

## ***THE NECESSITY OF ILLUSIONS IN MEDIA: ROOTS, EXCUSES AND CONDUCT***

In the advent of the French Revolution in 1789, as well as the American Revolution thirteen years earlier, and their upsurge in form of the democratic and liberal theories, along with the parallel evolution of mass media and communication by the invention of high-speed rotary steam printing presses in the eastern United States in the early 1800s, and the large-scale distribution over wide geographical areas by the invention of the railroads, the then concept of mass media had to be reshaped.

The inevitability for reshape to the new notion of media, and in particular the press, happened due to the role it played in public life. The press, and by the use of which, made the political life to circulate in every corner in American and Europe. It succeeded in keeping its eyes wide open to lay bare the secrets of politics, forcing the public figures to appear before the tribunal of opinion.<sup>1</sup> The press, also, not only controlled the political life but as is discussed by Tocqueville, "rallies interest around certain doctrines and gives shape to party slogans; through the press parties, without actually meeting, listen and argue with one another. When many organs of the press do take the same line, their influence in the long run is almost irresistible."<sup>2</sup>

Another advocatory role played by the press was in being a powerful weapon in the hands of weakened and oppressed men. If a citizen was oppressed, he would appeal, as one means of defense, to the nation as a whole, and if it is deaf, to humanity at large. The press provides his only means of doing this. In this way, it puts him, as well as each man in reach of a very powerful weapon and becomes, "par excellence, the domestic weapon of freedom."<sup>3</sup>

As a result to the emergence of the new concept of media, the world continued to reshape during the nineteenth century. The particular year that changed man's course of modern history was 1848<sup>4</sup>. From South American to the border separating the Austro-Hungarian Empire from the Ottoman Empire

---

<sup>1</sup> Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in American*, Vol. II. Abridged Edition. Scott A. Sandage. Edited. J. P. Mayer. Trans. George Lawrence. 1966; rpt. (New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classic, 2007), p. 105.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid, p. 395.

<sup>4</sup> A. C. Grayling, *Toward the Light of Liberty: The Struggles for Freedom and Rights That Made the Modern western World* (New York: Walker and Company, 2007), p, 218.

there were revolts and rebellions. The wave of change for new and more liberal constitutions was announced across Europe, as a number of monarchs fell, and others nearly followed. The motif behind all those events was the demand for liberty and guaranteed rights, although it was followed, in some cases, by bloodshed and disasters, the course was in the right direction since that it was moving toward constitutionality, democracy and liberty.

Unfortunately, the multiple character of history – the negative with the positive – is rarely to be denied. Alexis de Tocqueville, the strong advocate of the American Democracy, did not want to show only one side of the coin. In his writings on America, he pointed out that “equality, the sovereignty of the people, a free press, the expression of public opinion – all of these might be integral features of democracy ..., but their negative side includes extreme individualism, which threatens the cohesion of society, and ill-in-formed public opinion, which can lead to the tyranny of the majority.”<sup>5</sup> This warning was also taken seriously by the outstanding John Stuart Mill in 1859 in his *On Liberty*, in which he figured out that “the replacement of the aristocratic government by popular did not guarantee the end of tyranny, for there is no reason why majorities should not act with respect to minorities – especially as these almost by definition consist of people different from the majority – as any other irresistible authority behaves.”<sup>6</sup> Still, these thinkers were not to be considered as antidemocratic; rather, only as a warning to construct democracy carefully so that it safeguards the rights of individuals and minorities.

Unfortunately, the conduct of the reshape in media did not flow smoothly, because as soon as the theoretical substance of the liberal theory had started to shape, it faced the problem of incompatibility in the social reality. A clear example of this can be seen in mass media. The mass media, which is from the very beginning, is defined as a system to serve for “communicating messages and symbols to the general populace. It is their function to amuse, entertain, and inform, and to inculcate individuals with the values, beliefs, and codes of behavior that will integrate them into the institutional structures of the larger society,”<sup>7</sup> did not clearly state whom to satisfy of the populace. James Curran and Jean Seaton described that the inapplicability, appeared on the surface for the first time as a result of the radical press that emerged in Great Britain in the first half of the nineteenth century, and reached a national working-class audience. This press, the alternative press, was effective in a way of “reinforcing class consciousness.”<sup>8</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Ibid, p. 227.

<sup>6</sup> John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty* (London: 1859/1982), p. 63. In A. C. Grayling, *Toward the Light of Liberty: The Struggles for Freedom and Rights That Made the Modern western World* (New York: Walker and Company, 2007), p, 227-8.

<sup>7</sup> Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* (London: Vintage Books, 1988/1994), p. 1.

<sup>8</sup> James Curran and Jean Seaton, *Power Without Responsibility: The Press and Broadcasting In Britain*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (London: Methuen, 1985), p. 24; in Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* (London: Vintage Books, 1988/1994), p. 3.

It woke the workers up to be unified by fostering an alternative value system and framework for looking at the world, and by promoting "a greater collective confidence by repeatedly emphasizing the potential power of working people to effect social change through the force of 'combination' and organized action."<sup>9</sup> This emergence deepened the rift between the mass and the ruling class. It was especially deemed as a major threat by the ruling elites. For instance, one British MP asserted that the working-class newspapers "inflare passions and awaken their selfishness, contrasting their current condition with what they contend to be their future condition - a condition incompatible with human nature, and those immutable laws which Providence has established for the regulation of civil society."<sup>10</sup> As a result, an attempt to abate the working-class media was tried in different shape: by libel laws and prosecutions, by requiring an expensive security bond as a condition for publication, and by imposing various taxes designed to drive out radical media by raising their costs. These coercive efforts, after proving their ineffectiveness, had been abandoned by the mid nineteenth century in favor of the liberal view that the market would enforce responsibility.

The distinction between the working-class audience and the ruling elites emerged due to the conflict of values between these groups. The ruling elites were convinced that they are the ones whom were destined to lead the public due to the wisdom granted to them by the Providence; i.e. God. In the City of Man, only a small number of people are eligible to rule, whereas the public is to follow them almost blindly. The elites built their solid stance on the classical philosophy which differentiated between the Natural Right and Human Law. By natural right it is meant the "contradistinction to what is merely human, all too human. A human being is said to be natural if he is guided by nature rather than by convention, or by inherited opinion, or by tradition, to say nothing of mere whims."<sup>11</sup> Whereas by Human Law it is meant that Man is guided by convention, or by inherited opinions, or by traditions. Aristotle, the founder of the political philosophy, suggested that the perfect society is where the common people are to abide Human Law set by the ruling people whom, the latter, should be followed blindly, because the commons are in unequal stance with them. His suggestion is based on that "political inequality is ultimately justified by the natural inequality among men. The fact that some men are by nature rulers and others by nature ruled points in its turn to the inequality which pervades nature as a whole: the whole as an ordered whole consists of beings of different rank. In man the soul is by nature the ruler of the body and the mind is the ruling part of the soul. It is on the basis of this that thoughtful men are said to be the natural rulers of the thoughtless ones."<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> James Curran and Jean Seaton, *Power Without Responsibility: The Press and Broadcasting In Britain*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (London: Methuen, 1985), p. 23; in Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* (London: Vintage Books, 1988/1994), p. 3.

<sup>11</sup> Leo Strauss, *What is Political Philosophy?* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1959). p. 27

<sup>12</sup> Aristotle, *Politics*, 1254a28[17]-b16. In Leo Strauss, *The City and Man* (Chicago: The University of

By this dichotomy Aristotle meant the elites as the thoughtful men. He put great emphasis on them because they, as he said, "wrote of politics as if they had to bring order into a madhouse."<sup>13</sup>

Bringing order to the madhouse cannot be done by force in the democratic system. It is unlike the totalitarian state that can be satisfied with less degrees of allegiance to required truths, where it is sufficient that people obey what they think is a secondary concern. Rather, in a democratic political order, there is always the danger that independent thought might be translated into political action, so it is important to eliminate the threat at its root.

The problem presented above led to the invention of a new model of media, which is called Propaganda. The propaganda model that was set to be followed is of the micro type; i.e. systematic type, as well as of a system-reinforcing character. It focuses on the inequality of liberalism and power, mentioned above, and its multilevel effects on mass-media interests and choices. It traces the routes by which money and power interact to be able to filter out the news fit to print, marginalize dissent, and allow the government and dominant private interests to get their messages across to the public. The essential ingredients of this propaganda model, or set of news "filters," fall under the following headings, as were given by Curran and Seaton in *Manufacturing Consent: The Economics of Political Mass Media* by Herman and Chomsky:<sup>14</sup>

- (1) the size, concentrated ownership, owner wealth, and profit orientation of the dominant mass-media firms;
- (2) advertising as the primary income source of the mass media;
- (3) the reliance of the media on information provided by government, business, and "experts" funded and approved by these primary sources and agents of power;
- (4) "flak" as a means of disciplining the media; and
- (5) "anticommunism" as a national religion and control mechanism.

Before for trying to tackle each of these elements, it is very important to say that they interact with and reinforce one another. They cannot be taken individually, for they go around in a circle of dependency and functioning. Thus, the cleansed residue of the piece of information or news to be published is the one that had passed through these successive filters. The filters, too, are said to fix the premises of discourse and interpretation, and the definition of what is newsworthy in the first place, and they explain the basis and operations of what amount to propaganda campaigns.

---

Chicago Press, 1964), p. 38.

<sup>13</sup> Plato. *Theaetetus* 173e1-174b7; Aristotle, *Politics* 1259a6-18; ; in Leo Strauss, *The City and Man* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964). p 18.

<sup>14</sup> Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* (London: Vintage Books, 1988/1994), p. 2.

\* The aim of my paper is not to discuss the way manipulation is conducted, for is it done in a great way by the writers mentions above, rather is to show the causes and consequences for such a fact.

The importance of these filters, as stated by Curran and Seaton, shows that the market did successfully accomplish what state intervention failed to do. Following the repeal of the punitive taxes on newspapers between 1853 and 1869, a new daily local press came into existence, but not one new local working-class daily was established through the rest of the nineteenth century.

To unveil the pattern of manipulation and systematic bias in media, we need to elaborate in a brief way\* on each of the filters, as they were explained by Herman and Chomsky<sup>15</sup>. By size, it is meant the reduction of the number of the newspapers by raising the cost of the papers. This filter was successfully achieved by the rise in scale of newspaper enterprise and the associated increase in capital costs from the mid-nineteenth century onward, which was based on technological improvements along with the owners' increased stress on reaching large audiences. The expansion of the free market was accompanied by the "industrialization of the press." For example, the total cost of establishing a national weekly on a profitable basis in 1837 was under a thousand pounds, with a break-even circulation of 6,200 copies. By 1867, the estimated start-up cost of a new London daily was 50,000 pounds. The Sunday Express, launched in 1918, spent over two million pounds before it broke even with a circulation of over 200,000.

The situation in the United States was very similar to the one in the Great Britain. For instance, the start-up of a new newspaper in the New York City in 1851 was \$69,000; St. Louis Democrat paper in 1872 yielded \$456,000; and in the 1920s, the city papers were selling at from \$6 to \$18 million. Besides, the cost of machinery alone, of even very small newspapers, has for many decades run into the hundreds of thousands of dollars; in 1945 it could be said that "Even small-newspaper publishing is big business . . . [and] is no longer a trade one takes up lightly even if he has substantial cash-or takes up at all if he doesn't."<sup>16</sup>

The second filter is that advertising to be considered as the primary income source of the mass media, by means of which it is taken as a main source of reducing the cost of the papers. Curran and Seaton argued that advertising served as a powerful mechanism in weakening the working-class press. They, also, stated that the growth of advertising had contributed to the increase in capital costs which is a very important factor in accomplishing what the state taxes and harassment failed to do, noting that these "advertisers thus acquired a de facto licensing authority since, without their support, newspapers ceased to be economically viable."<sup>17</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Ibid, p. 2-31.

<sup>16</sup> Earl Vance, "Freedom of the Press for Whom," *Virginia Quarterly Review* (Summer 1945), quoted in *Survival of a Free, Competitive Press: The Small Newspaper: Democracy's Grass Roots*, report of the Chairman, Senate Small Business Committee, 80<sup>th</sup> Cong. 1st session, 1947, p.54; in Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* (London: Vintage Books, 1988/1994), p. 4.

<sup>17</sup> James Curran and Jean Seaton, *Power Without Responsibility: The Press and Broadcasting In Britain*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (London: Methuen, 1985), p. 41; in Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* (London: Vintage Books, 1988/1994), p. 14.

It is notable that at the beginning of press industry, the newspaper had to cover the costs of doing business; meanwhile the well production costs were afforded by the growth of advertising and their attractions in the papers. This of course, made the papers lacking in advertising at a serious disadvantage: their prices would tend to be higher, curtailing sales, and they would have less surplus to invest in improving the salability of the paper (features, attractive format, promotion, etc.). For this reason, an advertising-based system will tend to drive out of existence or into marginality the media companies and types that depend on revenue from sales alone. In this way, and from the very beginning of the introduction of advertising to press, the working-class and radical papers were at a serious disadvantage, for their readers have tended to be of modest means, a thing that has always affected advertiser interest. Those journals became poor vehicles for "their readers are not purchasers, and any money thrown upon them is so much thrown away", as one advertising executive stated in 1856.<sup>18</sup>

Another factor that resulted out of not having the advantage of advertising is that the working-class and radical media suffered from the political discrimination of advertisers. As the sole aim of advertising is to stress the people to buy, so the advertisers always refuse to patronize ideological enemies and especially those whom they think as damaging their interests. The cases of discrimination are also added to the voting system weighted by income. For instance, WENT<sup>19</sup>, the public-television station lost its corporate funding from Gulf + Western in 1985 after the station showed the documentary "Hungry for Profit," which contains material critical of multinational corporate activities in the Third World. The chief executive of Gulf + Western complained to the station that the program was "virulently anti-business if not anti-American," and that the station's carrying the program was not the behavior "of a friend" of the corporation.

Since that the sole aim of advertising is to sell by pressing people to buy, so it is very important to know the nature of the product promoted in advertising. The product is always of the nature of the superficial things of life, like fashionable consumption. This concept is called the "philosophy of futility,"<sup>20</sup> by means of which people try to pursue what were called "fancied ones," invented needs. The market leaders created the needs and then get the people to focus their attention on it. And by pursuing it, they do not bother the business leaders as they keep out of their hair. It is not hard to see the consequences years later.<sup>21</sup>

The third benefit of the free market as a means of controlling dissident opinion in the mid-nineteenth century is the reliance of media on information

<sup>18</sup> James Curran and Jean Seaton, *Power Without Responsibility: The Press and Broadcasting In Britain*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (London: Methuen, 1985), p. 43; in Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* (London: Vintage Books, 1988/1994), p. 15.

<sup>19</sup> Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* (London: Vintage Books, 1988/1994), p. 17.

<sup>20</sup> Noam Chomsky, *Propaganda and Public Mind* (London: Pluto Press, 2001), p. 151.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*

provided by government, business, and “experts” funded and approved by these primary sources and agents of power. The heavy reliance on these sources is due to the economic necessity and reciprocity of interest. Media need a steady, reliable flow of the raw material of news to meet the daily news demand and their imperative schedules. Media cannot always have a reporter and a camera in every corner of the world, or at the places where important stories are expected. So, they concentrate their sources where significant news often occurs, where important rumors and leaks abound, and where regular press conferences are held. For example, the White House, the Pentagon, and the State Department, in Washington, D.C., are central nodes of such news activity; whereas, the policemen and city hall are considered the “beats” for reporters on the local basis. Also, the business corporations and trade groups are regular and purveyors of stories deemed newsworthy. They turn out a large volume of material that meets the demand of news organizations for reliable, scheduled flows. Mark Fishman<sup>22</sup> calls this “the principle of bureaucratic affinity: only other bureaucracies can satisfy the input needs of a news bureaucracy.”

The prestige and the high status of the government and corporate individuals give the merit of being recognizable and credible sources of information, the thing that is of high importance to media. As Fishman notes,

Newsworkers are predisposed to treat bureaucratic accounts as factual because news personnel participate in upholding a normative order of authorized knowers in the society. Reporters operate with the attitude that officials ought to know what it is their job to know.... In particular, a newsworker will recognize an official’s claim to knowledge not merely as a claim, but as a credible, competent piece of knowledge. This amounts to a moral division of labor: officials have and give the facts; reporters merely get them.<sup>23</sup>

Objectivity is another reason to be given a heavy weight by media as a dispenser of the news. To do so, media should depend on these sources as they are always portrayed accurate, as well as to protect themselves of the criticisms of being bias and the threat of libel suits. Besides, the economic issues play a role in this matter in reducing the costs of investigating expense, whereas material from sources that are not prima facie credible, or that will elicit criticism and threats, requires careful checking and costly research.

As the powerful individuals are the main sources of information, they need to have a special treatment by media. They are powerful because they can threaten, reward and even coerce the media. In this way the media may feel obliged to carry extremely dubious stories and mute criticism in order not to offend their sources and disturb a close relationship. It is very difficult to decide who the liar is

---

<sup>22</sup> Mark Fishman, *Manufacturing the News* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), p. 143; in Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* (London: Vintage Books, 1988/1994), p. 19.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid. p. 144-145.

in the daily news, even if they tell whoppers. Critical sources may be avoided not only because of their lesser availability and higher cost of establishing credibility, but also because the primary sources may be offended and may even threaten the media using them. So the mutual relationship between them is more of a one-side relationship than a two-side one, but nevertheless it is still rewarding for the media.

In a hope to look as objective as possible, the media tried to verify its sources of information. It went further beyond the official and corporate provision to shaping the supply of "experts." It discovered that the official dominance can be weakened by the existence of the highly respectable unofficial sources that give dissident views with great authority. They present them as consultants - mostly from the academic institutes - whom can be controlled by funding their research, and organizing think tanks that will hire them directly and help disseminate their messages. But although, the media knows in advance that the experts always keep their loyalty in the direction desired by the government and "the market";<sup>24</sup> it depends upon them extensively, just to structure the bias in another shape. Henry Kissinger<sup>25</sup> has pointed out, in this "age of the expert," the "constituency" of the expert is "those who have a vested interest in commonly held opinions; elaborating and defining its consensus at a high level has, after all, made him an expert." In practice, the "expert is the loyal and useful servant of those who hold the reins of power."<sup>26</sup> Thus, the structuring has taken place to allow the commonly held opinions, which are functional for the elite interests, to continue to prevail.

The fourth filter that stated by Curran and Seaton is the "Flak". Flak means negative criticism or opposition. It is used here as countering the negative criticism against media. It is, also, defined by Herman and Chomsky<sup>27</sup> as: "refers to the negative responses to a media statement or program. It may take the form of letters, telegrams, phone calls, petitions, lawsuits, speeches and bills before Congress, and other modes of complaint, threat, and punitive action. It may be organized centrally or locally, or it may consist of the entirely independent actions of individuals."

Elaborating on the third filter in these headings, we found the immense strength of the elites, i.e. the government, which is a major producer of flak, by regularly assailing, threatening, and "correcting" the media, trying to contain any deviations from the established line. So, it is not surprising to find in this heading that

<sup>24</sup> Edward S. Herman, "The Institutionalization of Bias in Economics," *Media, Culture and Society* (July 1982), pp. 275-91; in Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky, Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media (London: Vintage Books, 1988/1994), p. 23.

<sup>25</sup> Henry Kissinger, *American Foreign Policy* (New York: Norton, 1969), p. 28; in Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky, Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media (London: Vintage Books, 1988/1994), p. 23.

<sup>26</sup> *American Foreign Policy* (Norton, 1969), p. 28; in Noam Chomsky, Deterring Democracy, (London: Vintage Books, 1991/2006), p. 232.

<sup>27</sup> Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky, Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media (London: Vintage Books, 1988/1994), p. 26.

the ability to produce flak, and especially flak that is threatening, is related to power. They can be either in a direct form, like sending a letter of protest to the officials in the media corporation or a phone call would be enough sometimes, or indirectly in a form of complain to their own constituencies (stockholders, employees), by generating institutional advertising that does the same, and by funding right-wing monitoring or think-tank operations designed to attack the media.

Another surprising way of producing the flaks is done by the elites in investing in constituting or funding the growth of institutions such as the American Legal Foundation, the Capital Legal Foundation, the Media Institute, the Center for Media and Public Affairs, and Accuracy in Media (AIM). There are some other institutes that take into their consideration the flak producing with a broader design, such as the Freedom House. The American Legal Foundation, organized in 1980, has specialized in Fairness Doctrine complaints and libel suits to aid "media victims." The Capital Legal Foundation, incorporated in 1977, was the Scaife vehicle for Westmoreland's \$120-million libel suit against CBS.<sup>28</sup>

Knowing the nature of their missions, media always give tremendous attention in dealing with the flak machines. They avoid mentioning or analyzing their propagandistic role and links to a larger corporate program. For example, the AIM head, Reed Irvine, who is always shown as an expert, is frequently given space to publish his diatribes, as well as Michael Laden, a right-wing network columnist who regularly assail the "liberal media," also is frequently given Op-Ed column space, sympathetic reviewers, and a regular place on talk shows as experts. This very clearly reflects the power and influence of the sponsors, including the well-entrenched position of the right wing in the mass media themselves. Thus the producers of flak add to one another's strength and reinforce the command of political authority in its news-management activities.

The last filter used in media is "anticommunism" as a national religion and controlling mechanism. By anticommunism it is meant, in general, the policy or ideology of fear. Fear, here, is used to mobilize the populace against an enemy, and because the concept is fuzzy it can be used against anybody advocating policies that threaten property interests or support to the other's ideology. During the Cold War, this policy helps fragment the left and labor movements and serves as a political-control mechanism. It is also used in justifying the external interventions on the basis of justification that if the triumph of communism is the worst imaginable result, the support of fascism abroad is justified as a lesser evil. And since that communism is no longer in the international political arena, the policy of fear is used nowadays as a mobilizing force against terrorism and extremism.

The policy of fear, as a controlling mechanism, is presented into the system to exercise a profound influence on the mass-media. In times of normality, as well as in periods of any foreign scares, as it once was with the Red scares, issues tend to be framed in terms of a dichotomized world those of "with us and against us". In this way, the losses and gains, especially those on our side are considered an

---

<sup>28</sup> Ibid, p. 27.

entirely legitimate news practice. Thus, the ideology and religion of external scare is a potent filter

Nevertheless, these five filters, which narrow the range of news that passes through the gates, do not “assert that the media parrot the line of the current state managers in the manner of a totalitarian regime; rather, that the media reflect the consensus of powerful elites of the state–corporate nexus generally, including those who object to some aspect of government policy, typically on tactical grounds.”<sup>29</sup> The model argues, from its foundations, that the media will protect the interests of the powerful, not that it will protect state managers from their criticisms; the persistent failure to see this point may reflect more general illusions about our democratic systems.

These notions were not new. They can be traced back to the seventeenth century and the first democratic revolutions,<sup>30</sup> as in 1650 when it was necessary to protect the “lunatic or distracted person,” the ignorant rabble, from their own “depraved and corrupt” judgments, just as one does not allow a child to cross the street without supervision.<sup>31</sup> But, with the magnificent help of the American and French Revolutions, they, the ideas, started to take the shape of contemporary media with the advent of the Industrial revolution and reached their climax or real upsurge in the 1920s and since. They become the huge industries of domination and control especially in the democratic systems where it is impossible to control people by force, but by controlling their minds. People are thought to be controlled or marginalized, as Walter Lippmann<sup>32</sup> put it, to be “spectators of action,” not “participants,” and one has to resort to propaganda. It is worth mentioning in here that this idea was well understood by lots of influential and moralist and foreign affairs advisers and considered as a very reasonable reaction. Reinhold Niebuhr<sup>33</sup>, for instance, wrote that “rationality belongs to the cool observers” while the common person follows not reason but faith. The cool observers, he explained, must recognize “the stupidity of the average man,” and must provide the “necessary illusion” and the “emotionally potent oversimplifications” that will keep the naive simpletons on course.”

In accordance with the necessity of such a notion, this idea was developed and took the form of formal position in certain governments. It was elevated to the position of ministry in Britain and called the Ministry of information, with the aim to control the thought of the world. Incidentally, the same can be said in

<sup>29</sup> Noam Chomsky, *Necessary Illusions: Thought Control in the Democratic Societies* (London: Pluto Press, 1989), p 149.

<sup>30</sup> Noam Chomsky, *Propaganda and Public Mind* (London: Pluto Press, 2001), p. 152.

<sup>31</sup> Noam Chomsky, *Grand Street*, Winter 1987; in Noam Chomsky, *Deterring Democracy* (London: Vintage Books, 1991/2006), p. 366.

<sup>32</sup> Walter Lippmann, *The Essential Lippmann: A Political Philosophy for Liberal Democracy*, ed. Clinton Rossiter and James Late (New York: Random House, 1963); in Noam Chomsky, *Propaganda and Public Mind* (London: Pluto Press, 2001), p. 152.

<sup>33</sup> Noam Chomsky, *Grand Street*, Winter 1987; in Noam Chomsky, *Deterring Democracy* (London: Vintage Books, 1991/2006), p. 366.

America where they had the committee of public information, which was known as the Creel Commission. Some remarkable fellows worked in this Committee like Walter Lippmann and Edward Bernays, and from there made a great contribution in flourishing the influential social and political theories that developed mostly from the progressive circles. They laid the basis for the modern political science and the public relations industry and the media. Bernays went on to found the public relations industry.<sup>34</sup> Whereas, Lippmann had an insight of this idea as the new "art of democracy", as they, the opinion leaders, now have ways to control and manipulate the mass. Both Lippmann and Bernays believed that by the use of propaganda, it became possible to regiment "the public mind every bit as much as an army regiments the bodies of its soldiers. And we should do it, because we are the good guys and smart guys and they are stupid and dumb, and therefore we have to control them for their own good. And we can do it because we have these marvelous new techniques of propaganda."<sup>35</sup>

In a hope to give an excuse to the use of propaganda which was the offspring of the distinction between the working-class and the ruling elites - the dichotomy explained by Aristotle - it is our aim now to shed the light on the conflict of perception between the conflicting groups towards media. The elites depended on the classical philosophy which differentiated between Natural Right and Human Right. No explanation was given earlier to the factor that holds this difference, and why it is believed that human beings are already classified into different categories. So, it is our aim to go into some details to elaborate on this matter.

Aristotle stated in his *Politics* that man cannot live alone without a union. The first union made by man is between Male and female. The union of pairing aimed at reproduction of the species - not from deliberate intention, but from the natural impulse. This union led to another association - which is also the first to be formed from more unions than one. The new union is the village, and then the city or *polis*. The distinguishing feature held all these institutes together was the virtue of being ruled. The household was ruled from the very beginning by the house lord; the village was ruled by certain distinguished eldest; the city was ruled by kings or rulers. In this way, everybody was already monarchically governed by the virtue of the kinship between their members.

The city, the final and perfect association was formed to reach the height of full self-sufficiency; or for the sake of mere life, i.e., a good life. In this way, every city exists by nature, just as did the earlier associations. So nature is the end and consummation to which those associations move, and the nature of things consists in their end or consummation. "From these considerations it is evident that the city belongs to the class of things that exist by nature, and that man is by

---

<sup>34</sup> Walter Lippmann, *The Essential Lippmann: A Political Philosophy for Liberal Democracy*, ed. Clinton Rossiter and James Late (New York: Random House, 1963); in Noam Chomsky, *Propaganda and Public Mind* (London: Pluto Press, 2001), p. 151.

<sup>35</sup> Noam Chomsky, *Propaganda and Public Mind* (London: Pluto Press, 2001), p. 151.

nature a political animal, whom alone possesses a perception of good and evil, of the just and the unjust, and other similar qualities, and it is association in these things which makes a family and a city. He who is without a city, by reason of his own nature and not of some accident, is either a poor sort of being, or being higher than man: he is like the man of whom Homer wrote in denunciation: clanless and lawless and heartless is he."<sup>36</sup>

In the hierarchy of the associations that constitute man's life, the city is prior in the order of nature to family and the individual. The reason is that the whole is necessarily prior to the part. For example, if the body loses one part of its parts, the other parts still exist; while if the whole is destroyed there would be no other parts. Even the parts "derive their essential character from their function and their capacity; and it follows that if they are no longer fit to discharge their function, we ought not to say that they are still the same things, but only that, ... they still have the same names."<sup>37</sup>

The classification of master - slave, house lord - wife, and ruled-ruler does not mean that the classics were antidemocratic; they were good democrats. They were not blind to the advantages of democracy. Hence, it would be silly to deny that the classics rejected democracy as an inferior kind of regime. Plato's *Republic* showed a severe indictment of democracy in the eighth book, but even there, Plato makes it clear that "democracy is, in every important respect, equal to the best regime, which corresponds to Hesiod's golden age: since the principle of democracy is freedom, all human can develop freely in a democracy, and hence in particular the best human type."<sup>38</sup> Yet Plato did not regard the freedom of democracy as a decisive factor, for he was concerned with a stable political order that would be congenial to moderate political courses; and such an order, he thought, depends on the predominance of old families. More generally, the classics rejected democracy because they thought that the aim of human life, and hence of social life, is not freedom but virtue. Freedom as a goal is ambiguous, because it is freedom for evil as well as for good. Virtue emerges normally only through education, that is to say, through the information of character, through habituation, and this requires leisure on the part of both parents and children.<sup>39</sup> Thus, the bond of political life is virtue, and it is sustained only by returning back to the classic political philosophy.

Aristotle's philosophy was rejected by the modern philosophers and unrealistic. Their claim was based on that the goal of classical political life is virtue, which is only conducive to the order of aristocratic republic that vanished away with the advent of the democratic revolutions. One of the modern philosophers who attacked, thought did not reject the classical philosophy is Machiavelli.

<sup>36</sup> Aristotle, *Politics*, Trans. Ernest Barker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995/2009), p. 10.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid*, p. 11

<sup>38</sup> Leo Strauss, *What is Political Philosophy?* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1959/1988), p. 36.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid*, p. 36-7.

Niccolo Machiavelli “the founder of modern political philosophy,”<sup>40</sup> tried to effect, and he did succeed in effecting the traditional philosophy. The approach of the traditional philosophy was based on the assumption that morality is something substantial: that is a force in the soul of man; whereas this assumption was contradicted by Machiavelli who “argues that virtue can be practiced only within society; man must be habituated to virtue by laws, customs and so forth.” Men must be educated to virtue by human beings. Man is malleable and if he is not ordered toward virtue or perfection, he can set for himself almost any end he desires: man is almost infinitely malleable. The type of education that Machiavelli aimed at was by emphasizing on the opposite side of things. For example, morality is created by immorality, for morality cannot create itself. Just as morality rests on immorality, justice rests on injustice, etc. “Man is not directed to virtue by nature.” In other words, one cannot define the good society or the common good in terms of virtue, but one must define virtue in terms of common good.” By common good we must understand the objectives pursued by all societies, which are: “freedom from foreign domination, stability or rule of law, prosperity, glory or empire.” Virtue is the sum of habits that is required for or conducive for this end. The end justifies the means for the sake of this good end.<sup>41</sup>

The teaching that Machiavelli presented is considered as a spectacle which has renewed itself in every generation since. Although there is no in the whole work of him a single observation regarding the nature of man and human affairs that the classical philosophers did fail to notice, still, he made an amazing enlargement to the horizon of classical political philosophy. Also, he is the first one of the philosophers to speak boldly about the subject of morality and change in the way ruling the society. He perceived his teaching as a war, spiritual war to change the opinion which in due time would precipitate a change in political power. His success is due to the long range conversion of the some men that would provide the vital centre to form the ruling class.

“No earlier philosopher had thought of guaranteeing the posthumous success of his teaching by developing a specific strategy and tactics for this purpose. The earlier philosophers of all persuasions were resigned to the fact that their teaching, the true teaching, would never supersede what they regarded as false teachings, but would coexist with them. They offered their teaching to their contemporaries and above all to posterity, without even dreaming of controlling the future fate of human thought in general. And if they were political philosophers, .... they did not for one moment believe that the true political teaching is, or is likely to be, the political teaching of the future.”<sup>42</sup>

Machiavelli is the first philosopher ever who attempted to force chance, to control the future by embarking on a campaign, a campaign of propaganda, that by the use of which he desired to convince, not merely to persuade or bully.

---

<sup>40</sup> Ibid, p. 40.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid, pp. 40-7.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid, p. 46.

Following the explanation given by the classical and modern social political philosophies, and the differentiation between freedom and virtue, the elites, in modern times, took it as an excuse to resort to propaganda to educate and tame the wild audiences. So their aim of using manipulation is to return back to the model that started four centuries before our millennium and has been continuing twenty centuries more to renew or strength the virtue – the bond holding society all together. By this discovery, we can say that manipulation is as old as man's history and used by man for the sake of man himself.