

Dear International Fact-Checking Network,

Reuters Fact Check made an error in a fact check on the subject of abortion. I sent a correction request to Reuters Fact Check, following its instructions for a correction request.

After over a week's time, Reuters Fact Check made no apparent effort to fix its error and provided no explanation for its failure to act.

Details:

Justice Sonia Sotomayor, in oral arguments before the Supreme Court, asked where “the life of the woman and putting her at risk, enter the calculus?” in regulating abortion.

So-called “anti-abortion” activist Alexandra DeSanctis Marr answered Sotomayor with the traditional understanding of “abortion” that “anti-abortionists” oppose: elective abortion. “Anti-abortionists” do not consider a procedure done to save the life of the mother a procedure used to deliberately kill the embryo or fetus.

Reuters Fact Check ignored the operative definition DeSanctis Marr used in her tweet and contradicted it for purposes of the “False” ruling using a different definition of “abortion.” That’s [a fallacy of equivocation](#). Fallacious reasoning has no rightful place in fact-checking.

Instead of equivocating, the fact checkers should have explained to readers the multiple ways “abortion” may be understood, placed the original claim in its proper context, and explained how DeSanctis Marr’s claim might mislead people if taken out of context.

I [emailed](#) that information to Reuters Fact Check on July 30, 2022. As of Aug. 11, 2022, Reuters Fact Check made [no apparent effort to correct or justify its error](#). That inaction, by any reasonable measure, counts as a failure to adhere scrupulously to an open and honest corrections policy.

If anyone at the IFCN reads this, I request an acknowledgment via email at zebrafactcheck@gmail.com, with the title of this document in the subject header. Thanks.

Sincerely,

Bryan W. White
Editor and publisher, Zebra Fact Check