

ABSTRACT

Morality of Abortions in Cases of Rape

Min-Suk Kwak

Director: Alexander R. Pruss, Ph.D.

In the paper, the morality of abortions in cases of rape was explored through a particular question: can one be morally forced to become a biological parent when one took no intentional action geared towards becoming a biological parent? The notion that sex is directed towards becoming a biological parent and that someone who has been raped took no intentional action towards becoming a biological parent was made in order to limit the scope of the paper. Two possible justifying reasons for the notion that it is morally permissible to force one to become a biological parent when one took no intentional action geared towards becoming a biological parent were investigated. Initially, the voluntary nature of parenthood was explored, followed by the permanent and nondispensable duties of biological parenthood. It was concluded that neither possible justifying reasons were sufficient to support the notion.

APPROVED BY DIRECTOR OF HONORS THESIS

Dr. Alexander R. Pruss, Philosophy

APPROVED BY THE HONORS PROGRAM

Dr. Elizabeth Corey, Director

DATE: _____

MORALITY OF ABORTIONS IN CASES OF RAPE

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of

Baylor University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Honors Program

By

Min-Suk Kwak

Waco, Texas

August 2017

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction	1
Chapter Two: Appeal to Voluntary Nature of Parenthood	6
Chapter Three: Appel to Permanent and Nondispensable Duties of Biological Parenthood	11
Chapter Four: Conclusion	22
Bibliography	24

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The Question

With millions of abortions terminating pregnancies worldwide each year, the moral permissibility of abortion is a topic that is still very much debated today.¹ However, for the most part, each side of the debate remains certain of its own conclusion, mainly because the two sides are usually divided at very fundamental levels of the debate, such as the nature of personhood, and so forth.²

Even with these certainties, however, there remain areas of the debate that are at least somewhat unclear to either side, such as cases in which the life of the mother is at stake or the pregnancy was a result of a rape.³

In this paper, a possible means to justify the morality of abortions in cases of rape will be investigated through exploring a particular question: can one be morally forced to become a biological parent, when one took not a single intentional action naturally geared towards becoming a biological parent?

This particular question was selected because, regardless of how a conception occurred, whether it was through consensual sex or through rape, a fetus with an equal

¹ “Abortion | Data and Statistics | Reproductive Health | CDC.”

² “The War That Never Ends.”

³ “Abortion | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy.”

degree of development is equal in moral status to any other.⁴ Furthermore, as alluded to before, much of the past debate on the moral permissibility of abortion has been centered on differences in definitions, making it difficult to find common ground upon which to argue.⁵ As a result, it appeared to be the case that there was a need to approach the topic from a different standpoint in order to obtain a meaningful conclusion.

Although some argue that pregnancies in cases of rape are rare, not only are they theoretically possible, it is reported that there have been more than 30,000 incidences in the United States in 1996 alone.⁶ Thus, investigation into the moral permissibility of abortions in cases of rape is imperative.

The proposed question applies to both raped men and women whose rape resulted in a pregnancy. The question might apply to other cases of unwanted pregnancies but not to cases in which consensual sex took place. One could consensually have sex and become pregnant without “intending” to become pregnant. However, one’s act of willingly engaging in sex is an intentional action, and therefore the case is different from pregnancies resulting from rape, in which it can be confidently said that the mother took no intentional action geared towards becoming pregnant. Although the primary goal of this paper is to investigate the moral permissibility of women having abortions in cases of rape, the question used for the investigation specifies those who have taken not a single action towards becoming a biological parent, which includes both raped women and men

⁴ Cohen, “Are All Abortions Equal?”

⁵ “The War That Never Ends.”

⁶ “Abortion | Data and Statistics | Reproductive Health | CDC”; “Rape-Related Pregnancy: Estimates and Descriptive Characteristics from a National Sample of Women. - PubMed - NCBI.”

whose rape resulted in a pregnancy. As a result, the subsequent findings of this paper could potentially be applied at a wider scope.

Definitions

Initially, rape is defined as “The penetration, no matter how slight, of the vagina or anus with any body part or object, or oral penetration by a sex organ of another person, without the consent of the victim” according to the department of justice of the United States.⁷

Pregnancy is defined as “a state in which a woman carries a fertilized egg inside her body.”⁸

Abortion, as defined by Merriam-Webster Dictionary, is

the termination of a pregnancy after, accompanied by, resulting in, or closely followed by the death of the embryo or fetus: such as

a : spontaneous expulsion of a human fetus during the first 12 weeks of gestation

— compare miscarriage

b : induced expulsion of a human fetus

c : expulsion of a fetus by a domestic animal often due to infection at any time

before completion of pregnancy —

Of the definitions presented above, only (b), “induced expulsion of a human fetus,” fits within the scope of this paper.⁹

⁷ “An Updated Definition of Rape.”

⁸ “Pregnancy | Definition of Pregnancy by Medical Dictionary.”

⁹ “Abortion | Definition of Abortion by Merriam-Webster.”

In this paper, “intentional action naturally geared towards becoming a parent” denotes consensual sex. This is a rather controversial point, as some argue that sex is not directed towards becoming a biological parent while many others deny that biological acts have any natural directedness. However, the assumption will be made for the sake of limiting the scope of this paper. Therefore, in the paper, “intentional action naturally geared towards becoming a biological parent,” denotes consensual sex.

Finally, for the purposes of this paper, becoming of a biological parent occurs only after one has given birth to a child. While it might be the case that one becomes a biological parent at the moment of conception, it is giving of birth that is central and of interest to the argument provided in this paper. Therefore, in this paper, biological parent denotes someone who has a born biological child.

Structure of the Paper

In this paper, two possible justifying reasons for the notion that abortions in cases of rape are morally permissible were carefully chosen and evaluated, each in its own section. The evaluations ultimately demonstrated why these possible justifying reasons fall short of sufficiently supporting the notion that one cannot be forced to become a biological parent even when one took not a single intentional action naturally geared towards it, and therefore lead to the conclusion that the two possible reasons fall short of justifying abortions in cases of rape for the time being.

In order, these are the possible justifying reasons that will be evaluated in the subsequent chapters.

1. Voluntary nature of parenthood

2. Permanent and nondispensable duties of biological parenthood

After each of the presented possible justifying reasons has been investigated, a conclusion will follow, explaining the significance of the findings.

CHAPTER TWO

Appeal to Voluntary Nature of Parenthood

A possible justification for the notion that abortions in cases of rape are morally permissible is the notion that biological parenthood should be voluntary, that one needs to have intentionally committed at least one action geared towards becoming a biological parent knowing the possible consequences. Under this notion, aborting pregnancies resulting from rape would be morally permissible, while aborting pregnancies from consensual sex, even if the pregnancy was not intended and contraception was used, might not be morally permissible because consensual sex is an intentional action geared towards becoming a biological parent.

Even if the obligation to raise the born child has been given up, becoming a mother or a father itself carries significant symbolic meaning today's society, marking a major step in one's life.¹⁰ Once one's biological child is born, regardless of what follows, one becomes a biological parent at the least. Furthermore, regardless of how weak the social tie is, the biological tie is significant in that one could never have come into existence without the biological parents and genetic makeup constitutes a significant portion of one's identity, among other possible reasons.¹¹

Keeping in mind the perceived significance of becoming a biological parent, as well as the permanence of the step, one could say that to force someone who has taken no intentional action geared towards becoming a biological parent to become a biological

¹⁰ "Being a Parent."

¹¹ Wilson and Barker, "The Biological Notion of Individual."

parent is cruel and morally impermissible. For example, marriage is often perceived as significant and permanent and it is deemed morally impermissible to force someone to marry someone against his or her will.¹²

To approach the notion from a different perspective, the voluntary childlessness of people, choosing not to have a child and taking the necessary steps, is generally accepted and respected. It can be reasonably said that this general respect for the voluntary childlessness of people seems to suggest that a reproductive relationship is viewed and generally accepted as a relationship one only voluntarily enters – one that one should not be forced into.

This is part of the reason why one forcing another to enter a reproductive relationship, verbally or physically, is deemed morally impermissible.

However, in the above cases, the life of a fetus is not in question because the fetus was prevented from forming rather than being terminated through abortion. While it does appear to be the case that one ought not force someone who has taken not a single intentional action towards becoming a parent to become a parent, this is only clear in cases in which the life of the fetus is not in question.

As a result, current conceptions of voluntary parenthood, although they do support the idea that someone who has committed no intentional action geared towards becoming a parent should not be forced to become a parent, seem to be working under the condition that the life of the fetus is not in question. Therefore, the notion appears to be supported only conditionally, namely that the life of the fetus is not in question.

¹² “BBC - Ethics.”

For additional support, one could say that, of the existing arguments in philosophy, the intentional and voluntarist accounts of parenthood, which appeal to intentions as the ground of parenthood, support the notion that parenthood should be voluntary and therefore one cannot be forced to become a parent when one took not a single intentional action geared towards becoming a parent.¹³

Here is an example of the kind of reasoning these accounts usually appeal to. The Khans wish to have a child “of their own.” They screen egg and sperm providers and find providers who satisfy their requirements. They then select a gestational mother, who carries the fetus to term and then hands the infant over to the Khans. Intentionalists argue that because they “carefully and intentionally orchestrated the procreational act, bringing together all the necessary components with the intention of creating a unique individual whom they intend to raise as their own” (Hill 1991, 359), the Khans should be regarded as the child's sole parents.¹⁴

These accounts also often appeal to cases of misplaced sperm, such as the one illustrated below.

Bruce is about to undergo some risky medical treatment, and has placed some of his sperm in a sperm-bank in case he needs it at a later date. Through a bureaucratic mishap, Bruce's sperm is swapped with that of a sperm-donor and is used by Bessie to produce a child. Does Bruce acquire parental rights and responsibilities over Bessie's child?¹⁵

Although intuitions vary, it does appear to be reasonable that it is because of intentions that the Khans are regarded as the sole parent of the child and unreasonable to say that Bruce acquires parental rights and responsibilities over Bessie’s child for the time being, suggesting that intentions ground the basis of parenthood.

¹³ Brake and Millum, “Parenthood and Procreation.”

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.

As these cases suggest, the intentional and voluntarist account do support the notion that parenthood should be voluntary. In each of the cases, it is the intention to become a parent that determined the supposedly right parents and assigned them the corresponding duties. Furthermore, every individual regarded as the parent of the child intentionally committed at least one action geared towards the creation of the child knowing the possible consequences.

However, as the above cases also suggest, these accounts deal more directly with the allotting of parental roles and duties of a born child, rather than the event of becoming a biological parent itself. In other words, while these accounts provide some guidance at figuring out who should be the rightful parents with the corresponding duties, they do not provide much guidance with respect to what someone who has not taken a single action towards becoming a child can do when the life of the fetus is in question.

Thus, these accounts of parenthood suffer from the same kind of problem faced by reasoning presented before them: while they do support the notion that parenthood should be voluntary and that one should not be forced to become a parent when one did not intend to do so, they also appear to be working under the assumption that the life of the fetus is not in question. In the case of the Khans family, the gestational mother not becoming a mother did not require the death of the fetus, as was the case with Bruce.

Judith Jarvis Thomson did provide an analogy that not only appears to work in cases in which the life of a fetus is in question, but especially well in cases of rape. However, Thomson's argument posed a problem with the use of one's body for a period of time without one's consent, rather than posing a problem with forcing one to become a parent without one's intent. Therefore, although a strong argument for the moral

permissibility of abortions in cases of rape, it is outside the scope of this paper, which puts emphasis on the intent and the becoming of a parent, rather than the use of one's body.

As a result, although existing theories and conceptions do seem to in general support the notion that one needs to have intentionally committed at least one action geared towards becoming a biological parent knowing the possible consequences to become a biological parent, based on their reasoning, it appears to be the case that they do not support the notion under all conditions, namely the condition in which the life of the fetus is in question.

CHAPTER THREE

Appeal to Permanent and Nondispensable duties of Biological Parenthood

If it is the case that biological parenthood carries with it permanent and nondispensable duties, it is a probable case that one should not be forced to become a biological parent when one has taken no intentional action geared towards becoming a biological parent. This is because if it is the case that biological parenthood carries with it permanent and nondispensable duties and one can be forced to become a biological parent when one has taken no intentional action geared towards becoming a biological parent, the victims of rape who became pregnant will have to assume the role of a parent and raise the child his or herself.

In logical form, the following case is illustrated as follows:

1. $(A \wedge B) \rightarrow C$
2. $\neg C$
- _____
3. $\neg(A \wedge B)$ Modus Tollens 1,2
4. A
5. $\neg A \vee \neg B$ De Morgan's Theorem 3
6. $\neg\neg A$ Double Negation 4
- _____
- $\neg B$ Elimination 5,6

where A is "Biological parenthood carries with it permanent and nondispensable duties", B is "One can be forced to become a biological parent when one has taken no intentional

action geared towards becoming a biological parent“, and C is “The victims of rape who became pregnant will have to assume the role of a parent and raise the child themselves”.

While some may perceive the claim that victims of rape who became pregnant have the moral obligation to assume the role of a parent and raise the child themselves, forcing someone who has been raped and impregnated to raise the born child against his or her will is morally questionable at the least. Under the same conditions, other seemingly absurd cases can be justified as well. For example, in the case of Bruce and his misplaced sperm that was alluded to earlier, Bruce would have to “acquire parental rights and responsibilities over Bessie's child,” becoming the acting father of the child.

Thus, if one can sufficiently support the notion that biological parenthood carries with it permanent and nondispensable duties, one might be able to produce a feasible argument with the conclusion that one cannot be forced to become a biological parent when one has taken no intentional action geared towards becoming a biological parent.

One bioethicist who argued for the notion that biological parenthood carries with it permanent and nondispensable duties is Daniel Callahan.

In *Bioethics and Fatherhood*, Callahan, in arguing that the “rapid and widespread acceptance of artificial insemination donors was much too thoughtless and casual, but for just that reason symbolic devaluation of fatherhood,” contended that biological fatherhood carries with it permanent and nondispensable duties.¹

¹ Callahan, *The Roots of Bioethics*.

The claim made by Callahan in the first section of his paper is that “biological fatherhood carries with it permanent and nondispensable duties”.² He defended this claim using the causal account of responsibility. The moral axiom he provided was that “human beings bear a moral responsibility for those voluntary acts that have an impact on lives of others”.³ From this axiom, he argued that “given the obvious importance of procreation in bringing human life into existence – fathers have a significant moral responsibility for the children they voluntarily procreate”.⁴ In doing so, Callahan emphasized the directness of the relationship, rhetorically asking “what connection could be more direct than biological procreation, without which human existence would not be possible,” suggesting that the directness of the causal relationship is an important factor for his idea of responsibility.⁵

Initially, the argument provided by Callahan to support his claim that “biological fatherhood carries with it permanent and nondispensable duties” is not logically valid.⁶ As in, even if “human beings bear a moral responsibility for those voluntary acts that have an impact on lives of others”, it does not logically follow that human beings bear a “permanent and nondispensable” responsibilities for every one of those voluntary acts.⁷ In other words, while the moral axiom provided by Callahan does successfully lead to the

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

conclusion that biological fathers have responsibilities for the children they procreate, it fails to show how those responsibilities are “permanent and nondispensable,” which is what Daniel Callahan was trying to support.⁸

In the form of a logical argument, what Callahan provided for his claim that biological fatherhood carries with it permanent and nondispensable duties is as follows:

1. If A is a voluntary act that has an impact on lives of others, then the person who committed A bears a moral responsibility for A.
2. A is a voluntary act that has an impact on lives of others
3. Therefore, the person who committed A bears a permanent and nondispensable moral responsibility for A.

General Form

1. If A, then B
2. A
3. Therefore, C

As indicated above, the justification provided by Callahan is invalid and therefore not sufficient to justify his claim that “biological fatherhood carries with it permanent and nondispensable duties,” even if the claim is true.⁹ In order for Callahan to support this claim, he either has to contend for the axiom that “human beings bear ‘permanent and nondispensable’ moral responsibility for those voluntary acts that have an impact on lives of others” or define conditions in which the responsibilities are permanent and nondispensable under the axiom that he provided in his argument and show that the

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

conditions regarding the fathers and the children they procreated satisfy those conditions.¹⁰ However, Callahan did neither of these, failing to sufficiently support his claim about biological fatherhood and the responsibilities that come with it.

Furthermore, the axiom provided by Callahan, that “human beings bear a moral responsibility for those voluntary acts that have an impact on lives of others,” is still a topic of much debate.¹¹ One of the possible problems with the axiom is that, in the case of parenthood and its responsibilities, this causal account of responsibility generates too many parents. As Giuliana Fuscaldo noted,

How do we determine what or who among the countless contributing factors is the cause of a child’s existence? In the case of an IVF pregnancy, for example, is it the action of the man and woman who provide the gametes, the embryologist who inseminates the egg, the clinician who performs the embryo transfer, and so on?¹²

Other philosophers such as Elizabeth Brake have contributed to the debate, specifically in the area of paternal responsibility, calling into question the “influential notion of paternal responsibility, namely, that fathers owe support to their children due to their causal responsibility for their existence”.¹³

Finally, it is unlikely that biological fatherhood carries permanent and nondispensable duties because many of its practical implications are absurd.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² “GENETIC TIES: ARE THEY MORALLY BINDING? - FUSCALDO - 2006 - Bioethics - Wiley Online Library.”

¹³ Brake, “Fatherhood and Child Support.”

Initially, under the assumption that “biological fatherhood carries with it permanent and nondispensable duties,” the practice of adoption becomes unjustified.¹⁴ As defined by the National Adoption Center of the United States, adoption is

A permanent, legally binding arrangement through which a person, usually a child or teenager, becomes a member of a new family. In this arrangement, persons other than the birthparents assume all parental rights and obligations. The birthparents no longer have these rights and obligations and are no longer the legal parents of the child.¹⁵

The practice of adoption becomes unjustified under Callahan’s notion of biological fatherhood and its duties because the comprehensive process of adoption requires the dispensing and transfer of parental duties. However Callahan defined the words “dispense” and “permanence,” the necessary end result is that the biological parents no longer have to or can carry out those parental duties, while the adoptive parents do have to carry out those duties from that point on and it is difficult to see how those parental duties are nondispensable and permanent if the biological parents are no longer carrying out any of those parental duties.¹⁶ Thus, the definition of fatherhood provided by the author prohibits this practice, because it dictates that biological fatherhood carries with it nondispensable duties and the process of adoption requires the dispensing and transfer of those duties.

However, with over 100,000 adoptions every year just in the United States, it seems to be the case that adoption is necessary in our world today.¹⁷ For example, some

¹⁴ Callahan, *The Roots of Bioethics*.

¹⁵ “Glossary | National Adoption Center.”

¹⁶ Callahan, *The Roots of Bioethics*.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

parents might lose their jobs and become unable to financially support their children. It is absurd to state that those parents must still maintain all their parental duties at the expense of the children's suffering (malnutrition, lack of education, etc). Therefore, Callahan's notion of biological fatherhood and the duties appear to be unjustified.

Although Callahan did attempt to account for cases of adoption by stating that "each and every father has a full set of moral obligations toward the children he procreates – unless he is mentally or financially incompetent to discharge those duties," he failed to uphold his claim in the process.¹⁸ By conceding that "each and every father has a full set of moral obligations toward the children he procreates – unless" under certain conditions, Daniel Callahan accepted that those responsibilities are not permanent and nondispensable.¹⁹ In other words, in an attempt to account for cases of adoption, he appears to have contradicted himself, acknowledging that the responsibilities that come with biological fatherhood are conditionally dispensable.

Additional to the practice of adoptions, gamete donations cannot be allowed as it is because according to Callahan, the practice allows the dispensing of nondispensable duties and therefore is unjustified. As it was in the case of adoption, this leads to absurd implications, questioning the truth value of Callahan's claim that biological fatherhood carries with it permanent and nondispensable duties.

If it is the case that artificial insemination donations cannot be allowed, this means that many couples will not be able to have biological children without having the donors acting as the fathers of the children brought to life through the process. This is

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

absurd because the mother and the biological father may not, and in clear majority of cases, do not have relationships that is reasonably compatible with them acting as parents together. In some cases, the children will have two acting fathers as a result. This is simply absurd and unreasonable.

Take, for example, a heterosexual couple well into their reproductive age. Upon finding out that the husband is sterile, their only option of having a biological child is to receive sperm from a known person, give birth to the child resulting from that sperm and the egg of the wife, and have that donor act as a father of the child. The donor and the mother will practically become husband and wife, as they are forced to carry out the duties of parenthood together. What the role of the real husband would be is unclear, but the case is already absurd enough to make the point. Or, it must be the case that many women simply shouldn't have biological children, because the above case is absurd. However, this appears to be an absurd claim as well because it severely limits the reproductive rights of those women.

Given the seemingly absurd claim that there is only one permissible method of having a biological child, couples like the one described above are practically banned from having a biological child. In other words, Callahan's notion of biological fatherhood and the permanent and nondispensable duties practically bans those couples from having a biological child.

Finally, in cases in which the victims of rape who have been impregnated decide to give birth to and raise the child, under Callahan's notion of biological fatherhood and the duties that come with it, it has to be the case that the victims of the rape have to raise the child with the rapists even if they didn't want to. Given the nature of the relationship

between the victims of crime and the criminals, and the fact that many of the victims of rape suffer from posttraumatic disorder, the case dictated by Callahan's notion of biological fatherhood and the duties that come with it is absurd to say the least.²⁰

As indicated above, the practical implications of the notion that "biological fatherhood carries with it permanent and nondispensable duties" are absurd in many cases. Although one may argue that adoptions are not necessary, certain couple shouldn't be allowed to have biological children, and so on, those arguments have failed to gain any substantial weight so far, most likely because they are very impractical. And given that Callahan's notion of biological fatherhood and duties dictate these absurd cases, it appears to be the case that his notion is not justified. As in, when an idea implies things that are clearly absurd, it is reasonable to believe in the falsity of that idea. The case appears to be very similar here. Daniel Callahan's notion of biological fatherhood and duties imply absurd things, and therefore is likely to be false.

In order to further support his claim that biological fatherhood carries with it permanent and nondispensable duties, Callahan raised the following point:

"The only difference between the male who impregnates a woman in the course of sexual liaison and then disappears, and the man who is asked to disappear voluntarily after providing sperm, is that the latter kind of irresponsibility is, so to speak, licensed and legitimized ... the effect on the child is of course absolutely identical – an unknown, absent father".²¹

²⁰ "Sexual Assault Against Females - PTSD."

²¹ Callahan, *The Roots of Bioethics*.

However, a difference Callahan failed to perceive is that the man voluntarily providing sperm is doing so with the knowledge that there are systems in place to ensure that the child is raised in adequate conditions, while the man who disappears leaves the future of the child in uncertainty, which most often leads to inadequate conditions. As a result, it is not the case the two men are committing morally equal actions, and therefore does not point to the inconsistent attitude of the society towards those actions. Thus, the point raised by Callahan fails to support his claim. Furthermore, society condemning men who disappear after impregnating a woman does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that biological fatherhood carries with it permanent and nondispensable duties. Rather, the notion that biological fatherhood carries with it some kind of duties seems to be a more plausible conclusion to reach from the condemnation.

Therefore, it appears to be the case that biological fatherhood carries with it conditionally dispensable duties, leading to the conclusion that biological fatherhood does not carry with it permanent and nondispensable duties. Logically, it is not the case that biological parenthood carries with it permanent and nondispensable duties as parenthood includes fatherhood.

Going back to the logical form of the argument provided earlier,

1. $(A \wedge B) \rightarrow C$

2. $\neg C$

3. $\neg(A \wedge B)$ Modus Tollens 1,2

4. A

5. $\neg A \vee \neg B$ De Morgan's Theorem 3

6. $\neg\neg A$ Double Negation 4

$\neg B$ Elimination 5,6

where A is “Biological parenthood carries with it permanent and nondispensable duties,” B is “One can be forced to become a biological parent when one has taken no intentional action geared towards becoming a biological parent“, and C is “The victims of rape who became pregnant will have to assume the role of a parent and raise the child themselves”, investigation into the truth value of A suggested that it is false. Because the truth value of A appears to be false, one no longer can use De Morgan’s and elimination to conclude $\neg B$, that one cannot be forced to become a biological parent when one has taken no intentional action geared towards becoming a biological parent.

Therefore, the appeal to permanence and nondispensable duties of parenthood cannot support the notion that one cannot be forced to become a biological parent when one took no intentional action geared towards becoming a biological parent.

CHAPTER FOUR

Conclusion

In hopes of gaining any insight into the morality of abortions in cases of rape, the question of whether one morally can be forced to become a biological parent when one took no intentional action geared towards becoming a biological parent was explored. Such an approach was taken in order to avoid dealing with definitions of personhood, etc. as explained in the introduction.

Two possible justifying reasons were chosen and investigated carefully. The voluntary nature of parenthood and the permanent and nondispensable duties of biological parenthood.

If any of these two possible justifying reasons was deemed sufficient for the notion that one cannot be forced to become a biological parent when one took no intentional action geared towards becoming a biological parent, the morality of abortions in cases of rape could have been justified, as in cases of rape, it can be reasonably said that one took no intentional action geared towards becoming a biological parent.

The investigation into the notion that biological parenthood should be voluntary revealed that although existing theories and conceptions do seem to in general support the notion that that one needs to have intentionally committed at least one action geared towards becoming a biological parent, it appears to be the case that they do not support the notion under all conditions, namely the condition in which the life of the fetus is in question.

Next, Daniel Callahan's claim that biological parenthood carries with it permanent and nondispensable duties was investigated, which, if supported sufficiently, could have produced a probable case justifying the morality of abortions in cases of rape. However, the analysis of Daniel Callahan's work led to the conclusion that biological parenthood carries with it conditionally dispensable duties, failing to produce a probable case justifying the morality of abortions in cases of rape.

Although other possible justifying reasons may exist, it appears to be the case that for the time being, appealing to the voluntary nature of parenthood or the permanent and nondispensable duties of biological parenthood are not adequate justification for the notion that one cannot be forced to become a biological parent when one took no intentional action geared towards becoming a biological parent, failing to justify the morality of abortions in cases of rape.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- “Abortion | Data and Statistics | Reproductive Health | CDC.” Accessed July 17, 2017.
https://www.cdc.gov/reproductivehealth/data_stats/abortion.htm.
- “Abortion | Definition of Abortion by Merriam-Webster.” Accessed July 17, 2017.
<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/abortion>.
- “Abortion | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy.” Accessed July 17, 2017.
<http://www.iep.utm.edu/abortion/>.
- “An Updated Definition of Rape.” *Department of Justice*, 2012.
<https://www.justice.gov/archives/opa/blog/updated-definition-rape>.
- “BBC - Ethics: Forced Marriage,” n.d. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/ethics/forcedmarriage/>.
- Booker, Rashid. “Slave Breeding Farms of ‘Africans in North America’,” n.d.
http://www.academia.edu/9864206/Slave_Breeding_Farms_of_Africans_in_North_America_.
- Brake, Elizabeth. “Fatherhood and Child Support: Do Men Have a Right to Choose?” *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 22, no. 1 (March 1, 2005): 55–73.
doi:10.1111/j.1468-5930.2005.00292.x.
- Brake, Elizabeth, and Joseph Millum. “Parenthood and Procreation.” In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta, Winter 2016. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2016.
<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/parenthood/>.
- Callahan, Daniel. *The Roots of Bioethics: Health, Progress, Technology, Death*. Oxford University Press, 2012. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199931378.001.0001.
- Child and Youth Health-CYH (South). “Being a Parent.” *Child and Youth Health*, n.d.
<http://www.cyh.com/HealthTopics/HealthTopicDetails.aspx?p=114&np=99&id=1684>.
- Cohen, I. Glenn. “Are All Abortions Equal? Should There Be Exceptions to the Criminalization of Abortion for Rape and Incest?” *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics* 43, no. 1 (March 2015): 87–104. doi:10.1111/jlme.12198.

- “GENETIC TIES: ARE THEY MORALLY BINDING? - FUSCALDO - 2006 - Bioethics - Wiley Online Library.” Accessed July 19, 2017. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8519.2006.00478.x/abstract>.
- “Glossary | National Adoption Center.” Accessed July 19, 2017. <http://www.adopt.org/glossary>.
- “Judith Jarvis Thomson - A Defense of Abortion — HCC Learning Web.” Accessed July 25, 2017. <https://learning.hccs.edu/faculty/james.ireland/phil1301/supplemental-readings/judith-jarvis-thomson-a-defense-of-abortion/view>.
- “Pregnancy | Definition of Pregnancy by Medical Dictionary.” Accessed July 15, 2017. <http://medical-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/pregnancy>.
- “Rape-Related Pregnancy: Estimates and Descriptive Characteristics from a National Sample of Women. - PubMed - NCBI.” Accessed July 16, 2017. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8765248/>.
- “Sexual Assault Against Females - PTSD: National Center for PTSD.” General Information, n.d. <https://www.ptsd.va.gov/public/ptsd-overview/women/sexual-assault-females.asp>.
- “The War That Never Ends.” *The Economist*, January 16, 2003. <http://www.economist.com/node/1534731>.
- Wilson, Robert A., and Matthew Barker. “The Biological Notion of Individual.” In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta, Spring 2017. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2017. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2017/entries/biology-individual/>.