

Moral issues raised by surrogacy

Sanctity of the marriage	Husband's bond with the surrogate (esp. if not AI) - she's growing his baby Wife's feelings - jealousy, inadequacy etc.
Surrogate mother's rights	Bonds with the baby - feels first kick, gives birth etc. If not IVF, surrogate has biological ties with the child Open to exploitation, particularly if poor or in countries where payment is greater than expenses Can she decide whether to smoke, exercise, work, travel, eat junk etc.? Can she decide whether to have an abortion? If she becomes ill, what support is she entitled to? If something happens to the couple now or in the future, what are her responsibilities?
Rights of the foetus/child	Any payment reduces the value of a child and commercialises humanity Do they have the right to contact the surrogate mother? What is the child's status if other children are born to the couple or the surrogate
Rights of the couple	The law won't enforce any contract, even in the case of IVF, so the surrogate can always keep the child The couple are open to manipulation and blackmail The couple have no legal right to prevent the surrogate from damaging the foetus by smoking etc, or aborting the foetus
What if it goes wrong?	Disability? Couple split up Couple change their minds Surrogate can't have another child Surrogate decides to keep the baby Couple have their own child Couple become ill or die
Gay couples	Should gay couples be able to have children through surrogacy?
Payment	Is 'payment for expenses' enough in the days of the minimum wage? Is any exchange of money appropriate?

Moral issues raised by IVF

Sanctity of the marriage	If egg and/or sperm are donated, is this akin to adultery? Will IVF replace sex?
Un-natural?	Not the way God intended May lead to 'weaker' sperm fertilising eggs
Eugenics	Allows pre-implantation genetic diagnosis Allows you to choose eggs/sperm from fitter, more intelligent people
Cost	Only wealthy people can afford multiple attempts Availability on the NHS means money not spent on saving lives
Success rate	Only 20% effective, costing time and money IVF pregnancies have a lower success rate, meaning that more implanted embryos die Can give couples false hope Can prolong and intensify the pain of childlessness May leave couples too old to adopt
Availability	Should it be available to lesbian couples? Under what conditions should it be available on the NHS? Should there be age restrictions?
Rights of the child	Should the child be told how it was born? What ties are there with egg or sperm donors?
Spare embryos	How many spare embryos should you produce? Can spare embryos be frozen? Can spare embryos be experimented on? Is killing a spare embryo murder?
Consent?	Can sperm be taken from a dead partner and used to produce a child? What happens if an embryo is frozen and the husband changes his mind?
Mistakes	What happens if embryos get mixed up? What happens if embryos get lost, stolen or accidentally destroyed?
Commercialisation	Eggs/sperm are sold on the internet

Moral issues raised by Artificial Insemination

Un-natural?	Not the way God intended people to procreate Must not replace sex Takes the beauty and love out of creating a child
Donor sperm	Attack on sanctity of marriage Donor's sperm can only be used a limited number of times Donor must remain anonymous
Child	Who are the child's parents? What if he wants to contact the biological father? There may be tensions between child through AID and any previous/subsequent child
Availability	Should lesbian couples be allowed to have children? Should single women be allowed to have children? Should people with disabilities or people over a certain age be allowed to use AI?
Cost	Is it appropriate to buy sperm over the internet? Is it right to pay more to get sperm from an athletic genius? Should AID be freely available on the NHS?
Husband	Husband may feel jealous/inadequate Husband may find it more difficult to bond with the baby

See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reproductive_technology for all technologies:

- [artificial insemination](#)
- [artificial wombs](#)
- [cloning](#) (see [human cloning](#) for the special case of human beings)
- [cryopreservation](#) of [sperm](#), [oocytes](#), [embryos](#)
- [embryo testing](#)
- [embryo transfer](#)
- [genetic engineering](#)
- [hormone treatment](#) to increase [fertility](#)
- [in vitro fertilization](#)
 - [intracytoplasmic sperm injection](#)
- [preimplantation genetic diagnosis \(PGD\)](#)
- [sperm selection](#)
- [reprogenetics](#)

'I'm determined to have my baby'

Natallie Evans, left infertile after cancer treatment, has said she is determined to use frozen embryos to have her own child.

She has lost the latest round of her battle to be allowed to use the embryos after her ex-partner Howard Johnston withdrew his consent.

She said: "I'm still as determined to do whatever it takes to be allowed to try for a child of my own using my stored embryos."

Ms Evans has said she will seek another legal hearing, in front of the Grand Chamber of the European Court of Human Rights, but she issued another appeal to her ex to resolve the issue away from the courts.

"Howard may feel it is too late for him to change his mind but it is not.

"Howard, please think about it. Just let me have what I want."

Six embryos were created for the couple in 2001.

But Mr Johnston withdrew his consent for the embryos to be implanted after the couple separated.

Celebration hope

However, Ms Evans say they represent her last chance to have a baby which is genetically hers.

Under UK laws, the embryos must be destroyed in October this year.

In a statement following the judgement, Ms Evans said: "I was very disappointed to learn of the judgment this morning.

"I had hoped that today would be a day for me to celebrate.

"I had really hoped that the Strasbourg decision would be an end to what I have gone through over the last four years."

Ms Evans said she objected to Mr Johnston's position that he had a right to decide if and when he had a family.

"He is preventing me from having one."

And she said she would not stop.

"This has been going on for four years. I am not giving up. If I was going to give up, I would have done so at the first hurdle."

Right-to-life

A panel of seven judges made the ruling, which read: "The Court, like the national courts, had great sympathy for the plight of the applicant who, if implantation did not take place, would be deprived of the ability to give birth to her own child." But it was ruled, in a majority verdict that, even in such exceptional circumstances as Ms Evans', the right to a family life - enshrined in article eight of the European Convention of Human Rights - could not override Mr Johnston's withdrawal of consent.

It also ruled unanimously that the embryos did not have an independent right to life.



Natallie Evans has been hoping to use the embryos since 2001

“ Just let me have what I want ”

Natallie Evans

