**Responses to Classmates**

**Classmate’s post**

       This topic is interesting to study and makes you realize how much women's health has changed in America in the past 50+ years. It is hard to say how I would be if I lived in 1960 but I know that if I became pregnant I would do the same thing I did one week ago and that is deliver the baby. People have their reasons for choosing abortion but for my case, I am married and the pregnancy was somewhat planned. I will have to say that abortion is something I feel strongly against so I chose to think about the Griswold v. Connecticut (1965) case which focuses on the use of contraceptives.

       In Griswold v. Connecticut (1965), the Supreme Court ruled that a state's ban on the use of contraceptives violated the right to marital privacy (Mcbride, 2007). Before this law was passed, women were restricted from the use of contraceptives. I understand that there are ways to prevent becoming pregnant without using contraceptives but there are sometimes conditions that women have or medications that they are on where they are putting themselves or their baby in danger if they become pregnant. With that being said, oral contraceptives are necessary. As I stated before, if I were to become pregnant in 1960 given my current life, I would not change anything.

**Response to Post 1:**

I agree with your choice of delivering the baby safely since you had planned the pregnancy in your marriage. The legalization of the use of contraceptives in the Griswold v. Connecticut case of 1965 has improved pregnancy planning since women can postpone conception until the time they are ready for pregnancy (Mcbride, 2007). In my opinion, the choice to protect the fetal life would improve the health of women since abortion has risks such as excessive per vaginal bleeding. Another rationale for agreeing with this position is the planning that married couples can achieve to ensure that the woman is both physically and emotionally ready for the pregnancy. Therefore, termination of pregnancy through abortion is inappropriate after good planning before conception. Finally, I would add that women have an additional option of seeking adoption services for the baby after delivery in the modern era.
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**Classmate’s post**

If I lived in the 1960s and became pregnant I would hope I could make the same decisions as if I was pregnant in 2018. I would keep the baby and find a way to financially support it through either a job or with family support. However, the 1960s were a very different time for women and if I were to become pregnant outside of marriage it could be very difficult to receive family support. Getting a job or keeping a job would be hard as well since it was socially frowned upon to be pregnant outside of marriage and most businesses might not want you to be representing them in that way. I don't think I could even receive an abortion and I couldn't legally receive one in the 1960s anyways. If I truly could not support the child or I was given an ultimatum I would try and give the child up for adoption so that they could hopefully have a better life. No matter what I definitely would not want to be in that position which is why I am thankful for the ability to purchase contraception as a non-married woman. Without the Eisenstadt v. Baird Supreme Court case in 1972 I would not have that option for my health. This case instated the law that allowed unmarried people to have contraceptives and nullified the law which made it a felony to possess it if you were not married. Through all of this I am very appreciative of the laws that have been instated because without them I would not have half the options I do now in regards of child bearing and sexual activity.

**Response to Post 2:**

 I agree with your choice to continue with the pregnancy till term and seek adoption services after delivery. The rationale behind my support for your choice is the limited choices that women had in 1960 in comparison to the modern era. For instance, women did not have access to contraception and safe abortion services that were illegal in 1960 until the Eisenstadt v. Baird Supreme Court case of 1972 (Alexander et al., 2017). The push for adoption of the baby results from the economic disparity among women who could not get employment opportunities due to restrictions of pregnancy and other maternal roles after delivery. Finally, I suggest that women should use the contraception services available in the modern era to plan their pregnancy in order to optimize their health outcomes.

**Reference**

Alexander, L. L., LaRosa, J. H., Bader, H., Garfield, S., & Alexander, W. J. (2017). *New dimensions in womens health* (7th ed.). Burlington, MA: Jones & Bartlett Learning.