

Letter exchanges between RRS and Reuters beginning on November 12, 2007 regarding sexual harassment campaign by Reuters employee of me and my daughter

LETTER EXCHANGES BETWEEN RRS AND REUTERS

Date: Mon, 12 Nov 2007 11:48:37 -0500
To: Thomas.Glocer@Reuters.Com
From: Rhonda R Shearer <r.r.shearer@asrlab.org>
Subject: RE: complaint about Reuter's employee's attack on citizen journalist

Dear Mr. Glocer,

I am director of a small not for profit, Art Science Research Laboratory, founded with my late husband, Harvard Professor, Stephen Jay Gould.

With your enthusiasm regarding citizen journalism, my complaint, that is presently being investigated by your LA staff (Frank DeMaria), may be of great concern to you. Please see attached letter.

I truly hope that your wife, mother, grandmother or daughters, if you are lucky enough to have them, will never have to endure to vile, sexist attacks that my daughter and I have experienced. I notified your staff that an employee's "friend" openly sponsored these attacks and that evidence indicated your employee's involvement. Links to the vile materials were posted on the GoodBadUgly (GBU) blog despite my multiple notifications and warnings.

The case is outlined in my letter. I hope hear from you

Best regards,
Rhonda
Rhonda Roland Shearer
Director, Art Science Research Laboratory
62 Greene Street
New York, New York, 10012
phone 212-925-8812
fax 212-925-0459
www.asrlab.org

RRS LETTER TO EDITORS AND ATTACHED TO EMAIL TO CEO ABOVE

(NOTE: hold Ctrl button and click left mouse to open links)

November 9, 2007
Mr. Robert C. Basler
Ms. Sophie Brendel
Reuters Group, Inc.

Dear Ms. Sophie Brendel and Mr. Robert Basler,

Obviously, Reuters editors or their staff photographer, Mario Anzuoni, can not publicly call me a "cunt" for questioning the authenticity of Mario's photographs. But - surprise! – Mario's close friend, Chris Weeks did, while Reuters turned a blind eye. Through lack of due diligence, Reuters allowed its moderated blogs to become a staging ground for Weeks' smear campaign against me and my daughter.

Reuters must be aware that journalists have been fired for attacking their critics anonymously in comment sections under a different name.
http://www.nytimes.com/2006/09/04/technology/04republic.html?_r=1&ex=1184817600&en=5458c986446720a7&ei=5070&oref=slogin Getting a *friend* to attack your enemies in comment sections and blogs is a whole new twist to the previous "sock puppet" scandals.

I notified Reuters multiple times on their moderated blog, GoodBadUgly (GBU), that one of Mario's friends organized a campaign against me (and my daughter). Yet they did nothing. Worse, they encouraged the harassment campaign by continuing to post the PG versions of culprits' XXX posts. Links to Weeks' sexist and porn filled diatribes were posted by me on GBU, alerting editors of "an employee problem."

Most troubling of all, Weeks openly writes that he, *unlike the public*, was able to see the entire series of fire doll photos. Reuters apparently has no problem that its property, shots by one of their employees, was examined by Weeks before editing and publication. It allowed Weeks to speak with dubious authority. His good friend would never fake photos. After all, Weeks saw them himself.

On October 30th, Chris Weeks' blog post (Uber.com/chrisweeks) began, "so ... i remember when i was scrolling through photos that my friend Mario was moving ... actually he was moving the entire take and they were being edited remotely in either l.a. or d.c. and i saw this photo: because we fuck with each other...when i saw the photo my friend mario made during the san diego fires, yeah, i gave him shit but his comment was, ' i'd rather cut my testicles than stage a photo.' i know him. i've travelled all over the world with the guy. he's not the kind of guy who would ever do anything remotely

closely to that. he loves his job making photos for the rest of the world to see."

With his first hand knowledge, Weeks, Mario's friend and champion, called for others on two blogs to defend his "brother" Mario. There are no limits to Weeks' bile on these websites. Here are just two examples:

At deviantart.com Weeks wrote "assuming she's even had an orgasm at least once in life. (i'll give her poor dead husband the benefit of the doubt)."

At Chris Weeks' Uber.com site, Weeks wrote, "so ... the editors at reuters stopped being 'blog posting pussies' and posted a couple of responses... do you not read your own fucking posts you stupid fucking cunt?"

Reuters, so far, seems to have had no issues with the fact that Weeks got an exclusive look at the doll photo series. We have requested these photos on behalf of independent experts we have reached out to. Our requests have been denied.

Despite these facts and circumstances—or maybe because of them—Reuters continues to approve Weeks et al's comments on two separate Reuters blogs. Links to Weeks' blog (Uber.com/chrisweeks) continue to be posted by Reuters moderators.

The rhetoric has intensified. Just the other night there was a death threat against me posted on Weeks' other blog (cweeks.deviantart.com). I have subsequently called the police and a police report was made. In spite of the ongoing severity of the matter, the last communication I received from Reuters was from Sophie, a Reuters PR rep, on November 2. She stated that the case was "closed" in response to my requests for access to high-resolution photographs. If I had any other comments, she wrote, it would be confined to the comments section of GBU. No Reuters moderator or representative has contacted me to discuss my posts on GBU regarding Chris Weeks' smear campaign – or to confirm or deny Mario's involvement.

The following is background information and an outline of my complaint regarding Reuters employee, Mario Anzuoni's and his "friend's" sexist cyber-hate campaign:

Background

I am director of Art Science Research Laboratory, a not for profit, co-founded by my late husband, Stephen Jay Gould. We have a non-partisan journalism ethics program where students work with professional researchers to promote the media's use of scientific methods and experts before publication. We also publish investigations of factual errors and ethical breaches by media outlets. Please see www.stinkyjournalism.org and www.checkyourfacts.org.

GoodBadUgly (GBU) published the public's questions about whether or not Reuters staff photographer, Mario Anzuoni's photograph of a seemingly pristine doll in fire embers, was staged. (" A doll lies in destroyed home near Rancho Santa Fe near San Diego, 24 Oct 2007, Source: Reuters"). See <http://blogs.reuters.com/gbu/2007/10/29/fire-damage-photo/> and <http://blogs.reuters.com/gbu/2007/10/31/more-on-fire-photos/#comments> .

Reuters' answer to "Jer," the first published complainant, was that Reuters had looked at Mario's other photos in the same series. Since other items—a doorknob or picture frame—were also untouched by the surrounding fires, you judged "the photo was fine." I first wrote, on October 30th, that for the sake of transparency, the other photographs in the same series should be posted so the public could judge for themselves. I also questioned the method used for determining whether or not the doll photo was staged.

Instead of consulting experts in fire science engineering, you looked at more photos in the same series taken by the same photographer. I said our group would like to work with you to consult experts, but needed higher resolution photographs than the 200x300 that were posted. After requesting further information by email – including multiple requests for the higher resolution images – I asked for the location of the house so that independent verification could be performed. I also asked if your photographer had permission to enter this private house and photograph it.

My email correspondence listed questions from the chair of a leading fire engineering school, who had volunteered, among other experts, to examine photographic and physical evidence of the scene. No answers to our or fire science experts' questions were provided. Sophie, a Reuters PR person, informed me the case was "closed" on Fri, 02 Nov 2007 at 5:55pm.

1. After my first postings, I informed Reuters on November 1st that an intimate friend of Reuters' photographer Mario Anzuoni, was organizing the postings of criticism about me on the Good, Bad and Ugly Reuters blog without any disclosures.

Rhonda Shearer states November 1st, 2007 at 2:32 pm GMT

"Mr. Weeks in his personal attack on me should have disclosed to the public that he is defending a friend, Mario [Anzuoni], the Reuters photographer, who took the doll photo. His web page makes his relationship with Mario clear. http://www.uber.com/mypage/?entity_id=243274033&blog_id=110 'Darren' who posted also on this blog, and on Mr. Weeks' site, is also a plant. Darren writes on Mr. Weeks' page: ' I posted a nasty message. Let's see if the [Reuters] moderator lets it through.' Posted by Darren on October 31,

2007 1:01 AM. Well, the message(s) did get posted here on the Reuters blog."

2. The first attack against me on Chris Weeks' blog makes the assertion of a relationship with your employee and unauthorized access to Reuters' property, which is even more disconcerting in light of these of these attacks.

Weeks writes that Mario allowed him to see all the photos of this doll series right after they were shot. Moreover, Weeks states that he was privy to knowing how and when these photos, now in dispute, were being edited:

**October 30, 2007 8:55 PM Chris Weeks writes:
"the wankerboy of the artworld?"**

"so ... i remember when i was scrolling through photos that my friend Mario was moving ...actually he was moving the entire take and they were being edited remotely in either l.a. or d.c. and i saw this photo: because we fuck with each other...when i saw the photo my friend mario made during the san diego fires, yeah, i gave him shit but his comment was, ' i'd rather cut my testicles than stage a photo.' i know him. i've travelled all over the world with the guy. he's not the kind of guy who would ever do anything remotely closely to that. he loves his job making photos for the rest of the world to see."

Other posts by Weeks indicate that your employee encouraged the attacks against me and was involved, by both omission and commission:

Posted by [Chris](#) [Weeks] on October 31, 2007 5:45 AM

"@darren: thanks, brother. and ... thank you for mario! :)"

Your employee continued to provide Weeks with insider information about the internal inquiry into his photos. Weeks indicted in a November 2nd post that he was aware that Reuters was not going to release the high rez images to me. Weeks wrote **"ms. shearer thinks that she's entitled to receiving access to the 'entire photo set' ... thank god ... reuters refused."** This was the same day I received a private email notification from Reuters that the case was "closed." It was not until November 3rd that I mentioned this fact on the GBU blog. So how did Weeks get this information in advance of the public? The answer would logically point to your employee, Mario. He told his friend and champion, Weeks.

3. The cyber hate attacks—and death threat—upon me and my daughter sponsored and authored by Chris Weeks are shocking. The

harassment was demonstrably encouraged by the ability of uber.com participants to post on Reuter's GBU blog and Mario's blog.

"yeah I am Ed on the [GBU] replies...**Thanks to Chris for the info! and you if you have something you want to say, Reuters page is open to your comments!**"

http://www.uber.com/mypage/?entity_id=243554213&blog_id=2 and

Posted by [Obsidian-F...](#) on November 02, 2007 3:53 AM

"back @ chris: Haha, you know you would want me there.. 😊 keep the peace so to speak, and **invite london [my daughter] as a guest speaker only to be hounded on by reuters staffers.. I had to email her**, her work bothered me and i really cant stand people making money off of garbage. it makes the rest of 'us' look bad, and cheapens the profession."

Posted by [Robert Pri...](#) on November 04, 2007 8:33 AM

"I think RShearer should just go after any one of the tabloid photos, prove them to be faked, shit, while shes at it London should get a job with the tabloids, their photos generally suck, so she would fit right in. She does need some dick unfortunately she probably couldn't get laid even with a stolen dick. :-D **I'm glad to see that Reuters took a stand and backed the photographs. It goes a long way to see them not back down.**"

[DJStrife](#) writes November 7, 5:18 am:

"**Made my mark comment-wise on the first reuters page.** Shearer's a fuckin' nutjob, though... Look at the bright side: if someone finally has enough of her woodpecking and **they kill her, her daughter will post a tribute photo** with that really lovely border-fade she uses for the baby pics."



Here are some more examples from the misogynistic, cyber-hate campaign against me and my daughter. Based upon information and belief, Reuters, or their agents, by commission or omission, has condoned, participated or encouraged the harassment below through its negligence and refusal to moderate the comments:

November 04, 2007 4:34 PM Chris Weeks writes:
"density..."

"so ... **the editors at reuters stopped being "blog posting pussies" and posted a couple of responses.** she calls me a plant. she calls me what-the-fuck-ever. do you not read your own fucking posts you stupid fucking **cunt?**...so ... please ... make more accusations ... we'll all be here. but ... seriously ... we'd rather look at photographs. talk about photography. or defend our friends or friends of friends. do intellectual fuckwads actually have friends? hope you have lotion on hand for all of that mental masturbation you so clearly love. i may never ever acquire a 4,000 sq. ft. loft in soho, but ... i do have friends. real ones. i have common sense. i have talent. and, no, double-shrew with a banana on top, i didn't finish college...."

Posted by [timothy](#) on November 04, 2007 5:04 PM

"...i want one that reads "I banged Rhonda Shearer in a burned out house and all I got was this lousy t-shirt - and the crabs"...

Posted by [Joona](#) on November 04, 2007 7:58 AM

" Anyway, some one should really go and take the camera off London Shearer **cunts** hands before something even more awful happens. And her mom should really find something else to do than stick his head where it dont belong."

Posted by [gONZOm](#) on November 04, 2007 8:05 AM

"hehehe, it seems that youre kinda enjoying this :P...but yeah, i agree with every word you say, and she only needs some nice dick, then shell shut up"

November 03, 2007 9:38 PM Chris Weeks writes :
"bitter shrews and bananas" (Bananas refers to this vile pornographic image that is a recurrent theme in Weeks and others sexist attacks -- please see <http://blink-182.com/> Chris Weeks' link)

"...and, no, mario is not behind this. some people are employed or are freelancers in a tightly knit group ... a brotherhood. i didn't say sisterhood ... i'm sure [ms. steinem](#) is your friend ... and i'll get nasty posts. oh, wait, she wouldn't stoop to my level of course. ;) mr. shearer, freudian slip, you don't understand what it means ...buy your daughter some more photography lessons, although that probably wouldn't do any good. knit. sculpt in the nude. whatever..."

November 03, 2007 2:45 PM

"woke up to check in my flight..." Chris Weeks writes:

"the rest of the world thinks you're full of shit and wholly unqualified to lead an investigation of any sort ... even into pig photos. you lost. by the way ...martha stewart is pissed ... you must have picked up the her dry cleaning. there is the matter of [this photo](#), <http://blink-182.com/> though, and perhaps you can tell us all if that is a "real banana"? also, perhaps, show your daughter this link ... some amazing tips for taking better pictures. that's what you need ... and perhaps lust after ... but ... you'll never get. pig photos or banana photos. stick with those. ;) "

November 02, 2007 11:13 PM ...Chris Weeks writes:

"Sorry ... her mom, a wanna-be elitist, opened the door by attacking someone she had no right attacking. oh, yeah, sorry, i'm sure someone in her academic circle would say she has every right. fucking intellectuals. fucking rich elitist intellectuals. an orgasm to them is winning some rhetorical argument. whatever ... any way ... i can't wait until those **cunts** call me paparazzi. and ... **a huge fucking thank you for the support you guys gave mario during the attempted assassination of his work product. fuck the pseudo-intellectuals! i can't say if he appreciates it or not but i'd imagine that he does. ;)** "

4. Reuters had a duty and failed to:

- a. Closely monitor Chris Weeks' two blogs after my notifications on their moderated GBU blog -- <http://www.uber.com/chrisweeks> and <http://cweeks.deviantart.com/journal/15324426/>
- b. Investigate their employee to determine the extent of his involvement with the campaign of personal attacks upon me and my daughter. Mario's intimate friend, Chris Weeks, openly engaged others to participate in a harassment campaign.
- c. Identify culprits who were acting in concert with Chris Weeks and discourage their harassment by not posting their comments. This identification was easily done. Flamers used the same names on Weeks' two blogs as they used on GBU and Mario's blog. No stealth here. They openly bragged about their GBU and Mario blog posts using the same text, names and links back to uber.com.
- d. After determining the vile, sexist and pornographic personal attacks upon me and my daughter, Chris Weeks, Darren, Scott Alexander, Ed and others, should have been banned from posting comments regarding me on GBU and on Mario's blog. Incredibly, however, comments by these same characters, in concert with Weeks, were still being posted by GBU editors as recently as November 5th. Furthermore, on November 6th, Mario was rewarded by

Reuters with his own blog page with a moderated comments section.

See <http://blogs.reuters.com/photo/2007/11/06/embers-and-ash-fall-from-above-like-hellish-snow/#comments>

Surprise! 4 of the 5 posts were from Chris Weeks et al. Courtesy of Mario's new Reuters blog, readers now simply click on Chris Weeks name and his latest attacks are accessible from the Reuters site.

Weeks' November 08th blog entry photo, flaunts Chris and Mario's close relationship, while giving the English version of the finger. Weeks writes: "it's nice not to see the pseudo-intellectuals out here in our fair city. i know ... they hate us in nyc ... or at least one sect. "

The photo caption links to Mario's Reuters blog:

"and i got to hang with [polkie](#), the [napolitano bitch](#) [aka Mario] "



e. After determining the serious nature of the harassment by Chris Weeks, a statement distancing both themselves and their photographer from these attacks should have been made. The public should have been informed that Reuters is not siding with the sexist cyber-hate campaign and is investigating to ensure their own employee is not involved.

5. Reuters failures to take the above actions, especially in light of the seriousness of the attacks, are irresponsible and inexcusable lapses.

Action must be taken to immediately hold accountable those within your organization who are responsible for these serious breaches of corporate responsibility, ethics and administrative judgment.

Importantly, Reuters had ample warning beyond my [November 1st, 2007 at 2:32 pm GMT](#) notification.

On November 3rd, 2007 at 4:52 pm GMT I wrote a post on GBU:

"I know Mario's the doll photographer's friends are worried about their colleague. But this does not entitle them to write me and my daughter nasty emails on our private emails. Can you imagine George Will at Newsweek friends, when he is criticized, openly campaigning with insults and personal attacks against the individuals who criticized him as Newsweek stands by and posts their comments? Does Reuters have a policy regarding this? Is this acceptable behavior for Reuters employee's "friends"? George Will apparently does not have such friends— or is it that Newsweek would not cotton such nonsense and would investigate to see if their employee is behind the campaign? Perception or real, the appearance of Reuters condoning such attacks upon me and my daughter by friends of a Reuters employee, is there. I am attacked by Mario's friends (aka Chris Weeks and his friends) only because I want to have the photographs examined by experts since Reuters has failed to do so themselves."

And again on [November 4th, 2007 at 2:25 am GMT](#)

"Mario's friends planning and comparison of their flame antics is found on <http://cweeks.deviantart.com/journal/15324426/> Chris Weeks is found encouraging all the other Mario friends write to me at my personal email...How did Chris have this advance knowledge that he shared with the rest of Mario's friends? After all, this is private, insider, employee/employer information from Mario's working relationship with Reuters about this public dispute? There is only one answer I can think of: Mario told Chris Weeks who shares it with all the other Mario friends on his blog. This surely is evidence that Mario, the Reuters professional photographer is, embarrassingly for Reuters, in cahoots with his friends' campaign to flame me and my daughter—as Chris Weeks openly admits on his blog ...Very troubling if Reuters turns a blind eye to this employee problem."

Reuters did not respond to my November 4th charge against their employee. They, instead, posted *Weeks'* rebuttal, with a link to Weeks venom filled uber site . See [chris weeks](#) says: [November 4th, 2007 at 12:48 pm GMT](#), GBU.

My last unheeded warning followed.

[Rhonda Shearer](#) says: [November 4th, 2007 at 6:23 pm GMT](#)

"Reuters editors and citizens see for yourself
<http://cweeks.deviantart.com/journal/15324426/> ... Sexist and porn references aimed at me and my daughter on your two blogs are not 'paranoia.' You actively encourage others to attack. You sent me a private, nasty email yourself; yet you write ' i know nothing of private emails.' See November 03, 2007 9:38 PM ' bitter shrews and bananas.'
<http://www.uber.com/chrisweeks> . I have the email."

Since I, as well as London Allen, my daughter, put Mr. Robert C. Basler, Reuters GBU editor, GBU comments moderator(s); Ms. Sophie Brendel, Reuters PR on notice beginning November 1st , and you failed to take action, we expect a substitutive response by Tuesday, November 13th.

Sincerely,

Rhonda Roland Shearer
Director, Art Science Research Laboratory
62 Greene Street
New York, New York, 10012
Phone: 212-925-8812
Fax: 212-925-0459
www.asrlab.org

TOM GLOCER, REUTERS CEO EMAIL TO RRS , c.c. to top executives

Date: Mon, 12 Nov 2007 19:02:43 +0000
From: Thomas Glocer <Thomas.Glocer@reuters.com>
Subject: Re: RE Reuters---Surprised not to hear from your office.
To: r.r.shearer@asrlab.org, Kathy.Casinelli@thomson.com
Cc: Rosemary Martin <Rosemary.Martin@reuters.com>, Stephen Dando
<Stephen.Dando@reuters.com>, David Schlesinger
<David.Schlesinger@reuters.com>

I have just heard about this and have launched a full investigation. Please give us a few days to get to the bottom of this.

Under no circumstances will reuters condone any form of sexual or other discrimination or aggression

Regards
Tom

RRS EMAIL TO THOMSON, REUTERS PARTNER

-----Original Message-----

From: Rhonda R Shearer <r.r.shearer@asrlab.org>

To: Kathy.Casinelli@thomson.com <Kathy.Casinelli@thomson.com>

CC: Thomas Glocer

Sent: Mon Nov 12 18:18:50 2007

Subject: RE Reuters---Surprised not to hear from your office.

Dear Ms. Casinelli,

Here is the updated letter that Frank DeMaria, Reuters LA 's PR, is acting upon. Importantly, this updated letter includes information about a death threat, that resulted in a police report, since my initial letter was received by you on November 5, when we last spoke.

Mr. Glocer's office has also been contacted and is now aware of this issue . There are numerous issues at stake here.

I was disappointed to have not heard from Mr. Hawrysh last week, as promised.

Thank you.

Best regards,

Rhonda

Rhonda Roland Shearer

Director, Art Science Research Laboratory

62 Greene Street

New York, New York, 10012

phone 212-925-8812

fax 212-925-0459

www.asrlab.org

This email was sent to you by Reuters, the global news and information company.

To find out more about Reuters visit www.about.reuters.com

Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender, except where the sender specifically states them to be the views of Reuters Limited.

Reuters Limited is part of the Reuters Group of companies, of which Reuters Group PLC is the ultimate parent company. Reuters Group PLC - Registered office address: The Reuters Building, South Colonnade, Canary Wharf, London E14 5EP, United Kingdom

Registered No: 3296375

Registered in England and Wales

EMAIL EXCHANGE –RRS AND JULIA FULLER, REUTERS CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY

Date: Tue, 13 Nov 2007 11:27:52 +0000
From: julia fuller <Julia.Fuller@reuters.com>
Subject: RE: RE Complaint regarding Reuters employee's role in a cyber-hate campaign
To: Rhonda R Shearer <r.r.shearer@asrlab.org>
Thread-Topic: RE Complaint regarding Reuters employee's role in a cyber-hate campaign

Dear Mrs Shearer

Thank you for your email and for drawing this matter to my attention. Tom Glocer, Reuters chief executive, has launched a full investigation into it.

Regards
Julia Fuller

JULIA FULLER
Corporate Responsibility Manager
Reuters General Counsel's Office
The Reuters Building, South Colonnade, Canary Wharf, London E14 5EP
United Kingdom

(t) +44 (0) 20 7542 7040 | (m) 07825 008905 | (f) +44 (0)20 7542 3603

julia.fuller@reuters.com
Reuters Messaging: julia.fuller.reuters.com@reuters.net
Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail. Thank you

Reuters news and information reaches one billion people every day. Get the latest news at Reuters.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Rhonda R Shearer [mailto:r.r.shearer@asrlab.org]
Sent: 11 November 2007 02:28
To: julia fuller
Subject: RE Complaint regarding Reuters employee's role in a cyber-hate campaign

Dear Ms. Fuller,

The attached letter details a disturbing case of misconduct by a Reuter's employee. I hope "corporate" will handle the situation better than editorial. I am confident that you will be shocked. Mr. Robert C. Basler, editor of Reuters blog, GoodBadUgly (GBU) and Ms. Sophie Brendel badly mishandled the situation.

Best regards,

Rhonda Roland Shearer
Director, Art Science Research Laboratory
62 Greene Street
New York, New York, 10012
phone 212-925-8812
fax 212-925-0459
www.asrlab.org

This email was sent to you by Reuters, the global news and information company.
To find out more about Reuters visit www.about.reuters.com

Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender,
except where the sender specifically states them to be the views of Reuters Limited.

Reuters Limited is part of the Reuters Group of companies, of which Reuters Group PLC is the ultimate parent company.
Reuters Group PLC - Registered office address: The Reuters Building, South Colonnade, Canary Wharf, London E14 5EP, United Kingdom
Registered No: 3296375
Registered in England and Wales

REUTERS EDITOR AND CHIEF, LETTER TO RRS

November 16, 2007

Ms. Rhonda Roland Shearer
Director, Art Science Research Laboratory
62 Greene Street
New York, New York 10012

Dear Ms. Shearer:

Thank you very much for your email of November 12th to Tom Glocer. The issues raised in your email and the letter which you attached are obviously very serious and I have been asked to conduct a thorough review. You have raised several points in your letter, and I have attempted to address each in turn below:

Veracity of the Photographs:

Reuters is committed to accurate and balanced reporting. Our editorial policy, which you can read in its entirety on about.reuters.com, requires that our news operations adhere to the Reuters Trust Principles. These Principles, which are the governing force behind Reuters operations, mandate that the integrity, independence and freedom from bias of Reuters must be upheld at all times. As a result, we have no tolerance for any false reporting. The debacle of the photograph published during the Israel-Lebanon war was greatly disappointing to all of us, and is not something which we wish to see repeated.

When claims were made about the veracity of the fire damage photo, both our North American news pictures editor (who has over 30 years experience as a photographer), and the photographer's manager immediately investigated the allegations. In the course of their investigation, they spoke to the photographer to determine exactly what he had done while at the scene. Further, they reviewed the sequence of photographs, and the unedited original photographs. Based on this review (which showed a number of other items in the house that had not burned), and their conversations, they determined that this photograph was in fact authentic.

While we do understand that you would prefer to do your own testing of the photographs, it is not our policy to make the additional photos you request generally available. However, please rest assured that we did a full and thorough review of the photograph at issue in order to ensure that it was not in violation of our Trust Principles.

Reuters America Inc
The Reuters Building
3 Times Square
New York NY 10036

Tel 646-223-4000
www.reuters.com



Improper Sharing of Information:

All of our employees and contractors are strictly prohibited from sharing confidential information. A violation of this prohibition will not be tolerated. After speaking with our photographer, we understand that the reference about Mr. Weeks' "scrolling through photos" was a reference to viewing the photographs on Yahoo as they were being posted. Yahoo is a licensed redistributor of Reuters photographs, and would have the right to post these photos on its website. We also spoke to our photographer about your very serious allegation that he conveyed information about our letter to you to Mr. Weeks. Our photographer was actually unaware of the contents of the letter being drafted to you, and so could not have conveyed these to his friend. Mr. Weeks may have been assuming Reuters response from the notes from the editor that appeared on October 29th and October 31st defending the pictures.

Blog Discourse:

We have reviewed the entire discourse on the topic that appeared on reuters.com. The Good, the Bad & the Ugly is a moderated blog and we do review comments before posting to ensure that completely unconstructive comments that do not advance dialogue in any way do not appear. We also will not post comments with hate speech or which do not have even a tangential relationship to the dialogue. In this regard, there were in fact several comments that we received in connection with the fire photos that we chose not to post. However, in the interest of promoting free discussion, we will include comments that might be deemed borderline if they contain relevant tangential information. While the discourse on reuters.com became very heated, and at times was not at the level at which we would prefer to see issues addressed, we do believe that everything posted was within our guidelines for postings.

We have also looked at the dialogue you were having on the other sites and the responses, and agree that there was some very negative language that would not have been posted on reuters.com. For instance, we clearly do not condone death threats. However, even if an individual has been extremely offensive on one site, we will not bar them from blogging on reuters.com as long they are not in violation of our standards when using reuters.com. I am sure that you can appreciate that any other policy would lead to a level of policing that would be unadministrable and also would be contrary to the free flow of ideas which we seek to encourage.

With respect to the links, we do not remove the links from blog postings. So, for instance, we did not remove the links included within your postings. As a general matter, it is not our policy to edit comments.

As I mentioned previously all of Reuters business is required to be conducted in accordance with the Reuters Trust Principles, and those Principles certainly would not allow a Reuters employee to either directly or indirectly encourage a smear campaign against any member of the public. We have discussed this with our photographer, and he asserts that he has not encouraged this behavior in any way. Mr. Weeks is a close friend



of our photographer, and we believe Mr. Weeks' actions are stemming from an attempt to defend a friend. Please do not understand the preceding as our attempt to justify the dialogue that has taken place off of our site, but only our attempt to explain why Mr. Weeks may be reacting so heatedly. As he is not a Reuters employee, we have not had any conversations with Mr. Weeks about this matter. However, we have asked our photographer to speak to Mr. Weeks and request that Mr. Weeks cease this line of dialogue.

Ms. Shearer, we appreciate the concerns that you have had regarding your safety and that of your daughter and therefore took the actions detailed above to confirm that Reuters editorial policies and principles were observed. We will continue to monitor the reuters.com blog sites to ensure that any dialogue that is posted stays within our stated policies of ensuring a free flow of ideas that does not veer off into negative language like that raised in your letter. We also obviously work every day to ensure that our Reuters-generated editorial content complies with our Trust Principles and the highest standards of journalism.

Thank you very much for bringing this matter to our attention.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David A. Schlesinger". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a prominent initial "D" and "S".

David A. Schlesinger
Editor-in-Chief

Digital version of above letter

November 16, 2007

Via Federal Express

Ms. Rhonda Roland Shearer
Director, Art Science Research Laboratory
62 Greene Street
New York, NY 10012

Dear Ms. Shearer,

Thank you very much for your email of November 12th to Tom Glocer. The issues raised in your email and the letter which you attached are obviously very serious and I have been asked to conduct a thorough review. You have raised several points in your letter, and I have attempted to address each in turn below:

Veracity of the Photographs:

Reuters is committed to accurate and balanced reporting. Our editorial policy, which you can read in its entirety on about.reuters.com, requires that our news operations adhere to the Reuters Trust Principles. These Principles, which are the governing force behind Reuters operations, mandate that the integrity, independence and freedom from bias of Reuters must be upheld at all times. As a result, we have no tolerance for any false reporting. The debacle of the photograph published during the Israel-Lebanon war was greatly disappointing to all of us, and is not something which we wish to see repeated.

When claims were made about the veracity of the fire damage photo, both our North American news pictures editor (who has over 30 years experience as a photographer), and the photographer's manager immediately investigated the allegations. In the course of their investigation, they spoke to the photographer to determine exactly what he had done while at the scene. Further, they reviewed the sequence of photographs, and the unedited original photographs. Based on this review (which showed a number of other items in the house that had not burned), and their conversations, they determined that this photograph was in fact authentic.

While we do understand that you would prefer to do your own testing of the photographs, it is not our policy to make the additional photos you request generally available. However, please rest assured that we did a full and thorough review of the photograph at issue in order to ensure that it was not in violation of our Trust Principles.

Improper Sharing of Information:

All of our employees and contractors are strictly prohibited from sharing confidential information. A violation of this prohibition will not be tolerated. After speaking with our photographer [Mario Anzuoni], we understand that the reference about Mr. Weeks' "scrolling through photos" was a reference to viewing the photographs on Yahoo as they

were being posted. Yahoo is a licensed redistributor of Reuters photographs, and would have the right to post these photos on its website. We also spoke to our photographer about your very serious allegation that he conveyed information about our letter to you to Mr. Weeks. Our photographer was actually unaware of the contents of the letter being drafted to you, and so could not have conveyed these to his friend. Mr. Weeks may have been assuming Reuters response from the notes from the editor that appeared on October 29th and October 31st defending the pictures.

Blog Discourse:

We have reviewed the entire discourse on the topic that appeared on reuters.com. The Good, the Bad & the Ugly is a moderated blog and we do review comments before posting to ensure that completely unconstructive comments that do not advance dialogue in any way do not appear. We also will not post comments with hate speech or which do not have even a tangential relationship to the dialogue. In this regard, there were in fact several comments that we received in connection with the fire photos that we chose not to post. However, in the interest of promoting free discussion, we will include comments that might be deemed borderline if they contain relevant tangential information. While the discourse on reuters.com became very heated, and at times was not at the level at which we would prefer to see issues addressed, we do believe that everything posted was within our guidelines for postings.

We have also looked at the dialogue you were having on the other sites and the responses, and agree that there was some very negative language that would not have been posted on reuters.com. For instance, we clearly do not condone death threats. However, even if an individual has been extremely offensive on one site, we will not bar them from blogging on reuters.com as long as they are not in violation of our standards when using reuters.com. I am sure that you can appreciate that any other policy would lead to a level of policing that would be unadministrable and also would be contrary to the free flow of ideas which we seek to encourage.

With respect to the links, we do not remove the links from blog postings. So, for instance, we did not remove the links included within your postings. As a general matter, it is not our policy to edit comments.

As I mentioned previously all of Reuters business is required to be conducted in accordance with the Reuters Trust Principles, and those Principles certainly would not allow a Reuters employee to either directly or indirectly encourage a smear campaign against any member of the public. We have discussed this with our photographer, and he asserts that he has not encouraged this behavior in any way. Mr. Weeks is a close friend of our photographer [Mario Anzuoni], and we believe Mr. Weeks' actions are stemming from an attempt to defend a friend. Please do not understand the preceding as our attempt to justify the dialogue that has taken place off of our site, but only our attempt to explain why Mr. Weeks may be reacting so heatedly. As he is not a Reuters employee, we have not had any conversations with Mr. Weeks about this matter. However, we have asked our photographer to speak to Mr. Weeks and request that Mr. Weeks cease this line of dialogue.

Ms. Shearer, we appreciate the concerns that you have had regarding your safety and that of your daughter and therefore took the actions detailed above to confirm that Reuters editorial policies and principles were observed. We will continue to monitor the reuters.com blog sites to ensure that any dialogue that is posted stays within our stated policies of ensuring a free flow of ideas that does not veer off into negative language like that raised in your letter. We also obviously work every day to ensure that our Reuters-generated editorial content complies with our Trust Principles and the highest standards of journalism.

Thank you very much for bringing this matter to our attention.

Very truly yours,

David A. Schlesinger
Editor-in-Chief

**RRS RESPONSE TO REUTERS CEO, GLOCER REGARDING
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF'S LETTER TO RRS**

Date: Thu, 06 Dec 2007 14:15:51 -0500

To: Thomas Glocer <Thomas.Glocer@reuters.com>

From: Rhonda R Shearer <r.r.shearer@asrlab.org>

Subject: RE:your promised "full investigation" of the misogynist harassment of my daughter and me by a Reuters employee by proxy

Cc: <Rosemary.Martin@reuters.com>, <Stephen.Dando@reuters.com>, <David.Schlesinger@reuters.com>, london713@netscape.com, lmed@fulbright.com, <Kathy.Casinelli@thomson.com>, <Julia.Fuller@reuters.com>

Thomas Glocer,
CEO, Reuters

Dear Tom,

This is in response to a November 16, 2007 letter from David A. Schlesinger, Reuters Editor-in-Chief. Mr. Schlesinger's letter was addressed only to me and did not copy you or the other recipients of your e-mail. I am now writing to you because I wanted to hear from you directly whether you stand behind Mr. Schlesinger's actions and words, and consider his "thorough review" befitting of your promise of a "full investigation." You wrote to me promising, and I trusted, that "Under no circumstances will Reuters condone any form of sexual or other discrimination or aggression." Yet Mr. Schlesinger's reply falls far short of a "thorough review" and "full investigation."

For example, Mr. Schlesinger writes in his response:

Mr. Weeks is a close friend of our photographer, and we believe Mr. Weeks actions are stemming from an attempt to defend a friend. Please do not understand the preceding as our attempt to justify the dialogue that has taken place off of our site, but only our attempt to explain why Mr. Weeks may be reacting so heatedly.

Mr. Schlesinger chooses to characterize Chris Weeks outrageous actions as heatedly defending a friend. Since when did sexist bullying and intimidation designed to both publicly humiliate and silence someone acting in the public interest pass for heatedly defending a friend. Such conduct goes way outside the boundary of the words Mr. Schlesinger chose to explain and rationalize Mr. Weeks motives and actions. These actions are nothing short of repugnant and would be condemned by anyone with courage and strength of character. Instead, Mr. Schlesinger chose to characterize harassment and death threats as the heated defense of a friend.

Look at this pornographic video that Mr. Weeks suggested was me and explain --as your Editor and Chief did---how Weeks was defending a friend, as opposed to engaging in sexist harassment of the worst kind: <http://blink-182.com/>

Where is Mr. Schlesinger's sense of decency and perspective? No reasonable person would allow a friend and close professional associate to use their name to wage a hate campaign by proxy consisting of harassment and death threats. No company should permit its employee to orchestrate a harassment campaign by proxy in an attempt to silence critics investigating his work.

From the precedent you have just created, the message to the public is chilling and clear: if you dare to challenge a *Reuters* photo, *Reuters* employees can and will be allowed to wage sexist proxy campaigns against you, and *Reuters* will not take action to prevent such behavior.

Such a campaign can include, with *Reuters* apparent approval or lack of disapproval, links to XXX smears about you and your relatives. These links will help drive traffic to the smut from *Reuters*. *Reuters* blogs moderators will even help *Reuters* employees you criticized by censoring you or your family members posts, while continuing posting those of your harassers. *Reuters* editors will even let harassers answer your questions for *Reuters*, which you unambiguously posed only to *Reuters* editors.

Bloggers have already characterized Mr. Anzuonis and Mr. Weeks sexist campaign on Mr. Weeks blog-- cross linked with *Reuters*-- as a woman bashing hate group! On DustMyBroom.com, Linda, with bitterness, wrote:

For some really interesting reading check out what Mario's friends are saying about Rhonda Shearer's daughter because she simply said the photo should be investigated. <http://www.uber.com/chrisweeks> (look at recent posts) Uber.com is a newish online community (like facebook but for artists) and Chris Weeks (Mario's friend) heads the

photography section. Let's all go and join the woman bashing hate group!

I take hope that you, and the others copied on your earlier email, agree with me that Mr. Schlesinger's investigation and response fall short of Reuters standards. Please read my attached letter, which provides ample detail of what transpired, and take appropriate action to properly deal with all the issues: authenticity of Mr. Anzuonis photos; the harassment campaign directed at me and my daughter; and Reuters handling of this matter to date.

I appeal to you to do the right thing. Please open a through investigation and take proper actions against those within your purview and control who were involved in actions and callous inactions that resulted in harassment, possible trespass and other breaches of photojournalistic ethics.

Show good faith and immediately take down the links to the harassment from Reuters blogs that continue to harm me and my daughter.

Best regards,
Rhonda
Rhonda Roland Shearer
Director, Art Science Research Laboratory
62 Greene Street
New York, New York, 10012
phone 212-925-8812
fax 212-925-0459

RRS RESPONSE TO REUTERS
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF'S LETTER TO RRS

David A. Schlesinger
Editor-in-Chief
Reuters

December 6, 2007

Dear Mr. Schlesinger,

Thank you for your letter (dated November 16, received November 20), which followed *Reuters* CEO Tom Glocer's November 12th e-mail that promised to launch "a full investigation." *Reuters'* investigation was prompted by evidence I presented, which showed that one of your employees, Mario Anzuoni, participated by omission or commission, in a vile, sexist, and hate-filled harassment campaign against me and my daughter, after I – in my professional capacity as an outside investigator and publisher of media ethics journals – questioned the authenticity of his photos.

I note that your letter is addressed only to me and fails to copy Tom Glocer or the other recipients of Mr. Glocer's e-mail. I assumed that Mr. Glocer and the others would be interested in the findings of your "full investigation" and my reply.

I also note and appreciate the following statements and findings in your letter:

- "The issues raised in your e-mail and the letter which you attached are obviously very serious"
- "[I] have been asked to conduct a thorough review."
- "*Reuters* Trust Principles ... which are the governing force behind *Reuters* operations, mandate that the integrity, independence and freedom from bias of *Reuters* must be upheld at all times."
- "The debacle of the photograph published during the Israel-Lebanon war was greatly disappointing to all of us, and is not something which we wish to see repeated."
- "All of our employees and contractors are strictly prohibited from sharing confidential information. A violation of this prohibition will not be tolerated."
- "*Reuters* Trust Principles ... certainly would not allow a *Reuters* employee to either directly or indirectly encourage a smear campaign against any member of the public."
- "We appreciate the concerns that you have had regarding your safety and that of your daughter."

The rest of your letter – the facts and circumstances you present – however, either falls short or stands in obvious contradiction with your statements above. None of the principles that characterize an independent and complete review were employed. What you have described as a "full investigation" is, in my view, a repeat of the same corporate irresponsibility and neglect that allowed this employee's (and others') misconduct in the first place. To now compound this initial negligence with what appears to be nothing more than a sham investigation is, frankly, unexpected and shocking.

Since "*Reuters* news and information reaches 1 billion people every day," it is critical that people trust the integrity of your company through its actions, not lip service, to maintain its principles. This requires real investigative steps comprised of verification and documentary support for what your employee tells you – not just taking what Mr. Anzuoni says at face value – which is apparently the method you used, as repeatedly cited in your letter.

I have selected four of your points as section headings for organizing my reply, which follow as A, B, C, etc. The fifth heading is a question of mine that *Reuters* failed to answer, despite my numerous requests.

1. You wrote: "*Reuters* Trust Principles ... certainly would not allow a *Reuters* employee to either *directly or indirectly* [emphasis added] encourage a smear campaign against any member of the public."

Yet you accept Mr. Anzuoni's answer at face value: "We have discussed this with our photographer, and he asserts that he has not encouraged this behavior in any way." That's it for your full investigation?

Mr. Anzuoni's close friend and professional associate, Chris Weeks, had launched a porn-filled public campaign *in Mario Anzuoni's name*, enlisting others to act along with him. Death threats resulted and a police report made. Since the law provides for protections against misuse of one's name, I assumed that Mr. Anzuoni, as a *Reuters* employee, and *Reuters* itself after my notice, would have wanted to stop misuse of Mr. Anzuoni's good name, and by affiliation, the very reputation of *Reuters*. But the reality is that *Reuters* took few steps, if any, to prevent or stop the harassments. Indeed, evidence reveals it was *Reuters'* employee Mr. Anzuoni who orchestrated a harassment campaign by proxy in an attempt to silence me, a professional critic investigating his work.

Mr. Anzuoni's relationship with Mr. Weeks goes well beyond social friendship and includes obvious close professional and business ties in the public eye. For example, a Vanity Fair Oscar party photograph, published on February 29, 2004, cites a shared credit line, "Mario Anzuoni/Chris Weeks." In February 2004, the team even had a gallery show: "Photo Exhibition by Chris Weeks and Mario Anzuoni ...Farmani Gallery of Contemporary Photography, Hollywood, California."



Here are the facts:

A. Mr. Anzuoni did not contact providers about taking down harassing materials. Nowhere was private or public notice given, in any one of the numerous forums at *Reuters* or at Mr. Anzuoni's disposal, that Mr. Weeks' statements were not authorized or condoned by *Reuters* or Mr. Anzuoni. It was I, not Mario Anzuoni or *Reuters*, who insisted that the two providers take down the venom spewed by Chris Weeks in Mr. Anzuoni's name.

B. Alas, while the providers of Mr. Weeks' Web pages perceived the danger and seriousness of the vitriol and complied with my request to take good faith action by removing the loathsome materials, *Reuters*, in contrast, did nothing. Worse, *Reuters* apparently had no problem that a photograph of Mr. Anzuoni with his pal Mr. Weeks, an image of solidity and defiance, was posted November 8, immediately after most of the smears were removed from the Web. Mr. Anzuoni is shown arm in arm with Mr. Weeks, giving the English finger straight into the camera. Given this photograph, how can anything but a sham investigation be satisfied with your employee's assertion "that he has not encouraged this behavior in any way"?

C. What disciplinary action was taken for appearing on a public blog as a known *Reuters'* employee giving the British version of the middle finger, sitting in solidarity with his friend and professional associate, Mr. Weeks during this smear campaign? None, according to your letter.



CAPTION: The photo above (posted November 8, 2007, on www.uber.com/chrisweeks) shows Messrs. Weeks and Anzuoni in solidarity and defiance. Instead of distancing himself, and without any fear of consequences from *Reuters*, Mr. Anzuoni is shown on this public blog to be both actively and passively endorsing his friend and professional associate, Mr. Weeks' sexist, porn-filled campaign against me and my daughter.

D. What kind of man stands aside while foul, misogynist attacks were taken against two women in his name? “Thank you for Mario!” Mr. Weeks wrote on his blog. Later, he is coy about Mr. Anzuoni’s involvement and uses the wink symbol – “;)” – after my November 1st notice of a campaign by Mr. Anzuoni’s friend on the *Reuters* blog:

November 02, 2007 11:13 PM

“i can't wait until those cunts call me paparazzi. and ... a huge fucking thank you for the support you guys gave mario during the attempted assination [sic] of his work product. fuck the pseudo-intellectuals! i can't say if he appreciates it or not but i'd imagine that he does. ;)”

E. *Reuters* has behaved as if Mr. Anzuoni’s brazen assumption, that he has no accountability, is sound. This position is in complete contradiction to your claim that *Reuters* would not allow “a *Reuters* employee to either directly or indirectly encourage a smear campaign against any member of the public.” Even after there was no doubt as to the extent of the attacks, including death threats, Mr. Anzuoni *still* chooses to pose with

his friend and professional associate, Mr. Weeks, signaling a hand curse, and further, he lets Mr. Weeks publish the photo on the offending blog. Again, Mr. Anzuoni is unambiguous in his endorsement. What is Mario Anzuoni's message to *Reuters*, to me, my daughter, and the public? Simple answer: that his friend Mr. Weeks did nothing to misrepresent him and has done nothing wrong.

F. It's unbelievable that someone as yourself, with such serious corporate responsibilities, could "explain" in your letter that:

"Mr. Weeks is a close friend of our photographer, and we believe Mr. Weeks' actions are stemming from an attempt to defend a friend. Please do not understand the preceding as our attempt to justify the dialogue that has taken place off of our site, but only our attempt to explain why Mr. Weeks may be reacting so heatedly."

Chris Weeks actions were "defending a friend" and "heated"? That's how you characterize this outrage? The sexist bullying and intimidation – designed to both publicly humiliate and silence me – was even extended to include my daughter. This, goes way outside the boundary of the words you chose to "explain" and rationalize Weeks' motives. These actions are nothing short of repugnant and would be condemned by anyone with courage and strength of character. Instead, you chose to characterize harassment and death threats as the heated defense of a friend. Where is your sense of decency and perspective?

US Code, Title 47, Sec. 230, states: "It is the policy of the United States—“to ensure vigorous enforcement of Federal criminal laws to deter and punish trafficking in obscenity, stalking, and harassment by means of computer.” Indeed the law discusses how information providers, such as *Reuters*, avoid civil liability when taking “voluntary action” and showing “good faith” by restricting offensive materials-- regardless, of “whether or not such material is constitutionally protected.” Title 47, Sec. 230 defines “offensive material” to include the “obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, excessively violent, harassing, or otherwise objectionable.”

With all due respect to your sham investigation, even one of Mr. Weeks' cohorts was eventually repulsed by Mr. Weeks' statements. Username Isha could not believe that Mr. Anzuoni would stand idly by while my daughter and I were treated so “cruelly” by Mr. Weeks' uncivilized behavior:

November 04, 2007 4:34 PM

Posted by [isha_1](#) on November 04, 2007 6:50 PM

“Your seething vitriol of Ms. Shearer and her daughter is way beyond necessary criticism, in my opinion. You certainly take no responsibility for being a gentleman and voicing your opinion in a civilized manner. Your use of profanity loses the power of the words, when you use abusive language so frequently. I've enjoyed your photography over the years and your writing, but I have to pass when it comes to being cruel to other persons who don't agree with you. So what's Mario's opinion on all this shit?”

No reasonable person would allow a friend and close professional associate to use their name to wage a campaign that included calling a widow and grandmother, and a young mother, “cunts” or worse. No company should permit its employee to orchestrate a harassment campaign by proxy in an attempt to silence critics investigating his work. Look at this pornographic video that Mr. Weeks suggested was me and “explain” again how he was “defending a friend,” as opposed to engaging in sexist harassment of the worst kind: <http://blink-182.com/>

Do I have to explain to you that toleration of such hate-filled misogyny (the “boys will be boys and it’s harmless” mentality) is at the root of all sexism and sexual harassment?

G. You write that between my letter of complaint to Mr. Glocer on November 12th and your letter of November 16th, “We have asked our photographer to speak to Mr. Weeks and request that Mr. Weeks cease this line of dialogue.”

Clearly, at the time of my November 1st notification, and those that followed through November 4th, *Reuters* editors and managers had a duty to, at the very least, ask Mr. Anzuoni to speak with Mr. Weeks and request that he “cease” this line of dialogue.” Instead you stood idle for two weeks, and only after which requested that Mr. Anzuoni ask Mr. Weeks to “cease” – all without any consequence to Mr. Anzuoni, and without requesting that an apology be made to me and my daughter or that or Mr. Anzuoni denounce or state that he did not and does not condone Mr. Weeks’ actions.

H. I note that you only “asked” that Mario “request that Mr. Weeks cease,” but you do not inform me that your employee has, in fact, sent written notice to Mr. Weeks to ensure my and my daughter’s safety. This is unacceptable. Indeed, Mr. Week threatened to continue his harassment campaign in Mr. Anzuoni’s name:

November 04, 2007 4:34 PM Chris Weeks writes in "density..." post:
“you stupid fucking cunt?...so ... please ... make more accusations ... we’ll all be here.”

I. There are obvious, unanswered investigative questions that would result in truth, such as: When did Mario Anzuoni first know about his “close friend’s” harassment campaign?

What did Mario Anzuoni do when he first learned of such actions? Is there any evidence that Mario Anzuoni showed good faith and emailed his friend to stop?

If Mario Anzuoni had no part in the vile harassment, how did he distance himself?

Did he write of his concerns to supervisors that a grandmother of three and mother of two were being viscerally attacked in a campaign waged in his behalf that he had nothing to do with and had no control of?

How could Mario Anzuoni have justified that he had nothing to do with the campaign when knew it was going on but did nothing? He had my address to express his concerns

to me and my daughter. He had a blog page to give a voice to his non-involvement in a friend's campaign that he felt was morally and ethically wrong.

Were these issues raised, much less addressed, in your thorough investigation?

2. You wrote: "All of our employees and contractors are strictly prohibited from sharing confidential information. A violation of this prohibition will not be tolerated."

I informed you in my November 12th letter that Mr. Weeks indicated on Uber.com/chrisweeks that Mr. Anzuoni had shown him the photos in question before editing and publication.

Mr. Weeks wrote on October 30th, "so ... i remember when i was scrolling through photos that my friend Mario was moving ...actually he was moving the entire take and they were being edited remotely in either l.a. or d.c."

Your investigative method to test what appears as evidence of a "violation of this prohibition" consisted of nothing more than speaking to Mr. Anzuoni and accepting what he said as true. You wrote, without having done any verification, "After speaking with our photographer, we understand that the reference about Mr. Weeks' 'scrolling through photos' was a reference to viewing the photographs on Yahoo as they were being posted."

How does one scroll "through the entire take of photos" that his friend "was moving" as "they were being edited remotely in either l.a. or d.c" as Mr. Weeks stated in his own words, except in violation of Yahoo's prohibition of access?

Have you informed your Yahoo that a non-employee appears to have gotten access to the photos in their system? I am confident in assuming that, even though "Yahoo is a licensed redistributor of *Reuters* photographs, and would have the right to post these photos on its Web site," you would be ethically required to inform Yahoo that a non employee accessed the pre-publication and editing movements of its licensed property.

A. A real investigation would include asking Yahoo to verify Mr. Anzuoni's story by checking its servers. All visitors are recorded on servers and Yahoo has sophisticated tracking. You know the pictures were taken on October 23rd and published on *Reuters* the next day. All you have to do is check when the photos were sent to Yahoo. If Mr. Weeks had access to Yahoo and was scrolling through the "entire take" as Mr. Anzuoni was moving the photos for editing, Mr. Weeks' IP address would obviously be on the Yahoo servers. If Mr. Anzuonio is lying, there will be no IP addresses matching Mr. Weeks'.

Since Mr. Weeks was a close professional associate of Mr. Anzuoni sharing photo credits and joint gallery exhibitions, Mr. Weeks and Mr. Anzuoni were obviously accustomed to sharing in-camera scrolling or computer downloading of pictures. With the advent of Mr.

Anzuoni' Reuters job, this practice should have stopped. However, all evidence points to: Mr. Anzuoni gave access to Mr. Weeks to the "entire set" of *Reuters* property as they were "moving" to be "edited remotely in DC or LA".

B. The ruse of the "Yahoo story" is revealed in a timeline:

October 30th: In his desire to argue from the authority of special knowledge, Mr. Weeks reveals that he had special access to the *Reuters* photos on uber.com/chrisweeks.

November 1st: I post on GBU *Reuters* blog that Mr. Weeks' campaign is afoot and provide the URL in my comment that opened to Mr. Weeks' claim of special access to the entire take of photos.

November 2nd: Damage control ensues. Post hoc cleanup of a serious mistake is evidenced when, suddenly, Mr. Weeks quickly seeds for a future cover story. On his DeviantArt.com blog, Mr. Weeks re-writes the Uber.com statement, but recasts the beginning in stilted but revealing language. Mr. Weeks states, "When i knew mario was in san diego last week i did a routine search of the newswire photos on yahoo."

"A *routine* search"? Who writes that formally? Not Mr. Weeks. But worse, this explanation does not square with his original October 30th statement. A "routine Yahoo newswire search" does not include the ability to scroll through the "entire take" of Mr. Anzuoni's photos that is being "moved" by Mario Anzuoni in real time, as they were being "edited remotely in either l.a. or d.c."

Do I really have to inform you on how to do an investigation of such importance to *Reuters* internal security? *Reuters* serves 1 billion people a day. Surely you know how to properly investigate your employee's ridiculously inconsistent statements? There are other post hoc mentions of Yahoo in Chris Weeks writings but I have done enough, I believe. So please, do your own work to learn more if you are serious about your no tolerance policy.

3. You wrote: "*Reuters* Trust Principles ... which are the governing force behind *Reuters* operations, mandate that the integrity, independence and freedom from bias of *Reuters* must be upheld at all times."

Evidence indicates, in our view, that *Reuters* management failed to: enforce this policy through inactions and actions, acted in conflict of interest, showed poor judgment and positive bias toward Mr. Anzuoni's friends and negative bias toward my daughter and me.

A. You wrote "With respect to the links, we do not remove the links from blog postings ... As a general matter, it is not our policy to edit comments."

Your published policy clearly states the opposite, see below. (Note that all emphasis is mine).

“When you submit a comment to us we request your name, e-mail address **and optionally a link to a website. Please note where you submit a website address, we may link to it via your name.** By sending us a comment, you accept that we have the right to show the comment and your name to users. **Although we require your e-mail address, this will not be published on the site, and is only required to enable us to check facts with you, e.g. if you are making a claim we can not confirm easily ... We moderate all comments and will publish everything** that advances the post directly or with relevant tangential information.

“We reserve the right to edit comments in order to maintain the quality of the comments, and may not include links to irrelevant material. We try not to publish comments that we think are offensive or appear to pass you off as another person, and we will be conservative if comments may be considered libelous. *Reuters* will use your data in accordance with *Reuters* privacy policy. **Reuters Limited is primarily responsible for managing your data.** As *Reuters* is a global company your data will be transferred and available internationally.”

My complaint, detailed in my November 12th letter, was that *Reuters* managers were negligent for choosing to link culprits names to the XXX attacks from the *Reuters* blog. You may not, in fact, “remove the links from blog postings” but it is clearly within your stated policy to not post these links.

Furthermore, the policy states, “We reserve the right to edit comments in order to maintain the quality of the comments, and *may not include links* to irrelevant material.” Your moderators’ decisions, to link the death threat and all of the smut, in light of your stated policies are reprehensible. Your posting of multiple links to Mr. Weeks’ vile, porn video campaign should have never occurred after multiple and clear notices by my daughter and me of these attacks.

B. Your policy states: “We moderate all comments and **will publish everything** that advances the post directly or with relevant tangential information.” Again, the bias of *Reuters* management toward Mr. Anzuoni and Mr. Weeks, *et al.* is, in my view, clearly evident in that they permitted their actions, thereby facilitating or allowing the harassment to occur and continue. *Reuters*’ editors censored my daughter’s comment, which clearly should have been permitted. Obviously, my daughter’s comment did not suit *Reuters* management’s bias, as it undeniably met your guidelines. At the same time, you kept posting the culprits’ comments. Apparently, “the free flow of ideas which we seek to encourage” did not include those of my daughter.

Scott Alexander was a Mr. Weeks, *et al.* recruit who made postings on *Reuters* and two of Mr. Weeks’ blogs. Mr. Alexander’s own words and actions, as well as my daughters rejected comment, unmistakably drew editors attention to a fully evident sexist campaign, as illustrated below.

London Shearer submitted the following comment to GBU blog. *Reuters'* moderators denied posting it, while continuing to post her harasser, Mr. Alexander's comments.

Fri, 2 Nov 2007, London Shearer posts, "While this topic has clearly become inflamed, I felt the community should be aware that there is something else going on. Mr. Scott Alexander sounds fairly reasonable in his post here but deemed it necessary to seek out my private e-mail and send me the following note:

'How can you seriously market yourself as a photographer with your horrific examples of what you can do? People like you, buying a big heavy camera and having absolutely NO idea how to use it, that is what is wrong with my profession. It is full of mothers with nothing better to do. I have no degree in anything photography, but more photographic talent than you will ever have. take a good look at the garbage you are selling yourself with and sell your canon rebel. take up knitting. Cheers'

"I have to ask what sin have I committed to receive such an e-mail. Is that I am a mother? The daughter of Rhonda Shearer? Or simply that I believe that journalists should be held up to scrutiny? In my post I made no accusations. As a photojournalist myself, I would not refuse for my work to be examined if something was in question. Athletes are routinely tested for drugs not because people think they specifically are doing drugs but because some athletes do and therefore all must pay. It is no different for journalism, some journalists are dishonest and therefore the media community at large must suffer some scrutiny. It is just the way of the world. You may not like what I have to say or for that matter the photographs I take but at least I am woman enough to post publicly instead of in a cowardly e-mail."

C. Your editors surly had a duty to post our comments if they were posting Mr. Alexander's comments, as well as those made by Mr. Weeks, *et al.* But they did not. This shows an inexcusable and direct editorial bias. Importantly, Mr. Alexander's posts included a plan that should have struck moderators as extremely problematic in its proposal for Mr. Weeks to organize *Reuters'* staffers to harass my daughter in a public forum. Again, *Reuters'* editors and moderators did nothing.

Posted by [Obsidian-F...](#) (aka Scott Alexander) on November 02, 2007 3:53 AM

"back @ chris: Haha, you know you would want me there.. 😊 keep the peace so to speak, and **invite london [Shearer] as a guest speaker only to be hounded on by Reuters staffers.. I had to e-mail her**, her work bothered me and i really cant stand people making money off of garbage. it makes the rest of 'us' look bad, and cheapens the profession."

Despite the facts, including your own policies, and the troubling misuse of the *Reuters* name such as quoted above, you wrote in your November 16th letter to me: "However, even if an individual has been extremely offensive on one site, we will not bar them from blogging on *Reuters.com* as long as they are not in violation of our standards when using *Reuters.com*. I am sure that you can appreciate that any other policy would lead to a

level of policing that would be unadministrable and also would be contrary to the free flow of ideas which we seek to encourage.”

Your policy, and therefore your duty in this case, especially after sufficient notice, *does* include policing by you. Please refer to US Code 47, Sec. 230 quoted earlier. The situation was spinning out of control, and as you see, included posted plans for organizing *Reuters* employees to harass my daughter. The acceptance of the culprits’ comments and links, when combined with the absence of any protest by Mr. Anzuoni to the unauthorized use of his name, gave a de facto green light to harassers – as evidenced in the chatter – causing us harm.

D. Your policy includes a commitment to great care in your moderation of readers’ comments – even going so far as to include “check[ing] facts” with those making comments. The policy notifies readers: “We require your e-mail address ... only required to enable us to check facts with you, e.g. if you are making a claim we can not confirm easily.” Yet you did not act to fact check comments and links that involve vile harassment.

E. *Reuters* editors were so comfortable in their alliance to Mr. Anzuoni and Mr. Week’s campaign that they allowed Mr. Weeks to answer on their behalf:

On November 4th at 2:25 a.m. (GMT), I notified *Reuters* editors on the GBU blog:

“Most interesting of all is that Chris knew–BEFORE I DID–as shown from the dates and times of his comments –that *Reuters* was not going to provide Mario’s doll photos in high resolution to me. How did Chris have this advance knowledge that he shared with the rest of Mario’s friends? After all, this is private, insider, employee/employer information from Mario’s working relationship with *Reuters* about this public dispute? There is only one answer I can think of: Mario told Chris Weeks who shares it with all the other Mario friends on his blog. This surly is evidence that Mario, the *Reuters* professional photographer is, embarrassingly for *Reuters*, in cahoots with his friends’ campaign to flame me and my daughter–as Chris Weeks openly admits on his blog. Frankly, I think Mario’s friends are doing much more damage to their friend’s career than my questions. Who wants a guy working for them who sends out flame throwers to attack critics of their work. Very troubling if *Reuters* turns a blind eye to this employee problem.”

I addressed *Reuters*’ editors, not Mr. Weeks. Yet, *Reuters*’ editors posted Mr. Weeks factually incorrect comment, instead of their own answer to my charge of Mr. Weeks having troubling insider knowledge from his friend Mr. Anzuoni, a *Reuters* employee. This is unacceptable and an obvious bias to allow a non-employee and agent of harassment answer for *Reuters*.

Reuters editor posted Weeks comment as their answer to my charge, on November 4th at 12:48 p.m. (GMT):

“@rhonda: ‘ Most interesting of all is that Chris knew–BEFORE I DID–as shown from the dateS and timeS of his comments –that *Reuters* was not going to provide Mario’s doll photos in high resolution to me.’ dA’s time and date stamp is utc i believe. i read what you wrote in your comment located at <http://blogs.Reuters.com/gbu/2007/10/29/fire-damage-photo/#comment-332306>, which said, ‘In fact, by e-mail *Reuters* has just informed me the doll and related photos case ‘is closed’ and that this GBU blog allows me to express my or others opinions.’ you really love a good conspiracy don’t you? the world and the media is not out to get you ms. shearer.”

In this troubled situation, involving a report of sexist porn attacks being linked to your blog, *Reuters*’ editors should have fact-checked my and Mr. Weeks’ claims. As stated in your policy, fact-checking is in your clear purview. *Reuters*’ editors never should have continued to empower Mr. Weeks and his campaign, especially not by allowing him to step in as proxy to answer for *Reuters* and Mr. Anzuoni. My answer to Mr. Weeks, shown below, should have caused *Reuters*’ editors to take immediate action.

November 4th at 6:23 p.m. (GMT)

“My post that announces that the case is ‘closed’ was November 3rd. But on Oct. 31st you were aware that *Reuters* was not going to give me the photos. You wrote, ‘ms. shearer thinks that she’s entitled to receiving access to the ‘entire photo set’ ... thank god ... *Reuters* refused.” *Reuters* editors and citizens see for yourself, <http://cweeks.deviantart.com/journal/15324426/> This is evidence that you knew insider information from Mario and *Reuters* on Oct 31st– three days before I posted on Nov 3rd. Sexist and porn references aimed at me and my daughter on your two blogs are not “paranoia.” You actively encourage others to attack. You sent me a private, nasty e-mail yourself; yet you write” i know nothing of private e-mails.” See November 03, 2007 9:38 PM “bitter shrews and bananas..” <http://www.uber.com/chrisweeks> . I have the e-mail. Readers don’t be fooled. If its not safe for me and my daughter to post comments here. Is it safe for you?”

F. At best, *Reuters*’ editors showed callous disregard for me and my daughter’s safety with their silence and inaction regarding my notice of Mr. Weeks’ postings and Mr. Anzuoni’s role in the cyber sexist attacks. At worst, *Reuters*’ editors promoted such activity by boosting Mr. Anzuoni’s public presence when they rewarded him with his own blog – a fact that Chris Weeks crowed about on his Web page.

This action by your editors sent a clear signal to the public that *Reuters* supported Mr. Anzuoni and his proxy, Mr. Weeks. Such action was also a hostile message to me and my daughter. Clearly, giving Mr. Anzuoni his new blog, not only was encouraging to him, but obviously expanded the base from which the Weeks, *et al.* campaign could be waged (i.e. more links to drive traffic to the harassing materials).

For example, Darren Abate, one of Mr. Weeks’ cohorts, posted a comment on Mr. Anzuoni’s blog that *Reuters still* allows to smear my name with a sexist attack. Reuters sanctioned a link to Mr. Abate’s comment about me, “Shearer” having a similar name to a soft porn star, “Rhonda Shear.” Mr. Abate’s November 20 blog post includes a soft

porn photo of “Shear.” The link is also posted on GBU.

“ November 20, 2007, Up All Night...It was a nightly movie segment hosted by Rhonda Shear (NOT Shearer -- *shudder*). She would hang out -- figuratively and literally -- on my television late at night.”

The text accompanying the offensive photo of Mr. Weeks and Mr. Anzuoni, posted on Mr. Weeks blog where Mr. Anzuoni is giving the British finger, also includes a link to Mr. Anzuoni new *Reuters* blog page. All of this cross linking, had the intent, with *Reuters* participation and consent, to drive traffic to the present and past attacks against me and my daughter on Mr. Weeks et al’s sites.

The message from *Reuters*: Mr. Anzuoni’s lack of protest or action to distance himself from the links to sexist porn, verbal attacks and death threats was proper and acceptable. Mr. Anzuoni, a *Reuters*’ employee, had done no wrong.

4. “The debacle of the photograph published during the Israel-Lebanon war was greatly disappointing to all of us, and is not something which we wish to see repeated.”

A. You wrote: “When claims were made about the veracity of the fire damage photo, both our North American news pictures editor (who has over 30 years experience as a photographer), and the photographer’s manager immediately investigated the allegations.”

In others words, the two individuals, besides Mr. Anzuoni, who had the most to lose were the ones in charge of the investigation. In light of your previous “debacle,” how could you allow the very individuals who will suffer the most career consequences if the photos turn out to have problems lead the investigation? How would the public accept as creditable such a flawed procedure?

B. You wrote: “In the course of their investigation, they spoke to the photographer to determine exactly what he had done while at the scene”.

Again, your method is to speak to Mr. Anzuoni, instead of talking to fire science experts, who would give you independent and important information about the details shown in Mr. Anzuoni’s fire scene photos. The chair of the University of Maryland’s department offered your editors, in an e-mail from me, to examine high resolution photographs at no charge. If this were not suitable, you could have consulted your own fire engineering professors or professionals with 30 plus year in fire sciences, which was required by the intellectual task at hand.

C. You wrote: “Further, they reviewed the sequence of photographs, and the unedited original photographs. Based on this review (which showed a number of other items in the house that had not burned), and their conversations, they determined that this photograph was in fact authentic.”

The inadequate method originally stated by the GBU blog still reoccurs here. The reasoning is: Because other items (a door knob and frames) appear unburned, the doll could also have survived the surrounding intense fires, too.

The main problem with this approach is that it is based on guesswork by non-experts, your editors. Obviously, picture frames and brass burn at different temperatures than doll clothing and acrylic doll hair, which is very flammable. I have checked with at least 15 experts, most previously unknown to me. All the experts universally agree that the doll that appears in the photo was placed there *after* the fire. This is not to say Mr. Anzuoni put it there. That is yet an unknown. Further investigation is necessary. However, many of the experts also raise concerns as to the authenticity of the photo showing the pink Paris sign. It appears to have burn damage only on the left side: on the top, end and left bottom edges. There is no burn or smoke damage anywhere on the rest of the sign: the middle or the right end. The absence of any smoke or burn damage on the wallpaper surrounding the Paris sign is also suspicious in the opinion of the experts we have consulted.

Since there are only so many houses near the Rancho Santa Fe area, and even fewer that were left partially standing, the house depicted in Mr. Anzuoni's photographs, if it was a house in this area as Mr. Anzuoni represented, can likely be found. Real estate agents, county and city inspectors, insurance adjustors – even the family that owns the house – will have taken their own photographs and have knowledge independent of Mr. Anzuoni's photos. In addition the Art Science Research Laboratory is running ads and will soon offer a reward for information. Our investigation will be unbiased. In our pursuit of the truth, information will be made available and transparent. We will not compromise the public's trust.

D. What kind of full investigation or thorough review does not involve interviewing all parties? Looking at all sides of the story and a complete set of facts would certainly include speaking with me and my daughter? A sincere seeker of truth would be interested, without bias, in looking at what evidence we have collected. Your editors are not expert witnesses in fire science engineering. This is a conspicuous lapse that breeds distrust of *Reuters*.

E. Your photos of the fire doll scene are supposedly objective, recorded data and represents unaltered facts. Refusal to allow our experts to examine the photos, or provide experts of your own, is simply unacceptable, especially in light of your recent scandal. You offer no evidence of having done a thorough review. Sadly, this whole issue would have never arisen if you would have simply said the truth, right at the beginning – that you had no idea how the doll got there. But isn't it a nice photo?

F. You have enjoyed a reputation of promoting citizen journalism. You write on your *Reuters* blog that your "Facebook friend" Richard Sambrook, is "most excited ... about the notion that you need to connect with your audience because within it are people who know more about any subject you might cover than your journalists. This holds the

promise of driving up standards in journalism.” You also quote, blog aggregator, Rebecca Mackinnon, who you said, “thinks that journalists will need to learn how to listen to the public via blogs.”

Do you think that your Facebook friends, bloggers, the public, or your peers will not see through your sham investigation and be troubled by *Reuters*’ lack of transparency and accountability? Your actions and inactions, rationalizations, hypocrisies, and indulgences in this male-photographer boys’ club is clearly operating among your editors and employees. Yet you do nothing about it. Worse, you appear to support it.

5. I asked your editors in two emails on November 2nd, and asked again on the GBU blog on November 4th, and again in my letter on November 12th, Did your photographer have permission to enter this private house and photograph it?

This question remains conspicuously unanswered by you. The National Press Photographers Association’s “National Media Guide For Emergency & Disaster Incidents” is quite definitive on this subject. Under a section titled “Private Property Considerations” they state [all emphasis is original]:

“Journalists do not have a general right of access to private property. Consent must be obtained from someone in authority to grant it. *Consent to enter private property is between media and the person having control of the property – not the public safety agency.* Invitation to enter private property location by public safety representatives does not constitute ‘lawful’ permission. Reporters (including photographers) should not enter private property with emergency responders. If private parties give the media access to private property, it MUST be clear that the emergency responders are not requesting the media’s presence. Consent is between the media and individual concerned. When newsworthy events occur on private property, special problems for news photographers are sure to follow. Every state has a law that makes it illegal for a person to enter private property without obtaining permission from the property owner; a legal concept commonly called trespassing.”

I have attached the ad, recently placed in a local Rancho Sante Fe area daily newspaper, *North County Times*. See the accompanying attachment with appendices. Our ad provoked a new policy at this paper. Journalists are told to keep out of private homes during an emergency if they do not have permission to enter and to take photographs from the property owners. From the perspective of media ethics, this is significant. Were you aware that even county or city inspectors are not allowed to enter private homes after a fire without the owner’s permission, and must look into windows to do *their* inspections? Reuters needs to be transparent about any ignorance or violations of state laws regarding Mr. Anzuoni’s apparent private property trespass. *Reuters* also needs to reassure the public that such violations of privacy will not happen again, and such conduct by employees will not be tolerated by *Reuters* .

We will use this case of the doll photos to promote higher consciousness among media outlets to respect the private property rights of citizens during an emergency. In Mr.

Anzuoni's photographs, there was no news imperative to enter this little girls bedroom instead of shooting photos from the public street. People feel vulnerable during an evacuation. Unless necessary, they generally don't want people inside their house – even firefighters, inspectors, or police. With no answer from you, I have assumed that you did not have permission from the owners to enter on October 23rd, to take photographs or to sell and publish them by October 24th.

As part of my report, I am asking you now, if you have notified your content sharing partners about the questions over the legitimacy of these photos? Do they know that it is unclear whether the photographer had permission to take these photos and that a trespass may have occurred?

CONCLUSION

To target my daughter and involve a friend and close professional associate to conduct a campaign of harassment attacks is called “stalking by proxy” or “victimization by proxy” in forensic literature. (See www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2002/11/15756/13113.) *The Scotsman* reported that this research “revealed that a growing number of people are ‘stalking by proxy,’ using other people to harass their victims.” The mode of the proxy harasser, according to the report, “direct[s] their attention to other people who are close to the victim (particularly parents and children)” and involves using “their own friends” as the agents for attacks.

My plans are to tell my story far and wide of how *Reuters* failed to act to do a full investigation to protect me and my daughter and *Reuters*' good name despite a promise by their CEO to do one. I continue seeking the truth about the fire doll photos and after sufficient investigation will report my results on www.stinkijournalism.org.

A vile sexist attack against me and my daughter was waged by your employee's “friend” and business associate – a proxy – without one word of criticism or disassociation by that employee. These facts provide ample evidence of Mr. Anzuoni's involvement in this proxy harassment. The world of public opinion will judge your investigation. The truth about the photos, and the legality or illegality of how they were obtained is yet to come.

From the precedent you have just created, the message to the public is chilling and clear: if you dare to challenge a *Reuters* photo, *Reuters* employees can and will be allowed to wage sexist proxy campaigns against you, and *Reuters* will not take action to prevent such behavior.

Such a campaign can include, with *Reuters*' apparent approval or lack of disapproval, links to XXX smears about you and your relatives. These links will help drive traffic to the smut from *Reuters*. *Reuters* blogs moderators will even help *Reuters* employees you criticized by censoring you or your family members' posts, while continuing posting those of your harassers. *Reuters* editors will even let harassers answer your questions for *Reuters*, which you unambiguously posed only to *Reuters* editors.

Even after all of what I have said and experienced, I am ready to help you turn this disaster into a positive result. My goal is to improve ethics in journalism.

I appeal to you to do the right thing. Show good faith and immediately take down the links to the harassment from Reuters blogs. Reopen your investigation and take proper actions against those within your purview and control who were involved in actions and callous inactions that resulted in harassment, possible trespass and other breaches of photojournalistic ethics.

Bloggers have already characterized Mr. Anzuoni's and Mr. Weeks sexist campaign on Mr. Weeks blog-- cross linked with *Reuters*-- as a "woman bashing hate group!" On DustMyBroom.com, "Linda," with bitterness, wrote:

"For some really interesting reading check out what Mario's friends are saying about Rhonda Shearer's daughter because she simply said the photo should be investigated. <http://www.uber.com/chrisweeks> (look at recent posts) Uber.com is a newish online community (like facebook but for artists) and Chris Weeks (Mario's friend) heads the photography section. Let's all go and join the woman bashing hate group!"

Sincerely,

Rhonda Roland Shearer

Director, Art Science Research Laboratory

62 Greene Street

New York, New York, 10012

phone 212-925-8812

fax 212-925-0459

www.asrlab.org , www.astrobio.net

www.checkyourfacts.org

www.stinkyjournalism.org

Appendix I.*

Full page advertisement that appeared on November 22, 2007, Thanksgiving, in the *North County Times* (NCTimes.com)

Appendix II. *

Sequence of Letter exchanges between RRS and Reuters beginning on November 9, 2007 regarding sexual harassment campaign by Reuters employee against me and my daughter

*** Appendices found in second attachment, accompanying this letter:**

