



DIRTY JOURNALISM: THE POLITICAL ECONOMY, ETHICS, AND PSYCHOLOGY OF MANUFACTURED NARRATIVES

Ayaz Safi, Rehman Shah

Ayaz Safi

Gomal University, D.I. Khan

Email: safi313@gmail.com

Rehman Shah

Gomal University, D.I. Khan

Email: shag208@gmail.com

Abstract:

Dirty journalism refers to the deliberate distortion, fabrication, or manipulation of facts, events, and discourses by media actors in pursuit of political, corporate, or ideological interests. It is an epistemic crime against democracy: while journalism is ideally tasked with holding power accountable, dirty journalism performs the inverse—it launders power through information. This paper interrogates the structural, psychological, and institutional underpinnings of dirty journalism as a form of communicative violence. We situate the phenomenon within critical political economy, post-truth theory, propaganda models, and the sociology of knowledge production. We examine how ownership structures, surveillance capitalism, partisan media ecosystems, and platform incentives create a fertile ground for dirty journalism. We also explore how disinformation, gaslighting, character assassination, and “strategic ignorance” are deployed as journalistic tactics. The consequences are devastating: erosion of public trust, polarization, electoral manipulation, and epistemic injustice. The paper closes with a normative and policy-oriented reflection on ethical journalism, media literacy, and institutional reform.

Keywords: Dirty Journalism, Deliberate Distortion, Fabrication, Manipulation of Facts, Epistemic Crime, Communicative Violence

Introduction

Journalism as a Double-Edged Sword

Journalism is often described as the “fourth estate,” entrusted with safeguarding democracy through truth-telling, watchdog reporting, and public accountability (Schudson, 2008). However, when journalism becomes an instrument of manipulation, deception, or partisan warfare, it mutates into a corrosive force. This mutation—often referred to as *dirty journalism*—is not merely poor journalism or sensationalism. Rather, it is a systemic distortion of the communicative function of the press, where journalistic tools are mobilized for propaganda, misinformation, or political engineering (McChesney, 2004; Herman & Chomsky, 1988).

Dirty journalism is not an aberration; it is often a product of structural forces: ownership concentration, political patronage, commercial imperatives, and ideological capture. It thrives in environments where institutional checks are weak, journalistic autonomy is compromised, and audiences are fragmented or polarized (Bennett & Livingston, 2018). While fake news has received significant attention in recent years, dirty journalism operates at a deeper level: it is the *professionalization* of misinformation under the guise of legitimate reporting.

Defining Dirty Journalism: Beyond Fake News

The term “dirty journalism” is not widely codified in academic literature, yet it captures a confluence of practices such as:

- **Fabrication:** Inventing facts, quotes, or events.
- **Framing manipulation:** Deliberately choosing frames to mislead or incite.
- **Character assassination:** Personal targeting of individuals using selective leaks or innuendo.
- **Strategic omission:** Withholding key facts to distort reality.
- **Pseudo-events:** Manufacturing events or controversies for media spectacle.
- **Source laundering:** Publishing planted stories from anonymous actors.
- **Narrative gaslighting:** Systematically denying or inverting truths (Lewandowsky et al., 2017; Stanley, 2015).

Dirty journalism differs from “yellow journalism” or “tabloidization” in that it often operates under a veneer of professionalism and is strategically orchestrated by power elites or intelligence networks (O’Neil, 2016). It may be cloaked in investigative style but is essentially weaponized storytelling.

Theoretical Frameworks

Political Economy of the Media

The political economy tradition argues that the structure of media ownership and funding shapes news content (Mosco, 2009). Herman and Chomsky’s (1988) “propaganda model” identifies five filters—ownership, advertising, sourcing, flak, and anti-communism (now anti-terrorism)—that condition media output. Dirty journalism is a logical outcome of these filters when combined with:

- **Concentrated ownership:** Few corporations controlling vast media landscapes.
- **State capture:** Political elites using media for regime maintenance.
- **Commercial imperatives:** Prioritizing sensationalism for ratings and ad revenue.
- **Platform capitalism:** Algorithmic amplification of outrage (Zuboff, 2019).

Post-Truth and Epistemic Erosion

Post-truth refers to the condition where emotional resonance and identity politics outweigh factual accuracy (Keyes, 2004; McIntyre, 2018). Dirty journalism thrives in post-truth cultures where audiences prefer narratives that confirm their biases (confirmation bias) and distrust mainstream fact-checking institutions. In this context, truth becomes negotiable, and journalism becomes a battlefield of competing realities.

Strategic Narratives and Cognitive Warfare

Dirty journalism often uses psychological operations (psyops) and “cognitive warfare” strategies to manipulate perception. These include repetition, framing, scapegoating, fear appeals, and moral panic construction (Lakoff, 2004; Entman, 2007). The narrative is the weapon; public opinion is the target.

Tactics and Techniques of Dirty Journalism

Framing and Agenda Manipulation

Framing theory (Entman, 1993) shows how media frames shape interpretation. Dirty journalism manipulates frames to emphasize certain aspects and suppress others. For example, a peaceful protest may be framed as a “riot,” or a whistleblower as a “traitor.”

Manufactured Leaks and Controlled Disclosures

Leaking information is a key journalistic tool. But in dirty journalism, leaks are often manufactured by intelligence agencies, political operatives, or corporate actors to shape narratives. These “controlled

disclosures” create selective outrage.

Character Assassination and Reputation Sabotage

Dirty journalism often targets individuals—activists, journalists, opposition leaders—through planted stories, doctored videos, or smear campaigns. These tactics delegitimize dissent and discourage whistleblowing (Barstow, 2010).

Strategic Silence and Erasure

Not all manipulation is active. Strategic silence—ignoring certain stories, suppressing voices, or refusing to report inconvenient truths—is also a hallmark of dirty journalism. The “non-event” becomes a tool of power.

Narrative Gaslighting

Gaslighting is a psychological tactic in which people are made to doubt their memory or perception. In dirty journalism, this manifests as *narrative gaslighting*—denying obvious realities, reversing cause and effect, or rewriting history in real time (Sweet, 2019).

Dirty Journalism in Practice: Global and Regional Case Studies

Iraq War and Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs)

One of the most infamous examples of dirty journalism was the coverage of WMDs in Iraq in 2002–2003. Major Western outlets published unverified intelligence leaks suggesting Saddam Hussein had active WMD programs. Later investigations showed this was false, yet the coverage helped justify the invasion (Rampton & Stauber, 2003; Kellner, 2005). This was not accidental error—it was orchestrated narrative laundering.

Dirty Journalism in Hybrid Regimes

In hybrid regimes (e.g., Turkey, India, Russia), dirty journalism often functions as a state propaganda arm. Governments use pliant journalists to launch defamation campaigns against critics, human rights defenders, or opposition parties. In these cases, state-owned or crony-owned outlets dominate the media sphere (Voltmer, 2013).

Dirty Journalism and Gendered Disinformation

Female journalists, politicians, and activists are disproportionately targeted with dirty journalism involving sexualized disinformation, deepfakes, and moral character attacks. These tactics are part of a broader gendered silencing strategy (Fazal & Tsui, 2021; Dragiewicz et al., 2018).

Structural Drivers of Dirty Journalism

Media Ownership and Patronage Networks

Dirty journalism flourishes in systems where media ownership is tied to political or corporate elites. The absence of independent editorial boards, public service models, or community journalism allows content to be dictated by owners’ interests.

Algorithmic Incentives and Platform Dynamics

In the age of digital media, algorithms reward outrage, virality, and emotional intensity. This creates a perverse incentive for dirty journalism: the more polarizing or misleading a story, the more engagement it generates. Platform capitalism thus becomes an accomplice (Tufekci, 2015).

Weak Regulatory and Ethical Institutions

Lack of press councils, ombudsman systems, ethical training, or independent media regulators allows dirty journalism to operate with impunity. Even where laws exist, they are often applied selectively or politically.

Consequences of Dirty Journalism

Erosion of Public Trust

Repeated exposure to dirty journalism leads to cynicism, distrust in institutions, and democratic disengagement (Hanitzsch et al., 2017). Audiences no longer know whom to trust, leading to epistemic fatigue.

Polarization and Identity-Based Conflict

Dirty journalism exacerbates polarization by creating echo chambers, demonizing opponents, and promoting “us vs. them” thinking. It undermines the possibility of rational public discourse.

Chilling Effects on Dissent and Journalism

Journalists who resist dirty journalism often face harassment, lawsuits, doxxing, or surveillance. This creates a chilling effect, discouraging investigative journalism and whistleblowing.

Epistemic Injustice

Dirty journalism produces *epistemic injustice*—when certain groups (e.g., minorities, women, dissidents) are systematically disbelieved, misrepresented, or silenced in the knowledge economy (Fricker, 2007).

Normative Frameworks and Ethical Responses

Journalism as a Public Good

Ethical journalism must be grounded in the idea that information is a public good, not a commodity. This requires institutional protections, subsidies for public interest journalism, and collective governance mechanisms (Pickard, 2020).

Restorative Journalism and Truth-Telling

Some scholars advocate “restorative journalism,” which acknowledges past harms, corrects misinformation, and builds epistemic repair. This involves not just fact-checking, but narrative reparation (Waisbord, 2019).

Media Literacy and Civic Epistemologies

Strengthening public resilience to dirty journalism requires media literacy education, critical thinking pedagogy, and civic epistemologies that empower citizens to interrogate information systems (Mihailidis & Viotty, 2017).

Institutional Reform

Possible institutional reforms include:

- Public service broadcasting charters.
- Independent media councils with sanctioning power.
- Algorithmic transparency laws.
- Whistleblower protections.
- Gender-sensitive reporting codes.

Conclusion

Dirty journalism is not simply “bad reporting.” It is a structural, ideological, and psychological phenomenon that weaponizes the journalistic form for anti-democratic ends. It corrodes the epistemic foundations of democracy, damages reputations, distorts reality, and manipulates public reason. Addressing dirty journalism requires a multi-level approach: dismantling ownership monopolies, rethinking platform governance, restoring ethical training, and rebuilding public trust. Journalism must return to its foundational role not as a mouthpiece of power, but as a mirror to it.

References

- Barstow, D. (2010). The New York Times and the death of investigative journalism. *The New York Times*.
- Bennett, W. L., & Livingston, S. (2018). The disinformation order: Disruptive communication and the decline of democratic institutions. *European Journal of Communication*, 33(2), 122–139. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323118760317>
- Dragiewicz, M., Burgess, J., Matamoros-Fernández, A., Salter, M., Suzor, N. P., Woodlock, D., & Harris, B. (2018). Technology-facilitated coercive control: Domestic violence and the digital frontier. *British Journal of Criminology*, 58(3), 530–549. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azx032>
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x>
- Entman, R. M. (2007). Framing bias: Media in the distribution of power. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 163–173. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00336.x>
- Fazal, T. M., & Tsui, K. (2021). Gendered disinformation and the politics of silencing. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 23(2), 180–202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616742.2020.1843392>
- Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford University Press.
- Hanitzsch, T., Van Dalen, A., & Steindl, N. (2017). Caught in the nexus: A comparative and longitudinal analysis of public trust in the press. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 23(1), 3–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1940161217740695>
- Herman, E. S., & Chomsky, N. (1988). *Manufacturing consent: The political economy of the mass media*. Pantheon Books.
- Kellner, D. (2005). *Media spectacle and the crisis of democracy: Terrorism, war, and election battles*. Paradigm Publishers.
- Keyes, R. (2004). *The post-truth era: Dishonesty and deception in contemporary life*. St. Martin's Press.
- Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't think of an elephant! Know your values and frame the debate*. Chelsea Green.
- Lewandowsky, S., Ecker, U. K., & Cook, J. (2017). Beyond misinformation: Understanding and coping with the “post-truth” era. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, 6(4), 353–369. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2017.07.008>
- McChesney, R. W. (2004). *The problem of the media: U.S. communication politics in the twenty-first century*. Monthly Review Press.
- McIntyre, L. (2018). *Post-truth*. MIT Press.
- Mihailidis, P., & Viotty, S. (2017). Spreadable spectacle in digital culture: Civic expression, fake news, and the role of media literacies in “post-fact” society. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 61(4), 441–454. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764217701217>
- Mosco, V. (2009). *The political economy of communication* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- O’Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown.
- Pickard, V. (2020). *Democracy without journalism? Confronting the misinformation society*. Oxford University Press.
- Rampton, S., & Stauber, J. (2003). *Weapons of mass deception: The uses of propaganda in Bush's war on*



- Iraq*. Tarcher/Penguin.
- Schudson, M. (2008). *Why democracies need an unlovable press*. Polity Press.
- Stanley, J. (2015). *How propaganda works*. Princeton University Press.
- Sweet, P. L. (2019). The sociology of gaslighting. *American Sociological Review*, 84(5), 851–875.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122419874843>
- Tufekci, Z. (2015). Algorithmic harms beyond Facebook and Google: Emergent challenges of computational agency. *Colorado Technology Law Journal*, 13(1), 203–218.
- Voltmer, K. (2013). *The media in transitional democracies*. Polity Press.
- Waisbord, S. (2019). *Communication: A post-discipline*. Polity Press.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.