

# *Let's Schmooze*

---

Other issues of *Let's Schmooze* can be found on the web at [www.heirling.com](http://www.heirling.com)

---

## **The Transcendent Underpinnings of the Abortion Debates**

All over the world, abortion debates are raging non-stop ~ from pro-life on the one end to pro-choice on the other end. It is a contentious issue that strikes deep at the very heart of the human spirit. This running battle should not be surprising. The roots of the abortion debates happen to run deep into the transcendent origins of creation itself.

Before we dig in after those transcendent roots, let's review for a minute what we mean by the term *Transcendent*. That way, all readers will be relatively comfortable with what follows. Many times, in written communication, mis-communication is caused by words whose definitions are inadvertently misinterpreted. We want clarity and togetherness in our discussion here.

We use the term *Transcendent* as generic code for the concept of the ultimate source of all being and reality. Different cultures have given that concept different names ~ Father, Mother, Brahman, God, Qi, Allah, Jehovah, Yahweh ~ just to name a few of the better known. Whenever you meet the term *Transcendent* in the following text, just substitute your own term or understanding ~ the one that you use ~ for the concept of the ultimate source of all being and reality. Then, we'll be on the same page for both term interpretation and meaning. For example, if we write "the Transcendent said" ~ a Christian would read "God said" ~ a Muslim would read "Allah said" ~ and a Hindu would read "Brahman said" ~ okay? Now that we have that pinned down, let's move on to tracing those transcendent roots of the abortion debates.

When the Transcendent set about to spin reality, it gave two great gifts to human beings. The first gift was life itself. The second gift was free will ~ the real, meaningful ability to make choices and decisions. Both of these transcendent gifts are of unfathomable value. Let's look at each of them a bit more closely.

The value of the first gift ~ the gift of life ~ is readily apparent. Without the gift of life, we would not exist. It is the gift of life per se that allows us to spring into existence. From the standpoint of human psychology, the transcendent gift of life is probably incomprehensible. To really grasp it and get our little human minds wrapped around it, we would have to be able to stand outside of that gift ~ in order to get a meaningful and objective perspective ~ and if we did that, we would immediately cease to exist. We only exist within the transcendent gift of life, and in that sense, we can only exist within that particular fish bowl. For us humans, transcendent comprehension is not to be had when it comes to the transcendent gift of life. Can you really imagine being dead? Think about it. You can only imagine being dead if-and-only-if you are really dead, and the really dead don't imagine anything!

The value of the second gift ~ the gift of free will ~ is equally unfathomable, but perhaps a bit more comprehensible, maybe. Without the gift of free will, but with the gift of life, we would have sprung into existence as puppets, or robots. Some would argue that puppets and robots are really not alive, since they have no free will. In that sense, it is the gift of free will that gives true meaning and value to the gift of life itself. Can you imagine being alive without the ability to make choices and decisions? What kind of life would that be? What good would that kind of life be? Who would want it?

The gifts of life and free will are utterly transcendent, and the very foundation of our human existence. They also happen to be the deep transcendent roots of the abortion debates. How's that? Let's dig a little deeper. But, before we do that, let's get our target into better focus.

Abortion debates are all about women. Men, by virtue of their physiology, do not have and cannot get abortions. When we talk about the transcendent roots of the abortion debates, the target audience we are talking about is roughly half of the human population ~ the female half. It is the woman who has an abortion choice to make, or has that choice foisted upon her by other humans. It is the woman who bears the vessel of new life within her, and

by virtue of that, becomes the primary guardian of new life. In goddess and deva phraseology, it is the woman who can be considered, or thought of, as the goddess and deva of new life.

When a woman chooses ~ or is forced to choose ~ to carry a baby to full-term, the emphasis is being put on the gift of life more than on the gift of free choice. It is as if the greatest value is being put on the ability to bring forth life, rather than on the ability to reject new life. Of the two great and foundational transcendent gifts to humanity ~ life per se and free will ~ the gift of life is being valued higher than the gift of free will.

Conversely, when a woman chooses ~ or is forced to choose ~ to abort a baby before full-term, the emphasis is being put on the gift of free will more than on the gift of life. It is as if the greatest value is being put on the ability to reject new life, rather than on the ability to bring forth life. Of the two great and foundational transcendent gifts to humanity ~ life per se and free will ~ the gift of free will is being valued higher (and being used) than the gift of life.

Ergo, when a woman chooses ~ or is forced to choose ~ to either carry a baby to full-term or to abort the baby before full-term, that choice and decision are directly rooted into one of the twin transcendent gifts of life itself and free will. And, there we have it, the transcendent roots of the abortion debates.

So, where do we go from here? Is there a way that we can determine which transcendent gift is greater, and which gift should be valued more highly than the other gift? Careful, it may not be as easy as one would think.

These two transcendent gifts are hopelessly intertwined. We cannot have one without the other, and because of that, we cannot value one higher than the other. Without life per se, free will itself would become moot. Without free will per se, life would be both meaningless and questionable. There's no disentangling them.

Can one take a position in the ongoing and hotly debated abortion issues without offending or doing violence to either one of these two transcendent gifts? Remember, since these gifts are purely transcendent, we have to find a way, or means of action, to

sincerely honor both of them at the same time. To honor one gift at the expense of the other would not be harmonious with the transcendent underpinnings of existence.

We believe that there is a way, or cause of action, to address these twin gifts of life per se and free will without doing violence to either one of them. It's a middle path. Obviously, to absolutely support life at the expense of choice would do violence to the gift of free will. And, just as obviously, to absolutely support the right-to-choose that comes with free will could end up doing violence to the gift of life, depending on which choice is actually made. What is one to do?

We suggest two twin positions in the abortion debate. First, abortion should not be banned; that would do violence to the transcendent gift of free will on the part of the woman. Second, public funds should not be used in abortion proceedings; that would do violence to those members of the public who value life more highly than choice. This may be an uneasy compromise, but it is a middle path between the hopelessly entwined transcendent gifts of life and free will.

Let's see where this middle path would lead us. When a woman has an abortion using strictly private funds, no member of the public can complain that they are being forced to support something that they abhor. If a woman should choose to have an abortion, but lacks the funds to carry it out, those many individuals who value free will over life can step forward to help her. That way, nobody, on either side of the abortion issue, can feel that they have been forced to participate willy-nilly in something that they do not value, or that they object to.

In cases of forced impregnation or medical necessity, it is doubtful that anyone on either side of the abortion debates would object to public funds being used to aid a woman in trouble; public fund participation would actually honor and support these two transcendent gifts of life and free will. In the case of forced impregnation, the gift of freewill on the woman's part would have been violated. In the case of medical necessity, the woman's life would be on the line. All would want to step forward to right the wrong, or save a life.

In this way, and following this middle path of action, we feel that the heated energy in the abortion debates can cool down, and that we humans can continue living with each other

in peace and harmony, without anyone feeling that their personal values are being threatened or violated.

We cannot take an absolute pro-life or an absolute pro-choice position.

Both gifts to humanity ~ life per se and free will ~ are transcendent and must be honored and valued in the same measure.

*~ 'til we meet again ~*