

Pro-Life letters in Waco Tribune-Herald, May 2019 (Page 1 of 2)

Waco Tribune-Herald May 2, 2019

Right to life?

We were intrigued by the Easter Sunday column by Pastor Jimmy Dorrell, "Right to life' far broader than opposing abortion." We agree with most of his points. All of Creation is important to God, especially humans made in His image. Pastor Dorrell is to be commended for his efforts on behalf of the poor and marginalized.

Pastor Dorrell maintains that he is committed to the "right to life," as evidenced by the heartbeat of preborn children. He states "...that a heartbeat is enough to validate personhood and protection for those fetuses conceived in a mother's womb." We would agree with him and suggest that God is the author of every human life (Ruth 4:13; Revelation 4:11).

What confuses us is what Pastor Dorrell's point actually was. Was he scolding right-to-lifers? We would agree with him that respecting human life must include helping the poor, the hungry, the sick, the prisoners, etc. We also understand that many Waco area churches support his ministry, Mission Waco, which helps the poor, homeless and those in need.

In a recent Trib ad, many leaders of those churches, but not Pastor Dorrell, listed their names as supporting the "40 Days for Life" prayer vigil at Planned Parenthood, the only abortion provider in the Waco area. The ad read, "Let us pray for decisions that both the preborn baby and the mother can live with. We pray for an end to abortion in Waco. Let us embrace the image bearers of God... as deserving of our support in life..." Surely, Pastor Dorrell could support such a statement and resulting prayer vigil.

Supporting the right to life must begin with that very right — *life!* That is the logical place to begin — by opposing abortion on demand. We should be concerned about people who are needy *and* preborn children. Surely, we can agree on that!

Warren Fain, Waco

MAY 3, 2019

Issue of the day

In his April 12 column, Pastor Jimmy Dorrell rightfully challenges pro-lifers to address the issues of poverty, teen pregnancy, racial prejudice, homelessness and the sustainability of the earth. Dorrell argues these issues rival abortion in importance. He overlooks the fact not a single aborted baby ever lives to face any issue or any opportunity to help the poor or others in need. Abortion is the life-or-death issue of the day.

Tom Harrison, Waco

Friday, May 10, 2019

Fungible dollars

In her May 3 column, Dr. Iliana Neumann states that "...Texas legislators ... are causing ... devastating consequences for uninsured women [needing] cancer screenings, annual exams, birth control and other health care." She despairs that "women forgo or delay breast and cancer screenings [and] birth control that would have been accessible ... from ... Planned Parenthood [PP]."

Dr. Neumann should be telling women of the Healthy Texas Women (HTW) program offered by the State of Texas. HTW offers virtually all the services that Dr. Neumann lists and most HTW services are free for the uninsured. She bemoans women's "limited options." Limited options? The HTW website lists more than 100 physicians and/or clinics within five miles of zip code 76701, including Dr. Neumann's Family Health Center. See www.healthytexaswomen.org and click on Find a Doctor.

Dr. Neumann states that "Tax dollars do not fund abortion in Texas." That's correct, but unlike medical services, dollars are fungible. If PP were included in the State of Texas programs, PP could use taxpayer funds in other areas and free up those unused dollars to finance its abortion practice.

An easy solution to Dr. Neumann's problem is for PP to stop doing abortions. Then the Texas Legislature would almost certainly include PP in women's health-care programs.

Nicholas O'Connor, Waco

Tuesday, May 14, 2019

Beneath the bridge

Regarding Ashley Bean Thornton's column on removal of the I-35 pedestrian bridge: I too will miss its presence but for the very reason she finds it so repugnant. That overpass offers a tremendous venue for life, especially the lives of unborn babies in the womb. Arguing for women's right to choose is a very tired argument when it excludes the life that a woman carries in her womb, regardless of how that life began.

Yes, a woman's control of "her" body is almost limitless. She may train for and run a marathon as she may also tattoo, body pierce or shave her head. However, those rights end where the life of another begins. Women can always "make the decision that is best for them (you)" but when there is a pregnancy attached to that decision, another life must be considered as well.

"Ending a pregnancy" cannot be sugarcoated. Abortion is the taking of another life, a life that began at conception. Anti-abortion activists on that overpass are very conscious of and sympathetic to the pregnant women who pass beneath and the all-important decision that confronts them regarding that other life they are carrying in their womb. They are prayed for and cared for, regardless of the decision they make.

Bob Lehman, Menard

May 15, 2019

A voice in the matter

Who are the people affected by a pregnancy? Certainly the pregnant woman should be the chief decision-maker. There also has to be a male husband or sexual partner. Both the woman's and the man's extended families may care about the pregnancy. And let's not forget the baby in the pregnant woman's womb.

Suppose the woman is deciding whether to end the pregnancy. Who is most affected by an abortion? Few would argue it's the husband or sex partner or the extended families. Many persons believe it's the pregnant woman because her body is holding the baby in-utero and she faces her own future and that of the baby. Others think the baby is most affected because he/she faces a life-or-death situation.

This brings us to Ashley Bean Thornton's May 7 column that describes four potential scenarios faced by pregnant women. In all four cases, Thornton's decision rule for the pregnant woman is "[make] the decision that you believe is best for you." What about the baby — a human being in the process of formation? What would be the outcome if the baby in the womb had a voice in the decision?

Erika McBurnett, Waco

Friday, May 17, 2019

Unwanted children

In her Thursday letter, La Nelda Hughes says nothing is more heartbreaking than an unwanted child. Then she says that every child deserves to be wanted, cared for and educated. I submit the only way those scenarios can play out is to not abort the child. She then suggests anti-abortionists volunteer at local schools or day cares. Fair enough. Right after she volunteers at the local abortion clinic and performs an abortion. She can relay to us how she lovingly pulled out the mangled remains of the child and whispered that she was happy to save him or her from a world full of danger, deprivation, hunger, fear and misery.

David Hayslip, Waco

Sunday, May 19, 2019

Be against abortion

"Alabama near-total abortion ban." I agree with the Trib's front-page placement (May 16) of this very big news. There are several facets to Alabama's enactment of the nation's strongest anti-abortion law. I point out here that the Alabama law counters a common misconception that anti-abortion is overwhelmingly a Catholic movement. Only 4 percent of the Alabama population is Catholic.

The reality for Waco, Alabama and the nation: The battle against abortion has broad support among the religious and nonreligious who recognize the devastating realities of abortion. I encourage all who consider involvement to step up now for pre-born babies and their moms.

Finally, I refer to our cause as *anti-abortion*. Those who battled the No. 1 social injustice of slavery in the 19th century did not shirk from being *against* something. Wacoans and all Americans willing to stand up against the No. 1 social injustice of the 21st century should embrace the challenge and name of anti-abortion.

John Pisciotta,
Director, Pro-Life Waco

May 23, 2019 ;

Abortion follies

In Michael Jones' May 21 letter challenging John Pisciotta's pro-life beliefs, he overlooks two issues:

First, as a pro-choice advocate, he argues that what a woman does with her own body is nobody else's business. Fine. However, the DNA of the fetus from conception is different from that of the woman. It is only attached to the woman's body for nourishment. It is a separate human being, not *her* body.

Jones appears to have some understanding of Bible teachings and may consider himself a Christian. If so, when does God create the immortal soul of an individual that lives forever? Is it at birth, the first breath, the first heartbeat, the second trimester or at conception? The answer is given in Ephesians 1:4 which states: "He chose us in Him before the foundation of the world."

If the immortal soul is created at conception, then Jones may not be "laughing" when his soul stands before the Creator. Oops — that may not be an acceptable reply. But Jones is free to make his own choices regarding his own body and soul.

Don Hardcastle, Waco