MedCrave
Step into the World of Research

Journal of Psychology & Clinical Psychiatry

Review Article

Open Access

CrossMark

When context is erased: how colonial histories and diagnostic reductionism shape psychopharmacology in Native American communities

Abstract

Understanding the adoption of Western psychiatric methods in Native American communities requires placing current clinical practices within the ongoing impacts of colonization, historical trauma, and systemic injustices that continue to influence Indigenous experiences of distress. These factors deeply shape how mental health symptoms are perceived, diagnosed, and treated, often leading to the use of simplistic biomedical models that ignore cultural, historical, and relational factors crucial to Native well-being. While psychiatric medications can provide stability during acute risks or severe symptoms, their wider use is problematic if implemented without proper cultural awareness or contextual understanding.

Despite these complexities, an estimated 15–20% of Native Americans use psychiatric medications, even as Indigenous participation in clinical trials remains disproportionately low. This underrepresentation reduces the relevance of psychopharmacologic research for Native populations and raises critical questions about safety, effectiveness, and the appropriateness of standard prescribing practices. Biological and lifestyle factors-including population-specific variations in cytochrome P450 enzyme activity, diet, substance use patterns, cultural beliefs, and the lasting psychological effects of historical trauma-further complicate medication adherence, metabolism, and treatment outcomes. These considerations highlight the importance of exploring culturally appropriate alternatives before starting pharmacologic treatment and ensuring that prescribing practices respect the sociocultural and historical realities of Indigenous communities.

Addressing these disparities requires culturally informed research and clinical care, as well as creating dedicated, community-driven, and culturally grounded spaces for psychiatric withdrawal, tapering, and psychosocial options. These spaces would enable Native individuals to safely reduce or stop medications within frameworks that respect both biological differences and Indigenous knowledge systems. Moving these initiatives forward is vital to improving mental health equity, fostering culturally competent interventions, and ensuring Indigenous communities have access to care that maintains scientific rigor while supporting cultural sovereignty. Equally essential is the development of culturally grounded policy frameworks for psychiatric medication prescribing in Native American communities, ensuring that clinical decision-making aligns with Indigenous sovereignty, community priorities, and the realities of lived experience.

Volume 17 Issue 2 - 2026

Norman Cooeyate,[1] Marcello Maviglia[2]

[1]Associate Director, Center for Native American Health - a Public Health Institute for Indigenous Knowledge and Development/Lecturer II, Department of Family & Community Medicine/University of New Mexico Health Sciences, USA

[2]Clinical Professor, Family and Community Medicine/ Core Faculty Member at CNAH (Center for Native American Health)/University Of New Mexico, USA

Correspondence: Marcello Maviglia, MD, MPH, Clinical Professor, Family and Community Medicine/ Core Faculty Member at CNAH (Center for Native American Health)/ University Of New Mexico, Albuquerque, USA

Received: March 03, 2026 | **Published:** April 9, 2026

Introduction

Native American populations are disproportionately diagnosed by mainstream mental health science with conditions such as depression, anxiety, and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Western psychiatry does not interpret these emotional states within Indigenous historical and relational contexts; instead, it applies its own diagnostic system, translating culturally grounded experiences of grief, loss, and disruption into individualized psychiatric disorders.[1–3] From an Indigenous perspective, this diagnostic translation is decontextualizing: it removes Native psychological distress from the collective and intergenerational realities of colonization that give it meaning.

Native scholars emphasize that what Western psychiatry labels as "mental disorders" is more accurately understood as the psychological imprint of historical trauma-the ongoing impacts of land dispossession, cultural suppression, and population decline that continue to affect Native well-being.[4–6] From this view, the high rate of psychiatric diagnoses in Native communities reflects not a collection of separate biomedical illnesses, but the unhealed wounds caused by colonial disruption. By assigning simplistic diagnostic labels to psychosocial and historically rooted Indigenous distress, Western psychiatry risks concealing the cultural, relational, and political roots of suffering.[7,8]

While psychiatric medications can stabilize and even be lifesaving during acute risk or severe symptoms, their wider use outside these contexts requires careful cultural and clinical review. Psychiatric medications are common in Native American communities, yet the scientific foundation guiding this prescribing remains limited. Research specifically examining the safety, effectiveness, and long-term outcomes of psychotropic drugs in Indigenous populations is notably sparse. Native individuals remain significantly underrepresented in clinical trials, restricting the applicability of standard psychopharmacologic findings to Native communities. Population-specific factors-including distinct pharmacogenetic profiles, culturally shaped illness meanings, and the historical context of mistrust toward biomedical systems-further complicate assumptions about dosing, risk-benefit ratios, and treatment trajectories.[8–11] These gaps exist alongside broader concerns about the methodological limitations and publication biases that shape the general evidence base for psychiatric medications.[2,12] Even when medications are essential

in urgent situations, the absence of Indigenous-specific data remains a structural blind spot that influences every stage of psychiatric care-from diagnosis to prescribing and withdrawal.

Along with these diagnostic and research limitations, there is a growing recognition of the need for structured, culturally sensitive policies and spaces dedicated to psychiatric withdrawal practices. Withdrawal from psychotropic medications, if not properly managed, can increase distress, destabilize recovery, and deepen mistrust in psychiatric care. Developing safe, evidence-based, and community-driven withdrawal frameworks is therefore essential to ensure that Native patients have support when tapering or stopping medications.[13,14]

However, some studies are increasingly showing that there are population-specific differences in cytochrome P450 (CYP450) enzyme activity among Native American communities, which significantly affect how psychotropic medications are metabolized. These enzymes-including CYP2D6, CYP2C19, and CYP3A4-break down a wide range of antidepressants, antipsychotics, and mood stabilizers.[9] Genetic variations in these pathways can lead to different metabolic types, from poor to ultra-rapid metabolizers, impacting plasma drug levels, side effects, and treatment outcomes. Native American populations have unique allele distributions in these genes but remain largely underrepresented in pharmacogenomic research.[15]

Historical experiences with exploitative research practices-including inadequate informed consent, lack of transparency, and inequitable benefit sharing-have fostered deep mistrust toward biomedical research among many Native communities.[16–18] These legacies highlight the need for ethical reforms rooted in tribal sovereignty, data governance, and community-driven oversight. Collecting and using data from Native American individuals and tribes must involve tribal agreements, cultural respect, and protections against misuse or commodification.[17,19,20] Without strong safeguards, behavioral health and pharmacologic research risk replicating the same extractive patterns that have long characterized Western engagement with Indigenous communities.

Engaging Indigenous communities in research must extend beyond token participation. It requires forming partnerships grounded in respect and empowering tribal nations to develop and implement their own research governance policies, including protocols for informed consent, data ownership, and community oversight.[21] These frameworks should be rooted in Indigenous data sovereignty and aligned with tribal values, priorities, and long-term health objectives. Within this policy environment, psychiatric withdrawal practices need to be explicitly addressed, creating safe spaces where tapering and discontinuation are guided by both medical expertise and cultural knowledge.[22]

Beyond biological factors, the sociocultural context significantly influences mental health experiences and treatment outcomes. Cultural identity, community ties, traditional diets, lifestyle choices, and Indigenous healing practices are central to Native perceptions of wellness.[23,24] However, mainstream psychiatric care often overlooks these aspects, resulting in mistrust and reduced utilization of services. Integrating Indigenous knowledge with evidence-based psychiatric treatment can produce more effective and culturally relevant interventions.

The widespread use of psychiatric medications in Native communities underscores the urgent need for a holistic and inclusive policy framework. Such a framework must prioritize Indigenous leadership in mental health research, program development, and clinical practice. Community-based participatory research models have shown promise in aligning mental health services with the values and needs of Native communities.[21] By emphasizing Indigenous perspectives and promoting culturally responsive care-including structured withdrawal services-psychiatric treatment models can be both respectful and effective.

Addressing the mental health needs of Native American communities benefits from an approach that recognizes past injustices, respects cultural traditions, and incorporates scientific advances. Moving toward such an integrated model-including policies and community-guided venues for safe psychiatric withdrawal-offers a promising path for supporting healing and resilience within these populations. Importantly, policy development must also consider the lessons learned from existing federal treatment guidelines, such as those outlined in SAMHSA's Treatment Improvement Protocols, which highlight the need for culturally informed, ethically grounded, and community-responsive approaches to medication use and discontinuation.[25]

Terminology note: *In this article, Native American specifically refers to tribal nations within the United States, while Indigenous is used when discussing broader pan-Indigenous, cross-community, or global contexts. Both terms are used intentionally to avoid unnecessary repetition and to reflect the layered identities relevant to the communities discussed.*

The chemical imbalance narrative: science, metaphor, and the construction of a psychiatric myth

For decades, the phrase "chemical imbalance" has circulated in clinical settings, pharmaceutical advertising, and public discourse as a seemingly authoritative explanation for depression, anxiety, and related conditions. The idea suggested that mental disorders resulted from deficiencies in neurotransmitters like serotonin, and that psychotropic medications fixed these issues. Its appeal relied on its simplicity: a complex range of human experiences could be reduced to a specific biological mechanism with a corresponding pharmacological solution.

A closer look at the scientific literature, however, shows that the chemical imbalance model was never conclusively proven as an explanation for mental disorders. Pies, a psychiatrist and scholar, has clarified that the chemical imbalance idea mainly served as a metaphor-a simple way of communicating rather than an empirically confirmed theory.[26] This realization raises important questions about how a metaphor became widely accepted as a biological fact and how it influenced prescribing practices for decades.

One factor was the persuasive power of storytelling. The chemical imbalance story was simple to grasp, emotionally comforting, and quickly incorporated into pharmaceutical marketing. Over time, repetition in clinical environments, the media, and advertising helped it evolve from a metaphor into what was seen as a scientific fact.[27] Pharmaceutical ads further supported this story by implying that antidepressants corrected a specific neurochemical defect, even though there was no evidence to back up such a defect.[28]

The scientific community's response also warrants careful review. If leading psychiatrists acknowledged that the chemical imbalance theory lacked strong evidence, their failure to communicate this clearly to the public reveals deeper issues related to scientific uncertainty, clinical practice, and public messaging.[26] This ambiguity has had notable effects, leading to an overdependence on medication and obscuring the social, cultural, and historical factors that contribute to distress.

Recent research has further challenged the biological reductionism in the chemical imbalance story. Moncrieff and colleagues conducted a thorough review of the serotonin hypothesis of depression and found no consistent evidence linking low serotonin levels to depression.[29,30] Their findings challenge decades of beliefs about the neurochemical roots of depression and question treatment approaches based on these ideas.

Lacasse and Leo similarly argued that the chemical imbalance narrative was pushed without scientific proof and has misled both clinicians and the public.[29] They highlight the influence of pharmaceutical advertising and educational materials in maintaining a narrative lacking empirical evidence. Other scholars have criticized the broader reductive biological model for hiding the social and psychological roots of distress. Levine argues that such models lead to overmedication and weaken the focus on context, meaning, and lived experience.[31] Hall, in his harm-reduction-focused guide on psychiatric drug withdrawal, stresses person-centered approaches that emphasize autonomy, informed choice, and non-pathologizing frameworks.[32]

Deegan, a key figure in the recovery movement, has long supported approaches that focus on empowerment, self-determination, and lived experience rather than diagnostic labels. Johnstone, co-developer of the Power Threat Meaning Framework, criticizes biomedical models for ignoring trauma, power dynamics, and personal meaning and recommends narrative-based alternatives.[14]

These critiques extend beyond North America. Globally, many scholars have examined the cultural limits of Western psychiatric models, arguing that they often rely on reductionist frameworks that overlook local histories, cultural values, and community-based understandings of distress. Their work emphasizes the need for mental health approaches that are culturally grounded, rights-based, and responsive to specific contexts. Their worldwide analyses similarly highlight the risks of universalizing Western psychiatric ideas and stress the importance of cultural context in developing effective mental health interventions.[33,34]

Overall, this body of literature shows that the chemical imbalance theory acts more as a cultural narrative than a scientific fact-one that has shaped treatment practices, influenced public opinions, and hindered the development of more comprehensive, culturally sensitive, and humane mental health approaches.

The Inadequacy-and potential harm-of biomedical psychiatry in indigenous contexts

The biomedical model of psychiatry has faced growing criticism for its scientific shortcomings and cultural insensitivity.[35] This critique is especially relevant in Indigenous communities, where mental health issues are deeply linked to colonial histories, cultural disruption, and ongoing systemic inequalities.[36] Duran's Native American Postcolonial Psychology introduced the concept of "soul wounding" to describe the intergenerational, spiritual, and communal aspects of trauma that Western psychiatry often overlooks. He argues that Indigenous suffering cannot be reduced to individual pathology but must be understood within broader historical, cultural, and cosmological contexts.[37]

Gone similarly redefines Indigenous mental health issues as "postcolonial pathologies," emphasizing the need for culturally grounded, community-focused healing practices that honor Indigenous worldviews and collective memory.[1,8,38] Smith's Decolonizing Methodologies offers a fundamental critique of the epistemological assumptions underlying Western science, including psychiatry.[39] She demonstrates how research has historically acted as a tool of imperialism, marginalizing Indigenous knowledge systems and imposing foreign interpretive frameworks. Smith calls for the decolonization of research and healing practices, insisting that Indigenous peoples must reclaim the authority to define and address their own mental health needs.

Mohawk, in *Thinking in Indian*, emphasizes the importance of relationality, ecological balance, and collective well-being-fundamental values in Indigenous health frameworks that sharply contrast with the individualistic and mechanistic views of biomedical psychiatry.[40] These principles are reaffirmed by Duran and Manson, who promote community-based participatory research (CBPR) to create culturally appropriate mental health interventions.[41]

Building on these critiques, Waitzkin offers a compelling analysis of how biomedical psychiatry can serve as a tool of social control, hiding the structural causes of suffering behind the facade of individual pathology.[7] In the Second Sickness, he argues that medical systems-especially in capitalist societies-tend to depoliticize illness, presenting it as a personal or biological failure rather than a response to systemic injustice. This perspective is especially relevant in Indigenous contexts, where mental health issues are deeply connected to histories of colonization, land dispossession, and cultural erasure.[10]

The imposition of Western psychiatric diagnoses and treatments can be not only ineffective but also alienating and harmful. Kleinman has long argued that psychiatric categories are culturally constructed and may not translate accurately across different cultural contexts.[42] Applying these categories uncritically in Indigenous communities risks pathologizing behaviors that are culturally normal and marginalizing traditional healing practices. This concern is reinforced by Kirmayer, who emphasizes that mental health must be understood through symbolic, narrative, and relational dimensions that biomedical models often overlook.[34]

In summary, the biomedical model of psychiatry-particularly in its reductive versions-fails to address the complex, culturally grounded aspects of Indigenous mental health and risks perpetuating epistemic violence.[8,30]

This broader critique of biomedical reductionism highlights the importance of examining not just diagnostic practices but also the medications themselves, whose effects in Native communities are often much more complex than clinical narratives imply.[6]

Psychiatric medications, side effects, and indigenous realities: a critical narrative

Psychiatric medications are often prescribed to alleviate psychological distress.[2] But for many Native American individuals and communities, these treatments can cause unintended and far-reaching consequences. The dominant biomedical model-partly influenced by the now-discredited "chemical imbalance" theory-still primarily views mental illness as a neurochemical disorder to be addressed with medication.[29,43] Although this reductionist approach may promote pharmaceutical marketing and clinical standardization, it neglects the complex psychological, social, cultural, spiritual, and historical factors that shape Indigenous experiences of distress.

For Native American populations, understanding mental illness requires acknowledging the lasting effects of colonization, forced assimilation, cultural suppression, and intergenerational trauma.[44] These shared experiences have disrupted traditional systems of knowledge, kinship, and healing.[6] This has led to higher rates of psychological distress, substance use, and suicide.[11,45,46] Instead of

addressing these root causes, mainstream psychiatry often depends on psychopharmacology as the first response. This approach risks medicalizing historical and structural violence while ignoring the need for cultural and community-based healing.[2,7,8,47]

The consequences of this approach are substantial. Psychiatric medications-including antipsychotics, antidepressants, and mood stabilizers-are associated with a wide range of adverse effects.[48] These include metabolic issues such as obesity and diabetes, cardiovascular problems, sexual dysfunction, emotional numbness, sedation, and cognitive decline. Long-term use of mood stabilizers like lithium can lead to thyroid and kidney issues in many patients.[18] These effects are not merely inconvenient; they can significantly disrupt the social and cultural fabric of Indigenous communities.[49] Sedation and emotional blunting may hinder participation in ceremonies, storytelling, and community gatherings-activities essential to cultural continuity and healing. Weight gain and sexual side effects can cause stigma within close-knit communities, resulting in shame, isolation, and withdrawal from care.

Particularly concerning is the link between certain antidepressants-especially SSRIs and SNRIs-and increased suicidal thoughts and behaviors in children, adolescents, and young adults.[50] This is especially alarming in Native American communities, where youth suicide rates are among the highest in the United States.[45] The FDA's black box warning highlights that the first weeks of treatment are the most dangerous. For Native youth already dealing with intergenerational trauma, cultural dislocation, and substance use, medications that affect mood and impulse control may increase the risk of self-harm.

Incorrect prescribing patterns-such as overmedication, polypharmacy, or insufficient monitoring-can further increase risk.[51] In under-resourced settings, medications may be prescribed as a default intervention when culturally appropriate therapies are unavailable. This can lead to misdiagnosis, where culturally normal behaviors are wrongly identified as pathological, and to iatrogenic harm, where the treatment itself worsens mental health.[11]

Psychiatric medications interact not only with biological factors, such as genetic variations in drug metabolism and chronic health conditions, but also with social, cultural, and historical realities. According to the American Psychiatric Association, stigma-both internal and external-is a significant non-biological factor influencing treatment outcomes.[52] In some Indigenous communities, mental illness and the use of psychiatric medications may be linked to weakness, shame, or spiritual imbalance. Visible side effects like emotional blunting or weight gain can reinforce stigma and social exclusion, especially in small communities where privacy is limited.

Cultural dissonance further complicates treatment. Western psychiatric models focus on individual problems and neurochemical explanations, which may clash with Indigenous views of mental health as connected to relationships, spirituality, and community.[1] When medications are given without considering cultural context, they might seem foreign or disempowering, causing identity issues, mistrust, and avoidance of care.

Historical trauma also plays a crucial role.[53] Psychiatric interventions that overlook this trauma may unintentionally re-traumatize individuals by addressing suffering solely as a medical problem instead of a response to historical and structural violence. Prescribing antidepressants to a young person grieving cultural loss or land dispossession can feel like denying their lived reality, intensifying feelings of invisibility and powerlessness.

Mistrust of medical institutions-based on histories of unethical research, forced sterilizations, and systemic neglect-further influences how psychiatric medications are received.[46,54] This mistrust can lead to nonadherence, reluctance to report side effects, or avoidance of follow-up care, all of which weaken treatment outcomes and raise the risk of suicide.

Genetic differences in liver enzymes like CYP2D6, CYP2C19, and CYP3A4 also affect how people metabolize medications. Native American groups may have unique metabolic profiles that influence both how well medications work and their toxicity.[55] Standard dosing guidelines-mainly based on studies in white populations-may therefore be unsuitable or unsafe. The lack of population-specific pharmacogenetic data worsens health disparities and raises the risk of adverse effects.

Environmental and lifestyle factors further complicate pharmacokinetics. Traditional diets rich in plant compounds can activate or inhibit liver enzymes.[56] Exposure to environmental toxins such as heavy metals can damage liver and kidney function.[57] High rates of diabetes, obesity, and liver disease-common in many Native communities-impact drug absorption, distribution, metabolism, and excretion.[58] [57] Despite these factors, they are often overlooked in clinical decision-making, reflecting broader patterns of biomedical neglect.

Voices from within Native communities have long challenged these paradigms. Walker, in *Coyote's Swing*, provides a powerful critique of the imposition of Western psychiatric models on Indigenous minds and bodies.[49] Gone has written extensively about the limitations of psychiatric diagnoses in capturing the collective wounds of colonization and cultural loss.[1] At the Center for Native American Health, Cooeyate (Zuni) and Maviglia advocate for culturally informed psychopharmacology, emphasizing protocols that support medication tapering, prioritize informed consent, and incorporate traditional healing practices.[59] They argue that psychiatric medications, when used, must be embedded within frameworks that respect tribal sovereignty, cultural identity, and historical context.

Moving forward, a paradigm shift is essential. Mental health systems must go beyond simply suppressing symptoms and adopt holistic, relationship-centered care models. This involves investing in culturally rooted education, training providers in cultural humility, and supporting community-led initiatives that incorporate Indigenous knowledge systems. Healing, in this context, is not merely about reducing symptoms; it includes restoring balance, reclaiming identity, and reconnecting with sources of strength that have sustained Native peoples for generations.[1,6]

Withdrawal, the kindling effect, and the challenge of discontinuation in native communities

In the broader discussion about psychiatric medication use in Indigenous communities, one of the most overlooked yet urgent issues is the lack of access to safe, culturally appropriate withdrawal support services. This imbalance reveals a deeper systemic bias: the assumption that once medications are prescribed, they will be used indefinitely, and that tapering off is either unnecessary or inherently wrong.[6,8] For Native communities-where historical trauma, cultural dislocation, and systemic neglect intersect with biomedical overreach-this neglect is not just a clinical gap; it represents a form of structural violence.

Access to withdrawal venues is essential because, for Native communities, the ability to discontinue psychiatric medications safely

is a matter of autonomy, dignity, and cultural and health sovereignty. Without this access, individuals are effectively trapped in a system with no way out-forced to choose between enduring unbearable side effects or risking unsupervised withdrawal. This situation is especially risky in communities where healthcare infrastructure is underfunded, culturally misaligned, and often distrusted due to generations of medical colonialism.[54] In this context, withdrawal support is not a luxury; it is a necessity, a human right, and an essential part of an ethical mental health system.[1]

One of the most clinically important phenomena in this context is the kindling effect, which usually develops after multiple cycles of abruptly stopping and poorly managed withdrawals from psychoactive substances. Maviglia et al.,[59] state: "The kindling phenomenon, often overlooked in clinical settings, emerges during the withdrawal phase from various substances, including sedative-hypnotic drugs (such as benzodiazepines and alcohol), psychiatric medications, and opioids. The progressive worsening of withdrawal symptoms with each successive episode characterizes this phenomenon. Consequently, its implications extend far beyond immediate clinical manifestations." In psychiatric care, this means that repeated cycles of starting and stopping medications can destabilize the nervous system, making each withdrawal more severe, longer-lasting, and potentially more dangerous.

For Native individuals, this process is often worsened by limited access to consistent, culturally competent, or professional psychiatric care.[43,58] Many are prescribed medications without adequate explanation of the risks of dependency or the neurobiological challenges of withdrawal. When medications do not address the deeper causes of distress-such as historical trauma, cultural disconnection, or spiritual imbalance-individuals may try to stop them on their own, often without medical supervision or community support. This gap is not just a clinical oversight; it is a structural failure rooted in the ongoing marginalization of Indigenous knowledge systems and the underfunding of Indigenous health infrastructure.[1,45]

Unfortunately, unsupported or unmonitored withdrawal can have disastrous effects. Symptoms like insomnia, agitation, mood swings, anxiety, mental fog, and even suicidal thoughts are not just a return of the original condition-they often become worse due to neurochemical changes caused by long-term medication use.[2] The kindling effect exacerbates this suffering, creating a feedback loop where each attempt at withdrawal becomes more difficult and dangerous, leading to a lasting, cumulative sensitization of neural circuits. This process can result in cycles of restarting psychiatric medication, not because the drugs are effective, but because overcoming withdrawal becomes too overwhelming to handle alone.[48]

Therefore, in Native communities, the lack of safe, culturally grounded withdrawal support systems can paradoxically cause long-term cycles of dependence on psychiatric drugs. This gap may erode trust in medical institutions, which can lead to poor adherence to treatment and reinforce the false narrative that Indigenous individuals are inherently "noncompliant" or "treatment-resistant," when in fact they are navigating a system that was never designed with their realities in mind.[54]

Withdrawal venues: a conceptual framework

Withdrawal venues for Native American communities can be envisioned as culturally grounded spaces where individuals can reduce psychiatric medications under professional supervision while receiving support from peers, family, and traditional healers. These venues should be designed to blend biomedical safety with Indigenous values of kinship, reciprocity, and spiritual harmony, and to address emotional distress through sociocultural methods appropriate for Native settings.[1]

Healing lodges or day program settings could provide environments in which healthcare professionals oversee tapering protocols. At the same time, elders, spiritual leaders, and cultural practitioners lead ceremonies, storytelling, and land-based healing practices.[40] Integrated care centers within tribal health systems might expand this model by combining psychiatric expertise with culturally specific practices such as talking circles, sweat lodges, and traditional medicines, integrating withdrawal into a continuum of care that respects both physical and spiritual well-being.[6,40]

In underserved or remote areas, mobile withdrawal teams could be established to deliver services directly to individuals, comprising a nurse or doctor, a cultural liaison, and a peer with lived withdrawal experience, ensuring that medical monitoring is combined with cultural mentorship and peer support.[54] Additionally, peer-led recovery interventions could offer significant support for individuals by providing helpful guidance and assistance through daily routines that include ceremony, communal meals, and storytelling.[49,60]

Across all these venues, the medical aspects of tapering-such as dosage adjustments, monitoring for withdrawal symptoms, and managing comorbid conditions-must be recognized as essential but not enough. Instead, they should be part of a broader approach that highlights cultural identity, spiritual practice, community belonging, and culturally appropriate ways to handle emotional distress as key to lasting recovery.[39]

The role of peer-related support is especially transformative within this framework. As Maviglia et al.,[22,61] highlight, Peer Support Specialists-individuals with lived experience of psychiatric medication use and withdrawal-should guide others through the complex process of tapering, providing emotional validation, cultural relevance, and hope grounded in shared experience. Peer-related support challenges hierarchical, expert-led models of care that have historically marginalized Indigenous voices, fostering trust, reducing stigma, and empowering individuals to take control of their healing journeys.[1]

By integrating biomedical and traditional systems, peer supporters help individuals understand their experiences through both clinical and cultural lenses. They also serve as advocates, educators, and companions in communities where formal mental health services may be limited or mistrusted. Research indicates that peer-led interventions enhance outcomes by increasing engagement, reducing isolation, and promoting long-term recovery.[59,61] In indigenous communities, where relationality and collective care are essential to well-being, peer support naturally aligns with cultural values, turning withdrawal from solitary struggles into a communal act of resilience, cultural reclamation, and holistic healing.[40]

Policy development for psychiatric medication prescriptions in Native American communities

To improve outcomes, both clinical practice and mental health policy must adapt to better support individuals who wish to discontinue psychiatric medications. Prescribing medication alone is insufficient; systems must also be prepared to assist with withdrawal ethically, safely, and in ways that respect cultural sovereignty.[2,8,44] Policies should be guided by a framework that combines biomedical standards with Indigenous traditions, recognizing withdrawal not only as a clinical process but also as a cultural and community journey.[1,40]

Essential steps in policy development include:

(i) Developing culturally grounded withdrawal venues within or in partnership with Native communities, ensuring access to both biomedical and traditional healing supports during tapering.[1,40,54]

(ii) Training clinicians in the neurobiology of withdrawal so they can recognize and compassionately manage withdrawal symptoms using culturally congruent interventions.[48,59]

(iii) Creating personalized tapering protocols that emphasize slow, patient-centered reductions rather than abrupt discontinuations or destabilizing polypharmacy changes.[2,6]

(iv) Integrating traditional healing methods-such as sweat lodges, talking circles, plant medicines, and spiritual guidance-into withdrawal support, acknowledging the emotional, cultural, and spiritual dimensions of healing.[39,40]

(v) Ensuring peer support and community involvement so individuals are surrounded by relational networks that affirm their strength, resilience, and cultural identity.[1,49,60]

Developing effective withdrawal support systems in Indigenous communities requires integrating evidence-based clinical protocols with culturally grounded approaches to care. This task is not just technical or administrative-it is a matter of justice, sovereignty, and survival. Policies must mandate that prescribers follow established, evidence-based tapering protocols and provide thorough, culturally appropriate education about the withdrawal process. These requirements align with best practices in behavioral health, emphasizing clinical rigor and cultural responsiveness in treatment and prevention.[8,39,46]

Culturally rooted policy frameworks

Culturally responsive care is especially vital in Indigenous communities, where distinct cultural values, traditions, and community frameworks shape understandings of mental health, illness, and healing.[1,18,37,40] Healing lodges and integrated care centers within tribal health systems offer settings where clinicians can oversee medication tapering alongside elders, spiritual leaders, and cultural practitioners. These environments emphasize relationality, kinship, and the restoration of balance, contrasting with clinical models that focus narrowly on symptom reduction. They integrate biomedical treatments into a continuum of care that honors both physical and spiritual well-being.[8,40,62]

At the heart of any effective policy on psychiatric medication withdrawal in Indigenous communities must be the full integration of Indigenous worldviews, values, and voices. This requires engaging Native leaders, elders, traditional healers, clinicians, and community members at every stage of policy development-from consultation and drafting to implementation and evaluation.[13,37,63] Policies should explicitly support the inclusion of traditional healing practices, ceremonies, storytelling, land-based healing, and spiritual guidance alongside or as alternatives to biomedical treatments.[39,40]

Mandating cultural humility and competency training for all healthcare providers serving Native communities is essential. Yet training alone is insufficient; a deeper shift in power dynamics is required. As Smith emphasizes, decolonizing care systems involves not only adopting new methods but also cultivating relationships grounded in respect, reciprocity, and relational accountability.[39] This approach positions Indigenous communities as equal partners and challenges hierarchical structures in favor of co-created, culturally relevant models of care.[1]

Community-led education and awareness campaigns

Policy interventions must be supported by community-driven educational programs that clarify the limits of biological psychiatry, address stigma, and promote traditional healing practices.[8,52] These programs should be linguistically and culturally tailored, using Indigenous languages, metaphors, storytelling, and other traditional communication methods to convey complex ideas in ways that resonate with community values.[39,40]

Educational efforts should also encourage open discussions about the risks of psychiatric medications, the challenges of withdrawal, and the full range of available healing options. Informed consent must be understood not as a single event but as an ongoing process that empowers individuals to make decisions about their care.[1,6]

Equitable access to holistic services

Access to mental health services remains a major challenge in many Native communities, particularly in rural and remote areas. Policy efforts should advocate for increased funding to expand mental health infrastructure and prioritize the recruitment and retention of Indigenous and culturally competent providers.[44,54] Telehealth services, mobile clinics, and community-based mental health hubs must be developed in collaboration with tribal governments to ensure that these initiatives meet local needs and honor cultural traditions. Respecting Native languages, healing practices, and community values is essential, as culturally grounded care fosters trust and improves outcomes.[1,40]

Improving access also requires addressing social determinants of mental health, including housing, food security, education, and safety. These broader socioeconomic factors fundamentally shape individual and community well-being.[46,63] Withdrawal management must therefore be understood not only as a technical process but as part of a comprehensive mental health strategy that prioritizes accessibility, equity, cultural responsiveness, and recovery-focused care.[8,39]

Safe withdrawal support and medication tapering protocols

Creating safe and effective support systems for individuals discontinuing psychiatric medications is a vital but often overlooked aspect of mental health policy. For many Native individuals, withdrawal is especially risky due to limited access to culturally grounded care and the historical mistrust of medical institutions.[48,54]

Based on the points discussed in this article, these settings should include:

(i) Personalized tapering protocols that consider pharmacological, cultural, and spiritual factors.[1,6,64]

(ii) Integration of traditional healing methods such as ceremonies, plant medicines, and spiritual guidance.[19,39,40]

(iii) Peer-led support networks rooted in lived experience and Indigenous cultural knowledge.[60,61,65]

(iv) Trauma-informed care that acknowledges the historical and systemic origins of psychological distress.[8,46,66]

(v) Continuous monitoring and follow-up to ensure safety, stability, and successful reintegration into the community.[54,61]

Withdrawal support must be recognized as a fundamental component of ethical mental health care. It is not an optional service but a basic right for individuals seeking to discontinue psychiatric medications.[1,39]

Withdrawal and tapering policies in a larger frame

Developing effective withdrawal and tapering policies cannot be seen as just a narrow clinical task; it must be part of a larger framework that includes intersectoral collaboration, tribal sovereignty, and culturally grounded research. Withdrawal venues and tapering protocols work best when integrated into systems that recognize the interconnected factors affecting health-such as housing, education, justice, and community safety-and when they are created in partnership with tribal governments as sovereign entities rather than secondary stakeholders.[20,63] In this way, withdrawal management becomes not only a medical process but also a means of promoting equity, cultural respect, and community-defined wellness.[8,39]

Intersectoral collaboration and tribal partnerships

Policy development must begin with meaningful collaboration across sectors such as health, education, housing, and justice, while integrating diverse systems of knowledge. Tribal governments need to be acknowledged and engaged as sovereign partners rather than sidelined participants. Policies should actively support the development of intertribal and interagency partnerships to facilitate resource sharing, cross-training, and the creation of wraparound services that align with Indigenous definitions of wellness.[63] Without genuine tribal consultation-ongoing, good-faith dialogue that respects sovereignty, ensures informed consent, and grants tribes real decision-making authority-withdrawal processes risk repeating external control rather than promoting healing. Clear mechanisms for tribal oversight and leadership are therefore essential.[13,20]

Indigenous-led research and data sovereignty

The collaborative structures outlined above must be supported by rigorous, ethical, and culturally grounded research. Withdrawal and tapering policies require longitudinal studies to understand the long-term effects of psychiatric medications, withdrawal outcomes, and the effectiveness of traditional healing practices. This research should be led by Indigenous scholars and guided by principles of tribal data sovereignty.[39,63] Tribal data sovereignty affirms the inherent rights of Indigenous nations to define, collect, protect, interpret, manage, and use data in ways that align with their own ethics, values, and relational responsibilities.[13,20] Incorporating withdrawal research within these principles ensures that all stages of the process remain under tribal oversight, with clear mechanisms for free, prior, and informed consent. Data must remain accessible and meaningful to Indigenous communities, supporting governance, self-determination, and decision-making.[63]

This research area is strongly connected to justice. As Waitzkin has argued, the biomedical model often conceals the structural and political factors that affect health.[66,67] Indigenous-led research guided by data sovereignty can reveal these links, ensuring that withdrawal and tapering policies promote justice and community well-being rather than perpetuating exploitative practices by pharmaceutical companies or academic institutions.[8,46]

Monitoring, evaluation, and accountability

Strong systems for monitoring, evaluation, and accountability must support withdrawal and tapering policies. These frameworks reach their full potential only when policies remain flexible and responsive to community needs. This requires clear success benchmarks, regular collection of community feedback, and a demonstrated willingness to adapt strategies based on lived experience and new evidence.[39,63] Accountability structures must go beyond institutional requirements to prioritize the needs and perspectives of those most directly impacted. Transparent reporting, community advisory boards, and participatory evaluation methods are essential for ensuring that withdrawal policies remain effective while reflecting Indigenous values, priorities, and holistic well-being. In this way, monitoring and evaluation become acts of respect, reciprocity, and relational accountability.[37,39]

Conclusion: reclaiming healing, restoring balance

The use of psychiatric medications in Native American communities should be understood not only as a clinical issue but also within the broader context of colonization, cultural disruption, and systemic inequities. While these medications may provide relief for some individuals, their widespread and often uncritical use-based on a reductionist biomedical model-has failed to address the deeper, collective wounds that influence Indigenous mental health.[1,8,52] This includes neglecting environmental, nutritional, and lifestyle factors that impact medication effects and withdrawal experiences, many of which are shaped by historical and structural determinants of health.[46,56]

This article has explored the challenges related to psychiatric medications in Native communities, including harmful physical and emotional side effects, the complexities of withdrawal and the kindling effect, and the cultural disconnect between Western psychiatry and Indigenous worldviews. It highlights the perspectives of Native scholars, clinicians, and community members who critically assess the limitations of biological psychiatry and advocate for relational, community-based, and spiritually grounded healing methods.[17,40,68] [8, 28, 34] Moving forward requires more than policy reform; it demands a fundamental transformation. Policies must prioritize Indigenous knowledge systems, establish safe and culturally appropriate withdrawal protocols, and expand access to comprehensive mental health services. Clinical practice must evolve to respect the full personhood of Native patients by integrating traditional healing with trauma-informed and culturally competent care. Research efforts should be led by Indigenous scholars and guided by ethical frameworks that support tribal sovereignty and the lived experiences of community members.[20,39,63]

Ultimately, healing must be defined and guided by Native communities themselves. It should reflect their values, traditions, and visions of wellness-coming from within rather than being imposed from outside. As LaDuke reminds us, "Health sovereignty is about restoring our relationship to ourselves, our communities, and the land. It is about reclaiming the ability to define wellness on our own terms, free from systems that have historically sought to erase us."[24] This vision emphasizes that reclaiming authority over mental health is linked to the recovery of cultural identity, dignity, and self-determination. By reclaiming the authority to shape their own mental health journeys, Native peoples can move beyond survival toward sovereignty, resilience, and renewal. In this spirit, the future of mental health care in Native communities extends beyond symptom management. It centers on restoring balance, rebuilding trust, and honoring the enduring wisdom embedded within Indigenous peoples, their traditions, and their worldviews. This article is therefore not only a critique of current practices but also a contribution to the broader movement for Native health sovereignty-an affirmation that real healing begins when Indigenous communities lead in defining, shaping, and sustaining their own paths to wellness.[1,24,69–73]

Acknowledgments

None.

Citation: Cooeyate N, Maviglia M. When context is erased: how colonial histories and diagnostic reductionism shape psychopharmacology in Native American communities. *J Psychol Clin Psychiatry.* 2026;17(2):75–84. DOI: 10.15406/jpcpy.2026.17.00856

Funding

None.

Conflicts of interest

The author declares there is no conflict of interest.

References

1. Gone JP. Redressing First Nations' historical trauma: theorizing mechanisms for Indigenous culture as mental health treatment. *Transcult Psychiatry*. 2013;50(5):683–706.
2. Leichsenring F, Steinert C, Ioannidis JPA, et al. The efficacy of psychotherapies and pharmacotherapies for mental disorders in adults: an umbrella review. *World Psychiatry*. 2022;21(1):133–145.
3. McGuire TG, Miranda J. New evidence regarding racial and ethnic disparities in mental health: policy implications. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2008;27(2):393–403.
4. Brave Heart MYH, Chase J, Elkins J, et al. Historical trauma among Indigenous peoples of the Americas: concepts, research, and clinical considerations. *J Psychoactive Drugs*. 2011;43(4):282–290.
5. Kirmayer LJ, Gone JP, Moses J. Rethinking historical trauma. *Transcult Psychiatry*. 2014;51(3):299–319.
6. Brave Heart MY, DeBruyn LM. The American Indian Holocaust: healing historical unresolved grief. *Am Indian Alsk Native Ment Health Res*. 1998;8(2):56–78.
7. Waitzkin H. *The second sickness: contradictions of capitalist health care*. 2nd ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield; 2000.
8. Gone JP, Kirmayer LJ. Advancing Indigenous mental health research: Ethical, conceptual and methodological challenges. *Transcult Psychiatry*. 2020;57(2):235–249.
9. Henderson L, Claw K, Woodahl E, et al. P450 pharmacogenetics in Indigenous North American populations. *J Pers Med*. 2018;8(1):9.
10. Nasir BF, Kisely S, Hides L, et al. Systematic review of indigenous involvement and content in mental health interventions and their effectiveness for Indigenous populations. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry*. 2022;56(10):1230–1251.
11. Gone JP, Trimble JE. American Indian and Alaska Native mental health: Diverse perspectives on enduring disparities. *Annu Rev Clin Psychol*. 2012;8:131–160.
12. Turner EH, Matthews AM, Linardatos E, et al. The cumulative effect of reporting and citation biases on the apparent efficacy of treatments: the case of depression. *Psychol Med*. 2018;48(13):2060–2067.
13. Maviglia M, Cooeyate NJ. Implementing psychiatric drug withdrawal practices: challenges with individuals with multiple comorbid behavioral and health problems. *J Psychol Clin Psychiatry*. 2024;15(2):79–85.
14. Johnstone L, Boyle M. *The power threat meaning framework*. Leicester, UK: British Psychological Society; 2018.
15. Claw K, Anderson M, Begay R, et al. A framework for enhancing ethical genomic research with Indigenous communities. *Nat Commun*. 2018;9(1):2957.
16. Tone-Pah-Hote T, Redvers N. The commercialization of biospecimens from Indigenous Peoples: a scoping review of benefit-sharing. *Front Med*. 2022;9:978826.
17. Carroll SR, Rodriguez-Lonebear D, Martinez A. Indigenous data governance: strategies from United States Native Nations. *Data Sci J*. 2019;18:31.
18. Crouch MC, Kim SM, Asquith-Heinz Z, et al. Indigenous Elder-centered methodology: research that decolonizes and indigenizes. *AlterNative*. 2023;19(2):447–456.
19. Walter M, Suina M. Indigenous data, indigenous methodologies and data sovereignty. *Int J Soc Res Methodol*. 2019;22(3):233–243.
20. Hudson M, Carroll SR, Anderson J, et al. Indigenous Peoples' rights in data: a contribution toward Indigenous research sovereignty. *Front Res Metr Anal*. 2023;8:1173805.
21. Rainie SC, Rodriguez-Lonebear D, Martinez A. *Indigenous data sovereignty in the United States*. Tucson, AZ: Native Nations Institute; 2017.
22. Maviglia M, Hume D, Cooeyate NJ. Peer support's role in helping individuals withdraw from psychiatric medications. *J Psychol Clin Psychiatry*. 2023;14(6):157–162.
23. Huang CY, Zane N. Cultural influences in mental health treatment. *Curr Opin Psychol*. 2016;8:131–136.
24. LaDuke W. *All our relations: native struggles for land and life*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press; 1999.
25. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. *Medications for opioid use disorder*. Treatment Improvement Protocol (TIP) Series 63. Publication No. PEP21-02-01-002. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration; 2021
26. Pies RW. Debunking the two chemical imbalance myths (again). *Psychiatr Times*. 2019;36(8).
27. Mintzes B. Advertising of prescription-only medicines to the public. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2012;33:259–277.
28. Lebowitz MS, Ahn WK. Effects of biological explanations for mental disorders on clinicians' empathy. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2014;111(50):17786–17790.
29. Lacasse JR, Leo J. Serotonin and depression: a disconnect between the advertisements and the scientific literature. *PLoS Med*. 2005;2(12):e392.
30. Moncrieff J, Cooper RE, Stockmann T, et al. The serotonin theory of depression: a systematic umbrella review of the evidence. *Mol Psychiatry*. 2023;28(8):3243–3256.
31. Levine BE. *Resisting illegitimate authority*. Oakland, CA: AK Press; 2018.
32. Hall W. *Harm reduction guide to coming off psychiatric drugs and withdrawal*. The Icarus Project and Freedom Center, 2012.
33. Fernando S. *Mental health worldwide: culture, globalization and development*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan; 2014.
34. Kirmayer LJ. Beyond the "new cross-cultural psychiatry": Cultural biology, discursive psychology and the ironies of globalization. *Transcult Psychiatry*. 2006;43(1):126–144.
35. Kirmayer LJ, Dandeneau S, Marshall E, et al. Rethinking resilience from Indigenous perspectives. *Can J Psychiatry*. 2011;56(2):84–91.
36. Redvers N, Platt J, Green M. The land is a healer: perspectives on land-based healing from Indigenous practitioners in northern Canada. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(12):4633.
37. Duran E, Duran B. *Native American postcolonial psychology*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press; 1995.
38. Gone JP. A community-based treatment for Native American historical trauma: prospects for evidence-based practice. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 2009;77(4):751–762.
39. Smith LT. *Decolonizing methodologies*. London, UK: Zed Books; 1999.
40. Mohawk J. *Thinking in Indian: A John Mohawk reader*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing; 2010.
41. Wallerstein NB, Duran B. Using community-based participatory research to address health disparities. *Health Promot Pract*. 2006;7(3):312–323.
42. Kleinman A. *Rethinking psychiatry: from cultural category to personal experience*. New York, NY: Free Press; 1988.

43. Ang B, Horowitz M, Moncrieff J. Is the chemical imbalance an 'Urban Legend'? An exploration of the status of the serotonin theory of depression in the scientific literature. *SSM - Mental Health*. 2022;2:100098.

44. Gopalkrishnan N. Cultural diversity and mental health: considerations for policy and practice. *Front Public Health*. 2018;6:179.

45. Iredale JM, Shults RA, Bertolli J. Suicides among American Indian or Alaska Native persons — National violent death reporting system, 18 States, 2003–2014. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2018;67:237–242.

46. Espey DK, Jim MA, Cobb N, et al. Leading causes of death and all-cause mortality in American Indians and Alaska Natives. *Am J Public Health*. 2014;104(suppl 3):S303–S311.

47. Whitaker R. *Anatomy of an epidemic*. New York, NY: Crown; 2010.

48. Kraszewska A, Czernikiewicz A, Wysokiński A. Organ functions after long-term lithium therapy. *Psychiatr Pol*. 2015;49(6):1235–1246.

49. Walker DE. *Coyote's swing: a memoir and critique of mental hygiene in Native America*. Pullman, WA: Washington State University Press; 2022.

50. Hetrick SE, McKenzie JE, Cox GR, et al. Newer generation antidepressants for depressive disorders in children and adolescents. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2012;11(11):CD004851.

51. Ferner RE, Aronson JK. Clarification of terminology in medication errors: definitions and classification. *Drug Saf*. 2006;29(11):1011–1022.

52. American Psychiatric Association. *Indigenous populations face unique barriers to accessing mental health help*. 2022.

53. Smith J. Historical trauma in indigenous populations. *J Trauma Stud*. 2024;12(3):45–50.

54. Lawrence J. The Indian Health Service and sterilization of Native American women. *Am Indian Q*. 2000;24(3):400–419.

55. Zhou SF, Liu JP, Chowbay B. Polymorphism of cytochrome P450 enzymes and its clinical impact. *Drug Metab Rev*. 2009;41(2):89–295.

56. Kuhnlein HV, Receveur O. Dietary change and traditional food systems of Indigenous peoples. *Annu Rev Nutr*. 1996;16:417–442.

57. Jaishankar M, Tseten T, Anbalagan N, et al. Toxicity, mechanism, and health effects of some heavy metals. *Interdiscip Toxicol*. 2014;7(2):60–72.

58. Moncrieff J. Does antipsychotic withdrawal provoke psychosis? *Acta Psychiatr Scand*. 2006;114(1):3–13.

59. Maviglia M, Hume D, Cooeyate NJ, et al. Kindling in psychopharmacology: Unveiling an overlooked clinical challenge with significant implications. *J Psychol Clin Psychiatry*. 2024;15(5):282–290.

60. Wexler L. Looking across three generations of Alaska Natives to explore how culture fosters indigenous resilience. *Transcult Psychiatry*. 2014;51(1):73–92.

61. World Health Organization. *Guidance on community mental health services: promoting person-centred and rights-based approaches*. World Health Organization; 2021.

62. Beauchamp TL, Childress JF. *Principles of biomedical ethics*. 8th ed. Oxford University Press, 2019.

63. LaDuke W. *Recovering the sacred: the power of naming and claiming*. Cambridge, MA. South End Press; 2005.

64. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. *SAMHSA's concept of trauma and guidance for a trauma-informed approach*. Rockville, MD: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration; 2014. HHS Publication SMA 14-4884.

65. Deegan PE. Recovery as a journey of the heart. *Psychiatr Rehabil J*. 1996;19(3):91–97.

66. Waitzkin H. *Medicine and public health at the end of empire*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers; 2011.

67. Waitzkin H. A Marxist view of medical care. *Ann Intern Med*. 1978;89(2):264–278.

68. White RG, Jain S, Orr DMR, et al eds. *The Palgrave handbook of sociocultural perspectives on global mental health*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan; 2017.

69. Whelshula M, Hill M, Galaitsi SE, et al. Native populations and the opioid crisis: forging a path to recovery. *Environ Syst Decis*. 2021;41(3):334–340.

70. Kleinman A. *Rethinking psychiatry: from cultural category to personal experience*. New York: Free Press; 1988.

71. Kirmayer LJ, Brass GM, Tait CL. The mental health of aboriginal peoples: transformations of identity and community. *Can J Psychiatry*. 2000;45(7):607–616.

72. Kirmayer LJ, Pedersen D. Toward a new architecture for global mental health. *Transcult Psychiatry*. 2014;51(6):759–776.

73. Gone JP, Kirmayer LJ. Considering culture and context in psychopathology. *Cult Med Psychiatry*. 2010;34(2):233–262.

Citation: Cooeyate N, Maviglia M. When context is erased: how colonial histories and diagnostic reductionism shape psychopharmacology in Native American communities. *J Psychol Clin Psychiatry*. 2026;17(2):75–84. DOI: 10.15406/jpcpy.2026.17.00856

Citation: Cooeyate N, Maviglia M. When context is erased: how colonial histories and diagnostic reductionism shape psychopharmacology in Native American communities. *J Psychol Clin Psychiatry.* 2026;17(2):75–84. DOI: 10.15406/jpcpy.2026.17.00856