

INDEX

- A, B, & C v X & Y* [2012], 204
A Local Authority v A & Anor [2010], 138–40
A Local Authority v E & Ors [2012], 135
A Local Authority v M & Ors [2014], 204
A Local Authority v WMA & Ors [2013], 146, 147, 148, 175, 176, 179–81
A Local Authority X v MM & Anor [2007], 171–2
A Primary Care Trust v P & Ors [2009], 155, 177–8
- absorbed coping, 194–5
 and autonomy, 75–82
- abusive relationships
 decision to intervene, 4
 influence on decisional capacity, 5
 justification for third-party interventions, 5–6
 public/private distinction, 27–34
- agent-relative appraisal, 203–5
- Agich, George, 191, 194
- Airedale NHS Trust v Bland* [1993], 54
- Appelbaum, Paul, 104, 105
- Aristotelian principle (Rawls), 94–5
- articulatory-disclosive mode of reasoning, 132–8
 application, 138–44
- assimilation of individuals with impairment, 202–3
- asymmetrical responsibility, 185–91
 and hermeneutic competence, 190–1
 and phenomenological awareness, 191–7
- role of dialogical understanding, 197–208
- attribution and undertaking, 111–12
- authentic self
 and autonomy, 84
 constituting through dialogue, 85–7
- authenticity conditions for autonomy, 57
- autism, 78–80, 192–7
- autonomous agency
 support for, 27–34
- autonomy, 1
 and absorbed coping, 75–82
 and the authentic self, 84
 appropriate criteria for mental capacity adjudications, 74–5
 authenticity conditions, 57
 in bioethics, 54–7
 competency conditions, 56–7
 compromised by relationships, 5–6
 conceptions in relation to mental capacity, 53–4
 defining personal autonomy, 51–2
 distinction from liberty and freedom, 36
 episodic autonomy, 88–9
 feminist theories, 67–8
 internalist–externalist spectrum, 57
 Kantian autonomy and dignity, 159–63
 legal framework for individuals with impairment, 13
 liberal individualist view, 37
 in liberal theory, 57–67
 and mental capacity, 1

- autonomy (*cont.*)
 and moral responsibility, 12
 negative and positive liberties, 34–7
 obligations on behalf of others, 4–5
 overdemandingness critique, 59–60
 oversimplification critique, 60–1
 and paternalism, 72–4
 phenomenological and relational dimensions, 225–6
 philosophical concept, 12–13
 procedural-internalist approach, 57–67, 68
 procedural-relational model, 68, 82–98
 procedural-substantive spectrum, 57
 programmatic autonomy, 88–9
 promoting for individuals with impairment, 4–5
 relational aspect, 4–5
 respect for patient autonomy, 54–5
 as a scale, 87–98
 substantive–relational approach, 68–75
- autonomy competencies, 83, 95–6
 evaluation of, 97–8
 influence of socialisation, 97
 influence of supportive environment and relationships, 5
 and nurturing relations-to-self, 84–5
- Bach, Michael, 25–6, 32, 33, 34–7
 Baker J, 195–7, 204
 Bartlett, Peter, 21
 Beauchamp, Tom L., 55
 beneficence, 12, 54
 Kantian duty of, 167–8
 Benson, Paul, 82
 Berlin, Isaiah, 34
 best interests judgments, 56, 129
 mental capacity as a spectrum, 228–30
- bioethics
 conception of autonomy, 54–7
- Bodey J, 142
 bodily interactions with the world, 75–82
- Brandom, Robert, 111–13, 114, 120–1, 123, 133
- HHJ Cardinal, 179–81
- care theory
 justification for third-party intervention, 155–8
- Categorical Imperative (CI) (Kant), 159–61
- Childress, James F., 55
- Christman, John, 61–2, 63–4, 65–6
- clinical tests of competency, 104
- Cockburn Lord C. J., 105
- Coleridge J., 142
- common law tradition, 49
- compassionate regard, 203–5
- compatibilism, 12, 121
- competency
 clinical tests, 104
- competency conditions for autonomy, 56–7
- contractualism
 and moral responsibility, 185–7
- Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), 13
 Article 12, 28, 35, 45, 150–1
 Article 16, 27
 external challenge to the concept of mental capacity, 19
 interpretations of Article 12, 23–6
 rejection of the concept of mental capacity, 22–3
 right to protection of autonomy, 19
 and the social model of disability, 150–1
See also will and preferences paradigm of the CRPD
- Davidson, Donald, 107
- decisional capacity
 influence of relationships, 5
 influence of the environment, 5
 relational aspect, 4–5
 relationships that enable and promote, 227–8
- decision-making process
 impact of relationships, 1–2

- decision-making status, 25–6
 facilitated decision-making status, 26
 legally independent status, 25
 supported decision-making status, 25
 Descartes, René, 79
 determinism, 12, 121
 diachronic self, 80
 diagnostic threshold for mental capacity, 20
 dialogical process
 constituting the authentic self, 85–7
 dialogical understanding
 agent-relative appraisal, 203–5
 compassionate regard, 203–5
 consequences of lack of, 197
 and hermeneutic competence, 197–208
 humility, 205–6, 207
 in situations of asymmetrical responsibility, 197–208
 meaning of, 197–8
 and prejudice, 198–201
 problem of assimilation, 202–3
 problem of objectification, 201–2
 reciprocity, 206–7
 disability
 terminology used to describe, 12
 disabling relationships
 third-party intervention, 175–81
 discrimination
 mental capacity concept as discriminatory, 22
 domestic abuse
 boundaries of intervention, 41–6
 public/private boundary, 41–6
 dominance principle, 93–5, 97, 98
 Donnelly, Mary, 231
 Dreyfus, Hubert, 75, 80, 81, 85, 199
 Dupré, Catherine, 148
 Dworkin, Ronald, 7–9, 38, 59, 62–3, 82, 87

 eating disorders, 136
 egosyntonic disorders, 65

 Eldergill DJ, 172–3, 217
 Ells, Carolyn, 71
 embodied coping, 75–82
 embodied self
 as the subject of rights, 39–41
 empathic attribution of meaning, 203
 environment
 influence on decisional capacity, 5
 episodic autonomy, 88–9
 epistemic injustice in mental capacity assessment, 214–23
 ethical justification for rights, 46–9
 European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)
 Article 3, 29–31, 154
 Article 8, 29–31, 154, 155
 public/private considerations, 29–31
 exercise-based concept of freedom, 35–6
 external challenge to the mental capacity concept, 22–7

 facilitated decision-making status, 26
 Falconer, Lord, 13
 feminist legal scholarship, 20
 challenge to liberal approaches to rights, 39
 feminist theory, 9
 autonomy, 67–8
 first-personal dimension of mental capacity, 9
 Fischer, John, 121–8
 formal equality
 and legal capacity, 23–4
 Formula of Humanity, 160–3, 165, 169, 171, 174
 Formula of Universal Law (CI-test), 159–61
 Frankfurt, Harry, 82
 freedom
 as an exercise-based concept, 35–6
 as an opportunity-based concept, 35–6
 distinction from autonomy, 36
 internal domain of, 35–6
 Fricker, Miranda, 214, 215

- functional tests of mental capacity,
 18–19, 20–1, 104–10
 contestable assumptions of the
 functional criteria, 21–2
 human rights issues, 23
 legal and ethical validity questioned,
 23
 viewed as discriminatory, 23
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg, 198, 199,
 200
- Goff, Lord, 54–5
- Grisso, Thomas, 104, 105
- Hale, Baroness, 159
- Harpur, Paul David, 151
- Hedley HJ, 211
- Hedley J, 195, 204
- Herman, Barbara, 169
- hermeneutic competence
 and asymmetrical responsibility,
 190–1
 best interest assessment, 220–2
 components of, 191
 definition, 184, 190–1
 and dialogical understanding,
 197–208
 in mental capacity assessment,
 212–14
 nurturing relations-to-self, 208–12
 and phenomenological awareness,
 191–7
- Herring, Jonathan, 17, 21, 29, 31, 147,
 155–8
- Holman J, 105, 108, 109, 113,
 130
- human rights issues
 functional tests of capacity, 23
 substituted decision-making, 22
- humility
 and dialogical understanding,
 205–6, 207
- hypergoods, 134–5
- individual rights, 28
- individualistic view of right of
 autonomy, 34–7
- inferential reasoning, 112–13
- informed consent, 18, 20
- inherent vulnerability, 176
- internal challenge to the concept of
 mental capacity, 20–2
- internal domain of freedom, 35–6
- internalism
 condition of the procedural model
 of rationality, 106–7
- internalist-externalist spectrum of
 autonomy, 57
- interpersonal source of capacity, 1–2
- intersubjective dialogue, 4
 impact on capacity, 2–3
- intersubjective perspective of capacity
 assessment, 6
- intrapersonal source of capacity, 2
- Jackson J, 135, 216–17, 229–30,
 234–5
- Jehovah's Witnesses, 114–17, 134
- justificatory inconsistency in mental
 capacity assessment, 214–17
- Kant, Immanuel, 148–9
- Kantian autonomy and dignity, 159–63
- Kantian positive duties, 165–9
 application to the law, 169–75
- Kerzner, Lana, 25–6, 32, 33, 34–7
- King's College Hospital NHS Foundation
 Trust v C and Anor* [2015], 218–20
- Kittay, Eva Feder, 205, 206
- KK v STCC* [2012], 195–7
- knowledge attribution, 111–12
- Lacey, Nicola, 41, 44
- law
 challenge to value-neutral
 attributions, 41
 potential for discrimination,
 exclusion or oppression, 41
 structuring relationships, 38–49
- LBL v RYJ & Anor* [2010], 217
- LBX v K, L, and M* [2013], 220–2
- legal analysis
 and the relational constituents of
 mental capacity, 10–11
- legal capacity, 28
 formal equality, 23–4

- negative and positive liberties, 34–5
- proposal to replace mental capacity, 23–5
- respect for, 32–3
- substantive equality, 24–5
- legal interpretations
 - fit with previous decisions and practices, 8
 - justification from political morality, 8
 - normative justification, 7–8
- legal jurisdiction, 13
- legally independent decision-making status, 25
- Levinas, Emmanuel, 187–9, 190
- liberal individualism, 28
 - view of rights, 37
- liberal rights
 - challenge to decontextualised focus, 41
 - nature of the body as subject, 39–41
 - public/private boundary, 41–6
 - regulated/unregulated boundary, 41–6
- liberal theory
 - conception of autonomy, 57–67
- liberty
 - distinction from autonomy, 36
- logical consistency
 - condition of the procedural model of rationality, 107–8
- Loughlin v Singh & Ors* [2013], 130–2
- Macdonald J, 218–20
- Mackenzie, Catriona, 176
- Macur J, 217
- Malette v Shulman* [1990], 114
- May, William, 191
- McDowell, John, 111
- medical paternalism, 54
- Mencap, 197
- mental capacity
 - as an all-or-nothing concept, 1 and autonomy, 1
 - conceptions of autonomy, 53–4
 - conflicting definitions of, 52–3
 - consequences of the all-or-nothing view, 4
 - contestable assumptions of the functional criteria, 21–2
 - criteria for, 1
 - diagnostic threshold, 20
 - as a discriminatory concept, 22
 - ethical reorientation, 225
 - external challenge to the concept, 22–7
 - first-personal dimension, 9
 - functional test, 20–1, 104–10
 - impact of relationships, 1–3
 - inclusive conception of, 4
 - internal challenge to the concept, 20–2
 - interpersonal source of, 1–2
 - intrapersonal source of, 2
 - legal perspective, 2
 - levels of analysis of the concept, 8–9
 - medico-judicial debate, 8–9
 - need for a new conceptualisation, 2–3
 - normative concept of, 8–9
 - proposal to replace with legal capacity, 23–5
 - as a relational concept, 4–5, 225
 - second-personal dimension, 9
 - as a spectrum, 228–30
 - third-personal dimension, 9–10
- Mental Capacity Act 2005, 2, 13
- relational analysis of rights, 47–8
- mental capacity assessment
 - appropriate criteria for autonomy, 74–5
 - avoiding epistemic injustice, 214–23
 - consideration of environmental and relational aspects, 5
 - ethical reorientation, 223–4
 - as a form of intervention, 6
 - hermeneutic competence, 212–14
 - influence on the individual's decisional capacity, 6
 - intersubjective perspective, 6
 - justificatory inconsistency, 214–17
 - narrative repair, 222–3
 - overdetermination, 217–22
 - procedural model of rationality, 101–3, 104–10

- mental capacity assessment (*cont.*)
 procedural-relational approach to
 autonomy, 98–9
 question of value-neutrality, 128–9
 relational and value framework,
 144–5
 relational aspect of decisional
 capacity, 4–5
 third-party standpoint, 9–10
 mental capacity assessor
 rethinking the role of, 231–5
 methodology
 multi-leveled, multi-perspectival
 approach, 7–11
 Meyers, Diana, 82–4, 86, 87, 89, 90, 91,
 93, 96, 97, 120
 Mill, John Stuart, 56
 moral responsibility
 and autonomy, 12
 contractualism, 185–7
 Munby J, 30–1, 155, 163–4, 169–72,
 173
 mutual recognition framework, 187–90

 Naoki Higashida, 78–80, 88, 192–7
 narrative repair, 222–3
 narratives
 content of self-constituting
 narratives, 227–8
 Nedelsky, Jennifer, 39, 40, 42–3, 44, 45,
 46–7
 negative and positive liberties
 approaches to autonomy, 34–7
 negative duties of constraint, 163–5
 neglect, 140, 141, 149, 153, 169,
 173
 Nelson, Hilde Lindemann, 201,
 209
 normative concept of mental capacity,
 8–9
 normative justification for legal
 interpretations, 7–8
 norms of justification
 social affirmation, 110–17
 nurturing relations-to-self
 and hermeneutic competence,
 208–12
 Nussbaum, Martha C., 203

 objectification of individuals with
 impairment, 201–2
 Ontario Law Commission, 25
 opportunity-based concept of freedom,
 35–6
 Oshana, Marina, 68–71, 72–4, 82, 87,
 90, 91, 96, 97
 outcome-based tests of capacity, 18,
 22
 overdetermination in mental capacity
 assessments, 217–22

 paternalism, 97, 109, 167, 168, 173
 and autonomy, 72–4
 legal implications, 175–81
 paternalistic care, 18, 19, 33
 pathogenic vulnerability, 176
PC and NC v City of York Council
 [2013], 141
 perceptual skills of absorbed coping,
 75–82
 perfectionism, 93–5, 97–8
 phenomenological analysis, 9
 phenomenological awareness
 and hermeneutic competence,
 191–7
 poise. *See* absorbed coping
 prejudice
 and dialogical understanding,
 198–201
 procedural-internalist approach to
 autonomy, 57–67, 68
 overdemandingness, 59–60
 oversimplification, 60–1
 procedural model of rationality, 101–3
 assumptions within, 110–20
 condition of internalism, 106–7
 condition of logical consistency,
 107–8
 mental capacity assessment, 104–10
 neutrality to content and value,
 108–9
 reason-responsiveness version,
 120–8
 and the social space of reasons,
 110–20
 socially affirmed norms of
 justification, 110–17

- procedural–relational approach to autonomy, 68, 82–7
 scalar approach to autonomy, 87–98
 procedural–substantive spectrum of autonomy, 57
 programmatic autonomy, 88–9
 public/private boundary of liberal rights, 41–6
 public/private distinction and third-party interventions, 27–34
 view of the ECHR, 29–31
- Quinn, Gerald, 35
- rationality, 12
 articulatory-disclosive mode of reasoning, 132–8
 knowledge attribution, 111–12
 social dimension, 100–1
 substantive model, 102, 105, 129
 valid inferential reasoning, 112–13
See also procedural model of rationality
- Ravizza, S.J., Mark, 121–8
 Rawls, John, 94–5
Re BKR [2015], 141
Re GC and Anor [2008], 195
Re GM; FP v GM and a Health Board [2011], 211
Re MB [1997], 105–6
Re MP; LBH v GP [2009], 140–1
Re SA [2005], 163–4, 170–1
Re SB [2013], 105–6, 108, 113, 130
 reason-responsiveness version of proceduralism, 120–8
 reciprocity in dialogical understanding, 206–7
 regulated/unregulated boundary of liberal rights, 41–6
 relational and value framework, 144–5
 relational aspect of autonomy, 4–5
 relational constituents of mental capacity
 consideration in legal analysis, 10–11
 relational rights, 38–49
 relationships
 impact on decision-making, 1–2
 impact on mental capacity, 1–3
 influence on decisional capacity, 5
 structured by rights, 38–49
 where autonomy is compromised, 5–6
 respect and care
 and competence, 185–7
 dichotomy in contractualism, 185–7
 mutual recognition framework, 187–90
 Rett syndrome, 153, 235–7
 right of autonomy
 individualistic perspective, 34–7
 rights, 12
 embodied self as the subject of, 39–41
 feminist challenge to liberal approaches, 39
 liberal individualist view, 37
 structuring relationships, 38–49
 underlying values and ethical justification for, 46–9
- second-personal dimension of mental capacity, 9
 self-constituting narratives
 importance of the content, 227–8
 self-esteem, 211
 self-respect, 209–10
 self-trust, 210–11
 serious adverse effects
 duty to protect individuals with impairment from, 32–4
 sexism
 non-regulated areas, 41
 sexual practices
 public/private boundary, 41–6
 Shakespeare, Tom, 152
Sheffield City Council v S [2002], 30, 155, 170
 situational vulnerability, 176
 skilful coping, 76
 social model of disability
 social-relational account of, 153–4
 and supported decision-making, 150–5

- social space of reasons, 110–20,
 136
 circular and reflexive functioning,
 117–20
 socially affirmed norms of
 justification, 110–17
 socialisation
 influence on autonomy
 competencies, 97
 South Africa
 post-apartheid constitutional
 reform, 44
 spatial disorientation, 191–2
 status-based tests of capacity, 18,
 22
 structural recognition
 and self-respect, 210
 substantive equality
 and legal capacity, 24–5
 substantive model of rationality, 102,
 105, 129
 substantive-relational approach to
 autonomy, 68–75
 substituted decision-making, 19, 26,
 167
 and human rights, 22
 supported decision-making status,
 25
- Taylor, Charles, 35, 80, 81, 85, 89,
 133–4, 199
- third-party intervention
 abusive relationships, 5–6
 applying Kantian positive duties to
 the law, 169–75
 boundaries of intervention, 38–49
 care theory, 155–8
 disabling relationships, 175–81
 justification for, 5–6, 146–9
 justification for supported
 decision-making, 150–5
 Kantian autonomy and dignity,
 159–63
 Kantian positive duties, 165–9
 legal implications of paternalism,
 175–81
- negative duties of constraint,
 163–5
 positive interpersonal duties,
 146–9
 private/public distinction, 27–34
 third-personal dimension of mental
 capacity, 9–10
 Thomas, Carol, 153–4
 time
 perception in individuals with
 impairment, 192–4
 Todes, Samuel, 75, 76
- unfreedom
 caused by internal restraints and
 barriers, 36
- V v R* [2011], 118–19, 144
 valid inferential reasoning, 112–13
 value-constituting frameworks and
 reasoning, 128–38
 value-neutrality of the procedural
 model, 108–9
 Velleman, J. David, 133
 violence against women
 boundaries of intervention, 41–6
 vulnerability
 types of, 176
- wandering behaviour, 191–2
*Wandsworth Clinical Commissioning
 Group v IA* [2014], 215
*Westminster City Council v Manuela
 Sykes* [2014], 172–3, 217
 will and preferences paradigm of the
 CRPD
 assumptions of, 38
 challenges to, 19–20
 internal contradictions,
 26–7
 interpretations of, 25–7
 private/public distinction, 27–34
 relational analysis, 48–9
 Williams, Bernard, 106
Wye Valley NHS Trust v Mr B [2015],
 216–17, 229–30, 234–5