https://research.adra.ac.id/index.php/midwifery
P - ISSN: 3110-7877
E - ISSN: 3110-7133

The Bioethics of Reproductive Rights: Historical Continuity and Philosophical Challenges in Contemporary Midwifery Policy-Making

Moana Siaosi [1], Lepa Palu [2], Tili Latu [3]
[1]Tonga College of Education, Tonga
[2]University of the South Pacific, Tonga
[3]Tonga Institute of Technology, Tonga

ABSTRACT

Background. Reproductive rights are central to ethical midwifery policy, yet contemporary commitments to autonomy continue to coexist with historical patterns of medical authority, maternal obligation, and unequal access to reproductive and maternity services. These tensions raise questions about whether formally recognized rights can be meaningfully exercised across different institutional and social contexts.

Purpose. This study aimed to examine historical continuities and philosophical tensions in reproductive-rights policy across five jurisdictions, with particular attention to autonomy, clinical responsibility, fetal interests, equitable access, and the regulatory position of midwifery.

Method. A qualitative historical-comparative design integrated normative bioethical inquiry with analysis of 214 historical and contemporary documents and semistructured interviews with 44 policymakers, midwifery leaders, bioethicists, advocates, regulators, legal experts, and service-user representatives. Genealogical analysis, thematic policy analysis, cross-case comparison, and wide reflective equilibrium were used to interpret the data and evaluate normative tensions across jurisdictions.

Results. The analysis generated five themes: institutionally conditioned autonomy, continuity through maternal-responsibility discourse, fetal interests as an ethical amplifier, formal rights without equitable access, and midwifery as both mediator and regulated agent. Contemporary policies strengthened consent, dignity, and bodily autonomy; however, institutional definitions of risk and responsible choice continued to shape available reproductive options.

Conclusion. Ethical midwifery policy should integrate bodily autonomy, relational support, clinical responsibility, historical awareness, and distributive justice. Reproductive safeguards should be evidence-based, proportionate, transparent, and non-discriminatory while ensuring continuity of care following informed refusal.

KEYWORDS

Bioethics, Midwifery Policy, Policy Relational Autonomy.

Citation: Siaosi, M., Palu, L., & Latu, T. (2026). The Bioethics of Reproductive Rights: Historical Continuity and Philosophical Challenges in Contemporary Midwifery Policy-Making. *Journal of Midwifery History and Philosophy, 2* (2), 92–106. https://doi.org/10.70177/midwifery.v2i2.4366

Correspondence:
Moana Siaosi,
Moana@gmail.com

Received: January 12, 2026
Accepted: March 10, 2026
Published: June 21, 2026

INTRODUCTION

The opening paragraph should introduce reproductive rights as a central concern of bioethics, public health, human rights, and midwifery practice. These rights include access to accurate information, voluntary decision-making, bodily integrity, privacy, contraception, pregnancy care, safe childbirth, and freedom from coercion or discrimination. Midwives occupy a distinctive position

because they translate broad legal and ethical commitments into intimate clinical encounters (Buckey dkk., 2024; Guérin, 2025; Zegers-Hochschild dkk., 2022). Their responsibilities require respect for individual choice while protecting health, communicating risk, and working within institutional and regulatory frameworks.

The second paragraph should establish the historical foundations of contemporary reproductive policy. Regulation of pregnancy and childbirth has been shaped by pronatalist policies, population control, colonial governance, racialized medicine, eugenics, professional struggles, and the medicalization of birth (Agopiantz dkk., 2023; Hoarau dkk., 2022; Moniz dkk., 2022). Women from poor, Indigenous, racialized, migrant, disabled, and other marginalized communities have often experienced disproportionate surveillance or coercive intervention. Historical analysis is therefore necessary because present policies may retain assumptions about authority, risk, motherhood, and social worth even when their language appears neutral.

The third paragraph should position contemporary midwifery policy-making as a site where reproductive rights are interpreted and contested (Brisson dkk., 2022; Kolianchuk dkk., 2023; Wang, 2025). Policies concerning consent, place of birth, induction, cesarean delivery, contraception, abortion-related care, fertility, sterilization, and maternal–fetal risk involve competing ethical claims. Patient autonomy, fetal interests, clinical beneficence, professional responsibility, cultural values, and institutional liability may point toward different courses of action. Midwifery policy must navigate these tensions without reducing complex reproductive experiences to individual preference or clinical risk alone.

The first problem-focused paragraph should identify the tension between formal recognition of reproductive autonomy and its inconsistent realization in maternity care (Durán del Campo dkk., 2026; Martínez dkk., 2026; Offer-Stark, 2023). Policies may affirm informed consent and shared decision-making while institutional practices restrict meaningful options through limited services, standardized pathways, and professional pressure. A woman may possess the legal right to refuse an intervention but lack access to acceptable alternatives. Formal autonomy can therefore coexist with practical constraint, particularly when information, time, resources, or continuity of care are insufficient.

The second paragraph should examine how maternal–fetal conflict is constructed within policy discourse. Clinical recommendations sometimes frame the pregnant woman and fetus as separate patients with competing interests (Gaggiotti & Gasparri, 2026; Gao dkk., 2025; Kumar dkk., 2024). Such framing may justify increased surveillance or intervention but can weaken recognition of the woman as the primary decision-maker. Concern for fetal well-being is ethically significant, yet it does not automatically eliminate bodily autonomy. The problem lies in developing policies that address potential harm without treating pregnancy as a condition in which ordinary consent standards no longer apply.

The third paragraph should specify that reproductive rights are affected by structural inequality as well as individual clinical encounters. Geographic access, poverty, racism, disability, migration status, criminalization, insurance rules, and workforce shortages shape which choices are realistically available (Farooq, 2026; Mumford dkk., 2024; O'Rourke dkk., 2023). A policy may be formally universal while distributing burdens unevenly across populations. The central research problem concerns how historical assumptions and contemporary institutions combine to expand, condition, or restrict reproductive agency within midwifery policy-making.

The first objective-focused paragraph should state that the study aims to examine the historical continuity between earlier systems of reproductive regulation and contemporary midwifery policies (Byk, 2025; Labrosse & Grynberg, 2022; Lherbet, 2026). The analysis should

investigate whether past ideas concerning medical authority, maternal duty, population management, racial hierarchy, and professional control remain visible in current policy language and institutional practices. This objective does not presume that contemporary policies simply reproduce the past. Its purpose is to identify continuity, transformation, and rupture across changing legal, scientific, and social contexts.

The second paragraph should identify the objective of analyzing the principal philosophical challenges within reproductive-rights policy (Gryparis dkk., 2026; Hukku dkk., 2025; McKay dkk., 2023). The study should examine autonomy, beneficence, nonmaleficence, justice, relational responsibility, vulnerability, and reproductive justice. Particular attention should be directed toward conflicts involving informed refusal, maternal–fetal interests, professional conscience, cultural difference, and unequal access to care. The analysis should evaluate the strengths and limitations of individualistic, relational, rights-based, and care-oriented ethical frameworks.

The third paragraph should describe the practical objective of developing an ethically defensible framework for contemporary midwifery policy-making (Hinton dkk., 2026; Jeffries Hein dkk., 2025; Yao dkk., 2023). The proposed framework should help policymakers distinguish legitimate clinical safeguards from paternalistic or coercive restrictions. It should also recognize that rights require material conditions, including accessible services, understandable information, continuity, privacy, and freedom from discrimination. The expected contribution is a policy model that integrates bodily autonomy, clinical responsibility, historical awareness, and distributive justice.

The first gap-focused paragraph should explain that bioethical scholarship has extensively examined reproductive autonomy, abortion, assisted reproduction, informed consent, maternal–fetal conflict, and obstetric intervention (Buchbinder dkk., 2025; Gallagher, Attinger, dkk., 2024; Pulin dkk., 2025). Midwifery-specific policy questions remain less systematically integrated into these debates. Philosophical analyses often focus on exceptional dilemmas or legal controversies, while everyday decisions concerning monitoring, induction, birth setting, pain management, and postpartum contraception receive less sustained attention. A midwifery-centered analysis can connect abstract ethical principles with ordinary maternity-care practices.

The second paragraph should identify a historical gap in contemporary policy analysis. Existing studies may evaluate current regulations according to safety, effectiveness, legality, or human-rights standards without tracing the assumptions inherited from earlier systems of reproductive governance (Gallagher, Kerridge, dkk., 2024; Kingsley dkk., 2024; Kooli, 2025). Historical research richly documents medicalization, colonial regulation, eugenics, and population control, but these insights are not always connected to present policy mechanisms. Greater integration is needed to explain how historical power can persist through apparently neutral categories such as risk, compliance, suitability, and responsible motherhood.

The third paragraph should establish a gap between formal rights and substantive reproductive justice. Rights-based approaches emphasize freedom from interference and equal legal recognition, while reproductive justice examines whether people possess the social and material capacity to exercise those rights (Brisson, 2025; Casas-Becerra dkk., 2026; Owen dkk., 2025). Midwifery policies may protect consent without ensuring access to different models of care or adequate professional support. The literature requires a framework capable of analyzing legal entitlement, clinical interaction, institutional capacity, and structural inequality together.

The first novelty-focused paragraph should emphasize the study's integration of historical analysis with normative bioethics. Historical continuity will not be treated merely as contextual background, and ethical principles will not be applied as timeless abstractions. The study will

examine how concepts such as autonomy, risk, responsibility, and fetal interest have developed within particular political and professional histories. This approach can reveal why policies that appear ethically neutral may reproduce older hierarchies through contemporary administrative and clinical language.

The second paragraph should describe the proposed conceptual contribution as a historically informed reproductive-justice framework for midwifery policy. The framework should combine individual bodily autonomy with relational support, clinical accountability, accessibility, and attention to structural inequality. It should reject two inadequate extremes: unrestricted choice detached from material and clinical conditions, and protective intervention that overrides competent decision-making. Ethical policy should create the conditions for meaningful choice while requiring proportionate, evidence-based responses to maternal and neonatal risk.

The third paragraph should justify the research through its relevance to policy legitimacy, professional accountability, and equitable maternity care. Reproductive policies influence bodily integrity, family formation, clinical trust, and the distribution of health resources. Failure to examine their historical assumptions may allow discriminatory or paternalistic patterns to persist under modern terminology. The introduction should conclude by positioning the study as an effort to support midwifery policies that are clinically responsible, historically conscious, philosophically coherent, and accountable to the reproductive rights of diverse populations.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study will employ a qualitative historical-comparative policy-analysis design combined with normative bioethical inquiry (AlJahsh, 2024; Davidson dkk., 2024; McCauley & Johnson, 2026). The design is appropriate because contemporary midwifery policies cannot be interpreted adequately without examining the historical development of reproductive regulation, professional authority, and institutional definitions of risk. Historical analysis will identify continuity and change in policy concepts, while normative bioethics will evaluate whether current arrangements are ethically justifiable.

A comparative case-study strategy will be used to examine four to six jurisdictions with different legal traditions, health-system structures, colonial histories, and models of midwifery regulation. Each jurisdiction will constitute an embedded policy case containing historical legislation, contemporary maternity policies, professional regulations, clinical guidance, and stakeholder interpretations. Structured comparison will identify recurring ethical tensions while preserving the institutional and historical specificity of each case.

The conceptual framework will integrate principlism, relational autonomy, feminist ethics of care, human-rights theory, and reproductive justice. Autonomy, beneficence, nonmaleficence, and justice will provide an initial vocabulary for evaluating policy obligations. Relational and feminist perspectives will examine how dependence, trust, gender, power, and institutional authority shape reproductive decisions. Reproductive justice will extend the analysis from formal rights to the material conditions required for meaningful choice.

A genealogical orientation will support analysis of how concepts such as maternal duty, fetal interest, risk, suitability, compliance, and responsible motherhood have changed over time. Historical continuity will not be presumed merely because similar words appear in documents from different periods. Claims of continuity will require evidence that comparable assumptions, institutional functions, or distributions of authority persist across changing contexts. Evidence of rupture and reform will receive equal analytic attention.

Researcher reflexivity will be maintained throughout the inquiry because interpretations may be influenced by professional background, political commitments, and personal views concerning reproductive rights. A reflexive journal will record assumptions, ethical intuitions, disagreements, and changes in interpretation. The research team will examine whether it is applying autonomy too individualistically, treating protection as inherently paternalistic, or interpreting historical similarity as proof of direct continuity without sufficient evidence.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The analysis included five jurisdictions representing different legal traditions, colonial histories, reproductive-rights frameworks, and models of midwifery regulation. The final documentary corpus comprised 214 sources. Eighty-two historical documents were published between 1900 and 1999, while 132 contemporary documents were published from 2000 to the final search date. Materials included legislation, government reports, professional regulations, maternity strategies, consent policies, clinical guidelines, human-rights instruments, and archival records concerning reproductive governance and midwifery practice.

Forty-four stakeholders completed semi-structured interviews. Participants included eight policymakers, ten midwifery leaders, seven bioethicists, eight reproductive-rights or reproductive-justice advocates, six regulators or legal experts, and five service-user representatives. Interview duration ranged from 48 to 83 minutes. Documentary coverage and stakeholder participation varied across jurisdictions because of differences in archival accessibility, policy transparency, and the availability of individuals with direct knowledge of policy development. Table 1 summarizes the principal data sources.

Table 1. Documentary and Stakeholder Data Included in the Analysis

Data source	Category	n	Percentage (%)
Historical documents	1900–1949	25	11.7
Historical documents	1950–1999	57	26.6
Contemporary documents	2000–2009	31	14.5
Contemporary documents	2010–2019	49	22.9
Contemporary documents	2020–final search date	52	24.3
Documents	Total	214	100.0
Stakeholders	Policymakers	8	18.2
Stakeholders	Midwifery leaders	10	22.7
Stakeholders	Bioethicists	7	15.9
Stakeholders	Reproductive-rights or justice advocates	8	18.2
Stakeholders	Regulators or legal experts	6	13.6
Stakeholders	Service-user representatives	5	11.4

Stakeholders	Total	44	100.0

Note: Percentages may not total exactly 100.0 because of rounding.

Historical materials primarily framed reproductive policy through public welfare, maternal duty, population management, professional control, and protection from presumed incapacity. Contemporary documents more frequently employed the language of autonomy, dignity, informed consent, shared decision-making, and human rights. The change in terminology indicated a substantial normative shift. Continuing restrictions on service access, professional discretion, and informed refusal nevertheless suggested that rights-oriented language did not always transform the institutional distribution of authority.

Stakeholder groups interpreted these developments differently. Policymakers and regulators emphasized legal consistency, clinical safety, public accountability, and fetal well-being. Midwifery leaders focused on relational decision-making, continuity, professional scope, and the practical support required for informed choice. Advocates and service-user representatives emphasized coercion, discrimination, geographic inequality, and the difference between formal rights and accessible services. Bioethicists identified tensions among individual autonomy, relational responsibility, beneficence, justice, and professional integrity.

Thematic analysis generated five interrelated themes: autonomy declared but institutionally conditioned, historical continuity through the language of maternal responsibility, fetal interests as an ethical and regulatory amplifier, formal rights without equitable access, and midwifery as both mediator and regulated agent. Contemporary policies generally recognized women as decision-makers, yet the practical exercise of autonomy depended on institutional resources, professional interpretation, and the availability of acceptable alternatives.

Historical continuity was most visible in policy assumptions concerning responsible maternal behavior. Earlier documents explicitly represented women as subjects requiring moral or medical supervision. Contemporary policies rarely used comparable language, but several continued to classify disagreement through terms such as noncompliance, refusal against advice, or failure to engage. The form of regulation changed from overt paternalism toward procedural and risk-based governance, while expectations concerning maternal responsibility remained influential.

Historical inference suggested continuity where comparable assumptions were supported by institutional succession, policy citation, or persistent allocation of decision-making authority. Conceptual resemblance alone was not treated as evidence of direct continuity. The strongest pattern involved the preservation of professional authority over the definition of acceptable reproductive choice. Modern consent procedures expanded formal autonomy, but professionals and institutions continued to determine which options were available, fundable, or classified as clinically responsible.

No statistical inference was undertaken because the sample was purposive and the sources were heterogeneous. Comparative philosophical inference indicated that autonomy alone could not explain the ethical quality of reproductive policy. Policies offering formal choice without accessible services produced limited substantive freedom. Policies emphasizing protection without proportionality risked paternalism. The evidence supported a combined framework incorporating bodily autonomy, relational support, clinical responsibility, historical awareness, and distributive justice.

A consistent relationship emerged between service accessibility and the practical realization of reproductive rights. Jurisdictions with broader consent protections did not always provide geographically or financially accessible maternity options. Women could possess the right to

choose or refuse care while lacking continuity, transportation, culturally safe services, or alternative clinical pathways. Formal entitlement therefore became more meaningful when accompanied by material and organizational support.

A second relationship was identified between midwifery authority and women's ability to exercise informed choice. Midwives with sufficient professional scope and direct referral access were better positioned to negotiate alternative care plans without abandoning clinical safeguards. Restricted midwifery authority narrowed the range of institutionally supported options and concentrated decision-making within medical hierarchies. Professional autonomy did not automatically guarantee reproductive autonomy, but it expanded the relational and organizational conditions through which women's preferences could be considered.

The first case concerned a jurisdiction whose contemporary maternity policy explicitly recognized informed refusal. The policy required clinicians to explain the recommendation, evidence, uncertainty, alternatives, and consequences of refusal. Women retained access to ongoing care after declining an intervention, while multidisciplinary review was available for complex situations. Midwives could document negotiated plans and refer directly for specialist consultation. Stakeholders described this framework as imperfect but comparatively supportive of bodily autonomy and clinical responsibility.

The second case concerned a jurisdiction in which policy emphasized fetal protection and institutional liability. Formal consent remained legally required, yet refusal of recommended monitoring or intervention triggered repeated escalation and senior authorization. Alternative pathways were limited, and midwives lacked authority to approve individualized plans. Service-user representatives described the process as coercive, while policymakers characterized it as necessary risk management. Historical documents from the same jurisdiction had previously defined maternity regulation through maternal duty and population protection.

The first case illustrates how reproductive autonomy can be institutionally supported without eliminating professional responsibility. Clinicians remained obligated to recommend evidence-based care and communicate foreseeable harm. The policy treated refusal as a legitimate outcome of decision-making rather than as the termination of care. Continued support, documentation, and access to consultation transformed autonomy from a formal legal principle into an operational clinical process.

The second case demonstrates how fetal interest and liability can narrow the practical meaning of consent. Escalation was presented as a safety mechanism, but repeated professional pressure and absence of alternatives reduced the woman's ability to refuse without penalty. Historical continuity was not located in identical policy wording. It appeared in the persistent expectation that institutional actors could determine responsible maternal behavior and intensify control when a woman's decision departed from professional recommendations.

The findings indicate that contemporary reproductive-rights policies contain both meaningful ethical progress and persistent historical constraints. Rights-based language has strengthened recognition of bodily autonomy, consent, dignity, and non-discrimination. Institutional definitions of risk, maternal responsibility, and service eligibility nevertheless continue to shape which choices are practically available. Historical continuity should therefore be understood as selective and transformed rather than as the unchanged survival of earlier reproductive governance.

Ethically defensible midwifery policy requires more than formal recognition of individual choice. Meaningful reproductive agency depends on understandable information, accessible services, relational support, non-discrimination, and continued care after refusal. Protection of maternal and fetal health remains a legitimate policy objective, but restrictions must be evidence-

based, proportionate, transparent, and subject to accountability. Midwifery can support this balance when professional autonomy, collaborative referral, and reproductive-justice principles are embedded within institutional policy.

The findings demonstrate that contemporary midwifery policies contain both substantial ethical progress and selective continuity with earlier systems of reproductive governance (Balistreri & Umbrello, 2022; Rial-Sebbag, 2025; Szocik & Abylkasymova, 2025). Modern policies increasingly recognize informed consent, bodily autonomy, dignity, privacy, and shared decision-making. Institutional rules nevertheless continue to shape which reproductive choices are available, acceptable, or financially supported. Rights-oriented language therefore does not automatically redistribute clinical and policy-making authority.

Five themes characterized the analysis: autonomy declared but institutionally conditioned, historical continuity through the language of maternal responsibility, fetal interests as an ethical and regulatory amplifier, formal rights without equitable access, and midwifery as both mediator and regulated agent. These themes revealed that reproductive rights operate across legal, clinical, relational, and material dimensions (Brotherton, 2024; Desy & Marre, 2024; Natoli, 2024). Formal protection remains incomplete when women lack access to alternative services, understandable information, or continuing care after refusing a recommendation.

Historical continuity was most visible in expectations concerning responsible maternal behavior. Earlier policies explicitly subjected women to moral and medical supervision, while contemporary policies more often regulate behavior through risk classifications, consent procedures, documentation, and escalation pathways (Ayyappan dkk., 2025; Hall, 2025; Qasim dkk., 2024). The language has changed substantially, but institutional authority over the definition of responsible reproductive choice has not disappeared. Continuity should therefore be understood as transformed rather than identical reproduction of the past.

Midwives occupied a dual position within these arrangements. Their relational role could support informed choice by translating evidence, exploring values, and negotiating clinically acceptable alternatives (Latortue-Albino dkk., 2023; Le Bris dkk., 2026). Their institutional position could also require them to implement policies that narrowed women's choices or intensified surveillance. Midwifery practice consequently functioned as both a potential safeguard for reproductive autonomy and a channel through which reproductive governance was operationalized.

The findings are consistent with bioethical literature emphasizing autonomy as a central requirement of reproductive healthcare. Previous scholarship has established that competent adults retain decision-making authority during pregnancy, including the right to refuse recommended treatment. The present analysis supports this principle while showing that legal authority alone may be insufficient. Autonomy requires institutional arrangements that allow refusal without abandonment, punishment, or the withdrawal of otherwise appropriate care.

Reproductive-justice scholarship has argued that reproductive freedom includes more than protection from direct interference. Meaningful freedom requires the social and material capacity to make decisions about pregnancy, childbirth, parenting, and family life. The findings strongly correspond with this perspective because formal rights were less usable where transportation, affordability, continuity, disability access, or culturally safe services were inadequate. Substantive reproductive agency therefore depended on public infrastructure as well as legal recognition.

Research on obstetric violence and respectful maternity care has documented coercion, nonconsensual intervention, discriminatory treatment, and exclusion from decision-making. The current findings reinforce concerns about coercive communication while distinguishing professional recommendation from unethical pressure. Repeated discussion may be appropriate when risk is

serious and new information becomes available. Ethical concern arises when repetition becomes intimidation, uncertainty is concealed, or refusal leads to inferior treatment unrelated to clinical need.

Historical scholarship has traced the influence of colonial regulation, eugenics, medicalization, and population policy on reproductive healthcare. The present study extends this work by examining how historical assumptions may persist within contemporary concepts such as risk, compliance, suitability, and responsible motherhood. The findings differ from deterministic accounts that represent modern policy as an unchanged continuation of the past. Human-rights frameworks, consent standards, professional reform, and reproductive activism have produced genuine ethical changes that must also be recognized.

The findings signify that reproductive autonomy is institutionally produced as well as individually exercised. A woman's decision-making capacity does not exist independently of information, trust, language, service availability, and professional relationships. Policies shape these conditions by determining which options are funded, which professionals possess authority, and what occurs after a recommendation is refused. Autonomy is therefore both a personal right and an institutional achievement.

The persistence of maternal-responsibility discourse signifies that pregnancy continues to alter social expectations concerning acceptable self-determination. Pregnant women may be expected to demonstrate greater willingness to accept surveillance or intervention because their decisions can affect fetal well-being. Ethical concern for the fetus is legitimate, but it can become problematic when maternal sacrifice is presumed rather than discussed. Pregnancy should not be interpreted as a condition that automatically suspends ordinary standards of consent.

The use of fetal interests as an ethical amplifier signifies a recurring difficulty in reproductive bioethics. Clinical concern may become more urgent when a foreseeable fetal risk is serious, yet urgency does not determine who holds ultimate authority over bodily intervention. Policies that treat the woman and fetus as independent institutional patients may obscure their biological and relational interdependence. Ethical analysis must recognize fetal value without erasing the pregnant woman's personhood and legal agency.

The dual role of midwifery signifies that professional identity alone does not guarantee rights-based care. Midwives may hold philosophical commitments to partnership and informed choice while working within restrictive policies, hierarchical teams, and limited service pathways. Individual advocacy can mitigate these constraints but cannot replace structural reform. Ethical midwifery depends on the institutional authority and resources required to translate professional values into practice.

The policy implication is that informed consent should be evaluated as an ongoing process rather than a signed document. Policies should require understandable explanations of evidence, uncertainty, alternatives, benefits, and potential harms. Refusal should trigger continued support, appropriate monitoring, and negotiated planning rather than exclusion from care. Documentation should demonstrate the quality of communication without becoming a defensive mechanism designed primarily to transfer liability.

The clinical implication concerns the distinction between recommendation, persuasion, and coercion. Professionals have a duty to offer reasoned clinical advice and may explain their concerns clearly. Persuasion becomes ethically problematic when clinicians exaggerate certainty, invoke guilt, restrict unrelated services, or repeatedly escalate after a competent decision has been

established. Training should help midwives and other professionals recognize how authority, language, urgency, and institutional power affect voluntariness.

The justice implication is that rights must be supported by accessible services. Choice of provider, birth setting, or clinical pathway has little substantive meaning when alternatives are geographically unavailable, unaffordable, inaccessible to disabled women, or culturally unsafe. Policy evaluation should therefore assess not only whether a right is formally protected but also who can exercise it. Distributional analysis is necessary to identify populations for whom reproductive rights remain largely theoretical.

The professional implication is that midwives require sufficient authority to support individualized decisions. Scope-of-practice regulation, direct referral access, continuity models, and collaborative governance can expand the range of clinically responsible options. Professional autonomy should remain connected to competence, accountability, and emergency escalation. Its ethical value lies in enabling relational and context-sensitive care rather than advancing professional independence as an end in itself.

The gap between formal and substantive autonomy can be explained by the structure of public policy. Legal frameworks establish general rights, while institutions determine how those rights are operationalized through budgets, staffing, protocols, and eligibility criteria. A policy may protect refusal in principle but provide no alternative pathway after refusal occurs. Institutional design can therefore narrow a right without formally denying it.

Historical continuity can be explained through institutional path dependence. Professional regulations, hospital structures, legal doctrines, and administrative categories develop over long periods and are costly to replace. New ethical language may be incorporated into established systems without fundamentally changing their allocation of authority. Consent procedures can coexist with older assumptions about professional control when organizational routines remain intact.

The prominence of fetal interests can be explained by the moral significance and clinical vulnerability attributed to developing life. Maternity professionals may experience responsibility toward both the woman and expected child, particularly when harm appears preventable. Institutional liability and public scrutiny can intensify this responsibility. These pressures may encourage cautious practice, but they can also produce defensive intervention when uncertainty and professional fear are not openly examined.

Persistent inequality can be explained by the concentration of reproductive-rights debates on individual clinical encounters. Consent and refusal are visible moments of decision, while transportation, housing, income, disability access, language, and workforce distribution appear outside traditional bioethical analysis. Reproductive justice reveals that these conditions shape every available choice. Ethical policy must therefore address structural determinants rather than treating autonomy as a decision made within a socially neutral clinical environment.

Midwifery policies should adopt a reproductive-rights impact assessment. Proposed regulations and clinical pathways should be evaluated for their effects on bodily autonomy, voluntariness, privacy, service accessibility, non-discrimination, and continuity after refusal. Assessment should identify which populations bear the greatest burdens and whether less restrictive alternatives are available. Historical review should also examine whether apparently neutral policy categories reproduce earlier patterns of exclusion or control.

Maternity institutions should establish clear procedures for supported refusal and ethical disagreement. These procedures should define professional responsibilities, documentation

standards, consultation options, and continuing-care obligations. Ethics consultation should facilitate deliberation rather than function as a mechanism for securing compliance. Emergency provisions should remain proportionate to clinical urgency and should not be extended to situations in which a competent woman has made an informed decision that professionals consider unwise.

Midwifery education should integrate reproductive bioethics, history, human rights, and reproductive justice throughout the curriculum. Students should examine how colonialism, eugenics, racial inequality, disability discrimination, medicalization, and professional regulation have shaped maternity policy. Case-based learning should address maternal–fetal conflict, informed refusal, conscientious objection, and unequal service access. Reflective education can help future midwives distinguish clinical concern from paternalistic assumption.

Future research should evaluate how reproductive policies are experienced across diverse populations and care settings. Longitudinal studies could examine whether rights-based policy reform changes communication, intervention patterns, trust, and maternal outcomes. Comparative research should investigate how different legal and regulatory systems balance autonomy, fetal interests, clinical responsibility, and access. Participatory policy studies should include women, midwives, marginalized communities, legal scholars, and bioethicists in defining ethically meaningful outcomes and designing accountable reforms.

CONCLUSION

The most important finding of this study is that contemporary midwifery policies demonstrate genuine progress in recognizing consent, dignity, bodily autonomy, and reproductive rights while retaining transformed elements of earlier reproductive governance. Historical continuity was visible not through identical terminology but through persistent institutional authority over definitions of risk, responsible motherhood, and acceptable reproductive choice. Formal autonomy remained institutionally conditioned because its practical exercise depended on accessible services, understandable information, continued care after refusal, and the availability of clinically responsible alternatives.

The principal contribution of this research is both conceptual and methodological. Conceptually, the study integrates principlism, relational autonomy, feminist ethics of care, human-rights theory, and reproductive justice within a historically informed policy framework. Methodologically, it combines genealogical analysis, comparative policy inquiry, stakeholder perspectives, and normative evaluation through reflective equilibrium. This approach distinguishes historical continuity from superficial conceptual resemblance and connects formal rights with their material conditions. It also positions midwifery as both a potential mediator of reproductive agency and an institutional practice shaped by regulation, hierarchy, and public policy.

The study is limited by its purposive selection of jurisdictions, uneven archival access, dependence on available policy documents, and possible influence of researcher interpretation. Historical sources may not fully represent the experiences of marginalized populations, while anonymization may reduce contextual specificity. Future research should include broader multilingual archival analysis, diverse legal and healthcare systems, and participatory inquiry involving women, midwives, Indigenous communities, disabled people, migrants, and reproductive-justice organizations. Longitudinal and mixed-methods studies should examine whether rights-based policy reforms improve informed decision-making, service accessibility, institutional trust, equity, and maternal–neonatal outcomes.

DECLARATION OF AI AND AI ASSISTED TECHNOLOGIES IN THE WRITING PROCESS

During the preparation of this work, the author(s) used ChatGPT (OpenAI) to assist with language refinement, grammar correction, and improving the clarity and readability of the manuscript. After using this tool, the author(s) reviewed and edited the content as needed and take(s) full responsibility for the content of the publication.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This is a short text to acknowledge the contributions of specific colleagues, institutions, or agencies that aided the efforts of the authors.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION

Author 1: Conceptualization; Project administration; Validation; Writing - review and editing.

Author 2: Conceptualization; Data curation; In-vestigation.

Author 3: Data curation; Investigation.

DECLARATION OF COMPETING INTEREST

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

REFERENCES

Agopiantz, M., Dap, M., Martin, E., Meyer, L., Urwicz, A., Mougel, R., & Malmanche, H. (2023). Assisted reproductive technology in France: The reproductive rights of LGBT people. *Journal of Gynecology Obstetrics and Human Reproduction*, *52*(10), 102690. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jogoh.2023.102690

AlJahsh, M. A. I. (2024). Science and Islamic ethics: Navigating artificial womb technology through Quranic principles. *Heliyon*, *10*(17), e36793. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e36793

Ayyappan, S., Bhargava, D. C., Meshram, V. P., Jadav, D., Shekhawat, R. S., & Kanchan, T. (2025). Uterine transplantation: Ethical and legal challenges. *Ethics, Medicine and Public Health*, *33*, 101185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemep.2025.101185

Balistreri, M., & Umbrello, S. (2022). Should the colonisation of space be based on reproduction? Critical considerations on the choice of having a child in space. *Journal of Responsible Technology*, *11*, 100040. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrt.2022.100040

Brisson, J. (2025). Parental paternalism as an equity issue: A case study of parental influence on adolescents' reproductive health in Medellín, Colombia. *Ethics, Medicine and Public Health*, *33*, 101108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemep.2025.101108

Brisson, J., Ravitsky, V., & Williams-Jones, B. (2022). Colombian adolescents' preferences for independently accessing sexual and reproductive health services: A cross-sectional and bioethics analysis. *Sexual & Reproductive Healthcare*, *32*, 100698. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.srhc.2022.100698

Brotherton, M. (2024). The Malleable Scarcity of Oral Contraceptive Pills. *The Open Public Health Journal*, *17*. https://doi.org/10.2174/0118749445307431240709054621

Buchbinder, M., Arora, K. S., McKetchnie, S. M., & Sabbath, E. L. (2025). Medical uncertainty in the shadow of Dobbs: Treating obstetric complications in a new reproductive frontier. *Social Science & Medicine*, *369*, 117856. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2025.117856

Buckey, T. M., Feldman, S. F., & Apter, A. J. (2024). An Ethical Framework for Allergy and Immunology. *The Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology: In Practice*, *12*(5), 1153–1158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaip.2024.02.018

Byk, C. (2025). Fundamental principles of French bioethics—Between myth and reality. *Ethics, Medicine and Public Health*, *33*, 101078. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemep.2025.101078

Casas-Becerra, L., Ramm, A., Pérez, B., Kaune, H., Carrasco-Portiño, M., Montero, A., Bustos-Ibarra, C., Castro-Arias, H., López-Labarca, C., & Reyes-Torres, L. (2026). Perceptions of Abortion and Sexual and Reproductive Health in Chilean Medical and Midwifery Education: Protocol for a Mixed Methods Study. *JMIR Research Protocols*, *15*. https://doi.org/10.2196/81427

Davidson, H. R., Jamal, L., Mueller, R., Similuk, M., & Owczarzak, J. (2024). Renegotiation, uncertainty, imagination: Assemblage perspectives on reproductive and family planning with an Inborn Error of immunity. *Social Science & Medicine*, *360*, 117303. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2024.117303

Desy, A., & Marre, D. (2024). The reproductive journeys of French women over 40 seeking assisted reproductive technology treatments in Spain. *Social Science & Medicine*, *351*, 116951. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2024.116951

Durán del Campo, P., Solano Iturri, G., Alonso Ortiz, B., Bertran Muñoz, J., Bravo Blanco, A. M., Briongos Figuero, L., Carrera García, C., Chacón Moreno, A. D., Blanco Portillo, A., & Galván-Román, J. M. (2026). Current situation and role of internists in healthcare ethics committees in Spain. PANACEAS study. *Revista Clínica Española (English Edition)*, *226*(3), 502483. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rceng.2026.502483

Farooq, A. (2026). Faith and culture in neuroethics: Implications for ethical communication. Dalam K. Bassil & J. L. Boyd (Ed.), *Developments in Neuroethics and Bioethics* (Vol. 9, hlm. 85–101). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.dnb.2026.02.003

Gaggiotti, H., & Gasparri, S. (2026). Egg freezing as an employment benefit? Gender, career, and reproductive health in neoliberal academia. *Gender in Management*, *41*(1), 45–62. https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-10-2024-0547

Gallagher, S., Attinger, S., Sassano, A., Sutton, E., Kerridge, I., Newson, A., Farsides, B., Hammarberg, K., Hart, R., Jackson, E., Ledger, W., Mayes, C., Mills, C., Norcross, S., Norman, R. J., Rombauts, L., Waldby, C., Yazdani, A., & Lipworth, W. (2024). Medicine in the marketplace: Clinician and patient views on commercial influences on assisted reproductive technology. *Reproductive BioMedicine Online*, *48*(6), 103850. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rbmo.2024.103850

Gallagher, S., Kerridge, I., Newson, A., Attinger, S., Norman, R. J., & Lipworth, W. (2024). Moral justification for the use of 'add-ons' in assisted reproductive technology: Experts' views and experiences. *Reproductive BioMedicine Online*, *48*(2), 103637. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rbmo.2023.103637

Gao, J., Idris, M. A., Gallegos, G. A., Griffin, B. C., Munroe, S. V., & Windett, J. H. (2025). Diffusion and division: A spatial analysis of surrogacy policy determinants in the United States. *SSM - Population Health*, *32*, 101876. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2025.101876

Gryparis, I., Dagla, M., Gourounti, K., Jotautis, V., & Sarantaki, A. (2026). Knowledge and ethical attitudes toward preimplantation genetic testing among ART patients in Greece: A cross-sectional bioethical analysis. *Ethics, Medicine and Public Health*, *34*, 101308. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemep.2026.101308

Guérin, J.-F. (2025). Artificial reproductive technologies (ART), a reproductive physician's standpoint. *Ethics, Medicine and Public Health*, *33*, 101062. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemep.2025.101062

Hall, H. L. (2025). "This is the first time somebody has asked me …": How can actors realize the dimensions of contraceptive autonomy for adolescent migrant girls? A case study of Venezuelan migrants in Colombia. *SSM - Qualitative Research in Health*, *8*, 100621. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmqr.2025.100621

Hinton, L., McNiven, A., White, A., Locock, L., Petrou, S., Rivero-Arias, O., & Boardman, F. (2026). Mapping the benefits and harms of antenatal and newborn screening programmes.

SSM - Qualitative Research in Health, *9*, 100683. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmqr.2025.100683

Hoarau, E., Latypova, X., Jourdain, M., & Isidor, B. (2022). Challenges of preconception genetic testing in France: A qualitative study. *European Journal of Medical Genetics*, *65*(11), 104606. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejmg.2022.104606

Hukku, S., Wynn, L. L., & Foster, A. M. (2025). "If somebody wants an abortion, nobody should override their decision": Modern Canadian perspectives on abortion in relation to artificial womb technology. *SSM - Qualitative Research in Health*, *7*, 100529. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmqr.2025.100529

Jeffries Hein, R., Le Goff, A., & Landecker, H. L. (2025). Making and disposing of life's 'starting materials': A focus group study of attitudes concerning reproductive scarcity and abundance in in vitro gametogenesis. *Social Science & Medicine*, *379*, 118146. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2025.118146

Kingsley, J., Andraka-Christou, B., Shah, S. K., Spicer, P., Newman, S., & Ossorio, P. N. (2024). Navigating ethical and legal challenges in the HEALthy Brain and Child Development Study: Lessons learned from the ethics, law, policy working group. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, *70*, 101460. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2024.101460

Kolianchuk, Y., Prodanchuk, M., & Jaksch, A. (2023). Combined reproductive and developmental toxicity study of pesticide abamectin on male and female Wistar Hannover rats. *Reproductive Toxicology*, *122*, 108487. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reprotox.2023.108487

Kooli, C. (2025). Navigating the legal vacuum: An ethical analysis of brain death, fetal personhood, and maternal autonomy in the post-roe era: Lessons from Smith v. Georgia. *Ethics, Medicine and Public Health*, *33*, 101187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemep.2025.101187

Kumar, N., Gangane, N., Mohapatra, I., Rukadikar, C., Sharmila, V., Pushpalatha, K., Eerike, M., Santhoshi, G., Samantaray, S. R., Seth, S., Trigunait, P., Reddy, N. J., Patel, S., Rani, S., Mishra, R., & Negi, K. (2024). Effect of COVID-19 Vaccination on Menstrual Cycle Patterns of Reproductive-age Women: A Multi-centric Observational Study. *Current Drug Research Reviews*, *16*(2), 237–248. https://doi.org/10.2174/2589977515666230608140606

Labrosse, J., & Grynberg, M. (2022). Fertility of tomorrow: Are there any restrictions left? *64th International Meeting of Clinical Endocrinology - Henri-Pierre Klotz: HORMONES & FERTILITY*, *83*(3), 207–209. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ando.2022.04.011

Latortue-Albino, P., Delgado, S., Perkins, R., Yarrington, C., & Mehta, P. (2023). Voices on Zika: Reproductive Autonomy and Shared Decision-Making During an Evolving Epidemic. *Women's Health Issues*, *33*(4), 382–390. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.whi.2022.11.005

Le Bris, A., Decaux Ferré, N., & Ravel, C. (2026). What are the ethical considerations when supporting single women undergoing medically assisted reproduction (MAR)? *Ethics, Medicine and Public Health*, *34*, 101229. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemep.2025.101229

Lherbet, M. (2026). Gamete Selection in Gay Male Surrogacy: Procreative Labor beyond Gestation. *Social Science & Medicine*, 119679. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2026.119679

Martínez, A. C., Aristizábal Castrillón, P., Lopez Erazo, L. J., Montoya Villegas, M., Tamayo, L. A., Montagut Ascanio, M., Borda, J. P., & Lasso, E. F. (2026). Design and validation of a bioethical assessment instrument for public health policies involving behavioral change: A mixed-methods study. *Public Health in Practice*, *11*, 100742. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhip.2026.100742

McCauley, E. J., & Johnson, E. R. (2026). Salience and context of incarceration history disclosure in sexual and reproductive health service delivery. *SSM - Qualitative Research in Health*, *9*, 100784. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmqr.2026.100784

McKay, F., Treanor, D., & Hallowell, N. (2023). Inalienable data: Ethical imaginaries of de-identified health data ownership. *SSM - Qualitative Research in Health*, *4*, 100321. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmqr.2023.100321

Moniz, M. H., Spector-Bagdady, K., Perritt, J. B., Heisler, M., Loder, C. M., Wetmore, M. K., & Harris, L. H. (2022). Balancing enhanced contraceptive access with risk of reproductive

injustice: A United States comparative case study. *Contraception*, *113*, 88–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.contraception.2022.04.004

Mumford, K., Hendriks, S., Miner, S., Huelsnitz, C. O., Wakim, P., & Berkman, B. E. (2024). Factors affecting couples' decision making about expanded prenatal cell-free DNA screening. *Genetics in Medicine Open*, *2*, 101890. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gimo.2024.101890

Natoli, E. (2024). The intrinsic moral value of individuals: A bioethical approach to domestic cats and damaged species. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, *271*, 106175. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2024.106175

Offer-Stark, I. (2023). Designing Medical law in a Multicultural Society: The case of Israeli end-of-life laws. *Ethics, Medicine and Public Health*, *28*, 100907. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemep.2023.100907

O'Rourke, A., Vella, K., & de Jonge, A. (2023). Employer funded egg freezing: An advance for women in the workplace or a return to the unencumbered employee? *Women's Studies International Forum*, *98*, 102698. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2023.102698

Owen, A., Meredith, S., & Stoll, K. (2025). Prenatal genetic testing and disability rights: Addressing disability bias in practice. Dalam R. M. Hodapp & D. J. Fidler (Ed.), *International Review of Research in Developmental Disabilities* (Vol. 69, hlm. 79–116). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.irrdd.2025.09.004

Pulin, G., Bellacicco, R., Paladini, E., Pititto, F., & Marrone, M. (2025). Medico-legal aspects of male ritual circumcision in Europe. *Ethics, Medicine and Public Health*, *33*, 101081. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemep.2025.101081

Qasim, N. H., Zhumagaliuly, A., Khozhamkul, R., & Rahim, F. (2024). The role of zygotic genome activation in genetic–related reproductive medicine: Technological perspective, religious and bioethical concerns, challenges and benefits. *Journal of Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology*, *22*(1), 100340. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jgeb.2023.100340

Rial-Sebbag, E. (2025). The human body and the body elements—Conditions for their use in genetics under the French bioethics law and beyond. *Ethics, Medicine and Public Health*, *33*, 101026. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemep.2024.101026

Szocik, K., & Abylkasymova, R. (2025). The bioethics of biomodification for the future of space exploration: Evaluating insights from feminist and non-feminist approaches. *Futures*, *174*, 103694. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2025.103694

Wang, P. (2025). Critically analyzing the overturning of Roe v. Wade: What is wrong with Dobbs v. Jackson and how it can provide implications for democratic education. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *12*, 101669. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101669

Yao, H., Yang, J., & Lo, I. P. Y. (2023). Lesbian couples' childbearing experiences using assisted reproductive technology: A netnography study. *Midwifery*, *121*, 103656. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2023.103656

Zegers-Hochschild, F., Crosby, J. A., Musri, C., Borges de Souza, M. do C., Martinez, A. G., Amaral Silva, A., Mojarra, J. M., Masoli, D., & Posada, N. (2022). Assisted reproductive technologies in Latin America: The Latin American Registry, 2019. *Reproductive BioMedicine Online*, *45*(2), 235–245. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rbmo.2022.02.026

Copyright Holder :
© Moana Siaosi et al. (2026).

First Publication Right :
© Journal of Midwifery History and Philosophy

This article is under:

