

Position paper 2

Philosophy



Position Paper Two al Affiliations Yelena and Yury have no justification for choosing a selective abortion as an alternative to their developing foetus because it's life has already started hence culminating it would be unfair to the foetus. Over time, it has always been discussed and agreed that all children are gifts and should be positively accepted such that if they tend to be abnormal, they are helped to understand that their abnormality is no big deal. Just as someone chooses to buy a gift for you and wraps it up so that you can hardly identify it unless you open the wrapper, so are children conceived. A mother cannot affirm the kind of child she is carrying until after birth whereby some prior screens can be proven wrong. All disabilities should be encouraged in the sense that a disability is not an inability hence the child should be given a chance to live and evaluate what he or she has to give back to the society (Collett, 2014). This paper examines the extent to which Yury and Yelena are not justified to do an abortion for their child on the basis of suspected Down's syndrome.

In life, we are given a chance to make alternatives on various people including our friends, husbands and wives but a blank fact that exists is that we have no alternative to make about the kind of children we give birth to. Therefore it is always difficult to tell the kind of qualities they will have hence Yury and Yelena should not take is a personal responsibility of their child's disability, if at all there will be any. Instead, in case the child is born disabled, they should offer him or her enough parental love so that the child's self-esteem is boosted and doesn't feel rejected in the society (Sandal, 2007).

In the present day world, scientists are trying to offer solutions to most complications associated with disability since genetic disabilities are on a <https://assignbuster.com/position-paper-2/>

rampant spread. This medical model works on reducing disability cases by curing existing ones and preventing new cases from arising. It is an obligatory role of the couple to visit places with such services so that their case is analysed in the most appropriate manner as compared to terminating the child. Dr. Samuel Gridley is a philosopher who argues that parents are totally responsible for ensuring that their deformed or disabled children get better help to address the conditions in their lives. On their moral side of view, philosophers affirm that parents should take responsibility to offer substantial help to their children, even if it involves medical help where abortion is excluded. Yelena and Yury should be prepared to do some cardiac surgical operations within the first six months just in case the condition becomes positive. However, making quick judgements of abortion is not the best option because the child might not be born with the condition or the abortion might have harmful effects on the mother, preventing her from bearing more children (Pridemore, & Freilich, 2007).

On the contrary, some couples decide to do biotechnological laboratory procedures to make some genetic variations on the kind of children they want to bear. These procedures involve genetic mutations during fertilization so that the couple gets a child they can handle. If Yury and Yelena did such procedures, then they are justified to conduct an abortion if the characteristics they wanted never manifested themselves in the child. In addition to this, the practice of euthanasia or mercy killing may have some influence in this case. Basing arguments on the future of the child which is at the risk of unnecessary suffering from Down syndrome, then the parents can opt to abort the child before it is born to avoid its suffering in future (Collett, 2014).

References

Collett, T. S. (2014). Previability abortion and the pain of the unborn.

Washington and Lee Law Review, 71(2), 1211-1231.

Pridemore, W. A., & Freilich, J. D. (2007). The impact of state laws protecting abortion clinics and reproductive rights on crimes against abortion providers: Deterrence, backlash, or neither? *Law and Human Behavior*, 31(6), 611-27.

Sandal, M. (2007). The case against Perfection. 45-46.