

AGENDA MOVIES

AGENDA MOVIES

Exposing the Hidden Messages
and Ethics in Movies

FREE VERSION
(order full version on Amazon)

Olli Stenlund

Ethics Movement

Agenda Movies
FREE VERSION

First Edition June 2022

Published by Ethics Movement
Website: EthicsM.com

Cover art by Olli Stenlund

ISBN: 9798831911015

Copyright © Olli Stenlund, 2022

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or used in any manner without written permission of the copyright owner except for the use of quotations in a book review.

For more information: info@EthicsM.com

Dedication

This book is dedicated to all those movie lovers who have been manipulated and abused by the movies they love. Now, it's time to open the eyes and see the truth.

Contents

Introduction.....	6
Movies.....	10
Anchorman (2004).....	10
Mean Girls (2004).....	20
The Proposal (2009).....	35
Bridesmaids (2011).....	44
Bad Teacher (2011).....	52
Ex Machina (2014).....	65
Noah (2014).....	77
Ghostbusters (2016).....	82
A United Kingdom (2016).....	90
Blackbird (2019).....	99
Conclusions.....	111
Literature.....	122

Introduction

Movies are something that are traditionally considered as great pieces of art and excellence. They reflect the cultural elements of the time they were made and are important material for cultural learning. More often movies are looked up in public discussion than criticised. They show people examples of a good life, teach behaviour models and values. For many people, they are like the priests and popes of modern times as they define more and more what is considered normal and ethical. But have you ever thought that there would be something wrong with today's movies? Why are they so provocative? Why am I feeling pressured to start thinking in a certain way or change my political beliefs after watching a movie? It feels that movies are becoming more and more arrogant, trying to shape the minds of people and the culture. Something must have happened to the movie industry, since the changes in movies feel so tangible.

Movies are never just entertainment, but have a tremendous impact on people. The movie stars are heroes and authorities who act as role models to many people. How they affect people is very real, and that's why it is not irrelevant what the movies reflect. Even an innocent looking "comedy movie" might be a shocking experience. Although

Introduction

movies contain a lot of controversial issues, they are rarely criticised from an ethical point of view. Movie critics are not helping in that sense, as they only concentrate on the artistic side of the movie. They do not have the expertise to analyse the social impacts or hidden content in the movies. Their interest is just to find out if a movie is “good” or not, because that’s what the public is mostly interested in. But that’s not enough. Something deeper is really needed to expose the secrets in movies. This book is such an attempt to analyse movies from new viewpoints that haven’t been explored that much. The book analyses a bunch of suspicious movies and exposes the hidden messages and ideologies in them. It also discusses the ethics of the topics and events in the movies. It is time to let the people know the truth behind movie production.

What is then a hidden message that this book is searching for? It can practically be any content in the movie that is clearly trying to affect the viewers’ behaviour in some way. It is often hidden in the attitudes and communication of the characters. In these situations, the characters’ lines or behaviour may seem surprising or unusual. Often, the hidden messages do not fit nicely into the movie and make the plot inconsistent in a way or another. And that’s where a scriptwriter has most probably added their external agenda into the film. This makes the movie more or less inconsistent, but still seems quite normal to most people. Sometimes it might even be part of

Agenda Movies

a political ideology that needs more political expertise to comprehend. There are also occasions when the hidden messages are spoken out loudly or clearly shown, but the attention of the viewer is quickly led elsewhere so that the viewer forgets quickly what he or she just saw or heard. That might be cleverly used to inject something into people's minds and quickly stop them from digesting too much of what they just experienced. The scriptwriters are experts at leading the viewers' attention to certain details and hiding the details that are not wanted to be shown.

A hidden message can also be hidden in the outcomes of the events. That means how the characters are treated and succeed in the movie. Which character is punished or fails and on the other hand which character gets rewarded or is successful in general? These facts always send messages about what kind of people are favored and what kind of individuals are unfavored in the movie. Although often it may seem to be just a coincidence, it is never the whole truth. It is always the scriptwriter's choice of who they want to reward and who gets punished. And that is always a message to the viewers as well.

How are the movies then assessed ethically? First, the movie characters are role models, whether or not they want it. How they behave makes a big difference and can be assessed whether it is right or wrong in general. Everything they do may affect millions of people and so it really makes a big difference. The key questions are the ones like what

Introduction

kind of role models the characters are for people? What kind of attitudes and values do they reflect towards others? Do they have a good sense of what is right and wrong, or do they just act selfishly thinking about themselves? And another big question is if justice happens in the movie or not. Is the “bad guy” punished or does he or she get a promotion? These questions are some of the most important ones to consider when thinking about ethics in movies.

In this book, ten suspicious movies are analysed in chronological order to expose the hidden messages and ethics in them. Most of the movies are Hollywood comedies, which is not only a coincidence. Many action and horror movies are not worth it because of the bigger amount of unethical material in them. Watching and analysing these movies would be like dumpster diving, which doesn't make much sense. That's why they have been skipped and some better ones have been chosen instead. But now it is time to start the journey.

Movies

Anchorman (2004)

- Origin: Hollywood
- Age limit: 15
- Genre: Comedy
- Director: Adam McKay
- Stars: Will Ferrell, Christina Applegate, Steve Carell

Anchorman (2004) starts the movie journey as a crazy comedy movie telling a story of insane news anchoring teams competing against each other with fists and weapons. This American satirical comedy movie is set in the 1970s news media company in San Diego, where news anchoring is still tightly a men's job. However, that is going to change when, obviously a radical and violent feminist, Veronica (Christina Applegate) infiltrates the company. Ron's (Will Ferrell) male news team reacts strongly and opposes her career in every possible way. Veronica's primary job as a radical feminist seems to be to crush the evil patriarchy of the childish

Anchorman (2004)

acting news guys, including the mentally retarded weatherman Brick (Steve Carell).

The first hidden message in the movie is female supremacy. Veronica is a supreme woman, a radical feminist, who succeeds in everything she does despite her cold and emotionless attitude. She gets promoted as a news anchor after just a short time in the company and avoids facing judgement from her acts of violence and misconduct at work. Her promotion doesn't make sense with her arrogant and rude behaviour towards others. She punishes the poor guys and even her boss repeatedly with her fists, but still gets promoted. She acts like a modern James Bond character who doesn't have much feelings or sense of humour, but lets his fists do the talking. And not only is she violent, she also lets down his work mate Ron by making him read some inappropriate words from the teleprompter on a live broadcast. As a result, Ron loses his job while the deceitful Veronica keeps her job. In her worldview, men seem to be inferior, lower-class people who don't deserve advice or empathy. She has come to just punish the guys, that's all. In the end, she also succeeds in her plan to take the anchoring role from Ron, although she has to share it with him. After that, Ron's behaviour changes as he starts to give credit to Veronica and praises her by saying that she is better than him. After all Veronica's misconduct, Ron is still scripted to proclaim Veronica's excellence.

Agenda Movies

Besides female supremacy, the male inferiority and weakness are equally central messages in the movie. The contrast between the men's and women's roles is clear. While Veronica is a strong woman, the guys are weak and childish. They like to show funny face gestures towards her and when they are unhappy, these grown-up men scream like babies. They like to brag about themselves like little boys and insult others. Additionally, they seem to be really uneducated and dumb, not having even general knowledge of common media world terms like diversity. Their attitude towards women at work is very negative, as they have a strong prejudice against working with women. Instead, they bully and sexually harass Veronica. The guys think that "God doesn't even want Veronica to live" and that women have super small brains. But still the guys are interested in Veronica's body and try constantly to hit on her. The guys also show their dumbness by trying to impress Veronica only with external things like showing their bare skin, posing in underwear, presenting their super perfumes or by touching her "accidentally". They don't respect her as a person and that's why they are failing. Veronica rejects their inappropriate and oversexual offers repeatedly and makes the guys' situation even worse with her violence and coldness. Unfortunately, the guys are so weak they don't learn anything. They remain in their childish mentality until the end.

Anchorman (2004)

But the guys' brainless behaviour is not only targeted to women. Their behaviour against other male news teams is also absurd. These news teams fight physically against each other with middle age weapons. All of that is crazy comedy, but also a message that men are so simple that they want to be the best news team, even if it requires fighting physically against each team. They are saying that men are always so violent that they can't even do an office job without knocking each other out. And that men cannot compete against each other just by doing their job well. In fact, these clown reporters are in themselves already an insult against men. Reporters and news anchors are expected to study years at university to be qualified. But these male reporters are so insane that they haven't even seen a university in their lives.

To demonstrate the weakness of the men in the movie, here are listed some scenes in the movie:

- The news guys are asking what diversity means, because they don't know
- Ron is known to read everything aloud from the teleprompter without thinking about it
- News teams criticise each other's clothes
- News teams comparing how many viewers they have
- News teams fighting against each other with real weapons
- Ron's team asks Ron what is love. The mentally retarded guy, Brick, says he loves carpet, desk and

Agenda Movies

lamp. Finally, Ron gives an answer to the question by singing a song about love: “holding a lady tight and grab with her some afternoon delight”. After that, the guys say Ron has mental problems.

- When Veronica starts reading the news, the guys are expressing childish face gestures next to her
- Ron says he thinks the female brain is so much smaller that it is only a third from a man’s brain. In reality, the difference is about 10 percent.
- Ron gets fired after reading an inappropriate text that was written by Veronica to the teleprompter, but Veronica keeps her job
- Ron brags to Veronica how important and a big deal he is. Then, he says that he wants to be “on her”.
- Champ tries deliberately to touch Veronica’s breast, making it look like it is an accident.
- Brian tries to impress Veronica with a special aftershave that, in reality, smells horrible.
- The simplest news guy, Brick, invites Veronica to join the “party in his pants”.
- Ron is doing bicep curls without a shirt at the office and invites Veronica to watch him.

Another hidden message in the movie is the gender swap: replacing men with women in news anchoring. Apparently, the scriptwriters wanted to present men as childish and lower-class people, so that it would seem

Anchorman (2004)

obvious that they need to be replaced by women or just by anyone. They seem to be saying that there's profoundly something wrong with men and that they obviously cannot work together just by themselves without women. By showing these weak guys instead of strong ones, they make clear that replacing the men is justified and natural. If they have had intelligent and skilled men in the same roles, they would have had a much harder time with the gender swap agenda. Now, it seems quite fair to replace these insane guys. However, their message is, in any case, outdated because women have been working as news anchors for a long time already. So, the message of a gender swap in news anchoring is not relevant anymore. Instead, their message is probably aimed at crushing the "evil patriarchy" anywhere else. Obviously, they want to please the radical feminists who see that kind of patriarchy everywhere. But in fact they should learn that there are not really evil patriarchies in western countries, because western countries have gender equality. However, the evil patriarchies are located somewhere else.

The movie has a few minor hidden messages too. First, it pushes totalitarian cancel culture: people with "wrong" opinions or beliefs are cancelled and fired from their jobs. Ron gets fired from the media company after he read, without thinking, the insults that the deceptive Veronica wrote in the teleprompter. Ron is obviously responsible for what he reads and should have noticed the inappropriate

Agenda Movies

text and not read it. But it was Veronica who was the root cause of Ron's mistake. She would need even more correction than Ron. She was unfaithful to her workmate and got him into trouble. But she doesn't get any correction or punishment for what she did. Only Ron gets a big penalty and gets fired, but Veronica can keep her job. That's obviously not fair. Why wasn't Veronica cancelled as well, like Ron? The answer is probably that Veronica is female, which is associated with superiority in the movie. But instead of firing anyone, they should have warned Ron. Firing someone is quite a big penalty. And by doing this, the movie is unfortunately sending a message to advance the unfair cancel culture that ruins people's careers after they do minor mistakes.

There is also another hidden message in a detail about Veronica's attack on Ron when he is doing his bicep curls at the office. Veronica doesn't seem to be worried about Ron's uncovered body at the office. Instead, she is worried about how Ron is talking to his body parts. She demands Ron to "stop calling his arms as guns". But why is she saying that? Isn't that Ron's own business what he wants to call his arms? It surely is. But as a radical feminist, she wants to get inside Ron's head and twist his view of his masculinity. Usually, radical feminists seem to fear and envy male biceps because they are a sign of power and authority to men. And that is not what these feminists want to see. Instead, they want to keep men weak and invisible so

Anchorman (2004)

that they can be controlled and replaced more easily. And that's what Veronica wants too. She uses Ron just for her ideological purposes to keep him weak and unaware of his possibilities. Here, Veronica really exposes her patronising attitude by accident. But in this case, it is really Veronica who should fix her attitude, not Ron.

The movie also includes a direct political message referring to the Bush administration (2000-2008) in the US. At the end of the movie, the dumbest news guy, Brick, is said to have become a political advisor of the Bush White House. This is the insane guy who has a "party in his pants" and he is the one who they are associating with the republican president. This is obviously a direct attack on the president George W. Bush, who was running for a second term of his presidency. It is not a coincidence that the US presidential elections were held the same year in 2004, just a few months after this movie was released. This movie was used as a political weapon against George W. Bush. Someone must have been behind this attack, because it seems so well planned. There is no doubt about it.

So what about the ethical side of the movie? Anyone watching this movie should be warned that they might feel like in a radical feminist's dream world where constant gender battle is taking place. The movie has quite a radical agenda relating to gender roles, and that is the main ethical problem of it. It labels men as evil abusers of women and suggests that men need to be replaced, because women are

Agenda Movies

better and men are evil. The men in the movie are insane crybabies and perverts that are too dumb to impress women in any way. The movie seems so provocative that it feels like a declaration of war against men who are seen as lower-level beings and idiots even in higher education jobs. But is it fair to give such a flawed image of men? No, it is not. This movie is psychologically harmful for men. It is a way the radical feminists get into the minds of men and make them feel unworthy and weak. It is all unconscious. While innocent people enjoy this funny comedy, their minds are being manipulated.

On the women's side, the movie teaches women some terrible lessons about using physical violence against men when they say something inappropriate. Women should know how to express themselves verbally, not with fists. Veronica's physical punishment towards the immature news guys, in fact, proves that she is not herself too mature either. She uses violence even when it is unnecessary. None of her punches were really necessary for her security. They were just meant to cause pain for the guys. That's why she is a terrible example for any woman as a violent and cold person. In real work life, that kind of woman would be set aside quite quickly. Who would like to work with that kind of woman? Although the movie's goal is to advance women's representation in anchoring, Veronica's attitude is not something that would bring success to her or anyone else in life. Nobody tells her to step down from her castle in

Anchorman (2004)

the air. She is unfairly not punished for being violent and rude. In the end, she gets the anchoring job coworking with Ron and her unhealthy attitude is rewarded.

Generally, it is good that this movie highlights the anchormen's roles in the news media. They are not just people who read what the teleprompter says, they often set the tone and gently hint their opinions about news. Too often they are part of the problem, even manipulating people. None of the news anchors are neutral, no matter if they admit it or not. Instead, they are the scriptwriters of their short clips and articles they are presenting to the public. They choose how and what they want to show and what they choose to hide. That's how they use their political power. And at the same time, none of the media people are elected by the people or any democratic entity. They are serving mainly their company that pays their salary, and that allows them to do their job quite freely without being criticised too much by others. Companies do not attack their own employees publicly, and so the public will always see the news anchors and reporters as people who are flawless, representing "the truth" about the world. However, their own and their company's views always get mixed with the information they are sharing, whether or not they admit it.

-----END OF SAMPLE-----

Thanks for reading!

Order the full version from here:

ETHICSM.COM/BOOKS