



**TITLE**

Editorial: Challenging ideas

**AUTHOR**

Stammers, Trevor

**JOURNAL**

The New Bioethics: A Multidisciplinary Journal of Biotechnology and the Body

**DATE DEPOSITED**

30 September 2016

**This version available at**

<https://research.stmarys.ac.uk/id/eprint/1241/>

---

**COPYRIGHT AND REUSE**

Open Research Archive makes this work available, in accordance with publisher policies, for research purposes.

**VERSIONS**

The version presented here may differ from the published version. For citation purposes, please consult the published version for pagination, volume/issue and date of publication.

# PROOF COVER SHEET

---

Author(s): Editorial  
Article Title: Editorial  
Article No: YNBI1239862  
Enclosures: 1) Query sheet  
2) Article proofs

---

Dear Author,

**1. Please check these proofs carefully.** It is the responsibility of the corresponding author to check these and approve or amend them. A second proof is not normally provided. Taylor & Francis cannot be held responsible for uncorrected errors, even if introduced during the production process. Once your corrections have been added to the article, it will be considered ready for publication.

Please limit changes at this stage to the correction of errors. You should not make trivial changes, improve prose style, add new material, or delete existing material at this stage. You may be charged if your corrections are excessive (we would not expect corrections to exceed 30 changes).

For detailed guidance on how to check your proofs, please paste this address into a new browser window: <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/production/checkingproofs.asp>

Your PDF proof file has been enabled so that you can comment on the proof directly using Adobe Acrobat. If you wish to do this, please save the file to your hard disk first. For further information on marking corrections using Acrobat, please paste this address into a new browser window: <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/production/acrobat.asp>

---

**2. Please review the table of contributors below and confirm that the first and last names are structured correctly and that the authors are listed in the correct order of contribution.** This check is to ensure that your name will appear correctly online and when the article is indexed.

Sequence	Prefix	Given name(s)	Surname	Suffix
1		Trevor	Stammers	

Queries are marked in the margins of the proofs, and you can also click the hyperlinks below.

## AUTHOR QUERIES

### General points:

1. **Permissions:** You have warranted that you have secured the necessary written permission from the appropriate copyright owner for the reproduction of any text, illustration, or other material in your article. Please see <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/permissions/usingThirdPartyMaterial.asp>.
2. **Third-party content:** If there is third-party content in your article, please check that the rightsholder details for re-use are shown correctly.
3. **Affiliation:** The corresponding author is responsible for ensuring that address and email details are correct for all the co-authors. Affiliations given in the article should be the affiliation at the time the research was conducted. Please see <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/preparation/writing.asp>.
4. **Funding:** Was your research for this article funded by a funding agency? If so, please insert 'This work was supported by <insert the name of the funding agency in full>', followed by the grant number in square brackets '[grant number xxxx]'.
5. **Supplemental data and underlying research materials:** Do you wish to include the location of the underlying research materials (e.g. data, samples or models) for your article? If so, please insert this sentence before the reference section: 'The underlying research materials for this article can be accessed at <full link>/ description of location [author to complete]'. If your article includes supplemental data, the link will also be provided in this paragraph. See <<http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/preparation/multimedia.asp>> for further explanation of supplemental data and underlying research materials.

QUERY NO.	QUERY DETAILS
	No Queries

## How to make corrections to your proofs using Adobe Acrobat/Reader

Taylor & Francis offers you a choice of options to help you make corrections to your proofs. Your PDF proof file has been enabled so that you can edit the proof directly using Adobe Acrobat/Reader. This is the simplest and best way for you to ensure that your corrections will be incorporated. If you wish to do this, please follow these instructions:

1. Save the file to your hard disk.
2. Check which version of Adobe Acrobat/Reader you have on your computer. You can do this by clicking on the “Help” tab, and then “About”.

If Adobe Reader is not installed, you can get the latest version free from <http://get.adobe.com/reader/>.

3. If you have Adobe Acrobat/Reader 10 or a later version, click on the “Comment” link at the right-hand side to view the Comments pane.
4. You can then select any text and mark it up for deletion or replacement, or insert new text as needed. Please note that these will clearly be displayed in the Comments pane and secondary annotation is not needed to draw attention to your corrections. If you need to include new sections of text, it is also possible to add a comment to the proofs. To do this, use the Sticky Note tool in the task bar. Please also see our FAQs here: <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/production/index.asp>.
5. Make sure that you save the file when you close the document before uploading it to CATS using the “Upload File” button on the online correction form. If you have more than one file, please zip them together and then upload the zip file.

If you prefer, you can make your corrections using the CATS online correction form.

### Troubleshooting

**Acrobat help:** <http://helpx.adobe.com/acrobat.html>

**Reader help:** <http://helpx.adobe.com/reader.html>

Please note that full user guides for earlier versions of these programs are available from the Adobe Help pages by clicking on the link “Previous versions” under the “Help and tutorials” heading from the relevant link above. Commenting functionality is available from Adobe Reader 8.0 onwards and from Adobe Acrobat 7.0 onwards.

**Firefox users:** Firefox’s inbuilt PDF Viewer is set to the default; please see the following for instructions on how to use this and download the PDF to your hard drive: [http://support.mozilla.org/en-US/kb/view-pdf-files-firefox-without-downloading-them#w\\_using-a-pdf-reader-plugin](http://support.mozilla.org/en-US/kb/view-pdf-files-firefox-without-downloading-them#w_using-a-pdf-reader-plugin)

## EDITORIAL

# Challenging Ideas

As we come to the end of our first year of publishing three issues of *The New Bioethics*, one of the many benefits of an extra issue has been to see the spectrum of authors increase. This one for example contains papers from both an undergraduate student and two professors. Though ranging in topic across the whole lifespan from gamete to corpse, all of the papers in this edition challenge existing paradigms. Three of these relate specifically to the beginning of life.

Watson challenges the widely accepted practice of reproductive surrogacy whether commercial or altruistic, arguing that the practice undermines the human dignity of both the surrogate mother and her child. Foster also makes use of the concept of human dignity and what he calls ‘four lenses manufactured by [it]’ to challenge the status of the UK abortion law and suggests furthermore that only this dignity-based approach is compatible with Article 8 of the European Convention of Human Rights. Saad challenges a widely held view of abortion — namely that it is no different ethically from contraception in that both interrupt the continuous process of the creation of a new person. He questions two premises on which this view rests and proposes rather that there is a clear moral boundary ‘on the basis that an embryo is something greater and other than the sum of its constituent gametes’.

Westin challenges the idea of a diagnosis in mental health by examining the language used in such diagnoses and how they relate to the self-concept being defined. In order to minimise the associated stigma in psychiatric diagnoses, she argues the need to move towards ‘a goal-directed diagnosis aiming at a healthy and empowered integration of the whole individual’.

Two prominent professors also debate challenges to religious — especially Christian — perspectives on both the living and the dead. David Albert Jones contends that the phrase ‘sanctity of life’ as currently used in arguing against intentional killing of the innocent is a twentieth century invention and the term should be quietly dropped as it is unhelpful in countering ‘quality of life’ arguments. David Gareth Jones, in a fascinating exploration of post-mortem plastination of the human body, considers whether the process devalues the body or not and what challenges it poses for Christian understandings of death and bodily resurrection.

**Trevor Stammers**  
Editor, *The New Bioethics*