

# Omertá (90): “Journalist” against the victims

escrito por Carme García Yeste | febrero 9, 2022



The “journalist” was afraid that the media crisis would lead him to lose his job and to have to get back to the job he had as a teacher and from which he had fled. Suddenly, he felt as if he had won the lottery, as he was commissioned to report on a major scandal. As he got deeper into the information, the arguments did not hold up. The evidence was conclusive that it was a big lie. The witness, who had been the basis for the beginning of the report, had explained in detail what he had experienced within that organization. Terrible things that gave a lot of sensationalism and, therefore, audience. However, he soon

saw that this witness had never been there and that the members of the organization had never seen him.

The rector of the university supported the proposal of this report. In addition, he confessed in a relevant newspaper in the country that he was a friend of the professor who had received more reporting from victims. Victims who had been supported by this organization. The people in charge of this media not only supported the «journalist», but also encouraged him to write this report. The people in charge of the media who supported him were closely linked to the powerful people of the University. There were not too many ethical objections in continuing with the writing, since the aim was to increase the audience.

Faced with this situation, the «journalist» began to fear the legal consequences for him of publishing this lie. So, he consulted his communication company. There, he was told not to worry, since there was no legal obligation to tell the truth and they told him to put in the report the information revealed by his sources. Despite the response, the journalist continued to be afraid that his informants would later be questioned and it would be discovered that everything was false and that the purpose was to attack those victims who dared to denounce. Brave people who could serve as role models for other victims and who can encourage them to break the silence about the harassment. However, again he was reassured by his media. He could say that these sources were anonymous and, therefore, no one would ever know who they are.

So the «journalist» decided to go ahead with the publication of the false report. His work was less famous than he would have liked. Nevertheless, it caused immense pain to the victims and to the people who support them.

The «journalist» could not avoid that little by little the

story turned against him. The most rigorous media published reports on this heroic organization that had been the first to support the victims. These publications won international awards and their good journalistic practice was published in high quality scientific journals.

Regarding the false report of the «journalist», what he achieved in the long run was it to become a stain on his resume, demonstrating his lack of ethics and his professional mediocrity. He was incapable of exercising quality journalism that would achieve audience, not for the achievement of lies, but for its human and professional quality.