

Dedicated to
Mike

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks are owed to a number of individuals who have contributed their time, wisdom, inspiration and encouragement to the completion of this dissertation. First of course are the members of my committee, Professors Larkin S. Dudley, Gary L. Wamsley, Wayne D. Moore, Joe V. Rees, and John A. Rohr who chaired the committee and has shepherded the entire prospectus and dissertation writing process. I believe that it must be a singular highlight in a budding scholar's academic career to have the careful attention, encouragement and assistance of such a stellar group of scholars. I must also thank John Rohr for inspiring my interest in administrative law and my desire to pursue its use as pedagogue; Joe Rees for carefully working with me on three independent studies in the area of bioethics—much of which found its way into this dissertation; Wayne Moore for allowing me to audit his constitutional law class and bringing his brilliant legal mind to the review of my prospectus and this document; Larkin Dudley for her positive encouragement and, of course, for her earlier work in the area of privatization and the public private distinction; and, Gary Wamsley for his friendship and inspiration.

Of course, there are many others whose efforts have aided me in this project. I have had the good fortune to interview Richard Giroux, Senior Attorney with North Carolina Prisoner Legal Services, Inc., Raleigh, by phone and in person. Rich has been very generous of his time and has provided me with many documents related to *West v. Atkins* and its progress through the courts. His recollections of and notes from preparation for oral arguments and their presentation to the Supreme Court have helped me feel like an observer of the event and helped me invaluablely in my recording of the events in Chapter Three. I must also thank: David W. Daniel, Clerk of the Federal District Court for Northeastern North Carolina, and his secretary, Kathy Thompson for their help; Karla Pearce, Archivist with the American Public Health Association, for providing me with a copy of the APHA *amicus curiae* brief in *West v. Atkins* (1988); staff of the National Prison Project of the American Civil Liberties Union for searching for and finding a copy of their *amicus* brief as well; Rob Thompson of the National Archives Motion Picture, Sound and Video Branch for advice on how to obtain a recording of the oral arguments before the Supreme Court; W. Robert Ellis, Jr., Archivist with the National Archives Records Administration, who provided me with a written transcript of those oral arguments; and, Michael Dolan, Professional Researcher, who made a recording of the Supreme Court proceedings for me.

There are others without whose efforts this project might not have been undertaken. They include David H. Rosenbloom, Distinguished Professor of Public Administration in the School of Public Affairs at American University in Washington, D.C. When I discussed my interest in the Third Chapter of his 2000 edition of *Constitutional Competence for Public Managers* as a dissertation topic, David suggested that I consider doing a case study of one of the cases included in that chapter. I selected *West v. Atkins* (1988) because of my interests and background in health care. I must also thank physicians James Mittelberger and Linda Engelstad, co-chairs of the Bioethics Committee at the Alameda County Medical Center for inspiring and informing my interest in bioethics, as we served together on that medical staff committee and Doris Zallen for her excellent class on human subjects' research. Acknowledgment is also due Quincy West whose quest for medical care and justice has touched so many lives. Finally, heartfelt thanks go to my mother, Alice N. Hardie, and son, David P. Shane, for their faith in me and to my husband and colleague, Samuel M. McCreary, who has proofread, cajoled and supported me throughout.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION	1
Overview	1
The Problem	8
Literature Contribution	11
Approach	15
CHAPTER TWO – THE INSTITUTIONAL	18
The Doctrine of State Action and the Fourteenth Amendment	18
Institutional Setting, Contemporary Values, and Legal, Social and Medical Contexts...	30
CHAPTER THREE – THE CONCRETE	44
Quincy West	44
Central Prison Hospital	45
Dr. Samuel Atkins	45
Injury, Pain, Frustration and Complaint	46
The District Court	49
North Carolina Prisoner Legal Services, Inc.	53
The Circuit Court of Appeals	54
Brief for the Appellant	55
Brief for the Appellees	58
The Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals Panel	61
The Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals <i>En Banc</i>	61
A Dissenting Opinion	62
The Supreme Court Grants Certiorari	65
Brief for the Respondent	65
Brief for the Petitioner	66
Friend of the Court: The American Public Health Association	67
Friend of the Court: the American Civil Liberties Union	70
The Hearing	75
The Decision	82
The Final Chapter in West’s Saga	84

Release	85
Summary	85
CHAPTER FOUR – THE DIALECTIC	87
Dissenting and Concurring opinions	88
Medical Research and Experimentation	90
Informed Consent	95
Informed Consent Footnotes	100
Medical Malpractice	101
Contract and the Duty of Care	102
Community Attitudes	104
Challenges of Prison Medical Services	108
CHAPTER FIVE – THE PERTINENT	110
Pertinence of <i>West</i> in the History of State Action	111
Progeny of <i>West</i>	112
Pertinence of <i>West</i> to Issues of Liability and Immunity	113
The Lessons of <i>West</i>	117
Judicial Activism	118
Reflections Regarding Privatization	119
Prescriptions Regarding Contract Mechanisms	123
An Expanded Understanding of Publicness	125
Revisiting the Question	126
Reflections on Values	129
CASES CITED	131
WORKS REFERENCED	136
APPENDICES	148
Appendix A – A Chronology of <i>West v. Atkins</i>	148
Appendix B – Atkins’ Contract for Professional Services	150
Appendix C – Quincy West’s Pro Se Complaint, filed November 29, 1984	152
Appendix D – Quincy West’s Traverse in Opposition to Defendants Motion to Dismiss, and Plaintiff’s Memorandum of Legal Points and Authorities in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment, and That Defendant’s Motion be Dismissed as Sham, filed May 31, 1985	158
Appendix E – <i>West v. Atkins</i> , 487 U.S. 42 (1988)	162
CURRICULUM VITAE	173