Email Timeline for Milford Mail-Journal Abortion Article Appeared 9-30-2015

(For the sake of clarity I am inserting additional information using italics)

The initial request for an article on abortion went out on Friday, August 21, 2015.

On 8/21/2015 3:08 PM, Balogh, Raymond wrote:

Greetings!

I am working on the next installment of the "Tackling the Tough Questions" series for the Mail-Journal Church Page. It appears that these articles will not follow a particular schedule, primarily due to limited space in the newspaper. Because they are timeless themes, the articles can be placed when the production department has room. Therefore, there is no deadline for the following request.

The next TTTQ topic is: Abortion.

Would any of you like to volunteer to contribute to the abortion article?

Ray Balogh rbalogh@the-papers.com (574) 658-4111, ext. 2504

I responded within hours:

On Aug 21, 2015, at 6:00 PM, Bushongs

descenturylink.net> wrote:

I'd like to throw my hat into the ring for that one. Approximately how many words?

Blessings-

Tim Bushong

On 8/24/2015 8:20 AM, Balogh, Raymond wrote:

Pastor Bushong:

Thank you for your response. The issue is a serious and complex one, and I'd like to get as much input as I can. The article is only 550 words max, but I may have to run a two- or three-part series.

Please feel free to weigh in with as much depth as you'd like. I am also interested in the Scriptures on which the various positions are based.

Ray Balogh

On Aug 24, 2015, at 9:57 AM, Bushongs <bushongs@centurylink.net> wrote:

Very good--when is the deadline for this one?

On 8/24/2015 10:00 AM, Balogh, Raymond wrote:

If you could have it in by the end of this week, that would work well for me.

Thank you.

Ray Balogh

I then wrote the article and submitted it before 5:00 that following Friday:

On 8/28/2015 4:28 PM, Bushongs wrote:

Here you go, Ray--thanks for the opportunity!

Tim

Almost 3 weeks go by, with no response—so I wrote this:

On Sep 17, 2015, at 12:36 PM, Bushongs <bushongs@centurylink.net> wrote:

Hi Ray-

Hope you're doing well--sadly, I am not a subscriber to Mail-Journal--did the article run yet?

Thanks-

Tim

Another week goes by, then I received this on Wednesday:

On 9/23/2015 11:31 AM, Balogh, Raymond wrote:

The articles have not run yet.

I have two submissions from different perspectives, and I'd like to run them side buy side in the same issue. We haven't had room for that just yet, but I may be able to schedule them in

for either the Sept. 30 or Oct. 7 issue.

Thanks.

Ray Balogh

That Friday I wrote back:

On Sep 25, 2015, at 10:41 AM, Bushongs

bushongs@centurylink.net> wrote:

Hi Ray-

I think that's a good idea. I'm guessing that the other article is not as strongly pro-life as mine is, and of course there are differing thoughts on this.

However, I wouldn't want to give the readers the perspective that it's merely two different opinions on such a profound topic, so I would suggest that you run at least one follow-up feature to allow for interaction and cross-examination of the other person's perspective.

As Proverbs 18:17 says "The one who states his case first seems right, until the other comes and examines him."

So both of us who are weighing in on this incredibly important issue would be required to support their case under 'examination' by the other side. Otherwise, it's just a "he said/she said" situation, with no clear resolution.

We could do it via email, or a transcribed moderated debate.

Thanks-

Tim

Then the following Wednesday Ray responded:

On 9/30/2015 1:17 PM, Balogh, Raymond wrote:

Rev. Bushong:

Thank you for your contribution to the discussion about the church's response to abortion. The position statements should both be out in today's issue. I asked the production department to lay out the articles so that it doesn't appear the newspaper is favoring one position over the other. We'll see how they've arranged that; they're pretty good at that sort of thing.

The editors consider the Church Page as more an informational venue than a debate forum.

Space is pretty limited right now and they'd rather focus on time-sensitive news items than on a back-and-forth debate.

Therefore, I will have to move on from the abortion discussion to other matters.

Thank you for your suggestion, but it is fairly unworkable in our journalistic setting.

Ray Balogh