

# How does the media negatively affect the public and celebrities assignment



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

So does the media negatively affect the public and celebrities? The short answer is yes, it does. There are a variety of reasons for this, but I have learnt that the main reason is money. People within the media industry want to get rich, and they want to get rich fast. A prime example of this is the paparazzi. Our obsession with celebrities is growing by the day, but have you ever wondered who the paparazzi are? How celebrity's personal moments get immortalized in gossip magazines?

The desire to feed the hunger for celebrity news is driving overly aggressive paparazzi tactics; the paparazzi pursuit causes danger to the celebrity, to the paparazzi and, let's not forget, the public. From incidents regarding Princess Diana and Britney Spears, too many people are happy to hate the paparazzi but don't see a problem buying magazines filled with their pictures. Go back several years and you would have only seen them at red carpet events such as the Academy Awards, but now you arrive in Los Angeles and they're everywhere.

It's their job to photograph celebrities and then sell their photographs on to gossip magazines and websites. But is it really ethical? I don't believe it is, sure it would be fine if stars went to glamorous events and got a few pictures taken of them. It gives fans a chance to see what their favourite celebrities have been up to and show fashion forward teenagers what the celebrities new outfits entail, this sort of photography is to be expected. It's good for the celebrity and good for the public. But now in magazines we see celebrities shopping at the grocery store or driving their cars.

Is that really needed? Does our 21st century society really get satisfaction out of seeing these images? If we opened up magazines and saw images of normal people doing everyday tasks and chores we would get bored rather quickly. So why are the gossip magazines filled with these supposedly boring photographs? Perhaps its just because they're famous or is it that the public idealizes them. Some even get godlike status, such as Michael Jackson, 14 people committed suicide after his death; these people didn't even know him.

Celebrities aren't an amazing new race, they are just people like us. The only difference is that they can sing or act really well and in some cases they can't even do that. They are also known worldwide, and I feel that this is why they get photographed so much, its simple, the more famous you are, the more famous you will become. When one person is shown in a magazine, they are generally then shown in most other magazines, giving paparazzi more chance to sell their photos to a lot of different and potential cliental.

This is how the paparazzi industry was formed and this is why it is so huge. A few years ago there would have only been a few paparazzi and now there are hundreds in Los Angeles alone. So overall who is to blame? Surely we can't blame the paparazzi fully, yes they have questionable ethics and have a lot of ability and power to make celebrities lives hell. But we all know if the paparazzi all suddenly quit tomorrow, normal everyday people would quickly take their places. Money talks in the 21st century and getting one good shot can earn a paparazzo thousands, that's the issue, isn't it?

If you could only make a few hundred dollars per great photograph there would only be a small amount of paparazzi taking pictures. They would earn enough money to survive, the public would get to see some worthwhile shots of celebrities and magazines would easily fill their pages. But it's not like that, there are so many magazines competing for our attention and hard earned dollars that they will pay ridiculous amounts for Britney Spears with no underpants or Brad Pitt and Angelina Jolie's newborn twins. The media and magazines are ultimately to blame in the process.

They want everybody to let them off the hook, saying they just give the public what they want to see, but I feel they have a certain responsibility. You can't tell somebody to kill someone else and get away with it just because it wasn't you who committed the crime. They fuel the paparazzi, without the media there would be no reason for paparazzi to exist. So when media companies hand over checks worth thousands of dollars what they're really saying is the celebrities we have starring in our magazines have no right to privacy. What about their children? I personally believe here is no reason for celebrity's children to be photographed. They are not famous, why should they be snapped when the only thing linking them to fame is accident of birth. But they're not off limits. Nobody is. Perez Hilton, a well-known paparazzo always has the same answers. " Move away. If they don't like it they can move away. " I don't see how his naive idea would help; it won't stop celebrities being harassed. Big stars get followed everywhere. It wouldn't matter if they moved to the middle of the Death Valley desert because the paparazzi would still station themselves anywhere the stars and their families go.

So the battle goes on between the hunted and the hunters, celebrities and paparazzi. But its obvious the paparazzi will not stop and the problem will only get worse. As long as we, the public buy the magazines, our favourite celebrities will be taunted and their right to privacy will cease to exist. The paparazzi take the photos, they sell them to the magazine companies and we buy the magazines. I feel that Britney Spears speaks clearly when she says to one paparazzo, " Please go away, I'm a person just like you. "