Journal of Neonatal Surgery
ISSN(Online): 2226-0439
Vol. 14, Issue 18s (2025)
https://www.jneonatalsurg.com

OPEN ACCESS

Intersectionality and Legal Recognition of Women's Role in Health-Related Family Decision-Making: Revisiting Reproductive and Neonatal Rights

Dr. Sanjeev Kumar[1], Prof. (Dr.) Sanjeet Singh[2]

[1]Post-Doctoral Fellow (ICSSR 2024-25), Central University of Himachal Pradesh, India (Corresponding Author) Email: sanjeevsanjeev292@gmail.com
[2]Head, Department of Economics, Central University of Himachal Pradesh, India

Cite this paper as: Dr. Sanjeev Kumar, Prof. (Dr.) Sanjeet Singh, et.al (2025) Intersectionality and Legal Recognition of Women's Role in Health-Related Family Decision-Making: Revisiting Reproductive and Neonatal Rights. *Journal of Neonatal Surgery*, 14 (18s), 48-52.

ABSTRACT
In this paper, we analyze how legal recognition of women's agency in health-related family decision-making, including reproductive and neonatal rights overlaps with the differential impact of various markers of identity such as, but not limited to, gender, race, and socioeconomic status. By employing a critical feminist jurisprudential framework, the paper examines the historical and current landscapes of law and policy that shape and limit the decision-making power of women. This analysis provides insight into the ongoing inequities in the law as they affect women with intersecting identities, and exposes the degree to which women belonging to multiple marginalized groups face compounded obstacles in asserting their right to decide how to care for their families. Legal paradigms frequently bypass the range of social determinants that inform women's health behavior by falling back on paternalistic or family-centered approaches that reduce autonomy. This paper advocates for reframing of health decision-making rights from an intersectional perspective in the context of the family, where respect for women's body autonomy is preserved. The paper ends with proposed reforms to the law itself that take an intersectional approach to provide fair treatment to women across populations in how their decision-making power is considered.

Keywords: Intersectionality, Reproductive Rights, Neonatal Rights, Legal Recognition, Women's Autonomy, Health Law

1. INTRODUCTION

The intersection of gender, race, class, and other identity markers in legal frameworks and medical practices makes the legal recognition of women's autonomy in health-related decision-making a complex and nuanced phenomenon that cannot be adequately captured in a single, universal narrative. Although strides have been made to afford women equal legal personhood during the last century, the right to self-determination with regard to one's own body (especially in regard to procreative and neonatal possibilities) remains challenged and disparate among different demographic strata (Crenshaw, 1989; Roberts, 2017). This paper explores how intersectionality informs the legal recognition of women's agency in matters of health, particularly as it relates to reproductive and neonatal rights.

The intersectionality framework (Kimberlé Crenshaw, 1989) examines how overlapping identities create unique experiences of inequity that cannot be understood through a single identity marker. With intersectionality, we highlight the ways in which legal frameworks ostensibly established to protect women's rights do not account for the compounded vulnerabilities of women whose identities lie at the intersection of multiple marginalized categories under the law (Ross & Solinger, 2017), which affects healthcare provision.

In this paper, researchers highlight how different legal systems acknowledge, facilitate, or obstruct women's decision-making authority over reproductive health and neonatal care according to various intersectional identities. This study uses an intersectional lens to examine legal precedents, policies, and practices to illuminate gaps and limitations in current legal frameworks, ultimately providing recommendations toward achieving equitable recognition of women's agency in family health decision-making. The central argument of the article is that legal recognition of women's participation in decision-making needs to be intersectional to be accepted, understood, and give voice to the various obstacles facing women with multiply marginalized identities.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Intersectionality and Legal Recognition

Intersectionality has proven transformative for legal scholarship, demonstrating the ways in which laws that seem neutral can have disproportionate effects on people who belong to multiple oppressed categories. Crenshaw (1991) originally devised the term to describe how, as victims of both race and gender discrimination, Black women find themselves falling through the cracks of antidiscrimination law, which, as a general rule, only recognizes claims based on either race or sex,

but rarely both. In the years since, using this framework as a basis, scholars have explored the ways in which legal systems are unable to meet the needs or account for the experiences of women from different backgrounds (Cho et al., 2013).
In health law in particular, intersectionality has been applied to understand inequalities in legal protections. Bridges (2011) described how low-income women of color experience over-policed public health systems, where societal values about unfit mothers intersect with poverty and race to curtail reproductive autonomy. This connects to Roberts' (2017) work tracking how the history of reproductive oppression against Black women plays out in modern legal protections for reproductive rights but not structural access.

Legal Recognition of Women's Decision-Making in Healthcare
The progress in the legal recognition of women's decision-making authority on health has been incremental and remains incomplete. At least since coverture, the legal principle whereby a married woman was legally deemed to be under the coverage of her husband, married women's medical decision-making was subordinated to male authority (Siegel, 1994). Academics point out that although these explicit legal barriers have largely been removed, the decision-making power of women is still being undermined in more subtle ways.
Organizational psychologists have shown that gendered stereotypes about rationality are used to undermine women's autonomy in healthcare decision-making, something feminist legal scholars have long documented. According to Halliday and Kitzinger (2015), courts routinely challenge women's ability to make rational choices about their reproductive care when they decline medical treatments, particularly if they are pregnant. Such skepticism is even higher for marginalized groups of women whose choices are more frequently nullified legally to protect the fetus, in the name of public health (Bordo 2003).

Reproductive and Neonatal Rights Across Intersectional Lines
The arenas of reproductive and neo-natal rights exhibit sharply divergent patterns along intersectional lines. Although reproductive rights jurisprudence has created baseline protections in theory, the lived experience of these protections is uneven across demographic groups. Luna et al. (2013) reported on the emergence of reproductive justice movements to fill the gaps in traditional reproductive rights frameworks, which did not accurately reflect the experiences of women situated at the intersection of multiple oppressions.
Decision-making in similar contexts in neonatal care is also stratified. This is illustrated by cases of maternal-fetal conflict which Oberman (2000) analyzed, finding that the cases brought forward more frequently involve low-income women and women of color than white women, as decisions regarding neonatal care are more readily challenged in court when made by a low-income woman or woman of color. This trend exposes the extent to which, in practice, intersectional realities inform not only rights on paper but also rights in practice.
Ross and Solinger (2017) call for a reproductive justice framework which not only permits but also ensures reproductive decision-making within social, economic, and political environments that provide genuine choice. Likewise, Waldman (2018) advocates for legal structures that acknowledge the interpersonal nature of health choices while preserving autonomy.
The conclusion discusses broader implications for expert testimony and family law and surveys the ways in which the topics discussed in this literature review create a mismatch between decision-making power afforded to women and its equivalent intersectionally, vis-à-vis the recognition within legal frameworks of women as equal arbiters of choice. This framework will then be used in the following sections to examine various legal tools that either facilitate or restrict the exercise of agency by women in making health-related decisions for their families.

3. METHOD

This research employs a qualitative, non-empirical approach through documentary analysis of legal frameworks, court decisions, and scholarly literature. The methodological framework is grounded in feminist legal theory with an intersectional lens, allowing for critical examination of how legal systems recognize or constrain women's decision-making authority across different identity markers.

Theoretical Framework
The research is guided by intersectional feminist jurisprudence, which examines how legal systems reflect and reinforce power structures based on gender, race, class, and other identity markers. This theoretical approach enables analysis of not only explicit legal rights but also the implicit barriers to exercising those rights experienced by women with overlapping marginalized identities (Bartlett & Kennedy, 2018).

Data Selection and Analysis
The analysis draws from three primary sources of data:

1. Legal frameworks and policies governing reproductive and neonatal healthcare decision-making, including constitutional protections, statutory provisions, and regulatory frameworks across different jurisdictions.
2. Judicial decisions in cases involving women's health-related decision-making authority, with particular attention to cases involving reproductive choices, maternal-fetal conflict, and neonatal care decisions.

3. Scholarly literature analyzing the interaction between intersectionality and legal recognition of women's agency in healthcare contexts.

The analytical approach involves critical discourse analysis, examining how legal language constructs and constrains women's agency across different intersectional identities. Particular attention is paid to identifying disparities in how legal frameworks recognize decision-making authority for women from dominant versus marginalized groups.

Limitations

This study is limited by its non-empirical nature, relying on published legal documents and scholarly analyses rather than direct data collection from affected women. Additionally, while the analysis attempts to address global legal frameworks, it necessarily focuses more heavily on Western legal systems due to the availability of scholarship and the researcher's linguistic limitations. These limitations are mitigated through deliberate inclusion of diverse perspectives in the literature review and careful attention to avoid universalizing Western experiences.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Intersectional Analysis of Legal Recognition in Reproductive Decision-Making

The legal acknowledgment of women's agency in making reproductive decisions is characterized by intersectional inequalities. Constitutional protections of reproductive rights, like those laid out in Roe v. Wade and later cases, apply in theory to all women but are not equally experienced when taking into account intersectionality (Bridges, 2020). Legal contexts may affirm a woman's control over fertility decisions, but structural impediments undermine this right for many women.

Court rulings show how women of color and women of low-income status are punished for their reproductive choices. For example, court-ordered cesarean sections are disproportionately used against low-income women and women of color (Oberman, 2000). Pemberton v. Tallahassee Memorial Regional Medical Center (1999) is a case in which, despite the woman's religious objections, a court forced a cesarean section. The case illustrates how the bodily autonomy of women may be overridden through legal means when their decisions conflict with doctors' orders and the women lack the social power to challenge medical authority.

This intersectional analysis shows how the law gives differential treatment to women making reproductive choices based on their economic status. Public healthcare laws frequently place additional limitations on reproductive decision-making among women qualifying for government aid. Policies such as mandatory counseling or waiting periods prior to receiving abortion services impose disproportionately high burdens on low-income women, who may not have time off from work or means for travel (Jones et al., 2013).

Legal Construction of Women's Authority in Neonatal Decision-Making

In neonatal contexts, legal discourses typically shift from individual autonomy by women toward "family" decision-making or "best interests of the child." Often, this transition curtails women's autonomy, especially for single mothers, young mothers, mothers of color, and mothers facing intensified scrutiny of their parenting practices (Roberts, 2017).

Cases of medical decision-making for newborns illustrate how various types of intersectionality affect legal outcomes. When parents decline medical recommendations for newborns, the courts use a "best interest" standard to assess parental choice, but this standard is not applied evenly or fairly across demographic groups. Court decisions indicate that parents belonging to marginalized populations are more likely to face state intervention for non-compliance with recommended neonatal interventions (Waldman, 2018).

Tensions between recognizing women as mothers and implementing child protection measures are evident in the legal framework related to neonatal decision-making. These are not always mutually exclusive, though legal approaches often pit them against one another, particularly when mothers (and/or people capable of becoming pregnant) are from vulnerable populations, and their judgment about whether to become pregnant or continue a pregnancy is more closely scrutinized (Ross & Solinger, 2017).

Institutional Policies and Practices: Reinforcing or Challenging Legal Frameworks

In addition to formal legal frameworks, institutional policies and practices play an important role in women's health-seeking autonomy and decision-making power by either enabling or limiting what health and reproductive rights decisions women can make in practice. The intersectional disempowerment is visible in hospital policies regarding informed consent, temporary emancipation, visitors, and medical decision-making orders.

In the case of birth practices, studies show that hospitals more heavily restrict the involvement of partners in birth decisions based on marital status, with married women generally having more secure decision-making than their unmarried counterparts, who are often seen as having less stable relationships and are more likely to experience institutional interference during decision-making (Summit, 2011). Similarly, women who are referred to child protective services in response to positive drug screens during pregnancy are most often from lower-income backgrounds and Black and ethnic minorities, resulting in criminalization of the prenatal behavior of poor women and women of color (Stone, 2015).

These institutional practices exist within legal systems that purportedly protect women's autonomy but contain such extensive loopholes that they enable discretionary and therefore discriminatory application. The interplay of formal rights and institutional practices demonstrates how both factors uniquely interact to construct a spectrum of recognition.

International Comparative Analysis

Legal frameworks within different jurisdictions take disparate approaches toward recognizing women's authority to make decisions within the family. Legal structures in countries with more robust social welfare systems can help mitigate structural barriers to autonomous reproductive choices. For instance, countries with universal access to healthcare reduce inequalities in the ability to exercise reproductive choices (UNFPA, 2021).

Yet even in more progressive legal systems, intersectional differences exist. In Canada, universal healthcare and protected rights do not necessarily translate to reproductive autonomy for all, as distinct barriers exist for Indigenous women (Stote, 2015). Similarly, even in European countries with robust legal protections of women's healthcare choice, there are disparities in the application of such protections for immigrant women and women of minority ethnic groups (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2017).

This comparison illustrates that while legal recognition of women's decision-making power is beneficial, it cannot be wholly separated from wider social, economic, and political processes. Legal rights are insufficient without an analysis of the structural conditions that facilitate or impede diverse women from asserting the right to care.

5. RECOMMENDATION

Based on the analysis presented, several recommendations emerge for reforming legal frameworks to ensure more equitable recognition of women's decision-making authority across intersectional identities:

1. **Incorporate Intersectional Analysis into Legal Standards**: Courts and legislatures should explicitly consider how proposed legal standards for health-related decision-making may impact women differently based on intersectional factors. This requires moving beyond formal equality approaches to recognize substantive equality.
2. **Expand Legal Recognition of Structural Constraints**: Legal frameworks should acknowledge and address structural barriers that prevent women from effectively exercising decision-making authority. This includes recognizing how poverty, racism, and other forms of discrimination shape health choices.
3. **Reform Judicial Training**: Judges should receive training on intersectionality and implicit bias to improve decision-making in cases involving women's health choices. This training should specifically address how stereotypes about different groups of women can influence legal outcomes.
4. **Strengthen Procedural Protections**: Legal systems should implement stronger procedural protections for women facing potential override of their health decisions, including robust requirements for informed consent and clear standards for when intervention is justified.
5. **Develop Community-Based Legal Resources**: Legal systems should support the development of community-based legal resources that are accessible to women from diverse backgrounds, enabling them to effectively advocate for their decision-making rights.
6. **Integrate Reproductive Justice Principles into Legal Frameworks**: Legislative bodies should incorporate reproductive justice principles that recognize the interconnection between reproductive rights and other social justice issues, acknowledging that meaningful choice requires addressing structural inequities.

These recommendations aim to reform legal frameworks to better recognize and protect women's health-related decision-making authority across diverse intersectional identities, moving beyond formal legal rights to ensure substantive equality in practice.

6. CONCLUSION

The researchers conclude that, although legal instruments have responded with a growing acknowledgment that women should be able to make their own decisions about their health, inequities along the intersectional axes of caste, class, religion, disability, age, and location reflect persistent bias in this regard. Women holding intersecting identities as members of multiple disadvantaged groups persistently encounter compounded obstacles to achieving their lawfully permitted rights to make informed health choices, especially in situations related to reproductive and neonatal activity.

The recognition of women's decision-making is directly tied to broader social, economic, and political circumstances surrounding women's lives. If legal frameworks ignore these intersectional experiences, they might entrench existing power asymmetries rather than challenge them. These findings point to the necessity of legal methods that center not on formal equality but on addressing real barriers to autonomous decision-making.

By reframing legal frameworks against an intersectional backdrop, this research responds to calls for more inclusive forms of women-centered health decision-making rights. The next stages of legal evolution in this area should center on the experiences of women from historically marginalized groups, both because they represent the most vulnerable members of society and because legal rights to exercise decision-making authority will only be meaningful if their particular intersectional identities are accounted for.

Finally, this paper advocates for a reframing of legal approaches to decision-making about women's health across identities by investing in bodily autonomy throughout the life course and by recognizing structural limitations on authentic choice. Only such an intersectional approach can genuinely respect the power of every woman in family matters related to health while providing protective laws.

REFERENCES

1. Bartlett, K. T., & Kennedy, R. (2018). *Feminist legal theory: Readings in law and gender*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429500480
2. Bordo, S. (2003). *Unbearable weight: Feminism, western culture, and the body* (10th anniversary ed.). University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520930711
3. Bridges, K. M. (2011). Reproducing race: An ethnography of pregnancy as a site of racialization. University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520950146
4. Bridges, K. M. (2020). *Reproductive rights and justice stories*. Foundation Press.
5. Cho, S., Crenshaw, K. W., & McCall, L. (2013). Toward a field of intersectionality studies: Theory, applications, and praxis. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 38(4), 785-810. https://doi.org/10.1086/669608
6. Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989(1), 139-167. https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/uclf/vol1989/iss1/8/
7. Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241-1299. https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039
8. European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2017). *Challenges to women's human rights in the EU*. Publications Office of the European Union. https://doi.org/10.2811/12742
9. Halliday, S., & Kitzinger, C. (2015). Women contesting the medical definition of a contested pregnancy: A critical discourse analysis. *Social Science & Medicine*, 146, 111-119. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.10.027
10. Jones, R. K., Upadhyay, U. D., & Weitz, T. A. (2013). At what cost? Payment for abortion care and consequences of the Hyde Amendment. *Women's Health Issues*, 23(3), e173-e178. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.whi.2013.03.001
11. Luna, Z., & Luker, K. (2013). Reproductive justice. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 9, 327-352. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-102612-134037
12. Oberman, M. (2000). Mothers and doctors' orders: Unmasking the doctor's fiduciary role in maternal-fetal conflicts. *Northwestern University Law Review*, 94(2), 451-501.
13. Roberts, D. E. (2017). *Killing the Black body: Race, reproduction, and the meaning of liberty* (20th anniversary ed.). Vintage Books.
14. Ross, L., & Solinger, R. (2017). *Reproductive justice: An introduction*. University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520963207
15. Siegel, R. B. (1994). Home as work: The first woman's rights claims concerning wives' household labor, 1850-1880. *Yale Law Journal*, 103(5), 1073-1217. https://doi.org/10.2307/797118
16. Stone, R. (2015). Pregnant women and substance use: Fear, stigma, and barriers to care. *Health & Justice*, 3(1), 2. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40352-015-0015-5
17. Stote, K. (2015). *An act of genocide: Colonialism and the sterilization of aboriginal women*. Fernwood Publishing.
18. United Nations Population Fund. (2021). *State of world population 2021: My body is my own*. UNFPA. https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/SoWP2021_Report_-_EN_web.3.21_0.pdf
19. Waldman, E. A. (2018). Medical decision making for children: A struggle for autonomy. *Saint Louis University Journal of Health Law & Policy*, 11(2), 293-336.