

This situation is rather difficult for any journalist to go through with. Information like this can be rather sensitive for anybody to hear, and can truly ruin someone, but also provide closure and justice to others. In order to make a decision, the Radio-Television Digital News Association, or the RTDNA for short, compiled a Code of Ethics, which provides journalists with ways to make good ethical decisions when it comes to writing stories. In order to make the decision on whether or not you should report this information that the prisoner has stated regarding a murder he performed, looking at these Code of Ethics is essential, and if all of them check out, then you should ensure that the information gets out if it's necessary.

The first aspect of the Code of Ethics is Truth and Accuracy above all. All journalism should be verified before publishing. Journalism is about truth. Without it, then it's not journalism; it's a lie. It's very important to acknowledge things that are left out, and you must decide if you can leave it out in the first place. In the scenario where the prisoner discusses the full details of the murder, that's something that can't be left out despite the mention of confidentiality. If it's verified by the prisoner itself, as well as additional research proving it to be true, then it has to be included. Even if it were to be left out, it would still be acknowledged, which either way would lead to an investigation and charges being pressed on the prisoner.

The next aspect of the RTDNA's Code of Ethics is independence/transparency. Even though a lot of media companies try to suppress it, independence gets harder to keep a grip on for these companies as the years go on. Public interest overpowers the media's hold on independence. Transparency provides the public with the means to assess credibility and to determine who deserves trust. Holding people accountable is highly important in journalism, especially in this caliber with a murder confession literally given to me by the prisoner who did it himself. Transparency also includes that even though I would give these details out, it could be

wrong in some way. Sure, I break the promise of confidentiality, and that makes me look dishonest to the prisoner. However, when it's a full fledged case that has not been solved, you are ethically obligated to disclose this information.

Acceptability and consequences is highly important in the RTDNA's Code of Ethics, especially here. As a journalist, you have to accept what could happen if this information is released to the public. Ethical code is extremely important, but obviously consequences would most likely occur no matter what happens. Truth should never be withheld from the public. Even though it might not feel right to do so, it's morally the right thing to do. Preserving privacy is not the way of journalism, so when this prisoner says not to disclose the information of a murder that he willingly confessed, then that right there is something that needs to be told to the public. It doesn't make a difference. The prisoner might make a case of his own, especially since the prompt states that I promised confidentiality, and I'd have to accept whatever consequences may arise from telling the truth, if there even are any in this situation. The prisoner might try to make a defamation case, but if all the evidence is there and it can connect back to him, then he would not win the case. Even then, it's very difficult to win a defamation case, especially against a journalist if they have all the facts and truth.

In conclusion, the information about the murder that the prisoner provided to me should be released to the public. Looking back on the RTDNA's Code of Ethics, which includes: Truth and accuracy above all, independence, transparency, accountability and consequences, the murder details must be released, regardless of what might have been told to the prisoners about confidentiality. In journalism, ethics are incredibly important and are crucial to the integrity of stories. The public looks to journalists for truth. Truth can affect your credibility in a positive manner, whereas if you were to lie about something or hold information back, people would

Ben Hilgen

ENG318WI

Ethics Essay

consider you an unreliable journalist. Credibility is of the utmost importance in journalism, and if you have good ethics, especially if releasing the information regarding the murder brings justice to the family/friends of the victim, that's what people look for in a journalist.