

Financial abortion essay



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

A sociologist by the name GoldScheider proposes that men should be allowed by law to escape from financial responsibilities the moment they tell their partners before sexual intercourse that they would not want to be fathers in case of conception. After the man asserts this before the lady conceives, he would not be responsible financially the moment she gets a baby. This is what is referred to ‘ financial abortion’. The sociologist asserts this having in mind that currently, fathers’ responsibilities are recognized in terms of money (Potts, 2010). Is this assertion morally, ethically and socially right? This assertion really threatens family institutions.

Even though the world perceives fathers responsibilities from financial point of view, it is not right to justify what already is a misconception on people’s part. First, it is not ethically and socially right to think of fathers that way but all the same people do. However, instead of correcting this, we are coming up with other principles that would further the misconception thus worsen the situation. The moment we adopt this kind of thinking, a time will come when fathers would be insignificant in their children’s lives or in the families. Some partners, who would have divorced long time ago, are still together for the sake of the children. The moment we perpetuate the belief that fathers are significant in their children’s lives financially only, then it would give these fathers who are still holding on to their families reasons to stay away from their children with a condition that, they would be supporting them financially.

Thus this calls for such kind of thinking to be done away with in order to strengthen our already fragile family institutions. The sociologist claims that financial abortion would help low income fathers since taking care of a child

is a burden to them, worsening their situation and the child's (Potts, 2010). One wonders whether this is a solution to their financial problems. It is very dangerous to solve a problem by creating another one.

If we do this, at the end of the day we would not have solved anything but instead worsening the situation. Fathers who are not able to fend for their families are in real problems, but financial abortion is not the solution. We cannot cut the head in trying to reduce pain in one of the fingers. By encouraging them to abdicate their responsibilities as fathers would not help them in any way. What should be done is to empower them economically by suggesting on methods of raising more money but not forego their responsibilities as fathers.

In fact, since they understand their economical situation, they have the ability to decide whether they would want children or not. If they do not want, there are so many ways of preventing pregnancies for example, the use of condoms and other family planning methods. Financial abortion implies that, it is a mistake on the part of the ladies to become pregnant and that is why men are to abdicate their responsibilities the moment the ladies get babies. This is not right scientifically and morally. Both partners are responsible for the pregnancy and thus men should be ready to bear the consequences the moment they impregnate women (Reinsman, 2010).

Since women have the option of aborting or not, there are those who feel that financial abortion would be giving men the same option women have. These people seem to equate the women's abortion to financial one. Do the two words really mean the same? In financial abortion, men would be able to

cease from being parents but for the woman, it would be a different case. If a woman conceives, she would be expected to cater for the pregnancy if she accepts to have the baby. If she does not want the baby she would still be expected to pay for the abortion.

At the end, she would be expected to go deeper into her pockets whether she keeps the baby or not. Men should be forced to recognize their role in pregnancy but not telling them to forego their responsibilities (Potts, 2010). A physical abortion is very different from the financial one. The former involves ending a life and the latter does not, it only leads to the end of parenthood.

After financial abortion the child would still be there to be taken care of and in this case the woman will take that responsibility. Moreover, the issue of responsibility should be looked at from a different perspective. The ones who are supporting the financial abortion are looking at sex from the intention point of view rather than from the potential one. Most people have sex with different intentions; some for pleasure and others for getting children. All the same, in both cases there is a potential to get a child and every man is aware of this.

This knowledge of sex potential is what makes them responsible for the consequences and this will not be determined by the mother. A woman cannot determine whether a man is responsible for the pregnancy or not. The moment a man sleeps with a woman, he is already responsible for the outcome thus it is not the place of the woman to determine whether he is responsible or not. Sometimes I wonder how financial abortion would go

about especially on legal grounds. What happens if a man agreed with his girlfriend that he would not be responsible as a father to the child and later the lady decides to take him to court for abdicating his responsibilities? Will they claim that, they had agreed to financial abortion? From what I understand about the law language, heresy and word of the mouth do not hold water in the court of Law. So, what next? Will people be required to have a written document and some witnesses every time they decide to have sex? It is quite out of order when every time people want to have an intercourse will be required to call two people to act as witnesses to their agreement and then write down the treaty as it suits the two and at the end sign to seal the agreement .

It should not be forgotten that, they would also require a lawyer . This sounds very ironic as a matter of fact, it will affect sexual lives of many people and the act itself will lose meaning and the purpose it was intended to accomplish in life. Another thing is that, there would be no privacy. Imagine that one's lawyer will always be aware of one's sexual endeavors, meaning that what was once a secretive activity would become a public thing. In addition, financial abortion also brings out inequality between the sexes. The woman is left with the option of either going on with the pregnancy or not.

This is quite unfair to women. Since the woman did not get the child alone then why is it that when she conceives, she is let to decide if to abort or not. People are really becoming selfish. The father only thinks of himself and how he is going to save his finances and the woman is the one to decide whether

the child will live or not. They have actually forgotten that the victim here is the child and not the couple.

If the father decides to abdicate his responsibilities, the child is the one who will suffer most. If the mother decides to procure an abortion, the child would still be the victim. Going both ways; financial abortion and physical abortion, the decisions of the two partners would be detrimental to the child.

Golschelder claims that women have many rights especially in regards to the use of contraceptives and that if they decide to get pregnant, they can do so without the knowledge of the man. She continues to claim that this is how many men have fallen victims to cunning activities of women who have ended trapping them by getting themselves pregnant.

In this way, they get huge sums of money for child support and thus men should also be given a right to choose whether to become fathers or not (Tierney, 2006). In other words, this financial abortion is all about rights. Women have their rights, men want theirs also. What about the child's right? Children do not have a say when it comes to abortion, adoption, divorce and many other things. Now the introduction of financial abortion is taking the right of the child to have a father; is this really fair? When parents are making decisions, they should always think of the children.

This is what affects our families today. Parents decide to divorce without thinking of the consequences on children. These days abortion is just like a piece of cake. No one sits down and contemplates on its effects on the child. We just want to rid ourselves of problems and responsibilities without thinking of the third party who would really be affected.

Some are worried about the rising trend of many men being caught up in court cases on child support and thus are of the idea that financial abortion would really help in alleviating this. I wish they would have thought of that before having sex. The fear of being forced into parenthood should deter them in the first place from having sex. Most women bear the blame of becoming pregnant and people forget that it takes two people to conceive. If a man does not want to be a father, then he would do everything possible to prevent that from happening, for example by using male contraceptives or even abstaining.

It is only the moment after the act that one starts shifting blame which is not right at all. It is not only men who are usually forced into parenthood.

Women have also been victims and thus every one is a victim. The proponents of financial abortion would claim that men have very few options when it comes to contraceptives and thus they justify their pointing of fingers towards women. This claim is a fact men are always aware of it before sleeping with any woman.

So the moment, a man decides to have sex, he is very aware of the consequences and thus he should be responsible for them. Another fact is that this kind of abortion would really increase the number of single mothers in the world. In the modern world, many men do not wish to be tied down by marriages and the responsibilities that come along with them and thus, if financial abortion comes to be a reality, then it would provide men with a way to escape from their responsibilities. I tend to think that it would also lead to increased immorality. One thing that many men fear having is an

extra burden of having children with different women, for this will call for child support.

The moment, they can be allowed to engage in sex without being held accountable for the pregnancies, I do not see why they should not exploit the opportunity and take full advantage of it. From the studies and common sense, finances do not amount to rearing of children. Child rearing is very complicated matter and so many things play crucial roles in bringing up a child. Proponents of financial abortion have really missed the point where for them; child rearing is a financial construct. Children need and desire more that financial support.

The physical presence of the father is very crucial in the child's life and the moment he is not there, the consequences are usually not good. Fathers are supposed to provide other kinds of support, for example emotional, spiritual, moral and social support. This can be emphasized by what president Obama said on the issue, " I came to understand that, the hole a man leaves when he abandons his responsibilities to his children, is one that no government can fill". These words have been quoted by Warren Ronald, the president of fatherhood initiative. The government can do a better in providing jobs, schools and safe streets for children but there is no day it will manage to replace the fathers (Warren, 2010).

Every child bears a ' hole in the soul' which has taken the shape of the father and the moment a father is not there to fill the hole, a wound would develop and it would not be easy to heal. Those people who have been brought up without fathers can really attest to this. The fatherly figure has so many

impacts in a child's life which include the emotional one, apart from the financial impacts (Warren, 2010). This issue of financial abortion is very degrading to men. Instead of empowering them, it is insulting because it assumes that women enjoy more rights and choices when it comes to sex than men and thus men have no control like women on the same. This implies that men are just after sex and nothing else and they are just controlled by instincts and urges.

This is not right because men have the opportunity to make choices when it comes to sex for; example, whether to use condoms or abstain completely. So if a man chooses to have his wallet closed, then he has a choice of not having sex (Warren, 2010). Moreover, it seems Golscheider's theory will worsen the situation of fathers' absenteeism in America, especially in the African America community, since most of them are low income earners. There is a high probability that most of men in the community would go for the abortion.

The theory seems to favor them and most of them would take full advantage of it leading to many children in the community going without fathers. Another important thing is that the theory would lead to some level of inequality among communities. Since most of African American fathers would really be affected, it means that the country would have so many absent fathers in the community compared to other communities in America (Jefferson, 2010). Most people who would really benefit from financial abortion when it becomes a law are those men who do not want to be fathers. This will be irrespective of whether one is financially stable or not.

There are those people who would not want to be fathers but are capable of bringing up a child and there are those who do not want to be fathers and they are not financially able to rear a child. In other words, there are those who would try to take advantage of the situation although they are eligible to be fathers (Jefferson 2010, p 1). Although it could be argued by some people that the low income men would really benefit from it, it is not right to encourage these fathers that finances are the most important thing in their children's lives and the moment they do not have these finances, then they are not worthy to be fathers. They should be made to feel they play more important roles in their children's lives other than the financial one. For example, just being with their children matters a lot. Researchers claim that so many men while dating usually find themselves using the terms " I want to have a baby with you" as a pick up line.

They usually say this without thinking of the implications of the line. On the ladies' part, these terms are usually very serious and this would motivate them to sleep with the men they love in order to give them children. It is so disheartening when at one point a man told a lady he would want children and later on changes his mind and say that he would not want to be the father (Jefferson 2010 p.). Research also shows that most of the men who have already abandoned their women on financial grounds, really do not know what parenthood is. Right now, financial abortion is not yet law but still men have already taken steps and abandoned their women.

If it becomes law, what would really happen? So many fathers would never know what the real meaning of parenthood is. They will always see it as a burden and misconceive it completely. This would also affect those who are

willing to be fathers. In fact studies have shown that, financial abortion would have major negative impacts on those men who would want to take care of their children. Even though they would not be directly affected, at the end the misconceptions about parenthood in the society will affect their views also about the same and they will start also thinking of finances as the backbone of parenthood (Jefferson 2010 p.

2). Let us picture 50 years and hundred years to come after financial abortion becomes law. Children especially boys would grow up thinking of parenthood as financially based and this will be so much ingrained in them. Right now, so many fathers are aware of what parenthood entails and that is why we will find in this society, not many are in favor of financial abortion. What will happen when children have been brought up to know that, one can have a child without supporting it, or people can write contracts before sleeping with a woman? Currently in the world, we also have marriage contracts and it has been seen to negatively affect marriage institutions.

What about when sex adopts the signing of contracts, would this not make the act adopt another meaning totally different? If the society goes ahead to legalize this kind of abortion, then we are assured that one day, sex will be only for pleasure and nothing else. This goes against our religious beliefs. So many religion view sex as a holy act and mainly meant for procreation. Furthermore, religion has taught that sex is not allowed between people who are not yet married and for the married couple, it is mainly meant for procreation. Financial abortion would definitely clash with these religious beliefs .

Children are gifts from God but financial abortion seems to demonize children. The moment a child is conceived, the father is given reason to relinquish his responsibilities and thus, if this is allowed in the society, most women, including those who are married, would fear to get children. Another point is that, Christianity, and I believe other major religions, teaches that the father is supposed to provide for the children. Financial abortion tends to go against this by encouraging fathers to choose whether to provide for children or not to. This is not in line with our religious beliefs and this will definitely lead to cultural clash. Both Christians and Muslims will have a problem with the whole issue.

The issue of parenthood should not be a contentious one. The society should agree on what parenthood really entails and here, the society mean everyone including the religious groups. We should talk of the most basic unit of the society; the family which includes father, mother and child or children. The moment we start tampering with this basic unit, at one time we will not have a society at all. People would just exist and the maxim, “ Every man for himself and God for us all,” will gain more ground. These kinds of theories have no significance in the contemporary world.

It is clear that divorce and marriage contracts have really affected marriage intuitions but instead of coming up with solutions, people are trying to tear apart of what remains of this institution to salvage. I am trying to put myself in a child’s shoes, who after staying without a father, decides one day to ask about him. This is not a new phenomenon; it is taking place in the current world especially since our families have been plagued by so many divorces and separations. So far we have witnessed children who have been

successfully reunited with their parents. There are so many reasons that lead to these divorces and one thing that makes these children accept their parents back is when they learn that, they were not abandoned. In contrast to this, how would a child react when he/she learns that, her/his father signed a contract that would allow him to relinquish his responsibilities as a father.

Does not this action of signing the contract amount to abandonment? The child will definitely suffer from emotional setback. Some may argue that it is not possible for a parent to inform the child of this kind of agreement. One thing I believe is that everything that happens under the sun would one day come to light. Moreover, if financial abortion becomes law then it would be a widely known phenomena and acceptable in the society.

If a mother decides to hide this from the child, the latter may decide to carry out investigations on his own. This is not the first time we have heard of children looking for their parents. Looking at it from this angle; there are those parents who made a mistake while in their teens and when they became of age, they decided to amend their mistakes. This made them to look for their families which they had abandoned while still young. Although some men would accept to financially abort especially in their ignorance, some would still come back to their senses when they become of age.

When this happens, how would this man explain to his child? Will he say, " I signed a contract with your mother that I would not take care for you, but I am sorry, I did it in my ignorance. " This explanation would be very difficult to swallow. The child will always have that feeling that he/she was unwanted

from conception. In conclusion, so much has been said by proponents of financial abortion but there is no single day a society can be justified to relinquish the responsibilities of fathers based on any reason. Every one has a right to make choices and decisions and the child too has his/her right to have a father despite of economical constraints.

The moment a man decides to have an intercourse with a woman, he should be able to accept the consequences. In fact, instead of signing contracts of relinquishing responsibilities, they should sign the ones that would tie them to those responsibilities.