

**Two emails from Columbia Journalism Review's managing editor/print, Brent Cunningham
One to iMediaEthics and the other to Marcy**

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

From: Brent Cunningham <wbc7@columbia.edu>

To: Marcy (redacted)

Sent: Mon, Nov 12, 2012 3:57 pm

Subject: Re: current Columbia Journalism Review

,

First, let me say that I'm sorry this article was upsetting to you. That was not our intention, and Bruce's whole point in writing it was to make amends for his mistake all those years ago.

Having said that, much of what you cite in your email below does not rise to the level of a published correction. For instance, we did not need your permission to publish your name and the names of your relatives, etc. (We also took into consideration the fact that you signed a release to be part of the documentary that Bruce and Dan are making.) We did, however, purposely not publish your address or your married name, which is how you are listed in the phone book, I believe. Concerning the matter of snow in Flint when Bruce made his trip there in 2011, what he wrote was that there was snow on the ground. And in fact a check of the weather in Flint that week shows that it did in fact snow on Wednesday and Friday, the day Bruce arrived. So it seems likely that there was at least some snow on the ground, and both Bruce and Dan are adamant that there was. Was there a foot? I don't know.

More to the point, it seems your concerns are mostly with the original Newsweek article. Bruce has detailed notes from his interview with you in 1967, and given the passage of so much time--45 years--we felt justified in relying on those notes, rather than on conflicting memories of what was said, or not said, in that interview so long ago.

Again, I'm sorry this caused you pain, but I hope you understand our position.

Sincerely,

Brent Cunningham
Deputy Editor
Columbia Journalism Review

Date: Tue, 13 Nov 2012 15:07:49 -0500

From: Brent Cunningham <wbc7@columbia.edu>

To: "Rhonda R. Shearer" <rhonda.r.shearer@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: RE CJR claim of foot of snow in Flint

Rhonda,

After talking to Bruce, and getting a list of Marcy's specific complaints, here is my response to your questions from last week.

--as I tried to explain to you, there was no reason for us to call the Flint reporter; Bruce's article referenced a story in the Sunday paper, Jan. 9 (that, not surprisingly, appeared online before it was published in print). We checked that such a story did in fact appear. It did. (I told you that I thought what Bruce did the following week was stupid, and it was--and he agrees--but it was not part of the story we published.)

--as to why we didn't call Marcy. First, her interview with Bruce took place 45 years ago. Bruce has detailed notes of that interview. Even under the best of circumstances, memory at that distance is unreliable--and clearly, Marcy's circumstances at the time were somewhat less than ideal (even in the back and forth with Bruce and me over the last several days, some of her claims have been inconsistent). We feel justified in relying on Bruce's notes.

Second, we did not need her permission to print her name, and we took care to not publish her address or her married name, which is what she uses now. Also, she had signed a release to participate in Bruce's documentary.

Please understand that this is all I'm going to say about it; we're in the middle of moving our offices and putting out an issue, and this has taken enough of my time.

Brent