



Selena, (And NPR editors looped in)

Sending an email, requesting comment, in the evening before you do a report that purports to have some scientific content that would require analysis – with the apparent purpose of including a dig at SFLA in your copy -- implies a lack of willingness to engage on your conclusions and is a low integrity move.

It's interesting to note that you did not reach out to the Charlotte Lozier Institute that analyzes such data or Dr. Michael New who specializes in such things. Or at least you choose not to mention their names. Instead, you came to us. Your goal did not appear to be discussion, but rather, to build a soap box for editorialization, not reporting. You could have quoted our website without trying to imply that we dodged your calls.

For the others on this chain, I have forwarded your one and only email to us, sent about 7 p.m. central/8 p.m. eastern.

You prewrote the copy, gave no time for response, and published with a call for more abortion as a conclusion.

Given the extraordinary numbers of rape – an evil crime of violence that demands a criminal justice response – you have nothing to say about what appears to be a dramatic increase in rape during the Biden Administration. Surely that merited a response. Nor do you note that [Soros-funded](#) prosecutors call for lenience for rapists – a horror of a policy. We note also that you do not explore in your reporting the implications of policy or how to address such crimes against women or support them. You don't seem to care about the rape at all only about abortion. Why is that? Having spent time as a reporter covering courts and criminal justice, I note that this is a topic journalists should be emphasizing.

And then there is the math that you cite, with the weak line that "an estimate that may spark some debate," Seriously? Did you look at that algebra? On the subject of math, it's worth a fact check alone, as the [CDC reports that over the course of a lifetime about 3M women](#) will experience rape-related pregnancy ... that's ALL US women, and over a lifetime, while this alleged data poll represents, it says, 14 states. So, your reported math of 64,565 rape-related pregnancies in a 4-to-18-month period (the abortionists said), considered in light of 3M women (CDC) over the course of a lifetime, means that an outsized portion of all pregnancies occurred in those 14 states? Did you look at California or New York or Illinois where crime waves are currently legendary?

On the core issue: We must first show love and concern for women when a rape takes place and second address the crime. But here you are with a third option of skipping all of that to note that an abortionist supports abortion.

The math does not add up, but the intention is clear – push for more abortion by pretending that abortion as an antidote to the violence and crime of rape. It is not. It adds to the trauma, as many who have experienced such pain can tell you, if you ask.

I note that you did not include the voices of people conceived in rape or talk with a woman who has experienced rape and had the baby. Instead, you offer some kind of second-class citizenship to people based on their conception.

In Hot News/Cold News analysis, I note that there was no rush to print. Step one, for such a query, would be to read the report. Step two would be to hear from voices other than only those in support of abortion. To include stories such as those below that you could also have found on our blog when you grabbed our website reference ... if you looked. And to talk with social scientists such as those already noted above.

As a former journalist, who works with journalists daily, it's disappointing to note such sloppy work.

Students for Life of America/SFLAction have worked often with NPR on a number of stories, which makes your gratuitous slam surprising.

Best of luck in your future endeavors, but should NPR need future comment, please go through your colleagues who have better journalistic ethics and practices, as it is clear that having pre-written your story, with your own foregone conclusions, you had no intention of including any thoughtful response as you neither sought a social policy researcher nor provided the time for us to actually read the report.

And to the editors on this chain, I hope that you all will have an internal conversation about this reporting.

Regards,
Kristi Hamrick