

CHAPTER 7

System Security: A Missing Filter for the Propaganda Model?

Daniel Broudy and Miyume Tanji

7.1 Introduction

In the present post-9/11 dispensation, the world's so-called indispensable nation¹ has managed, to a great extent, to dispense with liberty in the interest of security.² As with the spread of neoliberal ideology, the spreading assault on civil liberties appears to be a global phenomenon. But, what can be said of societies and their systems of public awareness and mass surveillance that seek to reinforce and normalise the destruction of these cherished liberties? We hypothesise from our close studies of the public discourse that powerful forms of state and corporate propaganda play integral parts in the political theatre conditioning citizens to tolerate the revolting decomposing corpse of liberty. For insights on how this decay appears today we turn to a postulated model of propaganda to help us apprehend what it can tell us about resistance to this contemporary stagecraft.

While gaining currency as a research tool, the 'Propaganda Model' (PM hereafter) set out by Edward Herman and Noam Chomsky in *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* has, over the past three decades, helped throw a critical light on elite control and management of

How to cite this book chapter:

Broudy, D. and Tanji, M. 2018. System Security: A Missing Filter for the Propaganda Model? In: Pedro-Carañana, J., Broudy, D. and Klaehn, J. (eds.). *The Propaganda Model Today: Filtering Perception and Awareness*. Pp. 93–106. London: University of Westminster Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.16997/book27.g>. License: CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0

the public discourse. Since the book first appeared in 1988, leaders in post-industrial societies have successfully mobilised support through technological advances in cybernetic communications. Efforts to control public perception and awareness have also been greatly enhanced through mass media consolidation³ and have, since 9/11, advanced to new levels of influence. In this chapter, we highlight the need for an additional filter in response to recent re-configurations of political and corporate power and emerging systems of control over information and public debate.

The original PM featured five conceptual ‘filters’ which have been useful in scholarship theorizing, exposing, and analysing the complex connections among society’s dominant institutions and non-coercive methods used to propagandise citizens and to control public awareness.⁴ As an effective filter both permits and impedes the flow of whatever materials seek to pass through it, they play a crucial role in the creation of clean fuel fit for an engine’s efficient use. Filters screen harmful debris that might hamper the (re)production of power. The motors of heavy industry, for example, run as a result of these functions, so, from a maintainer’s perspective, debris must be filtered out when it threatens to infect and compromise the overall system. Corporate media and ideological institutions that strategise and run the gathering, analysis, and dissemination of news information employ similar means of filtering out potentially dangerous debris in ideas, perspectives, and voices.

In an effort to explain mainstream media responses to voices such as Edward Snowden’s and other ‘leakers’ over the past decade as well as revelations regarding National Security Agency (NSA) counter-intelligence activities, this chapter engages with the question of how the general public is ‘driven from the arena of political debate’⁵ and conditioned to support political elites promulgating policies claiming to be essential for state security and public safety. While these mechanisms of cultural conditioning comprise interconnected networks of print and digital media, they also represent and reflect interlocking government and corporate interests that span international boundaries. We suggest that ‘state security’ can now be read as code for ‘system security’, which is the protection of a global capitalist system through digital media control mechanisms. We, thus, wonder to what extent elite responses to ‘security leaks’ can explain the high value placed upon secrecy as a purported guarantee for system security and stability of the status quo. While contemporary media performance suggests that a System Security Filter (SSF hereafter) has emerged as a safeguard for this post-9/11 era of global capitalism, we propose that this filter be considered as a component of the PM’s conceptual framework.

7.2 The Elite ‘System’

As the SSF is meant to be a metaphorical filter, we detect a ‘System’ that utilises the SSF for its own interest. Systems are complex collections of interacting,

interrelated, and interdependent parts (or people) forming a largely organised whole. Whereas horsepower generated from systems of internal combustion, for example, rely upon unique sets of pistons, cams, and interlocking gears and pulleys, political power may be generated from unique sets of interdependent persons interacting in an interlocking self-interested whole. News in the corporate media constitutes such pulleys and gears, interacting with other essential components that (re)generate the political power of wealthy individuals, larger industries and the state, which we call the elite ‘System.’

While governments are more visible within the public sphere, Chomsky contends, the state is relatively invisible but more stable and comprised of institutions that routinely establish the actual conditions for public policy, including the media. *The state* constitutes the ‘actual nexus of decision-making power ... including investment and political decisions, setting the framework within which the public policy can be discussed and determined,’ whereas *government* consists of ‘whatever groups happen to control the political system, one component of the state system, at a particular moment.’⁶

In the United States, private interests appear to the electorate to occupy one or both political parties that have long dominated the public discourse.⁷ Concerning the Republican system of governance, for example, Ian Haney López observes, that, ‘They’re giving over control of the regulatory state to the corporations, they say they want to shrink the Federal deficit, but in fact they’re spending massive amounts of money either on tax cuts for the really rich or in big subsidies that go to corporations.’⁸ The public’s voice has been filtered out and replaced by the ‘corporate managers [who] can in effect buy elections directly.’⁹ Beyond American party politics, the System, beholden to the imperatives of transnational big business, assumes a global standing, next to the state and government. In its turn, mass media have, through the government’s gift of deregulation, largely seized power over the public discourse to filter out dissenting views that might challenge or defy elite interests.

While the precise meanings of the term ‘elite’ are not so easy to pin down, Raymond Williams provides some background – observing that ‘elite’, from Old French, was used originally to describe someone elected but was, in time, extended from those formally chosen in the social process to those specially selected by God for some particular purpose. Today’s associated meanings of the elite in society are wealth, power, position, authority, and control. Williams’ final thought on the term is particularly relevant today: ‘the forgotten etymological association between elite and elected has a certain wry interest.’¹⁰

Herman and Chomsky describe the System as a ‘guided market system’¹¹ within which the guidance is ‘provided by the government [the elected elite], the leaders of the corporate community, the top media owners and executives, and the assorted individuals and groups’ who are assigned or allowed to assume positions that enable them to handle the levers of power. Globalization processes comprise part of the ‘guided market system’ in today’s transnational political economy.

Reflecting in 1928 on the democratizing influence of the steam engine, the press, and public school to shift power from the aristocracy to the masses, Edward Bernays observed that even the bourgeoisie came to fear the emerging might of the public. As a response to this progressive downward diffusion of social and economic influence, the elite minority found an effective counterweight in prevailing techniques of mass persuasion made possible by modern psychoanalysis to better understand and manage (or manipulate) the public mind. ‘Modern propaganda,’ observed Bernays, ‘is a consistent, enduring effort to create or shape events to influence the relations of the public to an enterprise, idea, or group.’¹² This socializing enterprise with its underlying aims from the early twentieth century persist in many contemporary capitalist democracies: manufacture, through mass media, public consent to political, corporate, and military strategies profiting the centres of elite power and wealth.

Critiquing the elite perspective on the market guided system, Chomsky dis-tilts some of the results of a 1975 Trilateral Commission study, aptly titled *The Crisis of Democracy*, that urged more ‘moderation in Democracy’¹³ to curb excesses in social freedoms exercised during America’s 1960s protest movements. As regards the Commission’s assessment of American democracy during this ‘counter-cultural’ period, Chomsky reinterprets and casts some of its central propositions in plain language: ‘the general public must be reduced to its traditional apathy and obedience, and driven from the arena of political debate, if democracy is to survive.’¹⁴

Pure democracy, from the vantage point of the elite class, was/is thought to be an unwieldy and destructive force for achieving and maintaining civil order and control.¹⁵ As witnessed through the 1960s, direct democratic action emboldened by a widespread belief in the power of utilitarian democracy¹⁶ had come to profoundly alter institutionalised systems of racial and gender oppression. Indeed, ‘shifts in public opinion dramatically [illustrate] how the vitality of democracy in the 1960s (as manifested in increased political participation) produced problems for the governability of democracy in the 1970s (as manifested in the decreased public confidence in government).’¹⁷

7.3 Managing Information

Standing at odds with these elite interests are recent citizen movements initiated by the likes of Edward Snowden, Chelsea Manning, and Julian Assange who have sought to expose and challenge privileged exploits and abuses of power. Their disruptions to official counter-intelligence policy have been called ‘illegal’ and read as unacceptable interpretations of patriotism. However illegal they may have been, it was also the structure of exploitation that was exposed – the System that exploits the public’s faith that civic participation in democratic actions (voting, petitioning, etc.) can bend elite power to the will of the people.

The Snowden, Manning, and Assange cases have shown that enduring confidence in the effectiveness of American-styled democracy is a false assurance.

US government agents engaged in the work of gathering and analysing counter-intelligence data on American citizens must have construed Snowden's 2013 interview with Glenn Greenwald as a critical 'service disruption' to the System. A key indicator of this perception appeared in the propaganda disseminated by those in power that portrayed Snowden (and earlier Manning) as grave dangers to national security. As such, their reputations as patriotic citizens necessitated a kind of assassination. It was vital that the positive qualities they had enjoyed as servants of the state be 'filtered out' immediately in the interests of maintaining System Security.

With the publication of Bradley (now Chelsea) Manning's classified disclosures to WikiLeaks, a significant moment in history unfolded on 25 July 2010, 'the beginning,' notes Denver Nicks, 'of the information age exploding upon itself.'¹⁸ Following the publication of 'Collateral Murder'¹⁹ and other later eruptions of raw news about the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and American diplomacy more broadly, P.J. Crowley, former Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, observed that the leaks, 'literally touched on just about every relationship the United States [has] had with every other government around the world.'²⁰

Acquitted on the charge of aiding the enemy, Manning revealed to the public rather alarming details long concealed concerning civilian casualties during the war as well as evidence already known to US authorities that the Maliki government was torturing its political opponents, and US officials did nothing to stop it. These revelations represent a significant shock to the System as concealed truths concerning system-wide abuses came to light. Indeed, despite Manning's prosecution, confinement, early clemency, and continued castigation,²¹ the signals communicated in Executive Orders, and President Obama's own insistence on the value of rules and laws at the time, must have offered, at least, some hope to those in positions to do so to call public attention to state breaches of law.

In no case shall information be classified ... in order to: conceal violations of law, inefficiency, or administrative error; prevent embarrassment to a person, organization, or agency ... or prevent or delay the release of information that does not require protection in the interest of the national security.²²

Subsequent news stories featured a range of unambiguous declarations about Manning, his character, his motives, and the conjectured damage that his leaks had created. Right-wing commentators pronounced Manning guilty 'of treason' and that 'anything less than an execution [would be] too kind a penalty.'²³ According to Fox News' Bill O'Reilly, 'the Sleaze ball ... Julian Assange' who runs 'this despicable website' [where Manning's disclosures appeared] is 'bent on damaging America.'²⁴ Neither did the left-wing leaders hold back. Presi-

dent Obama proclaimed: ‘We’re a nation of laws. We don’t individually make our own decisions about how laws operate,’ and concluded, ‘[Manning] broke the law.’²⁵

More recently, Edward Snowden’s 9 June 2013 interview with *The Guardian*’s Glenn Greenwald posed yet another significant shock to the System, characteristic of the sort of debris routinely ‘filtered out’ of power structures. Snowden and the stories he had told posed an almost immediate danger to the established order by exposing to the public rather serious systemic impurities which, in turn, immediately made Snowden himself both politically and ideologically toxic.

Nevertheless, the very breadth and depth of today’s counter-intelligence system and the conceptualization of it were scarcely fathomed by the broader populace, and this pervasive societal ignorance is indicative of hegemonic domination. As in the case of Manning, dominance is demonstrated in the methods used by agents of social power to silence any threats to the established order, such as character assassination, or literal assassination (i.e. ‘I can’t wait to write a defense of the drone strike that takes out Julian Assange,’²⁶ or ‘Can’t we just drone strike this guy?’)²⁷

Among the epithets used to describe Snowden, ‘traitor,’²⁸ ‘criminal,’²⁹ ‘defector,’³⁰ and ‘thief’³¹ appear to have largely supplanted ‘whistleblower,’ ‘leaker,’ and ‘dissident.’ John Bolton, then Senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute suggested lynching as he observed that Snowden, ‘committed treason, he ought to be convicted of that, and then swing from a tall oak tree.’³²

7.4 Controlling the Public Debate

Greenwald’s interview with Snowden did more than verify what many Americans had already tacitly sensed about their own government in this post-PATRIOT Act era: the government routinely spies on its own citizens with impunity. Indeed, to those aware of the lessons of history, recent news of the NSA’s PRISM³³ program was hardly surprising as the past half-century reveals a range of government efforts to tap into the lives of its citizens. Operation SHAMROCK (1945–1975), Project MINARET (1967–1973),³⁴ COINTELPRO (1956–1971),³⁵ Main Core (1980s-present),³⁶ STELLARWIND (2001–2011)³⁷ and ECHELON (1966-present)³⁸ all reveal, in part, the extent to which elite power in a ‘free’ society moves to assert with impunity its sweeping privileges.

With increased uses of personal electronic devices to communicate messages across the globe have come increased beliefs in the internet to equalise power between the private citizen and the corporate person. The public at large, thus, appears possessed by a mostly uncritical trust in its relative power and autonomy to access and direct the forces of digital communication in ways that temper traditional forms of elite control over discourse.

Yet, observes Edward Herman, there is ‘no evidence to support this view,’ that the opposite, in fact, could be argued. These new and more powerful tech-

nologies now ‘permit media firms to shrink staff even as they achieve greater outputs, and they make possible global distribution systems that reduce the number of media entities.’³⁹ The digital nature of information and the near-real-time production of news stories disseminated in text, signs, symbols, and videos enable ‘elite domination of [mass] media and the marginalization of dissidents’⁴⁰ with the temerity to alert the public to its hidden flaws.

Beyond ‘corporate media consolidation’⁴¹ in the private domain lay power consolidation and joint coordination in the public. In San Francisco, for example, Mark Klein, a telecommunications expert formerly with AT&T for over twenty-two years, testified in a class action suit filed in June 2006 that he was required as part of his job to maintain a ‘splitter’ that effectively shares all AT&T communications data traffic with the NSA. He also ‘learned that other such [splitters] were being installed in other cities, including Seattle, San Jose, Los Angeles, and San Diego.’⁴² Freedom rights advocates at the Electronic Frontier Foundation point out that, ‘AT&T’s deployment of NSA-controlled surveillance capability apparently involves considerably more locations than would be required to catch only international traffic.’⁴³ These sorts of coordination efforts have emerged from presidential decrees which, in recent years, are ‘lawlessly bypassing Congress ... and gutting privacy protections.’⁴⁴

In accordance with the ‘Assignment of National Security and Emergency Preparedness Communications Functions’ – an Executive Order defining justification for an Executive internet ‘kill switch’ – the System is also part of ‘... a joint industry-Government center ... capable of assisting in the initiation, coordination, restoration, and reconstitution of NS/EP communications services or facilities under all conditions of emerging threats, crisis, or emergency.’⁴⁵ The euphemistic title of this Order, whose enforcement is free from judicial review, reflects corresponding efforts in corporate media to enhance their dominance over the public’s free speech rights.

In demonstrating on CBS’s *Face the Nation* an inability (or unwillingness) to acknowledge already-existing abuses of power, Senator Dianne Feinstein obfuscated the NSA’s activities, since Snowden’s disclosures, by arguing that, ‘[she has] seen no abuse by these agencies, nor ... any claim ... made in any way shape or form that this (power) was abused.’⁴⁶ In referencing Glenn Greenwald’s suggestion about why Snowden may have fled, Bob Schieffer, host of *Face the Nation*, couched his query in his own speculation about Snowden’s motives: ‘This (leak) seems to me to go beyond your basic whistle-blower case.’⁴⁷ Feinstein agreed and re-asserted her position that Snowden is not, ‘a whistle-blower ... [that] he has taken an oath (of secrecy)’ and that ‘if [he] can’t keep the oath, [he ought to] get out (of the NSA) and then do something about it in a legal way.’⁴⁸

The ironies, absurd as they appear on the surface, are scarcely inescapable, as Senator Feinstein’s calls for legal challenges come from the lawmaker herself who, at the same time, holds the position of Chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee. Within this medium of corporate discourse, the tight boundaries drawn around a discussion of Snowden’s actions by two powerful public

personalities, as well as the labels used to define Snowden himself, illustrate a level of hegemonic control over public debate. Viewers of *Face the Nation* witness an unfolding narrative restricted to a discursive framework of law within which legislative leaders are free to condemn anyone who questions or uncovers System abuses while, at the same time, absolving themselves of responsibility.

When asked to put into perspective and make sense of the present issues of intelligence breaches, Senator Feinstein responded that, ‘What this is all about is the nation’s security.’⁴⁹ The ‘nation’ referenced here is part of the larger global System, or world order. In the words of Herbert Schiller, the System is built upon and employs an informational infrastructure that ‘produces meaning and awareness,’ and has a strong hand in controlling the key definitions, ‘images, and messages of the prevailing social order.’⁵⁰ The internet represents a key component of that infrastructure.

7.5 Protecting the System

Systems, as we have shown, are vulnerable to attack and, so, require powerful mechanisms of protection. Safeguarding today’s System demands both the routine maintenance of compliant actors working within as well as accommodating media without, which can effectively educate the masses by reflecting the policies of established power.

Protections for this particular System dominating US political power and its interests in the globalised market economy today are peculiar to the present Information Age. Public acquiescence, central to maintaining social control, is reinforced more explicitly within the System where well-paid participants, such as Manning and Snowden, signal their willingness to comply (through signed non-disclosure agreements) with the demands of secrecy in the interest of maintaining System Security. Indeed, the language of the intelligence apparatus serves as an unequivocal reminder that security trumps all other concerns, legal or illegal.⁵¹ In the domain of intelligence gathering, for example, those who work within this System understand and accept at least one guiding principle underlying the successful protection of sensitive information: one must have a ‘need to know’ in order to be ‘read on’ (i.e. gain access) to the information that one works with.⁵²

As such, this aspect of the System is certainly not a democracy: that participants are not free to speak of its inner-workings but most forgo some of the rights of citizenship even as national intelligence-gathering practices plainly infringe upon the constitutional rights of the larger nation. The Manning and Snowden cases (and others that have preceded and will likely follow) illustrate a strange paradox: access to highly sensitive secrets confers a kind of power that can be self-destructive. When secrets conflict with ethics, the resulting cognitive dissonance can compromise notions of unquestioned obedience. Yet, the

expectations to maintain unswerving compliance remain. Widespread societal submission to the dictates of the System can confer upon the public an abiding sense of security and peace of mind. It suggests, also, that all is well and that the elite, as usual, have things under control. This kind of necessary conformity to the status quo, Chomsky observes, is well reflected in the media we consume: “The United States is unusual among the industrial democracies in the rigidity of the system of ideological control – “indoctrination” we might say – exercised through the mass media.”⁵³

The filters of protection are generally comprised of privately owned, publicly traded, organizations oriented toward rational market-driven efficiencies and the processing of digital information – the concepts, ideas, and definitions that form the ‘raw materials of news’⁵⁴ fit to print. One can observe the mechanisms of protection that sustain the System embedded in the doctrine of *arcanae imperii* (secrets of the empire). These are reflected in the words, signs, symbols, and actions of right-minded actors at work in various leading institutions. Sheldon Wolin commented on the latest processes of wiretapping, secret surveillance, and extreme interrogation (torture) as an apparent aim to ‘extend the privileged secrecy of foreign policy to domestic affairs.’⁵⁵ Such activities bespeak a kind of paranoia on the part of elites obsessed with controlling leaks to the public and maintaining security classifications for official communications from the distant past so as to shape future readings of history.⁵⁶

Access to the System is guarded by powerful telecommunications companies whose public slogans serve to reinforce the impression, however insincere, that meaningful relationships between consumer and producer are forged through ‘free market’ ideals. Operating with the full weight of corporate power to imbue ‘free market’ with unique stipulated definitions, companies such as Comcast boast, ‘The Future of Awesome.’ Verizon asks, ‘Can you hear me now? Good.’ AT&T reminds consumers, ‘Your world. Delivered.’ Yet, in light of recent counter-intelligence revelations, it is also worth inquiring, to whom in this ‘free market’ is our ‘world’ being delivered, and who exactly is ‘hearing’ what we say? And, yes, the future may appear ‘awesome,’ but from whose perspective? From the perspective of the citizen secure in his or her personal communications, answers to these questions appear rather grim. In clarifying how dark the clouds over public discourse are presently gathered, Robert McChesney observes in a 2014 interview that we no longer have:

... privacy anymore and [large monopolistic corporations] use [our] information to sell to advisors. [...] They work closely with the government and the national security state and the military. They really walk hand-in-hand collecting this information, monitoring people in ways that by all democratic theory are inimical to a free society.⁵⁷

McChesney’s criticisms are verified by recent efforts in the US Congress to eradicate consumer privacy protections that, according to Glenn Greenwald,

‘... free Internet service providers (ISPs) – primarily AT&T, Comcast and Verizon – from the Obama-era FCC regulations barring them from storing and selling their users’ browsing histories without their consent.’⁵⁸ Backed by legions of lawyers campaigning in the corridors of political power for rules that profit their corporate employers, defences for the present System are also fortified by the public’s own participation in social networking and internet commerce where all activities, habits, sentiments, and attitudes are secretly monitored. This contemporary reconfiguration of the ‘free market’ has seen a compelling downward trend in civil freedoms over the years.

7.6 Conclusion

As we have aimed to illustrate in the cases of Manning, Snowden, Assange, and others, the System grants the elite a virtual monopoly over the definition of the acceptable boundaries of public debate and control over the ‘correct’ interpretation of key terms and ideas. This is the power of the System today, to impose upon the general public the designs of corporate, political, and military power, to define dissenters and differences in opinion with the status quo as traitorous, and to consign to the fringe of the public discussion whistleblowers who expose wrongdoing in the interest of the public itself. In these times when the interests of the corporate and political elite have merged, the rights of corporate persons subvert the intrinsic value of individual citizen rights, and mass media have had a direct hand in painting unflattering portraits of figures who call public attention to abuses.

Today, despite the conviction (and clemency) of Manning, Jim Michaels observes that, ‘the country faces threats from thousands of people with access to information and the ability to publish it instantly.’⁵⁹ Whereas corporate media performance today maintains a façade that a System Security Filter has emerged as a safeguard for this post-9/11 era of global capitalism, we propose that the SSF be considered for further discussion as a possible sixth filter for the PM. As the cases of Manning and Snowden show, the public discourse has become a well-managed elite enterprise featuring tight controls over dissenting views and private figures who risk their personal freedoms defending the Constitution against foreign and domestic assaults.

Notes and Bibliography

- ¹ In his final official trip abroad, Barack Obama urged incoming president Trump to regard America as the ‘indispensable nation’. For details of his final speech, visit <https://www.ft.com/content/643f6c9c-af84-11e6-a37c-f4a01f1b0fa1>.

- ² A summary of key details concerning surveillance and government overreach under the PATRIOT Act can be found at <https://www.aclu.org/infographic/surveillance-under-patriot-act>.
- ³ Ben Bagdikian (2004), *The New Media Monopoly*, Boston: Beacon Press, 16.
- ⁴ In rare instances of transparency, mainstream media personalities publicly reveal some of their underlying aims as news presenters. In responding to a perceived threat from President Trump and his habit of circumventing mass media filters to communicate directly to the public, Mika Brzezinski, MSNBC news anchor, observed that ‘...while unemployment and the economy worsens, [Trump] could have undermined the [corporate media] messaging so much that he c[ould] actually control exactly what people think. And that, that is our job.’
- ⁵ Noam Chomsky (2003), *Necessary Illusions: Thought Control in Democratic Societies*, Anansi: Toronto, 3.
- ⁶ Noam Chomsky (1985), *Turning the Tide: US Intervention in Central America and the Struggle for Peace*. London, Pluto, 230; also see Jeffery Klaehn (2002), ‘A Critical Review and Assessment of Herman and Chomsky’s “Propaganda Model”’, *European Journal of Communication*, 177.
- ⁷ In Japan, alternatively, nearly complete dominance over the public discourse has been maintained since the end of World War II by the Liberal Democratic Party, the de facto rulers of the postwar political economy.
- ⁸ Ian Haney-López (2014b), ‘The Dog Whistle Politics of Race, Part II’ Interview with Bill Moyers. *Moyers & Company*, Web. 10 March 2014.
- ⁹ Noam Chomsky (2010), ‘The Corporate Takeover of U.S. Democracy,’ *In These Times*, 3 February 2010. Web. 2 March 2014.
- ¹⁰ Raymond Williams (1976), *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, London: Fontana, 113.
- ¹¹ Edward Herman and Noam Chomsky (1988), *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media.*, New York, Pantheon, xii.
- ¹² Edward Bernays, *Propaganda*. (2005 [1928]), New York, Ig Publishing, 52.
- ¹³ Michael Crozier, Samuel P. Huntington, and Jyoji Watanuki (1975). *The Crisis of Democracy: Report on the Governability of Democracies to the Trilateral Commission*, New York, New York University Press, 113.
- ¹⁴ Noam Chomsky (1989), *Necessary Illusions: Thought Control in Democratic Societies*, Boston, South End Press, 3.
- ¹⁵ It may be no coincidence that George H. W. Bush’s calls for a ‘new world order’ during 1990 began taking shape during his work in the CIA as well as his involvement in the formation of the Trilateral Commission during the mid-1970s.
- ¹⁶ Utilitarian democracy: created to be practical and useful rather than attractive and vacuous. While the abstraction ‘democracy’ tends to hold positive connotations, practices of democratic principles in representative democracies, such as in the United States, are becoming increasingly anti-dem-

ocratic. Widespread public belief in democracy, generally, as a useful and practical way for the masses to engage in government affairs has not prevented elected representatives from acquiescing to their corporate donors. Direct forms of democratic action undertaken by the masses are increasingly seen as utilitarian and, thus, a threat to the representative order.

- ¹⁷ Op cit., Crozier, 76.
- ¹⁸ Denver Nicks (2012), *Private: Bradley Manning, Wikileaks, and the Biggest Exposure of Official Secrets in American History*. Chicago IL, Chicago Review Press, 191.
- ¹⁹ ‘Collateral Murder’ is the title of a segment of leaked footage from Iraq displaying the killing of journalists covering the war. The title appears to be an attempt by Wikileaks to reverse the flow of Orwellian language (i.e. preemptive War is Peace) into the public discourse by using accurate descriptions for the action taken against journalists. It is also worth noting that the title (Collateral Murder) of the leaked segment itself made news because of its honesty, yet the English title can be found in Wikipedia under the innocuous search term ‘July 12, 2007 Baghdad airstrike.’ By its own admission, Wikipedia states that it, ‘has been criticised for allegedly exhibiting systemic bias, presenting a mixture of ‘truths, half-truths, and some falsehood’, and, in controversial topics, being subject to manipulation and spin.’ We let our readers decide whether the Wikipedia appearance of ‘collateral murder’ qualifies as manipulation. A version of the segment can be found here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5rXPrfnU3G0>
- ²⁰ P. J. Crowley (2009), Interview by Matthew Bell. *What Did Bradley Manning Disclose? PRI’s The World*. Web. 21 August 2013.
- ²¹ James Kirchick (2017), ‘When transgender trumps treachery,’ *New York Times*. 29 August. Web. 30 August 2017.
- ²² Barack Obama, ‘Classified National Security Information.’ Executive Order 13526 of December 29, 2009. Section 1.7 1 March 2014.
- ²³ Mike Huckabee (2010), ‘101129 Huckabee at the Reagan Library.’ *Maria Sanchez Show*, 20 November. Web. 3 March 2014.
- ²⁴ Bill O’Reilly (2010), ‘There Are Traitors in America.’ *The O’Reilly Factor*, 29 November. Web. 1 March 2014.
- ²⁵ Barack Obama (2011), ‘Obama_Bradley.3GP’ *Free Bradley Manning Protest*, 21 April. Web. 1 March 2014.
- ²⁶ According to Mediaite’s Evan McMurray, *Time* magazine journalist Michael Grunwald tweeted Saturday night that he was thrilled for the imminent assassination of WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange, a tweet that was deleted just as quickly as it was condemned (18 August 2013).
- ²⁷ Hillary Clinton on Assange can be found at: <https://twitter.com/wikileaks/status/782906224937410562>
- ²⁸ John Bolton, Interview by Bill Hemmer. *Fox News*. 17 December 2013.
- ²⁹ Rick Perry, ‘Snowden: U.S. ‘setting fire to future of the Internet’: NSA leaker chides companies for not protecting customers,’ 10 March 2014, quoted in Mike Ward, *The Houston Chronicle*. Web.

- ³⁰ Michael Hayden, 'Hayden Labels Snowden a "Defector," 11 August 2013, quoted in Emma Caitlin, *Politico*. Web.
- ³¹ Mike Rogers, 'House Intelligence Chairman Hints at Russian Help in Snowden Leaks,' 18 January 2014. *Meet the Press*. Web.
- ³² John Bolton, Interview by Bill Hemmer. *Fox News*. 17 December 2013.
- ³³ Glenn Greenwald and MacAskill, 'NSA Prism program taps in to user data of Apple, Google and others.' *The Guardian*, 7 June 2013.
- ³⁴ Ed Pilkington, 'Declassified NSA files show agency spied on Muhammad Ali and MLK.' *The Guardian*, 26 September 2013.
- ³⁵ Branko Marcetic, 'The FBI's secret war.' *Jacobin*, 31 August 2016.
- ³⁶ Tim Shorrock, 'Main Core: New Evidence Reveals Top Secret Government Database Used in Bush Spy Program,' *Democracy Now*, 25 July 2008.
- ³⁷ Glenn Greenwald and Spencer Ackerman, 'NSA collected US email records in bulk for more than two years under Obama,' *The Guardian*, 27 June 2013.
- ³⁸ Jane Perrone, 'The Echelon spy network,' *The Guardian*, 29 May 2001.
- ³⁹ Edward Herman (2013), 'The Propaganda Model: A Retrospective.' *Against All Reason: Propaganda, Politics, Power*. 9 December. Web. 3 March 2014.
- ⁴⁰ Edward Herman and Noam Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*, New York, Pantheon, 1988, 2.
- ⁴¹ B. Yu, 'Cable Monopoly's Gain is Community Media's Loss: Comcast/Time Warner Cable Merger Threatens Local Voices.' *Fairness & Accuracy In Reporting*. 1 April 2014. Web. 2 April 2014.
- ⁴² Detailed testimony of Klein can be found at: <https://www.eff.org/files/file-node/att/Mark%20Klein%20Unredacted%20Decl-Including%20Exhibits.PDF>
- ⁴³ The full article may be found at: https://www.eff.org/files/filenode/att/presskit/ATT_onepager.pdf
- ⁴⁴ Alex Newman, 'Obama Vows to Bypass Congress and Rule by Decree.' *The New American*, 15 January 2014. Web. 15 July 2014.
- ⁴⁵ Further details of this Executive Order can be found at :<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2012/07/06/executive-order-assignment-national-security-and-emergency-preparedness>
- ⁴⁶ Dianne Feinstein, Interview by Bob Schieffer. 'Sen. Feinstein on Edward Snowden: "The Chase is On."' *Face the Nation*, CBS News. 23 June 2013. Web. 3 March 2014.
- ⁴⁷ Bob Schieffer, Interview by Bob Schieffer. 'Sen. Feinstein on Edward Snowden: "The Chase is On."' *Face the Nation*. CBS News. 23 June 2013 Web. 3 March 2014.
- ⁴⁸ Op cit., Feinstein.
- ⁴⁹ Ibid.
- ⁵⁰ Herbert I. Schiller (1999), 'U.S. as global overlord: Dumbing down, American-style,' *Le Monde Diplomatique*, August 1999.
- ⁵¹ *DHS Instruction Handbook 121-01-007: The Department of Homeland Security Personnel Suitability and Security Program*. June 2009. Accessed 24 May. Web

- ⁵² U.S. Office of Personnel Management. Position Classification Standard for Security Administration Series, GS-0080. December 1987. Web. 24 May.
- ⁵³ Noam Chomsky (1988), *On Language*, New York, The New Press, 8.
- ⁵⁴ Herman and Chomsky (1988), *Manufacturing Consent*, 2.
- ⁵⁵ Sheldon Wolin (2008), *Democracy Inc.: Managed Democracy and the Specter of Inverted Totalitarianism*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 133.
- ⁵⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁷ Robert McChesney (2013), 'Digital Disconnect: Robert McChesney on 'How Capitalism is Turning the Internet Against Democracy,' Interview with Amy Goodman and Juan González, *Democracy Now*. 5 April. Web. 4 March 2014.
- ⁵⁸ Glenn Greenwald (2017), 'To Serve AT&T and Comcast, Congressional GOP Votes to Destroy Online Privacy,' *The Intercept*, 29 July. Web. 29 March 2017.
- ⁵⁹ Jim Michaels, 'Manning Case Redefines Meaning of Traitor.' *USA Today*. Gannett, 30 July 2013. Web. 4 March 2014.