



Bryan White <zebrafactcheck@gmail.com>

Factually July 2, 2020, and a 20-word string

3 messages

Bryan White <zebrafactcheck@gmail.com>
To: susan.benkelman@pressinstitute.org

Fri, Jul 3, 2020 at 2:50 PM

Dear Susan Benkelman,

The July 2, 2020 edition of "Factually" continues to feature a 20-word string with no clear attribution, despite the fact that an identical 20-word string appears in a Washington Post article linked in a subsection following duplicated material.

... technology

- Facebook this week **said it had banned** hundreds of accounts and groups associated with **the far-right "boogaloo" movement whose followers have been linked to violence that disrupted mostly peaceful protests around the United States.**
 - The **Washington Post** **said** the action "was a shift in [Facebook's] strategy from just removing offending posts as they popped up."

Facebook on Tuesday removed hundreds of accounts and groups associated with a violent network of **the far-right "boogaloo" movement whose followers have been linked to violence that disrupted mostly peaceful protests around the United States.**

I had (privately) alerted Harrison Mantas to this problem, expecting some sort of fix such as a notice indicating the original version failed to offer a clear attribution of the material (as by using quotation marks and directly citing the source).

When 24 hours passed and I saw no change to the newsletter, I thought perhaps you do not view duplicating the 20-word string without clear attribution as **a problem**.

If the newsletter clearly passes ethical muster as-is, I am eager to understand the rationale backing that understanding. Supplying suitable linked material may certainly suffice.

If the newsletter had been updated with clear attribution and an appropriate update notice I would be finished writing about it. But if you view the newsletter as fine as it is without any changes, I would take the opportunity to present that viewpoint to the public in detail, of course reserving the right to present a counterargument.

We could all do with less gray area concerning what constitutes plagiarism and proper attribution.

Please be reminded that I am messaging you in my role as a journalist. When I publish on the subject readers will have access to my emails and the replies to those emails. That is, unless the replies come with stipulations such as "off the record" or the like.

Of note, I have taken issue with the accuracy of the words quoted from the Post. The Post published no evidence backing its claim that "boogaloo" group violence disrupted any BLM protest, mostly peaceful or otherwise. Poynter.org has been slow to publish my reply to the newsletter pointing out that problem.

Thanks, and have a nice weekend.

--

Sincerely,

Bryan W. White
editor
zebrafactcheck.com

Susan Benkelman <susan.benkelman@pressinstitute.org>

Fri, Jul 3, 2020 at 3:04 PM

To: Bryan White <zebrafactcheck@gmail.com>

Cc: Tom Rosenstiel <tom.rosenstiel@pressinstitute.org>, Amy Kovac-Ashley <amy.kovac-ashley@pressinstitute.org>

Bryan,

I think it's clear that this item came from The Washington Post, given the attribution and the link in the sub-bullet.

Susan Benkelman

cc: Tom Rosenstiel, executive director, API
Amy Kovac-Ashley, vice president, senior director, API

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Susan Benkelman
director, accountability journalism
American Press Institute
office: 571-366-1166
cell: 301-538-9399
email: susan.benkelman@pressinstitute.org
[@sbenkelman](https://twitter.com/sbenkelman)
 American Press Institute

Bryan White <zebrafactcheck@gmail.com>
To: Susan Benkelman <susan.benkelman@pressinstitute.org>

Fri, Jul 3, 2020 at 3:49 PM

Dear Susan Benkelman,

Thanks for the prompt reply.

Indeed, it is clear that the *item* comes, at least in part, from the Washington Post. But I doubt any reader would have a clue that much of the specific language in the top portion, linking as it does to a Facebook statement, would have come word-for-word from the Post article linked below.

Lacking further reply before Wednesday (July 8, 2020), I will take your reply as your final word on the subject.

Not that you're precluded from elaborating at any time before or after that.

Cheers.

[Quoted text hidden]