

1. In recent years, there is a widespread fear in many countries that their population is shrinking based on low fertility rates, and policy measures such as childbirth subsidies, baby bonuses, and child benefits are legislated in response. In a few countries, politicians also try to change abortion laws to make abortion more difficult. Can this kind of proposal to limit reproductive rights of individuals be justified? Also consider and examine other reasons which are mentioned when politicians support the control of reproductive choices. (Max. 750 words)

In many developed countries, population is shrinking mainly due to low fertility rates. Especially in South Korea, the total fertility rate rapidly dropped and reached 0.84 in 2020. In spite of this dramatic decrease of the fertility rate, any kind of restrictions on women's reproductive choices cannot be justified.

Reproductive rights are one of the basic human rights as it is directly related to women's reproductive health issue. For instance, female genital mutilation and forced abortion (usually sex-selective under patriarchal system) are harming women's body. And legal regulations to free abortion may also be ruin women's health both directly and indirectly, especially under some economic situations or diseases. It is clear that protecting individual health and well-being life is one of the most important right to be as a human. Thus, reproductive rights are one of the central human rights in our society.

Thus, morality and justice are valid only when one's basic rights are satisfied. Especially in a democratic society, each person should be respected their human rights. So, any social values under democracy should be based on guarantee of basic rights. Hence, women (and all humans) have rights to determine their reproductive choices and any limitation of reproductive from the nation cannot be justified over the nation's democratic values.

The hottest reproductive rights issue in recent South Korea is maybe about penalties for abortion. The main reason to oppose to the freedom of abortion is that the rights of feti to be born are more important than freedom of women to do abortion. However, most of anti-abortion activists have not objected to laws allowing abortion of one of twins during IVF or baby of some disabled people due to eugenical reasons. Usually, the main reason to not object these existent laws is the economic and social issue during raising the child, but those difficulties are neither originated from the disability nor related with infertility and twins. Those

reason can also be applied to general cases, which anti-abortion activists have been objected to. As a higher goal including all of those discussions, we can argue that we must guarantee one's reproductive rights.

There are other reasons as well. Some people name a reason of religious law, but many countries including South Korea say that the politics should be independent of religion in the constitutional law. Those kinds of objection is about morality, but not a topic of criminal charges. Also, if an ethical action functions as a tool to oppress someone, one might have to think again about its ethicality.

Finally, another main reason to object to not penalize abortion is to raise fertility rate as mentioned in the problem. First of all, it is a violence by nation to burden a solution of national issues such as low fertility rate on individuals, ignoring their basic human rights. Moreover, the fertility rate is not that correlated with legalizing abortion. According to [1], in the US, states legalizing abortion experienced only a 4% decrease in fertility rate compared to the other states where the legality of abortion was unchanged.

Controlling reproductive choices would lead the society in a way to suppress individual woman's reproductive rights, and this contradicts to the main social values of contemporary society, democracy. Instead of regulating one's choices, the nation should find another way to resolve a national issue on national growth like low fertility rate.

Citations

1. Levine, P. B., Staiger, D., Kane, T. J., & Zimmerman, D. J. (1999). Roe v Wade and American fertility. *American journal of public health*, 89(2), 199–203. <https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.89.2.199>

2. In the U.S., hate speech is not regulated by any law because the legal tradition strongly favors the right to free speech. However, it seems that there is a difference between “free speech” and “speaking your mind freely in any situation.” Do you think that hate speech should be

controlled or regulated by law? Please explain your reasoning with examples from your own everyday experience, and from our reading material on trans-genderism, same-sex marriage, and gendered work. (Max. 750 words)

Hate speech is a speech that attacks a person or a group based on its characteristic, such as race, color, national origin, sex, disability, religion, or sexual orientation. The regulation of hate speeches has been discussed globally, and some nations have accepted the laws in any form to regulate (some kinds of) hate speeches. In this regard, I think legal control of hate speech is necessary, and letting hate speech without any treatment is unconstitutional.

Firstly, connivance of hate speech is an incitement of attacks on groups (usually of minorities) on the basis of their characteristics. In particular, hate speech of public figures and national officials are more critical. Behaviors of people in public positions have a power to be recognized as right things to do. Especially, when those people have gained some popularities, people used to not think about the speech in a critical way and just accept it as it is. Also, the role of media is important, too. When media outlets started to use a newly coined word based on some attacks on minority groups, the word is used more and more broadly. It may form an atmosphere which is rampant in the society, which reinforces the discrimination on groups to be hated.

Second, especially for minority groups, hate speech has a power to make a prejudice which prevents them from being visualized in public spaces. For instance, some people make prejudices on sexual minorities, such as they are sexually promiscuous than "normal" heterosexual people. Especially to gay, there are some rumours that gay people have spreaded HIV/AIDS to the society. And by this reasons, queer festivals have been disturbed from some conservative Catholic people. This leads to the exclusion of those minority groups from the concept of normal humans. Eventually, it removes the necessity to discuss about their rights and this deprives basic rights to live as a human. There are still discriminations on basic rights: for example, transgender and androgyne people cannot use public toilets with ease. Sexual minorities usually do not have rights to be recognized with the gender they want, and many of them have discriminated from both the social public services and people living in that society. Higher rate of attempted suicide of sexual minorities compared to heterosexuals indicates the

harsh reality to them.

Besides the violation of basic human rights, hate speech may construct social atmosphere that hinder the equality of people. For instance, we have an example of Google Memo. The author of the memo sent it to all employees in Google, and this could form an atmosphere there to aggravate injustice on employment. Also, the injustice in the employment of banks such as Hana and Kookmin bank or the entrance exam of Tokyo medical school are based on patriarchal social atmosphere. There are many more examples of discriminations caused by social atmospheres. According to FBI, it said hate crimes under Trump surged nearly 20 percent, where Trump officially and publicly said a bunch of hate speech in his incumbency. Haters gain power under those social atmosphere formed by hate speeches and this reinforces people to get ideology of hating minority groups.

With these reasons, hate speech should be strictly regulated by laws, in order to control severe problems originated from hate speeches. In the short term, those regulations on hate speech might make resistances from some people, but over the long term, this will cause a social discussion on hate speech and minority groups and create a more egalitarian society.