Abortion is a matter that has been discussed for a long time. A lot of the argument stands on the moral rights that everyone gets. In this paper I want to focus on two philosophers, Judith Thomson and Don Marquis. They have a lot of the most popular and compelling arguments on the subject. The big question for the paper is this: Is abortion morally permissible? Personally, I feel as though it should be. To look more into this, I want to see what the philosophers feel on the matter. I want to equally evaluate where each side stands and then elaborate on where I stand.

To start off, I want to look at the abortion argument from Judith Thomson’s view. Thomson is a philosopher that is pro-choice and defends it with ethical dilemmas such as the giant baby dilemma or the violinist dilemma. One thing that she talks about is that argument on whether or not the fetus is considered a person and the rights that go along with it. According to Thomson, “I propose that we grant that the fetus is a person from the moment of conception” (Vaughn, 2015, p.175). She shows that she agrees with the idea that the fetus is considered a human but follows that up saying “Every person has a right to life. So the fetus has a right to life. No doubt the mother has a right to decide what shall happen in and to her body; everyone would grant that” (Vaughn, 2015, p.175). As the paper reads on, she says that the woman has every right to abort the child because it is her right to do whatever she wants with her body, but it is very inhumane because just as she has right to her body, the fetus has a right to its life. She goes on to say that in the situation that the life of the fetus will also cost the life of the mother, it is okay to abort the child because the mother has the right to do what’s best for her life.

This next philosopher will argue the opposite of Thomson’s argument. Don Marquis is a pro-life philosopher that argues that abortion is immoral. One of the ways that he views abortion is that the fetus has the opportunity to be a fully grown human with just as many rights as anyone else. He compares this thought to seeing a pre-med student, who is not yet a doctor, or an acorn, that is not yet an oak tree. The basic grounds this his argument stands on is that just because the fetus is not fully grown or able to defend itself, doesn’t mean that it should be treated any differently than we would treat anything else. You can see this same idea in his paper, “Why Abortion is Immoral,” and break down the problem that most pro-choice philosophers run into. According the Marquis, “The pro-choicer fares no better. She may attempt to find reasons why killing infants, young children, and severely retarded is wrong which are independent of her major principle that is supposed to explain the wrongness of taking human life, but which will not also make abortion immoral. This is no easy task” (Vaughn, 2015, p.195). A lot like how he expressed his idea earlier, he stands with the idea that, whether it is a fetus or not, it counts and it is immoral.

The big question that this paper stands on is if abortion should be ethically permissible? I want to start by mentioning that I’ve always seen this argument from a religious background, and personally to a certain extent, I agree with a lot of the pro-life mindset. The fetus should be considered a person just like everyone else, because essentially it is. Maybe they can’t articulate how they feel at this moment or know as much as we’ve grown to learn, but either way, that doesn’t make a fetus less human. That said, I would personally side with a lot of the pro-life philosopher and say that it is permissible, but more to any extent and not just to a certain degree. Though the fetus has just as many rights as the mother, at the end of the day, it is the mother’s choice.

I also like to look at this as if a law was in place to satisfy the needs of someone who is pro-life. The only time abortion would be allowed is if the person had consensual sex. Even if it was the mother’s choice to have consensual sex, a law like that essentially strips away the life of not only her and her needs but also her ability to truly dictate what is right for her future child and bring a child into a harder life to live. This is a consideration that I feel like Marquis never takes into consideration and just something that I feel like a lot of pro-life supporters don’t take into consideration. If this child were to be born and the mother chose to take care of them. She knows she isn’t ready for parenthood and she is uncomfortable with parenting. Is it right to strip away a person’s right to a happy life if they were forced to be a parent? Or say that she chooses to give to kid up for adoption. The process for adoption isn’t simple and kids will grow up feeling abandoned and unloved and have a much harder time than most. Is it right to make a child’s life harder than it needs to be? Is it right to put that burden on the mother?

In conclusion, I feel as though abortion is morally permissible. A lot of what Thomson has to say on the argument on abortion is how I feel. Women should have to right to do what they please with their bodies and no one else should be able to dictate what is done. A lot of the argument against it is focused on the rights of the fetus but never the rights of the mother or the repercussion ahead caused by it.
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