Chapter seven

Comparative analysis on the role of press in colonial and independent India
The separate treatment of both Gandhi and JP, their roles as communicators and use of the press as partners in political mobilization efforts, give us good insight into the subject matter that we have taken up for this research. However, this will remain incomplete if we fail to take a comparative analysis of the two great communicators and mobilizers. For despite having lived in two different eras, Gandhi and JP had many similarities. Their extensive use of the press for mobilisation, reliance on people's power for achieving success for a movement, following of best of ethics as journalists, avoidance of any form of propaganda, sharp writing and mass appeal have all made it quite enriching and interesting. They had many contrasts too, and identifying them was no easy task. We did achieve some success in the end. Thanks to a couple of rich interviews with great scholars. It's fascinating to see how Gandhi focussed his journalistic style for the 'mass public' while JP was concerned with the 'attentive public'; how Gandhi relied more on dialogue than JP; and how Gandhi went far ahead when it came to following pure journalistic style.

GANDHI and JP occupied the centre stage in two epoch making periods of Indian history. While Gandhi moved millions during his struggle against the mighty British Empire, JP stirred many souls in his campaign against the authoritative regime of Indian Gandhi. Gandhi in colonial times and JP in independent India represent two of the most versatile and powerful mass leaders in Indian tradition. On a superficial view, however, they may represent two different models of leadership as well as ideologies. This was partly due to “the contexts in which they separated” and partly due to “their personal predilections and endowments.”

In the beginning it is important to give an outline of the conceptual issues on which the following discussion is based.

Firstly, both Gandhi and JP were communicators who understood the basic processes of the mass media. They both had their own newspapers and seemed to confirm with the classical description of the way the press enables discrete individuals to join
together in purposeful groups, as given by Tocqueville. "The effect of a newspaper is not only to suggest the same purpose to a great number of persons, but also to furnish means for the execution of the designs which they may singly have conceived.... A newspaper then takes up the notion or the feeling that had occurred simultaneously, but singly, to each of them. All are then immediately guided toward the beacon; and these wandering minds, which had so long sought each other in darkness, at length meet and unite." This common action, believed the two great leaders, was made possible because of instrumental political participation, which is essentially directed, to the achievement of concrete goals. 3

Though leading from the front in two different eras, both relied heavily on public opinion. They agreed with Bailey who says that public opinion "has a giant's strength and we may use it with frightful effects." 4 Like students of communication Gandhi and JP see the public as semi-organized entity that in some way or another moves through stages of initiation and debate, and reach a recognizable collective decision on an issue. To them the public is an organic entity linked together by means of mass communication.

Further, while Gandhi conducted his dialogue both with the 'mass public' and 'attentive public,' a distinction suggested by Almond, JP communicated mostly with the 'attentive public.' 5 The mass public informed by the mass media pays heed to the tone of discussion and issues and responds through moods of apprehension or complacency. The attentive public, a far smaller group, follows public issue in an analytical manner, is relatively well informed, and constitutes a critical audience for the discussion of public affairs. However, the size of the attentive public varies from time to time as new issues and problems arise. Again, at times, the attentive public may be large and quickly responsive to events and actions. At other times and on other questions, public discontent may be generated rather slowly. It may require years or decades for a public sentiment to develop.
Whatever segment they may be targeting, both Gandhi and JP as communicators believed that an opinion has a bearing on groups of people and political mobilization takes place on the basis of groups and associations.\(^6\)

There are two main aspects to what occurs. On the one hand, there is the provision of a consistent picture of the social world, which may lead the audience to adopt this version of reality, a reality of facts and of norms, values and expectations. On the other hand, there is a continuing and selective interaction between self and the media, which plays a part in shaping the individual’s own behaviour and self-concept. We learn about our social environment and respond to the knowledge that we acquire. In greater detail, we can expect the mass media to guide us about different kinds of social role and the accompanying expectations in the sphere of work, family life, political behaviour and so on. We can expect certain values to be selectively reinforced in these and other areas of social experience. We can also expect the mass media to give an order of importance and structure to the world they portray, whether fictionally or as actuality.

There are several reasons for expectations listed above. Firstly, there is a good amount of patterning and consistency in the media version of the world. Another is the wide range of experience, which is open to view and to vicarious involvement, compared to the narrow range of real life experience available to most people. Third, there is the trust with which media are often held as a source of impressions about the world outside direct experience.

Gandhi and JP were quite methodical when it came to the content of their journals. Their content broadly fell in Eisenstadt’s three main classes of communication content: technical content, which provides instruction and information; general cognitive content, which covers news ranging from gossip to politics; and normative content, which defines what is proper behaviour and is oriented to the transmission and maintenance of social norms.\(^7\)
Besides, Gandhi and JP strongly believed in the agenda setting function of the media. This function was pointed out by Bernard C. Cohen who says that “the press may not be successful much of the time in telling people what to think, but it’s stunningly successful in telling its readers what to think about.” Political scientists too have been most alert to the process and Mc Combs and Shaw have given the term ‘agenda-setting’ to it also.

A truly comparative study of Gandhi and JP will require great scholarship and a large space. The focus of the present study restricts us from even stampeding to do so. We confine ourselves, in this brief account, partly on the style of leadership of the two and mostly on how they both made use of the press in political mobilization.

A large part of the analysis is based on interviews and content analysis.

**AS COMMUNICATORS**

Both, Gandhi and J.P. were great communicators. They knew the importance of getting their messages across to the people, that would in turn prompt them to action. “Both were master of communication.”

Though rooted in a mix of saintly and traditional languages of Indian politics in their discourses, it is important to understand the difference of time periods in which Gandhi and JP were operating to do an evaluation of their communication strategies.

“Gandhi belonged to that generation when media was an instrument of articulation of public opinion.” Even the authorities in the era when Gandhi lived used to rely on the contents of the newspapers upto a large extent. This was possible because of two reasons, as pointed out by G.S. Bhargava. “A kind of moderation with which the complaints were aired, and the restraint shown by them.” Gandhi was quite logical and sharp in his writings. Thus he wrote about a movements and British response to it: “Every good movement passes through five stages, indifference, ridicule, abuse, repression, and respect. We had indifference for a few months. Then the viceroy graciously laughed at it. Abuse, including misrepresentation, has been the order of
the day. The provincial Governors and the anti-non-cooperation press have heaped as much abuse upon the movement as they have been able to. Now comes repression, at present yet in its fairly mild form. Every movement that survives repression, mild or severe, invariably commands respect which is another name for success. This repression, if we are true, may be treated as a sure sign of the approaching victory. But, if were true, we shall neither be cowed down nor angrily retaliate and be violent. Violence is suicide. Let us recognize that power dies hard, and that it is but natural for the Government to make a final effort for life even though it is through repression. Complete self-restraint at the present critical moment is the speediest way to success."\(^{13}\)

On the other hand, JP was operating in a time when the mass media were fairly well developed. Newspapers in different languages had proliferated and the increased literacy rates facilitated the wide reach of the media. No wonder as both Ajit Bhattacharjea and G.S. Bhargava observed JP's *Everyman's* had specific focus of readership. "It was more for political readership than for mass consumption" observes Bhattacharjea. He further elaborates that unlike Gandhi's journals *Young India, Harijan, or Navajivan*, JP's *Everyman's* "was conceived in a very specific setting and was primarily aimed at the educated class and policy makers and was not meant for the masses."

The journals of Gandhi were meant for a wide range of readership. The very fact that he brought out his journals in different languages drives home the point that Gandhi's publications were meant for mass readership.

**CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC SPHERE THROUGH MEDIA**

However, both Gandhi and JP believed in the process of shaping public opinion through the use of the press. Both relied on the technique of conducting dialogue on various issues by creating a public sphere, (as suggested by Habermas), for it. As communicators both JP and Gandhi seem to be subscribing to the media centered
view of the communication theories, that stresses the means of communication as a force for change.

Thus apart from writing on issues that concern their immediate agenda like non-cooperation and total revolution, JP and Gandhi would also touch upon issues of wider relevance, in their journals and other writings. Gandhi wrote on education in his weekly Harijan on 8 May 1937 issue: “I hold that true education of the intellect can only come through a proper exercise and training of the bodily organs e.g. hands, feet, eyes, ears, nose, etc. In other words an intelligent use of the bodily organs in a child provides the best and quickest way of developing his intellect. But unless the development of the mind and body goes hand in hand with a corresponding awakening of the soul, the former alone would prove to be a poor lop-sided affair. By spiritual training I mean education of the heart. A proper and all-round development of the mind, therefore, can take place only when it proceeds pair pass with the education of the physical and spiritual faculties of the child. They constitute an indivisible whole. According to this theory, therefore, it would be a gross fallacy to suppose that they can be developed piecemeal and independently of one another.”

Similarly, JP’s weekly would highlight various social issues, despite being highly political in tone and tenor. In the thick if JP Movement, the April 12, 1975 issue of Everyman’s carried an article ‘Crimes against Harijans and Adivasis’ written by Madhu Limaye.

“Untouchability has no sanction of law,” read the page 7 story, “but it still rules the innermost recesses of the human heart. Unless men’s hearts are purified, unless the pernicious principle of dividing people into higher and lower castes based on birth is abolished, unless the youth of the country are inspired by a burning hatred of this inequality, and unless a genuine sympathy for the lot of the oppressed is created, how could one expect a change in the mental outlook of the common people? Harijans and Adivasis constitute 21.53 per cent or more than one-fifth-of India’s total population. And they are the most oppressed of the citizens. Twenty-seven years of
freedom has neither altered their living standards nor their social status. There is an urgent need to transform the living conditions of these oppressed millions.”

Thus even in politically volatile time periods, JP would not relegate social issues. Gandhi was, in fact, a step ahead from J.P. in this regard. All the issues of his weekly newsletters would have some ‘human interest’ articles. Later on, Gandhi started *Harijan* solely for the purpose of propagating his campaign against untouchability.

It is also possible to argue against the contention that both JP and Gandhi used the press for conducting dialogues on various issues. According to a Gandhian journalist the element of dialogue was “missing in JP’s approach, while it is more prominent in that of Gandhi’s.” He points out that “Gandhi had different target audience when he wrote in different languages.” Thus for the English version of the *Young India* he had one kind of readership in mind and so on.

Gandhi even kept the sentiments of a particular section of readership in mind while bringing out various editions of his newspapers. In the Gujrati edition of the *Indian Opinion* of December 21, 1913, the following remarks were made, that perhaps substantiate above mentioned point: “The Satyagraha campaign, as carried on this time and still continuing, has hardly a parallel in history. The real credit for this goes to the Hindi and Tamil speaking brothers and sisters living in this country. Their sacrifice has been the highest of all. Some of them have even lost their lives: killed by the bullets of the white soldiers. As a tribute to their memory, we have decided to give Hindi and Tamil news in this paper. Some years ago we used to bring out this paper in these two languages as well, but we had to discontinue the practice owing to some difficulties. Those difficulties are not yet over. And yet, we resume publication in these languages for the duration of the struggle, that being, in our judgement, the least we must do, even at some inconvenience to ourselves, in honour of communities whose members have made such sacrifices in a struggle of this kind.” So sensitive Gandhi was to the sentiments of his readers!
This does not imply, however, that JP as a communicator did not care about the sentiments of his readers. He too had due respect for his readership, but as pointed out by Shri Ajit Bhattacharjea, his focus was limited largely to the politically active and educated class or the 'attentive public'.

In addition to considering newspapers as the "most powerful vehicle for transmitting pure ideas in a concise manner..." and making them a tool to educate public opinion, Gandhi had equal regard for opinions expressed by his readers. JP came quite close to Gandhi in this respect. In fact a large part of page two of Everyman's was devoted to letters to the editor, that at times spilled over to page three also. And both of them gave proper display to letters representing dissent and opposite point of view. Another quality of great communicator!

Thus Gandhi published a letter by C.F. Andrews criticizing 'The Growth of Intolerance', at the peak of the non-cooperation movement on the front page of Young India even at the risk of irking many: "I wish to make every allowance for mere boyish enthusiasm and for any juvenile ebullition of feeling; but these and other previous acts have gone far beyond this. They amount to persecution and cruel humiliation. I have watched, for a long time, with greatest pain, that in spite of all that Mahatma Gandhi has done to condemn the evil, it has increased, and it is not confined to one part of India only. As it is entirely opposed to the principle of non-violence, which attracted me so strongly to the Movement, and drew me out of the retirement of Shanti Niketan to take part in it, I feel that the time has come for me to declare publicly and openly my detestation of these practices."  

JP too provided space to his readers to air their opinions. One of the letters on page two of 18 May 1975 issue of Everyman's titled 'The movement and the men behind', read thus: "JP's Movement started with its main target being the elected representative who have been constantly betraying the people who elected them. But how is it that these MLAs and MPs. Who are elected for a specific, brief period, are able to sit over the heads of the administrative and bureaucratic executives who are there to guard the system? What has happened to the sanity, morality and integrity of
these people? JP relies too much on student power to achieve his goals. I feel that the students are generally not mature to be worthy of this faith. There may be a few individual students who think on the lines of JP, but as a force they cannot be relied upon. How can we depend upon our students to achieve higher ideals in the larger canvass of society when they tend to be corrupt in their small sphere? Can we expect a student, who claims copying in the examination hall to be his right, to turn out to be a worthy product? Students have generally impressed the common man as an irresponsible lot. The majority of our present day students are incapable of any useful service to the illiterate masses. The so called education successfully makes than snobs, devoid of any human sympathy and stern moral attitude.”

There was no editing even of the harsh criticism. This shows the high degree of professionalism adhered to by both Gandhi and JP. In fact Gandhi went a step further and would reply to “almost all the letters personally”, as pointed out by Bhargava. “He wrote endlessly and made his point very sharply.” Gandhi is specially recognized to his letters as well. His letters, small or big, official or personal, were pure gems. These were worded appropriately and spoken from heart. “Many are playful; some loving. Many administer a paternal rebuke; some with describable restraint, hit, and hit well; a few are intimates; scarcely any throbs with the impulse of an unguarded moment. The author adjusts the tone, the language and the perspective of every letter - with uncanny precision so as to have the desired effect on the addresses. These letters have provided him with his greatest instrument of controlling the conscience and conduct of his friends and adherents. No man has wielded so great an influence through his letters; and few literary men have written with theirs with such art.”

JP too wrote letters. But they used to be mostly political in nature. The available accounts do not indicate to JP indulging in personal correspondence with the readers of his journal, unlike Gandhi.

Commenting on the overall content of their journals, Ajit Bhattacharjea observes that while the content of JP’s Everyman’s was “basically political, criticising the politics
and action of the government of the day, Gandhi covered broader national agenda as he had a much broader area to appeal to.” He further points out that while Gandhi was fighting an alien government and anti imperialist forces, the focus of JP was much different. “He was fighting a native anti democratic government, and hence the intensity differed.” Rajiv Vora, in fact, goes a step further and sees very little role of JP’s journal in Bihar Movement. “It was primarily an organ informing the educated class about the various developments of JP movement,” opines Vora.

Another factor that marks Gandhi as distinct from JP is the fact that the former “used to manage time to write even in the thick of movements. JP on the other hand could not manage time for writing for mass consumption, however he did produce party documents and theses,” informs G.S.Bhargava, who was an associate of JP

Thus even when the call for Quit India Movement had been given in 1942, Gandhi wrote a letter to his “American friends” in the August 9, 1942 issue of Harijan “I invite you to read my formula of withdrawal or as it has been popularly called ‘Quit India’ I claim to be a votary of truth from my childhood. It was the most natural thing to me. My prayerful search gave me the revealing maxim ‘Truth is God’ instead of the usual one ‘God is Truth’. That maxim enables me to see God face to face as it were. I feel him pervade every fiber of being. With this Truth as witness between you and me, I assert that I would not have asked my country to invite Great Britain to withdraw her rule over India, irrespective of any demand to the contrary, if I had not seen at once that for the sake of Great Britain and the Allied causes it was necessary for Britain boldly to perform the duty of freeing India from bondage. Without this essential act of fairly Justice, Britain could not justify her position before the unmurmuring World Conscience, which is there nevertheless. Singapore, Malaya and Burma taught me that the disaster must not be repeated in India. You have made common cause with Great Britain. You cannot therefore disown responsibility for anything that her representatives do in India. You will do a grievous wrong to the Allied cause, if you do not sift the truth from the chaff whilst there is yet time. Just
think of it. Is there anything wrong in the Congress demanding unconditional recognition of India’s independence?”

**AVOIDANCE OF PROPAGANDA**

Another factor on which Gandhi and JP seem to be at par is their dislike for “any form of propaganda.” “They would both make out their cases quite logically, convincingly and with great conviction even when there was scope of propaganda. They would never resort to cheap techniques of writing for mobilising the masses,” says G.S. Bhargava.

Gandhi was guarded in his writings. Thus he wrote on Khilafat: “in my humble opinion attainment of Swaraj is the quickest method of righting the Khilafat wrong. Hence it is that for me the solution of the Khilafat question is attainment of Swaraj and vice-versa. This only way to help the afflicted Turks is for India to generate sufficient power to be able to assert herself. If she cannot develop that power there is no way out for India and she must resign herself to the inevitable. What can paralytic do to stretch forth a helping hand to a neighbour but to try to cure himself of his paralysis? Mere ignorant, thoughtless and angry outburst of violence may given to pent-up rage but can bring no relief to Turkey. Nor can it increase the power of India to assert herself. And the measures taken to put down violence may well lessen the speed with which we are marching to our goal.”

JP was equally cautious and judicious in use of words. “It is interesting to note”, wrote JP in the November 16, 1974 issue of Everyman’s “that the Prime Minister made a casual reference to the injuries inflicted on me by the police on November 4, saying that there was not intention to hit me and that I was injured in a stampede. There is however a crucial question involved concerning the role of law in the country including that of discrimination between two groups to citizens. The entire machinery of the state was deployed on November 4 and the days preceding it to forcibly prevent the people of Bihar from coming to their capital city for a peaceful demonstration and dharna... The constitution provides that there shall be no discrimination in the
application of law. However, just a week after armed security forces did every thing short of killing to prevent a peaceful demonstration, the CPI has not only been given permission to stage a rally in Patna but official agencies have gone out of the way to provide all possible facilities to help the CPI. The people do not want any facilities from the Government, but they certainly have the right not to be obstructed in activities of peaceful assembly and expression. What is a matter of great concern to all democrats is that if this is repeated then the people will have no chance to give expression to anything that goes against Government policies and actions however bad or evil such policies might be. If this policy continues during election time democracy would be destroyed in our country.”

Similarly, Gandhi did not cross the limit while writing even against the harsh treatment of the South African administration against the Indians residing there. Indian Opinion was the spearhead of struggle in South Africa. Gandhi continued to inspire and infuse a spirit of passive resistance through his writings, which were sharp, straight and effective. Thus Gandhi wrote: “of the many accomplishments that passive resisters have to possess, tenacity is by no means the least important. They cannot and must not lose faith in themselves or in their mission because they may be in a minority. Instead, all reform has been brought about by the action of minorities in all countries and under all clines. Majorities simply follow minorities.” Then he wrote: “Brute force will avail against brute force only when it is proved that darkness can dispel darkness.” And, “Death should cause no fear in us if we have ... done nothing in violation of the voice of our conscience. Then, indeed, is death but a change for the better, and therefore, a welcome change which need not evoke any sorrow. And resisters must learn not only not to fear death, but must be prepared to face it and welcome it when it comes to use in the performance of our duty... I wish for no better end, and I am sure no other passive resister does.” This reflects Gandhi’s ability to put an even as emotive in a style that will not amount to propaganda.
No wonder a large section of the mainstream press relied heavily on Gandhi’s journals, when it came to picking up issues. Almost all the issues discussed by Gandhi figured prominently in all the major newspapers of the day, informs Bhargava. However, the situation was a little different in JP’s case. In fact, JP was already getting a good publicity through the wide coverage of his movement in the mainstream newspapers. And given the wide reach of the newspapers in the 1970’s, as compared to the colonial decades, the impact was much greater. There were, however, cases when issues were picked by the mainstream media from JP’s journal.

Despite this both the communicators had to face the brunt of the respective regimes. While Gandhi’s *Young India* was forced to close down during the Civil Disobedience Movement, JP’s *Everyman’s* was gagged during the peak of emergency. Both the journals were perceived to be creating a great impact on people’s mind and propagating the movements. Similarly, Gandhi’s *Harijan* was closed down forcibly during the peak of Quit India Movement. The British rulers had studied the penetration and power of Gandhi’s journals. As has been said, they used to guide the masses about the various moves made by Gandhi and his workers. Similarly, JP’s journal, though meant primarily for the politically conscious educated class, was becoming a vehicle of ideological and moral debasement of Indira Gandhi’s dictatorial regime. “There have been attacks on the freedom of press, the worst and most sustained occurring during the emergency when censorship was imposed and publications perceived to be hostile to the government were harassed legally illegally.”

Many veteran journalists resisted courageously and some of them were imprisoned. Several others participated in underground resistance. C.R. Irani’s *The Statesman* and Ramnath Goenka’s *the Indian Express* refused to bow to the pressures. Nikhil Chakravarty preferred to stop the publication of his weekly *Mainstream* rather than conform. Jayaprakash Narayan’s journal *Everyman’s* too was banned. The press as a whole, however, was unable to resist during the emergency which took it by surprise.

237
PRESS AS PARTNERS

Gandhi and JP both made the press partners in their campaign and mobilization efforts. They would both inform their readers about not only the development of movements and ideological moorings behind them, but also chalk out a programme for future action.

While taking about his stay in Musahari block in Bihar and his programme of Gramdan, JP wrote: “I should make it clear that we are fully aware that the implementation of our present programme would certainly not mark the completion of our work here. In fact, it would be only the beginning, Gramdan will only prepare the necessary socio-psychological conditions for the direct democracy of the village to function properly. But much will still remain to be done to make the democracy work.

The Gram Sabhas will have to develop the strength and moral resources to be able to resolve conflicts from being committed, and see that the Gram Kosh is collected regularly and utilized for the purposes laid down. The Sabhas will have to learn to prepare their own plans of development, to husband their own resources for their execution, and to obtain available help form Government agencies, credit institutions and other sources... There are other future tasks too. The Gram Sabhas we are establishing are of an ad hoc nature, so they will have to be confirmed according to the provisions of the Gramdan Act. That is a tedious and time-consuming process. Then again, when Gram Sabhas have been set up in all, or at least in 80 per cent, of the villages of the block, the next higher tier, or concentric circle as Gandhiji would have it, the Prakhand (Block) Sabha, will have to be organized. In that manner the structure of the communitarian policy of Sarvodaya will have to be raised tier by from the very grass roots of the primary community.”

Again in the middle of this famous Bihar Movement, JP wrote a signed letter titled ‘come with me to parliament’ in March 2, 1975 issue of Everyman’s: “I have made an appeal to the countrymen to hold at least a million-strong demonstration at the
Parliament in support of the people of Bihar. The National People’s Action coordinating committee has fixed March 6 for the demonstration.”

Similarly Gandhi informed “How to Boycott Foreign cloth” during non-cooperation movement through his journal Young India: “the proposed boycott of foreign cloth is not a vindictive measure, but is as necessary for national existence as breath is for life... It is of the highest importance to know how it can be brought about even before the first day of August next. To arrive at the boycott quickly, it is necessary

(1) For the mill-owners to regulate their profits and to manufacture principally for the Indian market,

(2) For importers to cease to buy foreign goods. A beginning has already been made by three principal merchants

(3) For the consumers to refuse to buy an foreign cloth and to buy khadi wherever possible,

(4) For the consumers to wear only Khadi cloth, mill cloth being retained for the poor who do not know the distinction between Swadeshi and Pardeshi

(5) For the consumers to use, till Swaraj is established and Khadi manufacture increased, Khadi just enough for covering the body.”27

Gandhi, in fact, was more elaborate in his writings about the steps, style and strategies of movements than JP. The reason is pointed out by Ajit Bhattacharjea. “While JP was conversed by the mainstream media during the Bihar movement, Gandhi had to rely mostly on his own journals for popularising his ideas.”

Additionally, Gandhi was multi-lingual (his journals were brought out in many languages) that enabled him to appeal to a much wider audience than JP could. JP could only write in Hindi and English, while Gandhi wrote prolifically in Hindi, English and Gujrati besides being conversant in languages like Sanskrit and Tamil.
A major difference between the two was way they ran their newspapers. While Gandhi was directly involved in the production of all his journals and wrote for most of the issues, JP had appointed a group of journalists to run his journals *Everyman’s* in English and *Prajaniti* in Hindi.

"During to years, that is until 1914 excepting the intervals of my enforced rest in prison, there was hardly an issue of Indian opinion without an article from me", wrote Gandhi.²⁸ Ajit Bhattacharjea was the editor of *Everyman’s* weekly for a large part of its life before it was shut down during the Emergency.

It is also important to point out here that while the media played the role of mediator during the times of Gandhi, it changed its role to that of a messenger during the JP Movement in independent India. This was possible because literacy rates were significantly higher and the growth of press made it possible for a large number of people to access it.

Another contrast appears in the different role that the media played during the two time periods. In Gandhian era it was a marginal motivator while during JP era it was playing the role of a monitor. It was a monitoring instrument for assessing the development of the JP Movement.

In the end, it can be said that both Gandhi and JP despite differences in their style of leadership and their ways of life are likely to be seen more and more belonging essentially to the same genre of leaders, who devoted their whole live is to political activities and brought about major changes in politics without ever aspiring to hold state power in their own hands.
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