

# International Journal of Mental Health

## The World Psychiatric Association's "Bill of Rights": a curious contribution to human rights --Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	
<b>Full Title:</b>	The World Psychiatric Association's "Bill of Rights": a curious contribution to human rights
<b>Article Type:</b>	Original Article
<b>Abstract:</b>	<p>In 2016 the World Psychiatric Association published a "Bill of Rights". This paper considers and analyses what is at stake in a global professional clinical organisation developing such a document that purports to support its efforts to tackle the social injustices experienced by people with mental health issues globally. It critically examines the text of the Bill and suggests that while the document promises serious engagement with human rights (as distinct from ethics) it fails to meet existing international human rights standards. For the WPA to be a present and engaged partner in the implementation of international human rights standards, the paper argues, it should not merely encourage governments to take action, but start with inward tasks. These include establishing minimum human rights-based criteria for its own members and holding them to account, so as to nudge psychiatrists towards a human rights-based approach that would benefit people with mental health issues around the world.</p>
<b>Author Comments:</b>	We weren't sure of the "type" of article this falls under, and would appreciate your guidance.
<b>Order of Authors Secondary Information:</b>	

**Submission to *International Journal of Mental Health***

24 November 2016

**TITLE**

The World Psychiatric Association's "Bill of Rights": a curious contribution to human rights

1 **Submission to *International Journal of Mental Health***

2  
3 24 November 2016

4  
5  
6  
7 **TITLE**

8 The World Psychiatric Association's "Bill of Rights": a curious contribution to human rights

9  
10  
11  
12 **CONFLICT OF INTERESTS**

13 The authors report no conflict of interest.

14  
15  
16 **SEARCH STRATEGY AND SELECTION CRITERIA**

17 Each author identified relevant legal instruments, ethical standards and declarations, as well  
18 as academic publications on human rights, ethics, and discrimination in relation to mental  
19 health issues and disability. Their significance was agreed through consensus. The  
20 information presented from these materials and the arguments made in relation to them  
21 were agreed by both authors.  
22  
23

24  
25 **ABSTRACT**

26 In 2016 the World Psychiatric Association published a "Bill of Rights". This paper considers  
27 and analyses what is at stake in a global professional clinical organisation developing such a  
28 document that purports to support its efforts to tackle the social injustices experienced by  
29 people with mental health issues globally. It critically examines the text of the Bill and  
30 suggests that while the document promises serious engagement with human rights (as  
31 distinct from ethics) it fails to meet existing international human rights standards. For the  
32 WPA to be a present and engaged partner in the implementation of international human  
33 rights standards, the paper argues, it should not merely encourage governments to take  
34 action, but start with inward tasks. These include establishing minimum human rights-based  
35 criteria for its own members and holding them to account, so as to nudge psychiatrists  
36 towards a human rights-based approach that would benefit people with mental health  
37 issues around the world.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 **WORD COUNT**

44 3,274 words excluding endnotes  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Social Justice for People with Mental Health Issues

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

There is a long history of struggle by those who have received psychiatric diagnoses both to render visible and to combat the profound discrimination and inequality they experience.<sup>1</sup> Such discrimination is now more widely acknowledged across multiple domains -- including psychiatry and other clinical specialities. This is evidenced by the 2016 special edition of the International Review of Psychiatry on “Social justice for people with mental illness”.<sup>2</sup> The edition points out how discrimination against people with mental health issues, “is widespread and much more common in low income countries”, and calls for steps to be taken to roll out treatments to people who currently have no access. The papers in the special issue highlight that laws around the world prevent people with mental health issues from exercising human rights, such as the right to work<sup>3</sup> and the right to vote.<sup>4</sup> Dinesh Bhugra, the President of the World Psychiatric Association (WPA) notes that these “discriminatory laws may well reflect underlying stigma against individuals with mental illness at a number of levels”.<sup>5</sup> He urges, “national associations to explore psychiatry’s contract with representative policy-makers, stakeholders, patients, their carers and families, and their groups.” We welcome this commitment of the WPA’s leadership to highlighting social injustices faced by people with mental health issues.

The special edition also contains a “Bill of Rights for Individuals with Mental Illness”,<sup>6</sup> authored by Bhugra, who, the paper emphasises, “alone is responsible for the content and writing of the paper”. To date, the Bill has been endorsed by the Asian and Latin American federations of psychiatric associations, psychiatric associations in Armenia and the Emirates, the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists, and several British mental health NGOs such as Mind and SANE.<sup>7</sup> In this Personal View, we consider and analyse what is at stake for a global professional clinical organisation publishing a document intended to support its efforts to tackle the social injustices experienced by its beneficiaries.

### The World Psychiatric Association’s engagements with ethics and human rights

The WPA has, historically, been at some distance from human rights discourse. It has tended, rather, to approach normative questions and problems affecting psychiatry through the lens of ethics. The 1977 Declaration of Hawaii,<sup>8</sup> which was the first WPA position statement regarding such issues, “laid down ... *ethical guidelines* for psychiatrists all over the world” [italics added]. Clarence Blomquist – who drafted the text, and who was trained in both psychiatry and practical philosophy – noted “the sometimes diverse approaches to medical ethics and the physician/patient relationship in Europe and the US”, and explained that he tried, when drafting, “to gain more concern for the patients’ autonomy and right to participate in decisions about their own lives and health but to avoid a rigid legalistic system and to give place for man’s legitimate need for trust, confidence and care”. Over a decade later, in 1989, the WPA published a “Statement and Viewpoints on the Rights and Legal Safeguards of the Mentally Ill” which, at times, mobilised a language of rights. It was at least in part a response to what had been perceived by the WPA as an “anti-psychiatric” tone within the preamble and articles that had been proposed in the Daes report,<sup>9</sup> published in 1986, the first of two reports resulting from the UN Commission for Human Rights

1 appointing two Special Rapporteurs to investigate and report on the lamentable conditions  
2 in institutions for people with mental health issues and intellectual disabilities.)<sup>10</sup>  
3

4 The 1989 document described itself as a “condensed catalogue of the WPA’s Executive  
5 Committee and Ethics Committee statements and viewpoints that *largely reflect* the body of  
6 general guidelines on the rights of mental patients” [italics added].<sup>11</sup> The deployment of  
7 “largely” makes clear that the Statement and Viewpoints departed in certain respects from  
8 other contemporaneous documents specifying the rights of people with mental health  
9 issues. The Madrid Declaration on Ethical Standards for Psychiatric Practice (first approved  
10 in 1996, and with most recent amendments made in September 2011 in Buenos Aires)  
11 maintained the focus on and language of ethics.<sup>12</sup> It alluded to law only at a few key  
12 moments, for example in specifying that, “[w]hen the patient is gravely disabled,  
13 incapacitated and/or incompetent to exercise proper judgment because of a mental  
14 disorder, the psychiatrists should consult with the family and, if appropriate, seek legal  
15 counsel, to safeguard the human dignity and the legal rights of the patient”. This statement  
16 departs from human rights guarantees that had been in place for five years by the time the  
17 Buenos Aires amendments were made: the 2006 UN Convention on the Rights of Persons  
18 with Disabilities (CRPD) states that all people with mental health issues (and other  
19 disabilities) have the right to legal capacity, meaning that everyone has equal rights  
20 irrespective of a psychiatrist’s opinion of the propriety of the person’s preferences or of  
21 the nature or degree of the person’s mental health issue.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 In its Bill, the WPA promises serious engagement with human rights, as distinct from ethics.  
29 This is to be welcomed, as the implementation of international norms takes place at the  
30 grassroots – in communities, schools, hospitals and so on – and does not stop with standard  
31 setting. Indeed, the work of implementation is even more complex, as standards require  
32 enforcement mechanisms that hold people and organisations to account for alleged  
33 violations through formal legal processes.  
34  
35  
36

37 In tracking the linguistic and potentially substantive movement on the part of the WPA  
38 towards rights, we should first of all recall that the relationship between (bio)ethics and  
39 human rights is both complex and vexed. Of the many differences between the two that  
40 Richard Ashcroft, an expert in both domains, has identified and analysed,<sup>13</sup> one is  
41 particularly apposite to our discussion here. From the perspective of human rights  
42 advocates, it might be expressed as what Ashcroft calls the “political quietism of bioethics”.  
43 From the side of (bio)ethics it would be the opposite: in other words, for “the professions,  
44 for governments, and for certain kinds of institutions (hospitals, research institutes,  
45 universities, some industrial concerns)”, bioethics might, rather “represent a more  
46 attractive vehicle for consultation and dispute resolution than would a human rights-  
47 oriented institution, precisely because of the lower ideological temperature of bioethics  
48 relative to human rights and the lesser likelihood that it can be taken up by a possibly rather  
49 protean social movement”.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55 The history of the WPA standards and declarations bears this out. A framework of ethics, as  
56 first formalised in Blomquist’s drafting of the Hawaii Declaration, arose in the midst of  
57 fraught and politicised struggles over the abuse of psychiatry in the Soviet Union. It is  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

generally accepted by the psychiatric community that at that time, a “code of ethics was the only means to reconcile the various member countries on issues of misuse of psychiatry”.<sup>14</sup>

What is the situation, though, today? Does the Bill of Rights signal a substantial engagement by the WPA with human rights, or is its invocation of the language of rights belied by its cleaving to longer-held commitments and positions that it has developed through the prism of psychiatric ethics?

### **The purpose of and the audience for the World Psychiatric Association’s “Bill of Rights”**

Our contention is twofold. First, the Bill only partially commits to existing international human rights standards, and second, it is unlikely to have much traction because it contains no accountability and monitoring mechanism.

First then, the Bill invokes international human rights law: its second paragraph expresses support for the “efforts of the international community as expressed through various international human rights Covenants and Conventions, and, more particularly, the 2006 United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD)”. However, it excises many rights that are more challenging to psychiatry. It does in the face of a range of publications (by lawyers, clinicians, social scientists, philosophers, mental health service users, and diverse advocacy groups) that interrogate the relationship between international human rights law and psychiatric practice and that offer potential ways forward in relation to the new legal and ethical landscape opened by the CRPD.<sup>15</sup> Through these excisions, the Bill sees to maintain an aspiration for a “lower ideological temperature” that is less likely to inflame some of its national associations. Perhaps individual psychiatrist members of those national associations are more likely to be nudged into human-rights compliant practice by the carrot of ethics than the stick of the law. The excision can be read as deeply ideological within the wider, heterogeneous mental health landscape wherein it is hard not to interpret the invisibility of certain issues that are particularly contentious flash-points in mental health – as we discuss below – as in some way a motivated decision.

Our second contention is that the Bill is unlikely to change practice on the ground, because it fails to establish monitoring mechanisms or accountability procedures. The Bill references the CRPD, an international treaty that contains provisions obliging governments to implement a range of human rights.<sup>16</sup> The CRPD does not stop at setting standards, rather it enjoins States to establish structures that make it more likely that the Convention will be implemented. These include a governmental focal point to carry out joined-up policymaking,<sup>17</sup> an independent mechanism to monitor progress in implementing the Convention,<sup>18</sup> and a duty to involve people with disabilities including those with mental health issues and their representative organisations in this pursuit.<sup>19</sup> It also contains duties on governments to fund research and development in universal design and new technologies,<sup>20</sup> to provide rights-based training professionals involved in providing services to people with disabilities,<sup>21</sup> to carry out comprehensive law reform and to mainstream disability (including mental health) across governmental policies and programmes. In this way the CRPD lists not only normative aspirations but detailed programmatic tasks too. It establishes an international monitoring scheme whereby each State Party is assessed by a

1 specific UN Committee on a regular basis,<sup>22</sup> and the relationship between the Committee  
2 and governments is itself regulated.<sup>23</sup>

3  
4 In contrast, the WPA’s Bill of Rights is devoid of any monitoring or accountability  
5 mechanism, prompting questions about how the WPA can measure the commitment of its  
6 member associations, and how the public can, in turn, hold the WPA to account. Omitting a  
7 feedback loop that could measure the Bill’s impact on people with mental health issues on  
8 the ground is a missed opportunity.  
9

10  
11 The audience of the Bill is difficult to ascertain. It calls on *governments* to take action, but  
12 governments are under an obligation to implement international human rights treaties they  
13 have ratified, irrespective of pronouncements by nongovernmental organisations such as  
14 the WPA. If nudging governments were the Bill’s only function, the WPA would have no  
15 need to issue such a document. The Bill seems to speak more to the WPA’s members  
16 (regional, national and sub-national associations of psychiatrists), encouraging them to  
17 engage in law and policy reform. Given that governments are supposed to hold psychiatrists  
18 to account, the Bill is more a nod directly to psychiatrists. In this respect, the Bill follows  
19 clearly in the tradition of the WPA’s standards and declarations, which largely interpellate  
20 psychiatrists as those responsible for upholding ethical practice.  
21  
22

23  
24 The term “Bill of Rights” dates from a 1689 Act of the English Parliament. Today, it is  
25 generally understood to mean a document endorsed by a country’s parliament, which  
26 enshrines rights and commits that country’s government to take certain actions and to  
27 refrain from taking others. In the late 1970s, it was suggested that doctors should establish a  
28 Bill of Rights to regulate themselves so as to uphold their professional autonomy.<sup>24</sup> There  
29 are a few other examples of non-governmental proclamations,<sup>25</sup> but we found no examples  
30 of a global professional group unilaterally anointing rights upon their *beneficiaries* rather  
31 than collating rights for their members. Indeed, such Bills of Rights have, on occasion,  
32 received criticism precisely for wielding the language of rights. Not only has the (US) Library  
33 Bill of Rights, for example, been described as “rife with examples of rhetoric unsupported by  
34 the legal principles that usually undergird ‘rights’”; it has been heavily criticised for “the  
35 false representation that [it] serves as a legal guarantee or as an accurate reflection of  
36 current legal doctrine”.<sup>26</sup> The WPA’s Bill of Rights – authored by one person granting rights  
37 that do not mirror international human rights law, to everyone with mental health issues in  
38 the world – could be criticised on similar grounds.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 The document calls for “ALL governments” (emphasis in the original) to end discrimination  
47 on the basis of mental health status. Rights violations happen partly because of systemic  
48 inequalities and a lack of attention by governments, and so reiterating governmental  
49 obligations is simple enough. More difficult is changing practice which the Bill steers away  
50 from attempting. Domains exercising public power – police, prisons, education, social work  
51 – have undergone reforms for a multitude of reasons. These include public commitments  
52 from people who lead those bodies, but norms are rarely sufficient to change behaviour. To  
53 reduce torture around the world, for example, practice has been regulated by law, and  
54 professionals held to account by way of statutory requirements for taped police interviews,  
55 access to advocates and monitoring of police stations.<sup>27</sup>  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Missed opportunities

Progressive global leadership of psychiatry is central to the larger imperative of protecting the rights of people with mental health issues, but the Bill of Rights is a missed opportunity for the WPA to be a galvanising agent of change. The Bill could, for example, have set out a commitment for every psychiatrist to undergo human rights training (implementing a key CRPD State obligation),<sup>28</sup> that includes trainers with mental health issues.<sup>29</sup> Most clubs have minimum entry criteria as well as accountability mechanisms to keep their membership in line. As a club of national psychiatric associations that vary widely in their commitment to human rights, the WPA could have used the Bill to establish basic minimum entry requirements that each association would need to meet before it is accepted, or demitted on transgression. For example, if the WPA's position is that electroshock therapy given in its unmodified form (without anaesthesia or muscle relaxants) breaches minimum standards, it would eject its member the Indian Psychiatric Society for endorsing this practice.<sup>30</sup>

The Bill suffers from substantive problems too, as it cherry-picks from well-established international human rights law. It supports living "independently in the community as other citizens", but it appears to falls short of endorsing "full inclusion and participation in the community", required by Article 19 of the CRPD that entails a more complex set of obligations that includes access to housing stock, accessible transport, inclusive education and so on (this also applies equally to people who are not citizens of the jurisdiction in question). Another example is the right to health. Human rights law splits economic, social and cultural rights such as the right to health into four parts: accessibility, availability, acceptability and quality – a formulation that the World Health Organization has used in operational guidance.<sup>31</sup> The Bill of Rights specifies that the right to health should be accessible and available, but is silent about whether healthcare should be acceptable or of satisfactory quality. Highlighting the omission of two words may seem pedantic, but the WPA has issued a text aligned to human rights law, a domain where words matter as they carry specific interpretive meaning. This particular omission gives the impression that the WPA is more concerned with the mass roll-out of treatments than user experience.

Similarly, the document omits the word "torture" when setting out the right to be free from cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment. It is uncontroversial to state that some psychiatric practice may be considered torture: unmodified electro-convulsive therapy being an example.<sup>32</sup> For the WPA to allow readers of the Bill to infer that is ignoring well-established and deep-rooted problems in parts of psychiatry risks the organisation being perceived as a bad-faith negotiator in a complex change process. Psychiatric leadership is urgently needed to end torture and other forms of ill-treatment carried out in the name of psychiatry, science and treatment.<sup>33</sup> For something called a "Bill of Rights" to omit this acknowledgement is not an encouraging starting point. Other rights are also missing. While the WPA is keen for people to be treated for mental health issues (this is – alongside access to physical healthcare – the top of the WPA's list), the document says nothing about consent, one of the most important debates at the interface of psychiatry and rights.<sup>34</sup> Also absent is the right to rehabilitation, particularly important in underpinning the recovery of people who have spent time in psychiatric or social care institutions.<sup>35</sup>



1 Given the often coercive nature of psychiatry,<sup>36</sup> mental health service users should have  
2 access to complaints systems and the courts to seek redress for alleged violations of their  
3 rights,<sup>37</sup> yet the Bill is silent on justice. This may mean that some readers of the Bill infer –  
4 rightly or wrongly – that psychiatrists have some investment in limiting victims from  
5 complaining and taking cases against them. Instead of appearing to fear such litigation, the  
6 WPA should welcome it for the potential to expose bad practice, maintain minimum  
7 standards, and arguably to strengthen trust with mental health service users.  
8  
9

## 10 11 **The role of psychiatrists in implementing human rights**

12  
13  
14 While the Bill contains some welcome elements, our analysis suggests that it remains largely  
15 an exhortatory document, which does not, despite its title, significantly depart from the  
16 WPA’s earlier sets of ethical standards and declarations, and from those documents’  
17 address to clinical practitioners. It is difficult, too, not to be aware of the wider context in  
18 which this Bill of Rights was drafted. In the midst of often fractious public debate that is  
19 often ignorant about – if not hostile to – psychiatry *in toto*, it is perhaps unsurprising that  
20 psychiatry – not least in the form of the WPA – is keen to emphasise its professionalism and  
21 the effectiveness of its treatments and practices. While this might help explain certain  
22 absences in the Bill (references to torture or access to complaints systems, for example), it  
23 does not excuse those absences within a document that expressly locates itself within and  
24 endorses the international human rights project.  
25  
26  
27  
28

29  
30 In conclusion, we are left troubled by the Bill because it ends up foreclosing any substantive  
31 engagement with the complex challenges – of coercion, institutionalisation, consent, and  
32 ensuring full inclusion in the community – that face all those in the global mental health  
33 community. The CRPD has opened new norms, new possibilities and new hopes for people  
34 with mental health issues, but hard thinking and hard work is needed for these to be  
35 realised, not least in relation to the clinical practice of psychiatry.  
36  
37

38  
39 A contribution from psychiatry was largely missing during the negotiation of the CRPD, but  
40 in its implementation psychiatry must be, and must be seen to be, a present and engaged  
41 partner. Both analytical and material resources from all stakeholders who are committed to  
42 ensuring social justice for people with mental health issues are indispensable. We welcome  
43 the efforts of those psychiatrists and other mental health clinicians who have – often in  
44 collaboration with legal and advocacy organisations – contributed clinical, analytical and  
45 policy-related acuity to making progress with these difficult questions.<sup>38</sup> We look forward to  
46 psychiatry offering a more audible voice in multi-disciplinary discussions over human rights  
47 in the future.  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 For the WPA to play a useful part in this reform process, its first task should be to continue  
53 to reform itself – at the bare minimum by establishing minimum membership criteria  
54 aligned to international human rights standards and a mechanism for holding its member  
55 associations to account. Unless such action is taken, this Bill will likely generate some  
56 limited academic interest (such as this Personal View), but is less likely to have an impact on  
57 improving the lives of people with mental health issues.  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 <sup>1</sup> See, for example, materials archived by the Survivors History Group

5 <http://studymore.org.uk/mpu.htm>.

6 <sup>2</sup> *International Review of Psychiatry*, Volume 28, 2016, Issue 4.

7 <sup>3</sup> Nardodkar R, Pathare S, Ventriglio S, Castaldelli-Maia J, Javate K, Torales J, and Bhugra D, “Legal  
8 protection of the right to work and employment for persons with mental health problems: a review  
9 of legislation across the world”, *International Review Of Psychiatry*, Vol. 28 , Iss. 4, 2016

10 <sup>4</sup> Bhugra D, Pathare S, Nardodkar R, Gosavi C, Ng R, Torales R & Ventriglio A, (2016) “Legislative  
11 provisions related to marriage and divorce of persons with mental health problems: a global  
12 review”, *International Review Of Psychiatry*, 28:4, 386-392

13 <sup>5</sup> Bhugra D, (2016) “Social discrimination and social justice”, *International Review of Psychiatry*, 28:4,  
14 336-341

15 <sup>6</sup> Bhugra D, (2016) “Bill of Rights for Persons with Mental Illness”, *International Review of Psychiatry*,  
16 28:4, 335-335,

17 <sup>7</sup> Several endorsements are listed on the WPA’s website:

18 [http://wpanet.org/WMMD16/BillofRights\\_MentalIllness\\_FINAL.pdf](http://wpanet.org/WMMD16/BillofRights_MentalIllness_FINAL.pdf). The Royal Australian and New  
19 Zealand College of Psychiatrists (RANZCP)’s endorsement is at [https://www.ranzcp.org/News-  
20 policy/News/New-Bill-of-Rights-to-safeguard-the-rights-of-peop.aspx](https://www.ranzcp.org/News-policy/News/New-Bill-of-Rights-to-safeguard-the-rights-of-peop.aspx).

21 <sup>8</sup> World Psychiatric Association, “The Declaration of Hawaii” Adopted in 1977 at the 6th World  
22 Congress of Psychiatry in Honolulu, Hawaii, Amended at the 7th Congress in Vienna, Italy, in July  
23 1983, at <http://www.codex.vr.se/texts/hawaii.html>.

24 <sup>9</sup> See Ottosson J (2000), The Declaration of Hawaii and Clarence Blomquist. *Acta Psychiatrica*  
25 Scandinavica, 101: 16–19, p. 21.

26 <sup>10</sup> Available at:

27 [http://hrlibrary.umn.edu/Principles%20Guidelines%20and%20Guarantees%20for%20Protection%20  
28 Mental%20Disorder\\_Daes.pdf](http://hrlibrary.umn.edu/Principles%20Guidelines%20and%20Guarantees%20for%20Protection%20Mental%20Disorder_Daes.pdf).

29 <sup>11</sup> [http://www.wpanet.org/detail.php?section\\_id=5&content\\_id=29](http://www.wpanet.org/detail.php?section_id=5&content_id=29).

30 <sup>12</sup> [http://wpanet.org/detail.php?section\\_id=5&content\\_id=48](http://wpanet.org/detail.php?section_id=5&content_id=48). See also Helmchen H and Okasha A,  
31 (2000), From the Hawaii Declaration to the Declaration of Madrid. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*,  
32 101: 20–23.

33 <sup>13</sup> Ashcroft R, “The Troubled Relationship Between Bioethics and Human Rights” in Freeman M, *Law  
34 and Bioethics: Current Legal Issues Volume 11*, Oxford Scholarship Online; January 2009.

35 <sup>14</sup> Ottosson J O, (2000), “The Declaration of Hawaii and Clarence Blomquist”, *Acta Psychiatrica  
36 Scandinavica*, 101: 16–19.

37 <sup>15</sup> See, for example, Minkowitz T (2007) “The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons  
38 with Disabilities and the Right to Be Free from Nonconsensual Psychiatric Interventions.” *Syracuse  
39 Journal of International Law and Commerce* 34 (d): 405–428; Bach M and Kerzner L, “A new  
40 paradigm for protecting autonomy and the right to legal capacity”, Law Commission of Ontario,  
41 2010, available at <http://www.lco-cdo.org/disabilities/bach-kerzner.pdf>; Lewis O, “The Expressive,  
42 Educational and Proactive Roles of Human Rights: an Analysis of the United Nations Convention on  
43 the Rights of Persons with Disabilities”, in McSherry B and Weller P (eds), *Rethinking Mental Health  
44 Laws*, Hart Publishing, 2010; Callard F, Sartoris N, Arboleda-Florez J, Bartlett P, Helchen H, Stuart H,  
45 Tanorda J and Thornicroft G, *Mental Illness, Discrimination and the Law: Fighting for Social Justice*,  
46 2012, Wiley-Blackwell; Bartlett, P. (2012), The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons  
47 with Disabilities and Mental Health Law. *Mod. L. Rev.*, 75: 752–778; Bartlett P (2012) “A mental  
48 disorder of a kind or degree warranting confinement: examining justifications for psychiatric  
49 detention”, *International Journal of Human Rights*, Vol 16, Issue 6; Munro N (2012) “Define  
50 acceptable: how can we ensure that treatment for mental disorder in detention is consistent with  
51 the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities?”, *The International Journal Of Human  
52*

1 *Rights*, Vol. 16 , Issue 6; Karsay D, and Lewis O, “Disability, torture and ill-treatment: taking stock and  
2 ending abuses”, *The International Journal Of Human Rights*, Vol. 16 , Issue 6, 2012, 816-830;  
3 Freeman M et al. “Reversing hard won victories in the name of human rights: a critique of the  
4 General Comment on Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities” *The  
5 Lancet Psychiatry*, Volume 2, Issue 9, 844-850; Szmukler G, “UN CRPD: equal recognition before the  
6 law”, *The Lancet Psychiatry*, Volume 2, Issue 11, e29, and Dawson J, “A realistic approach to  
7 assessing mental health laws' compliance with the UNCRPD”, *Int J Law Psychiatry*, 2015 May-Jun;  
8 40:70-9; Craigie J, “A fine balance: reconsidering patient autonomy in light of the UN Convention on  
9 the Rights of Persons with Disabilities”, *Bioethics*, Volume 29, Issue 6, 398–405, July 2015; Szmukler  
10 G and Bach M, Mental health disabilities and human rights protections” *Global Mental Health*, Vol 2,  
11 2015.

12  
13  
14 <sup>16</sup> CRPD, Articles 10 to 30.

15 <sup>17</sup> CRPD, Article 33(1).

16 <sup>18</sup> CRPD, Article 33(2).

17 <sup>19</sup> CRPD, Article 33(3).

18 <sup>20</sup> CRPD, Article 4(1)(f) and (g).

19 <sup>21</sup> CRPD, Article 4(1)(i).

20 <sup>22</sup> CRPD, Articles 34-36.

21 <sup>23</sup> CRPD, Article 37.

22 <sup>24</sup> Ruddick W, “Doctors’ Rights and Work”, *The Journal of Medicine and Philosophy*, (1979) 4 (2): 192-  
23 203.

24 <sup>25</sup> See, for example American Nurses Association’s “Bill of Rights for Registered Nurses” 2001.

25 <sup>26</sup> Wiegand S H, “Reality Bites: The Collision of Rhetoric, Rights, and Reality and the Library Bill of  
26 Rights”, *Library Trends*, Vol. 45, No. 1, Spring 1996, 75-86.

27 <sup>27</sup> Carver R and Handley L, *Does Torture Prevention Work?*, Liverpool University Press, 2016.

28 <sup>28</sup> See Article 4(1)(i) of the CRPD

29 <sup>29</sup> See Article 4(3) of the CRPD.

30 <sup>30</sup> Andrade C, Shah N, Tharyan P et al, “Position statement and guidelines on unmodified  
31 electroconvulsive therapy”, *Indian J Psychiatry*, 2012 Apr-Jun; 54(2): 119–133.

32 <sup>31</sup> See, for example, WHO and OHCHR, “The Right to Health”, Joint Fact Sheet WHO/OHCHR/323,  
33 August 2007, available at [http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs323\\_en.pdf](http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs323_en.pdf).

34 <sup>32</sup> “Applying the torture and ill-treatment protection framework to persons with disabilities”,  
35 Report of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment  
36 or punishment Manfred Nowak, 28 July 2008, A/63/175; and “Applying the torture and ill-  
37 treatment protection framework in health-care settings”, Report of the Special Rapporteur on  
38 torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, Juan E. Méndez, 1  
39 February 2013, A/HRC/22/53.

40 <sup>33</sup> Lewis O, “The Role of Global Psychiatry in Advancing Human Rights”, in Juan E. Méndez (ed)  
41 *Torture in Healthcare Settings: Reflections on the Special Rapporteur on Torture’s 2013 Thematic  
42 Report*, Anti-Torture Initiative, Center for Human Rights and Humanitarian Law, Washington College  
43 of Law, American University, Washington DC, 2013.

44 <sup>34</sup> See Article 25(d) of the CRPD.

45 <sup>35</sup> See Article 26 of the CRPD.

46 <sup>36</sup> Raboch J, Kališová L, Nawka A, et al , (2010) “Use of Coercive Measures During Involuntary  
47 Hospitalization: Findings From Ten European Countries” *Psychiatric Services*, Volume 61 Number 10,  
48 1012-1017.

49 <sup>37</sup> See Article 13 of the CRPD.

50 <sup>38</sup> See Szmukler (op cit), and Molodynski A, Turnpenny L, Rugkåsa J, Burns T, Moussaoui D, Coercion  
51 and compulsion in mental healthcare-an international perspective, *Asian J Psychiatr.* 2014 Apr, 8:2-  
52 6.