

**Book Review,  
Manufacturing Consent: United States Control on Main Stream Media  
(Propaganda Model Perspective)**

Muhammad Kaqbad Alam

Ph.D Scholar, Department of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Peshawar,  
Khyber Pakhtoonkhwa, Pakistan,(kaqbadalam@gmail.com)

Dr Faisal Aziz

Lecturer Department of Communication and Media Studies University of Sargodha, Sargodha,  
Pakistan. (faisal.aziz@uos.edu.pk)

Sahrish Rahmat

Ph. D Scholar, Institute of Media and Communication Studies, Bahauddin Zakria University  
Multan, Pakistan.(Pareeshyali786@gmail.com)

The date of Noam Chomsky's birth was December 7, 1928. He is by nature an American Nationalist. He is an accomplished linguist, social philosopher, social critic, cognitive and behavioral scientist, authentic historian, and one of the 20th century's most prominent political activists. He was referred to as "the father of modern linguistics" by researchers of his time. Another well-known name in analytical philosophy and social cognitive theory is Noam Chomsky. He helped establish the fields of cognitive science and the Propaganda Model. In addition, he is the author of over 100 books on a variety of subjects, including linguistics, conflict, politics, mass communication, and mass media. He agrees with "anarcho-syndicalism and libertarian socialism" from an ideological perspective. Leading figures in media studies and linguistics of the twentieth century include Noam Chomsky. At the age of just 32, he was promoted to full professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. His 1957 publication "Syntactic Structures" revolutionized linguistics and profoundly altered how we currently perceive language and the mind.

Many worldwide universities and institutions have awarded Noam Chomsky with honorary degrees. Chomsky received the "Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award" for his highly regarded and influential linguistics work. At the young age of ten, Chomsky published his first political essay about the struggle against fascism in Spain, demonstrating his early political awareness. His past works include "The Abuse of Power and the Attack on Democracy", Fateful Triangle, Necessary Illusions, Hegemony or Survival, Deterring Democracy and Failing States, and Towards a New Cold War. Chomsky is most recognized in the field of linguistic philosophy for his critiques of the emergence of reference and meaning in human language. "Manufacturing Consent," is one of his best pieces, distinguishes between the media's role in supporting and tolerating state programmes.

Chomsky excelled academically and joined a number of groups and societies throughout his study period. The school's hierarchical and structured teaching techniques alarmed him. Chomsky relocated to Managua in 1985 during the Nicaraguan Contra to meet with supporters and displaced people. Noam Chomsky began inspiring people with talks on politics and linguistics. Chomsky travelled to the "Palestinian areas" in 1988 to observe the effects of Israeli

occupation. Chomsky pioneered ideas on disliking capitalism and identifying material riches. He also grew disrespectful of authoritarian socialism, which the Soviet Union's Marxist-Leninist policies embodied. He suggests that a spectrum between complete democratic management of the economy and complete authoritarian control should be recognized rather than embracing the conventional perception among Americans. According to him, a democratic society is one in which "all persons have a say in public monetary policy," hence, Western capitalist countries are not truly democratic.

In addition, Chomsky has made significant contributions to the philosophy of cognition, the philosophy of language, and the philosophy of science. People often express a desire for the budget to be diverted from military expenditures to other civil defense priorities, such as education, health care, and other civil services, during times of war propaganda. The largest owners and investors, however, decide that a defense budget is required for military expenses. Mainstream media in support of stockholders and investors take similar actions here. The media's coverage of this spectrum of subjects is very well suited to the propaganda paradigm. In the University of Pennsylvania's "Wharton School," Edward S. Herman teaches finance. His work contains books relating to Corporate Control, Corporate Power, The Real Terror Network, Terrorism in Fact and Propaganda, and The Rise and Fall of the Bulgarian Connection, etc. He is a member of the American Academy of Science. He has published so many books related to linguistics and current affairs.

## **Introduction**

The main theme of Noam Chomsky's book "Manufacturing Consent" is the "propaganda model". This book offers an analytical approach that seeks to contextualize the performance of American mass media within the framework of fundamental institutional design. When it comes to the media purposes, one is to spread propaganda on behalf of the strong and dominating social regimes (Mullen, & Klaehn, 2010). Instead of relegating divergent viewpoints, this book explains the political spectrum. According to Chomsky, censorship enforced by "free market" forces that are driven by the government is limited and more difficult to overturn. He also makes the case that since the mainstream media is controlled by corporations; it reflects their objectives and interests. These strong regimes oversee the content of the mass media and provide funding to the owners of the mainstream media. Following this training, the representatives of these interests have significant personal goals and ideals they aim to advance through the media. Such individuals hold influential positions in civil society, where they can influence and restrain media policy (Targema, & Ayih, 2017). This is typically not accomplished by simple media manipulation, but rather through the hiring of journalists and editors who share this viewpoint, internalization of priorities, and the defining of newsworthiness as it relates to media strategy.

In fact, the mass media's adherence to an official agenda and lack of opposition are likely to sway public opinion in the direction projected (Gitlin, 1977). When the public's interests drastically conflict with those of the elite in a matter of degree and interest, it is a source of great surprise. Tycoons in the media have their own reliable sources of information, and the official narrative may be widely disputed. Although the number of very large corporations has decreased, the dominance of the media has increased, almost unchallenged by Republican and Democratic administrations and regulatory power. Ben Bagdikian claims in his research that since the publication of his first edition of *Media Monopoly* in 1983, fifty enormous enterprises have dominated nearly every mass media. Seven short years later, in 1990, only 23 companies still held the same dominant position (Bagdikian, 2004). Since 1990, waves of significant mergers and

acquisitions and quick globalization have further concentrated the media industries into nine transnational companies.

Disney, AOL, Time Warner, Viacom, News Corporation, Bertelsmann, General Electric, Sony, AT&T-Liberty Media, and Vivendi Universal are some of these conglomerates. These conglomerates now control all of the major film studios, TV networks, and music labels worldwide because of their activities. Additionally, these businesses operated significant cable channels, cable systems, periodicals, major-market TV stations, and publishing houses (Herman, & Chomsky, 2021). If we take a global perspective, we will see that the US government and other Elite Western governments have pushed for the interests of their nation's businesses that are keen to grow abroad. The World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF) have both adopted a similar strategy in an effort to improve transnational corporations' access to global media markets. Modern philosophy has provided the scholarly justification for preparations that have given private transnational speculators responsibility for stations, satellite linkages, and satellite frameworks (Fitzgerald, 2011).

The style of life and belief system promoted by the process of globalization is closely related to "way of life" issues, goods, and their acquisition. The indication of the global media architecture is its persistent, pervasive corporate greed, writes Robert Mc Chesney. The productivity of individuals and groups has increased by the internet and new technology. Yet, despite the internet's limits as a vital instrument, its invention has been a useful addition to the realm of mass communication (Smiers, 2003). The internet is not a tool for mass communication; instead, it is used for different types of conversation. Only sizable businesses have able to significantly increase in consumer awareness of their products. The capitalist ideology's political structures are observed through a liberal-pluralist lens (Mullen, & Klaehn, 2010). These democratic societies imply that there is a thriving market for mass productions and ideas. The liberal-pluralist sees the mass media as a fourth estate pillar.

The public interest is protected by the media, which also acts as "watchdogs" on the use of authority. The mass media make a substantial contribution to the modern democratic system of checks and balances in society. A huge step towards the internet technology becoming a democratic media platform is the privatization of the internet's portals and servers and their integration into non-internet corporations. The rapid spread of internet technology by the top newspapers and media conglomerates during the past ten years of technological innovation has been widely observed. The major media outlets that have entered the online space have tended to focus more on selling products, reducing their news coverage, and offering features that appeal to viewers and advertisers right away (Norris, 2009).

### **United States Control on Main Stream Media**

Bottom line considerations have gained increasing influence in western nations because of increased corporate power and worldwide influence, conglomerate meddling in the media sector, mergers and further media centralization, and the demise of public broadcasting. Advertising has grown more aggressively competitive. However, there are now even more gaps between editorial and advertising departments. These modifications have led to a deeper integration of newsrooms into global corporate edifices. Journalism that is entrenched and investigative has also questioned established power systems. The anti-communist worldview may have diminished with the fall of the Soviet Union, which also contributed to the virtually elimination of socialist movements worldwide (Croteau, et al., 2006). The success of capitalism and the growing influence of those interested in privatization and market rule have tightened the hold of market ideology, at least

among the elite, so that markets are considered benign and even democratic regardless of the available evidence. Although there are situations where private enterprises require government aid when conducting business abroad, nonmarket procedures are dubious. Journalism has assimilated this philosophy, which was put forth when the Soviet economy collapsed in the 1980s and was attributed on a lack of markets. On the other hand, the governments of Indonesia and Turkey have long been U.S. military allies and receivers of financial and economic support. The propaganda model would have predicted that the mainstream media would have paid little attention to Turkey's brutal treatment of Kurds during the 1990s (Herman, 1988).

### **Role of US media in international Conflicts**

The extravagant assistance provided by the Clinton administration to Turkey in carrying out its ethnic cleansing programme received media notice as well. The phrase "genocide" was rarely used in media coverage of Turkish operations for Kurds. Similar to how it was rarely used to describe Indonesia's abuse of East Timorese people, who in 1999 were subjected to yet another wave of terror as Indonesia sought to defeat a United Nations-sponsored referendum on independence. Compared to the treatment of Kurds in Turkey in the 1990s, this mistreatment was almost certainly less severe (Herman, & Peterson, 2010). The paramilitary opposition to a United Nations-sponsored independence referendum was planned and worked with the Indonesian Military. In 1966 and 1969, Laos carried out chemical assaults. These assaults target locals' communication channels, agriculture, and greenery. Agent Orange was also heavily used on 173,000 acres of Cambodian forests, cereals, and rubber plantations. Owing to this loss, the Cambodian government vehemently denounced this harsh and illegal action for violating its neutrality, but sadly, the government of Cambodia was too small and weak for its voice to be heard (Clymer, 2013).

Because of these repercussions, the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) vehemently denounced the deployment of chemical weapons in Cambodia as a violation of international law, but it was helpless to take action against the US government, and there was no international community movement to stop it. In the second month of 1997, The Wall Street Journal ran a front-page story about the possibility that 500,000 babies were born with dioxin-related abnormalities during Bill Clinton's presidency (Ortega, 001). This story looked into the idea that the US government ought to bear some of the blame for this catastrophe. In addition, this tale brought attention to additional American misdeeds, but it rejected the notion that the country, emotionally depleted from losing the war, paid little attention. However, the United States accepted absolutely no accountability for the state of its victims. It was established that chemical weapons were widely used against South Vietnam during the Vietnam War. One explanation for this was that the employment of these heinous and unlawful weapons against North Vietnam would have been extensively publicized because it had an ally-supported government (Merom, 2003). In order to disregard the oppressed South Vietnamese people and maintain unrelenting aggression, the United States and its client regime engaged South Vietnam.

The mass media ought to act in a socially responsible manner; however, they not only downplayed the violence but also failed to draw attention to the contradiction and its importance. According to a piece by Barbara Crossette, an embedded journalist with the New York Times, it was unfortunate that the United States did not participate in any way in researching the impacts of chemical warfare in Vietnam. Since the United States had only used dioxin on those. It was allegedly protecting against aggression, neither Crossett nor any other mainstream reporter had anything to say about the fact that Vietnam had been used as a controlled experiment in the effects

of dioxin on humans from which much could be learned that would be beneficial to us (Chomsky, & Herman, 1979).

### **The Propaganda Model by Noam Chomsky**

The purpose and objectives of mass media are very broad, and it serves as a means of getting messages, signals, and symbols over to the intended audience. The purpose of mass media is to inform, entertain, and indoctrinate individuals with values, beliefs, and moral principles. People will be integrated into the institutional framework of the greater society through this process. In various nations where the levers of power are in the hands of a government, a systematic propaganda approach is needed to attain these roles from mass media. In any media company where the media is private and censorship is not present, it is highly challenging to detect a propaganda system (Luhmann, 2000). This wealth and power disparity and its multiple consequences on the general populace are the subject of a propaganda model. Media practices follow the path of communication where capitalism and power are intimately involved in media content filtering and allowing the government and dominant business interests to communicate with the public.

The propaganda model's main interest is with how the media affects society. Several researchers of mass media returned to the traditional Marxist view of ideology in the early 1960s, focusing on the idea that the ideas of the ruling class are in every period the governing ideas (Cottle, 2006). Researchers created these novel ideas in an effort to understand and illuminate the function of the media in contemporary democracies. This research effectively advanced the mass society paradigm, which won the early 1920s to the late 1930s period of mass media effects. Propaganda model was created to describe how the American mass media functioned and dominated on rest of media. In addition, this paradigm works well in nations with very differing political and media landscapes. Propaganda Model, according to theoretical researcher, could benefit European media. Overall, changes in politics and political communication over the past few decades have tended to make the propaganda model more applicable (Pedro-Caraana, Etal, 2018). The following categories can be used to group the crucial components of a propaganda model for collection of news "filters".

- The scale, close ownership, and profit-driven nature of the dominant mass media companies
- Advertising serves as the primary revenue source for all mainstream media;
- The mainstream media's reliance on information from primary sources and agents of power including the government, business, and "experts" they finance and authorize.
- The use of "Flak" to punish the media and the term "Flak" to refer to negative reactions to media statements; and
- "Anticommunism" as a national religion and control mechanism.

These fundamental components of the propaganda model work in concert to reinforce one another. The news's source material must go through a series of filters. The definition of what is noteworthy in the first place, as well as the premises of conversation and interpretation is fixed using these filters. These filters also describe the rationale and methods of what are essentially propaganda campaigns (Mullen, 2010).

### **US Media Coverage in Indo China War**

The way the American conflicts in Vietnam have been covered by the mass media has generated a lot of ugly criticism. The consensus is that the mass media lost the war by making the public aware of its horrors and by providing unfair, subpar, and biased coverage. The best illustration of this animosity for established military power is the mass media's coverage of offence (Hallin, 1989). A propaganda model produces several outcomes. A propaganda model leads us to anticipate that the media would not be criticized for its gullible embrace of the American compassion philosophy in the second-level discussion on the performance of the mass media. This practice undermines the role of democratic institutions. It should be restricted forcefully either by the media themselves or by government agencies. The question would be whether the media should be held accountable for undermining the good cause by taking an excessively argumentative posture and losing any sense of fairness and objectivity as a result. There is not much disagreement over Soviet intervention.

Further security worries for the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe include other nations resultantly the Nazis in an attack on the Soviet Union. Afghanistan borders regions of the Soviet Union where a radical Islamic fundamentalist revival might incite the populace (Weiner, 1992). The Soviet Union's worst adversaries openly supported these insurgents. Yet, none of these issues excuses the Soviet Union war on Czechoslovakia. A government with some semblance of legitimacy invited the Russians into Afghanistan in 1979, but as the Economist correctly noted, an invader is an invader unless invited in. These ideas mimic the class-based basis of mass society as well as the laws, customs, and regulations that are supported to establish and uphold ruling class dominance. They said that the media had more influence starting in the middle of the 1960s. The ways that different research papers explain how the mass media are determined are varied (Garrity, 1980).

### **US media role in Legitimizing versus Meaningless Third World Elections**

The best place to test a propaganda model is during elections in developing nations. In order to legitimize their rulers and regimes, some elections are rigged in benevolent client states. To validate their political and economic systems, certain elections are staged in nations that are viewed negatively or as enemies. Elections in the friendly client states are frequently held under United States sponsorship, which strengthens this trend. As a result, in the Dominican Republic in 1996, the United States held elections in its client states that have come to be known as demonstration elections, which are those whose main goal is to persuade the local populace that the intervention is well-intentioned (Snow, 2011). The United States government employs a variety of tactics to promote the elections it supports. Additionally, it has a clear agenda of disagreements that it wants to be highlighted as well as disagreements. Technology is used to manipulate symbols and agendas in order to promote the preferred election. The sponsor government makes an effort to tie the election campaign to the military rule it supports by using the happy word democracy to do so (Gross, 2002).

The sponsoring government also pays close attention to any dissident remarks calling for abstention threats to scuttle the election. They are utilized to turn the election into a dramatic conflict. The agenda of the United States administration is turned on its side when elections are observed in unfriendly and hostile states. Elections are no longer equated with controlled democracy and American officials are no longer astounded that the election was held in a non-democratic manner. They do not give the military credit for backing the vote and pledging to respect the outcome (Chesnut, 1997). On the other hand, when the dominant party influence over and support from the military is highlighted, in this case as exposing the integrity of the election, this is referred to as a form of advantage. The focus right now is on the secret motivations of the

election sponsors, who are attempting to legitimate themselves through this cunning scheme of a so-called election.

## **Conclusion**

In this book, Herman and Chomsky present a "propaganda model" to explain the international affairs bias in Western media, particularly the US media. Their argument is despite the facts that the United States is not a dictatorship where a single person has the power to censor the press. The market forces that cause people to believe in press freedom actually work to create a self-imposed censorship that results in a biased media that is more concerned with delivering audiences to its advertisers and important corporate sponsors than giving its readers accurate and balanced news. Noam Chomsky emphasizes three important points and provides several instances to support his argument. Although, Herman and Chomsky are able to support their claim that US media reports are biased to portray the US and its allies as the good guys and other (enemy) states as the "bad guys" by using extensive quotations. US contemporary media reports follow these notions with official sources such as government documents, White House memos, State Department press releases, as well as reports in non-US based mass media. Although the US media did not agree, it is notable that they may criticize Nicaragua's restrictions on press freedom. These limitations were far more straightforward and noteworthy. The use of this separation procedure has led to the employment of a double standard by the authors of several American newspapers in the same article. They do not seem to be conscious of their own prejudice. Whether the army and the US will give up authority and control is a question. US mass media observers gave an excellent illustration of how to employ government controlled experts and pseudo-events to interest the media and push the subjective propaganda narratives. The administration chooses these official observers from recognized organizations based on their trustworthiness. These experts' observations will influence the opinion and policy in subject countries. In the same way, the regular use of these official observers by the media to remark on the quality of elections breaches norms of substantive objectivity.

People hold the misconception that the press is combative, tenacious, and pervasive in its pursuit of facts and the truth. Edward Herman and Noam Chomsky discuss the function of American media as an underlying exclusive consensus that essentially shapes all sides of the news in Noam Chomsky's book *Manufacturing Consent*. The mass media makes a concerted effort to identify and reflect its presumptions since they are undermining existing power and upper class observations. The market and the financing of publishing are expertly and comprehensively dissected in *Manufacturing Consent* as significant influences on the news industry. The book's author discusses the framing of issues, topic selection, and media biases that underlie claims of free elections, a free press, and governmental dominance. The authors also draw the conclusion that modern mass media can best be described in terms of a propaganda paradigm given the growth of technology. Corporations in the news, information, and entertainment swear to make money inside the established system.

Interests of the corporate sector include supporting governance expectations of both public and private authority. The propaganda model's implications make media professionals, journalists, editors, and broadcasters seem bad. Nonetheless, after twenty years after its initial publication, *Manufacturing Consent* continues to be the most significant indictment of the mass media. Media professionals, contemporary critics, and linguists regard Chomsky as the debatably most significant living thinker of the twenty-first century. Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky as obstinate, relentless, and all pervasive in their pursuit of the truth and the upholding of justice in the news media typically portray the news media in this amazing book. Instead of practicing

journalism, the media is defending the economic, social, and political goals of the privileged elite that dominate domestic society, the state, the government, and the international order. This great work is based on a number of case studies and experimental experiments, including the unfair treatment of worthy and unworthy victims in the media. Elections in third-world nations are being legitimized and made meaningless by the media. Media criticism of the US wars in Vietnam is being demoralized by the ruling class and ruling media. Herman and Chomsky put out a Propaganda Model in this book because of their decades of criticism and study to explain the effectiveness and eligibility of the media. This study book examines the extent to which the Propaganda Model, developed by Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky in *Manufacturing Consent*, applies to media concepts. This propaganda model is applicable to discussions in the US media on how the US government ought to react to the killings committed by Ugandan warlord Joseph Kony.

This study book also demonstrates that the concept of worthy and unworthy about the general function of the media does not adequately meet American geopolitical and economic goals in the Central African area. The relative absence of civil liberties in Ugandan society as a supporter of the United States, atrocities committed by the Ugandan army, and claims of American assistance for Ugandan government policies are all detailed in the book. The media emphasize humanitarian issues rather than performing investigative reporting. As a result, these data lend credibility to Herman and Chomsky's propaganda theory. This book review goes on to investigate the astounding effectiveness of the propaganda paradigm. This work's masterful analysis of the propaganda model paradigm mostly focuses on western media. The performance and structural behavior of the traditional media system in the United States were critiqued using this propaganda model as a framework.

### **Suggestions and Recommendations**

This evaluation is wholly dependent on the book *The Propaganda Model* book's framework is highlighted more. Herman and Chomsky changed it into "Manufacturing Consent," which implies that dominating specialized classes and elites create consent and common understanding. A few profit-seeking owners run every major mass media enterprise. The open flow of news and analysis that is totally opposed to their interest is not encouraged by mass media. As a result, it is more common for Pseudo realities to be created and distributed to the media. This is a convincing argument for why the writers of this study book chose to use the propaganda model to assess how well the American mass media performs. American mass media investigated the primary print and broadcast platforms while using the propaganda model as the foundation of their organization. The emergence of democratic societies asserted that everyone had a right to accurate information and knowledge. No one's fundamental human rights may be violated. Everyone received the concept of self-respect as a result. As people on the subcontinent learned about their rights through the media, the same concept spread there. They also developed their own press and newspapers because of this knowledge. According to Chomsky's propaganda, model, Western media has an understanding of the psychology of warfare. If we really examine how Western media operates, we will see that psychological warfare is a crucial component of mass media. The media in the Muslim world and the developing globe is far too behind to protect the interests of the populace. Finally yet importantly, the two authors of this book attempted to criticize viewpoints while looking for the propaganda model from that perspective. Indeed, media like radio, television, and newspapers should not be used for propagandizing.



## References

- Bagdikian, B. H. (2004). *The new media monopoly: A completely revised and updated edition with seven new chapters*. Beacon Press.
- Chesnut, R. A. (1997). *Born again in Brazil: The Pentecostal boom and the pathogens of poverty*. Rutgers University Press.
- Chomsky, N., & Herman, E. S. (1979). *The Washington connection and third world fascism* (Vol. 1). South End Press.
- Clymer, K. (2013). *The United States and Cambodia, 1969-2000: a troubled relationship*. Routledge.
- Cottle, S. (2006). *Mediatized conflicts*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Croteau, D., Hoynes, W., & Hoynes, W. D. (2006). *The business of media: Corporate media and the public interest*. Pine forge press.
- Deibert, R., Palfrey, J., Rohozinski, R., & Zittrain, J. (Eds.). (2011). *Access contested: security, identity, and resistance in Asian cyberspace*. mit Press.
- Fitzgerald, S. W. (2011). *Corporations and cultural industries: Time warner, bertelsmann, and news corporation*. Lexington Books.
- Garrity, P. J. (1980). The Soviet Military Stake in Afghanistan: 1956–79. *The RUSI Journal*, 125(3), 31-36.
- Gitlin, T. A. (1977). " *THE WHOLE WORLD IS WATCHING*": *MASS MEDIA AND THE NEW LEFT, 1965-70*. University of California, Berkeley.
- Gross, P. (2002). *Entangled evolutions: Media and democratization in Eastern Europe*. Woodrow Wilson Center Press.
- Hallin, D. C. (1989). *The uncensored war: The media and Vietnam*. Univ of California Press.
- Herman, E. S. (1988). a Noam CHOMSKY. *Manufacturing consent: the political economy of the mass media*.
- Herman, E. S. (1992). *Beyond hypocrisy: Decoding the news in an age of propaganda: Including a doublespeak dictionary for the 1990s*. Black Rose Books Ltd..
- Herman, E. S., & Chomsky, N. (2021). Manufacturing Consent. In *Power and Inequality* (pp. 198-206). Routledge.
- Herman, E. S., & Peterson, D. (2010). *The politics of genocide*. NYU Press.

- Herman, Edward, and Noam Chomsky (2012). "17 A Propaganda Model." *Media and cultural studies: Keywords* 204 (2012).
- Klaehn, J. (2002). A Critical Review and Assessment of Herman and Chomsky's Propaganda Model'. *European Journal of Communication*, 17(2), 147-182.
- Klaehn, J., & Mullen, A. (2010). The propaganda model and sociology: Understanding the media and society. *Synaesthesia: Communication Across Cultures*, 1(1), 10-23.
- Luhmann, N. (2000). *The reality of the mass media* (p. 1). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Merom, G. (2003). *How democracies lose small wars: state, society, and the failures of France in Algeria, Israel in Lebanon, and the United States in Vietnam*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mullen, A. (2010). Twenty years on: The second-order prediction of the Herman-Chomsky propaganda model. *Media, Culture & Society*, 32(4), 673-690.
- Mullen, A., & Klaehn, J. (2010). The Herman–Chomsky propaganda model: A critical approach to analysing mass media behaviour. *Sociology Compass*, 4(4), 215-229.
- Norris, P. (Ed.). (2009). *Public Sentinel: News media and governance reform*. World Bank Publications.
- Ortega, M. (2001). *Military intervention and the European Union* (Vol. 45). Institute for Security Studies, Western European Union.
- Pedro-Carañana, J., Broudy, D., & Klaehn, J. (2018). *The Propaganda Model Today*. University of Westminster Press.
- Roos, J. (2012). Nationalism, Racism and Propaganda in Early Weimar Germany: Contradictions in the Campaign against the 'Black Horror on the Rhine'. *German History*, 30(1), 45-74.
- Smiers, J. (2003). *Arts under pressure: promoting cultural diversity in the age of globalization*. Zed Books.
- Snow, N. (2011). *Information war: American propaganda, free speech and opinion control since 9-11*. Seven Stories Press.
- Targema, T. S., & Ayih, L. J. (2017). Nature and System of Media Ownership and Control in Nigeria: Implication for Grassroots Participation and Development. *Nairobi Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (NJHS)*, 1(7), 53-65.
- Weiner, M. (1992). Security, stability, and international migration. *International security*, 17(3), 91-126.