

Directed by American photojournalist Bill Ray, *Shattered Glass* is a fiction film based on a true story of Stephen Glass who was a young intern wanting to pursue his career in Journalism, however, he did not follow the ethical principles and standards of journalism: Honesty and credibility. The title of the film is a metaphor used to describe how Stephen Glass's life was wrecked and shattered at his own will. In 1998, 27 of the 41 articles he wrote for the *New Republic* magazine were revealed as entirely fabricated stories. The reenactments of these scenes were well played by Canadian actor Hayden Christensen also known as the main character Stephen Glass. It's disturbingly shocking how we would think "this is the type of journalist we want in a team", especially, in the beginning of the film where we assume Stephen as an idol giving a little speech in front of his professor and students of how great of a journalist he has become. Other acts of deceit and insincere behavior were for instance bringing lunch for his colleague or complementing his other colleague of how lovely her color lipstick is. The insane manipulation does not stop here, however, it gets extreme, with his psychotic sense of humor especially when he would pitch his delusional ideas during the editorial meetings. During each editorial meeting he would wrongfully use his sense of humor to entertain his colleagues and editor expecting to be loved and delighted by them, which unfortunately was the case. Again as a viewer we won't think this is the type of person who would end up betraying himself, his team, and the entire *New Republic* magazine by making up stories with fictional sources in the field of Journalism. His psychopathic acts were taken to another level where he would always play the victim and become extremely defensive. Or to make himself feel secure he always used the "are you mad at me?" or "I'm sorry" which was not in a sincere form.

The film sheds light on very important roles by portraying the devoted life of an editor, a reporter, a writer, and technically the role of being in the profession of journalism. One of the

most heartwarming scenes was when hearing former editor Michael Kelly ready to resign because his boss was putting unnecessary pressure on the team. According to the New York Times, Michael Kelly was a journalist for the NYT, a columnist for the Washington post, and an editor for the New Republic magazine (as played in the film). Kelly died the same year Shattered Glass was released (2003), while he was covering the invasion of Iraq. I personally think he was a prominent figure in the film but he did mess up by not extensively digging about Glass's story of the young republicans at the hotel conference. Calling the hotel to ask whether they provided fridges with alcohol was not sufficient to trust Stephen Glass's written piece. When Mike Kelly got replaced by Charles Chuck who was an associate editor like the rest, things got really heated. There was a lot of pressure put on him along with the betrayer. As an editor he knew how to do his role thanks to Forbes magazine of course, who did not buy the article Glass wrote "Hack Heaven". Glass thought this would be his masterpiece, his breakthrough to fame. Little do we know, it turned out to be a complete piece of fantasy.

With Chuck putting Glass on the spot and eventually firing him was the righteous thing to do. As nobody expects to be duped, especially in the world of Journalism, because it will negatively turn down everyone and deceive the team, the loyal readers, the whole image of the media company. If he couldn't make through the journalism career because of his deceitful acts, what would make him become an attorney? According to LA times, Glass who graduated from Georgetown University Law school with a law degree, attempted to start a new profession as an attorney. However, the state supreme court, rejected his application in 2014 and accused him of continuing his lies and deceit all the way.

The transitions of the film were smooth as the director included short captions of the dates and he actually managed to bring Stephen Glass's disturbing fantasies in picture motion. In other words, we can clearly see the delusions in Glass's head. The movie was not HD quality given the fact it was made in 2003 therefore I'd assume they had less developed equipment

for filming and less advanced software for editing. However, that does not really affect the plot and the storytelling at all.