

Abortion, In Our Face

A Perspective On The Culture Of Death by Dr. Don Matzat

In a recent article titled "Timothy McVeigh in our face," *Washington Post* editorialist E. J. Dionne Jr. discussed the wisdom of televising the May 16th execution of the Oklahoma City bomber. Quoting from an earlier *New York Times* editorial piece that suggested that televising the execution of McVeigh would "coarsen" our society, Dionne stated, "The debate about whether his May 16 execution should be televised has forced us all to contemplate exactly what it is that coarsens our culture – reality or its presentation."

He goes on to suggest that televising McVeigh's execution might change minds about the death penalty. He reasons that if we saw the stark reality of putting someone to death, we might begin to question the wisdom of executions. In his final paragraph, Dionne raises an intriguing question. He writes, "Timothy McVeigh ... may deserve to die. But will our society ennoble itself by putting him to death? If we were sure of the answer, we would have fewer qualms about putting his execution on television for all to see."

Dionne makes a good point. If we have qualms about viewing the execution of McVeigh on television, are we not actually saying that there is something inherently wrong with the death penalty? If we are not willing to

have the reality of the act "in our face," we must believe that there is something inherently wrong with the act itself.

I believe it is consistent with a Pro-Life position to be in favor of the death penalty. By executing McVeigh we are placing the ultimate price tag on the 168 people who were killed in his senseless bombing. The value of their lives demands the life of McVeigh in exchange. He committed a mass murder that was both calculated and premeditated. While I have no great desire to view the execution of McVeigh, if my position on the death penalty was challenged and I was called upon to view McVeigh's final moments in order to prove that I believed his punishment was proper, *I would do so without hesitation.*

Dionne is right in suggesting that one's unwillingness to view the reality of an act is clear evidence that one questions the morality of the act. In fact, I believe that if you are "on the fence" when it comes to the issue of capital punishment viewing an execution would be necessary in order to make-up your mind. How can you pass judgment on an act if you have no experience with the nature of the act? Numerous movies and documentaries have been

produced in recent years putting the death penalty "in your face" in hopes of changing public opinion.

How applicable is Dionne's premise to the abortion debate! Pro-Life advocates accurately believe that if the act of abortion was visually presented in all of its stark reality there would be an outcry of opposition to the procedure. Perhaps an abortion should be televised so that the society can make an informed decision? Perhaps all of the bleeding-heart liberals who defend a woman's right to choose should be required to view the heinous act?

There are Pro-Life groups who operate websites in which graphic pictures of aborted babies are displayed. While such presentations are very disturbing and hard to view, the reasoning behind the presentation is sound. Those who believe that abortion is right and proper must be called upon to "put up or shut-up." If they can't view the presentation are they not saying there is something wrong with the reality? On one such website (www.abortiontv.com) the question is raised, "If we were able to watch babies grow through windows on mothers' stomachs, would people still abort their babies?"

Realizing the truth of Dionne's principle, the Pro-Abortion forces are fiercely against showing the pictures of aborted babies. At the present time the people in Ireland are debating the abortion issue. During a street information session in the city of Lisburn, police ordered the Pro-Life action group *Precious Life* to remove pictures of babies killed by abortion from their display boards or face a prosecution for breach of the peace and confiscation of the boards.

On their website, *Planned Parenthood* complains that the Pro-Life counseling centers "show shocking and deceptive films or slide shows that include pictures of mutilated fetuses and stillborn babies."

The reasoning used by the Pro-Abortion forces in opposition to graphic presentations of abortion is seriously flawed. In an article titled "Women's Reproductive Self-Determination," T.F. Barans states: "Many medical procedures are gruesome. Should we show posters of open-heart surgeries ... people whose faces are being reconstructed after grotesque auto accidents?" The fact is if open-heart surgery and facial reconstruction were moral issues they should be graphically presented in order to allow people the right to make-up their minds as to whether the procedure is right or wrong. Comparing pictures of aborted babies with pictures of open-heart surgery is comparing apples and oranges. Graphic presentations of surgical procedures are readily seen in television documentaries.

Abortionists even oppose the right of a woman to view an ultrasound of the baby in the womb. Dr. Dr. L. Lacroix of Planned Parenthood, Kelowna, British Columbia, wrote in the *Kelowna Daily Courier* on August 24, 2000, "Abortion is a hard enough thing for any woman to decide without the torture of seeing the baby on an ultrasound screen."

The principle is correct: ***if you are unwilling to view a presentation of an act in all of its stark reality, you are thereby questioning the morality of the act!*** Jesus put it this way, "Everyone who does evil hates the light, and will not come into the light for fear that his deeds will be exposed." (John 3:20)

It is not the execution of Timothy McVeigh or the presentation of that execution that will coarsen our culture. We have already been coarsened by the execution of millions of innocent babies.

Dr. Don Matzat was the keynote speaker at the 2000 National Lutherans For Life Convention. An author, pastor, and apologist, Matzat has been an ordained minister in The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod for 35 years. He hosts a two-hour weekly national radio program called Issues, Etc. and a daily three-hour radio talk show for WORD-FM in Pittsburgh.