KnE Social Sciences

Knowledge E
enriching | engaging | empowering

Conference Paper

Propaganda Model in the Age of Social Media

Triyono Lukmantoro, Heru Nugroho, and Budiawan

Cultural Studies and Media Program, Graduate Faculty, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Abstract

In 1988, appeared *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* written by Edward Herman and Noam Chomsky. The propaganda model put forward in the book is so influential then gets many responses. The propaganda model is based on years of study that describes how the mass media in the US organize backing for particular interests that dictate state and private actions. In support of these interests, the propaganda model shows it in five filters, namely: (1) scope, converged ownership, owner prosperity, and revenue direction of leading corporation of the mass media; (2) advertising as the foremost foundation of profit of the mass media; (3) media reliance on data delivered by administration, companies and "experts" supported and favored by main informants and representatives of power; (4) "flak" as a method to punish the media; and (5) "anticommunism" as a domestic belief and regulator instrument. At the present time, the propaganda model, which puts mainstream mass media as the main institution of information dissemination, is questionable to its ability. Technologically the internet presence allows for rapid development of social media that provides excellent opportunities for netizens to engage in interactivity and participatory culture. It can be seen in the phenomenon of sending and exchanging messages with a variety of content that can not be controlled by the state or mainstream media companies.

Keywords: Propaganda model, social media, interactivity, participatory culture.

🔓 **OPEN ACCESS**

1. Introduction

The mass media are unlikely to be neutral. The media are always in the vortex of political power and capital. In such situations, all news and content presented by the media must represent the will of the ruling elite. More than that, the media is no more an object of play than anyone who is controlling the state or business corporations. It is very appropriate to say that the media are no more than an instrument to carry out numerous propaganda from parties that are so powerful. Their power to regulate the agenda, and even manipulate social reality, is so easy to do. All of this can happen comfortably because the political elite and business elites have come together to make the media simply become a megaphone that is obedient to them.

Thus, one of the main thoughts puts forward by Edward Herman and Noam Chomsky in their book is so popular, namely *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of Mass Media*. That book was distributed in 1988. This means that in October 2018, the book entered its thirtieth year. The most substantial thing about the work is the concept of propaganda model, which are so popular in media studies, which describe how mass media in the United States (US) organize backing for particular interests that dictate state and private actions. Herman-Chomsky strives to reject all postulates in the democracy which suggest that the media is independent and involved in finding and reporting the truth. It is true that, ideally, media does not merely reflect the world from the point of view of those in power. But, is this really good really able thing to be realized in a democratic political system?

To answer these fundamental problems, Herman-Chomsky put forward a propaganda model that outlines how the fabric of political and business power places the media only as tools to voice their interests. Interventions are not done roughly but through the selection of right-minded personnel. In addition, the intervention was also carried out through the editors and internalization of journalists working on the priorities and definitions of news values that adhere to the policies of state institutions and business corporations. More explicitly, Herman-Chomsky put forward five filters that work in the propaganda model, namely: (1) scope, converged ownership, owner prosperity, and revenue direction of leading corporation of the mass media; (2) advertising as the foremost foundation of profit of the mass media; (3) media reliance on data delivered by administration, companies and "experts" supported and favored by main informants and representatives of power; (4) "flak" as a method to punish the media; and (5) "anticommunism" as a domestic belief and regulator instrument.

These five filters in the propaganda model make the agreement in a democratic system able to run. The interesting thing to reveal is the concept of "manufacturing consent" was derived from the statement put forward by Walter Lippmann about "manufacture of consent" in relation to the formation of public opinion (Lippmann 1922/1988: 248). There are two important things that can be recorded in this domain. First, for Lippmann and Herman-Chomsky, a consensus in the democracy is not natural or just happens. There are various parties who can carry out manipulation for the formation of public opinion which is considered an agreement in democracy. It's just that there is a strong impression that for Lippmann the agreement is more static. In this connection, the consensus is the result or effect that will become a mere product in democracy. Meanwhile, the consensus for Herman-Chomsky is dynamic and constantly changes. Consensus itself is not a product, but a process that never stops in democracy. Second, for Lippmann,

public opinion which considered as a reference for a consensus in the democracy does not involve the media. That consensus occurs through public communication without being mediated by media forces. On the contrary, for Herman-Chomsky, the media actually has such an important power in the formation of public opinion. In addition, the media position for Herman-Chomsky does not accommodate the interests of all parties but merely serves as a servant for political elites and business corporations.

When Herman-Chomsky highlighted how the media, in fact, did not act fairly in creating consensus, then at the same time the two writers were disarming or dismantling the market model that regulates the operation of the media that is so praised in democracy. In the market model, things that get emphasis are the needs of society can be fulfilled through an exchange process that is relatively unregulated. Everything is based on the dynamics of demand and supply. This market model also places media as other products and services. There are a number of advantages of the market model, namely: (1) the market promotes efficiency; (2) the market promotes responsiveness; (3) the market promotes flexibility; (4) the market is able to encourage various innovations; and (5) the market is able to position the media as other products. However, the market also has a number of limitations, namely: (1) the market is not democratic; (2) the market reproduces injustice; (3) the market is immoral; (4) the market does not have the obligation to meet social needs; and (5) the market is not required to fulfill democratic needs (Croteau and Hoynes 2006: 15-40).

Thus, the market does have a bright side, but behind it, all markets actually have an extraordinary dark side. In fact, for Herman-Chomsky, the market and the mechanisms considered creating justice are mere nonsense. All things that are good in the market are nothing more than exaggerated myths. The two authors precisely show how the dark sides of the media market have destroyed democracy and various political expectations directed at public participation. Media that is trapped in the market model or mechanism is no more a money machine for investors who reside comfortably behind the media policies. The media are also no more than a loudspeaker for politicians who control aspects of public life. In the end, the media merely preserves dominant ideas. This shows that the media have failed to become a battle area for various thoughts that have been promised by the market model itself.

When read with two conflicting theoretical perspectives, namely liberal-pluralist versus Marxist, Herman-Chomsky is so firmly in the last stream. In liberal-pluralism, there is an assumption that the media is the fourth pillar of democracy, which presupposes the media is independent of the government. This perspective is strongly rejected by the Marxist paradigm. Media is nothing but the mouthpiece of the parties in power (Carey

1979; Curran, Gurevitch, and Woollacott in Gurevitch, Bennett, Curran, and Woollacott, eds. 1982/2005: 6-25). This clearly shows that Herman-Chomsky is completely dubious, even distrustful, of all liberal-pluralist assumptions that assert that the media is a market for various competing ideas, guard dogs for the public interest, means of criticism and control for those in power and, moreover, the media is the fourth pillar of democracy. Because, according to them, the media simply fell as mere instruments for those in power.

There is such a strong impression that Herman-Chomsky is in orthodox Marxism which asserts that production relations form the economic structure of society. This is what then becomes the real foundation for the emergence of the legal and political superstructure related to certain forms of social awareness. More explicitly can be stated that the general features of social, political, and spiritual life processes are determined by the way of production in real life. In this connection, Marx explicitly asserts that it is not existence determined by human consciousness, but, rather, human consciousness is determined by its social existence (Marx 1904: 11-13). It was this thinking of orthodox Marxism that was so clearly visible in the propaganda model put forward by Herman-Chomsky. All economic-related calculations, such as the proprietorship of the structure of media and advertising as the core revenue for the media, are the key things focused. It is true that Herman-Chomsky added about the role of experts, intervention through legal channels, and anti-communism ideology as a secular religion that also determines media performance. However, the style of vulgar Marxism thinking is very visible in the propaganda model. Through the Marxist perspective, Herman-Chomsky is also plunged into pessimism about how the media is nothing more than a tool for the ruling elites.

Media professionals in the propaganda model are no more than mere accomplices of the ruling elites. They seemed unable to say something different from the authorities. They, more than that, may not be able to carry out resistance. In other words, media professionals are among conspiracy victims. The reason is that in such situations there are a group of people who act in secret and full of secret with evil desires. In fact, in that situation, there are also secret societies that play a role in managing all life scenarios (Hodapp and Von Kannon 2008; Heins 2007; Moore 2018). This shows that the propaganda model, which is heavily influenced by the orthodoxy of Marxism, merely confirms that there is such a large power that media professionals cannot resist. What they can do is simply submit, obey, and carry out whatever is desired by the ruling elites. Media professionals have died and been destroyed in the current economic structure. They are nothing more than robots that have high automatic power to follow all the commands commanded by masters who are abundant in power.

Overall, it can also be stated that the propaganda concept put forward by Herman-Chomsky follows the thinking pattern proposed by Lippmann (1922/1988) which states that propaganda is so determined by a group of people who are able to prevent independent access to certain events. This group of people then organizes the news according to their purpose. These people can use their power to control the public to see things in accordance with the perspective they want. In addition, Herman-Chomsky was also influenced by the thinking of Ellul (1973: 59) who argued that propaganda must be carried out covertly. Various maneuvers that took place in the propaganda were obscured by screens of various protective words from the public. Using the perspective of Lippmann and Ellul, Herman-Chomsky views media as nothing more than an instrument that works in compliance. Moreover, media professionals are involved in an evil conspiracy to deceive the public. Media workers cunningly deliberately involve themselves in voicing various interests of elites who control the power of the state and business corporations.

It's just that there are sharp criticisms that can be directed at the propaganda model by referring to two things. First, the propaganda model is present when the mass media is so dominant in scheduling the interests of the ruling elites. This shows that information and communication technology is still so limited. There are only a few parties capable of being involved in media management. The public or anyone who is very small in number has the opportunity to be involved in managing the media, especially making alternative media to run the resistance. Secondly, the emergence of the internet as information and communication technology, which is not really taken into account in the propaganda model, has become a force that seriously challenges the centralistic and anti-democratic style of politics. The internet, which is accompanied by the emergence of social media, provides an open opportunity for the public to participate in accordance with their own agenda. A propaganda model that is linear, hierarchical, and one-way in conveying messages to audiences gets an open challenge. Thus, the purpose of writing this paper is a criticism of the propaganda model in the era of social media.

The method used in this paper is a literature review that presents an objective study, displays an overview of certain reading materials, and shows a critical analysis of the research and non-research literature being studied. The purpose of using the literature review is to show the latest references to carry out further studies. Through reviewing the literature, various contradictions and gaps in the knowledge being studied can also be displayed. Thus, this writing method is able to create a new dimension or a fresh perspective that is able to make different contributions (Cronin, Ryan, and Coughlan 2008; Jesson, Matheson, and Lacey 2011; Van Wee and Banister 2016). What's more,

the matter examined in this paper is a theory that has caused controversy to date. A literature review is relevant to be used in discussing propaganda models to show basic assumptions, advantages, and disadvantages contained in the theory.

2. Result and discussion

The propaganda model put forward by Herman-Chomsky is present when the internet has not developed widely. So, when such an internet allows more interactive or two-way message delivery patterns to occur, criticism must also be directed at the propaganda model. The internet allows for more interactive communication. Media corporations no longer play a dominant role in delivering messages to the public. Communication that was originally unidirectional (one-way) was able to change to bidirectional (two-way), and even multidirectional (many directions). The mass media, thus, is no longer the only force that determines the direction of communication. The internet, as a new media, can also play an important role in communication involving various parties, such as the state elite, media corporate control holders, and the public itself.

Not that Herman-Chomsky is unaware of the presence and strength of the internet that is so important. In the second edition of the *Manufacturing Consent* which was published in 2002, they argued that the internet and new communication technologies had been able to solve the various barriers that occur in journalism and open interactive democratic media that was unexpected. They also understand that the internet can improve the efficiency and scope of individual and group networks. One of the phenomenal examples put forward by Herman-Chomsky was the success of Indonesian students in overthrowing the Soeharto dictatorship in 1998. The use of the internet in momentum was able to produce global publicity and attention that had important consequences. However, for Herman-Chomsky, the internet is still considered a tool that has limitations. Various information access needs, said Herman-Chomsky, were not able to be met by the tool. Various databases available on the internet cannot meet public needs. The internet is not a communication instrument for anyone who does not have a popular name. Herman-Chomsky emphasized that only commercial organizations were able to utilize the internet.

Herman himself expressed almost the same opinion that the internet as a new technology could actually exacerbate existing problems. It is true that democratic-style communication can be created by a variety of new technologies. It's just that there is little reason for the realization of that hope if the internet still serves market objectives that are not democratic. On the other hand, when the ideology of anticommunism has been

deemed irrelevant to its time, there is even greater ideological power, namely trust in the "market miracle" (Herman 2000). Apparently, Herman was still clinging to the original idea of the propaganda model. The internet is indeed recognized as having the ability to carry out democratization in communication. However, the threat of commercialization carried out by market players made Herman still pessimistic. Likewise, ideas that are hostile to communism, according to him, are so easily broken by the beliefs of state officials of various miracles or mechanisms that take place in the market.

Herman-Chomsky's way of thinking about the development of new technology in communication is very dominant in the political economy perspective. This is a perspective that asserts that the fabric between economics and politics cannot be separated from each other. The symptoms that arise in the political realm are a reflection of economic interests. Conversely, impact in the political world results in the economic order that is developing in society. However, the political economy perspective put forward by Herman-Chomsky is different from the critical political economy adopted by the Frankfurt School thinkers. Although both use Marxism, the Frankfurt School does not fall on economic determinism. It can be read in how they highlight the issue regarding "cultural claims and consciousness" (Babe 2009). In contrast, Herman-Chomsky still insists on a view that is characterized by economistic or economic determinism. Thus, the problem of the internet as a propaganda instrument for those in power is also regarded as only an economic problem.

This is very visible when Herman-Chomsky considers that internet, and several other novel communication technologies, are nothing more than serving various market interests. In a market mechanism that only counts on supply-demand, of course, the parties that determine the game are those who are rich and powerful. The internet, in Herman-Chomsky's assessment, is only an expansion of various business expansions from media capitalists. In that situation, the internet is positioned as an instrument for carrying out horizontal integration. That is the phenomenon when a media company buys various types of media and then its ownership is concentrated on a variety of different types of media (Mosco 2009; Croteau, Hoynes, and Milan 2011). For example, a media company owner has mastered the book industry, newspapers, magazines, radio, and television. The presence of the internet is used to expand its business by establishing online-based news media. In fact, the internet is also used to unite the various media platforms that are indeed different. Thus, there is integration in the reporting of all media under its control. The internet is a technological tool that extends the power of media businessmen.

In addition to criticism of the Marxist orthodoxy applied by Herman-Chomsky in the propaganda model, there is a number of criticisms and applications from the theoretical perspective. In the political context in Uganda, Central Africa, for example, the media did not highlight the relative lack of application of civil rights, abuse of army power, the implications of implementing human rights from US assistance to Ugandan government policies, and the history of Western relations with Uganda. The media pay more attention to humanitarian issues. Overall it can be concluded that the propaganda model is proven in this case (Ecke 2012). In other aspects, the propaganda model is considered to privilege structural factors that determine news choices propagated, and thus avoid themselves or marginalize aspects of intentionality. Another filter that can be included in this context is the takeover of all wealth (buy out) found in the journalists or their publications by intelligence and organizations that have interests. This "sixth filter" can offset the misuse of non-routine operational standard procedures (Boyd-Barrett 2004).

Another highlight of the propaganda model is its perspective which is considered too deterministic in treating media behavior. In this connection, the interesting thing that remains worth talking about is the role of the media in carrying out hegemonic roles that lead to legitimacy, political accommodation, and ideological management (Klaehn 2002). The next study shows that it is false if the dominant media are so easily given up on political power and business corporations. Through a satire event that shows humor displayed in dominant media, precisely, various discourses and dominant ideologies remain capable of being dismantled (Anderson and Kincaid 2013). In the context of the general elections in Kenya, the phenomenon that occurs shows that media owners and journalists who take part in the "peaceful journalism" training actually over-run self-censorship to avoid post-election violence. The main symptom that can be raised is that training that emphasizes peace values is instead translated as "peaceful propaganda". Thus, the reporting filter pertaining to official sources of news and flak contained in the propaganda model is proven in this case (Maweu 2017). Despite having received sharp criticisms, the propaganda model is still able to provide important theoretical and methodological perspectives in media studies. In addition, contemporary capitalist societies can be understood by using propaganda model as their analytical tool (Mullen 2010; Mullen and Klaehn 2010).

The next problem that deserves to be revealed is that Herman-Chomsky deliberately ignored and underestimated the presence of the internet as an alternative to fighting the power. Dominant media for them is considered the best power to present various ideas from the authorities. Ironically, they do not provide a way out of how to carry out resistance to power through the dominant media itself. In fact, it must be admitted

that the age of mass media is an era of darkness. Conversely, the internet era, the digital period, or the period of interactivity are times that can be distinguished from the previous time (Holmes 2005). It's just that, Herman-Chomsky is still so fascinated with the era of mass media that is full of darkness and contrary to democratic values. They deliberately fell on pessimism and endless despair. Another substantial aspect that Herman-Chomsky deliberately marginalizes is that the internet, besides enabling interactivity and not linearity, is its ability to present one-to-many patterns of message delivery, few people to many parties (few-to-many), many people to many people (many-to-many), and one person to one person (one-to-one) (Fuchs 2008). This shows that the internet is able to create a very diverse message delivery pattern in accordance with the wishes of its users who indeed have many different interests.

More than just a technical issue of the internet, which does have its own uniqueness and superiority over the mass media, there is a political resistance that can be carried out with this new media. This shows that the internet is able to accommodate political activism. Internet users can take part in expressions of resistance and disgust. In addition, the internet has abilities to distract business programs and militarism through the creation of unrestricted networks, new disagreement spaces, and movements. There are other capabilities from the internet, namely to simply boost critical media studies, dispute, and new configuration of journalistic communities. All of these are revolutionary forces made possible by internet presence (Kahn and Kellner 2004). Of course, the internet can be positioned as a new public space even though there is a side that limits and loosens it. First, data storage and the capacity to get data back from internet-based technologies have encouraged political dialogue with information on the other side that is not available. This in unison with the injustice of access to information and new media learning compromises the representation of virtual space. Second, internet-based technologies allow far-flung people to run discussions. But, often the internet fragments political conversation. Third, internet-based technologies will align themselves with the prevailing political culture rather than creating a political culture that is entirely new in the patterns of global capitalism. (Papacharissi 2002). So, the internet is not merely seen as pessimistic as an expansion of the capitalists who own the media or even the market arena that inhibits democracy. Indeed, the internet is not the perfect medium for carrying out political activism or as a public space. But, the internet is better than the dominant media that only presents political darkness and merely becomes a propaganda instrument for the ruling elites.

The one form of political interactivity can be listened to in the presence of social media. In fact, social media is indeed synonymous with engaging interactive participation from its users. Social media is a realization of the interactive era, which is very contrary to the broadcast age. A special feature of the media in the broadcasting era is that it is almost exclusively centered on a single entity, such as a radio or television station, a newspaper company, or a film company studio, which distributes messages to many people. With the emergence of digital and mobile technology, greater scale interactions are easy to implement. Interactivity is also an important feature of this new media (Manning in Harvey, ed. 2014: 1158-1161). Interactivity refers to communicative links that occur fairly quickly from one party to another. Messages that initially experience delays can immediately be overcome. This is what makes new media have social characteristics, namely the exchange of messages can take place more immediately and more and more people are involved in it.

Other characteristics contained in social media are: (1) information and cognition, which means that social media allows the flow of information and the introduction of the device itself as a social activity; (2) communication, which indicates that social media is a site for reciprocal processes between at least two people, which involves the exchange of symbols and all partners involved in the interaction give meanings to these symbols; (3) community, which shows that communication that occurs on social media is not just social relations, but involves common equality or friendship; and (4) collaboration and cooperative work, which shows that the messages displayed on social media are shared work (Fuchs 2014: 4-5). All these characteristics show that togetherness is the most substantial value that occurs in social media. Through social media, there are not only encounters between various parties, but also conversations and even political battles.

One of the most important examples of cases that the dominant media cannot accommodate is how citizens tell stories about ongoing political events. When Greece was hit by the financial crisis in 2009, for example, Facebook could be considered as a grassroots channel that was so powerful to present the story of an extraordinary social-political upheaval. Facebook is a medium that has its own uniqueness in narrating these events (Georgalou 2015). Likewise, when Greek politicians were involved in the conflict regarding the crisis, it was also known how the formation of narratives and resemiotizations of citizens was displayed on Facebook (Georgakopoulou 2014). The stories of Facebook users about the financial crisis in Greece are one example of how political narratives are presented in social media. Thus, those little stories cannot possibly be presented in full in the dominant media.

The narratives are nothing but various status updates on Facebook. In this context, narratives are understood as "small stories" that capture all the various narrative activities that are not represented in large or canonical narratives. What is referred to as small stories are events that have just happened or are taking place so the little stories contain pieces of experience and appear as needs to be shared or perhaps pieces of gossip that are considered unattractive. These little stories, even in everyday language, can be regarded as something completely meaningless. For outsiders, small stories involving various parties that interact contain "about things that are not important". It's just that, in this context, the little stories are not understood as the subject matter that is whole or not at all, but rather as more or less. These little stories can also include various interactive oriented narrative momentum (Georgakopoulou 2006; Bamberg and Georgakopoulou 2008; De Fina and Georgakopoulou 2008). Small stories in the form of various statuses on Facebook are narratives formed by the participation of netizens who are involved in multi-directional communication.

The various conversations that took place on Facebook did not only create free narratives and were apart from the netizen's political interests. In relation to political changes that occur in an authoritarian regime, Facebook has a functional contribution, namely being able to create an infinite communication network that involves the international community and the power it has to gather citizens in sharing information for a particular reason; expand influence on audiences with increasingly large sizes; socially binding among users through sharing information that is both personal and collective; accelerate information exchange; and can encourage its users to use anonymous identity, especially for the public who want to present various oppositional views (Muller and Hubner 2014). These symptoms indicate that Facebook is not just a means to display things that are not important or empty. The various statuses are written on Facebook, which forms various simple and spontaneous narratives; also have political expressions which contain resistance as well.

Another successful example of using the internet or social media to fight against political regimes can be put forward in cases in Egypt and Syria. In this historical event, cyberwars took place between the ruling parties and various opposition groups, in the 2011 rebellion, which battled narratives, pictures, and symbols to win loyalty or prevent the crossing of leaders and ordinary citizens. During the Egyptian and Syrian rebellions, cyber activists developed and mobilized new forms of grassroots propaganda through various social media platforms to plan, organize, inspire, persuade, motivate, and continue massive efforts to reshape society, while protect (or minimize) violations of the basic rights of everyone to determine themselves, freedom of expression, and respect

for individual dignity. Grassroots propaganda here refers to the process of information or messages from the bottom up, decentralized, from many parties to many parties, interactive, and opening boundaries between information producers and information consumers (Khamis, Gold and Vaughn 2013). Propaganda that has been carried out by the rulers through dominant media that emphasizes the nature of communication in a direct, vertical and hierarchical manner, but at this time can be balanced through grassroots propaganda that is carried out through social media.

Facebook as a social media has demonstrated its capacity to eliminate boundaries between users as producers and consumers. In addition, Facebook has not only transformed activities into participation. Technologically, it shows how in a cultural context it has occurred that every person and group is able to do reappropriation, adjustment actions, with a developing technological field. In this position, Facebook is able to become a new public space for its users (Mazali 2011). Indeed, so far there have been two arguments that cast doubt on the role of social media in political life. First, social media is not effective in carrying out political change. Second, social media also has a disadvantage in the democratization effort itself because a repressive government will use the media to carry out repression of voices that are different from the government (Shirky 2011). In addition, even if the government is not repressive, Facebook is unable to provide alternative public space for political actors who appear in the mainstream media. In fact, political actors who often appear in the dominant media can attract the attention of their fans on social media. More than that, the online public on Facebook is actually fragmented and grouped in homogeneous political groups (Batorski and Grzywinska 2018). Even though Facebook as a social media still shows various weaknesses to be used as a public space, but at least alternative spaces for carrying out political activism are already available. Grouping features that show a tendency towards homogenization of thoughts and statements are inevitable political phenomena in online media.

The phenomenon of social media that has failed to become a public space and has fallen into rooms for people who have similar thoughts to reaffirm the political views that they already have is called echo chambers (Sunstein 2007 and 2017; Jamieson and Capella 2008). Social media is not an area to carry out political discussions or rational debate. Social media is only as comfortable spaces for individuals to confine themselves to a narrow attitude that is not willing to accept differences of view. At the momentum of the general election, for example, Facebook pages became exclusive rooms. Users who share the same views often comment separately, share, and post pages of individuals who share similar thoughts. Interactions that cross ideological sorting can be ignored (Gromping 2014). Similar symptoms also occurred among Twitter

users in the momentum of the Presidential Elections in the United States in 2016 which showed a level of significant political homogeneity and opinion leadership which created homogeneous communities (Guo, Rohde, and Wu 2018). In this political event, it can also be seen how YouTube users have also experienced a split, namely the feeling of joy in relation to emotional variation and sadness and fear to play important roles in emotional convergence (Hilbert, Ahmed, Cho, Liu, and Luu 2018). This shows, again, that social media plays a more important role in emphasizing emotional strength than rational power in decisive political momentum.

Another threat of social media presence comes from the interests of the political economy, which refers to how exploitation actually occurs when netizens use media that are considered democratic. Social media is driven by the emergence of content created by the user (*user-generated content*) and social networking platforms that can be freely accessed that produce because of the presence of online advertising. This is similar to what happens to mass media, such as television and radio, which carry out accumulation strategies employed by capital as well. It's just that what sets it apart is that the phenomenon is called a public commodity, which means that the public is sold to advertisers, in conventional mass media. Meanwhile, audience commodities on social media are those users who are content; in which user-generated content takes place, which means that users are involved in enduring inventive activities, interaction, public formation and content-creation (Fuchs 2010). A similar problem that occurs among Facebook users is the privacy and surveillance practices carried out by social media. The accumulation of capital on Facebook is carried out on the commodification of its users and the data they have. This is what is called the exploitation of prosumer internet commodities. Sharing practices that occur on Facebook are euphemisms of sales and commodification of data. Facebook commercializes data of behavior user. This simply proves that Facebook does not make the world better, but only becomes a world as a commercialized place, as befits a large shopping mall without an exit (Fuchs 2012). In this context, what Herman-Chomsky feared and criticized about market domination did occur.

Another dark side of social media or the internet is the space for hateful expressions directed at certain groups, especially minorities. The presence of cloaked websites, which are sites that are intentionally published by individuals and groups that hide their authorship to intentionally hide the covert political agenda. These sites are deliberately used to disguise cyber-racism by white supremacists (Daniels 2009). Not only that, but a number of fake Facebook pages are also disguised as belonging to radical Muslims who deliberately incite chauvinistic and anti-Muslim reactions as this also happens with

regard to sentiments to evacuees and immigrants in Denmark (Farkas, Schou, and Neu-mayer 2017). The bad thing that is also practiced through Facebook is the emergence of false identities that create and maintain antagonistic and racist discourses, such as Muslim extremists living in Denmark, deliberately conspiring to kill and rape citizens. That is the realization of the practices of antagonism between ethnocultural identities produced through fictitious social media accounts (Farkas, Schou, and Neumayer 2017). In fact, when a young Syrian refugee, Alan Kurdi, died and his body was stranded on the beach made an object of ridicule through comments and visual jokes (Topinka 2018). The practices of racism and harassment of minority identities are easily carried out through social media. The reason is that anonymity and identity forgery are so easily carried out through the media that relies on the participation of its users.

3. Conclusion

The propaganda model proposed by Herman-Chomsky has contributed a lot in media studies. Not only is that, on the macro level, the propaganda model able to sharply portray the state of contemporary capitalist society controlled by a handful of state elites and business corporations. Through the political economy perspective that they used, Herman-Chomsky radically criticized how the dominant mass media in the United States merely became an instrument or megaphone for propaganda carried out by the parties in power. Only, the two writers then fell into a dogmatic attitude by using the orthodox view of classical Marxism. Economics, in this case, the calculations of owner-ship and media business, is considered a determinant factor in politics. The economy is placed as a basis that determines politics. Meanwhile, politics is only regarded as an economic superstructure. In such situations, powerful elites who control the media are automatically able to determine ideological developments that are permitted or prohibited from broadcasting. Even worse, Herman-Chomsky did not see the possibility of resistance carried out by media professionals who were considered having been the engines of capital power.

The worst thing from Herman-Chomsky's economic-political dogmatism is that the emergence of new communication technologies, in this case, the internet, is only seen as an expansion of media business interests. The internet or new media is considered the best way for media capitalists to carry out horizontal integration which enables them to control diverse types of media. Pessimism about the presence of new media also appears in their view that the internet is ultimately subject to market calculations. Herman-Chomsky ignores the presence of the internet which provides opportunities

for the proliferation of activism that can provide resistance to the ruling elites. In other political situations, the internet or new media can be viewed more optimistically as new public spaces for netizens. Through the new media, interactivity and citizen participation can be carried out. Discussions and debates are very likely to take place there. In fact, more than that, new media can generate grassroots propaganda which is an open resistance for anyone who exercises power in a repressive manner. It must be realized that social media, in the end, becomes a comfortable place for anyone to group. Netizens form groups that share similar views to affirm the political views that they have believed. Social media that can provide opportunities for hiding the identity of its users (anonymity) is used to express hatred and racism for minority groups. Social media users who are positioned as prosumer are exploited for profit. The privacy of users is monitored or spied on, so their data is processed into commodities.

References

[1] Anderson, J. and A.D. Kincaid (2013). "Media Subservience and Satirical Subversiveness*: The Daily Show*, *The Colbert Report*, the Propaganda Model and the Paradox of Parody." *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 171-188. DOI: 10.1080/15295036.2013.771276.

[2] Babe, R.E. (2009). *Cultural Studies and Political Economy: Toward A New Integration*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

[3] Bamberg, M. and A. Georgakopoulou (2008). "Small Stories as a New Perspective in Narrative and Identity Analysis." *Text & Talk*, Vol. 28, No. 3, pp. 377-396. DOI: 10.1515/*TEXT*.2008.018.

[4] Batorski, D. and I. Grzywinska (2018). "Three Dimensions of the Public Sphere on Facebook." *Information, Communication & Society*, Vol 21, No. 3, pp. 356-374. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2017.1281329.

[5] Boyd-Barrett, O. (2004). "Judith Miller, *the New York Times*, and the Propaganda Model." *Journalism Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 435-449. DOI: 10.1080/14616700412331296383.

[6] Carey, J. (1979). "Book Reviews: Mass Communication and Society." *Media, Culture and Society*, Vol. 1, pp. 313-321.

[7] Cronin, P., F. Ryan, and M. Coughlan (2008). "Undertaking a Literature Review: A Step-by-step Approach." *British Journal of Nursing*, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 38-43.

[8] Croteau, D. and W. Hoynes (2006). *The Business of Media: Corporate Media and the Public Interest*. Thousand Oaks, California. Pine Forge Press.

[9] Croteau, D., W. Hoynes, and S. Milan (2011). *Media/Society: Industries, Images, and Audiences 4th Edition*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

[10] Curran, J., M. Gurevitch, and J. Woollacott (1982/2005). "The Study of the Media: Theoretical Approaches." Pp. 6-25 dalam *Culture, Society and the Media*, edited by M. Gurevitch, T. Bennett, J. Curran, and J. Woollacott. New York and London: Routledge.

[11] Daniels, J. (2009). "Cloaked Websites: Propaganda, Cyber-Racism and Epistemology in the Digital Era." *New Media & Society*, Vol. 11, No. 5, pp. 659-683. DOI: 10.1177/1461444809105345.

[12] De Fina, A. and A. Georgakopoulou (2008). "Analysing Narratives as Practice." *Qualitative Research*, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 379-387. DOI: 10.1177/1468794106093634.

[13] Ecke, J. (2012). "Manufacturing Consent in the Age of Youtube: The Case of Kony 2012." *The Interdisciplinary Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 131-144.

[14] Ellul, J. (1973). *Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

[15] Farkas, J., J. Schou, and C. Neumayer (2017). "Cloaked Facebook Pages: Exploring Fake Islamist Propaganda in Social Media." *New Media & Society*, pp. 1-18. DOI: 10.1177/1461444817707759.

[16] Farkas, J., J. Schou, and C. Neumayer (2018). "Platformed Antagonism: Racist Discourse on Fake Muslim Facebook Pages." *Critical Discourse Studies*, pp. 1-18. DOI:10.1080/17405904.2018.1450276.

[17] Fuchs, C. (2008). *Internet and Society: Social Thery in the Information Age*. New York and London: Routledge.

[18] Fuchs, C. (2010). "Class, Knowledge and New Media." *Media, Culture & Society*, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 141-150. DOI: 10.1177/0163443709350375.

[19] Fuchs, C. (2012). "The Political Economy of Privacy on Facebook." *Television & New Media*, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 139-159. DOI: 10.1177/1527476411415699.

[20] Fuchs, C. (2014). *Social Media: A Critical Introduction*. London: Sage Publications.

[21] Georgakopoulou, A. (2006). "The Other Side of the Story: Towards a Narrative Analysis of Narrative-in-Interaction." *Discourse Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 235-257. DOI: 10.1177/1461445606061795.

[22] Georgakopoulou, A. (2014). "Small Stories Transposition and Social Media: A Micro Perspective on the 'Greek Crisis'." *Discourse & Society*, Vol. 25, No. 4, pp. 519-539. DOI: 10.1177/0957926514536963.

[23] Georgalou, M. (2015). "Small Stories of the Greek Crisis on Facebook." *Social Media + Society*, July-December, pp. 1-15. DOI: 10.1177/2056305115605859.

[24] Gromping, M. (2014). "'Echo Chambers': Partisan Facebook Groups during the 2014 Thai Election." *Asia Pacific Media Educator*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 39-59. DOI: 10.1177/1326365X14539185.

[25] Guo, L., J. A. Rohde, and D. Wu (2018). "Who is Responsible for Twitter's Echo Chamber Problem? Evidence from 2016 U.S. Election Networks." *Information, Communication & Society*, pp. 1-18. DOI: 10.1080/1369118X.2018.1499793.

[26] Heins, V. (2007). "Critical Theory and the Traps of Conspiracy Thinking." *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, Vol. 33, No. 7, pp. 787-801. DOI: 10.1177/0191453707081675.

[27] Herman, E.S. and N. Chomsky (1988). *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of Mass Media*. New York: Pantheon Books.

[28] Herman, E.S. and N. Chomsky (2002). *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of Mass Media 2nd Edition*. New York: Pantheon Books.

[29] Herman, E.S. (2000). "The Propaganda Model: A Retrospective." *Journalism Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 101-112, https://doi.org/10.1080/146167000361195.

[30] Hilbert, M., S. Ahmed, J. Cho, B. Liu, and J. Luu (2018). "Communicating with Algorithms: A Transfer Entropy Analysis of Emotions-based Escapes from Online Echo Chambers. *Communication Method and Measures*, pp. 1-16. DOI: 10.1080/19312458.2018.1479843.

[31] Hodapp, C. and A. Von Kannon (2008). *Conspiracy Theories & Secret Societies for Dummies*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Publishing.

[32] Holmes, D. (2005). *Communication Theory: Media, Technology, Society*. London: Sage Publications.

[33] Jamieson, K.H. and J.N. Capella (2008). *Echo Chamber: Rush Limbaugh and the Conservative Media Establishment*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

[34] Jesson, J.K., L. Matheson, and F.M. Lacey (2011). *Doing Your Literature Review: Traditional and Systematic Techniques*. London: SAGE.

[35] Kahn, R. and D. Kellner (2004). "New Media and Internet Activism: from the 'Battle of Seattle' to Blogging." *New Media & Society*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 87-95. DOI:10.1177/1461444804039908

[36] Khamis, S., P.B. Gold, and K. Vaughn (2013). "Propaganda in Egypt and Syria's "Cyberwars": Contexts, Actors, Tools, and Tactics." Pp. 418-438 dalam *The Oxford Handbook of Propaganda Studies*, edited by Jonathan Auerbach and Russ Castronovo. NewYork, NY: Oxford University Press.

[37] Klaehn, J. (2002). "A Critical Review and Assessment of Herman and Chomsky's 'Propaganda Model'." *European Journal of Communication*, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 147-182.

[38] Lippmann, W. (1922/1998). *Public Opinion*. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers.

[39] Manning, J. (2014). "Social Media, Definition and Classes of." Pp. 1158-1161 dalam *Encyclopedia of Social Media and Politics: Volume 3*, edited by Kerric Harvey. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

[40] Marx, K. (1904). *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, translated frm the second edition of Germany by N.I. Stone. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company.

[41] Mazali, T. (2011). "Social Media as a New Public Sphere." *Leonardo*, Vol. 44, No. 3, pp. 290-291.

[42] Moore, A. (2018). "Conspiracies, Conspiracy Theories and Democracy." *Political Studies Review*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 2-12. DOI: 10.1111/1478-9302.12102.

[43] Mullen, A. (2010). "Twenty Years on: The Second-Order Prediction of the Herman Chomsky Propaganda Model." *Media, Culture, & Society*, Vol. 32, No. 4, pp. 673-690. DOI: 10.1177/0163443710367714.

[44] Mullen, A. and J. Klaehn (2010). "The Herman-Chomsky Propaganda Model: A Critical Approach to Analysing Mass Media Behaviour." *Sociology Compass*, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 215-229. DOI: 10.1111/j.1751-9020.2010.00275.x.

[45] Maweu, J. (2017). ""Peace Propaganda"? The Application of Chomsky's Propaganda Model to the *Daily Nation*'s Coverage of the 2013 Kenyan Elections." *Communicatio*, Vol. 43, No. 2, pp. 168-186, DOI: 10.1080/02500167.2017.1319873.

[46] Mosco, V. (2009). *The Political Economy of Communication 2nd Edition*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

[47] Muller, M.G. and C. Hubner (2014). "How Facebook Facilitated the Jasmine Revolution. Conceptualizing the Functions of Online Social Network Communication." *Journal of Social Media Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 17-33. DOI: 10.15340/214733661183.

[48] Papacharissi, Z. (2002). "The Virtual Sphere: The Internet as a Public Sphere." *New Media & Society*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 9-27.

[49] Shirky, C. (2011). "The Political Power of Social Media: Technology, the Public Sphere, and Political Change." *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 90, No. 1, pp. 28-41.

[50] Sunstein, C.R (2007). *Republic.com 2.0*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

[51] Sunstein, C.R. (2017). *#republic: Divided Democracy in the Age of Social Media*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

[52] Topinka, R.J. (2018). "Politically Incorrect Participatory Media: Racist Nationalism on r/ImGoingToHellForThis." *New Media & Society*, Vol. 20, No. 5, pp. 2050-2069. DOI: 10.1177/1461444817712516.

[53] Van Wee, B. and D. Banister (2016). "How to Write a Literature Review Paper?" *Transport Reviews*, Vol. 36, No. 2, pp. 278-288. DOI: 10.1080/01441647.2015.1065456.