

Abortion

It worries me when good people are against abortion rights. I do not think that abortion is a “necessary evil”, and I do not like it when it is framed that way. I could be wrong, but I will fight for this, because I think that the alternative is some kind of horror of logic.

I do not think that there is anything wrong with abortion. In my opinion, a developing baby is a woman's body parts, more than anything else, until it can be considered a separate person. It is impossible to know when that is, or what it means.

When I was younger, I thought about the logical conclusions that you could come to if you believed that abortion was truly wrong. If someone really believed that, what actions would they justify to stop the “murder” of a “baby”?

Good people with good judgement are held powerless by the limitations of “justifying” horrific acts. But still, there is the horror of the lie, of believing someone is a murderer of babies when they are no such thing.

What possible hypothetical horrors could exist? Chaining a woman in a basement, coveting all of her eggs? How about forcing her to grow a baby with her body. Altering the course of her whole life, her whole heart, potentially all of her future time and resources, and, if she can't look after that baby for some reason, taking that baby from her, and acting like that is an option, when for some it wouldn't be?

Separating a woman from her child is probably one of the cruelest acts that I can think of. How sure do you have to be about the truth of conception to insist on such a horror? When the truth might be that, actually, she really didn't need to go through all of that, after all.

That maybe cells dividing is a lot like a woman's period. That maybe it is fine, and ridiculous to insist otherwise.

There is nothing natural about modern abortion. But in theory, is abortion itself really unnatural? Realistically, across time, if a woman was in the wilderness, fending for herself, or in any situation where she knew that there was no way that she would be able to have a baby, in all seriousness, would she risk life and limb, poison herself, starve, do whatever it took, to avoid growing a child that would actually be a bad situation if brought into the world? Or if she was overcome by fear, or panic? Or had a single mindedness?

It's either wrong or it isn't. How can something so necessary be wrong? You are not being serious. If you were to look at a woman who is a loved one, perhaps your own wife, and if there was a possible situation, even just one, in which they would make that exact decision, and you would tell her to her face that she was a murderer of her own child. No, I cannot agree with that deduction. A woman and her child are in it together.

I even wonder about the lie of it, if the only answer to such a despicable lie was the truth of creation itself. A perfect checkmate.

It is interesting from a religious perspective, that the nature of conception and creation is unknown to us, we are actually blind to it, and yet of all things, when it is hidden, that the religious position is to believe that it is not ok. Instead of relinquishing to faith itself that it must be ok, that it has to be. What is the alternative? A baby is murdered or a woman is forced, or tortured?

It is probably good for a person to know of both arguments. How strongly others believe, and how they might have a better sense of it. They might be right in some way. But it has bothered me, the idea of someone being convinced that it is something it's not, when they have an actual choice.

I don't think that a potential life is nothing. I just don't think that you can think that way about every possible outcome. The exact combination of DNA of a "potential person" could exist "in possibility" anytime there is an egg and a #1 sperm in contention, even without conception.

I certainly think that forced abortion is extremely wrong, and is not nothing. In the same way that mutilating someone's body is wrong, and taking someone's choices for their own future, and their future child, is wrong. If they would have had that child of their own accord then that "potential" becomes a tangible loss.

From the male perspective it may be an unreconcilable betrayal to not have a say in their own future, but ultimately a woman's body is her own, she doesn't have to choose you. This is where two individuals need to know what they themselves are prepared for with the person they have sex with.

Sex is a morality issue, always has been. The reality is still that, conventionally, if you have sex, you can get pregnant. In our modern society that means that you have to be willing to have a baby or have an abortion, if pregnancy happens.

Men are equally responsible for the choice to partake, and in some ways are blatantly risking more. For some women abortion or adoption is not an option, and to suggest otherwise is so wrong, and to transfer responsibility for the outcome often seems cruel.

For men this might be their version of adoption, for their part in it. The thing is, that does also mean, in a lot of cases, that they adopted their half of financial responsibility out to the taxpayer: the time, effort, and money.

If nature representing itself were an indication, later in pregnancy, it becomes apparent that a woman is having a baby, and it starts to look less like just her body, and like something more. It seems that then it is maybe too bold for medical intervention, and this is where the lines are blurred to our eyes. When a baby would survive naturally on it's own is another. An ultrasound is accurate, but the technology is not necessarily "natural" or an indication of what we should be privy to if trying to discern based only on nature.

The truth might be that a baby is still an extension of the mother even after birth. I think that is too great a leap. One of the most horrific things that I could think of happening would be of a newborn plucked from its mother and killed. My heart wrenching goes to the mother, that is my personal instinct as to the true horror of it.

...continued...

There is also another concept.

Of being willing to walk away or of being willing to die.

It's not whether a person can choose to be born, but more so whether there is a standard that says, as human beings, we should be willing to walk away from our own lives, and not insist on our own existence at all costs.

There is nothing wrong with insisting on living, that I know of, and a child being born may, or may not be, the greatest gift to a person, beyond imagination, in every case. But, even as an adult, thinking of their own mother, is it right to insist on your own life, if you knew it went against the wishes of your mother?

I wanted to follow up on the topic of abortion. Should you in theory be willing to walk away, and if so, when does that cease to be true?

Is it really so hard to say, definitively, "I would not want it unless you wanted it, also"?

What if it is the standard with which we enter into life. Willing to die?

I am, in theory, willing to say that. Not now, with something "lived", to fight for. That would be wrong. But in theory, before you take a breath. Isn't it right, that in the finest of intention, that you are willing to blink out like a light, holding onto nothing that you can't hold on to?

If the point is whether or not it's wrong, not just whether or not it would be right, or worth it to have a child in any case.

Is there actually an expectation? To be effortless, willing, and free, when it is right to do so.