

**FORCE-FEEDING OF PRISONERS AND
DETAINEES ON HUNGER STRIKE**

**Right to Self-Determination versus
Right to Intervention**

Pauline JACOBS



intersentia

Cambridge – Antwerp – Portland

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	vii
<i>Contents</i>	xiii
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xix
Introduction	1
1. What is this book about?	1
2. Reasons for research and the research question	3
3. Medical (law) approach or human right approach?	4
4. Delineation	8
5. Structure of the book	8
6. Methodology	10
Chapter One. Prisoners and detainees on hunger strike	13
1. Introduction	13
2. Definitions	13
3. Difference from suicide and euthanasia	22
4. "On and off" hunger striking	23
5. The physical consequences of a hunger strike	23
6. Recovery after a hunger strike	26
7. Death as result of a hunger strike	26
8. Procedures for force-feeding and artificial feeding	29
9. Conclusions	34
Chapter Two. The concept of personal autonomy, the right to self-determination and informed consent and refusal in health care	37
1. Introduction	37
2. Definitions of personal autonomy and the right to self-determination	38

3. The relationship between the concepts of personal autonomy, the right to self-determination, the right to physical integrity and informed consent and refusal	44
4. Informed consent	45
5. Paternalism	58
6. Competence.....	59
7. Surrogate decision-making for incompetent patients	65
8. Expressions and codifications of personal autonomy, the right to self-determination and informed consent	67
9. Conclusions.....	76

Chapter Three. The prisoner’s and detainee’s personal autonomy and right to self-determination in health care 79

1. Introduction	79
2. Health care in prisons and other places of detention	80
3. Dual loyalties.....	98
4. Human rights for prisoners and detainees or “inherent limitations”?	98
5. Positive obligations on the basis of Article 2 ECHR	103
6. The prisoner’s and detainee’s right to consent to and refuse medical treatment	112
7. Conclusions	125

Chapter Four. Arguments for and against force-feeding prisoners and detainees on hunger strike 127

1. Introduction	127
2. Arguments against force-feeding prisoners and detainees on hunger strike	128
3. Arguments for force-feeding prisoners and detainees on hunger strike ..	135
4. Conclusions.....	145

Chapter Five. International and European documents and case law on force-feeding prisoners and detainees on hunger strike 147

1. Introduction	147
2. International documents and case law on force-feeding prisoners and detainees on hunger strike.....	148
3. European documents and case law on force-feeding prisoners and detainees on hunger strike.....	176
4. NGO analysis of force-feeding prisoners and detainees on hunger strike ..	209
5. Conclusions.....	214

Chapter Six. Force-feeding of prisoners and detainees on hunger strike: current policies and their development in the Netherlands, Germany, and England and Wales219

1. Introduction219
2. The Netherlands220
3. Germany247
4. England and Wales276
5. Conclusions306

Chapter Seven. Synthesis311

1. Introduction311
2. The assessment of (in)competence.....312
3. Basic principle: respect for the competent prisoner’s and detainee’s right to self-determination313
4. Food refusal by incompetent prisoners and detainees318
5. Exception to the basic principle of respect for the competent prisoner’s right to self-determination321

Bibliography341

ICE Is Force-Feeding Some Immigrant Detainees on Hunger Strikes: AP. The associated press (garance burke and martha mendoza). Updated on. 6:15.Â The force-feeding of detainees through nasal tubes at Guantanamo Bay garnered international blowback. Hunger strikes began shortly after the military prison opened in 2002, with force-feeding starting in early 2006 following mass refusals to eat. After four weeks without eating, the body's metabolic systems start to break down, and hunger strikers can risk permanent damage, including cognitive impairment, said Dr. Marc Stern, a correctional physician at the University of Washington in Seattle who has previously consulted with the Department of Homeland Security.

Freedom of speech Hunger strike Prisoner rights Solitary confinement Prisoner autonomy. This is a preview of subscription content, log in to check access. Notes. Acknowledgements. I wish to express my sincerest appreciation to my colleagues at Saint Louis University, Jeff Bishop, Harold Braswell, Kelly Dineen, Erica Salter, and Stephanie Solomon, who have offered generous feedback on an earlier version of this article. References. Annas, G. J. (1982). Prison hunger strikes: Why the motive matters. *Washington state's right to privacy does not permit a fasting inmate to refuse nutrition and hydration. Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 37(4), 563-565. Google Scholar. White V. Narick, 292 S.E. 2d 54.