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**Money can buy abortions and anti-abortion ads**

*The conservative Christian group Focus on the Family is sponsoring a
pro-life ad, featuring football star Tim Tebow, during Sunday's Super
Bowl. Should CBS show the ad? Should CBS allow other faith-based groups
to buy Super Bowl ads promoting their beliefs on social issues? Is a
major sporting event, or a TV ad campaign, an appropriate venue for
discussing such vital and divisive culture-war issues like abortion?*

Here in America we are, and should be, free to buy abortions and anti-abortion ads. We are not, and should not be, free to kill "abortionists" or to suppress "speech."

1.....Being pro-choice, I hope the public finds the Super Bowl ad *repulsive*.

2.....What I find more disturbing is the mentality of the question. If we were in China, we wouldn't be asked whether censoring Google is a good idea: the Government would not be interested in our opinion, and would suppress any public poll on an issue on which the Government's position is clear. But this is *America*! I am offended at being asked whether people (individuals and institutions) should feel free to buy ads pro/con "beliefs on social issues."

3.....Within its First Amendment right to freedom of speech, Focus on the Family felt free to buy an ad promoting its point of view. After America's half-century binge of individualism, we need more focus on the family: I favor much in Focus on the Family's mission statement. But I look with strong disfavor on the organization's current Focus on the Fetus, with its insistence that its view on the abortion issue is THE Christian view. That *unjustifiable narrowness*virtually excommunicates all of us pro-choice Christians.

4.....How is the narrowness unjustified? (1) It falsely claims that the present pro-life doctrine is biblical and orthodox. The truth: the view that the human fertilized egg (the zygote-conceptus) is a person did not exist until *very recent*times. (2) It fails to consider that "the sanctity of life" should include the "new occasions" that teach us "new duties." We pro-choice Christians view abortion in *wider contexts* of human rights and of the biosphere supporting human life than existed in previous times. The gospel of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ does not change; but "circumstances alter cases," and not to change with the changing times is to honor the past against the future.

5.....Since I have no interest in football, the first thing I ever heard about Tim Tebow is that he wasn't aborted. The clever, sneaky, unethical implication is that abortions have prevented millions of Americans from making great contributions to America. Consider the irony of Focus on the Family's illogic. Abortions occur to prevent the birth of unwanted children. Unwanted children are less likely to grow up in a loving, two-parent family (the FOTF ideal). They are more likely to grow up in circumstances excluding them from opportunities to become moral and productive citizens.

6.....An institution's "beliefs" appear in its mission statement. We panelists are being asked to judge the morality of CBS's ad budget, as to whom it should "allow" to buy certain ads for certain venues, and whether it should even "show" in a certain venue an ad it has already produced. The question strikes me as weirdly *unreal*.

7.....A further irony. The Super Bowl is a mad mix of what's wrong as well as what's right with America. In THAT war venue, It's almost laughable to raise the question whether ads on "divisive culture-war issues" are appropriate.

8.....From the marginal sanity of this week's question, I appeal to an ancient prayer: "Lord, give us *a right judgment*in all things."
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**Comments**

**Please report offensive comments below.**

I very much agree with your points, Tis sad though that we must wish that many find this a repulsive ad to protect a woman's right to choose. In some sense this ad is about having the right to choose.

**POSTED BY: JOB22 | FEBRUARY 4, 2010 8:50 AM****REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT**

?

**Yes, Money can buy a lot of things! However the things that Money can't buy are more abundant in number, quality and substance than those it can buy. Money of course can buy sex but not Love. It can buy "friends" but Not Loyalty, as the US Military and CIA knows very well, after their failed attempts in Afghanistan to do so.**

**Among other things Money can buy is Religion. Oh yeah! Tragically though, it won't buy the Ticket to the Kingdom of Heaven.**
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9... How many packages of diapers or cases of baby formula would that Super Bowl ad buy? If they really cared about "saving babies", FoTF would use their money to support the walking wombs...er... mothers AFTER the kid is born.
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