



Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

ELSEVIER

Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 149 (2014) 927 – 935

Procedia
Social and Behavioral Sciences

LUMEN 2014

Arguments for and Against Abortion in Terms of Teleological and Deontological Theories

Ionuț Ștefan^{a,b,*}

^aLecturer, Phd. in Philosophy

Faculty of Medicine and Pharmacy, "Dunărea de Jos" University, str. Al. I. Cuza, no.35, Galați, 800261, Romania

^bLecturer, Phd in Philosophy,

Faculty of Communication and International Relations, "Danubius" University, Blv. Galati, 800654, Romania

Abstract

The most important general and theoretical horizons regarding bioethics, refers to the ethical theories foundation. We can talk about two general main categories in which we can fall the ethical theories: teleological and deontological. Form the first category we enumerate the Aristotelian perspective or the one developed by J. St. Mill, while the Kantian perspective is exemplary for deontological ethics. According to the teleological perspective a form of human behavior is described as moral or non-moral according to the goals explicitly set. The mere achievement of these goals is a necessary and sufficient condition to qualify as moral actions or people's deeds without taking into account the "intermediate stages" of actions to achieve goals. Deontology, as a general horizon of articulating the ethical theories, believes on the contrary that in every moment of our existence, every action or deed that we accomplish can be described as moral or non-moral according to the ethical principles underlying our behavior. Very important consequences arising from the two general theoretical horizons concerns two different perspectives on "human nature" or what we call as the essence of being human. Starting from this horizon we have the consequentialist and deontological dimensions related to the abortion cases. The bioethical dimension in which we will discuss the issue of abortion involves both dimensions and horizons. The arguments against abortion seem to rely rather in the deontological horizon of Kantian type, while abortion pros seem to rely on consequentialist horizon.

© 2014 Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>).

Selection and peer-review under responsibility of the Organizing Committee of LUMEN 2014.

Keywords: abortion; bioethics; deontology; teleology; ethics; consequentialism;

* Corresponding author. Tel.: 0742974748, 0733180471.

E-mail address: ionutstefan1977@yahoo.com ; ionut.stefan@ugal.ro; ionut.stefan@univ-danubius.ro

1. Introduction

The topic of this article refers to a debate about the pros and cons of abortion based on the main elements of bioethics. It should be noted that any debate on abortion in which are made arguments and counter-arguments, is evidence of a general theoretical dichotomy that falls within ethical perspectives regarding abortion. Theorists are now in a consensus when categorizing great ethical systems or major ethical theories into two general classes: teleological ethics and deontological ethics. So is necessary to clarify, in advance, what the term means. In a general sense, "teleology" is a term that comes from two ancient Greek words: *telos* means "end" and *logos* taken with the sense of "science" or "theory". This term that could be taken in Romanian language by "scientific purpose" is becoming enshrined in the history of philosophy by Aristotle. This philosopher is the one who believes that principle or basis must be considered in four facets or "causes": material, formal, efficient and final. (Ross, 1998, p. 75) We emphasize the importance of final causes, if we refer to the Aristotelian interpretation regarding the pre-Socratic philosophy starting from the four cases. No previous philosopher of Aristotle had thought the fourfold basis of hypostasis. (Ștefan, 2010, p 218) The Aristotelian ethics will join this general theoretical horizon in the final case.

The other category of ethical theories, which aims to be a counterbalance of teleological horizon, refers to deontology. The deontological ethics believes that each shape of our behavior, each behavioral "sequence" can be described as moral or non-moral by referring to certain principles underlying them. Any form of human behavior from this perspective is founded by some very general principles or rules. Exemplary for understanding this type of ethical category is the Kantian theory related to "categorical imperative". The German philosopher Immanuel Kant, in the Critique of Practical Reason, develops a deontological system that will make a career not only in the academic environment, but also in the modern and civilized environment of the 21th century. Due to the size of this study, we are compelled to, again briefly, the most important theoretical elements of Kantian deontology, useful for our approach. Our behavior, according to the German philosopher, must be founded in every moment of our existence, by some universal and necessary rules or principles. Because of the universality and necessity of these rules of conduct, every man, that claims he "acts moral" mustn't break them under any excuse or circumstance. There is no "sorry" allowed or justification for that at least once in a particular situation I broke the "x" rule, while in the rest of somewhat similar situations I respected it. The most used and perhaps the most famous formulation of the Kantian categorical imperative it's about the way we relate, through our behavior, to each neighbor of ours, that is to every man. "Act in such way, as to always treat humanity, in its own person or in the person of another, always at the same time as purpose and never simply as a means." (Kant, 1972, p. 42) Through the fact that every human should be treated as a purpose in itself, we must understand that every person is autonomous her rights equal to every other human being regardless of other differences related to status, race, color, sex, income level, etc.

For our approach that is based on the horizon of applied philosophy and even more strictly on the horizon of applied ethics, we must make a very important statement pertaining to teleology. The initial establishment of the goal, in the first instance, is a relatively easy task. We will all agree that "happiness" or "absolute good" can be goals that the whole humanity wants to be achieved, fulfilled. But when we try to define as satisfactorily these very general concepts, we will encounter serious difficulties, threatening to get into semantic contradictions that may be impossible to overcome. Therefore, to avoid such problems, we will try to delimitate "the semantic horizon of goals", referring strictly only as their consequential appearance. Fixed goals both individually and overall, of human communities can be measured by observable consequences. The preference of purposes over other goals can be justified or regarded as justified by achieving less severe consequences than others, possibly with more serious effects.

Starting from this type of problematic situations, we try to tackle the issue of abortion, seeking to highlight precisely those problematic situations that cannot be resolved satisfactorily if we absolutize only one of the general theoretical perspectives applicable to the set of applied ethics, respectively only teleology without any type of deontology, and vice-versa, only deontology, without kind of consequentialist approach.

2. The abortion pros from a consequentialist perspective of the teleological ethics

We must emphasize, again, some very important issues. The pros vs. cons debates regarding abortion starts from a doublet of accepted or rejected premises by each side separately. It's about status of the conceptus or fetus. "The

defenders of" abortion believes that a fertilized egg, the offspring or fetus is not a human being. While the "opponents" of abortion considers that we are dealing with a human being from the moment of egg fertilization by the sperm. The discussions are far from being concluded, because none of the sides managed to develop a set of unassailable arguments undoubtedly valid and therefore to be accepted unanimously. (Judith Jarvis Thomson, 1994, p. 26)

To overcome this difficulty, we start from the premise that the design product is a human being, although the concept of the human being is ambiguous and difficult to define, to conceptually clarify. We will seek to emphasize that, although we are dealing with a human being, if the fetus in some problematic situations, the right to life or the life of the mother may clash with the right to life of the fetus. (Judith Jarvis Thomson, 1994, p. 29) Other theorists believe that the "fetus suffering" problem in case of abortion is wrong laid and in the first instance, the approach should focus on the consequences that may result from the damage that are brought to the person that can develop from that fetus. For this purpose are used: the Aristotelian distinction between potency and act (the fetus is a potential person that can be updated by the act of birth and subsequent of development) and the so-called "golden rule" according to how we should behave towards our neighbors (including those in potency such as fetus) as we would expect, how we would like them to behave themselves with us. (R.M. Hare, 1994, p. 53) This behavioral rule essentially deontological, of the Confucian type could be summed up by the high Romanian folk "what you don't like, other won't do". To a certain perspective, the golden rule is intended as a compromise between the Kantian theory of the categorical imperative and the utilitarian horizon developed by Mill. (Mureșan, 2012, p. 178) The extremely important specification made by the author of the "golden rule" is that the rule applies only to situations where we are dealing with abortions where the fetus could have a life similar to the one who aborted him. (R.M. Hare, 1994, p. 53) In this way it wants to be removed from the discussion, precisely those situations, dramatic and complicated to be solved satisfactorily. We want to talk about these situations.

It can be taken into account at least three categories of existential situations and thus we have no claim to have totally exhausted them. Surely it can be found or imagined other types of problematic situations. These are: a) traumatic situations, such as rape, the mother becomes pregnant without her will, b) situations where there is suspicion, and this suspicion is medically proven without doubt that whether the fetus has serious health problems or the mother is not able to lead the pregnancy until birth (we are dealing with the so-called "therapeutic abortion"), c) situations where we are dealing with people responsible, educated in this regard, who took all means of protection during intercourse, and yet end up becoming pregnant and don't want to keep this pregnancy. Would result in a child who is not desired at all by his natural parents and will grow up in institutional environments such as orphanages or foster care centers. For this latter category of cases we will resort to classic psychoanalysis of Freudian type in highlighting the serious consequences that may result.

a) Pregnancy resulting from rape. We are dealing in this situation with a form of deviant behavior very badly, with devastating effects on the victim. No democratic and civilized state, in the XXI allows the manifestation of such forms of behavior; sanctions are commensurate with the consequences, leading to death penalty, paradoxically, such as China. There is a high probability for the female victim to become pregnant after such an event. To eliminate this risk, it would mean rapists use contraception, such as condoms, which hardly happens. What should be done in such a case? It is clear that, a possible child who was born from a rape would arrive in a total hostile environment. We consider here the family that does not exist: the father is a very dangerous offender and his mother is an extremely traumatized person, who will not be able to show her maternal feeling normally. What would be preferable to the consequences? Abortion or the birth of this child? In the case of an abortion we are dealing with a woman's attempt to escape from a trauma and this attempt is not necessarily a guaranteed success. The traumas of such an event may remain permanently, but certainly they will be even more pronounced if, eventually, the child would be born. It is likely that at every moment of existence, whenever she sees him, to recall, to remember that traumatic event, very seriously through which was forced to pass. Therefore, in the first instance, we can conclude that, in this case, an abortion is less severe, being even the only solution, than an unwanted pregnancy resulting from trauma, that must be carried through. It is likely that, following a pregnancy carried to the end, both mother and child to spend the rest of their life in terrible suffering. This terrible and unnecessary suffering can be "solved" somewhat through abortion.

At this point of our approach we should make a very important statement. An important factor, in fact a

formidable and influential institution in making decisions including official decisions of democratic state is the Church. In our case we are dealing with the Romanian Orthodox Church for the European Union we have to deal with the Catholic Church, if we refer to the states of Southern Europe and the Protestant Church, if we are dealing with Northern Europe. We do not wish to make reference to Catholics and Protestants, although Vatican position is similar to the Romanian Orthodox Church, however, we must acknowledge, with sadness, that formally this very important institution of the democratic Romanian society, condemns unilateral abortion (any form of abortion), considering it a very serious sin before God. The official attitude of the Romanian Orthodox Church is very weak and questionable regarding abortion. Therefore, we consider it necessary to reproduce some text fragments relevant in this situation. In the context of political regime change in December 1989 and with the evolution of society, were issued some official documents of the Romanian Orthodox Church regarding: abortion, organ transplants and euthanasia. After being presented the arguments against abortion, "in the final formulation of the document is presented situation in which it is considered by the Church that might carry out, however, the abortion: if the mother's life is effectively in danger by the pregnancy or childbirth, priority should be given to the woman's life [...], not because life would have greater value in itself than another, but because of the maternal responsibilities towards children or family [...]. It is recommended the childbirth resulting from rape and even those discovered with severe disabilities [...]. But each of the three cases is required to take a final decision only in family counseling and / or family members with the doctor and especially confessor. It is also argued that "abortion can never be morally justified by the economic status of the family, disputes between partners, of affecting the career of the mother or her physical appearance." An important aspect refers to the coverage in Romanian society of the sin of abortion seriousness- which means nevertheless, intentional termination of life and, therefore, for whatever reason, murder – and the contemporary human education about the purpose of human sexuality, love and tenderness. ("Stefan Iloaie, *Morality and Life. Romanian Orthodox Church Documents on Bioethics*, in Romanian Journal of Bioethics, Vol 7, no. 2, April-June 2009) We shall believe that this "recommendation" of the Romanian Orthodox Church to pregnant woman through rape, to bear children is very risky and can have serious consequences both for children and for mothers. A serious trauma such as rape hardly can be cured through another trauma as a baby whose father is a rapist. The stigma of shame, which will be carried by the child, cannot be "deleted" in a community that is characterized by the worst forms of discrimination. It continues to remain a serious question mark the lack of awareness regarding the abortion case nuances expressed by the church as an institution. Using the "stigma" of sin before God again can have serious consequences, unsolvable in this case. We may have to deal with a female victim who was raised and educated in an environment with a deeply religious morality and which can be a rape victim. In this case, we have to deal with a strong "conflict" between "the strength" of moral principles deeply rooted in mental court described by Freud as the "superego" and the trauma that will be repressed in the unconscious. Such a conflict hard to satisfactorily solve in such a case, may be the source of extremely serious mental illness that can't be resolved, perhaps ever. Exemplary in this regard, of deepening the "stigma's" sin can be reading texts such as: Adrian G. Paul, *Sin of Abortion and anthropological Implications on the Fate of human Life* in the Romanian Journal of Bioethics, Vol 8, no. 4, October-December 2010. This category of existential events can't be unilaterally qualified in a rigid way, as it does in official positions of the Romanian Orthodox Church. Can be invoked in this way, to counterbalance the extremist position, a series of texts from both the New Testament (such as "Prodigal Son") and from the Old Testament ("Book of Job") that cannot be interpreted only in this way. God not only does not condemn people, but sometimes seem to appreciate exactly the critical positions of his decisions, as it happens in the final Book of Job. Such "moralizing" positions must be reviewed in the horizon cases that represent, on edge, unique events where we have to deal with unique individuals.

b) "Therapeutic" abortion. This category of existential events refers to situations where there is suspicion that either the mother or the child may have great health problems. If we take into situation the mother, we have seen that the positions are converging, including the Church as an official institution expresses this Agreement. More problematic, more dramatic, I find situations in which turns out undoubtedly that the fetus suffers from serious malformations that will cause him serious "disability" both physical and especially mental. Again we must consider the consequentialist dimension. In which case, the consequences are less serious? If such a child is born, the parents will be devastated because we start from the assumption that any normal parent wants normal children. Normality is defined by what a community of people accepts as normal. Even if we have to deal, again, with a vague concept, such as the "the normality" one, we can still establish some benchmarks. We mean by being "normal" any person

who will be able to learn a range of skills such as walking, eating, writing, reading, the meaning of restrictive rules of conduct, completing institutional educational stages "compulsory" etc.

We will conclude again that in this kind of existential problematic situations, abortion has less dramatic consequences, easier to bear; therefore, less serious than if a child is born with serious health problems. The fact that such a person will integrate very difficult, or at all, in a society intolerant of discrimination and "abnormal", involves a series of dramatic consequences for both the person and those close to him. Such a man has all the chances to live in a world which he cannot understand in any way to carry the burden of existential absurdity that can be unbearable and in some cases to commit acts again, with serious consequences such as: suicide, murder, rape, violence to get addicted to alcohol, drugs, etc. The consequentialist horizon in this situation seems to weigh, again in favor of abortion. There are very few cases at a statistic level, where children with physical or mental disabilities may not be abandoned in shelters, unable to grow in a family environment. Precisely because the drama of such parents that can't raise and educate their children with serious health problems is serious and grave, institutions and society must reflect better on these situations. Prevention in this case is closely related to permitting abortion.

c) Unwanted pregnancy even though contraceptive methods were used. This category of existential situations is probably the most common, and perhaps in first instance, seems to be less serious than other cases above. On closer analysis, it is this "trivial" situation that can be extremely problematic. How can one characterize these situations?

We are dealing with families and heterosexual couples in which partners are "educated" from a sexual point of view. There are people who realize what means an unwanted pregnancy, they use "advance" contraceptive methods ((high quality condoms, IUDs, contraceptive pills etc.) and yet it happens to be faced with an "unwanted pregnancy". We will not consider that they can be "convicted" of any moral instance by anyone, because they want ever-ending erotic sexual pleasure in perpetuating the species. The arguments brought in terms of "religion", according to which sexuality should be "unprotected" and left "in will of God" cannot be invoked if we take into account the autonomous will of the human freedom and responsibility for his behavior. At this point of our approach, we must make reference to the Freudian psychoanalytic perspective, which believes that sexuality and pleasure obtained from sexual acts are defining features of "human nature", even if they belong to the unconscious, irrational by definition. Freud believes that all our forms of behavior are reducible ultimately to sexuality. (Freud, Bucharest, 1991) Beyond the "extremism" of this view of human behavior, we must remember, however, the importance of sexuality for understanding human nature.

So we are dealing with this type of situation, where the erotic sexual pleasure of partners has as finality an unwanted pregnancy. We are dealing with the fact that neither the father nor the mother wants this child. What are the possibilities in this situation? At the end we can talk about four possible solutions: 1) the mother aborts, 2) the mother leads the pregnancy all the way, the baby is born and given up for adoption placement centers, 3) the mother leads the pregnancy all the way and the family changes their behavior, meaning that they accept him and will with love, 4) the mother lead the pregnancy all the way and the child is given up for adoption to a family who cannot have children naturally, but wishes to adopt. Let us look a little at each type of situation.

We will start downward. In cases 3) and 4) we are dealing with a considerable dose of chance. We cannot be certain that the mother will change its attitude towards the situation. It is likely to trigger the so-called maternal instinct, but it is again likely to not trigger this definitive felling of a woman's maternal behavior. In case 4), again we are dealing with the same hazard. It can happen that a couple or a family willing to adopt such a child and to grow up in a normal family environment, offering all conditions, but, again, it might be that such a happy ending will not occur. The hazards that can arise in these situations coerce us to eliminate them at rigor of the argumentative discussion that we want to bring into focus. So, it seems that, remains at the center of discussion, the possibilities 1) and 2). The two "solutions" will be consequentialist analyzed. The possibility 2) namely the arrival of the child in foster care reopen the discussion on child-family relationship. The classical Freudian psychoanalysis, focusing particularly on the early years of every child's life gives us a horizon of understanding the child-family relationship. We must say from the outset, that the family is non-replaceable. The happy case is that the family of each child is made of the natural mother and father. No institution and no other factor can be elected to replace family. Early years of child development are years when the family is the entire child universe. This family environment ensures all parameters in order to develop normally. If the family is missing and in its place we are

dealing with an impersonal and institutionalized environment, the classical Freudian psychoanalysis tells us that these individuals will remain with serious traumas, sometimes almost impossible to solve. The first 5-7 years of life is the stage in which the family is crucial to normal development of every person. So when we will weigh, at a consequentialist level, what would be worse, bringing an unwanted child into the world and placed in orphanages, or abortion, we incline to the last "solution". We say that are less serious consequences for an abortion unless we are dealing with an unwanted full-term pregnancy, and then with a child who will spend his childhood in an orphanage. The traumas analyzed from a psychoanalytic perspective for this case seems to tilt the balance, again in favor of abortion.

They will represent in our view, three types of situations that from a consequentialist perspective, abortion is more desirable than a pregnancy carried to term, followed by a birth. In order to complete the balance, protecting us from a unilateral approach, we will portray, in terms of deontology the arguments against abortion.

3. Arguments against abortion from the perspective of deontological ethics

The horizon of deontological ethics is based on a different understanding of the essence of humanity, or what we call "human nature". We depicted before the Kantian dimension of "categorical imperative", but this philosophical perspective is reinforced by a religious dimension, in our case from Christianity. According to this perspective each person or human being is a form of divine creation. All people are created "in the image and likeness of God." Life is the gift of God, and everyone should enjoy this gift unconditionally. The right to life is based on this horizon, that God as absolute Principle and universally unique, is the only source of life, and also only divinity has moral legitimacy and right to end all life. Every human and implicitly each product of human conception have the right to life unconditionally. No human is entitled or legitimate to end a form of human life. In these circumstances, abortion is a sin because it contradicts divine order, which is the natural order of the universe. (Adrian Gh. Paul, *The sin of abortion and anthropological implications on the fate of human life*, in the Romanian Journal of Bioethics, Vol. 8, No. 1, January-March 2010)

It should be noted that not only in Christianity is condemned the abortion, but in Hinduism or Buddhism, or in two other major religions of mankind, for the purposes of large number of believers. Hinduism spread in India includes hundreds of millions of followers, and Buddhism especially spread in Asia includes just as many believers. "Hindu sacred texts are expressed quite clearly in regard of abortion, associating it with the worst sins that a Hindu believer can commit. These texts plus the doctrine concerning karma and reincarnation law, substantiate intransigent attitude of Hinduism towards abortion. Regarding Buddhism, traditional embryology and the principle of nonviolence, reached the level of life mode, are the ones that determine an attitude similar to Hindu." (Constantin-Iulian Damian, *Abortion from the perspective of Eastern religions: Hinduism and Buddhism*, in Romanian Journal of Bioethics Vol 8, no. 1, January-March 2010)

Arguments of this type have a very big problem in the sense that relies on unproven rationally assumption that God exists. This assumption can always be attacked by a person who is declared atheist, or a scientist who wants to have access to testable evidence and intersubjective verifiable empirically, as practiced in the natural sciences. This assumption highly questionable, cannot be the subject only of faith of each of us, only that the faith universe is based on mystical, revelatory, intuitive and direct experiences that, by definition, are opposed to logical demonstration that starts from the premises described as being true and by derivation are obtained conclusions, which will be regarded as being true. To prevent this endless controversy discussion and rather less productive of our approach, we will explore the existential situations, types of human experience to qualify abortion as a wrong solution, a solution that can be successfully avoided and the consequences to be beneficial for everyone involved in this situation.

a) Pregnancy resulting from sexual behavior without specific education, and subject to a precarious financial situation. This type of existential situation is quite common including in Romanian society after the Revolution in December 1989. Among youth, especially among teenagers in high school these situations may occur frequently. Due to the lack of sexual education, due to lack of means of contraception or information about sexually transmitted diseases, or information on the risks of unwanted pregnancy, we can face such situations. The sexual education in European advanced societies among youth is meant to empower them for the purposes of risk awareness that they draw with the emergence of unprotected sexual intercourse.

If we are dealing with this category of existential situations a very important factor is the family of the pregnant teenager. Many abortions that can be avoided occur due to intransigent behavior exhibited by parents. Young girls are comprised of fear, fear of not upsetting their parents and then inevitably resort to abortion. These women don't have an income; have not yet graduated, at least the compulsory education cycle. The status of high school student may conflict with the status of mother, and this conflict of statuses can be a cause for this type of abortion. This problematic situation can be solved primarily through advanced educational system in this regard. The education should be initiated in family and continued by the educational system. The government public policies must be materialized in the ability to financially support a young woman in such a situation.

In this case we conclude in favor of the arguments against abortion. Not only that abortion can be successfully avoided but the consequences may be far better than if this phenomenon would occur. The society may act and so we refer to official state institutions and NGOs, so that any woman who ends up in this situation receive practical support, namely financial support, psychological counseling medical information support and so on. For the Western European space and generally for the Occidental civilization space these issues are satisfactorily resolved. Perhaps the Romanian society will also solve them satisfactorily in the near future through educational programs of youth responsibility regarding sexuality and through public politics at both national and regional level or maybe at a community level. The new trend of the European Union refers to the size of regionalization with emphasis on development of local communities.

Another situation not insignificant that can be avoided refers to the precarious financial situation either of the women who end up being pregnant or for poor families. Although abortion is not desirable in the first instance, however, this phenomenon becomes a reality in the absence of financial alternative. The absence of financial means "coerce" many women to resort to abortion, although not being what they wish. In this case the society may actually interfere through public policy, which means providing reasonable quantities of money sufficient to enable a woman in such a situation to avoid abortion. The Romanian society and state institutions might consider, for example, the Nordic model, such as Sweden in this regard.

b) Abortions caused by misdiagnosis. This type of situation can be invoked by the camp of those who are against abortion towards cases raised in the second case presented by us previously. It is about situations where there is suspicion that the fetus is seriously ill, suffers serious physical and mental malformations. In this situation can be invoked cases where doctors were wrong, or errors have been made in the medical act. After committing abortion, then it could be established that the baby was perfectly healthy.

In order to avoid such situations, the medical examination must be performed correctly. All analyzes must be complete and correct, and possibly, if time allows, it would be appropriate to repeat them, so any suspicion of error is eliminated. For this we need both competent medical personnel and performant medical equipment, and, not least, patients should afford them in financial terms.

It is clear that in this situation, those who are placed in the camp "against" abortion rely on a certain degree of hazard that must be removed to establish such a terrible diagnosis. We have remembered that in this case the Romanian Orthodox Church recommended childbirth, even if he is suffering from serious health problems. (Ștefan Iloaie, *Morality and life. Romanian Orthodox Church Documents on Bioethics*, in Romanian Journal of Bioethics, Vol 7, no. 2, April-June 2009) This position is based on the fact that every human life, whether manifested in the horizon health or stands under the sign of serious medical conditions, is a gift from God. In these circumstances, the family or the mother in question should accept the situation, understand it and assume it in order to enjoy this "divine gift". In theory, when we realize this statement, the arguments are presented naturally, but when situation are lived existentially surely that a different kind of horizon takes place in the acceptance or rejection of such arguments. What we want to emphasize is that the importance of the consequences cannot be denied, hidden or concealed in the roof of moral principles which the human found in an existentialist horizon dominated by the absurd and permanent suffering cannot understand and implicitly accept.

c) Unwanted pregnancy by the “natural parents” but wanted by infertile couples.

This last situation may be invoked as a counterargument to the situations presented in the third category of cases relied upon by those who are "pro" abortion. Even if the natural parents or the mother does not want the child, it may be that other families or couples who want children and cannot have any in a natural way or by artificial insemination, wish to adopt such a child. We are dealing with a situation where one or both members of the family

or couple are sterile, that sex cells are not viable for the act of procreation, or the woman cannot get pregnant. However, these people want to adopt children with the opportunity to give them an education and a normal development.

In this case, abortion can be avoided and the consequences are less serious to all parties. First, the child, even if it is not desired by the natural parents has an unexpected chance to be born and to be educated and raised in a normal family environment. Natural parents, the mother in particular, can be "liberated" from the burden of conscience when committing abortion and adoptive parents can get a child that even if he hasn't the couple heredity may be a reasonable solution for a rather delicate problem.

To avoid any kind of hazard and to enable such a happy situation should be developed a computerized system in which access to information is important, moreover, to be made the most easily. To do this, infertile couples who want to adopt children should be placed in a database that can be easily accessed by other couples or women who do not want children resulting from unwanted pregnancies. Such a situation could be a happy alternative to the possibility that an unwanted child of natural parents to go to orphanages, namely in the institutional environment specialized for these situations. A foster family may be the only "healthy" solution for growth and development, because we remembered that the family cannot be substituted by an institutionalized and impersonal environment. Such institutional environment can be a traumatic factor in the development of the child's personality and the psychoanalytic perspective confirms this truth.

These would be existential situations which can be invoked by those who are in the camp of "against" abortion. As we have tried to highlight some problematic situations in which it seems that the arguments "for" abortion seem to be stronger, similarly in order to balance the scales, we sought to highlight certain existential situations in which abortion can be avoided successful and consequences are regarded as beneficial as moral and implicitly desirable. Being in the end of our approach, some important conclusions are required.

4. Conclusions

The two categories of ethical theories in terms of which we tried to make our analysis regarding abortion, namely: teleological ethics, deontological and consequentialist ethics cannot be reducible and cannot cover in a unilateral way all existential situations that we can invoke. There are times when consequentialist seems to seek a favorable balance; as, indeed, there are situations in which deontological perspective works very well.

It is important to guard oneself against absolutization that can lead us to blind alley or unsolvable, absurd situation. We cannot operate only with teleology, as otherwise we cannot always scroll with a rigid and in-transformable deontology. Also, we must realize that we can always mislead the argument; no one between people should claim to be infallible. Such a claim cannot be regarded as authentically philosophical. Critical attitude, authentic philosophy means that we can apply a strict and critical examination, including our own arguments, prejudices, beliefs, etc.

This happens because the ethical theories in their core are founded on certain ways of understanding moral values on specific semantic horizons regarding the intelligibility of human nature. "The basic idea is that morality is an area extremely heterogeneous: "The basic idea is that morality is an area extremely heterogeneous: there is not only a single type of good, a only way to be just; moral values are multiple and are incommensurable. This diversity of the moral domain is irreducible. Sometimes anti-theorists bring for their support Aristotle, which in *Nicomachean Ethics* (1096b) stated that values such as those of courage, justice, friendship are distinct from one another and cannot be brought under one roof. And if moral principles and theories are tools that will cover underneath them all this diversity, to bring it to a single model to reduce diversity in a simple appearance, but united by a common depth - when their goal is not reductionist then is not justifiable. (Miroiu, Bucharest, 1995, p 16)

There is a "clash of values" that can be found in any ethical horizon (happiness can "interfere" with the truth, for example), or we can talk about radically different ways of thinking the meaning of a value. We could talk about the history of the concept of "good", the history of the concept of "happiness", the history of the concept of "freedom" and so on, in which to find different semantic horizons, even contradictory.

One of the most important values of civilized society in the XXI century is the freedom of decision. Individual autonomy, its actional responsibility is based on the possibility decision's freedom. From the perspective of democracy is more preferable unfaltering the freedom of decision, than restricting the right to decide freely,

especially in delicate existential situations. More over, this perspective harmonizes, in our case with the Orthodox Christian religious dimension, where the deeds responsibility is individual. Each of us will answer to God for our actions, but for this, each of us must be able to freely decide which option we prefer. Of course, these decisions or choices must be made knowingly, weighing both "argumentative plates of balance".

Under these conditions we will not tilt the balance in any way. There are situations "for" abortion and there are situations "against" abortion. We cannot unilaterally establish a single rule. "The case" is very important to be correctly analyzed by both patient and physician and also by a bioethicist. It is important to highlight the "uniqueness" of the case, the specific circumstances and the final decision must belong to the female person faced with such a dramatic situation such as abortion.

Bibliography

- Ross, sir David (1998). *Aristotle*, Bucharest: Humanitas Publisher's House.
- Štefan, Ionuț (2010). *Aristotle and Presocratics*, Giurgiu: Pelican Publisher's House.
- Mureșan, Valentin (2002). *The utilitarianism of John Stuart Mill*, Bucharest: Paideia Publisher's House.
- Mureșan, Valentin (2012). *Three ethical theories: Kant, Mill, Hare*, Bucharest: University of Bucharest Publisher's House.
- Kant, Immanuel (1972). *The Critique of Practical Reason*, Bucharest: Scientifical Publiser's House.
- Miroiu, Adrian (1994). *Applied ethics*, Bucharest: Alternative Publisher's House.
- Thomson, Judith Jarvis (1994). A pleading for abortion, in *Applied ethics*, coord. by Adrian Miroiu, Bucharest: Alternative Publisher's House.
- Hare, R., M. (1994). Abortion and the golden rule, in *Applied ethics*, coord. by Adrian Miroiu, Bucharest: Alternative Publisher's House
- Iloaie, ř Stefan (2009). Moral and life. The Romanian Orthodox Church Documents on Bioethics, in *Romanian Journal of Bioethics*, Vol. 7, No. 2, April – June.
- Paul, Adrian, G., (2010). The sin of abortion and the anthropological implications on the fate of human life, in *Romanian Journal of Bioethics*, Vol. 8, Nr. 4, October– December.
- Buta, Mircea, Gelu, Buta, Iulia, Alexandra (2008). The right to be born, in *Romanian Journal of Bioethics*, Vol. 6, Nr. 2, April – June.
- Freud, Sigmund (1991). *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, Bucharest: „Măiastra” Publisher's House.
- Damian, Constantin, Iulian (2010). Abortion from the perspective of Eastern religions: Hinduism and Buddhism, in *Romanian Journal of Bioethics*, Vol. 8, Nr. 1, January - March.
- Astărăstoae, Vasile, Trif, Almoš, Bela (1998). *Essentialia in bioethics*, Iași: Medical Publisher's House.
- Scripcaru, Gheorghe, Ciucă, Aurora, Astărăstoae, Vasile, Scripcaru, Călin (1998). *Bioethics, life sciences and human rights*, Iasi: Polirom Publisher's House.

Internet resources

- www.bioethics.gov/
- <http://www.mcgill.ca/biomedicalethicsunit/>
- www.nuffieldbioethics.org/
- www.thewhewatlantis.com/archive/8/bowman.htm
- www.bioethics.net/journal/
- www.masterbioethics.org/
- www.bioethics.iastate.edu/