

2015

Forensic Psychiatry and the Law: Litigation, Advocacy, Scholarship and Teaching

Michael L. Perlin
New York Law School

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.nyls.edu/fac_articles_chapters

 Part of the [Disability Law Commons](#), and the [Education Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Evolution of Forensic Psychiatry: History, Current Developments, Future Directions at 253-262 (R.L. Sadoff, ed., Oxford University Press, 2015)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Scholarship at DigitalCommons@NYLS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Articles & Chapters by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@NYLS.

The Evolution of Forensic Psychiatry

*History, Current Developments,
Future Directions*

EDITED BY

Robert L. Sadoff, M.D.

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford. It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship, and education by publishing worldwide.

Oxford New York
Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in
Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore
South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trademark of Oxford University Press
in the UK and certain other countries.

Published in the United States of America by
Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016

© Oxford University Press 2015

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted by law, by license, or under terms agreed with the appropriate reproduction rights organization. Inquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the address above.

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
The evolution of forensic psychiatry : history, current developments, future directions / edited by Robert L. Sadoff.
p. ; cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-0-19-939343-5 (alk. paper)
I. Sadoff, Robert L., 1936- , editor.
[DNLM: 1. Forensic Psychiatry—trends. 2. Forensic Psychiatry—history. W 740]
RA1151
614'.15—dc23
2014040352

This material is not intended to be, and should not be considered, a substitute for medical or other professional advice. Treatment for the conditions described in this material is highly dependent on the individual circumstances. And, while this material is designed to offer accurate information with respect to the subject matter covered and to be current as of the time it was written, research and knowledge about medical and health issues is constantly evolving and dose schedules for medications are being revised continually, with new side effects recognized and accounted for regularly. Readers must therefore always check the product information and clinical procedures with the most up-to-date published product information and data sheets provided by the manufacturers and the most recent codes of conduct and safety regulation. The publisher and the authors make no representations or warranties to readers, express or implied, as to the accuracy or completeness of this material. Without limiting the foregoing, the publisher and the authors make no representations or warranties as to the accuracy or efficacy of the drug dosages mentioned in the material. The authors and the publisher do not accept, and expressly disclaim, any responsibility for any liability, loss, or risk that may be claimed or incurred as a consequence of the use and/or application of any of the contents of this material.

This book, which contains contributions from so many and such diverse professions, is dedicated to my mentors and teachers, to my esteemed and cherished colleagues, to my students, both current and past, and to the people we have served over the years, all of whom have taught me so much that has led to the ideas formulated in this volume.

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
Printed in the United States of America
on acid-free paper

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	xi
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xiii
<i>List of Contributors</i>	xv
<i>Introduction</i>	xix
SECTION ONE History	
1. American Forensic Psychiatry Begins: Setting Standards <i>Kenneth J. Weiss</i>	3
2. Development of Forensic Psychiatry Training at Temple University and Services in Philadelphia and Pennsylvania: A Memoir <i>Melvin S. Heller</i>	21
3. The Modern Era of Forensic Psychiatry <i>Richard Rosner and Robert L. Sadoff</i>	33
SECTION TWO Current Developments: Teaching Forensic Psychiatry	
4. The Teaching Roles of the Forensic Psychiatrist <i>J. Richard Ciccone and Joshua C. W. Jones</i>	43
5. The Program in Psychiatry and the Law: A New Direction in Forensic Training and Experience <i>Thomas G. Gutheil</i>	55
6. Reflections of a Forensic Teacher <i>Phillip J. Resnick</i>	63
7. Forensic Psychiatry Fellowship Training: Fundamentals for the Future <i>Charles L. Scott</i>	71

8. The Development of a Fully Integrated Forensic Psychiatry Residency Within a General Department of Psychiatry 81
Stephen Bates Billick

SECTION THREE Child and Adolescent Forensic Psychiatry

9. “The Child Is Father of the Man”: Mutual Influences of Child and Adult Forensic Psychiatry 91
Annie Steinberg and Laurentine Fromm
10. Childhood Maltreatment and Chronic Unmediated Stress: A New View for Forensic Psychiatry 109
Steven Berkowitz
11. Social Policy, Child Abuse and Neglect, and Forensic Psychiatry 117
Richard J. Gelles and Debra Schilling Wolfe
12. Juvenile Sentencing and the Possibility of Parole Following *Miller v. Alabama* 127
Catherine Mao and Susan Rushing

SECTION FOUR Psychiatry Subspecialties and Forensic Psychiatry

13. Forensic Issues in Hospital-Based Psychiatric Consultations 143
Rachel Shmuts, Robert M. Weinrieb, and Kajal R. Patel
14. Forensic Issues in Geriatric Psychiatry 155
Joel E. Streim
15. Inpatient Forensic Psychiatry 163
Clarence Watson
16. Correctional Psychiatry: Its Influence on the Forensic Psychiatrist 173
Jeffrey L. Metzner, Kenneth L. Appelbaum, and Robert L. Trestman
17. Managing Malpractice Risks During Psychopharmacologic Treatment 181
Joseph N. DiGiacomo and Robert L. Sadoff
18. Forensic Psychiatry and Addiction Psychiatry 193
Richard F. Limoges

SECTION FIVE Forensic Psychiatry and Other Professions

19. Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology: Fraternal Twins of Courtroom Science 205
Eric Y. Drogin and Frank M. Dattilio
20. Forensic Psychiatric Ethics: A Return to the Ivory Tower 213
Claire Pouncey
21. Forensic Sleep Medicine: Sleepwalking, Automatism, Scientific Evidence, and the Law 221
Mark R. Pressman
22. Nobody Wins Without a Good Team 231
Kathleen Brown

23. Criminology and Forensic Psychiatry: Sharing a Discipline 239
William S. Laufer and Danielle M. Dorn

SECTION SIX Forensic Psychiatry and Legal Issues

24. Forensic Psychiatry and the Law: Litigation, Advocacy, Scholarship, and Teaching 253
Michael L. Perlin
25. Forensic Psychiatry: A View From a Trial Lawyer and a Judge 263
Hon. Robert J. Matthews
26. The Growing Intersection of Forensic Psychiatry and Federal Criminal Defense 269
NiaLena Caravaso
27. Forensic Psychiatry in Law Enforcement: A Practitioner’s Perspective 283
George Cronin

SECTION SEVEN Future Directions

28. Linking Brain and Behavioral Measures in the Medical-Legal Context 295
Ruben C. Gur and Oren M. Gur
29. Neurocriminology: Applications for Forensic Psychiatry 313
Robert A. Schug, Adrian Raine, Yu Gao, Andrea Glenn, and Yaling Yang
30. How Can the Neuroscience of Memory Inform Our Understanding of Amnesia in Criminal Settings? 329
Alisa R. Gutman
31. Indispensable Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology: The (Non) Challenge from Neuroscience 339
Stephen J. Morse

Appendix: ACGME Program Requirements for Graduate Medical Education

- in Forensic Psychiatry* 359
- Suggested Readings* 379
- Index* 385

Forensic Psychiatry and the Law

Litigation, Advocacy, Scholarship, and Teaching

Michael L. Perlin

I met Bob Sadoff on a snowy day in December 1971, and it changed my life.¹ I was a rookie public defender (PD) in Trenton, NJ, and I had been assigned to represent a young man (Raamon Jenkins), institutionalized in what was called the “Vroom Building,” New Jersey’s maximum security hospital for the “criminally insane.” He had been charged with assaulting his treating psychiatrist. Not surprisingly, most of the psychiatrists whom I called, quickly declined the offer, but several said, “Contact Bob Sadoff. I bet he’d love to do the case.” I didn’t know who Bob was at the time, but when I researched him and found that he was president of the American Academy of Psychiatry and Law, I gulped. Why on earth would an expert as prominent as *this* want to come to the Trenton PD office to work on a case with me, who had been practicing law all of 4 months?

Heart in mouth, I called Bob, and introduced myself. He said, without hesitation, “Sure! Just make sure that the guards know that I’m coming so we don’t kill half a day getting me access.” I was floored. A few days later, Bob came to my office, and introduced himself. We chatted for a few minutes (I am sure about sports), and he said, “Let’s get to work!” And we did.

The case turned into one of the ultimate shaggy-dog stories of my career. New Jersey was and is a *M’Naghten* state,²⁻⁵ but, at this point in time (12 years before John Hinckley shot Ronald Reagan), it seemed certainly within the realm of possibility that the state supreme court could be persuaded to abandon it, and adopt, instead, the more liberal Model Penal Code/American Law Institute test—that the defendant “as a result of mental disease or defect, lacked substantial capacity to conform his conduct to the requirements of the law

which he is alleged to have violated” (*United States v. Currens*, 1961),⁶ which a decade earlier had been adopted by the third circuit for federal criminal trials.^{7,8}

After Bob examined my client, he came back and said, “Do you want the good news or the bad news?”⁹ Although I am generally an optimist, my few months as a criminal defense lawyer had already amply demonstrated that the bad news would eventually prevail, so I said, “Start with the bad.” And Bob told me that my client did not meet the *M’Naghten* standard. Deflated, I asked, “So what’s the good news?” To which Bob responded, “He *does* meet the American Law Institute (ALI) standard. Maybe you want to use this as a test case?” I thought about it for 12 seconds, and said, “Sure!” And we were off and running.

The trial came, and Bob got up to testify. And, after a detailed explanation of my client’s actions, his motivations, his mental illness, and more, he explained to the judge (This was a bench trial; I might have been a rookie, but I realized that there was no way a jury could have grasped the nuances of this case) that my client did “lack substantial capacity to conform his conduct to the requirements of the law” (tracking the ALI test). At which point, the prosecutor jumped up and said, “Well, this is interesting, but it’s not the law of New Jersey. And, in fact, Dr. Sadoff *did* prepare a report in this case in which the court might be interested.” The judge looked at me, and said, “A report?” I said, “Yes, your honor. I was getting to that in a moment. I wanted to set the stage though, by putting on this testimony first.” In his report, Bob concluded that my client was *not* insane under *M’Naghten* but would have been insane *if New Jersey were to adopt the ALI test*. It took the judge about 3 minutes to wish me luck on my appeal and find my client guilty.

This was not unexpected at all, and Bob and I agreed that this was the perfect test case to take to the New Jersey Supreme Court—I had clerked for the state appellate division the year before and that position had given me a lot of time to think about how the justices felt about the toughest criminal law and procedure issues—and that we had, all in all, a fairly good shot, in what would probably be a 4-3 decision. My client, unfortunately, thought the wheels of justice moved too slowly, and decided that he would be better off taking matters in his own hands, so, one day, when the laundry truck was leaving the jail, he hopped in somehow and took his leave, thus ending our chances of a test case appeal.¹⁰

This is not the kind of case one forgets, and it was the start of what has perhaps been the most remarkable professional relationship of my life. I worked closely with Bob on many, many cases over the years. He was a witness in many cases that I have litigated,^{11,12} and has been the inspiration for others.¹³

We have taught together and presented on panels together,¹⁴ we have shared the podium innumerable times at meetings of the American Academy of Psychiatry and Law (AAPL), the American Association of Law Schools, the American Psychiatric Association, the International Academy of Law and Mental Health, and other cross-professional organizations. He has served on monitoring committees of cases I have litigated.¹⁵ We have made teaching tapes together,¹⁶ have co-authored articles,^{17,18} and I have written chapters in other books that he has edited.^{19,20} I present regularly in his Practical Applications in Forensic Psychiatry Seminar series at the University of Pennsylvania Medical School.²¹ Bob gave me my “national” start by inviting me to

present at an American Academy of Psychiatry and Law meeting in 1975 (see Perlin, 1975). He has written about me in his books,²² and I have written about him in my articles.^{23,24} I have written introductory forewords to two of his books,^{25,26} and I have participated in two *festschriften* honoring Bob.^{27,28}

I begin this chapter with these personal recollections because, in answering the question that was posed to me—to discuss the impact forensic psychiatry has had on my work and reciprocally the effect I have had on forensic psychiatry—I realized that so much of my answer flows from my relationship with Bob, a relationship that has touched on every aspect of my professional life.

I spent 13 years as a practicing lawyer and have now spent 30 as a law professor. Forensic psychiatry has had an impact on every aspect of my careers, in the context of litigation, advocacy, scholarship, and teaching. I hope that, both directly through my having taught forensic psychiatry fellows for many years, and less directly, through my scholarship—especially my foci on sanism and pretextuality and my incorporation of therapeutic jurisprudence in all aspects of my work, as discussed in the following—and my advocacy—especially my insistence that American mental health professionals learn about and incorporate international human rights principles and standards into their work—that I have had a modest effect on forensic psychiatric practice as well. Again, my work with Bob—my presentations at AAPL, my teaching in the fellowship programs, our co-authorships—form the core of that sphere of influence.

Litigation

I have spent much of the past 40 years seeking to persuade forensic psychiatrists that they could best influence the development of the law by working with plaintiffs’ lawyers in test cases that challenge the way the civil commitment process is carried out, that challenge the conditions of confinement in public psychiatric facilities (including the prescriptive right to treatment and the proscriptive right to refuse treatment), that challenge the way that hospital release plans rarely meet any of the criteria of a true deinstitutionalization program, and by working with criminal defendants’ lawyers in the full range of forensic issues, including competency to stand trial, responsibility determinations, sentencing, and the death penalty.²⁹

At the same time, forensic psychiatry has influenced me by demonstrating to me—on multiple occasions—that there are significant limits as to what lawyers can do for a client if they fail to acknowledge the reality of the limitations, political influences, and funding pressures on forensic systems.

I believe that these influences have been—and continue to be—symbiotic. It is only if forensic psychiatrists continue to work with lawyers, who seek consciously to advance a social law reform agenda, and only if those lawyers continue to work with forensic psychiatrists who continue to ask questions—questions about forensic systems, about clients beyond the narrow legal inquiry that may be the only question before the court (e.g., is the defendant competent to stand trial?)—that the law often simply does not ask, that litigation in this area can become an effective tool for social change.³⁰

Teaching: My Influence on Forensic Psychiatry

I began teaching in 1984. Almost immediately thereafter, students from the New York University (NYU) Forensic Fellowship program began to audit my mental disability law courses, and, from approximately 1986 to 2004, enrollment in and successful completion of one of my courses was a prerequisite for all NYU fellows. For many years, I was an adjunct professor of law and psychiatry at the University of Rochester Medical Center, and taught the forensic fellows affiliated with that program as well. For several years, I have done an annual lecture for the New York City Forensic Fellowship Consortium (attended by fellows in all the forensic programs in New York City and North/Central New Jersey). As noted, I present yearly at the Practical Applications in Forensic Psychiatry Seminar at the University of Pennsylvania Medical School, do grand rounds regularly at hospitals in New York, New Jersey, and elsewhere, and am a regular presenter at conferences and workshops offered by groups such as the American Academy of Psychiatry and Law, the American College of Forensic Psychiatry, and the World Psychiatric Association. Forensic psychiatrists from around the world have enrolled for many years in the masters program in mental disability law studies that I have directed at the New York Law School.

I think it is critical that psychiatrists understand the different perspectives of the legal system and how it is so different from the medical model taught in medical schools (even if the psychiatrist had had a course in “the law” in medical school that included case summaries or expository essays *about* cases). It is only by reading cases and by taking law courses or participating in legal seminars that psychiatrists in training can understand how the legal system works and why the questions posed by counsel and the courts may appear to be so discordant with the methodology in which they are versed.

Teaching: Forensic Psychiatry’s Influence on Me

By working with forensic psychiatrists, teaching them, studying with them, sharing the seminar table with them, I have come to grasp the chasm in the ways that the pedagogy in law is different from the pedagogy in psychiatry, and to more fully understand how the two fields “work” and how we (lawyers *and* law professors) must learn from forensic psychiatry teachers the same ways that we hope they learn from us.

I believe that this training will expand the pedagogic and practical horizons of all involved, and will ultimately lead to a forensic system that is more consonant with legal requirements (especially, *constitutional* requirements), that is more humane, and, in the end, provides better care and treatment for patients.

Scholarship

Since the early 1990s, I have been writing regularly about how sanism and pretextuality have ravaged the legal system and poisoned mental disability law practice.³¹ I define *sanism* as

an irrational prejudice of the same quality and character of other irrational prejudices that cause (and are reflected in) prevailing social attitudes of racism, sexism, homophobia, and ethnic bigotry,³² and define *pretextuality* as the ways in which courts accept, either implicitly or explicitly, testimonial dishonesty and engage similarly in dishonest and frequently meretricious decision making.³³ Since about the same time, I have begun to write about therapeutic jurisprudence, a model for assessing the impact of case law and legislation that recognizes that, as a therapeutic agent, the law can have therapeutic or antitherapeutic consequences.^{34,35} The ultimate aim of therapeutic jurisprudence is to determine whether legal rules, procedures, and lawyer roles can or should be reshaped to enhance their therapeutic potential while not subordinating due process principles.³⁶⁻³⁹ I have written about these approaches to the law in the *Bulletin of the Academy of Psychiatry and Law*,⁴⁰ the *American Journal of Forensic Psychiatry*,⁴¹ and other publications that I believe are regularly read by forensic psychiatrists.⁴²⁻⁴⁵ My hope is that, by publishing in such journals, I am able to reach out to forensic psychiatrists on their own turf so as to share some of what I think are the important aspects of understanding why and how the legal system treats persons with mental disabilities the way it does.

There is no question in my mind that scholarship is, and can be, a tool for social change.⁴⁶ By seeking to “unpack” how sanism and pretextuality can affect and infect the work of forensic psychiatrists, I seek to contribute to that social change. By reaching out to forensic psychiatrists in my work on therapeutic jurisprudence, I hope to sensitize this cohort to the contours of that discipline and to encourage them to apply those principles in their own writing. Not coincidentally, Bob Sadoff is one of the very few who has yet taken up that challenge.⁴⁷ Other such writings by forensic psychiatrists include Glaser (2003) and Mossman (1996).^{48,49}

Advocacy

Since the early 2000s, I have turned my attention to the intersection between mental disability law and international human rights law.⁵⁰⁻⁵⁶ In recent years, I have presented papers, workshops and panels to groups of forensic psychiatrists in the United States, New Zealand, Austria, the Czech Republic, Australia, Turkey, Argentina, and elsewhere, seeking to emphasize how important it is that they understand this connection, begin to incorporate international human rights insights into their reports and evaluations, and emphasize that state psychiatry is still, in many nations, used as a tool through which to suppress political dissent.⁵⁷ Interestingly, most of the forensic psychiatrists I speak to abroad know about recent developments in this area of the law—specifically, the ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities⁵⁸—but, domestically it is news to virtually everyone in my audiences. I hope to continue to share these insights with progressive forensic psychiatrists, in the hopes that, in the coming years, this will be as well known domestically as it is internationally.

Recently, I have written about the relationship between international human rights law and guardianship,⁵⁹ international human rights law and juvenile punishment,⁶⁰ international human rights law and mental health courts,⁶¹ international human rights law and

the treatment of patients in forensic facilities,⁶² and international human rights law and the sexual autonomy of psychiatric patients.^{63,64} Forensic psychiatrists should have something to say about each of these topics, and I hope that these pieces will lead to invigorated scholarship in that regard.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have considered the relationship between forensic psychiatry and the law through four filters (litigation, teaching, scholarship, and advocacy) and one very unique lens—my relationship with Bob Sadoff. Bob and I have worked together for more than 40 years, and I continue to learn from him each time we meet, speak, or e-mail. I believe that his career is a template for forensic psychiatrists in each of these areas of social policy. His work continues to be an inspiration to all of us.

Acknowledgment

The author wishes to thank Katherine Davies for her excellent editing assistance.

References

- Perlin ML. (2005). "May he stay forever young": Robert Sadoff and the history of mental health law. *J Am Acad Psychiatry*, 33, 236.
- New Jersey had adopted the narrow, "right-from-wrong" *M'Naghten* test shortly after it was introduced in England, see *State v Spencer*, 21 NJL. 196, 204–05 (Oyer and Terminer 1846), and employed it consistently thereafter.
- State v. Coleman*, 46 NJ 16, 39, 214 A2d 393 (1965).
- State v Lucas*, 30 NJ 37, 72, 152 A2d 50 (1959).
- State v Maioni*, 78 NJL 339, 341–42, 74 A. 526 (E. & A.1909).
- United States v Currens*, 290 F2d 751 (3d Cir 1961).
- Interestingly, at about the time of the *Jenkins* case, a NJ legislative commission had recommended that *M'Naghten* be discarded, and that the ALI test replace it. *Final Report*. 1971, 96–97. The Legislature eventually rejected this recommendation, and instead, codified *M'Naghten* in a 1978 global penal code revision. See NJ Stat Ann § 2C-4.1.
- For a full discussion, see *State v Singleton*, 48 A3d 285, 295 (NJ 2012).
- Personal communication with Robert L. Sadoff, MD.
- The denouement? My client went to Texas, got a job working in a community mental health facility, and was found out years later only when he was given some sort of award, and his picture was in the local paper. A Trenton jail guard was, coincidentally, visiting family in that town at the time, saw his picture, and he was quickly extradited to serve his prison sentence. . . . Bob discusses this case in a dialogue with Dr. Kenneth Weiss, in Weiss K, & Robert SL. (2012). From the journal of *Psychiatry & Law Archives*: Bernard L. Diamond, M.D. *J Psychiatry Law*, 40, 128–129.
- Perlin ML. *Mental Disability Law: Civil and Criminal*. 2nd ed. 2002; 4(8A-6.3):88; discussing *State v Miller*, Indictment No. 1869-71 (NJ Mercer Cty. Ct. 1974).
- Perlin ML. (1975). Psychiatric testimony in a criminal law setting. *Bull Am Acad Psychiatry Law*, 3(20), 1249.
- Perlin ML. (2005). "May he stay forever young": Robert Sadoff and the history of mental health law. *J Am Acad Psychiatry*, 33, 236 (discussing *Dixon v Cahill*, Docket No. L.30977/y-71 P.W., NJ Super Ct., Law Div. 1973), final order reprinted in Perlin ML. *Mental Disability Law: Civil and Criminal*. 2nd ed. 2002; 4(\$14-7):119-21; discussing *State v Miller*, Indictment No. 1869-71 (NJ Mercer Cty. Ct. 1974).
- From 1979 to 1984, we taught together as members of the Faculty for Continuing Education in the Program in Psychiatry at the Institute of the Pennsylvania Hospital (Philadelphia).
- Perlin ML. (2005). "May he stay forever young": Robert Sadoff and the history of mental health law. *J Am Acad Psychiatry*, 33, 243 (discussing the monitoring committee in *Doe v Klein*, Docket No. L-12088-74 PW, NJ Super Ct, Law Div 1977), In: *Ment. Dis. L. Rep.* 1977; 1:425 (Greystone Park Psychiatric Hospital case, Morris Plains, NJ).
- The sample direct and cross examination that I include in my Treatise (p. 6 n. 5: Perlin, *supra* note 6. 2nd ed. 1998; 1(\$2C-4.9): 338-53., is based on the Roland Rodney tape that Bob and I created in the late 1970s pursuant to a National Institute of Mental Health training project in conjunction with the Center for Studies in Social-Legal Psychiatry at the University of Pennsylvania Medical School (which Bob then directed). Bob also made a series of teaching tapes for me and with me ("The Case of Sharon Stevens"; "The Case of Darren Daniels") that I used in classes at New York Law School from 1990 to 2004.
- Perlin ML, & Sadoff RL. (1982). Ethical issues in the representation of individuals in the commitment process. *Law Contemp Problems*, 45, 161.
- Perlin ML, & Sadoff RL. (1978). The adversary system. In IL Kutash, SB Kutash, & LB Schlesinger (Eds.), *Violence: Perspectives on murder and aggression* (p. 394). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Perlin ML. (1983). Recent developments in mental health law. *Psychiatry Clin North Am*, 6(4), 539–549.
- Perlin ML. (2008). Competency to stand trial. In R Sadoff, F Dattillio (Eds.), *Crime and mental illness: A guide to courtroom practice* (p. 23). Mechanicsburg, PA: Pennsylvania Bar Institute.
- Most recently, e.g., "The Death Penalty, International Human Rights Law, Mental Disability & Therapeutic Jurisprudence" (Feb. 26, 2013).
- Sadoff RL. (2011). Ethical issues in forensic psychiatry: Minimizing harm. *BioMed Res Int*, 2014, p. 73.
- Perlin ML. (2010). "They keep it all hid": The ghettoization of mental disability law and its implications for legal education. *St. Louis Univ Law J*, 54, 871.
- Perlin ML. (2000). A law of healing. *Univ CT Law Rev*, 68, 417.
- Perlin ML. (1992). Foreword: New directions in the legal regulation of the mental health professions. In R Simon, & RL Sadoff (Eds.), *Psychiatric malpractice: Cases and comments for clinicians* (p. ix). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.
- Perlin ML. (1982). Foreword. In RL Sadoff. *Legal issues in the care*.
- Perlin ML. (2005). "May he stay forever young": Robert Sadoff and the history of mental health law. *J Am Acad Psychiatry*, 33, 236.
- Perlin ML. (2012). "Justice's beautiful fact": Bob Sadoff and the redemptive promise of therapeutic jurisprudence. *J Psychiatry Law*, 40, 265.
- I consciously limit this to working with civil plaintiffs and criminal defendants, since my four decades of experience has taught me, sadly, that this is the only work that authentically leads to ameliorative developments in the law. Some may disagree.
- Van Schaack B. (2004). With all deliberate speed: Civil human rights litigation as a tool for social change. *Vand Law Rev*, 57, 2338.
- Perlin ML. (2000). *The hidden prejudice: Mental disability on trial*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Perlin ML. (1992). On "sanism." *SMU Law Rev*, 46, 374–375.
- Perlin ML. (2009). "Simplify you, classify you": Stigma stereotypes and civil rights in disability classification systems. *Ga St Univ Law Rev*, 25, 621.
- Perlin ML. (2009). "His brain has been mismanaged with great skill": How will jurors respond to neuroimaging testimony in insanity defense cases? *Akron Law Rev*, 42, 912.
- Diesfeld K, & Freckelton I. (2006). *Mental health law and therapeutic jurisprudence*. In I Freckelton, & K Peterson (Eds.), *Disputes and dilemmas in health law* (p. 91). Sydney: Federation Press (providing a transnational perspective).

36. Perlin ML. (2008). "Everybody is making love/ or else expecting rain": Considering the sexual autonomy rights of persons institutionalized because of mental disability in forensic hospitals and in Asia. *Wash Law Rev*, 83(139), 510.
37. Perlin ML. (2008). "Baby, look inside your mirror": The legal profession's willful and sanist blindness to lawyers with mental disabilities. *Univ Pitt Law Rev*, 69, 591; (quoting, in part, Perlin, Disability on Trial, *supra* note xxx at 301) (discussing how TJ "might be a redemptive tool in efforts to combat sanism, as a means of 'strip[ping] bare the law's sanist façade'").
38. Perlmutter BP. (2005). George's story: Voice and transformation through the teaching and practice of therapeutic jurisprudence in a law school child advocacy clinic. *St Thomas Law Rev*, 17(111), 599.
39. Freckelton I. (2008). Therapeutic jurisprudence misunderstood and misrepresented: The price and risks of influence. *T Jefferson Law Rev*, 30, 585-586.
40. Perlin ML. (1991). Morality and pretextuality, psychiatry and law: Of ordinary common sense, heuristic reasoning and cognitive dissonance. *Bull Am Acad Psychiatry Law*, 131.
41. See e.g., Perlin ML. (2005). Limited in sex, they dare: Attitudes toward issues of patient sexuality. *Amer J Forens Psychiatry*, 26, 25.
42. Perlin ML, et al. (2008). Psychiatric ethics and the rights of persons with mental disabilities in the community. *World Psychiatry*, 6, 33-34.
43. Perlin ML. (2013). "There must be some way out of here": Why the convention on the rights of persons with disabilities is potentially the best weapon in the fight against sanism. *Psychiatry Psychol Law*, 20, 426.
44. Perlin ML. (2012). "Too stubborn to ever be governed by enforced insanity": Some therapeutic jurisprudence dilemmas in the representation of criminal defendants in incompetency and insanity cases. *Intl J Law Psychiatry*, 33, 475
45. Payne A, et al. (1993). Sexual activity among psychiatric inpatients: International perspectives, *J Forens Psychiatry*, 4, 109.
46. Kukura L, & Mastman K. (2010). From page to practice: An introduction. *NY Univ Rev Law Soc Change*, 34, 428.
47. Sadoff RL. (1993). Therapeutic jurisprudence: A view from a forensic psychiatrist. *NY Law School J Hum Rts*, 10, 825.
48. Glaser B. (2003). Therapeutic jurisprudence: An ethical paradigm for therapists in sex offender treatment programs. *W Criminol Rev*, 4, 143.
49. Mossman D. (1996). Veterans affairs disability compensation: A case studying counter therapeutic jurisprudence. *Bull Am Acad J Psychiatry Law*, 24, 27.
50. Perlin ML. (2011). *International Human Rights and Mental Disability Law: When the Silenced are Heard*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
51. Perlin ML. (2013). "Yonder stands your orphan with gun": The international human rights and therapeutic jurisprudence implications of juvenile punishment schemes. *Texas Tech Law Rev*, 46, 301.
52. Perlin ML. (2013). Understanding the intersection between international human rights and mental disability law: The role of dignity. In B Arrigo, H Bersot (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of international crime and justice studies* (p. 19). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
53. Perlin ML, & Szeli E. (2012). Mental health law and human rights: Evolution and contemporary challenges: In M Dudley, et al. (Eds.), *Mental health and human rights: Vision, praxis and courage* (p. 98). New York: Oxford University Press.
54. Perlin ML. (2012). Promoting social change in Asian and the Pacific: The need for a disability rights tribunal to give life to the un convention on the rights of persons with disabilities. *Geo Wash Intl Law Rev*, 44, 1.
55. Perlin ML. (2011). "Abandoned love": The impact of Wyatt v. Stickney on the intersection between international human rights and domestic mental disability law. *Law Psychol Rev*, 35, 121.
56. Perlin ML. (2011). "Abandoned love": The impact of Wyatt v. Stickney on the intersection between international human rights and domestic mental disability law. *Law Psychol Rev*, 35, 121.
57. Most recently, in January 2014, at the request of the American Bar Association's Center on Human Rights' Justice Defenders Program, I have filed a declaration with the High Court of Kazakhstan in the case of *Zinaida Mukhortova v. Republic of Kazakhstan*, a case involving the involuntary psychiatric commitment of a newspaper reporter/attorney who was institutionalized because she (quoting from the moving papers) "gave interviews to the media and started to write complaints to different bodies to 'restore justice'" in Kazakhstan. Perlin ML. (2006). International human rights and comparative mental disability law: The role of institutional psychiatry in the suppression of political dissent. *Israel Law Rev*, 39, 69.
58. See G.A. Res. 61/106, U.N. Doc. A/RES/61/106 (Jan. 24, 2007).
59. Perlin ML. (2013). "Striking for the guardians and protectors of the mind": The convention of the rights of persons with disabilities and the future of guardianship law. *Penn St Law Rev*, 1159.
60. Perlin ML. (2013). "Yonder stands your orphan with gun": The international human rights and therapeutic jurisprudence implications of juvenile punishment schemes. *Tex Tech Law Rev*, 46, 301.
61. Perlin ML. (2013). "The judge, he cast his robe aside": Mental health courts, dignity and due process. *J Ment Health Law Policy*, 3, 1.
62. Perlin ML, & Schriver MR. (2013). "You that hide behind walls": The relationship between the convention on persons with disabilities and the convention against torture and the treatment of institutionalized forensic patients. In: American University Center on Humanitarian Law (Ed.) *Torture and ill-treatment in health-care settings: A compilation*. Washington, DC: American University Center on Humanitarian Law.
63. Perlin ML, & Lynch AJ. (2014). "Love is just a four-letter word": Sexuality, international human rights and therapeutic jurisprudence. *Can J Comp Contemp Law*, in press.
64. Perlin ML, & Lynch AJ. (2014). "All his sexless patients": Persons with mental disabilities and the competence to have sex. *Wash Law Rev*, 89, 257-300.