

Name

Professor

Course

Date

Proposition 4: Parental Notification

In 2008, in California, a law was put to the vote, which suggested that if a teenage girl wants to terminate a pregnancy, she must warn parents or adult family members. The objections of supporters of the prohibition of abortion (except for medical reasons) appear to be weighty at first glance. It is because abortion can be seen as the deprivation of life of an unborn yet conceived and living being. Nevertheless, it is impossible not to speak out for the absolute inadmissibility of the prohibition of abortion. In this case, to give birth to a child or to have an abortion is the free expression of the will of the mother, no matter how dramatic it may be. A woman may decide to have an abortion due to different reasons. It can be an unwanted pregnancy if the mother has other children and is in a difficult financial situation. Pregnancy can be the result of a casual relationship, which never meant to go to a family. In all these and similar cases, abortion, from the mother's perspective, is an "extreme necessity." Thus, a legal ban on abortion in a medical institution leads only to illegal, criminal abortion with all the negative consequences - from the inability to have a child in future to the death of a woman. In the articles "No: It delays access to medical care and counseling," written by Patricia Bellasalma, and "Yes: It provides protection for children" by Steve and Gayle Francis, the authors shared their opinions on why Proposition 4 should or should not be adopted.

In the article "Yes: It provides protection for children," the authors attempted to convince the audience in the necessity and expediency of Proposition 4. The authors highlighted the fact that many teenage girls do not talk about termination of a minor's pregnancy with their parents (Francis and Francis n. p.). The importance of emotional support in such situations was emphasized. Besides, the authors pointed out to the fact that many young girls are vulnerable to sexual predators who can coerce them to terminate a pregnancy (Francis and Francis n. p.). The authors also highlighted the fact that several successful attempts in the spirit of Proposition 4 were made. In particular, Jessica's Law was passed in 2006 that increased penalties for sex offenders (Francis and Francis n. p.). In the article, it was noted that parental notification is beneficial because it contributes to the reduction of rates of teen pregnancies, abortions and sexually transmitted infections (Francis and Francis n. p.).

When it comes to the analysis of the first article, the authors were ambiguous when talking about the vulnerability of teenage girls in California. It is because the authors provided evidence about the age of teen mothers' partners instead of the documented cases of coercion that adult males use to encourage mothers to have an abortion. Overgeneralization was also present in the article, as the authors utilized such terms as "young," "majority," "all parents," etc. Authors utilized misleading analogies. Specifically, while discussing Proposition 4 that focus on parental notification, they draw a parallel with Jessica's Law that suggests increasing penalties for sex offenders. While Megan's Law showed its effectiveness, again, the law did not refer to the notion of abortion but associated with the prevention of crimes that come from sexual offenders. Despite the existence of similarities, they do not outweigh the apparent differences between the elements of the discussed above laws.

In the second article, Bellasalma's position on Proposition 4 is clear and is opposite to the statement of the authors of the first article. The author condemns Proposition 4 and attempts to provide the reasons for such a perception. In a similar manner to Steve and Gayle Francis, the author highlighted that protecting the most vulnerable teens is every voter's responsibility (Bellasalma n. p.). Bellasalma emphasized that Proposition 4 is not aimed at the promotion of family involvement but, instead, can result in deterioration of relationships between teenage girls and their parents. What is more, such an initiative can lead to increased rates of illegal abortion, self-induced abortion, and suicides (Bellasalma n. p.).

To my mind, the main problem of the second article is a bias of the author. It is because the authors failed to be objective throughout the article. Bellasalma tends to state her opinions as facts. For example, based on her considerations, she claimed that the "real intent" of Proposition 4 was to "eliminate access to doctors" (Bellasalma n. p.). She also failed to provide any documented facts or empirical evidence that supports her ideas. She refers to some studies, however, did not provide any details about them. Thus, the author expresses her opinion without reasonable evidence and objective information that can verify that her opinion can be trustworthy. In particular, the authors failed to provide documented information of why Proposition 4 endangers the lives and health of California teens. Also, Bellasalma utilized non-literal language in her article ("kicked out of her home," etc.). Besides, she generalized the position of Californian voters regarding the initiative.

Based on the above analyses, I object to the idea that the right to abortion should not be legally banned. If one looks into the history, abortions in the country were forbidden, then, in several years, they were allowed, etc. The initial motive for people's concern regarding abortions, in my opinion, is based solely on political reasons. Prohibition of abortion is also

can be seen for alleged demographic reasons. But neither bans that existed throughout the history did not bring the expected results: prohibitions led to an increase in clandestine abortions, with severe complications for women who get rid of accidental pregnancy in such a forced manner. As for me, the prohibition of abortion is just a game in which one or another political party, on the difference in approach to the problem, gaining the necessary political “points.”

After reading both articles and analyzing their problems, I firmly believe that the right to abortion should not be banned. In fact, the pieces that were analyzed in this paper did not convince me to support either of the sides. It is because the authors failed to avoid bias in the articles and overgeneralized their opinions. While in the first article, several studies were mentioned to support the view of the authors, in the second article, Bellasalma stated her opinion as a fact without any objective information that could support it. Therefore, I believe that women are free in their choice to decide whether terminate a pregnancy or not, and my opinion regarding abortion ban is based solely on my personal bias.

Works Cited

Bellasalma, Patricia. "No: It delays access to medical care and counseling." *Union-Tribune San Diego*, October 9, 2008. http://legacy.sandiegouniontribune.com/uniontrib/20081009/news_lz1e9bellasal.html Accessed 10 December 2017.

Francis, Steve, and Gayle Francis. "Yes: It provides protection for children." *Union-Tribune San Diego*, October 9, 2008. http://legacy.sandiegouniontribune.com/uniontrib/20081009/news_lz1e9francis.html Accessed 10 December 2017.