

What Things Make One Have Defensive Insanity?

Posted on October 15, 2019

View this essay online:

<https://academic-master.com/what-things-make-one-have-defensive-insanity/>

Introduction

The insanity defense concerns criminal responsibility at the time of an alleged offense, not the mere existence of mental illness. Its historical foundation is the 1843 English case of Daniel M’Naghten, whose acquittal led to a legal test asking whether a “disease of the mind” caused a defect of reason so serious that the accused did not understand the nature and quality of the act or did not know that it was wrong. Modern jurisdictions use different formulations, but the central principle remains that severe mental impairment may excuse criminal liability when it destroys capacities the law considers necessary for blame. Current federal law is narrower than some state standards: 18 U.S.C. § 17 provides an affirmative defense when a severe mental disease or defect made the defendant unable to appreciate the nature and quality or wrongfulness of the acts, and the defendant bears the burden of proving insanity by clear and convincing evidence (18 U.S.C. § 17, 2026). The [insanity defense](#) must therefore be distinguished from psychiatric diagnosis, temporary emotion, intoxication, or ordinary irrationality.

M’Naghten, Federal Law, and the Meaning of Legal Insanity

The M’Naghten framework focuses mainly on cognition: whether the accused could understand what was being done and whether the person could recognize its wrongfulness. That inquiry is legal rather than diagnostic. A person may live with schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, severe depression, post-traumatic stress disorder, or another psychiatric condition and still understand an act and its wrongfulness. Conversely, a severe psychotic episode may so distort perception or reasoning that the legal threshold is met. Federal law now uses the word “appreciate,” which can require more than rote knowledge of a rule because a person may be able to recite that homicide is unlawful while being unable to apply that understanding within a delusional state (18 U.S.C. § 17, 2026). State law varies considerably: some jurisdictions retain M’Naghten-style rules, some use modified cognitive tests, and others incorporate broader concepts associated with the Model Penal Code. The relevant standard must therefore be identified before evaluating any case because there is no single nationwide insanity test for every state prosecution.

Andrea Yates and the Importance of Mental State at the Time of the Act

Andrea Yates's prosecution illustrates how severe mental illness can become legally significant when it affects criminal responsibility at the exact time of an offense. Yates had a documented history of severe depression, psychosis, suicide attempts, psychiatric hospitalization, and postpartum mental illness before drowning her five children in 2001. Her first capital-murder conviction was later overturned after prosecution expert Park Dietz gave inaccurate testimony about a supposed television episode involving a mother who drowned her children and asserted insanity. At the 2006 retrial, the jury found Yates not guilty by reason of insanity, and she was committed to a secure psychiatric facility rather than simply released. The case demonstrates that planning or purposeful physical action does not automatically prove sanity because a person can organize behavior within a delusional framework. At the same time, diagnosis alone does not decide the legal issue. Experts and jurors must examine symptoms, statements, behavior, awareness of consequences, and the governing legal definition of wrongfulness when determining responsibility (Steadman et al., 1993).

Lorena Bobbitt, Jonathan Schmitz, and Different Legal Outcomes

Other highly publicized cases show why emotional disturbance and legal insanity should not be treated as interchangeable. In 1993, Lorena Bobbitt severed her husband's penis after alleging a history of domestic and sexual abuse and describing an acute psychological crisis. A Virginia jury accepted a temporary-insanity theory, and she was placed in a psychiatric facility for evaluation before later release. The phrase "temporary insanity" did not mean that anger itself excused the conduct; it meant the jury concluded that a qualifying legal incapacity existed at the relevant time under the applicable law. By contrast, Jonathan Schmitz killed Scott Amedure after appearing on *The Jenny Jones Show* and later presented evidence of depression and emotional disturbance. The jury did not accept a complete insanity defense and convicted him of second-degree murder. These different outcomes emphasize that psychiatric symptoms, humiliation, trauma, or stress do not automatically eliminate criminal responsibility. Courts examine whether the specific legal capacities required by the jurisdiction were actually impaired, and the burden of proof can materially affect the result (Steadman et al., 1993).

Competency, Expert Evidence, and the Role of the Jury

Competency to stand trial is legally distinct from insanity. Competency concerns the defendant's

present ability to understand the proceedings and assist counsel, whereas insanity concerns mental functioning at the earlier time of the alleged offense. Under current federal law, a competency hearing is required when there is reasonable cause to believe that a defendant may be unable to understand the nature and consequences of the proceedings or properly assist in the defense (18 U.S.C. § 4241, 2026). A person can therefore have been legally insane during an offense but later become competent after treatment, or can have been responsible at the time of the offense yet become incompetent before trial. Forensic psychiatrists and psychologists help courts reconstruct mental state by reviewing records, symptoms, witness accounts, communications, behavior, and possible malingering. Their role is to explain clinical evidence and its relationship to the legal test, not to replace the judge or jury. Expert disagreement is possible because reconstructing a past mental state is inherently difficult, making transparent methodology and accurate testimony especially important.

Control Tests, Public Misunderstanding, and Legal Consequences

Some insanity standards historically included a volitional element, asking whether mental disease destroyed the defendant's capacity to control conduct even when wrongfulness was understood. The Model Penal Code formulation, for example, asks whether mental disease or defect caused a lack of substantial capacity either to appreciate criminality or to conform behavior to law (American Law Institute, 1985). Federal law removed that broader volitional branch after the Insanity Defense Reform Act of 1984 and now uses the narrower cognitive standard in § 17. Public debate often portrays insanity as an easy loophole, but the defense is uncommon, demanding, and may lead to lengthy secure hospitalization following an insanity acquittal. Federal procedure permits a special verdict of not guilty only by reason of insanity when the issue is properly raised (18 U.S.C. § 4242, 2026). The legal system therefore attempts to balance two concerns: avoiding ordinary punishment when severe mental impairment destroys criminal responsibility while protecting the public through evaluation, treatment, supervision, and careful review of release decisions.

Conclusion

The factors that support an insanity defense are legal criteria tied to a defendant's mental state at the moment of the offense, not simply evidence that the person had a psychiatric diagnosis or behaved irrationally. The M'Naghten tradition focuses on inability to understand the nature and quality of an act or its wrongfulness, while other jurisdictions may use modified or broader tests. Current federal law requires a severe mental disease or defect that made the defendant unable to appreciate the nature and quality or wrongfulness of the acts and places the burden of proving insanity by clear and convincing evidence on the defendant (18 U.S.C. § 17, 2026). The contrasting outcomes in the Yates, Bobbitt, and Schmitz cases illustrate why courts must examine the exact legal standard, the quality of

expert evidence, and the defendant's capacities rather than infer insanity from the disturbing nature of an offense. Competency is a separate inquiry, and an insanity verdict can result in secure treatment rather than immediate freedom. The defense ultimately reflects the principle that criminal blame requires a minimum capacity for responsible understanding.

References

18 U.S.C. § 17 (2026).

18 U.S.C. § 4241 (2026).

18 U.S.C. § 4242 (2026).

American Law Institute. (1985). *Model Penal Code and commentaries*. American Law Institute.

M'Naghten's Case, 8 Eng. Rep. 718 (H.L. 1843).

Steadman, H. J., McGreevy, M. A., Morrissey, J. P., Callahan, L. A., Robbins, P. C., & Cirincione, C. (1993). *Before and after Hinckley: Evaluating insanity defense reform*. Guilford Press.