

Media response

[Literature](#), [Russian Literature](#)



The paper "Manufacturing Consent" is a good example of a movie review on media. This paper is a response to the documentary Film 'Manufacturing Consent' produced in 1992, authored by Naom Chomsky and Edward Herman. The film is directed by Mark Achbar and Peter Wintonick. In the Movie, a ruling elite is seen to propagate own ideas. This does not promote the idea of change in society. People, therefore, are looking for ways to blend with the present system and not freely think of their paths of liberation as argued by Chomsky, Mitchell, and Schoeffel, (2002). The writer will explore different themes in this film and how it impacts the media, its relation to the modern world, and how best ideas were propagated to achieve the desired results by the author. The film portrays the media as a vehicle used by the elite to manipulate the poor. It is a means to cover their social and political agendas and curtail the thirst for a need for reform by the unprivileged population. The media is being manipulated by the elite group to discourage the non-ruling elite from wanting to explore other actions that can be taken to change the social structure and the organization of the government (Chomsky, Mitchell and Schoeffel, 2002). In the movie, Chomsky showcases his opinion that the ideal societal setting should be one that encourages people to be creative and not manipulate them through managing media content.

Chomsky says that the manipulation of media denies people the means to detect lies. He is disturbed that America has a way of indoctrinating, therefore, spreading propaganda and insists that change can only be experienced starting from the grassroots. The movie depicts ordinary people as capable of understanding the world. Chomsky cites that ordinary people

have great creativity, probably because they try to think a lot about how to get their next plate of food or even become rich someday. People need creative work and not manipulation as in machines as argued by Chomsky, Mitchell, and Schoeffel, (2002). People should be in a position to understand the difference between authority and coercion and that control of public resources by the private individual should be challenged to ensure there is public participation in each and every decision made for any public resource. Community members run issues democratically without treating some as slaves and that democracy should mean access to ideas and opinions as argued by Chomsky, Mitchell, and Schoeffel, (2002).

Chomsky view of the American elite is that which filters only to allow limited and content that has been cleared by the ruling elite. To show this, He shows a case study of two different coverages of the same atrocity that are significantly different by far. He highlights that: biased coverage of issues in favor of the existing situation leads to ownership of media by major corporations sharing the same interest with the ruling elite. That person with differing views are not listened to, something that makes the world of media boring because people have to subscribe to a given idea whether it is fake or not as argued by Chomsky, Mitchell, and Schoeffel, (2002).

Debates are discouraged, and whenever debaters lack the moral, no meaningful discussion can take place because people will only respond for the sake of responding but not contributing meaningful content to the debate. Institutional Memory becomes history and that people's interest and attention are diverted from issues that would be of importance to them. The above facilitate to limit the society, thus ensuring the 20% of the elite

dominate 80% comprising of the masses.

The News is kept short and precise; different views are not welcome as are usually lengthy. According to Chomsky, people can only break free through getting alternative sources of news and becoming engaged in community action as argued by Chomsky, Mitchell, and Schoeffel, (2002). Chomsky proposes mass action as the vehicle of change. He argues that; there is a possibility of America's future being held hostage, the population will take control of its destiny, or there may be no destiny to control.

Chomsky, in his work, makes very vital observations. Watching his film, he assists to be the eye through which people get to see what binds them. It is true that the elite propagates propaganda, owns the media and that the masses should make efforts to liberate themselves from the bias and unfair control. His support for activism can, however, bring about social instability, but again could yield to the elite changing their dominance.

The film is biased as its flaws, everything that connects with leadership; it is all manipulation. The view of seeking information from other sources and reacting by the activism is fundamentally a cause for alarm; the reasoning is may be flawed. The film has not emphasized the use of dialogue as a means for conflict resolution; this perspective has been neglected. Dialogue should be embraced, and the media play its part by communication through the conveyance of uncensored information.