

Arguments against abortion research paper

[Life](#), [Childhood](#)



\n[[toc title="Table of Contents"](#)]\n

\n \t

1. [Introduction](#) \n \t
2. [Claim and opposing views](#) \n \t
3. [Warrant](#) \n \t
4. [Conclusion](#) \n \t
5. [Works Cited](#) \n

\n[/toc]\n \n

Introduction

The debate on abortion remains one of the most contentious, irrational and divisive debates of our times on political, legal, ethical and religious platforms (Garlikov). The debate is hinged on the differences between pro-choice (those who support abortion) and pro-life (those against abortion) forces. According Garlikov, the resolution on the abortion issue remains far from sight because the media focuses on the extreme differences rather than on the common grounds. Quite often the proponents and the opponents of abortion have presented inaccurate claims making the debate more irrational. This debate has experienced changes in the recent past in terms of the percentage of the American population supporting either side. A Gallup poll in 1995 revealed that 52% of the Americans polled considered themselves to be prolife and 42% considered themselves prochoice. The same poll in 2006 revealed that the percentages were reversed (Harsanyi). Despite the debate and emotions surrounding the abortion issues, abortion is morally, ethically and logically wrong based on several grounds. However the

efforts to create dialogue between the opposing sides have revealed that they agree on several grounds. The emphasis of the paper is on the arguments against abortion but it shall also explore the warrant.

Claim and opposing views

Abortion is wrong based on several reasons. The first and probably most important reason on which this claim is founded is respect for life. The proponents of abortion claim that the fetus is not alive and that it is just a blob of tissues and that most abortion occur before the fetus can exist independent of the mother. This claim could not be further from the truth. The very definition of the word fetus implies life; fetus in Latin means the “little one” while from the Webster’s dictionary the fetus has “passed the early stages of development and attained the basic final form prior to parturition” (Tazzy). Life begins at the fertilization and many studies at the molecular level attest to the fact that there is life at the fertilization stage (WJ Larsen 1-17). Since death is declared on the basis of when the brain waves and the heart beat cease it is only logical to conclude that the beginning of the two vital signs marks the beginning of life. About 78% of the abortions occur when the brain waves have begun and after the heart has begun beating (Deem). Therefore abortion is by all means equivalent to murder which is against legal, ethical, moral and religious principles.

At this point it is worth noting that the right to life is the most important principle of the law in any free republic. The declaration of independence of the USA claims, “we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain

unalienable Rights, that among those are life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness” (Deem). Therefore right to life was enshrined in the very foundation of the Nation by the founding fathers. Abortion is unjust discrimination against the innocent unborn human who can not defend him/herself (Reagan, Clark and Johnston 12). The right to life is not limited to the age of the person. Abortion deprives the fetus a valuable future which could be full of desirable experiences, projects and enjoyment. In addition abortion denies the society the chance to experience a potential person. In other words abortion may mean killing a potential president, doctor, scientist and much more.

The prochoice also argue that abortion should be allowed on the basis of prenatal genetic tests results indicating the child will be born with genetic disorders like Down syndrome. Legalizing or even justifying abortion on such grounds would be equivalent to opening a Pandora box. What happens there are advanced tests that can even determine other characteristics such as disability and IQ before birth? Then the society might use abortion as a means to weed out the ugly, the blind, the mentally ill or any other humans with “undesirable” qualities (Harsanyi).

In fact Sweden’s National Board of Health and Welfare made abortion on the basis of the sex of the fetus legal. With reports that 90% of women whose fetus test positive for Down syndrome choose abortion it is clear that the society is perilously sliding to eugenics (Harsanyi).

Ironically the medical advances that have enabled the prenatal detection of disabilities and genetic disorders have also made it easier to live with

disabilities. Today people with genetic disorders such as Down syndrome are living longer and healthier without requiring institutionalization (Bauer 13). In addition research in some of these disorders has shown promise of finding cure. In this day and age of medical advancement and extreme awareness it is morally and ethically wrong to abort a child because of the child's disability. Today more than ever before there are many disabled persons living independently and comfortably; some have even become an inspiration to the society.

There is also the claim by the prochoice that abortion is justified on the premise of an unwanted child. They claim that an unwanted child is very likely to suffer abuse and the vice versa. For several reasons this claim is unfounded and can not be used to justify abortion. The condition of being unwanted has nothing to do with the child but it is an attitude of the adult therefore it is unfair to kill the child based on the attitudes of adults. Often in this day and age of increased awareness some of the so called unwanted children are as a result of the carelessness of adults who engage in sex without contraceptive measures, in which case it is unfair to punish an innocent being because of the mistakes of adults. Of course there are incidences when the contraceptives fail but in any case there is the option of adoption which gives the child a chance to grow in a caring family (Lowen). Today parents who are unable to bare children of their own have to wait for years because abortion has drastically reduced the number of adoptable children. Currently there are approximately 1.5 million Families in the United States of America wanting to adopt children so the concept of unwanted children is neither here nor there (Lowen). The claim that abortion is justified

because wanted children are less likely to face abuse compared to the unwanted is not founded on evidence but on emotional prepositions. Child abuse statistics indicate that since the legalization of abortion in many states in 1973 the level of child abuse has increased drastically despite the fact that more than a million unwanted children are aborted every year (Administration for Children and Families, U. S. Department of Health and Human Services). It is actually possible to attribute the child abuse problems to the callous attitude brought about by the prevalence of abortion (Deem).

Abortion is also wrong because of the associated health complications. A plethora of research indicates that post abortion the risk of ectopic pregnancies is doubled. The risk of pelvic inflammatory disease and miscarriages increases after abortion. In addition some researchers have pointed out the possibility of abortion increasing the risk of breast cancer by three times. However the most profound and well established health effect of abortion is psychological with findings from several studies indicating that abortion is a risk factor for psychological disorders (Oates, Jones and Cantwell 453). Another research indicates that women who had abortion had 30% higher rates of mental disorders than the normal population (Fergusson, Horwood and Boden 448). In addition in most cases abortion involves young girls with very limited understanding of the consequences of abortion thus they end up regretting for the rest of their life and bearing the heavy burden of guilt (Lowen). The weight of guilt and the psychological disorders associated with abortion have also been associated to an increase in the probability of experiencing substance abuse disorders (Dingle, Alati and Clavarino 458). Finally many cases of loss of the uterus following abortion

have been reported. In these cases the woman is rendered incapable of conceiving and lives with the guilt that her choice to abort earlier has put her in that situation. This can be more complicated in communities that value children as a symbol of family and can result in divorce if the woman gets married later on and is unable to conceive.

Another prominent claim of the proponents of abortion is that the fetus is part of the woman's body and that the woman has a right to decide what to do with her body. On this premise the prochoice have even demanded government funding for abortion as part of comprehensive healthcare. Abortion can not be right on these grounds because control over ones body also entails the responsibility to use contraceptive (Lowen). In addition rights to ones body does not include the right to harm oneself otherwise drug abuse, self assault and even suicide should be justified and legalized on the same basis. Ironically many states have laws that prohibit the use of drugs and alcohol by pregnant women yet the same mothers are allowed to kill the fetus at will (Deem). The conclusion that the fetus is part of the mothers body is absurd and misguided because the fetus has its own DNA and circulatory system. The fetus is so unique from the mother that sometimes the mother's immune system can mount an immune response against the fetus; therefore the mother has no right to jeopardize the life of the fetus. It is also wrong for the proponents of abortion to demand for government funding on this premise; it is like demanding that the government pays for illicit drugs for the poor simply because the rich are able to buy the drugs for themselves (Tazzy).

There are other miscellaneous reasons that the proponents of abortion use to justify abortion which include the so called “ hard” cases such as rape and incest. While these cases may attract a lot of sympathy focus should be to provide proper medical assistance that would ensure women will not get pregnant or peradventure they do they can cope with the resulting child. Abortion on these grounds would be equivalent to punishing the innocent unborn child instead of the criminal. There is also the claim that abortion alleviates socioeconomic problems since pregnancy apparently interferes with a woman’s Education and career development. This argument is not only cruel but also not founded on facts and is selfish. For one there is no statistical evident to support such claims and there are also cases of mothers who are very successful in their careers. Currently there are laws protecting pregnant women from discrimination at their work place. In addition women are not forced to keep the child but the option of adoption is available. In fact California and many other states have established the “ safe Havens” program that allows women to drop their newborns at any emergency room or fire station within 72 hours of birth hence alleviating them of further responsibility (Deem). It would definitely be wrong to justify another evil on the basis of existence of socioeconomic problems instead the focus should be to address the socioeconomic problems rather than punish the unborn for the problems (Deem).

Last but not least there are also claims that abortion can be used to bring down the population and crime rates. This is again cruel and unfounded because there is no credible evidence that the legalization of abortion has lowered the population growth rate or the crime rates. In addition how would

anyone be justified to kill the unborn child on the assumption that the child will contribute to crime when he or she becomes an adult (Cuthbertson). We also do not condone war, famine and disease because they curb population growth (Deem).

Warrant

Though the debate on abortion has remained divisive, combative and acrimonious there have been efforts (through bipartisan advocacy, workshops, research and conferences) to find some common grounds as a means of addressing the issues related to abortion. The efforts to find some common grounds stated way back in the early 1990s by a group called “search for common grounds”. For the last two decades several groups all over America have been involved providing forums for the prolife and prochoice activists to dialogue (Co-Intelligence Institute). A recent conference, in October 2010, discussed and highlighted the common grounds (Scott Alessi 5-8).

It is important to note that the prochoice and prolife activists have some shared values. The two groups express a desire to lower the number of abortions by dealing with the underlying factors that contribute to the elevated rate of abortion. David Gushee, a prolife Baptist and ethics professor attending the ‘Open Hearts, Open Minds and Fair Minded Words’ conference at Princeton University recommended that the two sides should collaborate on addressing issues like sex outside marriage, economic hardships and unstable relationships. According to the professor these are

the factors contributing to the rising demand in abortion and can not be resolved by changing laws relating to abortion (Scott Alessi 6).

There is consensus among the prolife and prochoice activist about promoting family values. There have been arguments that the abortion issues should be handled under the family law because failure to do so has put a separation between marriage, procreation and sexual issues. The two antagonists agree that there is need to promote healthy and stable families. At the mentioned conference it was observed that there is need to reunite the issues of sex, marriage and procreation. In other words the opposing sides on the abortion debate agree on promoting pro-marriage laws that discourage birth outside wedlock. The next level of this consensus on strengthening family ties is in finding effective ways to do so on which there is currently no agreement by the opposing sides (Scott Alessi 7).

Another common ground in the abortion debate is that there is need to reduce the number of unwanted pregnancies. The majority of participants in this debate agree that increased education and access to contraceptive is more vital than campaign for or against abortion. However there is a sharp disagreement on the contraceptive strategy as a means of reducing unwanted pregnancies especially from the Catholics who advocate for use of natural family planning. The two opposing sides also agree that there is need to boost efforts that promote adoption as a better alternative to abortion. Experts from the opposing sides also agree that the Supreme Court, in the Roe V. Wade case, overstepped its mandate in ruling abortion a constitutional issue and that the issue should be dealt with at the legislative level.

Conclusion

The debate on abortion remains one of the most contentious, irrational and divisive debates of our times on political, legal, ethical and religious platforms (Garlikov). The debate is hinged on the differences between pro-choice (those who support abortion) and pro-life (those against abortion) forces. The claim of this paper is that abortion is wrong based on several grounds. Abortion is equivalent to murdering an innocent human being who has rights to life and is independent from the pregnant woman's body. It is cruel to abort simply because the mother does not want the child especially with the option of adoption being available. In the cases of rape and incest abortion would be tantamount to punishing the innocent unborn child instead of the culprit. Abortion is also associated with a number of health complications. It is also wrong to abort on the grounds of solving socioeconomic problems, population control and reducing crime rates. Finally it is cruel to justify the abortion of the unborn child detected to have a genetic disorder especially in a time with great medical advancement. However the opposing sides on the abortion agree that there is need to address the underlying factors thus decrease the number of abortion; to promote strong family ties; to encourage adoption; to promote birth control and to minimize the number of unwanted pregnancies. Despite the debate and the established common grounds abortion is morally, ethically and logically wrong.

Works Cited

Administration for Children and Families, U. S. Department of Health and Human Services. Child Maltreatment 2000. 2002. 9 May 2011 .

<https://assignbuster.com/arguments-against-abortion-research-paper/>

Bauer, Patricia E. " The Abortion Debate No One Wants to Have: Prenatal testing is making your right to abort a disabled child more like " your duty" to abort a disabled child." Washington Post 18 October 2005 : 21.

Co-Intelligence Institute. Beyond the Abortion Debate - Common Ground. 20 January 2000. 9 May 2011 .

Cuthbertson, Peter. 10 Fallacies in the Abortion Debate. 8 November 2002 . 9 May 2011 .

Deem, Rich. " Abortion–Life, Right, Choice?–Secular Arguments Against Abortion." The abortion Debate: Center for Research in the Sciences. New York: Center for Research in the Sciences, 2003. 10-29.

Dingle, Kaeleen, et al. " Pregnancy loss and psychiatric disorders in young women: an Australian birth cohort study." British Journal of Psychiatry (2008): 455-460.

Fergusson, David M., John L Horwood and Joseph M. Boden. " Abortion and mental health disorders: evidence from a 30-year longitudinal study{dagger}." The British Journal of Psychiatry (2008): 444-451.

Garlikov, Richard. The Abortion Debate . 6 June 2000. 9 May 2011 .

Harsanyi, David. " Is the abortion debate changing? ." The Denver Post 27 May 2009: 10-13.

Lowen, Linda. 10 Arguments For Abortion and 10 Arguments Against Abortion. Nd. 9 May 2011 .

Oates, Margaret, Ian Jones and Roch Cantwell. " Abortion and mental health disorders." The British Journal of Psychiatry (2008): 452-454.

Reagan, Ronald, et al. Abortion and the Conscience of the Nation. Washington: New Regency Pub, 1983.

Scott Alessi . " Opposing sides seek common ground on abortion issues."

OSV Newsweekly 31 October 2010: 5-8.

Tazzy, D. Misleading Claims About Abortion. 19 October 2005. 9 May 2011 .

WJ Larsen. Essentials of Human Embryology,. New York: Churchill

Livingstone, 1998.