

Why America's Major News-Media Must Change Their Thinking

By [Eric Zuesse](#)

Global Research, March 22, 2018

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Media Disinformation](#)

America's 'news'-media possess the mentality that characterizes a dictatorship, not a democracy. This will be documented in the linked-to empirical data which will be subsequently discussed. But, first, here is what will be documented by those data, and which will make sense of these data:

In a democracy, the public perceive their country to be improving, in accord with that nation's values and priorities. Consequently, they trust their government, and especially they approve of the job-performance of their nation's leader. In a dictatorship, they don't. In a dictatorship, the government doesn't really represent them, at all. It represents the rulers, typically a national oligarchy, an aristocracy of the richest 0.1% or even of only the richest 0.01%. No matter how much the government 'represents' the public in law (or "on paper"), it's not representing them in reality; and, so, the public don't trust their government, and the public's job-rating of their national leader, the head-of-state, is poor, perhaps even more disapproval than approval. So, whereas in a democracy, the public widely approve of both the government and the head-of-state; in a dictatorship, they don't.

In a dictatorship, the 'news'-media hide reality from the public, in order to serve the government — not the public. But the quality of government that the regime delivers to its public cannot be hidden as the lies continually pile up, and as the promises remain unfulfilled, and as the public find that despite all of the rosy promises, things are no better than before, or are even becoming worse. Trust in such a government falls, no matter how much the government lies and its media hide the fact that it has been lying. Though a 'democratic' election might not retain in power the same leaders, it retains in power the same regime (be it the richest 0.1%, or the richest 0.01%, or The Party, or whatever the dictatorship happens to be). That's because it's a dictatorship: it represents the same elite of power-holding insiders, no matter what. It does not represent the public. That elite — whatever it is — is referred to as the "Deep State," and [the same Deep State can control more than one country, in which case there is an empire](#), which nominally is headed by the head-of-state of its leading country (this used to be called an "Emperor"), but which actually consists of an alliance between the aristocracies within all these countries; and, sometimes, the nominal leading country is actually being led, in its foreign policies, by wealthier aristocrats in the supposedly vassal nations. But no empire can be a democracy, because the residents in no country want to be governed by any foreign power: the public, in every land, want their nation to be free — they want democracy, no dictatorship at all, *especially* no dictatorship from abroad.

In order for the elite to change, a revolution is required, even if it's only to a different elite, instead of to a democracy. So, if there is no revolution, then certainly it's the same dictatorship as before. The elite has changed (and this happens at least as often as

generations change), but the dictatorship has not. And in order to change from a dictatorship *to a democracy*, a revolution *also* is required, *but* it will have to be a revolution that totally removes from power the elite (and all their agents) who had been ruling. If this elite had been the nation's billionaires and its centi-millionaires who had also been billionaire-class donors to political campaigns (such as [has been proven to be the case in the United States](#)), then those people, who until the revolution had been behind the scenes producing the bad government, need to be dispossessed of their assets, because *their assets were being used as their weapons against the public*, and those weapons need (if there is to be a democracy) to be transferred to the public as represented by the new and authentically democratic government. If instead the elite had been a party, then all of those individuals need to be banned from every sort of political activity in the future. But, in either case, there will need to be a new constitution, and a consequent new body of laws, because the old order (the dictatorship) no longer reigns — it's no longer in force after a revolution. That's what "revolution" means. It doesn't necessarily mean "democratic," but *sometimes* it does *produce* a democracy where there wasn't one before. The idea that *every* revolution is democratic is ridiculous, though it's often assumed in 'news'-reports. In fact, coups (which the U.S. Government specializes in like no other) often are a revolution that replaces a democracy by a dictatorship (such as [the U.S. Government did to Ukraine in 2014](#), for example, and most famously before that, did to Iran in 1953). (Any country that perpetrates a coup anywhere is a dictatorship over the residents there, just the same as is the case when any invasion and occupation of a country are perpetrated upon a country. The imposed stooges are stooges, just the same. No country that imposes coups and/or invasions/occupations upon any government that has not posed an existential threat against the residents of that perpetrating country, supports democracy; to the exact contrary, that country unjustifiably imposes dictatorships; it spreads its own dictatorship, which is of the imperialistic type, and any government that spreads its dictatorship is evil and needs to be replaced — revolution is certainly justified there.)

This is how to identify which countries are democracies, and which ones are not: In a democracy, the public are served by the government, and thus are experiencing improvement in their lives and consequently approve of the job-performance of their head-of-state, and they trust the government. But in a dictatorship, none of these things is true.

In 2014, a Japanese international marketing-research firm polled citizens in each of ten countries asking whether they approve or disapprove of the job-performance of their nation's head-of-state, and Harvard then provided an English-translated version online for a few years, then eliminated that translation from its website; but, fortunately, the translation had been web-archived and so is permanent [here](#) (with no information however regarding methodology or sampling); and it shows the following percentages who approved of the job-performance of their President or other head-of-state in each of the given countries, at that time:

- China (Xi) 90%
- Russia (Putin) 87%
- India (Modi) 86%
- South Africa (Zuma) 70%
- Germany (Merkel) 67%
- Brazil (Roussef) 63%
- U.S. (Obama) 62%
- Japan (Abe) 60%

- UK (Cameron) 55%
- France (Hollande) 48%

In January 2018, the global PR firm Edelman came out with the latest in their annual series of scientifically polled surveys in more than two dozen countries throughout the world, tapping into, actually, some of the major criteria within each nation indicating whether or not the given nation is more toward the dictatorship model, or more toward the democracy model. The [2018 Edelman Trust Barometer](#) survey showed that “Trust in Government” (scored and ranked on page 39) is 44% in Russia, and is only 33% in the United States. Trust in Government is the highest in China: 84%. The U.S. and Russia are the nuclear super-powers; and the U.S. and China are the two economic super-powers; so, these are the world’s three leading powers; and, on that single measure of whether or not a country is democratic, China is the global leader (#1 of 28), Russia is in the middle (#13 of 28), and U.S. ranks at the bottom of the three, and near the bottom of the entire lot (#21 of 28). (#28 of 28 is South Africa, which, thus — clearly in retrospect — had a failed revolution when it transitioned out of its apartheid dictatorship. That’s just a fact, which cannot reasonably be denied, given this extreme finding. Though the nation’s leader, Zuma, was, according to the 2014 Japanese study, widely approved by South Africans, his Government was overwhelmingly distrusted. This distrust indicates that the public don’t believe that the head-of-state actually represents the Government. If the head-of-state doesn’t represent the Government, the country cannot possibly be a democracy: the leader might represent the people, but the Government doesn’t.)

When the government is trusted but the head-of-state is not, or vice-versa, there cannot be a functioning democracy. In other words: if either the head-of-state, or the Government, is widely distrusted, there’s a dictatorship at that time, and the only real question regarding it, is: What *type* of dictatorship is this?

These figures — the numbers reported here — contradict the ordinary propaganda; and, so, Edelman’s trust-barometer on each nation’s ‘news’-media (which are scored and ranked on page 40) might also be considered, because the natural question now is whether unreliable news-media might have caused this counter-intuitive (in Western countries) rank-order. However, a major reason why this media-trust-question is actually of only dubious relevance to whether or not the given nation is a democracy, is that to assume that it is, presumes that trust in the government can be that easily manipulated — it actually can’t. Media and PR can’t do that; they can’t achieve it. Here is a widespread misconception: Trust in government results not from the media but from a government’s having fulfilled its promises, and from the public’s experiencing and seeing all around themselves that they clearly have *been* fulfilled; and lying ‘news’-media can’t cover-up that reality, which is constantly and directly being experienced by the public.

However, even if trust in the ‘news’-media isn’t really such a thing as might be commonly hypothesized regarding trust in the government, here are those Edelman findings regarding the media, for whatever they’re worth regarding the question of democracy-versus-dictatorship: Trust in Media is the highest, #1, in China, 71%; and is 42% in #15 U.S.; and is 35% in #20 Russia. ([A July 2017 Marist poll](#) however found that only 30% of Americans trust the media. That’s a stunning 12% lower than the Edelman survey found.) In other words: Chinese people experience that what they encounter in their news-media becomes borne-out in retrospect as having been true, but only half of that percentage of Russians experience this; and U.S. scores nearer to Russia than to China on this matter.

(Interestingly, Turkey, which scores #7 on trust-in-government, scores #28 on trust-in-media. Evidently, Turks find that their government delivers well on its promises, but that their 'news'-media often deceive them. A contrast this extreme within the Edelman findings is unique. Turkey is a special case, regarding this.)

I have [elsewhere](#) reported regarding other key findings in that 2018 Edelman study.

According to all of these empirical findings, the United States is clearly not more of a democracy than it is a dictatorship. This particular finding from these studies has already been overwhelmingly (and *even more so*) confirmed in the world's only in-depth empirical scientific study of whether or not a given country is or is not a "democracy": This study ([the classic Gilens and Page study](#)) found, incontrovertibly, that the U.S. is a dictatorship — specifically an aristocracy, otherwise commonly called an "oligarchy," and that it's specifically a dictatorship by the richest, against the public.

Consequently, whenever the U.S. Government argues that it intends to "spread democracy" (such as it claims in regards to [Syria](#), and to [Ukraine](#)), it is most-flagrantly lying — and any 'news'-medium that reports such a claim without documenting (such as by linking to this article) its clear and already-proven falsehood (which is more fully documented here than has yet been done anywhere, since the Gilens and Page study is here being further proven by these international data), is no real 'news'-medium at all, but is, instead, a propaganda-vehicle for the U.S. Government, a propaganda-arm of [a dictatorship](#) — a nation that has been overwhelmingly proven to be a dictatorship, not a democracy.

The American public seem to know this (though the 'news'-media routinely deny it by using phrases such as 'America's democracy' in the current tense, not merely as referring to some past time): A scientifically designed Monmouth University poll of 803 American adults found — and [reported on March 19th](#) — that 74% believed either probably or definitely that "a group of unelected government and military officials who secretly manipulate or direct national policy" (commonly called the "Deep State") actually exists in America.

The question as asked was: "The term Deep State refers to the possible existence of a group of unelected government and military officials who secretly manipulate or direct national policy. Do you think this type of Deep State in the federal government definitely exists, probably exists, probably does not exist, or definitely does not exist?" 27% said "Definitely"; 47% said "Probably"; only 16% said "Probably not"; and only 5% said "Definitely not."

In effect, then: 74% think America is a dictatorship; only 21% think it's not. So: this isn't only fact; it's also widespread belief. How, then, can the American Government claim that when it invades a country like Iraq (2003), or like Libya (2011), or like Syria (2012-), or like Ukraine (by [coup](#) in 2014), it's hoping to 'bring democracy' there? Only by lying. Even the vast majority of the American public now know this.

So: America's major 'news'-media will have to change their thinking, to become at least as realistic as the American public already are. The con on that, has evidently run its course. It simply discredits those 'news'-media.

*

This article was originally published on [Strategic Culture Foundation](#).

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of [They're Not Even Close](#):

[The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010](#), and of [CHRIST'S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity](#). He is a frequent contributor to *Global Research*.

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Eric Zuesse](#), Global Research, 2018

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Eric Zuesse](#)

About the author:

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of *They're Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010*, and of *CHRIST'S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity*.

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.
For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca