Netherlands. In their portraits, shot in a rented studio in Tel Aviv, subjects sit on a chair before a nondescript background. Most of them wear the dress but some do not; many have bare feet; some gaze at the photographer, others look sideways or down; their expressions range from bored to startled, concerned to careless; one smokes a cigarette, another holds a child, still another burns a book of matches; several cover their faces with masks of other faces scanned from works of art or historical photographs; some sleep. The sheer volume of images and amount of variation within a tightly controlled setting is astonishing.

Heiman aims to bring these subjects with her as she re-enters the nineteenth-century asylum, activating the medium of photography and the methods of psychoanalysis to return to another era and site of trauma.²⁴ Her strategies for entering the asylum include filming videos;

photographing people in dormant states; enlisting transitional objects, wigs, costumes, and props; and speaking in different languages—elements that relate to psychoanalysis and can be expressed through film and photography.²⁵ These methods allow the individuals in Heiman's photographs to slip past the guards at the doors of the asylum, who are viewed by Heiman as obstacles to be overcome, much like the gatekeepers in Franz Kafka's parable, *Before the Law*.

Heiman also photographs subjects intended to serve as her own guards while she and her companions infiltrate the nineteenth-century asylum. "Infiltrate" has a particular and charged meaning in the Israeli-Palestinian context: the term has been used to describe Palestinians crossing into Israel during early years of statehood.²⁶ Heiman insists on using this term, to emphasize the political necessity of her work and indicate the risks that can accompany a return to one's origin, to one's self. In order to facilitate possible entry into the asylum, Heiman and her community require their own guards. Among her many subjects, Heiman photographed a man named Leonid Pekarovsky, who was an art curator in his native Moscow and who, upon immigrating to Israel in 1991, took such jobs as digging graves and guarding parking lots to support himself²⁷. While maintaining these jobs, he has risen to prominence as a writer. Heiman also photographed Nouredin Musa, a Sudanese immigrant fluent in six languages, who never technically received refugee status in Israel²⁸. In his home country, Musa refused to join the military and fight in the civil war; he was a conscientious objector, an individual who, like the subject of Plate 34, objected to the oppressive demands of the state. After living in Israel for six years, in 2014 Musa was interned at Holot, a detention center for asylum seekers, and held there for 19 months before returning to Tel Aviv and later obtaining a visa to Canada. At Holot, Musa once again resisted institutional injustice by teaching his fellow inmates and photographing around the detention center.²⁷

While Heiman had photographed Musa in the asylum dress, she also captured him in street clothes, and she photographed Pekarovsky in a guard's uniform. In the exhibition space, their photographs hang at each of the gallery entrances. They are men who blur the bounds of gender binaries and, rather than blocking women from exiting the asylum, enable the entrance of Heiman and her twenty-first century community. As Ben-Naftali describes Heiman's use of guards: "In thus expropriating the power of the officially designated security authorities to determine, to manage, to profile, and to discard, she is engaged in an act of resistance. Here, too, she changes the power dynamics."²⁸

In addition to photographing individuals with whom she chose to re-enter the asylum, Heiman physically traveled to London and Venice, both to research the history of their asylums and to make films. In 2016, her daughter Emily accompanied Heiman to London. Heiman photographed Emily wearing the asylum dress and, in some shots, a shawl over her shoulders and a wreath of laurel atop her head. In London, Emily traveled on the Underground and

walked the city streets en route to the former Surrey County Asylum, now Springfield University Hospital.²⁹ In the film, *Plate 34 Line, London*, 2016², Emily appears near the age of the woman in Plate 34 and a younger incarnation of her mother. Emily is shown entering the subway platform through a door labeled “No Entry,” sitting and standing on the train, and sleeping as she leans against a pole. When she emerges from the Underground, she walks to the Springfield University Hospital, passing trees and hedges to the sound of chirping birds until she arrives before the imposing red brick building, with “1840” inlaid in white brick across its facade. A man exits from the door of the hospital—a young Nouredin Musa?—and allows Emily to enter. Then an older man exits—an older Nouredin Musa?—and keeps watch until the film ends. On the same visit to London, Heiman made the film *Double Check*, 2016², which detailed a guided tour of the interior and grounds of the Springfield University Hospital and concluded with a visit to the “artefacts room,” containing aged equipment and old photographs. The film ends with stills of these objects; page spreads from Gilman’s books, including Plate 34; and an architectural plan of the Middlesex County Lunatic Asylum.

In May of 2017, Heiman traveled to Venice. She brought with her the checkered dress and three masks of other women’s faces—Diamond’s Plate 34, a photograph of Israeli artist Aviva Uri, and photographer Diane Arbus’ 1967 *Woman with Eyeliner*. Heiman traveled the alleys and crossed the bridges of Venice on her way to San Servolo, photographed and filmed by photographer and healthcare professional Meir Rakocz along the way.³⁰ She revisited Venice two years later, in May of 2019, with Emily. This time, Emily traveled by gondola and vaporetto to San Servolo, wearing the asylum dress and sometimes masks of other women’s faces². During her visits to Venice, Heiman also obtained records and images from the vast San Servolo Asylum archives, some of which are featured in “Radical Link.” The photographs of women at San Servolo, stored in binders alongside those of the male patients and organized systematically by date, display a level of control and discomfort far beyond those of Surrey County. In some images, like that of D’Alberto, the women sit solemnly, draped in scarves. In others, their faces and bodies exhibit signs of illness and are often bound by straitjackets and shackles, their heads forcibly held still by attendants, sometimes resulting in grimacing and blurring of the picture. Some patients challenge gender lines with a nonconforming quality echoed in Heiman’s photographs of male figures wearing the checkered dress. Nearly all of Bertani’s female subjects display the sorrow, fear, or shame of affliction and oppression.

Heiman’s final effort to enter the asylum entails her interaction with museum visitors. During the exhibition, clad in asylum dress, she sits at a table and speaks in a direct and intimate manner with visitors². Within the demarcated space that surrounds the artist and her visitors are archival folders containing scans of faces of deceased individuals and female artists Heiman would like to join her on her journey to the asylum. These include artist Frida Kahlo and Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine member Leila Khaled².³¹ They are the same

masks that have, at times, been held by the sitters in Heiman's portraits and films, and by Heiman herself in a manner that merges the subject's body with the mask's face. Also occupying the artist's space in the gallery is a vertical mirror in which she can glimpse both Plate 34, hanging across the gallery, and her own reflection as she speaks with visitors. This is a crucial and intensely personal element of the exhibition. The mirror, the tool of self-recognition and sometimes distortion, has long been an object of reassurance for the artist herself, allowing her to reassert her sense of self and extend the space around her, even when faced with a traumatic event.³²

The intersubjectivity that Heiman enacts in "Radical Link" is required not only for the encounter between a photographer and her subjects but also for that between a therapist and a client. By recreating such an interaction in the gallery space, Heiman merges the therapeutic and photographic with the exhibition space, and draws out her visitors' subjectivity and humanity, including them in the community she creates. Psychoanalyst Danielle Knafo writes of Heiman's offer to speak intimately with her visitors that Heiman "becomes the artist/analyst who provides the structure in which to reexperience their trauma in order to help them work through the effects of that trauma."³³ As Heiman has stated in regard to her engagement with the Surrey County Asylum photographs, "Every union between two or more subjects generates a radical linking."³⁴ This radical link is at the heart of Heiman's project.

Heiman's photographic time travel, determination to enter the space of a nineteenth-century photograph, and implicit request that participants practice a slight suspension of disbelief, are essential to her work. These concerns are closely related to the theoretical arguments of several scholars, two of whom have written about Heiman's work: noted photography and civil rights scholar Ariella Azoulay, visual culture and political theorist Sharon Sliwinski (whose essay is featured in this volume), and art historian Sarah Lewis. Azoulay, a close colleague of Heiman, whose work has been influenced by the artist and whose portrait is included in "Radical Link," urges individuals to "watch" photographs rather than simply look at them, reinscribing the dimension of time and movement into still images. She insists that, contrary to Roland Barthes' "was there" theory of photographs, the pictured individuals remain present: "The event of photography is never over. It can only be suspended, caught in the anticipation of the next encounter that will allow for its actualization..."³⁵ Sliwinski and Lewis also emphasize this possibility of truly entering photographs, even those from earlier periods. Sliwinski, in her essay in this volume, encourages spectators to see photographs as gateways to imaginary worlds and to enter them. Heiman, she writes, stumbles into the Surrey County photograph like Alice going through the looking-glass.³⁶ Lewis echoes Sliwinski's sentiments, arguing that spectators must move beyond merely seeing to hold a penetrating gaze on photographs, and she allows us to take this penetration, this entry into the picture, in a literal sense.³⁷

All three scholars argue for the crucial role of photography in the recognition and restoration of citizenship, justice, and human rights. This extends to anyone who is experiencing, in Azoulay's terms, "impaired civic status," including victims and survivors of trauma. By entering into photographs of trauma or violence, spectators can perform their civic duty toward the individuals pictured. The circulation of images of trauma allows a community of individuals to connect their aesthetic experience of the photograph to their moral judgment and ethical practice. As Sliwinski writes, "Our shared ideas about the constitution of the human subject leans on aesthetic encounters... the idea of justice... must be *seen* to be done."³⁸ Moving beyond Susan Sontag's influential argument that viewers become immune to the flood of violence experienced in photographs, these scholars maintain the radical hope that photographs of trauma can transform communities and create a positive regard for the dignity and rights of distant strangers, whether distanced by space or time.³⁹

Heiman enacts this kind of entry into photographs. She recognizes herself in the hands of the woman in Plate 34 and in Maria Dominica D'Alberto's gaze; photographs herself in the asylum dress; transports a community of contemporaries to the spaces she seeks to enter through her photographs; physically travels to the Surrey County and San Servolo asylums and engages with museum visitors who come to see her work. In undertaking her journey, she creates a community of citizens who can recognize the rights of the nineteenth-century asylum patients, as well as their own human rights and those of individuals around them. This community offers care, comfort, and a different kind of asylum, one that aligns more closely with ideas of sanctuary than political or mental asylum.

Though asylum and sanctuary are closely related concepts, their distinctions are important in an analysis of Heiman's project. Anthropologist Linda Rabben explains that asylum, a category of international law, distinguishes asylum seekers from refugees, immigrants, and undocumented migrants; it can be used to discriminate as well as to welcome. Asylum is often "provisional, temporary, and grudging, hedged by rules and restrictions." Sanctuary, on the other hand, is morally based and often takes place outside the law. Offering sanctuary is an act of generosity and compassion closely related to mercy. "Even when asylum is granted," Rabben writes, "sanctuary is not easy to obtain." It is what private citizens are moved to provide when governments and other institutions limit the availability of asylum.⁴⁰

The idea of asylum, both in the mental and political sense, is crucial to "Radical Link." It is clear from Heiman's pictures and her method that she is engaged with issues of mental asylum, psychoanalysis, and diagnosis. Equally vital is her engagement with political asylum. Among the array of portraits featured in the exhibition, the individuals returning with her to the mental asylum and forming a time-traveling community are refugees and asylum seekers. In addition to Sudanese refugee Nouredin Musa and Russian immigrant Leonid Pekarovsky, Heiman photographed Asmait Yohannes, an asylum-seeker from Eritrea, and her husband Simon

Kidane². She has also photographed foreign workers, Christian and Muslim Palestinians, and leaders and members of marginalized communities in Israel.

In 2019, in Israel and in the United States, political asylum is losing ground to tightening borders. Those who seek asylum are refused, detained, and deported. In Israel, asylum-seekers from Sudan and Eritrea are denied access to the refugee status determination process and at times indefinitely detained; for several months in 2018, they were deported in overwhelming numbers.⁴¹ In the United States, Central American asylum-seekers are pushed back at the United States/Mexico border, parents are separated from their children, and asylum-seekers face increasingly harsh, arbitrary, and indefinite detentions. Asylum-seekers are both treated like and regularly referred to as criminals.⁴²

Notably, in Israel, the United States, and across the globe, when governments fail to grant asylum, women bear the brunt of the detentions and tend to take the lead in offering sanctuary to refugees and political asylum-seekers. Studies in Britain have shown that women, LGBTQ people, children, and torture victims endure great difficulties in detention facilities; women wait longer for decisions on their cases, in part due to the refusal of governments to recognize sexual aggression as grounds for asylum; women also more often receive an incorrect initial decision on their claim.⁴³ In 2018, the United States Attorney General attempted to deny asylum consideration to women fleeing domestic violence. Furthermore, researchers have shown that the trauma experienced by women fleeing their home countries may be exacerbated in American detention centers and even after these women are released from detention.⁴⁴

Heiman's work reminds us that women in the receiving countries are often the ones who step in to provide sanctuary. In Israel, women have played a prominent role in representing Palestinian rights. Foremost among these was Felicia Langer, attorney and human rights activist who advocated powerfully for women, refugees, and Palestinians. Though Langer had moved to Germany by the time Heiman began "Radical Link" and passed away in 2018, Heiman insists that her spirit resides in the project, and she photographed one of Langer's successors, Lea Tsemel, at age 74². Tsemel, having represented Palestinian suicide bombers, among other clients, and participated in the Russell Tribunal for Palestine, carries the torch of legal advocacy.⁴⁵ In the sanctuary movement along the southwest border of the United States in the 1980s, women outnumbered men by about two-thirds, with a large contingent of women working from within the church. These women organized sanctuary provisions, participated in advocacy and outreach, traveled to Central America, and deployed the language of liberation theology upon their return.⁴⁶ Similarly, women were prominent activists and caregivers in the mid-1990s Sans Papiers movement in France, staging sit-ins and strikes; and in faith-based sanctuary movements in Canada in the 1990s and 2000s, during which women often cared for individuals in sanctuary, while men handled publicity and the media.⁴⁷ Women are taking leadership roles in the current global refugee crisis as well. While studies on this topic are

surely to come, German ship captain Carola Rackete serves as one notable example. Rackete was arrested in 2019 for breaking an Italian naval blockade in order to deliver to the island of Lampedusa 42 migrants and refugees she had rescued off the coast of Libya.

In “Radical Link,” Heiman and her community of female artists, doctors, migrants, scholars, writers, thinkers—women of great intellect and ingenuity—and gender fluid individuals cross spatial and temporal borders, traveling through photographs back in time, in order to infiltrate the nineteenth-century asylum. As Ben-Naftali writes of Heiman, “She invites us to imagine a world where more people would resist—and, traversing time and space, would have resisted—the turning of history itself into a mental case.”⁴⁸ Heiman invites her community of viewers to do the same and, beyond that, to consider others in our own time and place who deserve to be seen, heard, and offered sanctuary. Like making art and affecting change, this endeavor is not easy. As legal scholar and sanctuary provider Judith McDaniel states, “Sanctuary is about living dangerously. Sanctuary is about taking risks beyond the ordinary... risks of the heart.”⁴⁹

Sarah Gordon is Curator at the DC Commission on the Arts and Humanities in Washington, DC. She is the author of *Indecent Exposures: Eadweard Muybridge’s Animal Locomotion Nudes* (2015).

1 Sarah Lewis, “Vision & Justice,” *Aperture* 223 (Summer 2016), 13.

2 Sharon Sliwinski, *Human Rights in Camera* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2011), 4.

3 Sander L. Gilman, ed., *The Face of Madness: Hugh W. Diamond and the Origin of Psychiatric Photography* (New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1976).

4 See Aya Lurie, “Michal Heiman: AP—Artist Proof, *Asylum* (The Dress, 1855-2017),” In *Her Footsteps* (Herzliya: Herzliya Museum of Art, 2016), 47-49.

5 The origin of the phrase “the personal is political” is debated. Though it served as the title of a 1970 essay by Carol Hanisch, she denies originating it, and a variety of other sources have been cited. Nonetheless, it was quickly adopted and used by second-wave feminists in the context of consciousness-raising as political action. Though this use does not perfectly align with Heiman’s practice, it is a closely related concept.

6 *Attacks on Linking* was exhibited in 2008 at the Helena Rubenstein Pavilion for Contemporary Art, Tel Aviv Museum of Art, Tel Aviv, curated by Mordechai Omer.

7 Correspondence with author, 2019.

8 Michal Ben-Naftali, “I Am Not Here: On Michal Heiman’s Radical Realism,” *Michal Heiman: Attacks on Linking* (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv Museum of Art, 2008), 175. Ben-Naftali also refers to the “distinctive sort of anachronism” in Heiman’s work (180). Heiman used the same method in an animation series, *Thirdly*, 2008.

9 This period predates our current use of medications, sometimes regarded as chemical restraints. On this transition, see Carla Yanni, *The Architecture of Madness: Insane Asylums in the United States* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007), 3; Sharrona Pearl, “Through a Mediated Mirror: The Photographic Physiognomy of Dr. Hugh Welch Diamond,” *History of Photography* 33:3, 293; Nancy Tomes, *A Generous Confidence: Thomas Story Kirkbridge and the Art of Asylum-Keeping, 1840-1883* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 4. At St. Servolo, evidence exists of containment handcuffs, ankle bands, and strait tubs with covers for compulsory hours-long baths (Michal Heiman, “I Encountered My Gaze in Venice, 1880-2019,” unpublished manuscript, 2018).

10 See Tomes, *A Generous Confidence*, 8; Adrienne Burrows and Iwan Schumacher, *Portraits of the Insane: The Case of Dr. Diamond* (London: Quartet Books, 1990); Elaine Showalter, *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1830-1980* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985), 27.

11 Tomes, *A Generous Confidence*, 8-12.

12 Showalter, *The Female Malady*, 8, 18.

13 Tomes, *A Generous Confidence*, 112, 185-207. Tomes’ work focuses on the work of Dr. Thomas Story Kirkbride in the United States, but these details are applicable to the English asylum as well.

- 14 Orna Ben-Naftali, "The Asylum and Its Discontents: On an Exceptional Leave to Remain," in this volume, 146.
- 15 Showalter, *The Female Malady*, 49.
- 16 Showalter, *The Female Malady*, 51-73 (quotation is on page 73).
- 17 Showalter, *The Female Malady*, 5. See also: Pearl, "Through a Mediated Mirror," 300. Heiman critiques Showalter's analysis of Diamond's photographs in her essay "Attacks on 'Return'—A Proposal for a New Community of Women (Asylum 1855-2017)," 6. Delivered as a lecture at the Städelschule, Frankfurt, Germany, October 18, 2018.
- 18 On Diamond's moniker, see Gilman, *The Face of Madness*, 5. This was prior to the similar project by Jean-Martin Charcot and Albert Londe, who photographed patients at Paris's Salpêtrière, and the medical portraits taken at the Holloway Sanatorium in Surrey, both in the 1880s. On these projects, see Georges Didi-Huberman, *Invention of Hysteria: Charcot and the Photographic Iconography of the Salpêtrière* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2003); and Susan Sidlauskas, "Inventing the medical portrait: photography at the 'Benevolent Asylum' of Holloway, ca. 1885-1889," *Journal of Medical Humanities* 39 (2013), 29-37.
- 19 Laurie Dahlberg, "Dr. Diamond's Day Off," *History of Photography* 39:1, 9; Sander L. Gilman, *Seeing the Insane* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1982), 164-66. On the entwined discourses and development of photography and medicine during the second half of the nineteenth century in the United States, see Tanya Sheehan, *Doctored: The Medicine of Photography in Nineteenth-Century America* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2011).
- 20 Gilman, *Seeing the Insane*, 166.
- 21 Michal Heiman, "Attacks on 'Return'." This aligns somewhat with Burrows and Schumacher's argument that the Diamond photographs demonstrate a shared interest and joint participation between photographer and sitter, that the pictures "allowed patients an unprecedented freedom of expression." (Burrows and Schumacher, *Portraits of the Insane*, 45-48.)
- 22 See Pearl, *Through a Mediated Mirror*.
- 23 Pearl, *Through a Mediated Mirror*, 296.
- 24 See Heiman's 2018 description of the project in her essay, "A New Community of Women 1855-2019," *Humanity: An International Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and Development*, 9:3 (Winter 2018), 451-457.
- 25 Heiman, "Attacks on 'Return'," 6.
- 26 Nadera Shalhoub-Kevorkian argues that women were uniquely impacted by the criminalization of returning Palestinian refugees. "Infiltrated Intimacies: The Case of Palestinian Returnees," *Feminist Studies* 42:1, *Everyday Militarism* (2016), 166-193.
- 27 Heiman curated an exhibition of Musa's photographs in Tel Aviv in 2014, titled *Waiting* and produced with Diana Dallal at *Parasite*. Ben-Naftali details Musa's life in, "The Asylum and its Discontents," included in this volume.
- 28 Ben-Naftali, "The Asylum and its Discontents," 149.
- 29 Sliwinski, in her essay in this volume, notes that Emily evokes the figure of the model Elizabeth Siddal, who posed for the figure of Ophelia for Pre-Raphaelite painter John Everett Millais (1851-52).
- 30 For other photography projects in and around the San Servolo/San Clemente Asylum, see: Raymond Depardon, *San Clemente* (Paris: Diffusion Weber, 1984); and the exhibition, *Back to Light. Faces reflecting the Past at San Servolo Insane Asylum*, 2017.
- 31 Leila Khaled was involved in the 1969 TWA Flight 840 hijacking and the 1970 Dawson's Field hijackings. She is included in other works by Heiman.
- 32 On the significance of the mirror to Heiman and her work, see the preface to this volume and Danielle Knafo, "Creative and Clinical Transformations of Trauma: Private Pain in the Public Domain" *Israel Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 2003, 1 (4): 535.
- 33 Knafo, "Creative and Clinical Transformations," 538.
- 34 Michal Heiman, "Attacks on Linking," *Michal Heiman: Attacks on Linking* (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv Museum of Art, 2008), 4.
- 35 Ariella Azoulay, *The Civil Contract of Photography* (New York: Zone Books, 2008), 14-16; and Ariella Azoulay, *Civil Imagination: A Political Ontology of Photography* (New York: Verso, 2012), 25.
- 36 Sharon Sliwinski, "The Woman Who Walks Through Photographs," in this volume, 81-82, 88.
- 37 Lewis, "Vision and Justice," 11. In a related way Tina M. Campt, scholar of Africana and women's studies, proposes listening to photographs. In doing so, she identifies elements of refusal and resistance in pictures of black diasporic subjects. Tina M. Campt, *Listening to Images* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017).
- 38 Sliwinski, *Human Rights*, 5.
- 39 Azoulay, *The Civil Contract of Photography*, 14-17; Sliwinski, *Human Rights in Camera*, 5, 10; Sarah Lewis, "Vision & Justice," 11. See Susan Sontag, *Regarding the Pain of Others* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2003). On radical hope, see Rebecca Solnit, *Hope in the Dark: Untold Histories, Wild Possibilities* (Chicago:

Haymarket Books, 2016). In her formulation, hope does not equate optimism or pessimism, but a commitment to act in an uncertain world.

40 Linda Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum: A Social and Political History* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2016), 218, 267, 278. See also Ben-Naftali's discussion of the history of asylum in "Asylum and its Discontents," 145-147.

41 "Human Rights in the Middle East and North Africa: Review of 2018," Amnesty International, accessed 5/9/2019, <https://www.amnesty.org/download/Documents/MDE1599112019ENGLISH.pdf>

42 The authors of "USA: 'You Don't Have Any Rights Here,'" state: "The Trump administration is waging a deliberate campaign of human rights violations against asylum seekers..." Accessed 5/9/19, <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/research/2018/10/usa-treatment-of-asylum-seekers-southern-border/>. In the United States, Rabben writes, political asylum-seekers are often treated more harshly than criminals. See: Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum*, 25, 203.

43 Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum*, 166-68.

44 Laurie C. Heffron, "Central American Women Fleeing Violence Experience More Trauma After Seeking Asylum," PRI, April 12, 2019. <https://www.pri.org/stories/2019-04-25/central-american-women-fleeing-violence-experience-more-trauma-after-seeking>. Accessed 7.9.19, 2019.

45 See Ben-Naftali, "The Asylum and Its Discontents," 473; and the 2019 documentary film, *Advocate*, directed by Rachel Leah Jones and Philippe Bellaïche.

46 See the introduction to Robin Lorentzen, *Women in the Sanctuary Movement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991). On the Arizona sanctuary movement, see Anne Crittenden, *Sanctuary: A Story of American Conscience and the Law in Collision* (New York: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1988).

47 Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum*, 140, 220, 238.

48 See Ben-Naftali, "The Asylum and Its Discontents," 142.

49 Judith McDaniel, *Sanctuary: A Journey* (Ithaca, NY: Firebrand Books, 1987): 147. See also Judith McDaniel, "The Sanctuary Movement, Then and Now," *Religion and Politics*, February 21, 2017. <https://religionandpolitics.org/2017/02/21/the-sanctuary-movement-then-and-now/>. Accessed 7.14.19, 2019.

I would like to express my deep gratitude to Michal Heiman for her inspiring work, her devotion to both art and human rights, and her willingness to engage and challenge my thinking over the past several years. Many thanks also to Leslie Ureña, Anne Nellis Richter, Sarah Marsh, and Ryan Mace for their important contributions to this essay.

A Dream with a Camera*

I lift a baby, he is beautiful, with a wonderful, wholesome face, and he is full of soul and wisdom. Maybe it's a baby girl? Only he or she knows. I'm squatting, as if in labor, in the bathroom. As I lift the baby, he slips, in a strange fashion, with force; he falls out of my hands and his head hits the edge of the tub. He falls on his back, looking at me, making no sound. I'm stunned and I'm looking at him, and despite the accident and his silence, I tell myself that no, even though the fall was hard, he is all right. He looks at me; I pick him up. Now I'm in a large room, a living room or a studio full of women, all in dresses. I lie on a couch, a narrow sofa, in the middle of the room; another woman is by my side. I feel condensed; my legs are hanging out of the couch. There is a camera in the room. The women want to photograph me on the sofa with that reclining woman. I get up, I approach a big camera on a tripod, and I arrange the women, all wearing similar dresses, for a photograph. The baby, I know in my heart, is there in the room, on a cot. I don't see him; I just know he is there. I can't remember how he got there, just like I can't remember how I got from the bathroom to the large room. I haven't spoken to any of the women about what had happened with the baby. And then I decide, in the middle of the photo shoot, to break the silence, and I say out loud, I tell the baby, who I know can hear me, that I have dropped him. I want him to hear, I want all the women to hear.

Michal Heiman, May 26, 2014

* "Years later, as a psychotherapist, I found that cameras appeared in the dreams of my psychotic patients. They appeared in other patients' dreams too: dreaming of cameras does not mean that you are psychotic. But after the decimated or barren landscapes, butchered meat, bloody flowers, frightening attackers—sooner or later, as recovery is underway—cameras." Michael Eigen, *Damaged Bonds* (New York: Karnack, 2001), 92.

The Guard

The figure of the male guard has been on my mind since the beginning of the project, in 2012, as a representation of visual and political complexity. I have struggled with the simultaneity of disobeying and abiding by the law. The guard of the historical Surrey County Lunatic Asylum in London represents this duality of entry, becoming the primary obstacle to my community. Everything surrounding the idea of this obstacle becomes a tactic: how can I deceive the guard and gain entry into the asylum? While contemplating the possibility of entering the Surrey County Asylum, I became obsessed with images of guards standing at the asylum's gate. They prevent my photographs and videos from reaching the female patients photographed by Dr. Diamond as they appear in the book, *The Face of Madness* (1976), edited by Sander L. Gilman. Some guards I know in the present day came to my mind, earning minimum wages and facing constant danger, almost like cannon fodder to security companies who place them in traumatic situations where they are likely to confront violence. I thought of the ancient theme of Nostos in which the epic hero exhibits his greatness by managing to return. It also brings to mind the guard in Franz Kafka's 1915 parable *Before the Law*. So, too, the temptations and challenges we must negotiate when faced with a net of security guards, who may deny or permit access to different locations, came to my mind. The strategy of intervening in existing spaces is not new to my practice (see Photographer Unknown archive and *Michal Heiman Test (M.H.Ts) 1-4*, etc.). But, oh, the guards... Will these guards permit the process required to create a new community of women? Will they allow us to infiltrate institutions of knowledge, such as 19th-century archives and museums? The guards that I had in mind are stationed at the asylums—and at this point it was not just in the Surrey County Asylum, but also in San Servolo in Venice, Bethlem in London, and others in Illinois, New York, New Zealand, Australia, and all over the world—don't distinguish between eras, between the future and the past. Are they suffering post-trauma? As expected, some of the strategies have already failed, and some will eventually fail. Donning the plaid dress, wearing uniforms, studying the plans of the asylum, while internalizing Jorge Luis Borges's "que tiemblan como enojados," requires practice.* Methods of kamikaze, military force, martyrdom, or simulated investments in urban warfare, are out of the question. It's obvious that my guards are fascinated by the power of art and have a deep appreciation for it. Their love of art is so great that they may even allow entry to people who accompany me into the asylum, even people of color who are absent from the photographs in the *Face of Madness* book. The guards will be so awed by their resemblance to canonical figures of art history, such as Vermeer's *Girl with a Pearl Earring* (ca. 1665), that they won't question them. I found myself gradually employing more and more strategies to enhance the possibilities of gaining entrance. They involved filming a video series I call *Pre-Enactments*, filming and photographing people in various states and gestures in order to transmit them to

the asylum and slip them past the guards: gestures of determination, confidence, melancholy, embarrassment, submission and allurements; the use of dreaming and dormant states as transitional strategies; the use of transitional objects; therapeutic settings and models of observation; employing characteristics studied from everything I could discover on Dr. Diamond's patients (men photographed in profile); wigs, costumes, and fake weapons. I created masks and photographed them on the faces of men and women. These masks included: female artists who made use of weapons in their works or depicted scenes of violence; family members; theoreticians; people who have passed away whom I wished to take along with me; and childhood heroes—including Leila Khaled, a woman I admired in secret, although she was and still is considered a terrible enemy. But then—! So many years of letting my imagination take hold, creating in the inflections of my mind an image of a malleable, complex guard, trying not to use violence, yet it all becomes empty in light of one photograph. In the end, all that is left is the figure of the guard holding a set of keys and violently gripping the hair of a female patient at the San Servolo Asylum. Holding her, like photography, a complacent, potentially exploitative medium, cannot be tricked like the guard of my imagination. Is this photograph going to destroy it all?

Michal Heiman, August 29, 2019

* "Tremble as if they were mad," from Jorge Luis Borges, "The Analytical Language of John Wilkins" in *Other Inquisitions, 1937-1952* (New York: Washington Square Press, 1966), 103.

Savior-Attacker: A Negative with No Witnesses

I asked to build a merging environment, to move between different fields, with all their expressions. I asked to look for a new mediating space between you and me. Here is the negative that holds the image, the light and shadow are opposite. There is no reality. A witness is necessary. A paper-witness, sensitive to light. The positive is the negative of the negative. In the wake of an attack rescuers often appear, running with those they have saved in their arms. There is no visibility to the attack that has preceded the rescue. Only the act of rescuing is visible, and what came before is asked to be hidden. It's very difficult to see this, almost impossible, to be interested recipients in such dim frequencies. The savior-attacker exists in open and private spaces, in the space of the photo album, in newspapers, in a museum, between the pages of art history, and also in the pages of psychoanalysis, in dozens of case studies. Not only patients, but paintings and photographs also experience attacks, from the front and from the back. And movies, too. The attackers, after they finished their attack, go on rescuing, showing off the glory of what was saved, appearing out of the fog like saviors. Nobody saw and nobody heard that a moment ago, in a "space without witnesses," the rescuers themselves were the attackers. In the sensitive, difficult spaces from which the (supposedly common) "Third" is taken as testimony in the public sphere, almost always by the same participant—it's the attacker who has the tools and the ability to express himself, the capacity to create a space in which to voice or show his findings. Who is mad? And who is in charge of their interpretation? The ones who see? Or those who stop their gaze from seeing? And then she wants to say that the rescuer is the attacker, the same one! She is a blank slate, a *tabula rasa*, over and over again, always from scratch. She has no voice, no resistance, just a silent rebellion in her body, a tingling of fingers like Virginia Woolf's *Orlando*, and she points to the board, and turns into a ghost, if not a ghost, a witch. One time she is the daughter, another the mother, or him. And them? They will say out loud: You brought them with you. Dissociation, association, conspiracy, what do they want from you? Carolina? Rosine? Anna O.? Katharina? Michal? Geula? Virginia? Are you there? Elisabeth Von R.? Ophelia? Aurelia? Bruriah? Guillotine? Ilona? Were you cold? Open your mouth, ahhhh! Here is William Hope, using photography to save and to attack. Using photography's double standards and split ethics—both the damaging and therapeutic, living behind questions of responsibility, accountability, a potential sense of abandonment, which I believe are inherent to the medium. Double-exposure Savior-Attacker. Paranormal investigator, a pioneer of so-called "spirit photography?" Hope, based in Crewe, England, was the leader of the famous spiritualist group, the Crewe Circle Spiritualists. He asked people who lost members of their families for a photograph from when they were still alive. Later, they came to his studio, and he took their portraits. Hope produced for them a "spirit" photograph they believed in. In February 1922, the Society for

Psychical Research and other paranormal investigators demonstrated that Hope was fraudulent in tests at the British College of Psychic Science: “William Hope has been found guilty of deliberately substituting his own plates for those of a sitter... It implies that the medium brings to the sitting a duplicate slide and faked plates for fraudulent purposes.” James Black, in an article for the *Scientific American* in 1922, concluded that Hope was a “common cheat who obtains money under false pretenses.”

Michal Heiman, April 15, 2007 - September 1, 2019

Sharon Sliwinski

The Woman Who Walks Through Photographs

In the opening moments of Lewis Carroll's *Through the Looking-Glass*, Alice reprimands her little black kitten for the "grand game of romps" it's just had with a ball of yarn. Do you remember the scene? In the midst of the scolding, Alice becomes distracted by the big mirror that hangs in the drawing room. Or, more accurately, she becomes preoccupied with the room that lies on the other side of the mirror—the room in the "Looking-glass House." She pauses to take note of the ways the room on the other side is almost identical to her own. All the familiar features from her drawing room appear there, too, albeit in reverse. The mirror-world fascinates Alice (as it fascinates all of us) and she climbs up onto the mantel to examine it more closely. Suddenly, without warning, the surface melts into a bright silvery mist and in the blink of an eye, Alice finds herself on the other side.

Many adventures ensue, and by the close of Carroll's book Alice is back in her own world, trying to convince herself that all the remarkable things that happened in the looking-glass world were only a dream. But Alice remains perturbed by the thought of exactly whose dream this has been: "Who do you think dreamed it all?" she asks the naughty kitten, who reappears in the closing scene. When her query is ignored, Alice protests: "This is a serious question!" Was it her dream, or was it the Red King's? "He was part of my dream, of course—but then I was part of his dream, too!" The book ends before the dilemma is resolved. The story concludes on an unexpected and somewhat unsettling note: "Which do you think it was?"

These days it is rather easy to dismiss such queer questions. Who's got time for the world that appears on the other side of the looking-glass? Perhaps one might similarly be tempted to dismiss the Israeli artist Michal Heiman's remarkable claim that one day she stumbled across a photograph of herself in a book on nineteenth-century portraits of lunatics in the Surrey County Asylum in England. Admittedly, the idea of finding a picture of one's adolescent self among 150-year-old photographs might seem a bit peculiar. How can one live in the past as well as in the present? Aren't photographs things to be looked at, rather than stumbled into?

Fortunately for us, Heiman allowed her mind to go wandering.¹ Indeed, rather like Lewis Carroll, she began inventing strategies to gain further access to the world she glimpsed on the other side of Dr. Hugh Welch Diamond's glass plates. She began by recreating the simple checkered dress that the female inmates from the asylum wore. Then she got hold of the architectural plan of the Surrey Asylum where Diamond worked and where he photographed his patients. Heiman began to create her own images, including a short film, *Double Check* (2016), which makes use of the asylum plan to bear witness to the institution's organizational structure and operating methods. The floor plans show separate areas for men

and women, rooms for solitary confinement and punishment, sleeping halls, communal showers, and workshops.

Heiman also started making portraits. She photographed contemporary asylum-seekers, political activists, artists, academics, and others, including herself. Some of her sitters wear the dress she recreated. Some cover their faces with photographic-masks. To date, “Radical Link: A New Community of Women, 1855-2020,” and “I Encountered My Gaze in Venice, 1880-2020” include more than 150 photographs and 120 videos. Heiman also participated in a long-duration performance at Herzliya Museum in 2017, in which she invited spectators to speak with her and to imagine the asylum and its women through a collection of documents that she assembled. The conversations touched on issues such as refusal, ethics, law, the return of the oppressed, violence, regression, screen memories, dissociation, and the right to return.²

In effect, Heiman has created an extensive series of tools and techniques for imaginatively returning to the asylum. And she has enlisted the public’s help in developing further strategies—new gestures for extending solidarity to people who have been subjugated by the institution, new ways of connecting with those individuals who have been bereft of legal rights to property, family, or public hearing. In its own way, the project poses several questions: How are our imaginative practices bound up with the process of political recognition? What separates one life from another? Whose dream is this? Is the asylum a place or a state of mind? How does one enter these gates? And how does one return home?

These are serious questions for our times as much for Dr. Diamond’s era. Now, just as then, the words “asylum” and “return” can invoke multiple and, indeed, even violently contradictory meanings. Heiman’s project aims to grant these contradictions the room to coexist. Like D.W. Winnicott, one of her theoretical references, Heiman asks for certain paradoxes to be tolerated and for them not to be resolved.³

It is an understatement to say that we live in a polarized political climate. How we remain connected to each other depends more and more on aesthetic encounters in so-called virtual communities. There is a great deal to be said about the way these encounters and communities open spaces for important political work—and, conversely, how they constrain and confine it. Increasingly, our contact with the world beyond our doors occurs via images. To my mind, this means there is an urgent need for artists, those “great disturbers of the peace” who spend their time studying and surveying this imaginary terrain.⁴ As counterintuitive as it sounds, attending to the imaginary dimension allows artists to register those parts of reality that have been obscured for one reason or another. Their work has the potential to bear us across the gulf that separates us and perhaps even to facilitate a kind of “benevolent surrender,” to borrow Sarah Lewis’s remarkable phrase.⁵ At its best, art creates the conditions for emotional and psychological transformation, paving a way for the emergence of a new version of ourselves and of our common political world.

Photography as Object Relations

Michal Heiman's particular gift is akin to Alice's: she has the ability to access the world on the other side of the looking-glass. Among other things, "Radical Link" serves as a potent reminder that the photographic camera belongs to a long lineage of optical devices—tools that purport to produce a faithful representation of whoever (or whatever) appears before their unblinking gaze but in fact are a gateway to the imaginary world. Heiman's project leans on this idea but also sounds a warning: caution and canniness are needed when engaging such devices. The images that appear on the surface of the mirror—or in the camera's viewfinder—are, in fact, only a tiny glimpse of a vast imaginary terrain that does not easily yield to sight.

Heiman's work has long been grounded in the rich intersection of psychoanalytic and visual theory. Among her previous works are videos based on case studies by Sigmund Freud and D. W. Winnicott, as well as two lecture-films, *Attacks on Linking* and *Daughtertype*, which engage the work of the British psychiatrist and psychoanalyst Wilfred Bion.

"Radical Link" highlights Heiman's preoccupation with D.W. Winnicott's work and, perhaps in particular, with the psychoanalyst's insights about the relational dimensions of the human condition. One of Winnicott's signal contributions in this regard is his 1967 paper, "Mirror-Role of Mother and Family in Child Development." The paper involves a subtle critique of Jacques Lacan's well-known theory of the mirror phase. Lacan famously argued that, in the normal course of events, a baby will internalize the image that appears in the mirror as an imaginary representative of the self. For better or worse, he proposed, this "mirror phase" is crucial for developing a sense of a self.⁶ Winnicott's critique involved pointing out that this early recognition is, in fact, a relational activity and, more specifically, a relationship that is facilitated by the primary caregiver—often the mother.⁷ It is in this figure's face that the baby first encounters an image of itself, which is to say, the mother's face serves as the original mirror. If all goes well, Winnicott observes, in the baby's first months, the maternal figure will project an image of the baby back to itself, which, in turn, enables the baby to develop a sense of self.

The complexity and significance of this basic relational activity is all too easily taken for granted. Winnicott described several cases where this all-important recognition failed—occasions when a mother could not respond to her baby, often for reasons not of her own making. (He served as the psychiatric consultant for the child evacuation program in Great Britain during World War II.) Winnicott understood his psychoanalytic work as a kind of reparation for this early environmental failure. Therapy, in his view, consisted of "a long-term giving back to the patient what the patient brings. It is a complex derivative of the face that reflects what is there to be seen."⁸

"Radical Link" exposes the political stakes of this fundamental relational drama, showing how the human being requires the other's gaze in order to develop and maintain one's own sense of self and identity. Or, put differently, Heiman offers a radically different account of the social bond, one in which our very life and sense of existence is radically bound up with

the other. In the relational view, we are always already tied together in a social bond that precedes and makes possible both of our lives.⁹ Heiman both highlights and extends this profound psychological insight, mobilizing photography as a medium of object relations. She poses and bravely refuses to resolve the question of how photography can facilitate this important work of reflecting back what is there to be seen. In this respect, the project asks how our everyday forms of regard have manifest political effects—the ways photography can be used to reflect back what is there to be seen, but also how it can serve as a screen, blocking out any meaningful engagement with the world. Heiman challenges us to consider how our forms of regard can become ossified in institutional practice and how citizens might develop new strategies for imaginatively re-cognizing those people for whom the process of social recognition has failed.

Difficult Returns

In order to animate these fundamental issues, Heiman returns to the primal scene, so to speak, the origin of photography's initial entanglement with the asylum: the Female Department of the Surrey County Lunatic Asylum circa 1855. The gatekeeper to this particular world is the perpetually weary-looking resident superintendent, Dr. Hugh Welsh Diamond. Diamond had studied medicine at the Royal College of Surgeons, and later undertook his psychiatric studies at Bethlem Hospital, which was famous for its stringent forms of treatment (the hospital was better known under its sobriquet, Bedlam). Diamond expressed sympathy for the new, humane methods that were starting to take hold in Britain, but his particular contribution involved marrying his passion for psychiatry with his passion for photography. He was an early advocate of the technology, helping to found the Royal Photographic Society and serving as an editor of its journal. His essays and notes on the medium were widely influential. By 1850, Diamond built a small photographic studio in the Surrey Asylum, where he set about creating portraits of his patients, a first in the history of psychiatry. This project, like so many scientific contributions to the study of madness, involved its own form of delusion. Diamond believed, like many in his day, that the outward appearance of a person could provide evidence for the inward, psychological state. In 1838, Sir Alexander Morison published *The Physiognomy of Mental Diseases*, which included illustrations of the many faces of madness; Diamond believed that the camera could succeed in this illustrative function, securing “with unerring accuracy the external phenomenon of each passion.”¹⁰

But apart from using photography as a diagnostic tool, Diamond also experimented with the medium as a method of treatment. He took note of the way the experience of being photographed affected his patients and went so far as to suggest that the process could help facilitate a cure. In a lecture delivered to the Royal Society in 1856, the doctor provides a brief account of such a treatment in a short vignette about A.D., a twenty-year-old patient

who had come from Bedlam. Among other delusional symptoms, A.D. believed she was a queen. This was not entirely uncommon among the Surrey lunatics; Diamond provides a photograph of another woman who fashioned for herself a crown, which she proudly wore to signify her status.

After some negotiation, Diamond reports that he managed to coax A.D. to pose for him by telling her that he sought to make portraits of all the royal personages under his care. A.D. initially scoffed at this idea: "Queens indeed! How did they obtain their titles?" Diamond replies, "They imagined them," suggesting that she, too, was suffering from this delusion. "No!" A.D. replied sharply, "I never imagine such foolish delusions, they are to be pitied, but I was born a Queen." When A.D. finally allowed herself to be photographed, Diamond reports that she found the subsequent portraits amusing: "Her frequent conversation about them was the first decided step in her gradual improvement." After four months, A.D. was discharged "perfectly cured and laughing heartily at her former imaginations."¹¹ If we are to believe Diamond's account, the experience of being photographed, the resulting portraits, and the dialogue about them seemed to help dispel A.D.'s delusional self-image. In Winnicott's terms, the doctor used his camera to reflect back what was there to be seen, facilitating a positive change in his patient's state of mind. One might be tempted, in this respect, to read Diamond as a forerunner of the later tradition of talk-therapy.¹² It is certainly something of an exception to find evidence of a psychiatric patient's voice in the mid-nineteenth century. But as several scholars have argued, Diamond was not entirely distinct from the larger institutional apparatus that regularly imposed its discourse upon patients.¹³

This imposition is more obvious in Dr. John Conolly's series of extended commentaries on Diamond's portraits, which were published in 1858 in the *Medical Times and Gazette*. The two doctors were professionally acquainted, but there is no evidence that Conolly has ever spoken with any of Diamond's patients directly. This did not seem to deter him from making diagnoses. Of the woman pictured on the facing page, Conolly proffers the following narrative:

Her story is but one in a larger chapter of such which London furnishes. She gained a small livelihood by the occupation of a sorter and folder of paper, and lived but poorly. After a confinement she had an attack of puerperal mania, lasting about six months [i.e., postpartum psychosis]; her conversation was generally incoherent, and her actions were sometimes impulsive and violent. She repudiated her infant, declaring that it did not belong to her, and on one occasion she leaped out of a window fourteen feet from the ground. About a month after being received into the Surrey Asylum the excitement left her, and great despondency supervened. [...] The photograph, taken when the state of melancholy was passing into that of excitement, retains something of the fixedness of attitude and expression in the first state; as in the arms held close to the body, and the position of the lower extremities, and the downward tension of the cheek. The body is thin, and the hair lank and heavy. But the eyes are not lost in vacancy; they seem to discern some person or object which excites displeasure

or suspicion. The forehead is wrinkled with some strong emotion, and the eyebrows, although corrugated, have not the tense contraction toward the nose which is observable in many cases of melancholia.¹⁴

Conolly's account reads like an exemplar of Michel Foucault's claim that "the constitution of madness as mental illness, at the end of the eighteenth century, affords evidence of a broken dialogue."¹⁵ The Men of Reason issued their scientific statements from one side of a great discursive divide; on the other side, the Mad were relegated to silence.

Winnicott might help us describe this situation in visual terms: Conolly's engagement with the medium reads like a model of therapeutic failure—an occasion when the caregiver failed to reflect back what was there to be seen.¹⁶ Instead, Conolly projected his own investments onto the images. And indeed, the medium seems to invite this particular defense mechanism; photographs all too easily perform as screens upon which viewers cast their projections. Not enough attention has been paid to the ways projection replaces apperception in the history of photography—all the ways we fail to see what was there to be seen. This form of "object-relating" seems to block what might have been the beginning of a significant exchange with the world.¹⁷

Thank God for the artists, who, as James Baldwin once observed, are present to correct the delusions to which we fall prey.¹⁸

Heiman's "Radical Link" teaches us to be rightly wary of this trap of visibility. Her project aims to emphasize that our ways of seeing and forms of recognition are, in fact, relational. Heiman invites viewers into a profound engagement with these past figures, enticing us to establish imaginative identifications with these Victorian women; as a result, she encourages viewers to identify with others who might be subject to the contemporary institutional gaze of the asylum. The artist brings her nuanced understanding of psychological processes to political arena and, in so doing, reminds us that our museums and exhibition halls can be important places to engage in the work of social recognition. Put more simply, exhibitions can provide one important venue where people can come to see and to be seen, to make an appearance on the world stage, to reflect on each of our varying degrees of visibility and exposure.

In her construction of a new community, Heiman asks us to attend to the boundaries that constitute the parameters of the public sphere—challenging us to think about the ways photography can serve and hinder this work. Her project also emphasizes the performative dynamics of the polis. This space of appearance must be continually recreated through embodied gestures and the human exercise of imagination. But perhaps most important of all, Heiman reminds us that the images in the looking-glass are not static representations but dynamic gateways. Like Alice, she poses fundamental questions about the shared terrain of the imaginary. Whose world is this? You are part of my dream, of course—but then I am part of your dream, too.

Sharon Sliwinski is Associate Dean and Professor in the Faculty of Information and Media Studies at the University of Western Ontario in Canada. She is author of *Dreaming in Dark Times: Six Exercises in Political Thought* (2017) and *Human Rights in Camera* (2011).

1 As Oliver Sacks taught us, in the early sixteenth century, before reason anxiously walled itself off from madness, the term “hallucination” simply meant “a wandering mind.” See Oliver Sacks, *Hallucinations* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2012), ix.

2 Heiman’s practice of speaking with museum visitors continues and elaborates her earlier artistic actions, such as *Michal Heiman Test (M.H.Ts) 1-4*, in which examiners spoke to visitors on her behalf, either individually or in groups, about their impressions of photographs they were shown, while completing personal questionnaires.

3 In his introduction to *Playing and Reality*, D.W. Winnicott draws attention to the paradox involved in the use of an object, namely, that the baby both creates the object and that the object is also already there, waiting to be created: “My contribution is to ask for this paradox to be accepted and tolerated and respected, and for it not to be resolved. By flight to split-off intellectual functioning it is possible to resolve the paradox, the price of this is the loss of the value of the paradox itself.” D.W. Winnicott, *Playing and Reality* (1971; New York: Routledge, 2005), xvi.

4 James Baldwin, “The Creative Process” [1962], *Collected Essays*, ed. Toni Morrison (New York: Library of America, 1998), 669.

5 Sarah Lewis, “Vision & Justice,” *Aperture* 223 (Summer 2016): 14.

6 Jacques Lacan, “The Mirror Stage as Formative of the Function of the I [1949],” in *Ecrits: A Selection*, trans. Bruce Fink (New York: W. W. Norton, 2002). Lacan also argued that identifying with an external image will bring about a radical alienation. The danger, as Alice discovers, lies in the fact that the looking-glass world—the image in the mirror—is not, in fact, identical to the self. But Lacan nevertheless considered identification to be essential to the development of the human ego.

7 D.W. Winnicott, “Mirror-Role of Mother and Family in Child Development [1967],” in *Playing and Reality*, 149-59. Winnicott’s theoretical intervention leans on Melanie Klein’s extensive body of work, in which the psychic life of the subject is oriented around maternal functioning (in contrast to the Freudian/Lacanian universe, which centers on the role of the father).

8 Winnicott, “Mirror-Role of Mother and Family in Child Development,” 158.

9 Judith Butler has proposed a similar point in her 2016 Tanner Lecture, “Why Preserve the Life of the Other?,” March 31, 2016, accessed June 27, 2018, <https://tinyurl.com/y4ab895m/>

10 Hugh Welch Diamond, “On the Application of Photography to the Physiognomic and Mental Phenomenon of Insanity [1856],” in *The Face of Madness: Hugh W. Diamond and the Origin of Psychiatric Photography*, ed. Sander L. Gilman (Secaucus, N.J.: Citadel Press, 1976), 20.

11 *Ibid.*, 23.

12 Sharrona Pearl argues: “Diamond pushed physiognomical principles in a dramatically new direction, one that established a discourse of internality, a concept echoed by later doctors Jean-Martin Charcot and Sigmund Freud.” Sharrona Pearl, “Through a Mediated Mirror: The Photographic Physiognomy of Dr. Hugh Welch Diamond,” *History of Photography* 33, no. 3 (August 2009): 290, <https://doi.org/10.1080/03087290902752978>.

13 Elaine Showalter has severely criticized Diamond for being complicit with the institutional violence, for joining the ranks of those doctors who, armed with the new technology of photography, imposed their fantasies on female patients. Showalter highlights the way these women were cast in the literary myth of Ophelia, in particular. See Elaine Showalter, “Representing Ophelia: Women, Madness and the Responsibility of Feminist Criticism [1977],” in *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*, ed. Patricia Parker and Geoffrey Hartman (New York: Methuen, 1985). In direct response to this lineage of criticism, Heiman’s film *Plate 34 Line*, London (2016) follows the artist’s daughter Emily in the role of a time traveler, evoking the figure of Elizabeth Siddal, the famous model of the Pre-Raphaelite artists, who was immortalized in John Everett Millais’s painting of Ophelia. Here Emily aims to gain entry into the institution precisely by embracing the figure of Ophelia.

14 John Conolly, “Case Studies from The Physiognomy of Insanity [1858],” in *The Face of Madness*, ed. Sander L. Gilman, 45-46.

15 Michel Foucault, *Madness and Civilization* (New York: Routledge, 1988), xii. Conolly had his reputation damaged in the 1850s by scandals linking him to cases of wrongful confinement. Peter Melville Logan argued that *The Physiognomy of Insanity* had been written as a response to the scandals and the charges against him. See Peter Melville Logan, “Imitations of Insanity and Victorian Medical Aesthetics,” *Romanticism and Victorianism on the Net*, no. 49 (February 2008), <http://dx.doi.org/10.7202/017855ar>.

16 Contrast this with a Lacanian reading, in which Conolly’s intervention might be regarded as exacerbating the psychosis that circulates under the Name-of-the-Father (*nom de père*). In Lacan’s conceptualization, the paternal figure is required to impose the law, relegate desire, and intervene in the imaginary relationship between mother and child—to introduce a necessary symbolic distance between them. Psychosis stems, in

Lacan's view, from a failure of this paternal functioning. And indeed, the paternal figure failed twice in this woman's case: first, in his evident absence from the situation of the pregnancy that precipitated the psychosis, and second, in the form of the psychiatric institution (of which Conolly is a representative), which, rather than establish a relationship with the patient, simply imposed an interpretative frame from afar.

17 In a signal paper from 1969, Winnicott defines two different kinds of object relations. Primitive emotional states were often expressed in cruder relationships with objects. "Object-relating" was his term for an aggressive kind of relationality. In this state of mind, the individual fails to recognize the independent existence of the object. Things (and people) are manipulated as projections and extensions of the self—controlled as a means to shore up a fragile sense of omnipotence. In contrast, "object-use" requires a degree of emotional development: recognition that the object has an independent status outside of one's subjective experience. See Winnicott, "The Use of an Object and Relating through Identification [1969]," in *Playing and Reality*, 115-27. 18 Baldwin, "The Creative Process," 669.

Lamentation: Do You Remember Orlando, Mother?

Why, mother, didn't you allow me to develop a "negative hallucination?" Why did you dismiss the theory of representation? Didn't you understand that there was a screen, introverted, on which images appear? Didn't that pediatrician you liked, and I couldn't stand, Dr. Rudich, tell you that only with your help I could think, actually be? You died, mother, and left me with a "hole in the screen" representation.

And I ask, mother, why didn't you tell me? I would have understood, together with you, that you were there and yet you were not, and that even before I was born, you already died. Like Orlando, who was engaged while lying down, "I'm dead," she responded to the one on the horse.

You know, mother, like all witches, all mad women. Not one word... mother...? I am reminded of you in our home in Tel Aviv, in the 1960s, a half-lying woman, while I read psychoanalytic writings on the subject of testimony—on soul-crushing events. Reading for us mothers and daughters, the children. Day and night. I will respond to them. One day. Do survivors of trauma have no reflective language? No and no, they have an articulate language of silence, ambiguity, body aching, testimonies come and go, inconsistent, floating, and disappearing; is there anything more precise than this? More shared than this? How many years will it take them to build the dictionary, the index, of the faithful representation of the fracture of the world? A new index/order. We will determine it, slowly. No longer submissive outside and inside the treatment room, nor will we surrender unconditionally to courthouses, and we will not stop writing testimonies ourselves. Who has the monopoly over the representation of symbolic order? Have you left us the representation of the unthinkable, of the unanswerable? Have you left us the art and the writing, the theater and the dance, where we will compress all the hallucinations? And will we cherish the negative ones in the treatment rooms, blurred worlds, autistic, without knowing...? A dyad of not knowing.

See how, in a few sentences, Virginia illuminates the moment of appearance, the bursting forth, of the birth of the "Dead Mother" (Virginia, who has chosen not to be...). Orlando died and is engaged.

Do you remember Orlando, mother? "One, two, three, four," she counted; then she heard a stumble; then, as it came nearer and nearer, she could hear the snap of a twig and the suck of the wet bog in its hooves. The horse was almost on her. She sat upright. Towering dark against the yellow-slashed sky of dawn, with the plovers rising and falling about him, she saw a man on horseback. He started. The horse stopped.

“‘Madam,’ the man cried, leaping to the ground, ‘you’re hurt!’ ‘I’m dead, sir!’ she replied. A few minutes later, they became engaged.”

Are you awake, mother?

Michal Heiman, March 8, 2019

Orna Ben-Naftali

The Asylum and its Discontents

On an Exceptional Leave to Remain

This is Nouredin Musa. He is a Sudanese refugee who sought asylum in Israel. In the photo, taken by the artist Michal Heiman in Tel Aviv in 2015, he is in uniform: a dress similar to one worn by women hospitalized in the 1850s at the former Surrey County Lunatic Asylum. Traversing time, space, gender, race, and institutional practices of asylum, it is his expression that first captivates my gaze. I see the universal, ever-present sorrow of s/he who has been evicted from history only to return to it by virtue of her eviction.

Nouredin Musa was lucky enough to have been a citizen before he became a refugee. He was born in Darfur, Sudan, on August 20, 1976. He grew up in Eastern Sudan and graduated from high secondary school. Then the civil war began. In 1997, he refused the state's demand to enlist and fight against his brethren in South Sudan, a refusal for which he was barred from pursuing academic studies. He then became engaged in civil resistance as a member of an underground movement that worked to convince young men to refuse the draft. By 1999, the risk of exposure became imminent, compelling him to escape. He has not seen his family since. He became a refugee. His first stop was Libya, where he lived for some nine years, running a small shop. Unrest in Libya caused him, together with many Sudanese refugees who had enjoyed partial protection under the Gaddafi regime, to flee yet again. In 2008, he reached Israel via Egypt. At the time there were some 16,500 asylum seekers in Israel, mostly from South Sudan, and there was yet no policy set for the regulation of their status. Nouredin found a job in the pastry kitchen of a hotel in the Dead Sea area, and learned the Hebrew language. He was making a living and hoping to make a life.

By 2011, there were some 54,000 African refugees in Israel. In response to public dissatisfaction, coming mostly from long-term residents of poor urban centers where many of the refugees lived, the government decided to devise a policy to restrict their numbers. Two main means were put in place to implement this policy. One was material: the building of a wall along the Sinai desert border with Egypt; the other was legal: in 2012, Israel amended its 1954 Law for the Prevention of the Entry of Infiltrators into Israel, a law originally designed to prevent Palestinian refugees from the 1948 war—referred to as “infiltrators”—who attempted to cross the border and return home, from doing so. In this manner, the law created a confluence between Israel's age-old enemy, Palestinian refugees, and African refugees. The law authorized the administrative internment of asylum seekers for three years or until the

time it would be feasible to expel them to their home countries. This amendment was nullified by the Israeli High Court of Justice, generating a series of amendments and petitions against its constitutionality. Under the authority of the amended law, on January 29, 2014, Nouraldin was incarcerated in Holot, a dismal detention center in the desert, about two kilometers from the border with Egypt.

Holot was operated by the Israeli Prison Authority for men like Nouraldin, men construed as a threat: enemies of the people of Israel. The government insisted that Holot was not a prison, because the “infiltrators” had to be present there only between 22:00 and 06:00, as well as during a registration procedure, which took place three times a day, but were otherwise free to leave as they pleased. The distance between Holot and the nearest town, coupled with lack of private transportation, suggests that one would be hard-pressed to point at a meaningful difference between Holot and a prison. Under the terms of the 2012 amended law, people incarcerated in Holot could be held there for up to three years. As of early 2014, asylum seekers whose residence in Israel was considered legal, but whose temporary permit had expired, were dispatched to Holot as well.

Nouraldin spent nineteen months in Holot. Thereafter, under the oddly-named permission known as “exceptional leave to remain,” he resumed his work in a hotel in a town north of Tel Aviv, while awaiting a visa to Canada, where his wife, a Canadian citizen of Sudanese origin whom he met in Israel, and his three-year-old daughter whom he has met only once, anticipated his arrival.

On Resistance

Camps like Holot are designed to break the human spirit. Nouraldin resisted becoming less than fully human: he initiated English language classes for the inmates, participated in a “legislative theater” project, and started photographing with his smartphone. The photographs were brought to the attention of Michal Heiman, an established Israeli artist, and together with her agency, Parasite Space, she organized and curated their exhibition in Tel Aviv.

In the brochure accompanying the exhibition, Nouraldin writes:

It is there [in Holot] that I started figuring out the beautiful scenery of the desert. It is a place where I am waiting for the hope to deepen inside my heart, waiting for the nature to create the pretty beauty of the scene of daily life in the quiet desert. Everything changes very slowly but beautifully in a very promising way.¹

Heiman called the exhibition *Waiting*. Nouraldin has managed to transform his waiting for release from the camp, for the light to shine over the desert, for a visa, and indeed for his halted life to resume, from a passive position to an active and creative engagement.

Notably, he took no photos of the camp itself. In a conversation with Heiman published in the Bezael Academy of Art journal, he recounted the way he explained this decision to his fellow inmates:

I do not want anything to remain of Holot. Holot did not exist. I do not want you to retain any memory of having been there because there is the danger that one day you would hold positions of power and I do not want you to build such facilities in your own countries. Such things happen.²

This, I think, is more than a poignant critique of the value attached to the documentation of catastrophes and more than an insight into the mechanisms that produce their eternal recurrence. It is a new way to resist this recurrence. It is an act of resistance that defies not only the attempt to expel him from humanity, but also aspires to prevent the persecuted from becoming prosecutors. It is through the prism of the ugliness of the camp that Nouredin was able to reimagine the beauty of the sanctuary: to reimagine other possibilities of human response to catastrophes. His art is a magic carpet to elsewhere. That elsewhere is not Holot. It is where Holot might lead.

Heiman took photos and videos (2013-16) of other people who resist the barbarity in our midst, people who have not lost their response-abilities. Here are a few examples—one is Dr. Ruhama Marton³, a psychiatrist. In 1988, she founded Physicians for Human Rights-Israel (PHR), an NGO devoted to the promotion of an inclusive society, in which the right to health is applied equally to Israelis and other people under Israel's control. Lack of such equal application to Palestinians living under Israeli occupation has generated PHR's understanding that the occupation itself is a source of endless human rights violations, and an explicit commitment to oppose it and strive to bring it to an end.

The prolonged occupation of the Palestinian territory by Israel is also a legal laboratory, attesting to the truth of the truism that more laws do not necessarily generate more justice. Israeli lawyers who defend Palestinians before Israeli courts know that their record of professional success would be inversely related to the level of public hostility they would encounter. It is, therefore, not entirely surprising that not many lawyers decide to be thus engaged. Among those who do, women have been prominent. There is, indeed a sense of "Antonia's Line" when one thinks of them. Felicia Langer was the first: she was born in 1939 in Poland; her family fled the German invasion to the Soviet Union, where her father died in one of Stalin's prisons. She married a Holocaust survivor, exercised her "right of return" to Israel, a right granted by law exclusively to Jews, and studied law. She became the first Jewish lawyer to represent Palestinians before Israeli civil and military courts in cases where they were deported or tortured, where their lands were confiscated or their houses demolished, that is, in cases where their resistance was criminalized and punished. In 1990, having concluded that one cannot expect justice for Palestinians from the Israeli justice system, she closed her law offices and emigrated to

Germany.³ Leah Tsemel³ was Langer's legal intern and proceeded to establish a similar practice, encountering the wrath of the Israeli public for having represented, among others, Palestinian suicide bombers. Both Langer and Tsemel participated in the Russell Tribunal for Palestine. Heiman photographed Tsemel in 2016, and the portrait was displayed in "AP—Artist Proof (The Dress, 1855-2017)," a 2017 exhibition at the Herzliya Museum of Contemporary Art, curated by Aya Lurie. In 2019, it is included in "Radical Link: A New Community of Women, 1855-2020."

In the installation view³, the women wearing the asylum dress are, from left to right, an artist, an asylum seeker, and a law professor. Tags on the cabinet drawers invite the viewers to respond to questions such as: "What have you seen?" "What do you think?" "Did you refuse?" The installation has been part of the art collection of the Tel Aviv District Court since 2014. I wonder what the judges, the lawyers, the women and men seeking justice before the law see when they pass by. What do they think about what they see?

Heiman's dress portraits do more than underline the equality between the identically dressed subjects, some of whom enjoy a wide range of human rights while others do not. Heiman changes the power relations. She, too, is engaged in an act of resistance. She invites us to imagine a world where more people would resist—and, traversing time and space, would have resisted—the turning of history itself into a mental case. The time machine in which she invites us to take a ride is not a technological device but a discourse on memory. Our memory, too, does not work in a linear fashion: confounding past and present, it may arrest our future, but it may also free us to find that which we have lost, to intervene in the course of history.

On the Eternal Recurrence: History as a Mental Case

Dora Heiman Kagan, whose face conceals as it replaces and assumes the identity of an anonymous sitter, was Michal Heiman's aunt. Like millions of other Jews, she woke up one day and found herself in the European heart of darkness. Dora was mutilated and burned in her hometown. Others managed to escape. Some found refuge in Palestine. Then, claiming a divinely ordained, morally warranted, and legally sanctioned right to return there, they proceeded to generate Palestinian refugees to whom they denied a right of return, as well as to deny asylum to African refugees. When Noureldin insists that Holot did not exist, he resists the uncanny moment where the persecuted return as prosecutors.

Heiman's photos do not titillate us with the pain of others.⁴ They evoke the sense that there is no safe distance between them and us. This sense may toll the bells of solidarity but, more commonly, we feel compelled to create that distance: the refugees are the "scum of the earth,"⁵ or, in the words of Israeli top officials, a "cancer in the body of the nation," a plague to be confined and eliminated.⁶

Fear destroys solidarity. Outraged, we transform our sanctuaries into prison camps. We become clerics of the security theology.⁷ We elect leaders who promise to fortify our borders; nourish resentment, not responsiveness; cultivate hostility, not hospitality.⁸ We allow a “vague pervasive hatred of everybody and everything” to denigrate our political life.⁹ Let us pause on these defenses.

On Asylum Theologies of Inclusion/Exclusion

The practice of giving refuge to the threatened, the persecuted, the vulnerable, to outcasts and survivors is as old and as universal as humanity.¹⁰ The “long and sacred history” of the right of asylum, “the only right that has ever figured as a symbol of the Rights of Man,” notes Hannah Arendt, “dates back to the very beginning of regulated political life.”¹¹ Yet, from the very beginning, the dialectical tension between inclusion and exclusion characterized its articulation, regulation, and institutionalization.

The Old Testament attests to the existence of a legally recognized religious practice of granting wrongdoers a right of refuge within the walls of a consecrated site.¹² This right of asylum, however, was neither automatic nor granted to all wrongdoers; in biblical times, it was granted only upon a priestly determination and only to a person who killed another person by mistake. In later times, Jews and thieves, among others, were excluded from Christian notions of clemency. A religious belief in repentance granted to criminals was eventually overshadowed by a political will to exclude outlaws from society, transforming sanctuaries into places of exile. The practice persisted in Europe until the late sixteenth century, when notions of retributive justice became more dominant than those of restorative justice, and when state monopoly of power—including the power to punish—matured enough to have lesser need for clerical intervention.¹³

Formal demise notwithstanding, long-standing legal institutions, especially those with deep religious roots, often enjoy various forms of afterlife. The legal institution of the asylum has reappeared in the form of a social practice of resistance when individuals and communities have taken upon themselves, often at a risk, to give sanctuary to persecuted people fleeing from the violence of oppressive regimes.¹⁴ In this form it was, however, no longer a right but an act of grace. It also was resurrected as a juridical space in the form of an asylum for the insane.

The modern asylum for the insane is the brainchild of the devout followers of the theology of man’s reason. The process that replaced a discursive engagement with people cast to the margins of society with a rational discourse about them generated what Foucault called “the Great Confinement.” In essence, it consisted of the assignment of a moral blame to society’s misfits—the mad, the vagabonds, the prostitutes, and the blasphemous, among other undesirables—and of their institutional exclusion for two purposes: to protect society from

them, and to compel them to choose a more “civilized” course of life. The generation, in the late eighteenth century, of the modern mental institution substituted inclusive exclusion for exclusive exclusion. Designed solely for the mentally ill, the protective rationale for confinement was coupled with a professional rationale requiring the inmates to be supervised, studied, and eventually treated. This medical discourse, more appetizing to enlightened palates, obfuscated the reality that the modern asylum remained a juridical space of incarceration where people, under horrible conditions, were judged (categorized, supervised, diagnosed) and condemned to having neither a language, nor an opinion, nor a judgment: that is, exiled from their life and stripped of their humanity.¹⁵ The dress imposed on them in the asylum signified this bare life.

There is an uncanny similarity between this experience within the mental asylum, wrought by the age of reason, and the unworldly conditions of those who do not belong to any world in which they matter as human beings and seek political asylum—in the current age of rage. The return of repression happens, as it tends to do, with a vengeance; the mass phenomenon of tens of millions of people who were forced to become homeless and seek sanctuary breeds public panic. They all become dangerous. Refugees, immigrants, and terrorists are interwoven into a suspect class of fearsome people, generating a global obsession with security.¹⁶ Asylum seekers, caught between the Scylla of a place they had to flee and the Charybdis of a place that would not let them in, are yet again expelled from humanity. The sacred roots of the institution of the asylum, that “symbol of the rights of man,” are sacrificed by the security forces at the altar of the security theology.

On Security Theology: Metamorphoses of the Enemy¹⁷

“Security theology,” a term coined by Yael Berda, signifies a conceptual paradigm that sees the world as divided between those who present a security risk and those who do not. This schematic friend/foe division is characteristic of fundamentalist theologies.¹⁸ While closely affiliated with nondemocratic politics, it is becoming increasingly pervasive in self-defined democracies as well.¹⁹ Its primary edict is grounded in the axiomatic existence of an enemy who presents a risk that can and must be managed.

All theologies are devoted to the rational study of their subject of worship. The security theology is no exception. Its devotion to the study of security entails the study of the nature of the enemy. The nature ascribed to the enemy has undergone change over time. It is worth our while to follow, albeit briefly, this metamorphosis.

The gradual fading of the era of interstate wars has blurred the profile of the equal enemy, the combatant imagined by the laws of war. Wars in “the open seas,” belonging to no state, have seen the emergence of the *hostis humanis generis*, the “enemy of humanity”—a global criminal to be squashed by states fighting not to advance their own interests but to

protect an imagined community—humanity. The profile evolved with the changing face of war: the “real enemy,” the partisan or freedom fighter, who is neither a criminal nor an equal combatant, appeared and was soon followed by its radical version, the “absolute enemy,” a world aggressor requiring absolute destruction and rendering all distinctions other than those between friend and foe meaningless.²⁰ The emergence of the “objective enemy,”²¹ a mirror image of the “real enemy,” whose status—and guilt—are (pre)determined by his mere being, not by his action, further collapsed the distinctions between politics and culture, the individual and the collectivity, the citizen and the other.²²

The transformation of the concept of war from an outward activity limited in space and time to a constant activity flowing across and within borders has generated the invisible enemy: a hidden carrier of risk, a contaminating virus lurking within the population. His profile is determined by biopolitics.²³ Given his invisibility, identifying him requires both devotion and expertise. The clergy entrusted with this task are the security services. Risk management is their proper rite.

It is also a global, profitable security enterprise with legal dimensions.

Its legal consciousness is framed within the matrix of exceptional times: an emergency wrought by the confluence of terrorists, refugees, immigrants, and criminals, which requires and legitimates special security measures.

A wealth of means is needed to perform the rite. These means include surveillance technologies required for identification; interdisciplinary knowledge and analytical tools employed in, and borrowed from, benevolent industries, such as health, insurance, and law-enforcement for the purpose of constructing the enemy profile; the development of forward-looking procedures designed to eliminate the risk; and authorization to operate all of these. Given the indeterminate and chaotic, yet omnipresent, nature of a risk that obeys neither borders nor other boundaries, its expert management further necessitates the generation of a permanent sense of urgency and cooperation with like-minded clergy worldwide. It also requires devout followers willingly accepting the cost in terms of human rights that successful risk-management entails. Fear has proven to be an excellent antidote not only to human solidarity but also to critical sensibilities, and it is instilled in the populace to mobilize support for the risk that risk-management presents to democratic sensibilities.

The clerics of the security theology identified Nouraldin Musa as an enemy, a security risk. Much like Gregor Samsa, a man seeking asylum is being transformed, for our sake and well-being into a giant insect. Let us look at another photo of him.

Heiman's oeuvre includes a few people who are dressed in their regular clothes. She has selected them with great care, for she has entrusted them with a sensitive job: they are the gatekeepers. They will determine who will be allowed and who will be denied entry into the asylum as a sacred site, a sanctuary. In thus expropriating the power of the officially designated security authorities to manage, profile, and select, she is engaged in an act of

resistance. Here, too, in creating a civic archive—that is, an alternative designed to subvert the State’s control over collective memory—she intervenes in the power dynamics and weaves an alternative narrative.

What do you see? I see Nouraldin looking back at me. His gaze creates an encounter.

What else do you see? I see a man, who is not a passive victim but an actor who has taken extraordinary risks to assert his equal membership in humanity, looking back at me.

What do you feel? I feel compelled to lower my eyes. I feel implicated.

What do you think? I think his gaze reflects not his but the viewers’ transformation into an ungeheures Ungeziefer, a monstrous vermin.²⁴

I think his gaze suggests the denigration of the viewer who has succumbed to fear and the price-tag attached to the loss of the human ability to respond and to resist. I think for those of us who have lost it, time is not an arrow; it is a boomerang.²⁵ I think only those who have retained the meaning of the asylum as a sacred symbol of human rights, are capable of short-circuiting the eternal recurrence of its contamination.

What do you hope for? I hope to be able to act on what I see.

What do you believe in? I believe in the human potential to intervene; to issue a transit visa from the loop of the eternal recurrence;²⁶ to write a different ending.

On Human Intervention

“Radical Link: A New Community of Women, 1855-2020” is an act of intervention, or re-presentation, of human potential. S/he who wears the asylum dress has the potential to return as witness, reader, artist, prosecutor, judge, gatekeeper, or rebel, thereby transforming her/his exceptional story into one relevant to us all. Whether or not the participant translates the potential into action and intervenes is an individual decision. In any case, it engages the participant’s responsibility and generates her/his accountability.

Human intervention is an enactment of Arendt’s “right to have rights.” It is an exercise of political freedom. It engages human imagination. It re-presents the option of a shared humanity and the regenerative power of human solidarity. Reclaiming a humanity by substituting hostility with hospitality may well need a new language. Michal Heiman’s “Radical Link” participates in its genesis.

Orna Ben-Naftali is rector of the College of Management Academic Studies and the Émile Zola Chair for Human Rights at the Striks School of Law in Israel. She is co-author of *The ABC of the OPT: A Legal Lexicon of the Israeli Control over the Occupied Palestinian Territory* (with Michael Sfard & Hedi Viterbo, 2018) and *International Law Between War and Peace* (with Yuval Shany, 2006.)

1 On file with author.

2 Michal Heiman, “Did Holot Exist? Conversations with Nouraldin Musa,” *Bezalel Journal for Visual and Material Culture* 3 (May 2016) [Hebrew], accessed November 30, 2016, <http://journal.bezalel.ac.il/he/article/3622>.

3 See, for example, Felicia Langer, *An Age of Stone* (London: Quartet Books, 1988).

- 4 Susan Sontag, *Regarding the Pain of Others* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2003).
- 5 Arendt, contemplating the refugee crisis between the wars, wrote: “Those whom the persecutor had singled out as scum of the earth ... actually were received as scum of the earth everywhere; those whom persecution had called undesirable became the indésirables of Europe. The official SS newspaper ... stated explicitly in 1938 that if the world was not yet convinced that the Jews were the scum of the earth, it soon would be when unidentifiable beggars, without nationality, without money and without passports crossed their frontiers.” Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, 2nd ed. (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1973), 269.
- 6 On the cultural, political and legal construction of asylum seekers in Israel, see for example, Elisabeth Tsurkov, “‘Cancer in Our Body’: On Recent Incitement against African Asylum Seekers in Israel,” report of the Hotline for Migrant Workers, January-June 2012 http://hotline.org.il/wp-content/uploads/IncitementReport_English.pdf (accessed August 10, 2017).
- 7 The notion of “security theology” signifies a conceptual paradigm that sees the world as divided between those who present a security risk and those who do not. It is discussed below.
- 8 Jacques Derrida and Anne Dufourmantelle, *Of Hospitality*, trans. Bowlby (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2000).
- 9 Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, 268.
- 10 Linda Raben, *Sanctuary and Asylum: A Social and Political History* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2016).
- 11 Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, 280.
- 12 For example, Numbers 35: 6 “Six of the towns you give the Levites will be cities of refuge...”.
- 13 Karl Shoemaker, *Sanctuary and Crime in the Middle Ages, 400-1500* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2011).
- 14 See, for example, Philip Hailie, *Lest Innocent Blood Be Shed: The Story of the Village of Le Chambon and How Goodness Happened There* (1979; New York: Harper Perennial, 1994), which tells the story of how the citizens of La Chambon turned their village into a sanctuary for Jews during the Holocaust; Ann Crittenden, *Sanctuary: A Story of American Conscience and the Law in Collision* (New York: Grove Press, 1988), examines the “sanctuary movement” in the United States which in the 1980s sheltered in churches people who fled Central American countries but were designated as “illegal immigrants.”
- 15 Michel Foucault, *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, trans. Jonathan Murphy and Jean Khalifa (New York: Routledge, 1964)
- 16 On the weaving together of crime, immigration, and terror into a paradigm of suspicion, see Ronen Shamir, “Without Borders? Notes on Globalization as a Mobility Regime,” *Sociological Theory* 23, no. 2 (June 2005): 197.
- 17 This section is based on Orna Ben-Naftali, “X-Rays: Surveillance Technologies,” in Orna Ben-Naftali, Michael Sfard, and Hedi Viterbo, *The ABC of the OPT: A Legal Lexicon of the Israeli Control over the Occupied Palestinian Territory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018).
- 18 Yael Berda, “The Security Risk as a Security Risk: Notes on the Classification and Practices of the Israeli Security Services,” in *Threat: Palestinian Political Prisoners in Israel*, ed. Abeer Baker and Anat Matar (London: Pluto Press, 2011), 44-55. See also Nadira Shalhoub-Kevorkian, *Security Theology, Surveillance and the Politics of Fear* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 16-20.
- 19 Carl Schmitt, *The Concept of the Political*, trans. George Schwab (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 26-57.
- 20 Carl Schmitt, *Theory of the Partisan: Intermediate Commentary on the Concept of the Political*, trans. G. L. Ulmen (New York: Telos Press Publishing, 2007). For a brief review of the intellectual genealogy of the “enemy,” see the comment published in the Library of Social Science on January 1, 2014, by Mikkel Thorup, “Total Enemies: Understanding ‘The Total Enemy’ through Schmitt, Arendt, Foucault and Agamben,” accessed August 10, 2017, https://www.libraryofsocialscience.com/essays/thorup-total_enemies.html.
- 21 Ibid.
- 22 Hannah Arendt, *On Revolution* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965), 100. Note that while Foucault does not refer to Arendt, his biopolitical reading of enmity is clearly influenced by her notion of the “objective enemy.”
- 23 Michel Foucault, “Society Must Be Defended”: *Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-76*, trans. David Macey (New York: Picador, 2003).
- 24 Franz Kafka, *The Metamorphosis and Other Stories*, trans., John R. Williams, (Wordsworth Classics, 2014) (the opening line reads: “One morning, Gregor Samsa woke up from uneasy dreams and found he was turned into a large verminous insect.”).
- 25 The metaphor is taken from Jeanette Winterson, *Love* (London: Penguin, Vintage Minis, 2017), 93.
- 26 Ariella Azoulay, *The Civil Contract of Photography*, trans., Relā Mazali & Ruvik Danieli, (Cambridge: Zone Books, MIT Press 2012). (“Transit visas” are accessible through the gaze: they grant citizenship that transcends borders and time, forming alternative lines of belonging and accountability).

Female Infiltrators (מסתננות1): Penetration Tactics

to the San Servolo Asylum, 1855-2020

In May 2017, in the course my research, I encountered my gaze in Venice on the face of Maria, on the Island of St. Servolo. The asylum on the Island of St. Servolo, run by the religious order of San Giovanni di Dio, opened in 1725 with the proclamation that all insane men be relocated there. In 1798, it began to accept women as well. Over its 250 years in operation, 200,000 patients had been admitted to the asylum. Most never left. In 1978 the asylum was closed, and the government of Venice founded an institute to preserve all the documents. In 2006, the building was reopened in its present iteration as a museum dedicated to the history of the asylum. The archives contain photo albums of patients from 1874 through the 20th century, including 13,695 glass plates, and the library contains a collection left by the San Servolo and San Clemente Psychiatric Hospitals. Many of the photographs were taken by Oreste Bertani (b. Venice, 1850), entrusted with documenting the asylum of San Servolo and the neighboring asylum, San Clemente, from 1882-1891. Extant research on Bertani, who remains a mere footnote in history, has become crucial for my understanding and perception of an unknown photographer (except for some materials in Italian I've found), and his work. Like Szondi's esoteric test (published in 1935) based on photographs of criminals and what had been considered mental illness at the time, Oreste Bertani and his cryptic photographs of female patients are tellingly absent from the accounts of the history of photographic practices meant to regulate, archive, and codify the body, missing from the history of visual culture, and receiving no mention even in the thorough study of the social uses of photography written by artist and writer Allan Sekula in *The Body and the Archive*.² I have never seen documentation of so many forced prisoners. So many women positioned with their hands tied, while others clutch their heads. Was it following electroshock therapy or forced ice baths, both regarded as treatment methods? I began sorting through thousands of photographs and videos, formulating new series.

After my frustrations in finding information regarding the Surrey County Lunatic Asylum, including my difficulties finding any information on Plate 34, photographed by Hugh W. Diamond at that asylum, the San Servolo archive appeared to have enormous amounts of information. Yet the horrors visible in the photographs, including so many women in straitjackets, and the disturbing (then cutting-edge) technology on display at the museum—containment handcuffs, ankle bands, strait-tubs with covers for compulsory hours-long baths—relegated to small side rooms along the main displays of art collected by the monastery, reveals the enduring dark days for those with no rights.

That is why I decided to assume the role of “infiltrator,” to join the photographs of the female patients at the San Servolo Asylum. Just as I previously filmed my daughter Emily riding

the London Underground to the Springfield County Hospital, I now filmed her traveling in a gondola. The women isolated in the asylum of San Servolo could see the city, yet the city cannot see them.

Michal Heiman, August 11, 2019

1 Infiltrators (Mistanenim in Hebrew מסתננים)—“filtrate” means filtering liquids, and “infiltrate” means surreptitiously entering a forbidden organization or area. The Hebrew verb sinen, from which the term mistanenim is derived, refers to the transfer of liquids for the purpose of cleaning waste. Infiltrators is the official term used by the government of Israel and most of the Israeli media since 1949 to refer primarily to Palestinians trying to return to their villages and cities after 1948. 2 In chapter 3, *Legends of Photography*, p. 39, in *Invention of Hysteria* (1982), Georges Didi-Huberman mentions the thousands of photographs of Bertani, but his name is missing: “A few prodigious collections remain to us today, at the Bethlem Royal Hospital of Beckenham and the San Clemente hospital in Venice (an immense clinical and administrative record of madwomen—thousands of images).”

Comparative Album

Thousands of men entered the San Servolo Asylum in Venice; they are documented in two albums in the the asylum's archive, in photographs dated between 1873 and 1887. Their photographs reveal how gaunt and distraught they appeared on arrival. Like the women, they were not spared the nightmares of disease and hunger. One of the two albums, titled "Comparative Album," includes 519 portraits of men who were deemed as recovered and who were photographed twice—once upon hospitalization and once at their release. It is clear, from the handwritten dates accompanying their photographs, that some of the patients were released after a few months, others after a couple of years.

The categories in the archive's clinical files reveal that both men and women were registered in the same way: females discharged, females transferred, female deaths, males discharged, males transferred, and male deaths. However, the manner of depicting the women who had entered the asylum, many of them in restraints, is strikingly different from the way the men were photographed; the ones I saw were given a little more dignity. Furthermore, I haven't seen any comparative pairings of photographs of released women, neither from San Clemente Hospital nor from the San Servolo Asylum, and, to my knowledge, there are no such albums in existence.

Unable to find even a single photograph of how any of the women looked when they left the asylum compared to the way they had entered it, I was left with a profound feeling of sadness.

One image left a strong impression on me, staying with me and epitomizing what I had witnessed. A document was lying there, tied with a ribbon. On the document was the drawing of a cross, signifying the death of the patient within the walls of the asylum.

Michal Heiman, October 5, 2017 - September 5, 2019

Hearing: Elizabeth Packard, Female Objector to Asylums

“Mrs. Packard was asked whether married women could be protected by law and government, just as men were protected in their rights. ‘No. For married woman is a slave! and we cannot protect slaves, except through their master.’ ‘Slave!’ said Mrs. Packard, ‘Why, I have always been an abolitionist, and I never before knew that I was a slave. I supposed I was the partner and companion of my husband. I never suspected or thought I was his slave!’”¹ “Married women and infants who, in the judgment of the medical superintendent are evidently insane or distracted, may be entered or detained in the hospital at the request of women’s husbands, parents, or guardians of the infants, without the evidence of insanity or distraction required in other cases.”²

All of the writings I had found on asylums before I began my research in 2012 had been written by men: 19th-century doctors and psychiatrists, reminding me of male European painters who painted nude women in hammams they had never visited. I then discovered written testimonies by the American Elizabeth Packard (1816-1897), who had earned her freedom by defending herself at a hearing. On May 21, 1839, Elizabeth married the Calvinist minister Theophilus Packard, fourteen years her senior, and the couple had six children. In 1860, her husband had her committed to the Illinois State Hospital for the Insane for three years, after having judged that his wife was “slightly insane,” a condition he attributed to “excessive application of body and mind.”³ She began composing her first book while incarcerated, and completed it upon her release.

“...The great evil of our present Insane Asylum System lies in the fact, that insanity is there treated as a crime, instead of a misfortune, which is indeed a gross act of injustice...” wrote Packard.⁴

This began my investigation into women who had put their voices into writing, unlike the left-behind and silent photographs forced on the restrained and subjugated women of the Surrey County Asylum (London), the Bethlem Royal Hospital (London), and the San Servolo Asylum (Venice).

Elizabeth was not the only woman to act with courage. Elizabeth Cochran Seaman, known by her penname Nellie Bly, demonstrated incredible bravery given her social status as a woman in 19th-century New York. In 1887, at the age of twenty-three, she went undercover in Blackwell’s Island Asylum in New York to expose the brutal abuse against the insane, as well as women who were wrongfully confined. She discovered that among these women were immigrants who did not speak English, as well as impoverished women. In 1890, ten years after her release, Clarissa Caldwell Lathrop published the book *A Secret Institution*, in which she recounted her experience in the Utica Asylum in New York, where she had been committed after her mother believed she had been suffering from delusions. After 23 months, with the help of a lawyer who, like her, had been forcibly committed, she was pronounced sane and

unlawfully incarcerated. Our community grew to include photographs and writings of women in the 19th century who had vocally objected. This catalogue is equally dedicated to them.

Michal Heiman, May 1, 2019

1 Elizabeth Parsons Ware Packard, *Modern Persecution, or Married Woman's Liabilities*, Vol II (Hartford: Case, Lockwood & Brainard Printers and Enders, 1873) 68-69.

2 General Laws of the State of Illinois, Passed by the Seventeenth General Assembly (Springfield, 1851), 98. Hendrik Hartog, *Mrs. Packard on Dependency*, 1 *YALE J.L. & HUMAN* (1989). 3 Myra Samuels Himelhoch and Arthur H. Shaffer, "Elizabeth Packard: Nineteenth-Century Crusader for the Rights of Mental Patients," *Journal of American Studies*, Cambridge University Press on behalf of the British Association for American Studies, 13, no.

3 (1979): 343-375.

4 Elizabeth Parsons Ware Packard, *The Prisoners' Hidden Life, Or, Insane Asylums Unveiled: As Demonstrated by the Report of the Investigating Committee of the Legislature of Illinois, Together with Mrs. Packard's Coadjutors' Testimony* (Chicago, Published by the author, 1868) iii.