

MEDIA ETHICS NEWS

URL: <http://www.imediaethics.org> (<http://www.imediaethics.org>)

Updated: 5 hours 16 min ago

 (<http://imediaethics.org/feed/>)

DO 1/3 OF DRUNK VEGETARIANS EAT MEAT? WHERE'S THE SURVEY MEDIA COVERED?

([HTTP://WWW.IMEDIAETHICS.ORG/DO-13-OF-DRUNK-VEGETARIANS-EAT-MEAT-WHERES-THE-SURVEY-MEDIA-COVERED/](http://www.imediaethics.org/do-13-of-drunk-vegetarians-eat-meat-wheres-the-survey-media-covered/))

13 hours 16 min ago

Do a third of vegetarians really go for hamburgers and bacon after drinking too much?

The media was quick to cover a survey saying so earlier this fall, but where is the survey? The news site that apparently originated the coverage of the survey, the UK *Morning Advertiser*, is a trade publication for pubs and told iMediaEthics its report was based on a press release. Not only that, but its story is essentially a copy and paste from the survey company's press release.

UK coupon website Voucher Codes Pro is credited with producing the survey the media covered — which claims a polling of 1,789 British vegetarians found 1/3 of them ate meat when they were drunk.

But iMediaEthics is still trying to track down the survey. We've written several times to Voucher Codes Pro and left messages on its voicemail. Despite its website's promise to respond to press inquiries "**within minutes (<http://www.vouchercodespro.co.uk/press>),**" iMediaEthics has not heard back, much less been provided with the survey, its methodology or any other information on the alleged findings. We first contacted Voucher Codes Pro Oct. 10.

iMediaEthics' polling director David Moore looked at the information provided on Voucher Codes Pro's website, and published on the *Advertiser's* site. "Everyone citing it probably because it has entertainment value (!)...but there's no information I can see that talks about how the survey was done," he commented.

Moore raised serious concerns about the poll: "It's only of vegetarians, so the question is – how was a representative sample of vegetarians collected? With no information at all about how the survey was conducted, there is no reason to take the results seriously."

Last year, iMediaEthics **came across a similar case (<http://www.imediaethics.org/updated-latimes-time-buzzfeed-cite-poll-10-america-thinks-html-is-a-std/>)**, when media was citing, without fact checking or verifying, a survey from another UK coupon website, VoucherCloud, that was promoted by a viral marketing firm in the UK. In that case, the media said one of ten Americans thought HTML was an STD but the media never saw the survey before reporting on it or being skeptical.

Where did the Story Come From?

The *Morning Advertiser* (<http://www.morningadvertiser.co.uk/Pub-Food/Healthy-options/A-third-of-vegetarians-eat-meat-when-drunk>) appears to be the first news outlet to cite the study, with other outlets reporting on the story early on, including **Food and Wine** (<http://www.foodandwine.com/fwx/food/little-secret-37-percent-vegetarians-dont-want-you-know>) and Vice's **Munchies**, (<http://munchies.vice.com/articles/a-third-of-vegetarians-eat-meat-when-theyre-drunk>) linking to the Advertiser's coverage, or **had** (<http://www.femalefirst.co.uk/foodanddrink/vegetarian-meat-eaters-882193.html>) the same **content** (<http://www.belfastvibe.com/big-stories/1-in-3-vegetarians-confess-to-eating-meat-when-drunk/>) as the Voucher Codes Pro blogpost on the survey.

(<http://www.imediaethics.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/morningadv.jpg>)

A screenshot from the *Morning Advertiser's* story on the drunk vegetarian survey.

The *Morning Advertiser's* Oct. 8 story carried the byline of James Evison and its information is credited to Voucher Codes Pro, the company that is listed as **conducting** (<http://www.poynter.org/news/mediawire/387140/ap-changes-style-hillary-clinton-not-hillary-rodham-clinton/>) the survey. The *Advertiser* is a weekly magazine devoted to pubs in England and Wales.

iMediaEthics went to the website for Voucher Codes Pro, where the site's blog **writes** (<http://www.vouchercodespro.co.uk/blog/drunk-vegetarians-eating-meat>) about the survey, including the information and quote from its CEO cited by the *Morning Advertiser*. Voucher Codes Pro's blogpost about the survey reads like a press release and in some cases is verbatim what the *Morning Advertiser* published, leading iMediaEthics to suspect that the *Morning*

Advertiser simply re-wrote the press release.

iMediaEthics contacted the *Advertiser*'s editor Ed Bedington who directed us to Voucher Codes Pro for more information about the survey and confirmed that the *Advertiser*'s writer lifted from the Voucher Codes Pro press release. "The story is from a press release by the vouchers website – you'll have to chase them for the source material," he e-mailed iMediaEthics. "It looks like James took the story from the original press release, hence the similarity (I'll have a word with him about cutting and pasting!!!)."

See below a highlighted version of the *Advertiser*'s story. Highlights indicate content that is verbatim from the *Morning Advertiser* blogpost.

<http://www.imediaethics.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/veggie1.jpg>

<http://www.imediaethics.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/veggies2.jpg>

Voucher Codes Pro identifies itself as a "leading money saving website in the UK" and said it surveyed 1,789 UK vegetarians.

Who Has Covered the Story?

Voucher Codes Pro's [website \(http://www.vouchercodespro.co.uk/press/USA-Today---081015\)](http://www.vouchercodespro.co.uk/press/USA-Today---081015) boasts the media coverage the study received:

"We recently conducted some research into the number of vegetarians who eat meat when they are drunk. Our research found that 1 in 3 vegetarians eat meat when they are drunk. The research was really interesting for us here and couldn't wait to get it out to the press. The response we have seen has been incredible! The likes of the Independent, Metro, Yahoo, Huffington Post and the Telegraph ran the story in the UK. We didn't, however, expect the response we received over in America. We've received incredible numbers of coverage including Fox News, Elite Daily, Daily Wire, Today FM, Mother Jones, App.com and many many more. We were also covered on USA Today, which is the subject of today's press article."

The study warranted not one, but two stories in the *Huffington Post*. Below are links to some of the many, many news stories on the unverified survey:

- Huffington Post UK's Rachel Moss "[A Third of Vegetarians Eat Meat When They're Drunk, Survey Reveals](http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/2015/10/09/vegetarians-eat-meat-when-drunk-survey_n_8267806.html)" (http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/2015/10/09/vegetarians-eat-meat-when-drunk-survey_n_8267806.html)
- Huffington Post US's Ron Dicker "[Surprising Number Of Drunk Vegetarians Secretly Eat Meat](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/vegetarians-eat-meat-drunk-survey_56167f34e4b0e66ad4c69f50)" (http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/vegetarians-eat-meat-drunk-survey_56167f34e4b0e66ad4c69f50)
- The Telegraph's "agency" story: "[A third of 'vegetarians' eat meat when drunk on a night out](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/11918091/A-third-of-vegetarians-eat-meat-when-drunk-on-a-night-out.html)" (<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/11918091/A-third-of-vegetarians-eat-meat-when-drunk-on-a-night-out.html>)
- Elite Daily, "[Drunk-etarians: 1 In 3 Vegetarians Eats Meat When Drunk, Study Says](http://elitedaily.com/social-news/drunk-etarians-1-3-vegetarians-eat-meat-drunk-study-says/1239822/?utm_source=huffingtonpost.com&utm_medium=referral&utm_campaign=pubexchange_article)" (http://elitedaily.com/social-news/drunk-etarians-1-3-vegetarians-eat-meat-drunk-study-says/1239822/?utm_source=huffingtonpost.com&utm_medium=referral&utm_campaign=pubexchange_article)"
- Fox News: "[One third of vegetarians eat meat when drunk](http://www.foxnews.com/leisure/2015/10/07/one-third-vegetarians-eat-meat-when-get-drunk/)" (<http://www.foxnews.com/leisure/2015/10/07/one-third-vegetarians-eat-meat-when-get-drunk/>)"
- Daily Beast: "[Why drunk vegetarians eat meat](http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2015/10/11/why-drunk-vegetarians-eat-meat.html)" (<http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2015/10/11/why-drunk-vegetarians-eat-meat.html>)"
- USA Today: "[Survey: 1 in 3 Vegetarians admits to eating meat when drunk](http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation-now/2015/10/08/survey-vegetarians-secretly-eat-meat-drunk/73583378/)" (<http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation-now/2015/10/08/survey-vegetarians-secretly-eat-meat-drunk/73583378/>)"
- Jezebel: "[Study claims vegetarians secretly eat meat while drunk](http://jezebel.com/study-claims-vegetarians-secretly-eat-meat-while-drunk-1735589252/)" (<http://jezebel.com/study-claims-vegetarians-secretly-eat-meat-while-drunk-1735589252/>)"
- CBC: "[Drunk vegetarians admit to eating meat: survey](http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/drunk-vegetarians-admit-to-eating-meat-survey-1.3288678)" (<http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/drunk-vegetarians-admit-to-eating-meat-survey-1.3288678>)"
- News.com.au "[One in three vegetarians eat meat when they're drunk because following the diet is hard](http://www.news.com.au/technology/science/human-body/one-in-three-vegetarians-eat-meat-when-theyre-drunk-because-following-the-diet-is-hard/news-story/3939ec801990a8ea0fb085278dcb9145)" (<http://www.news.com.au/technology/science/human-body/one-in-three-vegetarians-eat-meat-when-theyre-drunk-because-following-the-diet-is-hard/news-story/3939ec801990a8ea0fb085278dcb9145>)
- Mother Jones "[Drunken Vegetarians Are Sometimes Secret Meat Eaters](http://www.motherjones.com/blue-marble/2015/10/drunken-vegetarians-are-sometimes-secret-meat-eaters)" (<http://www.motherjones.com/blue-marble/2015/10/drunken-vegetarians-are-sometimes-secret-meat-eaters>)
- SFGate.com "[Study finds vegetarians secretly eat meat while drunk](http://www.sfgate.com/news/article/Study-finds-vegetarians-secretly-eat-meat-while-6560947.php)" (<http://www.sfgate.com/news/article/Study-finds-vegetarians-secretly-eat-meat-while-6560947.php>)"
- New York Daily News "[British study finds that more than 1 in 3 vegetarians eat meat when they're drinking](http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/study-finds-1-3-vegetarians-eat-meat-drinking-article-1.2391444)" (<http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/study-finds-1-3-vegetarians-eat-meat-drinking-article-1.2391444>)

The post [Do 1/3 of Drunk Vegetarians Eat Meat? Where's the Survey Media Covered?](http://www.imediaethics.org/do-13-of-drunk-vegetarians-eat-meat-wheres-the-survey-media-covered/) (<http://www.imediaethics.org/do-13-of-drunk-vegetarians-eat-meat-wheres-the-survey-media-covered/>) appeared first on [iMediaEthics \(http://www.imediaethics.org\)](http://www.imediaethics.org).

BBC: COVERAGE OF SYED FAROOK & TASHFEEN MALIK'S APARTMENT 'APPROPRIATE AND RELEVANT' (HTTP://WWW.IMEDIAETHICS.ORG/BBC-COVERAGE-OF-SYED-FAROOK-TASHFEEN-MALIKS-APARTMENT-APPROPRIATE-AND-RELEVANT/)

Tue, 12/08/2015 - 9:12pm

The BBC stands by its coverage of the **San Bernardino shootings** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/things/san-bernardino-shootings/>), specifically its footage from inside the apartments of **Syed Farook** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/people/syed-farook/>) and Tashfeen Malik.

In a **statement** (<http://www.bbc.co.uk/complaints/complaint/sanbernadinocoverage/>) on its website today, the BBC said it did receive complaints about invasion of privacy and a lack of newsworthiness of the apartment video.

"We received complaints from viewers unhappy with coverage from inside the apartment of the San Bernadino attackers, Syed Rizwan Farook and Tashfeen Malik," the BBC said. "Some viewers felt the coverage was intrusive and voyeuristic, while others were concerned about the newsworthiness of the reporting and the legality of the media presence in the apartment."

However, the BBC argued its video from the apartment added context by showing "how they had lived their lives" and noted that the FBI and police didn't complain about the media's access to the apartment.

"The shootings in San Bernadino were carried out by a seemingly ordinary married couple and we wanted to show how they had lived their lives, deceiving friends, relatives and neighbours," the BBC said. "The FBI stated that journalists were allowed into their home, as it was no longer part of its investigation. The local police force was present when journalists went into the premises."

The BBC went on:

"This story raised many issues, including gun ownership, home-grown terrorism and Islam. The coverage from inside the apartment was a brief part of our overall reporting of these wider subjects. In this context we felt it was an appropriate and relevant part of understanding who the killers were and the changing nature of Islamist attacks their domestic arrangements may reflect."

iMediaEthics has written to the BBC to ask how many complaints it has received over its coverage.

Broadcast regulator OfCom told iMediaEthics it has received 4 complaints about the apartment coverage. "We'll assess these complaints before deciding whether to investigate or not," an OfCom spokesperson told iMediaEthics.

MSNBC **apologized** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/san-bernardino-shootings-coverage-we-regret-showing-photos-licence-msnbc-says/>) last week for showing on live TV a close-up of the drivers license of Syed Farook's mother as well as photos of unidentified people it found inside the apartment.

The Daily Beast **apologized** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/daily-beast-ids-wrong-san-bernardino-shootings-suspect-mixes-up-syed-farook-with-brother/>) after it wrongly identified the shooter Syed Rizwan Farook's brother as the shooter. The Associated Press **corrected** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/associated-press-corrects-duped-by-fake-san-bernardino-witness-who-linked-shootings-to-gamergate/>) after it was hoaxed and published an interview with someone who posed as a witness to the shootings and said the suspects referenced GamerGate.

UPDATED: 12/9/2015 11:38 AM EST With response from OfCom

The post **BBC: Coverage of Syed Farook & Tashfeen Malik's Apartment 'Appropriate and Relevant'** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/bbc-coverage-of-syed-farook-tashfeen-maliks-apartment-appropriate-and-relevant/>) appeared first on **iMediaEthics** (<http://www.imediaethics.org>).

UK SUN RETRACTS: FREELANCER DIDN'T GO FROM TURKEY TO FRANCE WITHOUT SHOWING PASSPORT (HTTP://WWW.IMEDIAETHICS.ORG/DID-REPORTER-MAKE-IT-FROM-TURKEY-TO-FRANCE-WITHOUT-SHOWING-PASSPORT-SUN-RETRACTS/)

Tue, 12/08/2015 - 12:02pm

The UK *Sun* hit delete on a Dec. 5 story claiming its reporter Emile Ghessen traveled from Turkey to France over six days without having to show his passport at any borders. The Croatian government busted the story as false because it had records of the passport being checked twice.

The *Sun* pointed iMediaEthics to its correction in today's print edition apologizing for the story and saying the newspaper was "misled" by the freelancer who made the claims.

After finding out the reporter used his passport during the trip, the *Sun* admitted "his story did not, therefore, demonstrate that the borders of Europe had lax controls."

"We apologise for publishing misleading information," the *Sun* wrote. "We have now changed our policy regarding the use of freelance journalists in stories such as these."

<http://www.imediaethics.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/unnamed.jpg>

The Croatian government showed "a picture of the passport it said he was asked to present at its borders" to prove the story bogus, the *Guardian* **reported** [http://www.theguardian.com/media/2015/dec/07/sun-reporter-passport-croatia-paris?](http://www.theguardian.com/media/2015/dec/07/sun-reporter-passport-croatia-paris?utm_source=esp&utm_medium=Email&utm_campaign=Media+Briefing+new+v2&utm_term=142003&subid=1250340&CMP=ema_546)

[utm_source=esp&utm_medium=Email&utm_campaign=Media+Briefing+new+v2&utm_term=142003&subid=1250340&CMP=ema_546](http://www.theguardian.com/media/2015/dec/07/sun-reporter-passport-croatia-paris?utm_source=esp&utm_medium=Email&utm_campaign=Media+Briefing+new+v2&utm_term=142003&subid=1250340&CMP=ema_546)). The government published the photo "as evidence," it said, calling the *Sun* claims "false and malicious allegations which are harmful not only to the reputation of the Croatian police, but also the Republic of Croatia, presenting it unsafe ground."

The government **said** (<http://www.mup.hr/225695/1.aspx>) Ghessen had to show his passport to authorities when he entered and exited Croatia. The government's statement reads, according to Google Translate:

"In fact, it is a false and inaccurate claims because the Croatian border police recorded Emile Pierre Ghessena 23.11.2015. at 14:10 hours at the railway border crossing Tovarnik when entering the Republic of Croatia, while it is 24.11.at 17:20 hours recorded at the airport border crossing Zagreb (airport Pleso) at the exit of the Republic of Croatia."

Below see the *Sun*'s story, which the *Guardian* uploaded. With the reporter's claim about his passport having been debunked, the veracity of the rest of his article should be questioned, especially at a time of heightened fears of terrorism.

<http://www.imediaethics.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/1613.jpg>

More than 2,600 people **complained** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/2600-complaints-over-suns-claims-1-in-5-muslims-sympathize-with-isis-times-of-london-corrects/>) last month about the *Sun*'s cover story claiming a poll recently found 1 in 5 British Muslims sympathized with ISIS.

The post **UK Sun Retracts: Freelancer didn't go from Turkey to France without showing passport** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/did-reporter-make-it-from-turkey-to-france-without-showing-passport-sun-retracts/>) appeared first on **iMediaEthics** (<http://www.imediaethics.org>).

DAILY MAIL HIRED A HELICOPTER TO TAKE PICTURES OF PRINCE ANDREW'S HOUSE FOR PRINCESS EUGENIE'S BIRTHDAY PARTY STORIES (HTTP://WWW.IMEDIAETHICS.ORG/DAILY-MAIL-HIRED-A-HELICOPTER-TO-TAKE-PICTURES-OF-PRINCE-ANDREWS-HOUSE-FOR-PRINCESS-EUGENIES-BIRTHDAY-PARTY-STORIES/)

Tue, 12/08/2015 - 5:00am

It was wrong for the *Daily Mail* to have a helicopter fly over Prince Andrew's house and take photos of his daughter's 25th birthday party, UK print regulator the Independent Press Standards Organisation ruled.

The *Mail*'s four articles, published between June 20 and 26 of this year, about Princess Eugenie's birthday party invaded the family's privacy and wasn't in the public interest, IPSO found.

"Before publication of the articles, the newspaper chartered a helicopter to fly over the grounds of the Royal Lodge and take aerial photographs of preparations for the party happening at the complainant's home and garden," IPSO said.

Prince Andrew complained to IPSO, saying "he had not known of, or consented to, the flight over the grounds, which were a private place."

He pointed out that his house "was secluded and not visible to the naked eye from any part of the public highway, and that access to the house and gardens was restricted, including with fencing, and controlled by security."

In response to Prince Andrew's complaints, the *Mail* said Princess Eugenie was naturally in the public interest since she is "eighth in line to the throne and a senior member of the Royal Family."

The *Mail* also claimed its helicopter photographs were to fact-check and that it got information about the plans for the party from an anonymous source and wanted the helicopter to double check before publication.

“Aerial photographs of people’s homes are a matter of routine and are taken, for example, by Google Earth,” the *Mail* argued, adding that Prince Andrew didn’t complain about any of the photos following publication and that the *Mail* knew the prince wouldn’t be at the house when its helicopter flew by.

Regardless of those claims, IPSO said Prince Andrew’s house was a private place and in this case, the hiring of a helicopter was specifically to see Prince Andrew’s private event. “Any public interest served by the information published in the articles was not proportionate to the intrusion caused by the flight,” IPSO ruled, noting the paper had other ways to find out the information it wanted.

The *Mail* must publish the IPSO ruling in print in the first ten pages of its print edition and for 12 hours on its homepage.

iMediaEthics is writing to the *Mail* for comment.

iMediaEthics **notes** (<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3139607/Dancing-dwarfs-bisexual-supermodel-Fergie-s-Wizard-Oz-outfit-Welcome-Princess-Eugenie-s-11-hour-b-day-bash.html>) that one of the *Mail*’s stories shows Princess Eugenie Photoshopped into a Snow White costume. The photo doctoring was disclosed.

The post **[Daily Mail Hired a Helicopter to Take Pictures of Prince Andrew’s House for Princess Eugenie’s Birthday Party Stories](http://www.imediaethics.org/daily-mail-hired-a-helicopter-to-take-pictures-of-prince-andrews-house-for-princess-eugenies-birthday-party-stories/)** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/daily-mail-hired-a-helicopter-to-take-pictures-of-prince-andrews-house-for-princess-eugenies-birthday-party-stories/>) appeared first on **iMediaEthics** (<http://www.imediaethics.org>).

DAILY BEAST IDS WRONG SAN BERNARDINO SHOOTINGS SUSPECT, MIXES UP SYED FAROOK WITH BROTHER OF SAME NAME (HTTP://WWW.IMEDIAETHICS.ORG/DAILY-BEAST-IDS-WRONG-SAN-BERNARDINO-SHOOTINGS-SUSPECT-MIXES-UP-SYED-FAROOK-WITH-BROTHER/)

Mon, 12/07/2015 - 6:26pm

The Daily Beast named the wrong person as the suspect in the San Bernardino shootings, mixing up one of the suspects, Syed Rizwan Farook, with his brother, Syed Raheel Farook.

A correction atop its article now reads: “CORRECTION 12/3/15 1:41 A.M. An earlier version of this story identified one of the San Bernardino shooters as Syed Raheel Farook, not Syed Rizwan Farook. We sincerely regret the error. ”

The article by Katie Zavadski, “**[Suspect ID’d in San Bernardino Massacre as Syed Farook](http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2015/12/02/police-id-suspect-in-san-bernardino-massacre-as-syed-farook.html)** (<http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2015/12/02/police-id-suspect-in-san-bernardino-massacre-as-syed-farook.html>),” notes the two Farooks are brothers. What the correction doesn’t note is that the *Daily Beast* also published the Facebook photo of the wrong brother, *Ad Week*’s Fishbowl NY **reported** (<http://www.adweek.com/fishbowlny/the-daily-beast-tags-the-wrong-syed-farook/361180>). BuzzFeed has more information on the wrongly identified brother, Syed Raheel Farook who it **says** (<http://www.buzzfeed.com/aramroston/brother-of-suspected-san-bernardino-shooter-is-decorated-nav#.ihXnvEEen>) is a U.S. Navy veteran.

iMediaEthics has written to the *Daily Beast* for further comment.

This type of mix-up happened following the Sandy Hook shootings, iMediaEthics notes. Media outlets, including CNN and the Associated Press, wrongly showed photos of Sandy Hook shooter Adam Lanza’s brother Ryan Lanza, **identifying** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/media-mess-ups-whos-who-of-sandy-hook-school-shooting-reporting-errors-part-1/>) him as the shooter. That also led to news outlets using photos of Ryan Lanza pulled from Facebook labeled as the suspected shooter.

The mix-up of the Farook brothers wasn’t the only mis-identification in reporting on the shootings, Fishbowl NY noted. The second suspect, Tashfeen Malik, was wrongly identified by a *Los Angeles Times* reporter and Fox News.

“L.A. Times FBI and justice reporter Rick Serrano initially reported the name of the female suspect to be Tayeep Bin Ardogan,” Fishbowl NY **reported** (<http://www.adweek.com/fishbowlny/the-daily-beast-tags-the-wrong-syed-farook/361180>). “And again, because of the nature of these breaking news situations, that wrong information quickly **made its way** (<https://twitter.com/laseptiemwilay/status/672308198087516160>) onto the Fox News Channel scroll.”

Serrano tweeted later that the suspect ID was incorrect, Mediaite **noted** (<http://www.mediaite.com/online/who-is-san-bernardino-shooting-suspect-syed-farook/>). He wrote, “[San Bernardino] police clarifying that 2nd name was not released by them. Appears now to be a hoax. We are disregarding.” iMediaEthics has written to Serrano to ask for more information.

SB police clarifying that 2nd name was not released by them. Appears now to be a hoax. We are disregarding.

— Rick Serrano (@RickSerranoLAT) **December 3, 2015** (<https://twitter.com/RickSerranoLAT/status/672280932703932417>)

The post **[Daily Beast IDs Wrong San Bernardino Shootings Suspect, Mixes up Syed Farook with brother of same name](http://www.imediaethics.org/daily-beast-ids-wrong-san-bernardino-shootings-suspect-mixes-up-syed-farook-with-brother/)** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/daily-beast-ids-wrong-san-bernardino-shootings-suspect-mixes-up-syed-farook-with-brother/>) appeared first on **iMediaEthics** (<http://www.imediaethics.org>).

[RALPH PETERS, STACEY DASH SUSPENDED FROM FOX NEWS FOR OBAMA COMMENTS](http://www.imediaethics.org/Ralph-Peters-Stacey-Dash-Suspended-from-Fox-News-for-Obama-Comments/) **([HTTP://WWW.IMEDIAETHICS.ORG/RALPH-PETERS-STACEY-DASH-SUSPENDED-FROM-FOX-NEWS-FOR-OBAMA-COMMENTS/](http://www.imediaethics.org/Ralph-Peters-Stacey-Dash-Suspended-from-Fox-News-for-Obama-Comments/))**

Mon, 12/07/2015 - 4:29pm

Fox News and Fox Business Network suspended contributor Lt. Col. Ralph Peters after he called President Barack Obama a “total p*ssy” on air, and contributor Stacey Dash for saying of Obama “I felt like he could give a s**t — excuse me, like he could care less.”

Both were suspended for two weeks over their comments in response to Pres. Obama’s Dec. 6 speech from the Oval Office about terrorism, ISIS and the San Bernardino shootings. Bill Shine, Senior Executive Vice President of Programming issued a statement, which Fox News sent to iMediaEthics, saying:

“Earlier today, FOX contributors Lt. Col. Ralph Peters and Stacey Dash made comments on different programs that were completely inappropriate and unacceptable for our air. FOX Business Network and FOX News Channel do not condone the use of such language, and have suspended both Peters and Dash for two weeks.”

Fox Business’ Stuart Varney called Peters out on air for his comments, which were made during Varney’s show on Fox Business Network. Varney said, **[according to Salon](http://www.salon.com/2015/12/07/fox_news_contributor_calls_obama_a_total_pssy_in_unhinged_rant_about_presidents_terrorism_speech/?utm_source=twitter&utm_medium=socialflow)**.

http://www.salon.com/2015/12/07/fox_news_contributor_calls_obama_a_total_pssy_in_unhinged_rant_about_presidents_terrorism_speech/?utm_source=twitter&utm_medium=socialflow “I can tell you are super angry, and I asked you what your reaction was, but I have got to call you — you can’t use language like that on the program, OK? I’m sorry.”

Peters’ comments are below.

Dash called Obama’s speech an “epic fail.”

“I did not feel better,” she said. “I didn’t feel any passion from him, like you said Andrea, I felt like he could give a s**t, excuse me, he could care less.”

Dash’s comments are below, **[via The Wrap](http://www.thewrap.com/fox-news-suspends-stacey-dash-for-anti-obama-profanity/)**: (<http://www.thewrap.com/fox-news-suspends-stacey-dash-for-anti-obama-profanity/>)

Fox News’ media analyst Howard Kurtz said the comments by Peters and Dash were “flippin’ embarrassing,” Media Matters noted.

On Fox, Ralph Peters calls Obama a “total pussy” and Stacey Dash says he doesn’t “give a shit” about terrorism. Fliippin’ embarrassing

— HowardKurtz (@HowardKurtz) **[December 7, 2015](https://twitter.com/HowardKurtz/status/673963149192593408)** (<https://twitter.com/HowardKurtz/status/673963149192593408>)

Critics can say what they want about the president’s policies, but no need for such crude language on the air

— HowardKurtz (@HowardKurtz) **[December 7, 2015](https://twitter.com/HowardKurtz/status/673963389215899648)** (<https://twitter.com/HowardKurtz/status/673963389215899648>)

Peters retired **[in 1998](http://www.imdb.com/name/nm2006923/bio)** (<http://www.imdb.com/name/nm2006923/bio>) after 22 years in the U.S. Army after becoming a Lt. Col. He writes books, columns and essays, his bio **[says](http://usacac.army.mil/cac2/cgsc/events/peters/RalphPetersBio.pdf)** (<http://usacac.army.mil/cac2/cgsc/events/peters/RalphPetersBio.pdf>).

Hat tip: **[Taegan Goddard](https://twitter.com/politicalwire/status/673974849048551425)** (<https://twitter.com/politicalwire/status/673974849048551425>)

The post **[Ralph Peters, Stacey Dash Suspended from Fox News for Obama Comments](http://www.imediaethics.org/Ralph-Peters-Stacey-Dash-Suspended-from-Fox-News-for-Obama-Comments/)** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/Ralph-Peters-Stacey-Dash-Suspended-from-Fox-News-for-Obama-Comments/>) appeared first on **iMediaEthics** (<http://www.imediaethics.org>).

[BAND BOSTON’S FOUNDER LOSES LIBEL LAWSUIT OVER BOSTON HERALD BRAD DELP COLUMNS](http://www.imediaethics.org/Band-Bostons-Founder-Loses-Libel-Lawsuit-Over-Boston-Herald-Brad-Delp-Columns/) **([HTTP://WWW.IMEDIAETHICS.ORG/BAND-BOSTONS-FOUNDER-LOSES-LIBEL-LAWSUIT-OVER-BOSTON-HERALD-BRAD-DELP-COLUMNS/](http://www.imediaethics.org/Band-Bostons-Founder-Loses-Libel-Lawsuit-Over-Boston-Herald-Brad-Delp-Columns/))**

Mon, 12/07/2015 - 5:00am

The *Boston Herald* didn’t libel the band Boston’s Donald Thomas Scholz with three columns about the death of the band’s lead singer Brad Delp, **[MassLive reported](http://www.masslive.com/politics/index.ssf/2015/11/sjc_rules_for_boston_herald_in.html)** (http://www.masslive.com/politics/index.ssf/2015/11/sjc_rules_for_boston_herald_in.html). Delp died by suicide in 2007.

According (<http://www.mass.gov/courts/docs/sjc/reporter-of-decisions/new-opinions/11511.pdf>) to the court ruling, the three columns by columnists Gayle Fee and Laura Raposa “relied on information from Brad’s former wife, Micki Delp, and various unnamed ‘insiders’ and ‘friends.’”

Scholz sued the *Herald*, the columnists and Delp’s ex-wife Micki Delp because he said the claims “insinuated that Scholz was responsible for Brad’s suicide.” But the ruling found the Herald published “nonactionable opinions based on disclosed non defamatory facts that do not imply undisclosed defamatory facts.”

The Herald’s lawyer Jeffrey Robbins explained to iMediaEthics by phone that the court ruling found that “you cannot objectively prove what was in his mind at the moment or moments when he decided to take his life and therefore it couldn’t be objectively proven [why]” Delp died. Therefore, “it was by definition pure opinion and protected by the First Amendment,” he said.

“This happens to be one of those cases where the reporting was extremely strong and very transparent as the court indicated,” Robbins said. “These articles were filled with all of the information that cut in every direction” including quoting a note Delp left “saying he was responsible,” and “a police officer saying no one knew why.”

The court said it didn’t agree with Scholz’s claim that “The Herald articles are actionable because they impliedly assert that Scholz was responsible for Brad’s death.”

“While we can imagine rare circumstances in which the motivations for a suicide would be manifestly clear and unambiguous, this is not such a case,” the ruling reads. “The statements at issue could not have been understood by a reasonable reader to have been anything but opinions regarding the reason Brad committed suicide.”

The judge also noted that the articles were clearly publishing speculation and “a reasonable reader would not expect to include nuanced phrasing” in the headline.

The Herald’s lawyer Robbins told iMediaEthics the case went over “a very large body of evidence” as to Delp’s state of mind and life through testimony from his family, friends and doctor.

They testified about Delp’s “feelings about Tom Scholz, about what being around Scholz made him feel like, about the prospect of going out one more time with Scholz [on tour] when he did not want to, about his feelings that he had — that he could not stand up to Scholz and in his perspective betrayed his friends who had had extremely difficult situations with Scholz.”

“The people who really suffered the most were Brad Delp’s loved ones, who felt, it’s fair to say, very intimidated by this process and who rather courageously stepped forward to testify about what Brad Delp had told them,” Robbins commented. “That’s not easy to do under any circumstance, let alone when the individuals fear being sued themselves.”

Scholz said in a press statement sent to iMediaEthics he was “wrongly blamed for Brad Delp’s suicide” and “he is disappointed that the court has decided to allow a tabloid newspaper to avoid having a jury decide the facts.”

Pointing to information revealed during the trial about Delp’s life before his death, Scholz’s statement went on:

“Based on these undisputed events immediately prior to Brad’s death, Mr. Scholz disagrees with the court’s decision that the cause of Brad’s suicide is unknowable. Mr. Scholz believes this decision will have adverse consequences well beyond his case against the Herald because it regrettably means that people are largely free to accuse another of causing someone’s suicide, even when, as here, the accusation is false.

“In the end, Mr. Scholz remains saddened by the loss of his friend and bandmate, Brad Delp.”

Scholz has to pay \$132,000 in court costs for the *Herald*, **according** (http://www.masslive.com/politics/index.ssf/2015/11/sjc_rules_for_boston_herald_in.html) to MassLive.

Likewise, the case against Micki Delp was dismissed.

The post **[Band Boston’s Founder Loses Libel Lawsuit over Boston Herald Brad Delp Columns](http://www.imediaethics.org/band-bostons-founder-loses-libel-lawsuit-over-boston-herald-brad-delp-columns/)** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/band-bostons-founder-loses-libel-lawsuit-over-boston-herald-brad-delp-columns/>) appeared first on **[iMediaEthics](http://www.imediaethics.org)** (<http://www.imediaethics.org>).

ASSOCIATED PRESS CORRECTS, DUPED BY FAKE SAN BERNARDINO WITNESS WHO LINKED SHOOTINGS TO GAMERGATE (HTTP://WWW.IMEDIAETHICS.ORG/ASSOCIATED-PRESS-CORRECTS-DUPED-BY-FAKE-SAN-BERNARDINO-WITNESS-WHO-LINKED-SHOOTINGS-TO-GAMERGATE/)

Sun, 12/06/2015 - 5:00am

The Associated Press and CNN were duped by a person pretending to be a witness to the San Bernardino shootings. The hoaxer tweeted that she saw the shooter and that the shooter linked the attack to **GamerGate (http://www.imediaethics.org/journalism-ethics-gamergate-debate-in-miami-next-month/)**. **“an online movement ostensibly concerned with ethics in game journalism and with protecting the ‘gamer’ identity.” (http://gawker.com/what-is-gamergate-and-why-an-explainer-for-non-geeks-1642909080)**

The Associated Press published a correction admitting the hoax: “This story has been corrected to eliminate the section attributed to Marie A. Parker. A social media account that led AP to a person who used that name and claimed to be a witness later posted that the anecdote was a hoax.”

Steve Buttry, Director of Student Media at Louisiana State University, published a screenshot of the Associated Press bulletin retracting the story and Parker’s claims. “The Associated Press has withdrawn its story about survivors of the mass shooting at a California social services center. The account given by someone named Marie A. Parker, who said she was walking back to her car when she saw a man with a gun, was not inaccurate. The story will be replaced with a version that does not include Parker’s account.”

That same **correction (http://www.nytimes.com/aponline/2015/12/03/us/ap-us-california-shootings-the-survivors.html? r=1)** appears on *The New York Times*’ website, which published the AP story, “Stories of Those who Survived Mass Shooting in California.”

Conservative news site Breitbart **interviewed (http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2015/12/04/associated-press-retracts-interview-with-san-bernardino-troll-following-breitbart-report/)** the hoaxer who said

“When the shooting occurred and made its way to the news, I tweeted saying how I was in hiding at the shooting and I had gotten a glimpse of what happened. Immediately a bunch of reporters kept following and dming [direct messaging] me asking me if I wanted to be interviewed. Then someone from CNN asked me to be on Anderson Cooper. I took that interview. Took a few hours but I finally got put on the air. I didn’t get to say anything I wanted but it was still pretty amazing how I somehow made my way on the broadcast.”

CNN’s Anderson Cooper interviewed the hoaxer on air, Mediaite **noted (http://www.mediaite.com/online/ny-times-cnn-fall-for-fake-eyewitness-blaming-san-bernardino-on-gamergate/)**. iMediaEthics has reached out to CNN to ask for comment.

Parker’s Twitter account, @jewymarie, is **set (https://twitter.com/jewymarie)** on private.

Steve Buttry **detailed (https://stevebuttry.wordpress.com/2015/12/03/the-case-of-marie-christmas-verifying-eyewitnesses-isnt-simple-or-polite/)** the backstory on the hoaxer and raised several key issues:

1. “You can call it a prank, ‘Marie,’ but it’s also a lie. That may make you smarter than some journalists, but you’re still a liar.
2. “Exploiting a tragedy for fun and laughs is lower on the scale of humanity than whatever you think media do in seeking to interview witnesses to tragedies. Enjoy your end zone dance, but I think you should attend the funerals of each of the San Bernardino victims whose deaths gave you such glee.
3. “‘Marie’ didn’t expose ‘the media.’ She exposed a few media outlets (albeit some big ones; more on them later). As far as I can tell, most journalists who contacted ‘Marie’ didn’t use her story. Some told me privately that they were skeptical. I will be asking them if I can use their time-stamped expressions of skepticism, all before her victory tweet.”

The post **Associated Press Corrects, Duped by Fake San Bernardino Witness who linked Shootings to GamerGate (http://www.imediaethics.org/associated-press-corrects-duped-by-fake-san-bernardino-witness-who-linked-shootings-to-gamergate/)** appeared first on **iMediaEthics (http://www.imediaethics.org)**.

NUTRITIONIST WROTE TWO POSITIVE REVIEWS OF HIS OWN BOOK, HUFFINGTON POST DELETES (HTTP://WWW.IMEDIAETHICS.ORG/NUTRITIONIST-WROTE-TWO-POSITIVE-REVIEWS-OF-HIS-OWN-BOOK-HUFFINGTON-POST-DELETES/)

Sat, 12/05/2015 - 5:00am

The Huffington Post unpublished two blogposts by Yale nutritionist **David Katz (http://www.davidkatzmd.com/default.aspx)** after it was revealed he wrote articles praising his own book. However, the conflict in the blogposts wasn’t obvious because Katz’s book was written under a pseudonym.

According to Retraction Watch, (http://retractionwatch.com/2015/11/20/yale-doc-loses-2-huffpo-blog-posts-after-secretly-pushing-his-novel/) Katz’s two “incredibly favorable reviews of reVision,” his book, “implied he had discovered the novel as a reader.”

The Huffington Post deleted both of the reviews, with one of the reviews being replaced with a note explaining there had been a “previously undisclosed conflict of interest.”

Last year, Katz **came clean** (<https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/20140401131214-23027997-i-am-samhu-iyam>) and fessed up to being the author of *reVision* and using the fake name Samhu Iyyam.

In a **Huffington Post** blogpost, (http://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-katz-md/national-nutrition-policy_b_8380658.html) Katz explained why he used the fake name and argued it wasn't a “scandal.”

“For reasons related mostly to the integrity of the tale, the “author” could not be me- so the book was written under a nom-de-plume. Attempting to preserve that separation between myself and the author, I soon realized that left me with no way to tell anyone interested in my writing about this book, which I honestly consider the best thing I've written. I decided to write a blog about it in the third person, and express my opinion. As noted, the writing in question was not compensated.

“But of course, that was a naïve solution. It still left me with no reasonable basis to refer to the book again. So I disclosed that **reVision** (<https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/late-summer-idyll-favorite-chapter-from-book-david-i-katz-md-mph?trk=mp-reader-card>) was indeed mine, although it is more correct to say that my imagination is parent to the author, Samhu Iyyam, than to say that she is me.”

As *Yale Daily News* **summarized** (<http://yaledailynews.com/blog/2015/11/04/katz-faces-criticism-for-book-review/>), Katz's reviews weren't just kind, they were “glowing.” Katz's review said his book had “lyrically beautiful writing” and was on the same-level as Plato.

“I finished with a sense of illumination from a great source,” he wrote, according to *Yale Daily Review*. “The most opportune comparison may be to a fine wine.”

Katz defended his undisclosed conflict of interest in praising his own book secretly, telling the *Yale Daily News*: “I wrote a ... review of my anonymously self-published fiction novel, and said what I really think about it — then disclosed that I wrote it,” Katz said. “There's really a story there?”

Katz told iMediaEthics by e-mail he writes for the *Huffington Post* “in an entirely ‘volunteer’ capacity.”

“There is no contract, and there is NO compensation,” he said, adding that he usually writes about “health promotion and disease prevention, and interpretations of scientific studies in these areas.”

“The content of my blogs is entirely up to me, but is then subject to processing by editors at HP,” he wrote. Katz said he used to submit to editors to publish, but recently he was able to publish directly to the website. That has been revoked, he noted.

“The blogs are submitted to editors, but in my case, they rarely did any editing- although they had the right to do so, or to ask questions. In fact, rather recently, I was told- perhaps as a ‘reward’ for contributing reams and reams of high-quality content that did not require any editing, that I could post directly to the site, without passing through editors. This was implemented only very recently, long after the two blogs about *reVision*, which appeared roughly a year ago, to the best of my knowledge. I note, however, that since this kerfuffle, that direct access to the site seems to have reverted back to the former two-step process: submit to editors, who then make the piece live.”

Katz said the self-publishing company for his book “suggested I blog about the book in the third person, as I did.” Katz said “Very few people ever read those columns, and virtually no copies of the book were sold as a result. I have not made 1 cent as a result of those columns,” he said.

Katz said *Huffington Post* never told him they were deleting his blogposts. He added, “I am insulted by their presumption, fair weather friendliness, rush to judgment, thanklessness, and incivility. Other than that, I presume the reversion of my ‘post directly’ privilege back to the standard ‘submit to editors’ is related to all this, although no one has bothered to tell me that directly.”

Katz also argued he was following “a long and well-established tradition,” pointing to Dr. Seuss and Mark Twain as pen names whose work was promoted by their authors. He likened what he has done to sharing a recipe he created with a soup kitchen without telling people it was his own recipe.

In a LinkedIn post after iMediaEthics' inquiry, Katz **argued** (<https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/scandalous-huffington-post-columns-retracted-so-eat-david?trk=mp-reader-card>) the retractions were “inconsequential” given how long ago the posts were written and how few people read them. Katz also commented that he thinks the issue of *Huffington Post* retracting his blogposts got more attention because of a recent controversy about nutrition guidelines. (More on that over at **Retraction Watch**. (<http://retractionwatch.com/2015/11/20/yale-doc-loses-2-huffpo-blog-posts-after-secretly-pushing-his-novel/>))

In a follow-up e-mail, Katz conceded, “I certainly had a conflict: how to make my readers aware of the book while respecting the alter-ego firewall.” But Katz maintained his claim that his self-promotion didn't benefit him very much and added that he thinks that many of the writers in the Healthy Living section

promote their own work with conflicts of interest.
iMediaEthics has written to the *Huffington Post* for comment.

The post **[Nutritionist Wrote Two Positive Reviews of his Own Book, Huffington Post Deletes](http://www.imediaethics.org/nutritionist-wrote-two-positive-reviews-of-his-own-book-huffington-post-deletes/)** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/nutritionist-wrote-two-positive-reviews-of-his-own-book-huffington-post-deletes/>) appeared first on **[iMediaEthics](http://www.imediaethics.org)** (<http://www.imediaethics.org>).

[SAN BERNARDINO SHOOTINGS COVERAGE: 'WE REGRET' SHOWING PHOTOS, LICENSE, MSNBC SAYS](http://www.imediaethics.org/san-bernardino-shootings-coverage-we-regret-showing-photos-licence-msnbc-says/) **[\(HTTP://WWW.IMEDIAETHICS.ORG/SAN-BERNARDINO-SHOOTINGS-COVERAGE-WE-REGRET-SHOWING-PHOTOS-LICENCE-MSNBC-SAYS/\)](http://www.imediaethics.org/san-bernardino-shootings-coverage-we-regret-showing-photos-licence-msnbc-says/)**

Fri, 12/04/2015 - 8:29pm

MSNBC apologized for broadcasting a close-up image of Syed Farook's mother's driver's license and photographs of unidentified people. Farook and his wife, Tashfeen Malik, are the suspected San Bernardino shooters. MSNBC said in a **[statement](http://talkingpointsmemo.com/livewire/msnbc-statement-san-bernardino-attackers-home)** (<http://talkingpointsmemo.com/livewire/msnbc-statement-san-bernardino-attackers-home>) about its actions:

"MSNBC and other news organizations were invited into the home by the landlord after law enforcement officials had finished examining the site and returned control to the landlord. Although MSNBC was not the first crew to enter the home, we did have the first live shots from inside. We regret that we briefly showed images of photographs and identification cards that should not have been aired without review."

"A CBS reporter, live on CBSN, explained he would not show closeups of personal material—and would not even touch anything, as it was private property," TV Newser **[reported](http://www.adweek.com/tvnewser/media-search-of-suspects-apartment-raises-questions/278917)** (<http://www.adweek.com/tvnewser/media-search-of-suspects-apartment-raises-questions/278917>).

Fox News echoed CNN's **[previous statement](http://www.imediaethics.org/msnbc-shows-rafia-farooks-drivers-license-photos-of-unidentified-people-on-air/)** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/msnbc-shows-rafia-farooks-drivers-license-photos-of-unidentified-people-on-air/>), telling TV Newser:

After receiving permission by the landlord, and after the FBI investigation, we entered the suspect's home to report on what we saw. We exercised cautious editorial judgement and refrained from showing close-ups of sensitive information, including specific identifications and photographs.

The Society of Professional Journalists' ethics chairman Andrew Seaman weighed in on the press coverage of the apartment.

"Journalists should feel free to investigate stories when and where possible," Seaman **[said](https://twitter.com/brianstelter/status/672889561048096769)**

<https://twitter.com/brianstelter/status/672889561048096769> in a statement. "They need to minimize harm in their reporting, however. Walking into a building and live broadcasting the pictures, addresses and other identifying information of children or other people who may have no involvement in the story does not represent best and ethical practices."

Vital reminder of perils of live TV news: Why show images of shooter's home without editorial discretion? I mean, is this Capone's vault?

— David Folkenflik (@davidfolkenflik) **[December 4, 2015](https://twitter.com/davidfolkenflik/status/672874439776870400)** (<https://twitter.com/davidfolkenflik/status/672874439776870400>)

The Washington Post's Erik Wemple **[argued](https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/erik-wemple/wp/2015/12/04/msnbcs-terrible-live-tour-of-the-san-bernardino-attackers-apartment/?postshare=631449260831374&tid=ss_tw)** (https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/erik-wemple/wp/2015/12/04/msnbcs-terrible-live-tour-of-the-san-bernardino-attackers-apartment/?postshare=631449260831374&tid=ss_tw): "What's craven about the MSNBC treatment is the live airing and narration. It adds nothing and trivializes everything. This is a case in which MSNBC, being a cable network, had time to fill and a live opportunity on a hot story — and just decided to go for it. In doing so, it put itself in a situation where it encountered editorial calls more quickly than they could be processed. [CNN's Kerry] Sanders was just having a ball in there, chatting about baby toys and quite possibly invading the privacy of innocent people."

The post **[San Bernardino Shootings Coverage: 'We Regret' Showing Photos, License, MSNBC says](http://www.imediaethics.org/san-bernardino-shootings-coverage-we-regret-showing-photos-licence-msnbc-says/)** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/san-bernardino-shootings-coverage-we-regret-showing-photos-licence-msnbc-says/>) appeared first on **[iMediaEthics](http://www.imediaethics.org)** (<http://www.imediaethics.org>).

[MSNBC SHOWS RAFIA FAROOK'S DRIVER'S LICENSE, PHOTOS OF UNIDENTIFIED PEOPLE ON AIR](http://www.imediaethics.org/msnbc-shows-rafia-farooks-drivers-license-photos-of-unidentified-people-on-air/) **[\(HTTP://WWW.IMEDIAETHICS.ORG/MSNBC-SHOWS-RAFIA-FAROOKS-DRIVERS-LICENSE-PHOTOS-OF-UNIDENTIFIED-PEOPLE-ON-AIR/\)](http://www.imediaethics.org/msnbc-shows-rafia-farooks-drivers-license-photos-of-unidentified-people-on-air/)**

Fri, 12/04/2015 - 1:29pm

MSNBC showed a close-up image of Rafia Farook's driver's license on live TV today.

Farook is the mother of Syed Farook, one of the accused shooters in the San Bernardino shooting this week.

iMediaEthics watched the video of MSNBC going through Syed Farook's townhouse **after his landlord let media in.**

(<http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/05/us/landlord-lets-reporters-into-san-bernardino-suspects-apartment.html?smid=tw-share&r=0>) The MSNBC reporter went through the rooms, looking through a calendar, a stack of photos of unidentified people, and so on, with the camera showing close-ups of some. At one point MSNBC's Andrea Mitchell in the studio cautions to not show pictures of the children.

Ironically, on MSNBC later, the commentator said law enforcement wanted to be "slow and correct rather than fast and wrong."

Over at CNN, Wolf Blitzer discussed the media going through the townhouse.

"Never have I seen something like this," CNN legal analyst Paul Callan said on air about the media being allowed such access to the townhouse, going through belongings, especially when it doesn't appear fingerprinting was done yet.

"Turned a crime scene in a terrorist mass murder into a garage sale," he added.

"I've certainly never seen anything like this," CNN's Wolf Blitzer commented.

For its part, CNN **told** (**http://mashable.com/2015/12/04/san-bernardino-shooters-apartment-journalists/?utm_cid=hp-hh-sec#2NbZTbLtAgqC**) Mashable:

"CNN, like many other news organizations, was granted access to the home by the landlord. We made a conscious editorial decision not to show close-up footage of any material that could be considered sensitive or identifiable, such as photos or ID cards."

NBC News spokesperson Erika Masonhall tweeted:

As **@mitchellreports** (**<https://twitter.com/mitchellreports>**) said on **@MSNBC** (**<https://twitter.com/MSNBC>**): the apt owner permitted the press tour, the FBI has already cleared out useful evidence

— Erika Masonhall (@ErikaMasonhall) **December 4, 2015** (**<https://twitter.com/ErikaMasonhall/status/672833395773202432>**)

The Huffington Post **noted** (**http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/san-bernardino-shooters-home_5661d125e4b08e945fef418b?ej4z33di**): "Multiple television networks, including MSNBC, CNN and CBS, aired footage Friday from inside the home of San Bernardino shooting suspects Syed Rizwan Farook and Tashfeen Malik."

Mashable added: "News outlets, including MSNBC, BBC, CBS News and CNN, broadcast live scenes as reporters toting cameras and microphones pushed through the open door and reported from inside the apartment."

Below, see some tweets about the media coverage inside the townhouse.

MSNBC got in first and was most reckless, with so many close-up shots of family photos (including children) and IDs. **[pic.twitter.com/OCQaf84LL0](https://t.co/OCQaf84LL0)** (**<https://t.co/OCQaf84LL0>**)

— Michael Calderone (@mlcalderone) **December 4, 2015** (**<https://twitter.com/mlcalderone/status/672841922441035776>**)

You're journalists. You're supposed to care about integrity, not spectacle. Go to Hollywood where you belong and get out of my profession.

— Heather Billings (@hbillings) **December 4, 2015** (**<https://twitter.com/hbillings/status/672839108356677632>**)

That was some of the nuttiest live TV I've seen in a while. Imagine journalism schools will examine this for years.

— Brian Ries (@moneyries) **December 4, 2015** (**<https://twitter.com/moneyries/status/672835363606523908>**)

brb, giving up america and journalism to be a goat farmer in new zealand

— Marcus Gilmer (@marcusgilmer) **December 4, 2015** (**<https://twitter.com/marcusgilmer/status/672842081677672453>**)

MSNBC just doxed Rafia Farook, mother of a terrorist, on live television. I've blurred the important bits. [pic.twitter.com/VqPwT60yVY](https://t.co/VqPwT60yVY)

(<https://t.co/VqPwT60yVY>)

— David Boles (@DavidBoles) **December 4, 2015** (<https://twitter.com/DavidBoles/status/672835027961446401>)

Classy: NBC inside the house of San Bernardino attackers <https://t.co/6p368wU3o4> (<https://t.co/6p368wU3o4>)

— Stuart Millar (@stuartmillar159) **December 4, 2015** (<https://twitter.com/stuartmillar159/status/672830563825373185>)

MSNBC now cut from the live shot, maybe deciding not such a great idea to show unknown people's pics, driver's license[] on live TV

— James Poniewozik (@poniewozik) **December 4, 2015** (<https://twitter.com/poniewozik/status/672830803404017664>)

iMediaEthics has written to MSNBC to ask if it will apologize, blur or remove the driver's license, in particular, from its coverage.

The post **MSNBC shows Rafia Farook's Driver's License, Photos of Unidentified People on Air** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/msnbc-shows-rafia-farooks-drivers-license-photos-of-unidentified-people-on-air/>) appeared first on **iMediaEthics** (<http://www.imediaethics.org>).

NEW ETHICS GUIDELINES FOR WORLD PRESS PHOTO (HTTP://WWW.IMEDIAETHICS.ORG/NEW-ETHICS-GUIDELINES-FOR-WORLD-PRESS-PHOTO/)

Fri, 12/04/2015 - 5:00am

World Press Photo has released its first set of **ethics guidelines** (<http://www.worldpressphoto.org/activities/photo-contest/code-of-ethics>) for its annual photography contest, which is currently accepting entries.

According to the World Press Photo press release, sent to iMediaEthics by the organization, the new guidelines were the product of “a five-month review of both the foundation's activities and lessons learned from previous photo contests.”

As iMediaEthics **reported** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/world-press-photo-entries-20-finalist-entries-faked-disqualified-for-photo-manipulation/>) earlier this year, twenty percent of the finalist entries to the 2015 contest were disqualified for going too far with photo editing. The foundation admitted it took part of the responsibility for the photo issues. “As a foundation, we were not clear enough in our criteria and guidance to entrants, and our communications on this issue should have been much better,” managing director Lars Boering said in the **press release**. (<http://www.worldpressphoto.org/news/2015-11-25/world-press-photo-foundation-announces-new-photo-contest-procedures-and-online>)

Now, anyone submitting work to the contest “must ensure their pictures provide an accurate and fair representation of the scene they witnessed so the audience is not misled,” the guidelines read. Photos cannot be staged, altered, re-enacted, or feature inaccurate captions. The guidelines state:

“This means that entrants:

1. Should be aware of the influence their presence can exert on a scene they photograph, and should resist being misled by staged photo opportunities.
2. Must not intentionally contribute to, or alter, the scene they picture by re-enacting or staging events.
3. Must maintain the integrity of the picture by ensuring there are no material changes to content.
4. Must ensure captions are accurate.
5. Must ensure the editing of a picture story provides an accurate and fair representation of its context.
6. Must be open and transparent about the entire process through which their pictures are made, and be accountable to the World Press Photo Foundation for their practice.

“This code of ethics provides guidelines on best practice.”

In addition, “Only single exposure and single frame pictures will be accepted. The following are not accepted: Multiple exposures, polyptychs (diptychs, triptychs, and so forth) [and] Stitched panoramas, either produced in-camera or with image editing software,” the entry rules **note** (<http://www.worldpressphoto.org/activities/photo-contest/entry-rules>).

World Press Photo also explains **“what counts as manipulation?”** (<http://www.worldpressphoto.org/activities/photo-contest/verification-process/what-counts-as-manipulation/>) “The first thing that counts as manipulation is staging or re-enacting events,” the group says. “The code of ethics says photographers must not intentionally contribute to, or alter, the scene they picture by re-enacting or staging events.” However, portraits, when clearly labeled and not altering positioning of bodies, don't count as manipulation. “The second thing that counts as manipulation is adding or removing content from the image,” the instructions state.

World Press Photo goes on: "It is not acceptable to remove things such as: physical marks on body, small objects in the picture, reflected light spots, shadows, extraneous items on picture's border that could not be removed by crop." On the opposite end, "It is not acceptable to add things. This includes, but is not limited, to: cloning in highlights, enhancing body, or costume size, painting in object details, photo montage, replicating material on the border of a picture to make a neat crop possible."

The contest also bans photographers who have been busted twice for altering content submitted to the World Press Photo award for five years.

"Photographers eligible for the final round of judging will now have to provide a digital raw file or the original unprocessed jpeg file along with the three frames before and after the contest entry," the *New York Times* **reported** (http://lens.blogs.nytimes.com/2015/11/25/world-press-photo-introduces-new-ethics-guidelines-for-contest/?_r=1). "If they shot film they will have to provide scans of negatives showing a series of at least three frames before and after the entry. These images will be examined by two independent digital experts."

The new ethics guidelines signal "the first time the 60-year-old contest has published such a thing, as well as revised rules and detailed guidance for entries," **according** (<http://petapixel.com/2015/11/25/world-press-photo-now-has-a-code-of-ethics-after-60-years-in-existence/>) to photo news website Peta Pixel.

The deadline for entering the awards contest is Jan. 13, 2016 at noon, Central European Time.

The post **New Ethics Guidelines for World Press Photo** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/new-ethics-guidelines-for-world-press-photo/>) appeared first on **iMediaEthics** (<http://www.imediaethics.org>).

GENDER-NEUTRAL MX. USED BY NYTIMES AS HONORIFIC

([HTTP://WWW.IMEDIAETHICS.ORG/GENDER-NEUTRAL-MX-USED-BY-NYTIMES-AS-HONORIFIC/](http://www.imediaethics.org/gender-neutral-mx-used-by-nytimes-as-honorific/))

Thu, 12/03/2015 - 5:00am

The *New York Times* used the gender-neutral pronoun Mx. in a recent story, the *New York Observer* **reported** (<http://observer.com/2015/11/the-new-york-times-adds-mx-to-the-honorific-mix/>).

The *Times*' Nov. 25 story, "**At Bluestockings, a Manhattan Activist Center, Radical is Sensible** (<http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/29/nyregion/at-bluestockings-a-manhattan-bookshop-and-activist-center-radical-is-sensible.html>)," refers to a **Bluestockings** (<http://bluestockings.com/>) staffer as Mx. with a last name and noted the staffer "prefers not to be assigned a gender — and also insists on the gender-neutral Mx. in place of Ms. or Mr."

Mx. is pronounced "mix," *Time* reported **last month** (<http://time.com/4106718/what-mx-means/>). "Dating back to at least the late 1970s, the *M* was taken from the first letters of those gendered honorifics, and the *x* was attached to suggest an unknown quantity or thing, like it might in algebra class," *Time* said.

What is Mx? The *Observer* **explains** (<http://observer.com/2015/11/the-new-york-times-adds-mx-to-the-honorific-mix/>):

"While still unfamiliar to many, the honorific has made even bigger strides since June. Earlier this month, it was **added to Dictionary.com** (<http://time.com/4106718/what-mx-means/>) and is being **considered for addition to the Oxford English Dictionary** (<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/gender-neutral-honorific-mx-to-be-included-in-the-oxford-english-dictionary-alongside-mr-ms-and-mrs-10222287.html>). Using non gender-specific identifiers presents a **notable challenge to journalists** (<http://publiceditor.blogs.nytimes.com/2015/02/11/the-times-and-transgender-issues-part-one-of-two-on-pronouns/>) who rely on pronouns for clarity and to break up the monotony of proper names."

In an e-mail to iMediaEthics, *New York Times* standards editor Philip B. Corbett repeated his comments he also made to the *Observer* about Mx.: "As I've said to several others who have inquired, in my view, it's too soon to set down any clear-cut style guidelines in this area. Our approach on style decisions is generally to follow accepted, settled usage, not to make the rules. But in referring to people who don't identify as male or female, I think usage is still evolving and there's not one settled or widely recognized set of guidelines."

"In the meantime, we just have to discuss situations case by case," he added. "The two main goals are to be respectful to those we write about, and to be clear to our readers."

Corbett laid out his position back in June, telling the *Times* then "I don't think we're likely to adopt Mx. in the near future." Corbett said the term was "too unfamiliar to most people, and it's not clear when or if it will emerge as a widely adopted term."

Hat Tip: **Kristen Hare** (<https://twitter.com/kristenhare/status/671413247891886082>)

The post **[Gender-neutral Mx. used by NYTimes as Honorific \(http://www.imediaethics.org/gender-neutral-mx-used-by-nytimes-as-honorific/\)](http://www.imediaethics.org/gender-neutral-mx-used-by-nytimes-as-honorific/)** appeared first on **[iMediaEthics \(http://www.imediaethics.org\)](http://www.imediaethics.org)**.

[TIM YEO MUST PAY \\$600,000 AFTER FAILED LIBEL LAWSUIT AGAINST UK SUNDAY TIMES \(HTTP://WWW.IMEDIAETHICS.ORG/TIM-YEO-MUST-PAY-600000-AFTER-FAILED-LIBEL-LAWSUIT-AGAINST-UK-SUNDAY-TIMES/\)](http://www.imediaethics.org/tim-yeo-must-pay-600000-after-failed-libel-lawsuit-against-uk-sunday-times/)

Wed, 12/02/2015 - 5:00am

Former UK Parliament member Tim Yeo must cough up “more than £400,000” (about \$600,000) after unsuccessfully suing the UK *Sunday Times* for libel.

Yeo sued over the newspaper saying he “behaved scandalously” and was “willing to abuse his position in Parliament to further his own financial and business interests in preference to the public interest,” as iMediaEthics **[previously reported. \(http://www.imediaethics.org/sunday-times-sued-tim-yeo-libel/#sthash.TelQ0xcl.dpuf\)](http://www.imediaethics.org/sunday-times-sued-tim-yeo-libel/#sthash.TelQ0xcl.dpuf)** The 2013 *Times* story was based on undercover reporting.

The BBC **[explained \(http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-suffolk-34921715\)](http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-suffolk-34921715)** that the *Times*’ story claimed Yeo “breached parliamentary codes of conduct by telling reporters he could promote business concerns in return for cash” and that Yeo “would approach ministers for a daily fee of £7,000.”

The *Sunday Times* argued its story was “true,” “fair comment” and “responsible journalism on matters of public interest.”

In a statement after the case, the *Times*’s editor Martin Ivens called the dismissal a “victory for investigative journalism. It vindicates the role of the press in exposing the clandestine advocacy by MPs for undisclosed interests.” Ivens went on, **[according \(http://www.theguardian.com/media/2015/nov/25/tim-yeo-loses-libel-case-sunday-times-tory-mp\)](http://www.theguardian.com/media/2015/nov/25/tim-yeo-loses-libel-case-sunday-times-tory-mp)**

to the *Guardian*:

“The *Sunday Times*’ Insight team has a long history of reporting on the conduct of politicians and is proud to have forced reform of standards in public life.

“This case has emphasised the essential role of newspapers in disclosing wrongdoing. It is good to see the courts recognise that journalism carried out in good faith is vital to a healthy democracy.”

The judge said Yeo gave “unreliable” and “untruthable evidence,” that was partially “utterly implausible,” the *Mail* **[reported \(http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3334287/Former-MP-branded-untruthful-libel-judge-Tim-Yeo-s-reputation-left-tatters-compared-fish-wriggling-hook-loses-case.htm\)](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3334287/Former-MP-branded-untruthful-libel-judge-Tim-Yeo-s-reputation-left-tatters-compared-fish-wriggling-hook-loses-case.htm)**.

Yeo’s lawyer sent iMediaEthics the following statement from Yeo Nov. 25:

“I am very disappointed with today’s judgment. I made the mistake of accepting a lunch invitation with two undercover journalists who posed as consultants working for a leading edge solar technology development company. I did so in the belief that they had approached me in good faith, seeking my advice on the promotion of an innovative product which would be of great benefit to the country. The conversation over lunch was informal, general and preliminary. The journalists never made clear what exactly they wanted from me, even when I asked them directly “if you want to define fairly precisely what you would expect me to do I can tell you whether I can do it or not.” My words, spoken in a friendly chat at an introductory lunch, were not carefully chosen, and I regret that, it seems, they have been misinterpreted. The fact is that I have not and would never have acted in breach of the rules of the House of Commons, which I have scrupulously observed throughout the time I was an MP.”

iMediaEthics has written to the *Times* for comment.

The post **[Tim Yeo must pay \\$600,000 after failed Libel Lawsuit against UK Sunday Times \(http://www.imediaethics.org/tim-yeo-must-pay-600000-after-failed-libel-lawsuit-against-uk-sunday-times/\)](http://www.imediaethics.org/tim-yeo-must-pay-600000-after-failed-libel-lawsuit-against-uk-sunday-times/)** appeared first on **[iMediaEthics \(http://www.imediaethics.org\)](http://www.imediaethics.org)**.

[POLITICO’S MIKE ALLEN E-MAILED HE’D AGREE TO CHELSEA CLINTON QUESTIONS IN ADVANCE, NOW SAYS ‘MY BAD,’ HE’D ‘NEVER DO THAT’ \(HTTP://WWW.IMEDIAETHICS.ORG/POLITICOS-MIKE-ALLEN-E-MAILED-HED-AGREE-TO-CHELSEA-CLINTON-QUESTIONS-IN-ADVANCE-NOW-SAYS-MY-BAD-HED-NEVER-DO-THAT/\)](http://www.imediaethics.org/politicos-mike-allen-e-mailed-hed-agree-to-chelsea-clinton-questions-in-advance-now-says-my-bad-he-d-never-do-that/)

Tue, 12/01/2015 - 7:45pm

Politico’s Chief White House Correspondent Mike Allen apologized after a Freedom of Information request turned up e-mails with then-Senior Communications Advisor for Hillary Clinton when she was Secretary of State, Philippe Reines, in which he said he’d give Chelsea Clinton veto over interview questions.

In his morning [roundup](http://www.politico.com/playbook/2015/11/politico-playbook-presented-by-jpmorgan-chase-co-63-days-to-iowa-exclusive-from-mckay-coppins-book-ws-stop-it-call-to-jeb-marcos-secret-vetting-bday-larry-summers-michael-beschloss-is-60-andy-glass-is-80-lauren-pratap-is-30-211477?utm_source=hootsuite), (http://www.politico.com/playbook/2015/11/politico-playbook-presented-by-jpmorgan-chase-co-63-days-to-iowa-exclusive-from-mckay-coppins-book-ws-stop-it-call-to-jeb-marcos-secret-vetting-bday-larry-summers-michael-beschloss-is-60-andy-glass-is-80-lauren-pratap-is-30-211477?utm_source=hootsuite) Politico Playbook, Allen said he never did the interview and wouldn't have actually let Clinton have:

“MY BAD! You may have missed a Gawker post last week that rightly took me to task for something clumsy I wrote in an email to Philippe Reines in 2013, seeking an interview with Chelsea Clinton at a POLITICO brunch. In the email, I said I'd agree to the questions in advance. I have never done that, and would never do that. POLITICO has a policy against it, and it would make for a boring event. As you know from attending our events (or can tell by clicking on any of the videos on our website), they're spontaneous, conversational and news-driven. Without stunts or grandstanding, we challenge guests to address newsworthy topics, and to be original, relevant and revelatory. A scripted back-and-forth would be a snore.

“We didn't do the interview with Chelsea Clinton, and would never clear our questions. But the email makes me cringe, because I should never have suggested we would. We retain full, unambiguous editorial control over our events and questioning. My bond with readers and newsmakers is built on knowing I don't pull punches. So I wanted to share my take on this, and make sure our policy is clear. **Read the Gawker item here.**

<http://bit.ly/1MYX9D> (<http://bit.ly/1MYX9D>)

Allen's e-mail, revealed [via a Gawker Freedom of Information request](https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2552771-october-30-2015-reines-batch.html#document/p354), (<https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2552771-october-30-2015-reines-batch.html#document/p354>) reads in part (emphasis [Gawker's](http://gawker.com/emails-show-politico-s-mike-allen-promised-positive-cov-1744201426) (<http://gawker.com/emails-show-politico-s-mike-allen-promised-positive-cov-1744201426>)):

“No one besides me would ask her a question, and you and I would agree on them precisely in advance. This would be a relaxed conversation, and our innovative format (like a speedy Playbook Breakfast) always gets heavy social-media pickup. **The interview would be “no-surprises”:** I would work with you on topics, and would start with anything she wants to cover or make news on. Quicker than a network hit, and **reaching an audience you care about with no risk.”**

Allen repeated the request in a follow-up e-mail, noting “I would stick to topics we agree on.”

The post [Politico's Mike Allen E-mailed He'd Agree to Chelsea Clinton Questions in Advance, Now says 'My Bad,' He'd 'Never Do That'](http://www.imediaethics.org/politicos-mike-allen-e-mailed-hed-agree-to-chelsea-clinton-questions-in-advance-now-says-my-bad-hed-never-do-that/) (<http://www.imediaethics.org/politicos-mike-allen-e-mailed-hed-agree-to-chelsea-clinton-questions-in-advance-now-says-my-bad-hed-never-do-that/>) appeared first on [iMediaEthics](http://www.imediaethics.org) (<http://www.imediaethics.org>).

[REUTERS CALLS PLANNED PARENTHOOD AN 'ABORTION CLINIC' WHEN ONLY 3% OF SERVICES IN 2013 WERE ABORTIONS \(HTTP://WWW.IMEDIAETHICS.ORG/REUTERS-CALLS-PLANNED-PARENTHOOD-AN-ABORTION-CLINIC-WHEN-ONLY-3-OF-SERVICES-IN-2013-WERE-ABORTIONS/\)](http://www.imediaethics.org/reuters-calls-planned-parenthood-an-abortion-clinic-when-only-3-of-services-in-2013-were-abortion/)

Tue, 12/01/2015 - 9:45am

Only three percent of the services Planned Parenthood provided in 2013 were abortion procedures but Reuters labeled the whole organization as an “abortion clinic” in an initial report about the shootings at the Planned Parenthood in Colorado Springs, Colorado last week.

The Nov. 28 [article](http://www.reuters.com/article/2015/11/28/us-colorado-shooter-idUSKBN0TG27D20151128?utm_source=twitter#qu9ELq41438whBqz.97) (http://www.reuters.com/article/2015/11/28/us-colorado-shooter-idUSKBN0TG27D20151128?utm_source=twitter#qu9ELq41438whBqz.97) was headlined “Three killed, nine injured in attack on Colorado abortion clinic.” The first sentence of the article reads: “A gunman stormed a Planned Parenthood abortion clinic in Colorado Springs on Friday and opened fire with a rifle in an attack that left three people dead and nine others injured, authorities said.”

Reuters cherry-picked the most controversial aspect of Planned Parenthood's work to sensationalize the already-newsworthy shooting. The use of “abortion clinic” as a description for Planned Parenthood grabbed iMediaEthics' attention when reading about the shooting last week and stood in contrast with other news outlets' coverage.

When asked why the headline, tweet and first paragraph of the article refer to Planned Parenthood as an “abortion clinic” instead of “Planned Parenthood” or some other more accurate identifier, a Reuters spokesperson told iMediaEthics by e-mail:

“Our reference to the Colorado Springs Planned Parenthood as an ‘abortion clinic’ was incomplete, but not inaccurate. Subsequent reporting that followed this story revised references to the clinic to more completely characterize their range of health services.”

UPDATE: Police arrest gunman who opened fire in Colorado abortion clinic: <https://t.co/UAjcLUDzXw> (<https://t.co/UAjcLUDzXw>)
[pic.twitter.com/yi72h05jWi](https://t.co/yi72h05jWi) (<https://t.co/yi72h05jWi>)

— Reuters Top News (@Reuters) **November 28, 2015** (<https://twitter.com/Reuters/status/670399015851335680>)

This is clearly a case where word selection is important. In our view, calling Planned Parenthood an “abortion clinic” is misleading and could be seen as biased given that a very small fraction of Planned Parenthood’s work involves abortion.

"Abortion clinic" ... not "Planned parenthood?" **#wordsmatter** (<https://twitter.com/hashtag/wordsmatter?src=hash>) <https://t.co/p1dpa3hNwV> (<https://t.co/p1dpa3hNwV>)

— Sydney Smith (@SSmithWriter) **November 28, 2015** (<https://twitter.com/SSmithWriter/status/670400140532981762>)

Planned Parenthood, however, isn’t simply an “abortion clinic.” It offers health care for women and men.

“This year, Planned Parenthood affiliates reached 1.5 million young people and families through sex education and outreach,” the organization’s 2013-2014 annual report reads. “Planned Parenthood educators trained over 18,000 teachers, school staff, and other youth-serving professionals within their communities. Teenage birth, pregnancy and abortion rates are down to their lowest levels in 20 years. These declines are the result of what Planned Parenthood does better than anyone else – provide sex education and birth control.”

According to **Planned Parenthood’s report**, (http://issuu.com/actionfund/docs/annual_report_final_proof_12.16.14_/0) in 2013 only 3% of its services were “abortion services,” therefore making it a far cry to call it an “abortion clinic.” Based on the numbers, it would make more sense to say that Planned Parenthood is a STI-testing clinic since it provided 3,727,359 STI (sexually-transmitted infection) tests for both women and men or, even more fitting, a pregnancy testing clinic since it provided 1,128,783 pregnancy tests in 2013.

The figures provided say that Planned Parenthood provided 327,653 abortion procedures out of a total of 10,590,433 services which included 487,029 breast exams/breast care, 378,692 pap tests, and 704,079 HIV tests.

Planned Parenthood’s Vice President of Communications Eric Ferrero said in a statement sent to iMediaEthics

“Despite the recent false and discredited accusations about Planned Parenthood, people across the country know who Planned Parenthood is and what we do. The approximately 700 Planned Parenthood health centers across the country are just that: health centers. Every single one provides a wide range of reproductive and sexual health services including STI testing and treatment, birth control, breast exams, Pap tests, well-woman exams, and more — including safe and legal abortion for women if and when they make that decision.

“About 53 percent of Planned Parenthood health centers provide abortion services in addition to other reproductive and sexual health services. No Planned Parenthood health center provides only abortion services.

“One of the lessons of the awful tragedy last week is that words matter. Accuracy matters. Committed, compassionate Planned Parenthood doctors, nurses, physician assistants, and health center staff across the country work every day to keep people healthy and ensure they can live their healthiest lives by providing a wide range of preventive health services.

“Planned Parenthood is proud of the work we do, including providing safe and legal abortion to women if and when they make that decision. We are committed to providing every patient with high-quality, confidential, and nonjudgmental care. The work of our compassionate and highly skilled health center staff makes this possible, and ensures that the communities we serve get the best care possible, every day — no matter what.”

See below a chart from Planned Parenthood’s 2013-2014 **report** (http://issuu.com/actionfund/docs/annual_report_final_proof_12.16.14_/0)(chart is on page 19) showing the data count for its services.

<http://www.imediaethics.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/pp.jpg>

<http://www.imediaethics.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/pp2.jpg>

UPDATE: 12/1/2015 7:07 PM EST With statement from Planned Parenthood

The post **Reuters Calls Planned Parenthood an ‘Abortion Clinic’ when only 3% of Services in 2013 were abortions**

<http://www.imediaethics.org/reuters-calls-planned-parenthood-an-abortion-clinic-when-only-3-of-services-in-2013-were-abortions/>

appeared first on **iMediaEthics** (<http://www.imediaethics.org>).

DID PARLIAMENT MEMBER SAY 'WHORE' OR 'HORDE?' CANADIAN REPORTER QUILTS, SAYS PAPER REFUSED TO REPORT ON VIDEO ([HTTP://WWW.IMEDIAETHICS.ORG/DID-PARLIAMENT-MEMBER-SAY-WHORE-OR-HORDE-CANADIAN-REPORTER-QUILTS-SAYS-PAPER-REFUSED-TO-REPORT-ON-VIDEO/](http://www.imediaethics.org/did-parliament-member-say-whore-or-horde-canadian-reporter-quits-says-paper-refused-to-report-on-video/))

Mon, 11/30/2015 - 5:00am

Reporter Mickey Djuric quit the *Moosejaw Times-Herald*, a local newspaper in Moosejaw, Saskatchewan, Canada, alleging the newspaper refused to publish her report on a local politician.

"I choose personal integrity and strong ethics over deception and censorship," Djuric [wrote \(<http://mickeydjuric.com/2015/11/19/my-resignation/>\)](http://mickeydjuric.com/2015/11/19/my-resignation/) on her website. "After much heart-felt thinking, I have chosen to resign this morning from the *Moose Jaw Times-Herald*, as a journalist. The MJTH management staff has made an editorial decision that I strongly disagreed with."

Djuric wrote that a month earlier she videotaped the local Parliament member, [Tom Lukiwski. \(<http://www.tomlukiwski.com/>\)](http://www.tomlukiwski.com/) saying another politician was an "NDP whore."

She said she wanted to cover it for the newspaper and about two weeks ago was given the go-ahead. But then last week, the paper changed its mind, she wrote. "The *Times-Herald* stated to me that it was in their best interest to not publish the story nor the video," she wrote. "They specified that they did not want to draw negative attention to the MJTH."

Djuric told iMediaEthics by e-mail, "The reaction from the journalism community has been overwhelming," since she posted her announcement about quitting. "I've received extreme support from several journalists and media outlets." She went on:

"Even people who heard the word 'horde' have supported my decision and agree the video needed to be released. People understand the decision I made. It is our responsibility – as the media – to seek out the truth. The media is what separates our free nation from other countries in the world, and I never want to abuse my responsibility as a reporter or journalist. And I certainly don't want to compromise my values and integrity, nor should I be asked to compromise myself. In good conscious I couldn't continue to work for an organization that substitutes deception for excellence and ethical journalism."

Djuric said she doesn't have a job lined up but is "taking this minute by minute."

The *Times-Herald* [responded \(<http://www.mjtimes.sk.ca/News/2015-11-19/article-4349421/Why-not-run-it%3F1>\)](http://www.mjtimes.sk.ca/News/2015-11-19/article-4349421/Why-not-run-it%3F1) to her claims in its own post Nov. 19. "The *Moose Jaw Times-Herald* does not practice 'gotcha' journalism," it wrote. "We don't go with best guesses and half-truths when full facts are needed."

"This week, we were working on a story that put us to the test of fairness, accuracy and standards, and we made a decision as an editorial team to not publish or post – because we had serious doubts about accuracy," it added.

The newspaper said it decided against reporting on the taped comment because it wasn't clear whether Lukiwski said "whore" or "horde." When asked, Lukiwski claimed that he said "horde."

"When reviewing the tape, we found reasonable doubt as to which word was used," the paper explained, denying that it censored the reporting or the claims, but noting it didn't want to report on unconfirmed, uncertain information.

"We strive to meet good journalistic and legal standards and included our legal counsel in our discussions on this. In the end we could not with certainty confirm the word choice that the MP had made," the paper added.

Despite Djuric's claims, the paper said it stands by its decision against reporting on the video. It wrote:

"In this situation, we stand by – as editors, a newspaper and as a media newsgroup – our process. We, even amid an uproar, are very proud of it. Not every story investigated will be published. If something falls short, then it doesn't make the grade. This is a basic and trusted principal of good journalism.

"The video in question has now been made public, and we know people will form their own opinions on the single word that was used. But we trust the decision we made to hold a story based on guesswork, opinion and a 'could be'. We don't take easy shortcuts for the sake of page-views on our sites or notoriety in a byline. We're not going to try to make a name for ourselves on serving up poor journalism."

Craig Slater, the managing editor for the newspaper, told iMediaEthics by e-mail both Djuric's resignation and publication of the video "came as a surprise."

“We have received mixed response from the community,” he added. “The majority of the comments have been positive – people in the business community, police, city and health officials, local politicians – have all been thankful and have praised us for sticking to our ethical and fair approach to journalism. Other media outlets in this province have shared with us that they would have made the same decision. Of course, there are others (subscribers and general folks on the street) who expressed a displeasure.”

He confirmed the newspaper stands by its decision. “We remain 100 per cent confident in the decision we made,” he wrote. “There is no definitive answer as to what was said in the video. After enhanced analysis from video experts, there remains a lot of doubt into what was said. In addition, the conversation surrounding this issue has cooled off dramatically. It appears as though people have moved on.”

The post **[Did Parliament Member say ‘Whore’ or ‘Horde?’ Canadian Reporter Quits, Says Paper Refused to Report on Video](http://www.imediaethics.org/did-parliament-member-say-whore-or-horde-canadian-reporter-quits-says-paper-refused-to-report-on-video/)** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/did-parliament-member-say-whore-or-horde-canadian-reporter-quits-says-paper-refused-to-report-on-video/>) appeared first on **iMediaEthics** (<http://www.imediaethics.org>).

[2 PUBLIC EDITORS ON ISIS, ISIL, DAESH OR ISLAMIC STATE \(HTTP://WWW.IMEDIAETHICS.ORG/2-PUBLIC-EDITORS-ON-ISIS-ISIL-DAESH-OR-ISLAMIC-STATE/\)](http://www.imediaethics.org/2-public-editors-on-isis-isil-daesh-or-islamic-state/)

Sun, 11/29/2015 - 5:00am

Two public editors blogged this past week about what to call the Middle East-based terrorist organization widely known as ISIS.

This concern about the organization’s name is not surprising, given the amount of news coverage it has garnered after the attacks on Paris and the various names ascribed to the terrorists.

NPR public editor Elizabeth Jensen’s Nov. 20 post was headlined, **[“Islamic State, ISIS, ISIL or Daesh](http://www.npr.org/sections/ombudsman/2015/11/18/456507131/islamic-state-isis-isil-or-daesh/)** (<http://www.npr.org/sections/ombudsman/2015/11/18/456507131/islamic-state-isis-isil-or-daesh/>)? Jensen stated NPR’s policy for describing the group despite the competing names: “Current NPR policy, as at many major English-language media outlets, is to refer to the group as ‘Islamic State’ — which is a shortened version of the English translation of what it calls itself — and to add the caveats ‘self-described’ or ‘self-declared.’” Despite that policy, sometimes NPR refers to the group as ISIS, she wrote.

Daesh, the *New York Times* **[explains](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/03/world/europe/islamic-state-isis-muslims-term.html)**, (<http://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/03/world/europe/islamic-state-isis-muslims-term.html>) is the acronym for its Arabic name Al-Dawlaal-Islamiya fi al-Iraq wa al-Sham. Politicians are using Daesh more and more, the NY Daily News **[noted](http://www.nydailynews.com/news/world/word-isis-doesn-article-1.2438861)** (<http://www.nydailynews.com/news/world/word-isis-doesn-article-1.2438861>).

As an explanation for those name choices, Jensen quoted standards editor Mark Memmott who said Islamic State is “the clearest and most succinct English translation of the group’s name.” On the other hand, Daesh is “least familiar” with NPR’s audience. He went on:

[“We advise our journalists](http://ethics.npr.org/category/memos-from-memmott/#2453) (<http://ethics.npr.org/category/memos-from-memmott/#2453>) to remind listeners and Web users that it is a ‘self-described’ or ‘self-declared’ Islamic State to make clear that the organization is not a ‘state’ in the usual sense of that word, even though it claims to be one. On second reference, we use the acronym ISIS because it is based on that English translation of the group’s full name – the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (or al-Sham).”

Likewise, *Toronto Star* public editor Kathy English’s Nov. 21 post asks **[“Talking terror: What’s in a name](http://www.thestar.com/opinion/2015/11/21/talking-terror-whats-in-a-name-public-editor.html)** (<http://www.thestar.com/opinion/2015/11/21/talking-terror-whats-in-a-name-public-editor.html>)?”

“The *Star*, in line with the current style of most international news organizations and wire services, now refers to the ‘Islamic State group’ or ‘Islamic State militants,’” she wrote. “In headlines, that can be shortened to ‘ISIS’ — the short form of Islamic State of Iraq and Syria.”

She noted that the wire service Canadian Press, however, calls the group the Islamic State of Iraq and Levant or ISIL, and the BBC calls it the “self-styled” or “so-called” Islamic State to add distancing language.

For our part, at iMediaEthics, we typically use ISIS to refer to the terrorist group as that is the most common name we’ve seen used.

The post **[2 Public Editors on ISIS, ISIL, Daesh or Islamic State](http://www.imediaethics.org/2-public-editors-on-isis-isil-daesh-or-islamic-state/)** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/2-public-editors-on-isis-isil-daesh-or-islamic-state/>) appeared first on **iMediaEthics** (<http://www.imediaethics.org>).

RIHANNA ANTI ALBUM ARTICLE ACCIDENTALLY POSTED ON YAHOO NEWS?

([HTTP://WWW.IMEDIAETHICS.ORG/RIHANNA-ANTI-ALBUM-ARTICLE-ACCIDENTALLY-POSTED-ON-YAHOO-NEWS/](http://www.imediaethics.org/rihanna-anti-album-article-accidentally-posted-on-yahoo-news/))

Sat, 11/28/2015 - 12:17pm

Yahoo News published an article about Rihanna's new album *Anti*, which hasn't been released yet.

The article, "Rihanna 'Anti' New Album: Complete Lyrics, Tracklist, Download and Streaming Options," is a draft that included many notes to insert information about the album when available.

Yahoo News has since deleted the article, which carried Mic's byline. The [link \(https://www.yahoo.com/?err=404&err_url=http%3a%2f%2fnews.yahoo.com%2frihanna-anti-album-complete-lyrics-191135829.html\)](https://www.yahoo.com/?err=404&err_url=http%3a%2f%2fnews.yahoo.com%2frihanna-anti-album-complete-lyrics-191135829.html) to the article on Yahoo now re-directs to the homepage.

See below a screenshot of the article before it was removed from Yahoo's website. The article read in part: "Barbadian powerhouse pop star Rihanna dropped her long-awaited album on [FRIDAY], featuring some of the hottest names in the music industry, including [FEATURED ARTISTS]."

<http://www.imediaethics.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/review.png>

"Anti is [DELETE ONE OF THESE ENDINGS TO THE SENTENCE AND KEEP THE OTHER BASED ON FACTS: streaming exclusively on Tidal before it makes it way over to iTunes and other streaming services OR streaming on Apple Music, Spotify, Tidal and can be purchased on iTunes]," the article said. "The 27-year-old performer's latest album has [NUMBER OF TRACKS] and its lyrics [HYPER-LINK TO RAP GENIUS] continue the 'BBHMM' storyline of an even edgier, freer Rihanna than fans were introduced to her last album three years ago, Unapologetic. Rihanna especially pushes the edge in [NAME RELEVANT SONG FROM ANTI THAT MATCHES DESCRIPTION], where she sings: [LYRICS]."

Vice's i-d website [noted \(https://i-d.vice.com/en_us/article/mic-publishes-rihanna-review-before-hearing-anti\)](https://i-d.vice.com/en_us/article/mic-publishes-rihanna-review-before-hearing-anti) that the Mic article was written by Chris Riotta, who tweeted a picture of Rihanna with a shrugging emoticon and the text "S**t happens."

Shit happens ¯_(ツ)_/¯ [pic.twitter.com/vO1c19m1PR](https://twitter.com/vO1c19m1PR) (<https://t.co/vO1c19m1PR>)

— Chris Riotta (@chrisriotta) **November 27, 2015** (<https://twitter.com/chrisriotta/status/670127951703367680>)

iMediaEthics has written to Mic and Yahoo News for comment.

Hat Tip: [Ben Greenman \(https://twitter.com/bengreenman/status/670375731373936640\)](https://twitter.com/bengreenman/status/670375731373936640)

UPDATE: 11/28/2015 8:26 PM EST Yahoo News PR manager Megan Rose told iMediaEthics: "Some stories on Yahoo's homepage are selected by an algorithm, including this MIC post, which was flagged for being in violation of Yahoo's editorial policy and was removed within a short time."

The post [Rihanna Anti Album Article Accidentally Posted on Yahoo News? \(http://www.imediaethics.org/rihanna-anti-album-article-accidentally-posted-on-yahoo-news/\)](http://www.imediaethics.org/rihanna-anti-album-article-accidentally-posted-on-yahoo-news/) appeared first on [iMediaEthics \(http://www.imediaethics.org\)](http://www.imediaethics.org).

2,600 COMPLAINTS OVER SUN'S CLAIMS 1 IN 5 MUSLIMS SYMPATHIZE WITH ISIS, TIMES OF LONDON CORRECTS (HTTP://WWW.IMEDIAETHICS.ORG/2600-COMPLAINTS-OVER-SUNS-CLAIMS-1-IN-5-MUSLIMS-SYMPATHIZE-WITH-ISIS-TIMES-OF-LONDON-CORRECTS/)

Sat, 11/28/2015 - 5:00am

The Sun's front-page story claiming 1 in 5 Muslims "sympathizes" with ISIS has prompted a record 2,600 complaints to the UK press regulator the Independent Press Standards Organisation.

In a press statement sent to iMediaEthics, IPSO said:

"IPSO's policy when dealing with a large number of complaints about a particular issue that requires investigation is to select a lead complaint. In this case, IPSO has selected MEND (Muslim Engagement & Development) as the lead complaint. We have written to *The Sun* to inform them that we have commenced an investigation into this matter.

“As of this morning, Thursday 25th November, IPSO has received around 2,600 complaints relating to the article. The majority of these refer to Clause 1 (Accuracy) of the Editors’ Code of Practice. Each correspondent will have their complaint logged and will be informed of the decision to select MEND as the lead complaint. IPSO will notify all complainants of the outcome of the investigation.

“While the matter is ongoing, IPSO will not make any further comment on the case.”

The Sun previously **defended** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/1200-complaints-suns-british-muslims-poll-sympathy-for-isis/>) the poll and its interpretation, as iMediaEthics reported earlier this week. The polling company that conducted the poll, Survation, **criticized** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/sun-criticized-for-muslim-isis-poll-interpretation/>) *The Sun*’s interpretation of its results.

However, *The Sun*’s sister newspaper, the *Times of London*, published a correction admitting the poll was “misleading,” according to *The Guardian*.

“We reported the findings of a Survation poll of 1,000 British Muslims... Asked ‘How do you feel about young Muslims who leave the UK to join fighters in **Syria** (<http://www.theguardian.com/world/syria>)?’, 14% of respondents expressed ‘some sympathy’ and 5% ‘a lot of sympathy’.

“The survey did not distinguish between those who go to fight for Islamic State and those who join other factions in Syria, and it did not ask about attitudes towards Isis itself. Our headline, ‘**One in five British Muslims has sympathy for Isis** (<http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/news/uk/article4621965.ece>)’, was misleading in failing to reflect this.”

The Guardian **noted** (<http://www.theguardian.com/media/2015/nov/24/criticism-grows-over-suns-muslim-poll>) that *The Sun* usually uses YouGov to conduct its polls but YouGov didn’t want to conduct the poll *The Sun* wanted on Muslims’ sympathizing with ISIS. YouGov told *The Guardian*: “To survey Britain’s Muslim population, particularly at a time of such heightened sensitivities, requires the kind of time, care and therefore cost that is beyond a newspaper’s budget.”

The post **2,600 Complaints over Sun’s Claims 1 in 5 Muslims Sympathize with ISIS, Times of London Corrects** (<http://www.imediaethics.org/2600-complaints-over-suns-claims-1-in-5-muslims-sympathize-with-isis-times-of-london-corrects/>) appeared first on **iMediaEthics** (<http://www.imediaethics.org>).

[1](#) [2 \(/aggregator/sources/16?page=1\)](#) [3 \(/aggregator/sources/16?page=2\)](#) [4 \(/aggregator/sources/16?page=3\)](#) [5 \(/aggregator/sources/16?page=4\)](#)
[6 \(/aggregator/sources/16?page=5\)](#) [7 \(/aggregator/sources/16?page=6\)](#) [8 \(/aggregator/sources/16?page=7\)](#) [9 \(/aggregator/sources/16?page=8\)](#)
[next » \(/aggregator/sources/16?page=1\)](#) [last » \(/aggregator/sources/16?page=8\)](#)

[COLLEGES & SCHOOLS](#) ▶

[ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES](#) ▶

[JOBS & EMPLOYMENT](#) ▶









[TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT](#) ▶

[ACCESSIBILITY](#) ▶

[EMERGENCY INFORMATION](#) ▶

[FOR PARENTS](#) ▶

[FOR THE MEDIA](#) ▶

-  <https://www.facebook.com/kentstate>
-  <https://www.twitter.com/kentstate>
-  <https://www.instagram.com/kentstate>
-  <https://www.kent.edu/webteam/snapchat>
-  <https://www.youtube.com/KentStateTV>
-  <https://www.pinterest.com/kentstate>
-  <http://www.linkedin.com/company/kent-state-university>
-  [\(/social-media\)](#)



[\(\)](#)



[Back to Top](#)

PHONE

330-672-3000

STREET ADDRESS

800 E. Summit St., Kent, OH 44240

MAILING ADDRESS

P.O. Box 5190, Kent, OH 44242-0001

EMAIL

info@kent.edu (<mailto:info@kent.edu>)

As a top Ohio undergraduate and graduate school, Kent State's eight campuses offer the resources of a large university with the friendly atmosphere of a liberal arts college. Enroll today to start pursuing your future at one of the best colleges in Ohio. We've been educating graduates for over 100 years; join us today.

Copyright 2015 Kent State University