

Ethical Point Of View On The Act Of Abortion

Posted on May 7, 2020

View this essay online:

<https://academic-master.com/ethical-point-of-view-on-the-act-of-abortion/>

Introduction

Abortion presents an enduring ethical conflict because several serious values can point in different directions at the same time. Debate concerns the moral significance of developing human life, bodily autonomy, health, responsibility, family relationships, equality, conscience, and the social conditions surrounding pregnancy. Ethical disagreement persists partly because people answer different foundational questions differently: when moral status begins, whether moral status develops gradually, what obligations pregnancy creates, and how far the state or medical profession may compel one person to sustain another biologically. A careful analysis should therefore avoid reducing the issue to slogans such as “choice” or “life,” since each identifies one important consideration without resolving the others. Biological development can be described scientifically, but the moral meaning assigned to fertilization, sentience, viability, or birth involves philosophical judgment. Likewise, recognizing bodily autonomy does not by itself settle every question about fetal value. The most useful ethical approach compares competing frameworks, distinguishes medical facts from moral premises, and acknowledges uncertainty without treating disagreement as evidence of bad faith.

Moral Status and the Significance of Development

Moral-status arguments ask which characteristics make developing human life morally considerable and whether protection changes across gestation. Conception offers a clear biological starting point for a new organism, but philosophers disagree about whether biological humanity alone establishes the same moral claims as a child or adult. Other accounts emphasize consciousness, sentience, relationships, potential, or a “future like ours.” Don Marquis, for example, argues that killing is seriously wrong because it deprives an individual of a valuable future, giving fetal life moral weight even before developed consciousness. Personhood approaches instead examine capacities such as awareness, reasoning, or self-directed interests, though critics worry that capacity-based standards can be applied too broadly to newborns or people with significant cognitive disabilities. Gradualist approaches avoid an all-or-nothing threshold by assigning increasing moral weight as development advances. Each position has strengths and unresolved problems. Viability depends partly on technology and healthcare access, sentience develops gradually, and birth is legally clear while remaining biologically continuous with late pregnancy. Ethical reasoning must explain why a chosen threshold matters rather than merely naming it.

Bodily Autonomy, Consent, and Responsibility

Bodily-autonomy arguments focus on a different question: even if developing fetal life has substantial moral value, what kind of claim does that create over another person's body? Judith Jarvis Thomson's famous violinist analogy separates a right to life from an automatic right to use someone else's organs. Critics respond that pregnancy differs because parent-child relationships and voluntary sexual activity may create special responsibilities. Supporters of abortion rights answer that consenting to sex is not identical to consenting to continue a pregnancy and that ordinary law rarely compels organ or tissue donation even after a person contributed to another's need. The dispute therefore concerns both causal responsibility and the limits of bodily obligation. Pregnancy can also arise through contraceptive failure, reproductive coercion, sexual assault, misinformation, or limited access to contraception, making a single account of responsibility inadequate for every case. Ethical analysis should distinguish the fact that choices can have foreseeable consequences from the stronger claim that those consequences always create an enforceable duty to provide continuing bodily support regardless of health, circumstances, or changing consent.

Consequences, Care, and Reproductive Justice

Consequentialism, care ethics, and reproductive-justice frameworks broaden the inquiry beyond abstract rights. Consequentialist analysis considers physical health, mental well-being, existing children, education, economic stability, intimate-partner violence, and the effects of delayed or unavailable care, while also recognizing the moral significance attributed to fetal loss. Care ethics asks how dependency, relationships, grief, obligation, and vulnerability shape a decision that is rarely made by an isolated chooser. Reproductive justice adds that meaningful agency depends on social conditions: the ability to avoid pregnancy, continue a wanted pregnancy, obtain healthcare, and raise children safely may be constrained by poverty, disability barriers, housing, childcare, discrimination, or coercive relationships. These perspectives caution against assuming that abortion invariably produces either relief or trauma, or that continuing pregnancy is always a minor burden or always a moral fulfillment. They also show how coercion can operate in both directions. A person should not be pressured toward termination because of poverty or disability, and decisions about continuing pregnancy should not ignore the medical, relational, and socioeconomic burdens borne by the pregnant person.

Clinical Circumstances Complicate Abstract Rules

Clinical circumstances make categorical moral claims especially difficult. Some pregnancies threaten life or major bodily function through hemorrhage, infection, ectopic implantation, severe hypertension, cardiac disease, or conflicts with necessary treatment. Other wanted pregnancies receive fetal diagnoses involving uncertain prognosis, severe disability, anticipated neonatal death, or

intensive lifelong care. Ethical counseling in these situations should provide accurate information about prognosis, treatment, palliative options, support services, and uncertainty without assuming that disability makes a life less valuable or that parents must accept every burden regardless of circumstance. Gestational age can also change the moral analysis because development, possible sentience, medical complexity, and prospects for survival outside the uterus change over time. Later abortions are often discussed abstractly even though the cases that remain later in pregnancy can involve delayed diagnosis, access barriers, or serious medical developments. Ethical reflection should therefore connect gestational thresholds with actual clinical context and should avoid using unusual cases as if they represented every abortion decision.

Quality Care and Professional Conscience

Quality care requires informed consent, privacy, competent clinical practice, truthful counseling, and respect for conscience without allowing disagreement to become abandonment. The World Health Organization's second-edition abortion-care guideline, published in 2025, consolidates evidence-based recommendations and best-practice statements while acknowledging that legal and policy settings differ among countries. Medical guidance can inform safety and service delivery, but it cannot settle philosophical disputes about moral status or legitimate law. Healthcare professionals may also hold conscientious objections. Respect for conscience protects moral integrity, yet professional systems must consider the patient's need for accurate information, timely emergency care, and continuity. Institutions should plan for foreseeable conflicts rather than leaving patients and individual clinicians to negotiate them during crises. Ethical communication is especially important because counseling can become coercive when it uses misleading claims, deliberately withholds options, or assumes that a person's disability, age, faith, or social circumstances determine the "correct" decision. Informed choice requires both clinical accuracy and freedom from manipulation.

Religion, Law, and Reasonable Moral Disagreement

Religion and law add another layer because moral convictions that guide an individual do not automatically provide a shared public justification for coercive policy. Religious traditions themselves contain varied views about pregnancy, ensoulment, maternal health, fetal value, and permissible exceptions. Secular moral reasoning is also divided. Some people consider most abortions morally wrong while opposing criminal prohibition because of enforcement consequences or competing rights; others consider abortion morally permissible while supporting professional regulation related to safety and later gestation. A neutral ethical analysis should keep these positions distinct rather than assuming that one moral judgment mechanically determines one legal policy. Public rules must also be administrable: they affect clinicians facing uncertainty, patients with changing health conditions, families with limited resources, and institutions deciding when an exception applies. Because

reasonable people assign different weight to autonomy, fetal value, equality, and state authority, debate benefits from precise claims and transparent premises. Ethical disagreement is more productive when participants identify which principle or factual prediction differs instead of treating opponents as indifferent to either life or freedom.

Conclusion

The ethics of abortion cannot be resolved by one biological fact, one analogy, or one moral theory because the dispute concerns several interacting questions. Moral-status theories explain why developing human life may command increasing concern, bodily-autonomy theories examine the limits of compelled gestational support, and consequentialist, care, and reproductive-justice approaches show how health, relationships, vulnerability, and social conditions influence what choices mean in practice. Clinical cases add further complexity because serious maternal illness, fetal diagnosis, gestational development, and uncertainty do not fit comfortably into slogans. Evidence-based medical guidance can improve safety and informed consent without determining the philosophical or legal conclusion for every society. People may therefore reach different judgments while reasoning seriously from different premises about personhood, responsibility, rights, and public authority. A rigorous ethical discussion should make those premises visible, protect accurate information, reject coercion and stigma, and distinguish moral conviction from factual assertion. The most defensible academic conclusion is not that disagreement disappears, but that respectful analysis becomes possible when each competing value is defined and examined honestly.

References

- Thomson, J. J. (1971). A defense of abortion. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 1(1), 47–66.
- Marquis, D. (1989). Why abortion is immoral. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 86(4), 183–202.
- Ross, L. J., & Solinger, R. (2017). *Reproductive Justice: An Introduction*. University of California Press.
- World Health Organization. (2025). *Abortion Care Guideline* (2nd ed.).