

HERE ARE THE BEST INSIGHTS FROM ANN FUREDI'S BOOK THE MORAL CASE FOR ABORTION

BPAS

Ann Furedi runs the British Pregnancy Advisory Service (BPAS), which provides abortions to nearly 65,000 women a year in England & Wales. Most of these are provided free to women and paid for by NHS. Women travelling from Ireland need to self-fund, but BPAS has a policy of never turning any woman away that it can safely and legally treat. BPAS was established as a charity in 1968 to provide both clinic services and public education. Today, it is known internationally for promoting women's reproductive choice (www.wetrustwomen.org.uk) and the decriminalisation of abortion.

From BPAS website.

Ann's Book, The Moral Case for Abortion

This thought-provoking book sets out the ethical arguments for a woman's right to choose. Drawing on the traditions of sociological thinking and moral philosophy, it maintains that there is a strong moral case for recognizing autonomy in personal decision-making about reproductive intentions. More than this, it argues that to prevent a woman from making her own choice to continue or end her pregnancy is to undermine the essence of her humanity. The author, a provider of abortion services in the UK, asserts that true respect for human life and true regard for individual conscience demand that we respect a woman's right to decide, and that support for a woman's right to a termination has moral foundations and ethical integrity. This fresh perspective on abortion will interest both pro- and anti-choice individuals and organizations, along with academics in the fields of gender studies, philosophy, ethics and religion.

From Amazon

INFORMATION FROM THE BOOK

To say that if you think abortion is immoral or murder then don't have one and don't let others not have the choice turns the whole subject into a claim about preferences. My comment is that even if abortion is not murder, it might be and you cannot turn something as important as that into a preference claim!

To be pro-life or pro-choice involves judging. To judge itself is a choice.

It is not true that a pregnancy necessarily develops into an embryo. It can develop into a hydatidiform mole that engenders a significant risk of cancer.

A being has moral status when what it has or its interests matter for its own sake. A person is wronged is wronged for her or his own sake. Thus it is MY personal loss if my fancy watch or my Church or my religion or my nose are attacked or desecrated. It is an attack on me though none of these things are me. An unborn cannot have moral status for it is not wronged if anybody say gets its inheritance. I would add that some would say that an unborn at 10 weeks cannot be wronged the same way as a 24 week can be. A 24 week cannot be as a 30 week would be. Its a progression. If a child in the womb can be wronged then that may still not amount to much so we can treat it as having no moral status.

A lot of arguments against JJT are against the analogy she used but the principle stills stands out: you cannot be a life support system to another being against your will. You have the right to have the child removed though it will die.

It is the case that if a woman dies you cannot even take her organs then to save her baby.

A right to life and a right to exist are not exactly the same thing. Too many confuse the two. The woman has a life and the unborn has an existence. The life comes first.

It is wrong to kill somebody just because it makes your life easier. It is said that there is no difference whether it is one day we are talking about or nine months. But there is a difference between taking the life of an unborn baby while doubting if it has much of a right to life and in taking the life of a one year old who clearly has such a right. The doubt means the intention is not about hurting somebody.

The book says that removing an unborn which will end its life is not morally different from injecting it to kill it in the

womb. There is a dead body at the end.

Yet I would add that some would see removing the baby as consistent with you refusing to be forced to give life support and though it will die that is not your intention. They would see the injecting as murder.

A woman having the right to end a pregnancy does not automatically mean anybody has a right or duty to help her.

MY COMMENT: Apply Darwinism to how pregnancy is full of errors and "design" flaws that harm the mother. The hips are not wide enough and a woman needs too much assistance. The vast majority of history's mothers were killed by pregnancy and childbirth. Motherhood will do permanent damage and can be called a necessary illness. With poor design the maker is either not perfectly powerful, not perfectly knowing or not perfectly good or any combination of these. Pregnancy is a health danger not an illness as such which is why abortion rights must be granted. It is still very much linked to illness which is why saying it is not an illness doesn't carry much moral relevance.

No human being is born on time. When we are born we are helpless for unlike other animals we have a lot more brain development to go through until we can look after ourselves. All human births are premature! This thought scares religion for it may argue that a newborn is much the same as an unborn.

The point about the organs shows that society lies about how much it values the unborn child. Here we have a case where it is a DEAD WOMAN'S BODY and we are not allowed to use it to save her baby. Imagine what that says about a living body!

The point that nobody and no health system is bound to help a woman use her right to end her pregnancy shows that abortion rights are fragile in a sense.

There is a difference between removing a baby from the womb and it dying and in attacking it.

In a burning building, do you save the fridge with several fairly advanced embryos in it or the newborn baby? You will make a choice and say, "I did the right thing though I feel bad about the babies/baby." Your choice was still a weapon against the loser. You won't feel that so you are not the righteous person you claim to be. You are smug. A weapon is a weapon if you use it against your will or not. It should not matter for it is about what you did with the weapon not if you intended to hurt or not. Don't use the situation to feel good just because you had a good intention.

Something tells us that abortion should be immoral. That suggests a spiritual dimension. But it cannot be so that shows that God is a useless concept. It cannot handle the big issues of abortion or suicide which are health issues rather than moral ones. A useless God is just an idol.

The woman is on her own. God is not looking after her. He is not going to make it right if she carries her pregnancy to term and it kills her.

Abortion is a necessity for we are stuck with nature and nature is dangerous and brutal.