

: ,

:

1.

1 (induced abortion) 500,000,000 가
 (, 1990). 가
 (Henshaw, 1990).
 1)
 2) 269 14 가
 (, 1996: , 1990) . 가
 “ (,
 1990)”
 (Green, 1993).
 , 19 가
 가
 , “ ”
 270 “ , ” 3) ‘ ’가
 가 (Dans, 1992),
 1995 , “
 , ”(, 1996)
 가 가 가
 , 가 ,
 ,

가

2.

- 1)
- 2)
- 3)

3.

가 ‘ 가

- 1)

(人工妊娠中絶, artificial termination): 가

20

28

500g

가

(elective)

(voluntary)

(, 1991).

가

“ ”

- 2)

, 가

(1991)

가

, 가

가

가 ‘ ’

, 가

12

20

28

28

가

가

가

가

1) (conservative position): (the pro-lifers)

”(, 1994) 가 “ = 가 (模償)”(, 1992: , 1992) . 2
7

“ (, 1990 譯語), “ (, 1994)” , 가 (, 1992).

가 가 가 가 “ = (Beody, 1988), Singer(1993)

가 (slipperey slope argument)"

Noonan(1987) , 가 가 가 가 가

“ = ”

(Singer, 1993).

가

가

2)

(liberal position);

(the pro-choicers)

가

가

가

가

가

가

가

가

(Brody, 1988).

Thomson(1971)

9

4)

Tooley (1972)

가

가

가 ,

가

Warren(1987) “ ”

가

가

가

가

5)

가

가

가

가

3)

(moderate position)

(1)

. Singer(1993)
 :
 :
 :
 Singer(1993) Warren(1987)
 가
 가 가 가
 , ‘ , , ‘
 , ‘ , ‘
 , ,
 가 가 가
 가 가 , 가

Singer(1993)
 Buckle(1990) () Parfit(1984) (1996)
 14
 가 ,

(2)
 가 (Sumner, 1981).

Callahan(1987) “ (replacement theory)”
 ” 가 가
 “ 가 x y
 , 가
 가 ,
 가 , 가

가
 가
 가
 가
 가?
 . Held(1978) 가 가

가
가
()

(4) :
Holmgrn & Uddenberg(1994) 가

가 Gilligan(1982)
(pro-life) (pro-choice) 3
가

가
“ ”

Gilligan (1990)
“ ” “ ”

가 “ ” “

가 ” (1990) 가
가

가

90% 가 ‘ ’ 16.7% ‘ ’가
 216(18.0%), ‘ ’가 214(17.8%), 가 770(64%) (1992)
 ‘ ’ 55 (27%), 119 (58.3%), 43 (21.1%), 23 (11.3%),
 16 (7.8%), 28 (13.7%), 24 (11.8%)“
 (1992) 19.7%가
 , 가 39.5%, 가 14.6%
 , 7.4%
 , (1992) ‘ ’가 66.0%.
 10.4%, 6.5%. 5.5%, 1.7%, 0.9%’
 (1994) 14
 8가 “
 ”
 가 가 55.6% (44.4%)
 (, 1991), (1992) 가 ‘ 31.7%, 56.3%가 , 4.5%가
 . 7.5%
 “ , , , , ,
 , , ” (1975, : 1995,).
 가
 (Adler et. al., 1990).
 (1995) Parse
 “가 , 가 , 가
 가 ”

1.

(, 1994
) (1994), (1994) , ,

(Arras, 1991) (1994), (1994)
(Jonsen & Toulmin, 1988; Jonsen, 1991) Beauchamp &
Childress(1994)가 1970
가 (1994), (Richardson, 1990; Degrazia, 1992) “

- 1)
- 2)
- 3)
- 4)
- 5)

가
2.

1) : 1996 7 8 23 S
10 , 20 17

14 14 1
, 2 6
2) : 가

3 가
3)

가 , 가

30 -50 가

3.

1) : 6

2) :

3) :
4) 1, 4 가 1, 1, 1,
1, 4 가

1.

31 43 6, 33 1 7
1 -10 1 4
가 가
6 (5) , , 1
4 1
5 , 1
3 가 3 가 가
가 가 가 가

2.

14 6 .8 6 3가
.6
1)
2)
3) 가 가
가

1)
< 1> (A)
(3 .31
1)
1994 10 , 3 d
가8 가 가
가 가

(가) : 가? 가

가?

() : 1 가 가 .

가

2 가

가

3 , 가 : 가

가

() : 가 3가 가

Gilligan . Gilligan

가

A 가

A 1

Callahan A

가 가 B C가 가

가

Singer

Haretr

가 “

가 (Callahan, 1987)”

2)

< 4> (D).

가

4

4

가

(가) : 가 가? (31).

()

:

가

:

가

가 가

가

가

()

:

D가

“ ”가

가

D “ ”

가?

가

가

가

(Held, 1978).

Callahan

D가

, D가

“ ”

가

가

(1990)

D가

“ ”

. D

가

가

3)

< 5>

(E)

가

가

가 16

. 20

가 ,

43

50 60

가

1

가

가

가

, 7

가

가

가

< 6>

(F)

5 1

가 . 4

.(가? “ ? ”

.(31)

(가) :
가?
()

: 가
가 : 가
가 가

() : 가 가 가

가 E F

3. :

“ ” 가
“ ” “ ” “ ” 가

1) 가 가 : 가

가 .
 2) 가 : 가
 가 가
 , 가 가 .
 가 .

1.
 1 A ,
 가 가 .
 Holmgren & Uddenberg(1994)
 Gilligan(1982)
 “ 가 ” 가 “
 ”

가
 1) . 2) ,
 3) 가
 가

2. 가
 Callahan(1987) ,
 Singer(1993) 가 Held(1987) 가
 Hard(1975)
 , Callahan(1987)
 (1990)가
 가
 “ 가 가 ”
 , “ 가
 ”

“ 가 ” 가, “ 가
 ”, “가 ”
 가
 Uddenberg (1994), (1991), Tores & Forrest(1988). Holmgrn & (1992)
 (1996)
 , “ 가 ” 가
 ” 가
 “ ”
 가
 가 28
 14 가 가 28
 100 가
 Singer(1993)
 Callahan(1987)
 17 6 가
 (Jonsen & Toulmin. 1988: Jonsen, 1991)

(Richardson, 1990: Degrzia, 1992)

1)

“ ” .
, 2) , 3)

가

가

(1996)

6) 7)

가

가

가

1

가

1. 1988-1993 , 1988 31
, 1989 26 , 1990 42 , 1991 33 , 1992 15 , 1993 32 , 1988
4 , 1989 7 , 1991 6 , 1992 9 , 1993 8 .

2. (1991) ,
, 49.4% , 25.5%
, 25.1% .

3. , , , 2
(1996. 7. 1)

4. .
.
가
가
가

5. :
:

6.
7.
가

12

1. (1995).
2. (1996).
3. (1996).
4. (1991).
5. (1995).
6. 14 , 135
7. (1992).
8. (1991).
9. (1994).
10. (1994). 가
11. (1995).
12. (1995).
13. (1994). , 24(2): 190-205
:157- 174
14. (1992).
15. (1992). : , 7: 54-85.
16. (1994). : 가
17. (1996),
18. (1990).
19. (1991).

20. (1994). (), : .
21. (1975). , 가 , : 191-198.
22. 가 (1994). 醫學倫理, : .
23. , (1995). , : .
24. (1991). 30 , : .
25. (1995). , : .
26. (1990). , : .
27. 27 , 269 , 270 .
28. Adler, N.F., & Wyatt, G.E.(1990), Psychological responses after abortion, *Science*. 248: 41-44
29. Arras, J.D.(1991), Getting down to cases: the revival of casuistry in bioethics, *The Journal of medicine and Philosophy*, 16: 29-51.
30. Beauchamp, t.L. & Childress, J.F.(1994), *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*(4th ed), N.Y.:Oxford University Press.
31. Callahan, D.(1987). Abortion decisions: personal morality, in Mappes, T.A. & Zembaty, J.S., ed., *Social Ethics*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, pp. 22-28.
32. Dans, P.E.(1992), Medical students and abortion: Reconciling personal beliefs and professional roles at one medical school, *Academic Medicine*, 67(3): 207-211.
33. Degrzia, D.(1992), Moving forward in bioethical theory: Theories, case, and specified principlism, *The Journal of Medicine and Philosophy*, 17(5): 511-539.
34. English, J.(1987), Abortion and the concept of a person, in Mappes, T.A. & Zembaty, J.S., ed., *Social Ethics*, New York: McGraw-hill Book Company, pp. 14-21.
35. Gilligan, C.(1982). In a Different Voice(: , : , 1994).
36. Green, S.(1993). (), : .
37. Held, V.(1978). Abortion and rightt to life, in *Bioethics and Human Right*, Ed. by Banman, E.L., & Bandman, B., ed.(1978), Boston: Liitel, Brown and Company, pp. 103-108.
38. Henshaw, S.K.(1986), Induces abortion: A worldwide perspective, *Family Planning Perspectivex*, 18(6): 250-254.
39. Henshaw, S.K.,(1990). Induced abortion: A world review, 1990, *Family Planning Perspectives*, 22(2): 76-89.
40. Jonsen, A.R.(1991). Casuistry as methodology in clinical ethics, *Theoretical Medicine*, 12: 296-307.
41. Jonsen, A.R. & Toulmin, S.(1988). *The Abuse of Casuistry: A Histry of Moral Reasoning*, Berkley: University of California Press.
42. Mappes, T.A & Zembaty, J.S., ed.(1987), *Social Ethics*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
43. Noonan, J., Jr.(1987), An almost absolute value in history, in Mappes, T.A. &

- Zembaty, J.S., ed., *Social Ethics*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, pp. 8-13.
44. Pence, G.E.(1990), *Classic Cases in Medical Ethics* New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
45. Richardson, H.S.(1990). Specifying norms as a way to resolve concrete ethical problems, *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 19(4):279-310.
46. Sarvis, B. & Rodman, H.(1973), *The Abortion Controversy*, New York: Columbia Univ, Press.
47. Thomson, J.J.(1971). A defense of abortion, *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 1(1): 47-66.
48. Tietze, C.(1963). Some facts about legal abortion, in *Human Fertility and Population Problems*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing Company, INC., pp.222-274.
49. Torres, A. & Forrest, J.D.(1988), Why woman have abortion?, *Family Planning perspective*, 20(4): 169-176.
50. Warren, A.M.(1987). On the Moral and Legal Status of Abortion, in Mappes, T.A. & Zembaty, J.A., ed., *Social Ethics*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, pp.14-21

- Abstract -

Key word : Induced abortion, nursing ethics, Ingrated case method

Ethical Argumants and Problems Analysis Related to Induced Abortion

Um, Young Rhan

Um, Young Rhan:Dept, of Nursing, College of Medicine, Soonchunhyand Univ

Over one million cases of the induced abortion have been conducted annually in Korea. Among those cases, most of all were illegally done, but this has not been addressed in the literature. While Korean Nurse Association Code of Ethics presents the respect for life as one of the basic ideology, it was not dealt enough in nursing education.

The purposes of the study were to activate the debate on the issues related to an induced abortion ; to introduce the related ethical theories ; and to seek the solution of the ethical problems, which will eventually result in establishing the morality of nursing practice.

The ethical theories of an induced abortion have traditionally addressed two extreme perspectives ; the conservatives who emphasize the sanctity of human life and the right of life that will never ethically allow the killing fetus ; and the liberalists who insist the right to choice for women to control their body. Since these extreme theories has not been helpful to

solve the ethical problems, the recent trend is leading to the modified theories both from conservative and liberal perspectives. The examples of the theories are the potentiality of fetus(Singer, 1993), the obligation of women to serve their body to fetus(Held, 1987), the Replacement theory (Callahan, 1987), and the Principle of Caring (Gilligan, 1982).

The study conducted the indepth interviews with 17 women who experienced the induced abortion and the 6 cases were selected to be analyzed. The cases were analyzed and interpreted by using an integrated case method which was combined of the New Casuistry(Jonsen & Toulmin, 1988 ; Jonsen, 1991) and the Specified Principlism (Richardson, 1990 ; Degrazia, 1992).

The result of analysis revealed three types of ethical problems ; (1) the responsibility of taking care of the baby to be born (2) the fear for the condition of the fetus, and (3) the choice of induced abortion as the method of birth control. The findings also revealed the related ethical principles for various situations ; the principle of caring was used for choosing an induced abortion by the subjects ; the principles of the potentiality of fetus and the obligation of women to serve their body were for the consideration for the life of fetus ; and the principle of replacement was utilized for the right to choice for women.

The ethical principles related to an induced abortion introduced in the study provided the way to solve the moral problems by applying to the clinical situations for nurses. The study also revealed the possibility of modifying the current ethical theories from the method of applying the principles to the various situation in the study. The modified theories would be more useful to guide the clinical practice with similar ethical problems.