

Moise Walters

Prof Greeves

Com 428

19 March 2020

### Media Ethics: Chapter 11

This media reflection will be based on the grey box in chapter eleven titled. “ A Good Thing”. Martha Stewart has been famous for a pretty long time and in the public eye, but not always for the right reasons. In 2003, she was indicted on charges of security fraud, obstruction of justice, conspiracy, and making false statements to the court which are obviously very serious. I personally think it is really sad to see somebody who initially worked so hard to achieve their goals make some negative decisions which then affect their entire lives.

It made matters worse than she was personally linked with ImClone CEO Sam Waksal. The Food and Drug Administration announced in 2001 that they had rejected shares of almost 4,000 ImClone stocks and it had rejected the biotechnology corporations application for approval for a new drug which made its value drop a lot. The reason why I said that it was a negative thing that she was linked to him is because in the summer of 2002, he was arrested and tried for tell people close to him to sell shares of the corporation. He made the smart move in October of 2002 to turn himself in and plead guilty to several accounts of bank fraud, fraud, conspiracy to obstruct justice, and perjury. The courts checked phone records and saw she had been in touch with her stockbroker and Waksal during this time.

Stewart tried to brush over all the smoke allegations that surrounded her and her camp by claiming her public stance of innocence. That planned seemed to backfire when she avoided certain questions which were being thrown her way. Realistically speaking, her avoiding questions makes sense for several reasons. Her lawyers and close individuals in her circle probably instructed her to only say what she needed to. Many people get in trouble from speaking about things when they are in sticky situations which their opposition can use against them.

I personally think Martha's use of a controlled social media environment in terms of advertising and her own website was put at the forefront of her argument because of how lopsided the media is when they are trying to get a story. I obviously think she did some wrong but I would have to agree on her stance on the mass media being lopsided. The media is no stranger to attempting to try and overexaggerate situations and ruin peoples careers simply or the sake of telling a story. Martha knew that being in the spotlight for so much of her career. I know I am supposed to use moral reasoning from an ethical standpoint so I think that she was simply trying to protect herself and her family.

I guess her thought process was that if she could not protect herself and her businesses her family would suffer. No disrespect to her husband, but I think it is safe to say that she was probably the breadwinner between the two in the household and made at least twice as more than him. Her sight had nothing but positive things to say about her which seemed a little bit off. When she got rude comments or things that made her be put in a negative light, she had her editors delete them. That way of thinking is pretty unhealthy and self harming because not everyone in life will like or agree with you and that is something we all have to accept.

I commend the fact that she tried to stay ten toes down for herself and her family in such a trying time. A lot of people would have folded and would not have been able to handle the pressure. She was more than able to which is respectable. Reflecting back, I do think that she made a poor decision dodging questions which might have lead to her ultimate downfall. Loyalty is one of the topics I learned about in this chapter and something I think everyone should have to at least something in their lives. I think her fans and close supporters who have poured so much time and energy into businesses should have had more inside information as to what was transpiring during these times.

That being said I did find it interesting that many women's rights activists came to her defense and thought that the prosecutors were possibly portraying her in a rather negative light because of sexism and not wanting to see a women with all that money and power beat the system.

Obviously her and her team could have used that as a defensive front to shy away from the real issues at hand, but racism and sexism is something that truly does take place. My opinion is that she was in the wrong for what she did but that the situation was fabricated and made even worse by those who wished to see her downfall.

Maybe if she did not make a website that seemed to favor her own needs and boost her reputation and just came out with her lawyer and answered questions straight up, things would have gone differently for her. After her trial, the website was closed and she was convicted and had to serve up to five months in jail. That being said, she went to a white collar upscale jail not prison. In my opinion, this not only hurt her financially but might have put a permanent smudge on her squeaky clean motherly image. Being that it is 2020, this situation is something I hope she has grown and learned from but I do fear that people will not want to do big business with her if they have this situation in mind.

To further reflect, I feel as though everyone in life no matter how rich or poor you are deserves a second chance at doing the right thing. I have used my own moral reasoning and have come to the conclusion that maybe Martha Stewart and the media both had their parts to play in this unfortunate scenario.