

Reading response assignment #2 (critical thinking)

Use these closely related questions as the basis for your submission:

1. *If* it is morally wrong to obtain or perform an abortion (except perhaps in special circumstances, e.g., in order to save the life of the mother), should there be laws prohibiting citizens from obtaining or performing abortions (except perhaps in special circumstances, e.g., in order to save the life of the mother)?
2. If so, what should be the minimum and maximum penalties of breaking those laws? Why?
3. Should your answers differ substantially for other questions of the form “*If* it is morally wrong to X, then should there be laws prohibiting citizens from X-ing?” Why or why not?

The “if” in the first question is meant to be a **big** “if.” In other words, ***even if*** you think that abortion is morally permissible (or even morally right), you should be able to motivate an answer to this question. (If you think that abortion *is* morally permissible, consider this an opportunity to clarify or strengthen your political positions and/or as a means to the end of refuting a position in future work. Please feel free to make it clear in your assignment that you are only granting the assumption for the sake of argument.) Moreover, the answers to these questions **aren’t** meant to be obvious or uncontroversial. (Like Judith Jarvis Thomson in her paper, it is possible to grant the premise in order to challenge claims concerning what follows from it.) **Your task is to persuade your reader of your theses (answers yes/no) by providing reasons to accept those theses.**