Chapter - III

Political communication and Slogans
POLITICAL COMMUNICATION AND SLOGANS

Political movements and institutions, from the most primitive to the most complex cannot exist without communication, which is essential to the symbolic representation of authority and to competition for, and exercise of power. The conduct of modern, democratic politics also depends on participation of citizens, for which extensive means of public communication are indispensable. The vistas and spectrum of political communication, its scope and extend is wider beyond our reach and imagination. Its historical dimensions indicate the extent of its territory. This chapter is to provide an over view to the most important issues concerning communication, slogans and political communication, including: the centrality of slogans to the emergence of public communication, formation of public opinion through political communication for the formation of a public sphere to the end of communicative rationality.

Political communication is as old as politics; Political communication has generally been associated with the expression and diffusion of ideas (thus ideologies) and also with conflicts: between ruled and ruling, between rival contenders for office; between parties and ideologies; between government and opposition and government and people. Political communication is the organised, association of the individuals, masses or public for a political end by registering their idea, opinion or protests through one or other forms of communication.\(^1\) So political communication comprises of different elements and variable in the society in different proportions and levels. It can be termed as a mixture of opposites and a bundle of contradictions in idea or ideology, cause or concern. It comprises of active variable ranging from citizens, groups, political parties, movements and even governments. So political communication comprises of all communication processes that are of importance with respect to political decision making.

The term political communication, itself only appeared in very recent times, but the most noble and admired forms of political communication were probably the Greek and Latin art of Rhetoric's. The emergence of political communication as an important phenomenon is quite simply the end result of the dual process of democratisation and communication which has begun two centuries ago, the aim of which was to transcribe the democratic political ideals of the eighteenth century into an enlarged public space where the various partners would have legitimate status. For two centuries the problem has been not only to secure acceptance of the democratic model but also to adapt it to a radically different society from the one in which it was thought out. Political communication is the space in which contradictory discourses is exchanged between different elements in a society which has the legitimate right to express themselves in public.² Political communication is the arena in which different types of discourse revolving around politics vie to gain ascendancy in the political interpretation of the situation. This definition stresses the interaction of contradictory discourses preferred by actors who share neither the same status nor the same legitimacy, but who by reason of their respective positions in the public arena effectively guarantee the functioning of mass democracy. It is a constant process, fuelled by the political problems of the day, but comes regularly to gain momentum through public communication, in the democratic political system, closes off one space of political communication and open up another.

Denton and Woodward described political communication in a Laswellian Manner, "Public Discussion about the allocation of public resources (money), official authority (who decides) and official sanctions (what is to be rewarded)."³ Contemporary day political communication revolves and rotates about the authority and materialism associated with it. It merely confines the broad spectrum of political communication on the phenomenon of power and decision making. The term political communication was first used to refer to the study of communication from the government to the voting public (now called government communication); it then came to designate the exchange of political discourse

between the politicians in power and their political opponents. The field expanded to include the study of the role of different forms and means of communication in a polity, role of media in forming public opinion, and was further enlarged to cover the influence of ideology, partisan politics, schools and streams of political thoughts, and the influence of public opinion on political life etc.

Today, political communication encompasses the study of the role of communication in political life in the fullest sense, including the media, opinion polls, public sphere, political marketing, publicity, advertising, public relations, and propaganda, with special emphasis on electoral periods.\(^4\) This broad definition stresses the process of exchange of political discourse between growing numbers of political actors, with the implicit idea that the core of modern politics is progressively coming to centre on political communication. At a stretch the term political communication can be applied to any communication on the subject of politics! Despite the fact that this is too broad a definition, it does take into account the two major characteristics of politics, namely the enlargement of political sphere with an increasing number of problems and elements in the political limelight, and the expansion of communication backed by the mediations of communications and public opinion as opinion polls. But at the same time these two developments also explain the suspicion political communication arouses, the impression being that communication wields unbending tyrannical power over politics, dressing it up as a spectacle. In a sense political communication has been subjected to an operation of displacement.

The broad definition of political communication need to be challenged since it makes it impossible to grasp the specificity of modern political communication. The frequently voiced opinion that political communication is a caricature of politics and represents the triumph of communication, implying the domination of form over content. On the contrary political communication represents important development in the field of politics as mass media and public opinion were in the respective fields of information and democracy. Political communication attests to importance of communication in politics, not in the
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sense of confrontation ceasing to exist but inversely, in the sense that confrontation, which is characteristic of politics, takes place today in democratic countries in the ‘communicational mode’ meaning that there is recognition of ‘the other person’ or an external force of communication.

There are five points to be remembered in favour of framing and constituting a broad and acceptable definition of political communication and to enlarge from the vistas of traditional concept of political communication, they are:

**Firstly**: Interaction of Politics, Information and Communication constitutes political communication. In reality these three different types of discourse form a system in the sense that they respond one to the other, but also they represent the three legitimacies of democracy. The interaction of the above three comes closer to a space for the ‘confrontation’ of contradictory points of view, than a space for communication.\(^5\) For this reason there are only limited numbers of elements—those who have the legitimate right to express themselves—and it is consubstantial with the logic of interaction. In this sense political communication differs from the political debate which is extremely important for democracy but which assembles discourse emanating from political actor in the strict sense.

**Secondly**: Political communication consists of managing three contradictory and complementary dimensions of mass democracy: namely Politics, Information and Communication. These three dimensions cannot in fact be dissociated from mass democracy. The originality of political communication lies precisely in the fact that it is the arena where the constituent and contradictory legitimacies of mass democracy are expressed and confronted.\(^6\) Political communication is something new, on both the functional and the theoretical levels. From this postulate must be assumed that the added weight of politics with the greater number of problems being handled on the political level and the greater number of elements involved in it is equalised with universal adult suffrage and the existence of mass
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communication and mass media keeps the masses informed of the need to the assessment of the state of public opinion.

The three constituents of political communication did not appear simultaneously. Politics and information were the first to develop, as of the eighteenth century. The struggle for universal adult suffrage goes hand in hand with the demand for freedom of speech and information. Public opinion and communication originated in more recent times. What reason is there for the coupling of communication and public opinion? Firstly, because there can be no mass democracy without taking public opinion into account and public opinion is doubly dependent on a communication process: (to exist at all and to express itself). In fact public opinion does not exist as such, but is the intangible product of a permanent social process of construction/deconstruction linked to the manner in which certain themes emerge or fail to emerge into the social and political domain and become the focus of political interest. Hence public opinion could not exist without social interaction, this being in a way its lifeblood.

Communication techniques are only a means since they guarantee transmission of 'information'. On the other hand, communication is an essential value where public opinion is concerned both as regards its 'existence' and its 'exposition'. Thus political communication guarantees the cohabitation of the three logics, each of which is a constituent part of 'democratic legitimacy'. Political communication and political slogans in one way or other generate social interaction and pave the way for the formation of public opinion through the phenomenon of communication and information dissemination. Public opinion acquires significance and it exists only with the communication phenomenon, which provides it with a voice and publicise it in the public arena. Failing this 'it does not exist'. Historically, then, the logic of public opinion and communication is more recent, but today it is impossible to dissociate the three.
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The restrictive definition of political communication confined to the exchange of discourse between three elements authorised to express themselves in all areas of politics, makes it possible to distinguish it from another, far larger space set aside for exchanges, but on which democracy is equally dependent. This is the 'public arena'. The Public arena is consubstantial with the existence of democracy. Its organisational principle is linked to freedom of speech, expression and though in certain of its themes may be political, many others are not, since it is the first and the foremost a space for expression and exchange of opinions concerning everything in the public domain. The words 'to make public' express the aspect of publicity in the strict sense with reference to the public arena carries. One makes public whatever one wishes to communicate to the public arena, an appropriate description of the public arena being the open space where anyone who feels authorised to speak in public may do so, guaranteeing in this way that his discourse is accorded a certain publicity and mediation. The constraints that go with mass democracy are what in fact makes it necessary to reserve a more limited space for political communication. Public arena is much broader and, in principle, opens to whoever feels authorised to speak in public. Consequently it extends far beyond the field authorised the field of political communication. Political communication is more limited and has a greater number of restrictions than the public arena. Political communication deals with the exchanges between politicians/leaders, mass/public, government/rulers by means of public opinions. Finally, the public arena is the largest of the three, since it accepts all discourse expressed in public.

Thirdly: Definitions of political communication must serve to reminder that not all political speeches of the day come under the heading of political communication. Only those which becomes the subject of conflict and polemics enter into this category. Since it is the arena where contradictory politics of the day are fought out, it follows that the content of political communication varies with time. It can readily be understood that the themes of unemployment, education, immigration, ecology, national independence, and regionalisation, etc. will not remain
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conflictual issues year after year. There are two meanings attached to the contradictory content of the exchange: first in the classic sense of a political position—left or right, conservative or progressive politics; and secondly in the sense that politicians, public or government interpret political reality according to their position in it, and according to what legitimates their discourse.

Fourthly: Definitions on political communication must revalorise politics in relation to communication, or rather shows how the two cannot be separated today, even though there are radical differences between them. Communication has not ‘devoured’ politics. The fact is, rather, that politics takes place today in a communicational mode. The question arises as to why, in the space of half a century, communication has become one of the basic problems. Communication is a consequence of democratisation in the sense that universal suffrage and rising standards of living make it necessary to take account of the hopes of an ever greater number of citizens. This means that governing without a ‘rear-view mirror’, without being aware of public opinion, is now impossible.11 For mass democracy to function, communication is essential, ‘downwards’ from the seat of power to the electorate by means of the media, and ‘upwards’ from the public opinion to the politicians.

The considerable importance that communication has achieved is therefore to be ascribed on two distinct factors. On the one hand, the growth of the media, linked to the democratic model and the functional needs of mass society and, on the other, the appearance of communication with public opinion. Additionally, this growth of communication produces a disjunction of communication in two different directions; one branch follows the logic of information—essentially that of the mass media—and the other, the logic of communication which is that of public opinion. Political communication and mass democracy are dependent on the maintenance of the two. There is familiar common trunk but they are growing apart as mass democracy develops.

Fifthly: Different definitions in the field of political communication must draw attention to the fact that the public has a prolific place in the interaction of politics.

information and communication. Political communication is not limited to the exchange of ‘political and journalistic class‘ discourse. Public opinion, represented by different opinion polls and election mandates (public) are also present. It plays an active part, not simply as witness to exchange of discourse but also as the modifiers of the different elements in the discourse process. Political communication is also ‘public’ in the sense that it takes place in front of the public which regularly brings discussions. This visibility of political communication is the fundamental principle of our political system where the mass decides publically. Thus political communication can be likened to a stage where arguments, thoughts, and passionate beliefs are exchanged for the public to make the choice. Finally political communication is a set of strict rules guaranteeing that this arena for the exchange of discourse remains operational.

Political communication is more than just political campaigning. In the terms used by Seymour-Ure, it has a horizontal as well as a vertical dimension. The former refers to communication between equals, whether these are members of the same political elite, or citizens who interact and assemble together. Vertical communication takes place between government (or parties) and people (in principle in either direction). Their early emphasis on campaigns focused attention on the ‘top-down‘ flow on the vertical dimension (from government or party to citizens and followers). This, however led to the neglect of communication within elites and of interpersonal, informal communication. Equally important is the flow of communication ‘upwards’, to the political ‘top’, in the form of demonstrations, protests, strikes, boycotts, voting ‘feedback’, opinion poll results or other forms of intelligence gathering by leaders, politicians and governments. Political communication can be cited as a porous medium in which 360 degree communication operates and performs. It may be vertical, horizontal, diagonal, lateral, parallel, upward and downward etc.

Manuel Pare i Maicas the prominent French social scientist says that political communication, its elements, process and phenomenon cannot be confined to the strict boundaries of a single concise definition. In his renowned
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work ‘Introduction a la comunicacion social’ he illustrates a number of postulates for political communication instead of a single definition for political communication. They are:

(a) It is any communication message which keeps a more or less direct relationship with the political dynamics of the social system, irrespective of political actors-public and governmental institutions, political parties, social movements, pressure groups or citizens-and whether they behave as communicators or receivers. This definition may include conflicts of power provoked by pressure groups which attain a public diffusion and impact.

(b) Considering its connections with the concepts of power, ideology, interests, conflict and consensus, any political communication message has always an intentional and persuasive element, which sometimes may become manipulative or false. These concepts are fundamental to understanding any political communication message. It is necessary to stress the essential role played by power and the ideological and interest conflicts which derive from it.

(c) Depending on the circumstances of the political messages it can adopt the nature and form of news, simultaneously perhaps, with a propaganda or disinformation content. In addition they may be expressed using the techniques and language of advertising and public relations in political communication process.

(d) Political Communication can either be referred as terms of office in exercising power or a process of marketing to power. This is a transition from opinion democracy to the concept of people’s representatives through the various means of communication.  

Political communication is primarily persuasive in nature; and it basically serves the function of transmission of political information. In practice it may also include more or less unabashed degree of propaganda or disinformation. The
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conventional function of any sort of communication is to inform, to educate and socialise, in addition to entertain, in this area, the concept of persuasion is applied, which is generally considered as the main intention of any political communication message for the masses. Here comes the problem of truth in political communication. In political communication the approach to truth is more tortuous, sometimes non-existent. If the messages are coming from political institutions (public or private) and/or from politicians who frequently, partially or completely ignore the truth due to their own power interests or to conflict developments, the concept of political communication moves into a state of crisis. If political communication adopts a persuasive, seductive, biased manipulative tone, it will be confronted with the real issues of political communication ethics.

Political Communication thus refers to all process of information (including facts, opinions, beliefs, ideologies etc) transmission, exchange and search engaged in by the participants in the course of institutionalised political activities. Confining the attention to those activities which belong to the ‘public sphere’ or political life, a reference both to the content of open political debate and the ‘arenas’, where such debates occur inevitably in many such occasions. Such arenas comprise institutionally guaranteed social space, as much as locations set aside for political debate. In practice, political communication covers the following:

a) Activities directed towards the formation, mobilisation, deployment of individuals, parties and similar political movement.

b) All forms of organised campaign designed to gain political support for a party, cause, policy or government, by influencing public opinion and behaviour.

c) Many processes involving the expression, measurement, dissemination and also ‘management’ of public opinion (this includes informal, interpersonal, discussion).

d) The activities of established mass communication and mass media in reporting, projecting or commenting on political events.
e) Informal political socialisation, the formation and maintenance of political consciousness.

The study of political communication during the twentieth century, beyond the story of the rise of the organised and systematic political mass media, has been shaped by a trend towards ‘mass politics’, based on universal suffrage with in large-scale bureaucratically organised societies\(^{15}\). This trend placed a premium on the capacity of political leaders to manage the direction of individual choice of large number of citizens, with whom ties are inevitably remote or superficial. The modern study of political communication virtually began with the study of propaganda, especially as a response to the uses made of new means of communication during and after the First World War to promote patriotism and other ideologies amongst national mass publics. The early equation of political communication with propaganda was reinforced by the example of the Soviet Union and the Nazi Germany, both of which used their monopoly of control of public means and methods of communication for their own different projects of social transformation.

Michael Foucault (1980) points out that political power through the art of communication ‘traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourses.’\(^{16}\) The political discourses formulated and enforced by various instruments of communication are accepted by the vast majority of the grass root level population because of the lack of ideological indoctrination, illiteracy, ignorance, fear etc. Political slogans too exploit these particular situations. Political communication by a group or a government purposefully, deliberately and / or knowingly examines the modes and means of persuasion in shaping public opinion and social reality.

Political communication is a vital process in contemporary politics since it allows the confrontation of the characteristic types of political discourses, these being ideology and action for politicians/leaders, information for media/journalists, and communication for public through opinion polls. These three types


of discourses are in a permanent state of tension. Each has its share of
democratic political legitimacy and can thus claim to interpret the political reality
of the day to the exclusion of the others. The three types of discourses are in
opposition to one another due to differing relationships each has with legitimacy,
politics and communication. As social reality and public arena are open
phenomena, political communications too remain open to society in the sense that
all the elements speak permanently on two levels. It is not a closed space. On the
one hand, oral communication is directed at one’s peers and the other partners in
political communication, and on the other, at public opinion. This double level of
verbal communication is a necessity to avoid a dialogue of the deaf, because the
interests of one group are not the interests of the other. In this respect political
communication is not only a space for the exchange of discourse but, even more
importantly perhaps, a space for the confrontation of logic and differing concerns.

The fundamental role of political communication is to prevent the political
debate from closing in upon itself. It achieves this by integrating a diversity of
themes, which then become political issues and by facilitating the permanent
process of selection, hierarchical classification and elimination which ensures the
necessary flexibility of the political system. There is no rationality in this
fluctuation of the themes of political communication as they are taken up or
discarded in a necessarily arbitrary manner according to the pressures of the
movement. Whereas the dream of every politician is to close political communication
on familiar themes, to avoid others being introduced, the role of political
communication is to guard against such an eventuality since functioning in a closed
circuit would be liable to detach the political world from the rest of the society.
Political communication makes it possible to take up the discourse of the social
movements which regularly appear in the period between political movements or
campaigns and which may show themselves perfectly capable of challenging the
authority, and sometimes even the legitimacy and representativeness, of those
whose task it is to govern.17 Political communication serves to regulate the
principal contradictions in the democratic political system, which is to allow for the

existence of two alternating systems, the one open and receptive to new problems, and the other closed, to avoid eternal public debate on every matter. Political communication performs three functions in regulating this dual opening and closing. Firstly, it aids in the identification of new problems as they arise, the role of politicians and the mass media being fundamentally important in this respect. Secondly, it then contributes to the integration into the day to day political debates by providing them with a legitimacy of sorts. Finally, it facilitates the exclusion of themes that have ceased to be conflictual or on which there is a temporary consensus of opinion. These three simultaneous functions are in fact uncontrollable. Performance of this triple function is what gives political communication its specific worth, making it rather like the 'lung' of democracy. There are variations of a pattern, according to historical context. In politics normal situation is rarity! In each of the three most characteristic situations, one of the three discursive logics comes to the forefront.

When instruments of communication become seats of heated consideration of political communication, some others like King and Cushman (1992) argue that political language too is linked to the phenomenon of social discourses. According to them the political language is linked to its effect on culture and ideology of a society. Political language, while serving to shape thought, guide action, induce commitment, and control the public mind, is at the same time the practice of ideology and representation of cultural values. While ideology often divides people and nations, it is interesting to note that whatever ideology a society values and promotes, the role, the function and the effect of political language is similar.

German sociologist Dahrendorf claims that for the process of political communication to occur in a democracy two kinds of audience must exist in that polity. He makes the audience distinction as 'active' and 'passive'. Dahrendorf calls the active audience as 'politically responsible public' where as the latter consists of those who only participate in the political process at the election time.

by casting their ballot. Between two elections, the passive does not concerns themselves with ‘politics’; at most they follow developments in the ‘capital’ through the media. Politically responsible public consists of that segment of the public that regularly take some kind of initiative with respect to the political process: national leaders, social activists, political leaders, elected representatives, political parties, trade unions, social interests organisations and pressure groups all belong to this category. Political slogans can operate effectively only through the active audience in the society, because they will have a vigilant, conscious and studious mind of closely monitoring the day today politics of the society and exhibits a responsible mind with interest on responding to it. The issue in a democracy then, is to what extent ‘politically active public’ and ‘politically passive public’ have at their disposal the means of discovering ‘how the other half lives’. Or to put in another way: to what extent are these two groups of people able to collect information about one another’s activities.

Political communication existing and prevailing in one nation or state may differ and contrast. It is because of these elements: ethics, politics and communication. Any positive relation with ethics and politics is conflicting or non-existent. It will be the same as that of maintaining a positive relation with ethics and communication too. Words like propaganda, campaigns, agitations, protests, revolts etc has an imbibed negative meaning in their usages even if they are guided by ethical motives. So the possibility of developing an ethics of political communication will be problematic. Political slogans too face these problems of dissemination backed by the tenants of ethics. Also it is very difficult to deal properly with the subject of political communication and the discourse of political slogans from an international and comparative basis. This is because each country, with its corresponding political history, has its own values, political culture etc. By the same token; the connections between politics, ethics and communication have acquired their own characteristics.

Edelman sees political communication as a spectacle; the conscious or sub-conscious creation of images, problems and antagonisms. Political slogans...
communication consists in dealing with contradictory and complementary elements of mass democracy: Politics, Information and Communication. Political slogans greatly perform the functions attributed by Edelman as political communications. A political slogan create images, deals problems and raises protests and representations as a part of antagonism. Marxist Philosopher Louis Althusser sees political communication as part of the ongoing and pervasive set of communication practices which transcends classes. In the history, the activity devoted to the exchange of political communication (political discourse) was referred to by a variety of rather inglorious, even disparaging names, particularly since the twentieth century, with Communism and Nazism. Action has always been considered as the noble task of politics, whereas its counterpart, oral communication, which sometimes becomes the substitute or even the very essence of politics, has never been accorded the same status or the same legitimacy; so is political slogans too. Political discourses and more recently political communication seem to be considered as a degraded form of politics.

The dissociation of action and words, with considerable privileging of the former and distrust of the latter, has long been a characteristic of politics, due perhaps due to the fact that political speeches bring to mind the lies, promises and ideologies which comprise the hidden side of politics. However, there has been a significant change in this troubled history with the present day valorisation of communication with in politics, which concerns the exchange of discourse and more recently public opinion and formation of public sphere. This valourisation of communication, notably with the emergence of political communication, came into existence simultaneously with mass society and mass democracy. Political communication intuitively brings to mind the whole processes of political discourse being produced and exchanged by the different factors that are transmitted. Despite its growing importance however, political communication has not risen in public esteem. Political slogans in the contemporary world too didn’t gained massive acceptances. This lack of acceptance is because of the fact that political communications in the past decades has become the blind spot onto which all criticisms converged, has been sighted as one of the ills of the society.

22 Ibid.,
According to McGee and Denton “Political slogans are forms of Ideographs, are considered as the building blocks of ideology, an effective means of persuasion, and a way to express political goals, raise political consciousness, and organise certain cultural attitudes.” Ideographs are flexible cultural signifiers that change and control the mind of the public. McGee suggested two approaches to the analysis of ideographic actions in political slogan usages in political language: (a) The diachronic approach and (b) The synchronic approach. The diachronic approach examines how usages changes and expands throughout its history. The synchronic approach examines how the meaning of the ideograph is accommodated in the slogan to specific situations. In other words of Condit and Lucaites, ‘Political slogans by charting the diachronic and synchronic structures of an ideograph as it is employed in the public discourse of a particular rhetorical culture, can provide insight into how social and political problems are constituted and negotiated through public discourse.’ While ‘ideograph’ as defined by the western rhetorical scholars is closely associated with ideological formation and social construction of meaning that can be applied to any society, the term also has a specific meaning in the linguistic field to describe socio-cultural-religious and ideological factors in Indian Independence struggle slogans.

Although ‘ideology’ and ‘culture’ are not synonymous terms, one cannot fully understand a nation’s ideology without examining its culture, and vice versa. Philip Wander (1984) makes an inseparable connection between the two notions, defining ideological criticism as insisting on a historical perspective in relation to cultural artifacts and political issues. Similarly cultural criticism is the practice of interpreting cultural products in the context of ideological struggles. Furthermore, it examines the world-view conveyed by such products, facts they do or do not acknowledge, and consequences and alternatives they do or do not ignore in light of moral, social, economic and political issues. Studying and analysing the Indian freedom struggle slogans without considering the vistas of
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Indian cultural tradition, heritage and long up-held socio-politico-economic and cultural ideology is futile in all manners.

Political slogans in the phenomenon of political communication serve as a means for controlling mass consciousness and shaping the individual’s ‘reality.’ A Political slogan is produced by the dynamics of cultural force and the shifting of political power, thus ideological change is inevitable. According to Terence Ball, such change is revealed through the use of newly coined terms or by assigning new meanings to old terms. Ball suggests that political discourse and its connection with ideological transformation must be analysed and examined with a consideration of historical context, the intention and motive of the political agent, and any other circumstances that may have caused the need for conceptual and ideological change.27

All definitions to some extent, explain, how the state, explicitly or otherwise, uses communication apparatuses to ensure consent and legitimacy. Thus, political communication can take many forms, from the overt such as political advertising and propaganda to subtle such as the creation and propagation of myths and symbols of the state. They can be embedded in the entertainment of popular culture or take the ‘guise’ of information found in the news. Political slogans usually emphasised uniformity, both in terms of rhetoric and action.

POLITICAL COMMUNICATION THROUGH CENTURIES

Any transmission of messages that has or is intended to have an effect on the distribution or use of power in society can be considered political communication.28 The term is generally applied to messages concerning power in nation-states but can also refer to communication in a church, school, family, or any other setting in which power is at stake. Indeed, with the expansion of state power all over the globe in the past century, private life has been increasingly


politicised, subjected more and more to state policy. Defining the limits of the political communication has grown correspondingly more difficult.

Picturising the world as spheres of the governors and the governed, it can be classified as follows,

- The governors communicate among themselves (*Elite Communication*),
- They governors address the governed (*Hegemonic Communication*),
- The governed address the governors (*Petitionary Communication*),
- The governed communicate among themselves (*Associational Communication*).

This schema is overtly simple, but it facilitates defining the field of discussion and clarifying historic trends in political communication.

**EARLY MODERN EUROPE**

With the invention of the printing press and the spread of print shops throughout Europe in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, a technical possibility emerged for expanding political communication that was not exclusively elite communication. But printed news and political opinion remained largely within the realm of elite communication until the mid-1700s and later in many countries. Church and state supervision of printers and censorship of printing tried to keep pace with the spread of the new technology.

Only when representative government became institutionalised did political communication move from predominantly elite communication to the hegemonic and petitionary forms of communication that link governors and governed. Representative government developed in England and in the American colonies in the 1600s, but even there it took another century to establish the principle that the voting public had a right to know what the legislature was doing.²⁹

In 1726 James Franklin became the first person on either side of the Atlantic to record in the public press the votes of individual lawmakers on a bill before the legislature. This became standard practice only in the 1770s in England; the English press did not gain full rights to listen to parliamentary debates until after 1800. The U.S. Senate acted completely in secret for its first four years. While the eighteenth-century press was by no means muzzled in the English-speaking world, most newspaper political writing and pamphleteering did not report information about what politics was so much as express (often very freely) opinions about what it should be.

The pamphlet and the broadside developed as important forms of communication in eighteenth-century Europe and in colonial America. Perhaps the most famous pamphlet of that time was Thomas Paine's *Common Sense*. It went through twenty-five editions and gained thousands of readers in 1776 alone. It helped in the pioneering of a new style of political writing. Earlier pamphleteers in America were lawyers, merchants, planters, or ministers, who typically wrote to others of their peer group in a florid style full of classical references. Paine's style of writing was republican as his politics: "As it is my design to make those that can scarcely read understand, I shall therefore avoid every literary ornament and put it in language as plain as the alphabet." Paine was original in this rejection of the elite political language of the past. The move away from elite communication as the exclusive domain for political messages was under way.30

The pamphlet, like the newspaper, had roots in the seventeenth century but was still a break from more traditional means of expressing or shaping public opinion. In the eighteenth century, in the American colonies, without written constitutions or school texts on government (or many schools), people learned about politics by participating - usually in a subordinate and deferential role - in rituals of authority. People learned about government by attending courthouse sessions or public executions. Voting itself was as much an act of hegemonic communication as of petitionary communication. In the state of Virginia, for instance, it was typically an act of deference since there was no secret ballot. The

sheriff would ask the voter whom he favored in the presence of the candidates. The fortunate candidate would then thank the voter. Candidates "treated" voters to rum, not so much to buy votes as to express the paternalism of the gentry toward the lower orders. 31 Politics was not so much a separate sphere of activity as it was just one more expression of the etiquette of a deferential society in which inequality was taken for granted.

In contrast, New England's political culture made more room for petitionary political expression. Town meetings voiced objection to the Stamp Act of 1765 (a British law requiring publications in its American colonies to bear a tax stamp) by written instructions to their representatives in the colonial assembly. The instructions were typically printed in newspapers, spreading the ideas of resistance. Political writing in the colonies was directed to the legislature, not to the public, until at least the 1720s. Political expression in print was at first elite communication. But by the 1750s pamphlets and newspapers were directed to voters and might be printed in several thousand copies and read aloud at the polls. Elites were not happy with this inclusion of a larger (although still narrow by modern standards) public, but parties out of office sought to broaden their political base by such means to unseat incumbents. This intra-elite rivalry led even social conservatives to appeal to a wider public. 32 Colonial elites did not want to democratise society, but their hesitation in encouraging mob violence directed at British imperial officers lessened over the years.

The riot may have been the archetypal form of petitionary communication in the eighteenth century. In England and France so-called food riots were generally an assertion of the local community's right to consume available food at a fair price. These often tumultuous but only occasionally violent gatherings threatened hoarders and profiteers and led to searches of storehouses and private homes for hoarded grain and seizure of food shipments. In London riots were often directed toward Parliament and in this respect were
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most directly political. In the American colonies riots also became expressly political as local issues became assimilated to the single theme of opposition to British rule. The eighteenth-century mobs were a kind of halfway house of political consciousness: in part concerned only with local economic issues, in part developing a sense of political rights, in part a tool of the gentry that organised or incited the riots, in part an emerging separation from the traditions of deference. The eighteenth-century riot typically resisted the encroachment of state power; it was a reactionary form of collective violence and died out by the mid-nineteenth century in England, France, and the United States, to be replaced by more organised violence based on social or political associations and directed toward a broad political programme.

Political communication also took place through the calendar of the year's activities. In Boston, March 5 was celebrated in the 1770s as the anniversary of the Boston Massacre. Public orations were an important part of the commemoration, and they served, in Sam Adams's view, "to preserve in the Minds of the People a lively Sense of the Danger of standing Armies." The mobilisation of opinion through holidays and celebrations greatly accelerated with the French Revolution. Jacobin revolutionary leaders established republicanism as a pseudo-religion. Jacobin clubs throughout France employed revolutionary catechisms, prayers, hymns, communal feasts, civic altars, and Trees of Liberty (a symbol borrowed from the American Revolution) to encourage republican sentiment. Indeed, the French Revolution provided the first self-conscious, directed, and total effort at political indoctrination in history. Where earlier rulers had sought compliance or loyalty, the French leaders wanted commitment. They believed with other Enlightenment thinkers that human beings could be fundamentally changed and that "men could be led to practice social virtues if moral lessons were constantly associated with pleasant sensations." Hence music, festivals, spectacles, and dramas were all drawn into the service of political education. With the French Revolution the interest of
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the state in hegemonic political communication began to encompass control over
the private life and passions of individuals, not just their public behaviour.

**POLITICAL PARTIES AND NEWSPAPERS**

The nineteenth century saw two significant developments in political
communication in Western Europe and North America.

*First*, the political party emerged as the central institution of opinion formation
and articulation.

*Second*, the newspaper grew substantially as an avenue of political communication.

The political party is, as Benjamin Disraeli put it, "organised opinion." It is
even more important than this suggests. French political scientist Maurice
Duverger wrote that "parties create public opinion as much as they express it;
they form it rather than distort it; there is dialogue rather than echo." Like
political communication generally, parties began as intra-elite institutions and only
later became a link between rulers and citizens. The modern political party, the
mass-based party, developed in the United States and Western Europe in the
nineteenth century. In England a Parliamentary party moved toward a mass party
system as the Reform Bills of 1832, 1867, and 1884 broadened the electorate. In
the United States the mass party developed in the Jacksonian period, from 1828
to 1840. Other European party systems emerged in the middle to late nineteenth
century.

The rise of the party in England was connected with the extension of the
franchise to the working class. This is a vital story in itself, for the vote is the
primary expression of petitionary communication in democratic societies. The
growth of the franchise concerns; not only who is eligible to vote but how voting
is conducted. The working class in some countries had the franchise before they
were able to exercise it freely. Not until 1872 in Great Britain, the 1890s in the
United States, 1901 in Denmark, 1918 in Prussia, and the 1930s in Hungary was a
secret ballot a protection within the electoral process.
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Many of the developments in political communication in the nineteenth century accompanied working-class (and later feminist) agitation for the vote. In Great Britain this included popular lecture series, workingmen's educational institutes, indoor and outdoor mass political meetings, union organising, demonstrations that spurred the Chartist and other reform movements, and a tradition of banners that accompanied the demonstrations and outdoor meetings. In the United States similar kinds of activities developed with the emergence of the mass-based political party. In election campaigns from at least 1840 on, banners, torches (for nighttime parades), campaign buttons, handkerchiefs, and other paraphernalia became part of popular political culture. The election, from the mid-nineteenth century on, has been the chief institution of dramatised ideology and legitimating political ritual.

The idea that party opposition to the governing party is legitimate developed and became institutionalised in the nineteenth century. In the United States the Federalists and Republicans did not at first see themselves as alternatives in a two-party system; each side hoped to eliminate the other. Eighteenth-century political thinkers took party loyalty to be an insidious substitute for loyalty to the public good. Edmund Burke, in 1779, was probably the first to state effectively the case for party competition as a legitimate structure within representative government.36 But it was the United States that first developed the legitimacy of party opposition early in the nineteenth century, and also the United States that first incorporated a large electorate and the machinery of mass based political parties. In Great Britain the idea of an organised opposition had roots in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries but did not develop into a genuinely organised and led opposition until the late nineteenth century.

As parties became the main institutional locus of political expression, newspapers became the major medium. The French Revolution stimulated a politicisation of the news media in Europe. In Scotland the editorial voice of the newspaper (the leading article, or leader) acquired importance for the first time in

the early nineteenth century. The eighteenth-century Scottish newspaper had been an advertising medium without political influence. The Edinburgh Review certainly exaggerated when it claimed in 1860 that journalists were no longer hack writers but were "men of fixed opinions, consummate knowledge, and deliberate purpose," but it recognised that the press had become an established political institution.

At the same time, the French Revolution led to a reaction and increased censorship of the press in many parts of Europe. In Great Britain a key distinction emerged between the "respectable press" and the "pauper press." Radical journalists in the early 1800s ran papers of much greater circulation than even the leading newspaper of the age, the Times of London. But while political expression in the latter was tolerated, the readership being "safe," government's fears of the working class led to efforts to limit the reach of the radical journals. A newspaper tax and an advertisement tax, which the bourgeois papers were wealthy enough to pay, could not be paid by the working-class press. Hence these "unstamped" papers were denied access to the mails, and a paper like William Cobbett's famous Political Register had to be sold and distributed by its own readers.

The British stamp tax was ended in 1836 and the advertisement duty in 1853, opening the way to a newspaper press of vastly increased circulation and influence. The social and economic basis of the new popular press was an improvement in the production and distribution of newspapers, connected with improved technology in printing and paper making and the growth of the railroads in the mid-nineteenth century. (In France and England, bookstalls at the railroad stations were a major marketplace for reading matter.) The success of newspapers was as much a result as a cause of political communication: the drive for a wider franchise gave more people a stake in political life and reason to want to inform themselves about it.

In France a daily newspaper press at prices that a growing middle-class readership could afford was inaugurated in the 1830s. Stimulated by the freedom
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of expression that the French Revolution unleashed, hundreds of papers sprang up (and expired) in France in the first decades of the nineteenth century. The press became closely allied with politics. In 1830 and again in 1848 journalists played central roles in overthrowing governments, and freedom of the press was a burning issue. A close accommodation between government and the press developed after 1848. During much of the nineteenth century the French press deposited "caution money" with the government as an advance against fines. The size of this deposit and the nature of the fines limited the growth of the press and led to a press more venal than that in England or the United States. 39 In the late nineteenth century the French commercial press was notoriously corrupt. The Russian government paid millions of francs to the French press from 1889 to 1905 to help raise loans in France; respected journalists took bribes to write favourably about Russia. As for the French government, it operated on a similar system of secret funds, subsidies, and bribes to attract favourable press publicity.

In the United States an active party press in the early 1800s gave way to a self-consciously "independent" commercial press, the "penny press," that arose in New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Baltimore in the 1830s. These papers were distinctive in that they were cheap, were sold on the street by newsboys rather than solely by subscription, attended to local news (early U.S. newspapers had copied most of their news items from London papers), and paid greater attention to areas on the border between public and private life - the social life of elites and the police and court reports. While the penny papers were not all affiliated with political parties and were the first papers to seek commercial success without government printing contracts (a major source of income for the earlier press), they remained engaged in the political field of battle. 40 Indeed, nineteenth-century newspapers frequently grew up (and died) with specific parties and movements. The press was an instrument of political and cultural association and was often more an institution of associational than of elite or hegemonic communication.

In countries without the institutions of democracy political communication was very different. In Russia, as late as 1703, all foreign and domestic news were regarded as a state secret. Only at the end of the eighteenth century did literature emerge from patrimonial subservience as an independent field. Catherine II (r. 1762-1796) encouraged a new level of free expression. In the nineteenth century several institutions among the privileged developed as centers of critical discussion: the salon, the universities, and the periodicals. From the 1860s on, a student movement became a constant feature of Russian life. With the reforms of Alexander II (r. 1855-1881) freeing the serfs, establishing limited local self-government and opportunities for political expression grew. While censorship, including the requirement of a prepublication government stamp, existed throughout the nineteenth century, it was not strictly enforced. A secret police provided a strong system of social control, but the severity of the repressive apparatus generated its opposite number in the dramatic terrorist activities of the Czar’s opposition. Further, dissidents used the privileged place of literature as a political field of expression. One of the most influential political documents in history was Nikolai Chernyshevsky’s novel *What Is to Be Done?* (1863). This utopian novel describes a revolutionary "new people" who dedicate themselves to liberation through selfless struggle. It was the Bible of Russian radicals and deeply influenced V. I. Lenin himself, who wrote a revolutionary pamphlet with the same title (1902).

**TWENTIETH-CENTURY DEVELOPMENTS**

The mass-based party and the newspaper were the great inventions of nineteenth-century political communication. The twentieth century’s contributions have been the Leninist party and the rise of what might be called the public relations state.

**USSR and China.** Lenin created the new-model political party, not as part of a multiparty system within constitutional government but as a revolutionary army and instrument of mobilisation. Today, about one adult person in ten in the Soviet Union is a Communist party member, recruited through youth organisations and obligated to study political doctrine, attend meetings, and often serve as a leader of youth groups and an administrator of party institutions.
The Bolshevik Revolution (1917) and the first years of Soviet rule established, besides the party, another major institution of political communication, "agit-prop" - organised agitation (promoting a few, simple ideas to masses of people) and propaganda (promoting many and complex ideas to a literate elite) on behalf of building the new Soviet citizen. Agitational events directed by the state have included the massive annual festival on May Day and on the anniversary of the October Revolution, the erection of heroic statues, and the development of a cult surrounding the person of Lenin (even before his death). During World War I a newsprint shortage limited the value of this conventional source of propaganda, and the Bolsheviks substituted with "agit-trains" and "agit-ships." The "Lenin Train" was covered with frescoes depicting workers and soldiers; it carried books, leaflets, posters, films, and trained agitators themselves to the front.

Agitators operate extensively in the Soviet Union. There is a vast system of mass oral media. More than 15 million lectures are given annually (figures for the 1970s). Because of the vastness of the system it is difficult to monitor and operates to a large extent outside the critique and control of party officials, although most lecturers are party members. Related models have been adopted in other Communist states. In Cuba two mass organisations, the Committees for the Defense of the Revolution and the Central Organisation of Cuban Trade Unions organise people for mass demonstrations. In China, Mao Zedong's "mass line" policy developed in the 1940s advocated that the party "take the ideas of the masses (scattered and unsystematic ideas) and concentrate them ... then go to the masses and propagate and explain these ideas until the masses embrace them as their own, hold fast to them and translate them into action, and test the correctness of these ideas in such action. Then once again take them to the masses...." This policy grew out of the efforts of the Communist army to organise the masses in the 1940s and continued as an instrument of hegemonic communication in China after 1949.

The People's Republic of China, like the Soviet Union, relies heavily in its campaigns of mass indoctrination on interpersonal communication rather than on
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the mass media for its key efforts at hegemonic communication. This is not to say that newspapers, radio, and television play no role in it. In the Soviet Union there are thousands of newspapers that serve not only to report government views on political and economic affairs but also to act as a forum for complaint and criticism. Soviet papers publish hundreds and thousands of letters to the editor. These letters often complain of bureaucratic mismanagement, and many of the letters lead to government remedies. The letter columns are a form of quality control of party and government officials and also serve as a means of legitimating the political system as a whole while criticising some of its machinery. In China, as in the Soviet Union, the electronic media have developed more slowly, but they are also becoming important media for hegemonic communication.

**ELECTRONIC MEDIA AND PUBLIC RELATIONS**

The image of all-powerful electronic media in political communication comes not from the Communist countries but from the development of propaganda and public relations in the West during and after World War I (1914-1918). The fear that governments could manipulate the masses at will was greatly stimulated by Adolf Hitler’s spellbinding abilities as an orator, not only in front of large crowds but as transmitted around the world by radio broadcast. Hitler was very interested in how the media could be used to solidify his leadership. The actual Nazi media policy involved much more than skillful exhortation, however; during the 1930s a combination of concentrated social pressure, economic strangulation, arbitrary use of police power, and physical terror eliminated opposition parties, the opposition press, and public expression of dissident opinion.

Radio and television broadcasting emerged in the twentieth century around the world as government-controlled or government-regulated media of communication. Government control of broadcasting ranges widely: from the U.S. system, where broadcasting is primarily in private commercial hands, to the British "arm’s-length" system of a government-appointed broadcasting authority that operates with a high degree of autonomy, to more tightly state-directed
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systems like the French, to systems where broadcasting is explicitly conceived as an instrument of government policy making, like the Soviet.

Perhaps the most striking and original use of the electronic media for political communication to date was the Ayatollah Khomeini’s use of telephone and tape recorder in engineering the Iranian revolution of 1979. In Paris, in exile, Khomeini had better communication (by telephone) to his followers in Iran than he did when in Iran. And his voice (distributed by audiocassette) reached more people than he could have reached face to face from within the country.

In liberal societies in the twentieth century elections have remained the central institution for both hegemonic and petitionary communication, but the character of elections has changed. The authority of the political party has declined notably in the United States and, to a lesser degree, in European countries. Candidacy for office is now less dependent on grooming by party service and more reliant on candidates abilities to gather around them organisations personally loyal to them and to reach directly to the voters through the mass media. Campaigning has increasingly been run not by party loyalists but by professionals in public opinion, public relations, and advertising. The vast reach of the media, especially television, has provided a more direct link between national candidates and the public, much less mediated by party leaders. In the United States this gives the president and presidential candidates at least the illusion that an election is a personal plebiscite. Democratic reforms have led to a vast increase in the importance of primary elections, and the United States has moved closer to plebiscitary democracy.

Apart from electoral communication, the field on which hegemonic and petitionary communication meet, a major change in twentieth-century political communication has been the institutionalisation of the hegemonic functions as part of standard government operations. Propaganda or public relations have become a major governmental function. Government agencies in the United States began hiring press relations specialists in the 1920s, and this has been a key government function ever since. From World War II on, foreign policy has become a more important aspect of U.S. governmental functions, national security
has become a more central concern, and secrecy has been more often invoked as a barrier between government and the press. While the U.S. government remains more open in its information policies than France, Britain, or most other liberal democracies, the government is nonetheless increasingly self-conscious about using the mass media as a forum for persuasion. Whether one calls it news management or public relations or image building, it is a sophisticated derivative of the propaganda that became part of the property of governments, both autocratic and democratic, from World War I on.

In many parts of the world, of course, governments have come to use a much wider array of tools of information control than would be accepted as legitimate in North America or Western Europe. In some of the more liberal nations of Latin America, for instance, direct press censorship is rare, but many other measures effectively limit political debate. In Mexico, Argentina, and Brazil suspension of publication of offending newspapers has been widely practiced. In Mexico the state controls newsprint and has withheld it from dissident publications, and the state has used its control of the banks to exert economic leverage on the press. The Latin American press, like an earlier U.S. or European press, is generally much more effective at publishing dissenting opinion than at publishing potentially embarrassing news. This, of course, is true not only of Latin America. In France there is a tolerance of government secrecy and a relatively modest demand for information about government compared to the Anglo-American tradition. France's liberal legal framework for political expression is not realised in actual political information because of toleration of a rather secretive administrative bureaucracy.

Political communication as discussed here is a much smaller realm than politics as such. This is true in two respects. First, where people do not have the civil rights of political participation, access to political voice, or enough education and wealth to feel a sense of efficacy in the political sphere, the opportunity for political expression is absent or reduced. Second, where key decisions are removed from public view, where the key decision to be made is less "How shall I stand on a public issue?" - Questions, in short, of agenda-setting - the vast majority of people with little or no access to the agenda-setting corridors of power
are left out of politics. Even in representative democracies with relative freedom of association and freedom of speech and the press, most political communication concerning the actions of nation-states remains elite communication.

**POLITICAL COMMUNICATION AS THE CATALYST OF PUBLIC SPHERE**

In a world in which geographical and political boundaries are weakened by the process of globalisation, it becomes even more imperative to grasp the ways in which communication is used to build political identities and to support political action. It is no longer possible for the citizens of one nation to ignore the processes and content of political communication in other nations, as to do so it would imperil the fragile global order as it is now. Societies continue to make and remake themselves, they take from their surroundings and they take from their surroundings and they continue to transform themselves in complex ways. This process is neither unilinear nor monocausal. As before, there is a need for proper exploration of societal changes in a way that is not reduced to a seemingly straightforward account of the causes of changes in the nature and contents of the political communication practices too. Social change connects with an account of changes in the practices of political communication. Political communication, as an empirical reality on the one hand, and as basic concept for the analysis of democracies in mass societies on the other hand have five distinct advantages:

*Firstly:* its very existence is proof that there is no structural antagonism between social groups, since political communication implies exchange, and therefore recognition of the other person, i.e. the adversary. It proves the existence of a space for the exchange of contradictory political discourse. Many authors have emphasised that the appearance of democracy is linked to the creation of a public space, although they usually admit that the conditions required for such an arena to function in a mass society are no longer present. Degradation of the ‘public’ once composed of freely assembled individuals but now transformed into a denatured kind of ‘mass’, together with omnipresent media and public opinions, are the supposed reasons for this denaturation of public space in mass democracy. Against this view, the theory of political communication shows that
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public space has not been destroyed and, in addition, that in mass democracy there is a direct link between political communication and the functioning public space. Neither can the media and public opinions be charged with having denatured public space. They have simply enabled it to adapt to a sociological and political context which differs radically from the eighteenth-century context in which it was devised. Political communication and political slogans are the necessary driving force of enlarged public space.

**Secondly**: Political information restores importance to the elements behind the discourse. The contradictory logics at the heart of political communication are given human embodiment. Revalorisation of the role of elements in politics goes hand in hand with the revalorisation of communication, the reason being that although communication is a structural necessity, it is nothing without the dynamic and unstable process of exchange of speech which takes place in communication. This does not mean that the elements ‘communicate’ better, but that there is a space where they can affront one another without posing a threat to modern democracy.

**Thirdly**: In political communication, the three logics, *Politics*, *Information*, and *Communication* are autonomous. An awareness of this autonomy is important from the point of view of democracy since it serves as a reminder that the media’s logic of information and public opinion’s logic of communication are now separate. The two are once historically linked, as we have seen, but today, particularly with the growth of the information sector, there are visible differences between these types of information. More than ever before, the media derive legitimacy from the value of information in relation to the democratic political project; where as public opinion is linked to the legitimacy of communication and representation. The autonomy acquired by public opinion in relation to information is probably one of the most important facts to have been recognised since the basic role of political communication came to light. It indicates a change in the status of public opinion, this being both the reference concept which has guaranteed the functioning of public space since the eighteenth century, and at the same time

---

a series of problems and concerns which are necessary for political interplay, despite the near impossibility of controlling them.

The emergence of political communication as an autonomous space for the exchange of contradictory discourse, express two qualitative changes in our democracies: on the one hand, the separation of two logics, which had more or less overlapped since the eighteenth century, into logic of media and a logic of public opinion.; on the other, the contradictory stand of three sets of discourse in relation to the question of the representatives of the public opinion.

*Fourthly:* The acumen of that political communication is dynamic in essence. The ideal of political communication is to arrive at a certain balance in the tension between its three constituent logics. This is rare, if only because of variations in the rhythm of the three logics of discourse (another reason is the historical process with its constant influx of disturbances) this is why political communication is a model of dynamic analysis which can be put to use to reveal the state of the political system. Situations of imbalance are many and often endanger political life.

*Fifthly:* Political communication highlights the phenomenon that wherever it plays an essential role in our democracies, politics is always dominant. Communication does not take the place of politics. It allows politics to exist. It can even be supposed that recognising the political communication functions on this level is the sign of the healthy functioning of democracy and a certain political maturity – maturity in the sense of accepting the two complementary parameters of communication and politics in the process of managing necessarily contradictory interests.\(^{46}\) More over it is possible to establish an agenda setting function for political communication, like there is for the media. It is simply more complicated to construct due to the greater number of parameters, including those of the media. The aim is the same: to understand the state of political communication at all times, the way in which different logics counterbalance one another, its strong and weak points as well as the risks of structural imbalance. Naturally this agenda setting function differs from one political situation to

another, depending on whether it is an electoral period, a normal situation or a crisis, but it can be extremely useful in providing an understanding of the balances and imbalances in each situation.

In a way the agenda of political communication at a particular moment in time not only provides a snapshot of politics but also a more general view of the democratic system. Political communication finally consists of three simultaneous phenomena. It is a visible everyday reality of discourse exchanged between elements legitimately authorised to express themselves. It is a new level of political functioning, linked to the spread of democracy (with even numerous problems being treated politically) and an increasing number of participants, together with the increased visibility of political interplay. Finally, it is the distinct concept of public space and as such is essential if one is to understand how pluralistic mass democracies operate. In other words, political communication is at the same time a visible phenomenon, a level of functioning and a concept applying to the phenomena of contemporary politics. Political slogans too can be inserted in the same cocoon in which political slogan is defined. Indian freedom struggle slogans were a visible phenomenon of protest against the British during that time, it exhibited the pluralistic public with a level of functioning and exhibiting the state of polity during the reign of East India Company.

In avoiding too pat a theory of communication constructed around the dream of an ideal age of fusion, or its opposite, the reign of manipulation, political communication also preserves politics. It is a reminder that even in the age of communication and the merging of world visions, the essence of politics still consists of a confrontation of viewpoints and the assumption that one will triumph over the others. Political slogans and communication emerges finally as the factor which organises political irrationality with in a communicational framework.

THEORETICAL ATTRIBUTES OF PERSUASIONS AND POLITICAL SLOGANS

Political slogans are coined to meet the changing need of social conditions as well as the need of both the public and the ruler to establish control over the society. Throughout the history, political slogans were directly or indirectly used
as an instrument to persuade for a desirable change; both on the public and on the ruling class. Unlike any other means of communication mechanisms slogans too endeavour to get results in a short period of time, political slogans becomes more aggressive in its approach. Political slogans were used to highlight or raise and issue, to register the dissent or protest, to preach and propagate an ideology or party, to argue for a cause or reason, to amass support and establish solidarity. So political slogans are used in image-building, and to demolish the opponent’s image. Political slogans are meant to communicate political truth (at least from the encoders perspective), but often truths in political slogans are negatively packed in usage and in general perception of the public. Slogans directly influence the perceptions of the public at large. It creates a kind of “Social Perception”. Perceptions of the public are selective too. ‘Social Perception refers to the application of becoming aware and making senses of the stimuli received from our environment, it is a process by which human’s attempts to explain, understand, make judgments about and predict the behaviour of other people in the community’. Slogans are trying for a social perception and make cognitive and attitudinal change in favour of the message of the slogans. Humans are surrounded by many sensations but we tend to direct our attention to only a few of these. Our decision as to what to attend to can be influenced by the social environmental and personal factors. Slogans are discourses disseminated and scattered to the social environment to change the individual perceptions and create a favourable social perceptonal environment as whole. The environmental factors can include the intensity of the slogan, the size of the sloganeering group, and the novelty of the stimuli.

The wit, sarcasm, the rhythm, the tune, and pun on the words delivered in the political slogans are some of the techniques that will always be remembered and relished. It is only because of the effectiveness of the delivery of slogans it is remembered and relished. People come to have a collection of ideas about what is expected of them in terms of their behaviour in certain social situations and, in turn of what they should expect concerning the behaviour of others and of

their treatment in society generally. Expectations have high influence on the social perceptions and discourses. Expectations are formed from personal experiences and by information received from various other sources. Information received from these other sources may modify previous expectations or play a particular crucial role in shaping expectations about persons or social situations of which the individual has no direct experience. Political slogans tend to modify the personal expectations and social perceptions for their desired end. An item of information will be more readily accepted if it is incompatible with the existing ideas and expectations; if it is not then dissonance may occur and the message may be rejected or ignored. All political messages, particularly those conveyed to a mass audience, are potentially a source of dissonance to someone. Political slogans are an important source of information about many social and political events of which the individual has little or no first-hand experience. Effectiveness on social perceptions can be studied as a “cognitive” phenomenon. Two persuasive theories can be used to study the effectiveness of political slogans: (a) Expectancy Theory (b) Cognitive Response Theory. Expectancy theory establishes the relationship between the languages in a political slogan and the effectiveness of such language on the level of persuasion. Expectancy theory assumes that “since the language is rule-governed system, people develop norms and expectations concerning appropriate usage in given situations.” Most cultures and societies shape their own patterns of language and determine normative or non-normative patterns of language use. When messages conform to people’s norms and expectations, “the norms and expectations are strengthened, but the messages exert minimal impact on attitudes”. On the other hand, when “communicators, intentionally or accidentally, violate norms governing appropriate language usage”, they violate “the expectations of message receivers, and, in turn, affect their receptivity.” If messages violate people’s norms and expectations, they can have more or less persuasive effects, depending on the situation and circumstances. Often messages in political slogans do not conform to the norms and expectations of the majority public because it is conceived and framed by a micro minority at the beginning stage of a political campaign. On the
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contrary expectancy theory states that the messages of political slogans which differ from the norms and expectation of the public exert impact on the public attitudes, perceptions and receptivity. Expectancy theory identifies two violations in the usage of political slogans: positive and negative violation. In regard to the persuasive effects, the theory assumes that when messages positively violate people’s linguistic expectations, the violation has positive impact towards people’s attitudes and evokes persuasive effectiveness. In contrast when messages negatively violate people’s linguistic expectations, a boomerang effect occurs, with the receivers changing to the position opposite to the one advocated by the communicator of slogans. Analysing the history of slogans one can see that linguistic violations in slogans can positively or negatively affect the persuasion of the citizenry. Often the creators of political slogans manipulate the verbal resources available to project an attitude, to evoke a feeling to create a particular telling effect and to achieve a total effect. If there is no basic inherent difference between the language of political slogan and common language, how does a political campaign can generate heat and emotions by using positive or negative political slogans?

That area or domain of human behaviour which can be described as intellectual–knowing, understanding, and reasoning is often referred to as the cognitive. A substantial amount of political communication is aimed at producing cognitive responses in the receiver. That area which is involved with the attitudes, emotions, values and feelings is termed as the response or reaction. Obviously the two overlap and intertwine. When the content of a political slogan is cognitively responsive its orientation will greatly influence the mode chosen for its communication. If the content of a message is judged to be of cognitive response, then language will generally be couched in more active terms and presentation will strive after objectivity, rationale and balance. An effective political slogan will be more likely to be framed in emotive language, its imagery directed towards emotional response.\(^50\) On the other hand, Cognitive Response model assumes that when people are exposed to a message, they have psychological process that determines the impact of the message. There are three distinct responses.

\(^{50}\) *Ibid.*,
identified in the psychological process of message acceptance: (a) counter argument (b) source derogation (c) support argument. In the political slogans counter argument occurs when public attempt to dissent with the sloganeer or group. When counter argument is activated, receivers would neutralise the message to reduce the discrepancy. Source derogation involves negative images of the sloganeer or of the messages in the slogans. Support argument involves negative images of the audience or the target of the slogans. In a public sphere political slogans frequently experience and undergo all the three postulates of the cognitive response model. Heterogeneous public and common mob usually have an inherent perceptional bias on all political slogans; so the three ingredients of cognitive response theory are often trialed in the discourses of political slogans.

Negative political slogans often cause source derogations. Source derogation is a more frequent response to dissonance than counter-argument in situations where source must be assumed bias. Negative political slogans are also rated as ‘effective’ because the message itself is remembered. Persuasion studies indicate that the more credible the source is, the more persuasive the message will be. Persuasive effectiveness of political slogans greatly depends on the credibility of the source and the slogans, the informativeness of the language and vocabulary of the slogans etc.

**SLOGANS OF POLITICAL COMMUNICATION & INTERACTIVE PROCESS**

“Workers of the World, Unite !." This powerful political slogan revolutionised the world to the colourful spectrum of democracy. It became the flesh and blood, bread and hope of the working class millions. They created the spirit of human right to a movement of solidarity throughout the globe; irrespective of boundaries, languages, culture and ideology. The mood of that historical moment is deeply embedded in this slogan. So is the power of political slogans. Political slogans are effective political devices especially in a heavily mediated context. A political slogan generally expresses a goal or aim in a political context. Political slogans are multi-formatted. With convergence of media they are written, spoken, sung, recited, posted, e-mailed and sms-ed. They are repeated
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like mirrors, mirroring each other into infinity. Political slogans in connection with political campaigns actually run through our public life because politics doesn’t end when a campaign does. There is a relationship between the slogan and what is out there in the world. Great slogans are feasts of political savvy. They identify and express something that really is in the minds of the masses. Because no matter how well-worded a slogan might be, if the string isn’t there to be plucked, the slogan will make no music.

The political slogan is, by definition, partisan: it incites, but against; it rallies, but against; we can say, in the present–day world, that propaganda is war pursued by other means. As far as the ideological slogan is concerned, this too is “the battle-cry of a clan”: by making the foe something or someone hateful or ridiculous, it makes it possible to consider it or him as a conversational partner; it eliminates all dialogue. Moreover, by claiming to justify the imperative which it contains, the political slogan clearly addresses thought, but to lull it to sleep; by anticipating any questions, it encapsulates thought in its response; aimed at provoking action whether one likes it or not, it silences all the reasons which might postpone the action, and focuses the thought on just one action. Even when it tells the truth, it is lying, in the sense that it suppresses the conditions attaching to the truth: interrogation, examination and dialogue. Political slogans lie, using processes which are often like those of the poet, but they go to any length to stop one knowing that they are lying.\textsuperscript{52} Someone will say that there can be critical slogans. In saying so they are forgetting that the only criterion of the slogan is its effectiveness. And is only made effective by relying on the conformism of those at whom it is addressed, on their intellectual habits, their prejudices, their stereotypes and their Manichaeism. If slogans disturb, worry or go “against the grain,” they do not work. The proper slogan, on the contrary, reassures, by putting across the idea that there is no need to worry, that all problems, even the most alarming, have a single and obvious answer. “That goes without saying” would be the formula common to all slogans. A political slogan is undoubtedly polemical; it cannot be critical, at least if we mean by this something which arouses individual thought. Does this mean that all political slogans are

essentially pernicious? Are there some good slogans? One is tempted to reply: yes, but on two conditions: (a) The cause dramatised by the slogan is valid in itself; (b) The slogan does not lie that it comes across for what it is, and not in the name of some principle or proof: “When slogans are taken literally, they deserve literal criticism.” Let us briefly analyse the above two criteria (a) It is undeniable that some causes are more valid than others; and the same goes for slogans which handle the more valid causes. The problem is that all political slogans tend to validate themselves, reply to themselves for the cause which they express and thus mask the complexities of that cause, its gaps and any doubtful elements attaching to it. To admit that the validity of a cause is enough to justify the slogans which propagate it is to admit that the end justifies the means—nothing short of the ideological slogan. (b) As well as the soundly established good of the cause, it is thus the analysis of the slogan itself which must indicate to us its validity or its harmfulness. But what validity? It would seem to be quite hard to rehabilitate a term which, by definition, is pejorative; discovering any valid slogans—people will still be able to say—and not without reason—that they are not slogans. And in fact would a slogan which did not lie, and was recognisable as such, still be a political slogan. The political slogan proper enthralls the thought to stir people to act. The anti-slogan, like the proverb and the sayings, suspends action to encourage thought.

Political slogans may be readily ironical or supercilious; they will not admit humour if one can see in the humour any kind of backfire in relation to the action and emotions which they entail. Political slogans mobilise and humour demobilises. This is why humouristic phrases are usually anti-slogans. The anti-slogan is not without its dangers, though. Like most proverbs and sayings, it aims at abstention. All ideological and political communication relies heavily on proverbs and sayings. Are these proverbs and sayings precisely “educative slogans”? Proverbs do not share several features in common with political slogans. They are anonymous. Their punch lies in their form—brevity, prosody, use of metaphor, and so on—which lends them to repetition; likewise, proverbs cannot be translated. Furthermore, they contain a word of advice and its justification in

one and the same breath. Lastly, they are self-contained; thus two proverbs like two slogans, may contradict each other. The proverb is a kind of widespread education; this is most true in illiterate societies where, for the school-less, it represents school. And yet its practical purport is quite different from that of the slogan. The latter urges us to act; the proverb usually urges us to abstain from. Most proverbs preach prudence. Proverbs in fact do not represent a reactionary doctrine for the very simple reason that they do not represent any doctrine at all. If many of them urge prudence, others encourage us to run risks. If some proverbs are submissive, others belittle strength. In other words, proverbs only ever apply to one given situation and they always go against the grains.\(^\text{54}\)

Sayings and maxims by great authors also have many points in common with slogans: they are slogans as soon as used as principles or proof. And yet proverbs and sayings are political education of political communication of that sort. Proverbs’ and sayings are like “thoughts” for us, enabling us to reformulate our own thought. It could be said that the same goes for the political slogan. Slogans and sayings, broadly defined, are repeated utterances that encapsulate the perspective formulated and disseminated by the group, crowd, and mass support groups. Nevertheless the latter “arrests” thought, in order to stop it all together; the proverb and the saying “arrest” it to enable it to think for itself. They may not always be true, you will say, exactly one can and may question them, and “agree” in rejecting them. The repetition of slogans and sayings serve both informational and interactional functions: slogans and sayings serve the informational functions of disseminating information and a perspective on that information, and they serve the interactional functions of establishing solidarity among the participants and managing the complicated floor of group communication.\(^\text{55}\) Many conversational repetitions are not fixed in form but situational in context, as interlocutors enter and leave the floor, or support the contributions of framers of slogans. In the research of repetition, however, one particular configuration of expressions, contexts, and meanings that has not


received much attention in the use of repetitive devices in political discourses, may be often ignored. Political Slogans and sayings not only occur in one particular political discourse but also serve the both: informational and interactional functions in a dynamic interplay of the use of repetition to create understanding in the context.\textsuperscript{56} Political slogans and sayings are seen more descriptive of the kinds of fixed and semi-fixed expressions that are repeated in institutionalised political discourses. Political slogans express more specific meanings associated with groups and organisations, and sayings too, can be created and used in more local contexts such as political discourses.

People get a lot of pleasure from pejorative slogans. Derogatory slogans can also be used to sum up despised groups of people such as “The Loony Left”, “Feminazis”, or “Chardonnay Socialists”. When political slogans become popular slogans it is often called as ‘gnomes.’ For example the slogan “War on Terror” can be unpacked as a response to 9/11, a mobilisation call to war against terrorism, a repeat of other wars such as war against drugs, and so on. Gnomes become a short-cut analysis of a historical period.\textsuperscript{57} People may think that they are immune because they consciously ignore the rhetoric of politics, but political slogans have a way of penetrating even rock-solid defences. Political slogans range from the sublime to the ridiculous. The sublime can change the history for better as Gandhian slogan preaches “War is an unmitigated evil”. Political slogans as an integral part of propaganda, and are used as methods of social control throughout the world. Consider the Chinese slogan “It is good to have just one child”, or the famous Theodore Roosevelt slogan “speak softly and carry a big stick”.

Political slogans are interesting and instructive because they originate in some political issue upon which the opinions of the mass, mob, or public are divided. Some of them are provoking, arousing, protesting, some are sarcastic, some state the essence of political corruption, some are rabble rousing designed to impose some personal belief or political policy upon common mass


by causing them to accept and to react and respond for principles which the people who posses information. Analytical minds on the first hand may not accept or support, others are worded so as to suggest or advocate moral, religious, humanitarian, social and economic reforms.

Practical politicians and other popular religious leaders have already used slogans to arouse people to high patriotic, religious ardour. Since many people do not stop to investigate platforms, politicians try to catch them by slogans. Even elections are experiencing the bombardment of slogans in the contemporary world. "Public Office is a Public Trust" is a very popular slogan used during American Presidential Election in 1884. This slogan summarises the desire of the people to get rid of corruption prevalent at that time. Slogans are especially effective at critical periods. This, precisely, is the point to be elaborated. It is especially in critical tinges that practical politicians utilise slogans most effectively in order to push people in the direction they wish them to go. In America during the tense days of World War, "He kept us out of War" was an effective slogan in favour of the then President Wilson's reelection. After America entered the War on the side of Allies, the intense situation demanded its appropriate slogans, among which two good examples are: "A War to End War" and "Make the World Safe for Democracy." The suffragettes of America were quick to give their versions of the famous slogans ie. "He kept us out of Suffrage" and "Democracy should begin at Home." In the confusion associated with misery and insecurity the Nazi propagandists, side by side with their insistence on slogans extolling Aryan blood purity, Nordic superiority and romantic culture, utilised socialist slogans that fitted the temper of German masses at the time. Some of the slogans used by the Nazis might very well be used by their socialist's opponents. The "Share the Wealth" slogan of Huey Long is a similar slogan which caught the imagination of at least a portion of the petit-bourgeois population of America as the way out of their difficulties. Likewise as part of the programme to incorporate everything in Fascism, The Italian Fascists crystallised the chaotic and staggering situation in Italy for the time being. A few slogans may summarise this particular fascists solutions: "All within the State, Nothing outside the State, Nothing against the State.", "A Book and a Rifle make a perfect Fascist.", "A Plow makes the furrow
but the Sword will defend it.” 58 Successful slogans are bellwethers. They reflect something going on out there in the minds of mass and hint at where we are headed as a nation, this is true in the past and the dynamics haven’t changed. In the future years too, lots of slogans will buzz past our ears. If one of them catches fire and spawns gnomes, it will signal some widespread shift and polarisation taking place.

Nowadays the newspaper headlines in heavy print also serve somewhat as slogans in that they call attention in dramatic shortcuts to that aspect of the news which falls in harmony with the interests and prejudices of the power or powers that control the paper. Slogans in the social discourse vary from the written and the visual to the chanted and the vulgar. Often their simple rhetorical nature leaves little room for details, and as such they serve perhaps more as a social expression of unified purpose, rather than a projection for an intended audience. Slogans are attractive particularly in the modern age of informational bombardment from numerous media sources. Slogans are a core part of the propaganda in the mediated contemporary world.

Analysis into the persuasive potential of political communication campaigns, although often inconclusive, has also established a number of generalisations about the probabilities and the conditions for the achievement of intended objectives and effects. Opinion and information changes are more likely to occur on ‘distant’ and newly emerging issues than on matters on which attitudes have already been informed. Monopoly control of the source or simply consonance and repetition of messages may also achieve results in a predictable direction. It is easier to reinforce existing support than to recruit new supporters by conversion. The status, attractiveness and credibility of the communicator do matter. Effects are easier to achieve in relation to separate facts and opinions than on deeper attitudes, outlooks or world view. In general much more depends on the receivers- their dispositions, motivation, prior attitudes and knowledge- than on the message itself or the status of the source.

An important development in political communication research was a closer attention to the motives of the audience, the possible uses and satisfactions of political communication and the interactive nature of the process. It has become clear that actual and potential audiences for political communication vary considerably and have diverse motives and expectations, including the wish to be informed, re-activated, entertained, excited and advised\textsuperscript{59}. Reception is also often accompanied by informal response and discussion. Audience varies not only in the strength of motivation to engage in political activity but also in their attitude to politics itself. Slogans as a medium of interactive political communication compel the members of the society to engage in the political activity rather than being passive. It is motivational and inspiring by generating a feeling of group solidarity and public concern. Heterogeneity of the audience is often diminished through the resonance and acoustic of the slogans of the masses. The natural ambience and the rhythm created by the political slogans in the public sphere compels the individuals to get identified with the issue to oneself rather with the mass movement.

Political communication is not just one-way ‘transportation’ of information and beliefs, but a matter of interaction and transaction between the sender and the receiver. There exists an emphasis on the ‘attitude’ as object of influence or the key to understanding the behaviour of masses. In political communication; through slogans there has to be more attention to political ‘cognitions’ of several kinds - awareness of issues, formation of images based on information, connotations and associations. The use of slogans as an interactive medium of political communication have to be analysed in more ‘holistic’ investigations, looking at ‘critical events’ in the political life of a society which are played out over time and involve several different kinds of participants and not just the communicators and receivers\textsuperscript{60}.

There has also been more appreciation of the ‘ritual’ aspects of slogans in public communication, such as election campaigns, which are not just rational


means to some persuasive end, but symbolic expressions and celebrations of political beliefs and values. The ubiquity of political messages has also been more generally recognised. Initially, political communication was looked for almost exclusively in party or national propaganda. There has been a gradual recognition that one should look more to the potential political effects, because of its wide reach, high credibility and apparent impact. So political slogans in the traditional usages itself emphasis it dual dimension of effect and impact in the general public or mass communication campaigns.

Karin Dovring in his book ‘Double Talk in Global Persuasion’ argues that “slogans of political communications are rapid in the renewal and disposal of words and their ambivalence in meanings”.61 The slogan - if it is successful - sums up the meaning of the communication process, changes in the meaning of words and concepts are often done on the purpose by speakers according to their system of value – read ideology – and their goals.

The flexibility and oblivion in meanings come especially to a fore when the changes appear in slogans that are the short-hand of communications in politics. ‘Peace in our times’ is one of the few slogans whose disastrous consequences have made it a classic, hard to forget.

SLOGANS...POLITICAL INFORMATION AND POLITICAL PERSUASION

Political communication campaigns typically have multiple (and sometimes inconsistent) objectives: to inform about the policy and proposal; to establish and modify the ideology and party ‘images’; to identify a movement or party with certain issues; to attract and convert wavers; to mobilise supporters. Despite the emphasis on persuasion and image making, the clearest evidence has been of informational learning. Two features of political communication campaign learning can be pointed out. One of these has been known under the heading of ‘agenda-setting’. This refers to the process whereby the volume of attention given to an issue by the public, political leaders, and the mass media (whether or not by design) tends to shape the public perception of what are the most salient issues

---

of the moment. This perception, in turn, can be influential in the information of opinion. The logic is plausible, and it can be demonstrated that trends in attention to issues do follow the relative weight of public attention.

The second concept that relates to the political learning is that of the ‘knowledge gap’. This refers to structured inequalities in knowledge (not only by politics) in a whole population, as a result of a differential growth in knowledge on the part of those who are rich in information resources (education, motivation, the means of being generally informed)\textsuperscript{62}. The early development of politics was accompanied by a necessary diffusion of basic political knowledge throughout a citizen body, newly enfranchised, aided by the preaching’s and oratory of leaders. A minority of population remains intensely involved and well informed, while a growing minority ceases to participate or to be easily reachable by mass political communication.

**POLITICAL SLOGANS AND OPINION FORMATION**

Douglas D. Webster offers a penetrating argument about the significance of the importance of Public Opinion. He states that “Public Opinion has become an arbiter of truth, dictating the terms of acceptability according to the market place. The sovereignty of the audience makes serious, prayful thinking about the will of God and monarchy unnecessary, because opinions are formed on the basis of taste and preferences rather than careful divine conviction and thoughtful theological reflections. Humans easily become ‘slave of slogans’ when discernment is reduced to ratings.”\textsuperscript{63} Opinion formation through slogans depends much on the social and group context of reception. Opinion formation and acquiring strength has been advanced to account for the apparent growth of a dominant political consensus, largely as a result of word of mouth communications, art of oratory, interpersonal communication, group and crowd communication. This is named as the ‘spiral of silence’ theory by E. Neumann Noelle\textsuperscript{64}. Its main foundation is the idea that most people have a psychological

\begin{itemize}
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need to avoid the isolation and discomfort of disagreement. Thus, under conditions where certain views seem, because of unanimity and frequency of their public repetition, to represent what the great majority think, or ought to think, then those who hold different views remain silent, whatever the actual strength and extent of such dissident opinion. The more they remain silent, the more the impression of dominance increases, and the fewer are those prepared to speak out, hence the 'spiralling' effect referred to.

On the evolution from a representative democracy to an opinion democracy, the world had witnessed the significance and the growing role of opinion leader in influencing and forming public opinion. Often opinion leaders comprise of individual or groups affiliated to ideologies and committed to their own interests. Assessing the Indian Independence struggle it can be identified that political slogans of freedom struggle prioritised the issues and situations before the public to the formation of public opinion. The elaboration, realisation, interpretation, diffusion and attention seeking in favour of the freedom fighters arguments was effectively done through the large scale propagation of slogans on different issues. Slogans often do not carry out a predictive function but they perform a representative or indicative function. Owing to the fact that Indian societies under British rule were less and less homogeneous, and added to the fact that religious, social, economic, cultural and linguistic divides exist in the Indian societies, freedom struggle slogans were effective in unifying an intercultural fragmented society to a strengthened public opinion for Independence.

Sarah Sanderson King and Donald P. Cushman states that the success of forming public opinion through slogans is firstly, the ability of the movement and the success in creating various forms of political slogans in different phrases needed for different occasion of open and public communication. Second is the political genius of the movement leaders in their struggle to turn the rhetoric of political slogans into the real action, practice that was sometimes successful and sometimes failure but that always leads to a response by the central powers
either directly or indirectly. Creating political consciousness, making mass mobilisation, promoting political control, programming persuasion, establishing identity, mystification of the prevailing ideology, polarising the thinking process, changing the perceptual reality etc is often done by political slogans in the process of political communication in building and framing public opinion.

POLITICAL LINGUISTICS AND SLOGANS OF POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

The study of political communication is often represented by traditions other than that of research into campaigns, political resistance, protests and public opinion. An alternative route has been by way of the study of language and rhetoric, which has concentrated on the use of political slogans, symbols and on the texts and documents of politics, rather than on the effect of these messages. One of the routes does, however, also lie in the study of political propaganda which has concerned with the manipulation of languages as well as people. All political movements and ideologies have sought, consciously or not to establish usages of words and symbols that suit their own purposes. Political communication language is often remarked as; 'Politics is largely a word game.' Language has a significant role in political communication. The role of language and its impact in this area necessitates the ethical analysis and implications of political communication. The language and words employed in political communication helps in the proper understanding of political process and its consequences. Through the linguistic analysis of the message the content of the message can be realised and can assess whether there is a risk of inherent propaganda, disinformation etc. In the social use of language, both stereotypes and prejudices can be evaluated. Words and phrases in politics carry inferences and symbolic meanings which help the purpose of the communicator.

Grabber has made an inventory on the different ‘functions’ of political language, under five headings. They are classified as follows,

---

a) 'Informational' - a process of giving of facts and also the invoking of connotations by the use of code words in phrases.

b) 'Agenda-setting' - a process noted in which a communicator tries to become identified with an issue.

c) 'Interpretation & Linkage' - refers to the construction and structuring of wider patterns of meaning and association.

d) 'Projection to Past & Future' - following the tradition and having the continuity.

e) 'Action Stimulation' – mobilising and activating functions of the language.

Words can thus do many different things in political communication-arise protests, build resistance, invoke associations, provide symbolic rewards, structure the context of debate, be a substitute for action as well as a means of action, and address themselves to numerous different receivers etc. G.R.Semin and K.Fielder suggested a Linguistic Category Model (LCM) for Political Communication Linguistics; have extensive applications in political slogans of communication. This model is a model of interpersonal language that has been designed to analyse politically motivated communicative acts. However, the model should be useful when used in a communication context that analytically distinguishes among speakers, messages, and addressees, and between psychological processes of message production and comprehension. Conceptualising these processes in terms of interdependent communicative agents introduces analytical assumptions that can lead to innovative psychological theories that are socially informed.

According to LCM theory, the slogans of political communications can be represented or described into four categories of verbs or adjectives that vary in terms of their concreteness, situational orientation, objectivity, and evaluative nature. These four adjectives or verbs are as follows:

A) Descriptive Action Verb : These verbs in political slogans describe a single observational action with clear beginning and ending. They are characterised by at least one physically invariant feature. Their peculiarity is concreteness. Very often descriptive action verb sentences or phrases include adverbial
references to the situational context. Because they describe very closely actual behavioural occurrences, their objectivity is and there is small leeway for interpretation.

B) *Interpretative Action Verbs*: refers to clusters of behavioural episodes in political communication language. Usually, it takes an interpretative act to categorise an observed behaviour under the heading of a more general behaviour or, rather, of a type of behaviour. Interpretative action verbs always include evaluative accent. Their meaning is also connected with the contexts.

C) *State Verbs*: These verbs in political slogans describe a subjective state or the change of a subjective state (emotional, motivational, or cognitive one) and the underlying behaviour is therefore not directly noticeable. They are detached from the single actions and make reference to enduring states rather than to discrete behavioural episodes.

D) *Adjectives*: Adjectives in the slogans of political communications are the highest level of abstractness, in that they not only abstract from specific actions and situations but also from the sentence object.68

Linguistic Category Model of interpreting political communication language is focused on the interplay between intra-personal processes (cognitive and motivational) and the linguistic structure of messages in the context of political transmission. It also observes the relationship between stereotypes and language in the context of political communication. Words and phrases involved in the slogans do the same as of unlimited functions beyond the calculations and estimations of the communicator.

**INDIAN INDEPENDENCE SLOGANS AND PUBLIC OPINION**

One striking phenomenon during the Indian Independence movement was the production and popularisation of revolutionary political slogans. The rhetorical impact of these art forms went far beyond the functions of protests and

aesthetics. They were the important tools of political discourse; exerting powerful persuasive appeals and inciting revolutionary fervour through public opinion. Many argue that Indian Independence struggle slogans largely reflected the public opinion of the masses during that time. Public opinion is the expressed views of a group of people about issues of common interest or concern. Opinion is not subject to verifiable proof. It commonly represents a value judgment or preference, or an estimate of the outcome of future events. Private opinions cannot form a part of public opinion unless they are expressed in some way. There can be no public opinion about individual concerns unless these concerns become of common interest. The relevant public is most often considered to be the adult citizenry of a political unit such as village, town, or a nation. But one may also speak of neighborhood public opinion with in various subgroups of a population, or even world public opinion. In the usage of slogans during Indian Independence struggle these postulates may not function.

Indian independence struggle slogans were reinforced in many ways during the freedom struggle. It was extensively illustrated in the political study class sessions, political gatherings, agitations, conferences, strikes etc by the nationalist leaders, and sometimes even in private conversation, letters and in underground literatures. Through these channels of propaganda, the political slogans initiated in the Independence struggle soon became public discourse spreading throughout the country. Repeating such slogans both in written and oral form has become a measure of ‘political correctness’ for the Indian citizens. In fact the frequency and eloquence in the use of nationalist slogans indicates a person’s political/ideological status and degree of loyalty to the freedom movement and the cause of Independence. For the nationalist leaders the use of slogans has become a means of fulfilling the dream of ‘swaraj.’

Opinions, attitudes and values are often compared or confused, most authorities regard attitudes as more fundamentally generalised predispositions, opinions as specific manifestations of underlying attitudes, and values as peoples ideals and the commitments they make to pursue them. A person’s expressed opinion will normally reflect his or her attitude towards the issue, although, for

---

reasons of social or political pressure, that person may conceal his or her attitude or express a contrary opinion. Attitudes themselves are products of cultural, social and psychological factors affecting each individual. Values often involve religious beliefs, standards of interpersonal relations, or moral and ethical judgements. All the three enter into the formation of public opinion in the terms broadest sense. Indian nationalist movement slogans exhibit a blend of all these three elements in a unique pattern. When an event occurs or issue arises, values may tested, individual attitudes are activated, public discussion ensues, attitudes and values are modified or strengthened and public opinion is formed. Many issues and events during the period of English East India Company had paved the way for the development of slogans as tokens of public opinion at that time.

Public opinion is most often characterised with respect to direction, intensity, breadth, and depth. Direction refers to the for-or-against continuum; opinion can be described as preponderantly favourable or unfavourable or divided with respect to an issue. Intensity refers to strength with which an opinion is held. Breadth refers to its scope or generality; opinion can be highly specific to a particular issue, or it can be generalised, so that opinions on many related issues reinforce one another. The depth of opinion refers to its anchorage in the individuals system of values. It differs from intensity in that an opinion may be strongly held yet susceptible to change through the influence of contrary evidence, while deeply rooted opinions are much more difficult to shift. Public opinion depends on freedom of communication, expression and representation. If communication is difficult or restricted, public opinion is less likely to form or change. Thus public opinion is usually more powerful in a free, open, and advanced society than it is in a primitive or a closed society- though even in the latter it cannot be ignored. Slogans acted as a means of communication in the context of Indian independence struggle when freedom of expression, representation and communication were restricted. Efforts to ascertain public opinion have long been characteristics of a democratic society. Slogans of Indian

---


Independence struggle performed the unique function of unifications which the time demanded. They were the (a) Unification of nationalistic feelings and thoughts, (b) Unification of freedom movement programmes, policy and campaigns, (c) Unification of the planning done for the Independence struggle irrespective of geographical boundaries and language, (d) Unification of commands to achieve the goal of Independence, (e) Unification of the actions in the freedom struggle etc.

Indian slogans do, however, exhibit several peculiarities. Age old Indian freedom fighter Sri. Narain N. Bhavnani in an interview with BBC correspondent Peter Ruhe on 27 February 2005, commented that Indian Independence struggle slogans as proved itself to be sui generis in several ways. Bhavnani says that Indian Independence struggle slogans reflects (a) the vast extent of the Indian Republic affords more regional slogans than any other country; (b) the diversity of princely states and languages finally cohering into an extra ordinary distinct and self-contained nation has brought a larger proportion of non-English words and phrases—and, most remarkably, syntactical turns—than one finds in English slang or, correspondingly, in French, German, Italian, or Spanish slogan; (c) It changes more rapidly, this feature being influenced by the preceding facts; and (d) it owes more, and owes it far more readily and quickly, to cant than does any other national slogan. Indian independence slogans are instead a special language, partly vocational and partly social but, above all, protective and self-protective—that is, secret. Indian freedom struggle slogans are more brutal, more realistic, more earthy, and less humorous although not less spontaneous, and more obscure in its origins despite being more direct in its applications.

INDIAN INDEPENDENCE SLOGANS IN SOCIAL THEORETICAL FRAMES

Can Indian Independence Slogans be confined into a theoretical frame and be interpreted in the strong boundaries of a social theory? Why is it necessary so?

Life compels us to give our attention to particular things. Beyond these imperatives we have a degree of freedom where we can choose to engage in
somethings, and ignore the rest. The trick, of course, is to know which concerns are obligatory and which are optional, not least since the boundary between them shifts as circumstances change. It is interesting to note the kinds of concerns that were obligatory in the study of Indian independence struggle Slogans: Communication, Politics, Political Communication, Freedom, Discourse, Public Sphere, Communicative Rationality, Legitimate and Responsible Democracy etc... the obligatory priorities go on. Indian Independence struggle slogans have intense reflections on the foundations of knowledge, information, rhetoric’s, linguistics, etymology psychology, philosophy, culture, epistemology etc. A great deal of attention is to be directed at disciplinary matters in this regard, about the fragmentation of the field and the possibility for better coherence.

Today, the situation has changed. In this research study an elaborate take up on the notion of the field of slogans and political communication’s overall porous boundaries and its cohesion, especially in regard to theories are found indispensible and inevitable. The theme of political slogans at times is still problematic. The concerns about this aspect in the field of slogans are becoming discretionary and optional. Our sense of field of slogans has a plural confederation of topics, traditions, methods and theories that are becoming normalised regularly. Indeed, the permeable boundaries of the field of Indian Independence struggle slogans can be seen as one of its strengths, given how much of the theory is imported from other disciplines. Moreover, theories need non-doctrinaire critical stances to address the distress of the world. Systems of political communication and political sloganeering are always in rapid transformation and good theoretical tools are needed to confront the changes. This sub field is still very much coloured by traditional Political Science and History; however, important contributions for the public sphere and from socio-cultural and religious tradition too have to be estimated. All these have strengths and weaknesses, all have their differences that must be respected and evaluated. Yet there are some signs of complementarities and contributiveness.

More attention is needed, however, in specific areas within the field of political slogans, where, for example, diverse theoretical currents are at play, at times interfacing productively, but often simply ignoring each other, not meshing well, or in
some other ways inadequate, such domains in the field of Indian Independence struggle slogans have to identified with in the field of Political Communication; addressing the rambling terrain of the Indian nationalist movement. On the one hand the conditions and practices of political communication through slogans and the profound changes it made. On the other hand, as an area or subfield, it has several theoretical strands at work with in it, e.g. political science, public sphere theory, discourse analysis, newer culturalist elements and not least political philosophy. This heterogeneity is problematic but also potentially useful, since the various traditions of Indianess has something to offer, even if the desperate theoretical elements are not necessarily compatible. Thus, the first order of this research is not choosing which strand(s) to ignore but rather trying to identify their potential complementarities, and from there consider possible steps towards the integration of various theoretical attributes. In this regard we have to consider the most acclaimed lesson of post modernism too: The research and researcher will be more at ease with epistemological ambivalence, more tolerant of difference, and perhaps more appreciative of pluralism. In short the field of political communication through slogans during Indian Independence struggle is permeable, resulting in a sort of free flow across it borders, though this flow tends to be unidirectional: we import more theory than we export.

Despite the difficulties deriving from its amorphous character, political communication and Indian independence struggle slogans has shown a capacity and willingness to engage with many currents of contemporary thought, often in a self reflexive manner. In its best moments it theorises creatively and comparatively, probing issues of epistemology, meaning, power, discourses, public sphere, cultural practices, religious traditions and products. Obviously the comparison between the two fields can only go so far, but a bit more kind of restless theoretic energy and intellectual exuberance is expected to derive from the encounters of this research. Undoubtedly, the most significant manifestation of the permeable borders of political communication and slogans will pave the way for fruitful trans-disciplinary investigations.

Optimal permeability involves not just theoretical imports and their integration; it also entails the familiarity, and possible participation in theoretic
domains outside the field of research. It is very difficult to speak about theory in a lucid manner. Theory in their texts is at times treated as some kind of decorative window dressing, tacked on to some data or an argument; alternatively it is understood as simply quoting the more abstract passages of the course of literature. It gets easier to talk about as we move from the field in general to specific areas of work. Denis McQuail’s formulation about theory is not just vague hypothesis, but also ‘any systematic set of ideas that can help make sense of a phenomenon, guide action or predict a consequence’. This view highlights theories function as intellectual scaffolding for the research. It serves to orient the research, to pull together set of facts and assumptions, and offers normative dispositions. Theory helps to provide significance to that what we observe, and to suggest the implications of various types of action or intervention. In this sense, there may not always be demarcated distinctions between formalised theory and the more general (and less systematic) thought modes in the research process. Theoretical application on the study of Indian Independence struggle slogans facilitates a rereading and significant estimation on the effects and impacts of the slogans on the Indian public psyche and polity even after fifty years of Independence. Theoretical interpretations on the Indian Independence struggle slogans will provide an elaborate acumen on the far reaching significance and the cognitive changes it made in the Indian sub continent during the British Raj.

Application of theories in research can blind the whole process, structuring shadows in the thought process and obstacles to the perceptions of the researcher. Thus from a bird’s eye-view, it would seem to be healthy if the researcher can maintain a balance between the systematic, codified and ‘finished’ character of the theory, and its discursively open, admittedly probing and eternally unfinished quality. That, of course, is a tall order: Hence in this research theory is taken as a bed rock, ignoring its ‘constructed’ quality, at least in the due course of this study, which may ultimately be for the best. In the long term, however, we can see the process of theory evolution, how it undergoes modification and even dramatic changes. In the case where too many theoretical currents are present at the same time, we usually resist the entropy by

---

pragmatically selecting (consciously or not) some strand to work with and disregarding the rest. This is of course however, always runs a risk that something potentially useful might be lost. In this study the above was applied consciously selecting the wide range of theoretical postulates by Jurgen Habermas. It includes: ‘The Structural Transformation of Public Sphere, Communicative Rationality, Formation of Civil Societies, Shaping of Legitimate, Deliberative and Responsible Democracy etc.

Political Communication theory and Political slogans of the Indian Independence struggle, as a speciality with in social theory, has an obligation to help us better understand not just the institutions of the communication or the process of communication, even if these are central, but also fundamental features and process of the communication and the polity of the modern world too. This world, our societies, our cultures, is not only in rapid transformation, but also in many ways in distress, a reality that theory cannot ignore. The catalogue of ills is all too familiar and too long to repeat here, but occasionally this researcher simply underscore the massive discrepancy, between the current states of suffering, deprivation and constraints on human freedom, and the potentials inherent in the world for transcending to some degree these circumstances. This would seem to evoke the need for at least some kind of ‘critical theory’ as a theoretic horizon or trajectory with in political communication, though this researcher is reluctant to use the term. Today, it all too readily associates to specific schools of thought, theory battles of the past, and the ambivalent legacy of the various ‘isms.’ The current historical juncture of research does need to carry forward that which is useful from the past endeavours, and integrate it with contemporary theoretic developments. No doubt has stuck with such concepts, so perhaps the best this researcher can do is to firmly emphasise that ‘critical’ has a boarder meaning than the traditional associations with the various forms of neo-Marxism. It emerges, robustly out of the Enlightenment tradition, not least from Immanuel Kant’s incitement for people to pull themselves out of unnecessary limitations on knowledge. Following that lineage down to the present-day results in a plethora of various perspectives, positions and modes of engagement that can help this researcher to elucidate and illuminate our modern political communication and Indian Freedom struggle slogans within its constructive ways.
Indian independence struggle slogans find expression in a wide range of theoretic trajectories, from individualism to collectivism, from political economy to ethnic cultural studies. This research on Indian Independence slogans borrows limited attributes from modern critical stances also because the modern critical stance seeks to specify the conditions and sources of suffering, exploitation, un-freedom, and its struggles with an eye to finding progressive paths beyond them. It has no prior truth claim, and certainly should not strive for some exclusionary status vis-à-vis other modes of theorising; it is dependent on dialogic openness. All that it can do is present evidence and arguments for its case. Theory, then, seen in this light, strives to articulate empirical social reality with developed better notions of better alternatives. It is thus imperative than in the theory we use in social studies – which may not always be ‘political communication theory’ per se—this research finds normative guides to the good society.

To make this research a bit more concrete, the researcher purposefully turned the study on Indian Independence struggle slogans to the area of political communication. This is because of the acumen that the concept of democracy seems sometimes almost as tired as many of the old ‘isms’. This researcher reminds himself of the old signifier; there lurk ever-present and crucial questions about how we live together, about how we solve societal conflicts, about power and accountability. Democracy in this sense can still function as a critical concept, since it invites us to think about the good society. That actually existing Indian democracy has increasingly fallen on hard times and has become an ever-pervasive theme in both the public debate and the research literature. The compelling evidence for the stagnation of Indian democratic systems, popular disengagement from formal nation politics, for growing cynicism among citizens, for the emergence of newer forms of extra-parliamentarian political involvement, all suggest important questions about the Indian democracy, Independence struggle, political communication, social life, and cultural traditions, and the need for sharp theoretical tools. Among the major trends mentioned in this study of slogans are the increasing socio-cultural heterogeneity, and the impact that this has on the audiences for political communication in the present day world.
Political Communication is in flux, as the significance of traditional national boarders becomes weakened. It is to be beware that there are not only more political advocators today, but also a group of political mediators, which includes the massive growth in the professionalisation of political communication, with experts, consultants, spin doctors, etc. Indifferent from the contemporary political communication, slogans of the Indian Independence struggle set the emergence of ‘porous’ politics, that materialised all over the social terrain, and manifest itself in many contexts during the freedom struggle, including the popular culture. This ‘infinite’ view of politics is increasingly parallel with the more traditional bounded ‘Indianess’, though this study partially imbibes modernist theoretical attributes. Transformation of the Indian sub continent since the independence also compels for the application of developed theoretical horizons. Dominant within political slogans and political communication today is still the mother discipline of political science. Most of the research work done in political communication still reflects this heritage. The political science tradition has evoked criticisms over the years, for being too formalistic, too bound to the prevailing political/institutional arrangements, too wedded to constructive methodologies-and too non-responsive towards its critics.

SLOGANS, HABERMAS, DISCOURSE AND COMMUNICATIVE RATIONALITY

Over the past decades there have emerged alternative theoretical streams that chart their own directions within political communication and also in the instruments like political slogans. For the sake of theoretical brevity of political communications in Indian Independence slogans these have to be fused with this research and interpretations has to be made based on their framework also. Habermasian tradition includes a range of interests and approaches that take up not only the ‘public sphere’, but also such themes as ‘communicative rationality’, ‘deliberative democracy’, and ‘civil society’. The public sphere approach emphatically asserts the norms of democracy, often understood in procedural terms with an emphasis on its deliberative character; it thereby gravitates towards republican conceptions of democracy.\(^{74}\) Which the Indian freedom fighters dreamt of after the British Raj in India.

The concept of public sphere was first introduced by Jurgen Habermas in his famous book ‘The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere- An Enquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society’ (originally in German and later translated into English). Through this work, he gave a historical and sociological account of the rise and decay of the public sphere. Habermas described Public sphere as “a network for communicating information and points of view, which eventually transforms them into a public opinion”. The German term ‘Offentlichkeit’ which paved the way for the derivation of the term public sphere encompasses a variety of meanings and it implies to a spatial concept, the social sites or arenas where meanings are articulated, distributed and negotiated, as well as a collective body constituted by, and in this process the, “public”. Freedom struggle slogans used during the nationalist period enunciated in the creation of a purposeful political public sphere in India and the ultimate aim of it was to secure freedom to the motherland from the British Raj. Independence slogans were attributing a wider world of meanings to the dream of Independence nourished by every Indian in their minds. Slogans were instrumental in moulding, framing, shaping, communicating and transmitting the ideals of Independence and freedom throughout the length and breadth of the country. Slogans of freedom movement was creating a political public sphere in India which became the platform to protest, agitate and revolt with the sole aim of achieving a legitimate democracy through communicative rationality and public opinion.

The concept, by the “Public Sphere” is meant in this research as a realm of our social life in which something approaching public opinion can be formed. Access is guaranteed to all citizens. A portion of the public sphere comes into being in every conversation in which private individuals assemble to form a public body. Then they behave neither like business or professional people transacting private affairs, nor like members of a constitutional order subject to the legal constraints of a state bureaucracy. Citizens behave as a public body when they confer in an unrestricted fashion - that is, with the guarantee of freedom of assembly and association and the freedom to express and publish their opinions.

Habermas’s concept of the public sphere is not equated with that of “the public,” i.e., of the individuals who assemble. His concept is directed instead at the institution, which to be sure only assumes concrete form through the participation of people. It cannot, however, be characterised simply as a crowd.
about matters of general interest. In a large public body, this kind of communication requires specific means for transmitting information and influencing those who receive it. Today, newspapers and magazines, radio and television, portals, websites and blogs are the media of the public sphere. During the Indian freedom movement slogans, graffiti’s, posters, conferences, public gatherings, meetings, protests, bill boards, flags were the medium of the public sphere. This research discuss of the political public sphere in contrasts, for instance, to the literary one, when public discussions deals with objects connected with the activity of the state. Although state authority is, so to speak, the executor of the political public sphere, it is not a part of it. To be sure, state authority is usually considered “public” authority, but it derives its task of caring for the well being of citizens primarily from this aspect of public sphere. Only when the exercise of political control is effectively subordinated to the democratic demand that institutionalised or individual information is accessible to the public, does the political sphere win an institutionalised influence over the government through the instrument of law making bodies.

The expression of public opinion refers to the tasks of criticism and controls which a public body of citizens informally—and, in periodic representations or communication, formally as well-practices vis-à-vis the ruling structure organised in the form of a state. Regulations demanding that certain proceedings be public—for example, those providing for open court hearings—are also related to this function of public opinion. The public sphere as a sphere which mediates between society and state, in which the public organises itself as the bearer of public opinion, accords with the principle of the public sphere—that principle of public information which once had to be fought for against the arcane of monarchies and which since that time has made possible the democratic control of state activities.

The state and public sphere do not overlap, as one might suppose from casual language use. Rather, they confront one another as opponents. Habermas designates that sphere as public with antiquity understood to be private, i.e., the sphere of nongovernmental opinion making. The principle of the public sphere could still be distinguished from an institution which is demonstrable in social history. Habermas thus would mean a model of norms and modes of behaviour by means of which the very functioning of public opinion can be guaranteed for the first time. These norms and modes of behaviour include: a) general accessibility, b) elimination of all privileges, and c) discovery of general norms and rational legitimations.
It is no coincidence that these concepts of the public sphere and public opinion arose for the first time only in the eighteenth century. They acquire their specific meaning from a concrete historical situation. It was at that time that the distinction of “opinion” from “opinion publique” and “public opinion” came about. Though mere opinions (cultural assumptions, normative attitudes, collective prejudices and values) seem to persist unchanged in their natural form as a kind of sediment of history, public opinion can by definition come into existence only when a reasoning public is presupposed. Public discussions about the exercise of political power which are both critical in intent and institutionally guaranteed have not always existed- they grew out of a specific phase of bourgeois society and could enter into the order of the bourgeois constitutional state only as a result of a particular constellation of interest.

PUBLIC SPHERE THROUGH HISTORY

There is no indication that European society of the high middle ages possessed a public sphere as a unique realm distinct from the private sphere. Nevertheless, it was not coincidental that during that period symbol of sovereignty, for instance, the princely seal were deemed “public”. At that time there existed a public representation of power. The status of the feudal lord, at whatever level of the feudal pyramid made it unnecessary they employ the categories “public” and “private”. The holder of the position represented it publicly; he showed himself, presented himself as the embodiment of an ever present “higher” power. The concept of this representation has been maintained up to the most recent constitutional history. The regardless the degree to which it has loosen itself from the old base, the authority of political power today still demands a representation at the highest level by a head of state. Such elements however, derive from a pre bourgeois social structure. Representation in sense of the bourgeois public sphere, for instance, the representation of the nation or of particular mandates has nothing to do with the medieval representative public sphere- a public sphere directly linked to the concrete existence of a ruler, as long

79 The expression represent is used in a very specific sense in this research, mainly, to “present oneself”. The important thing to understand is that the medieval public sphere, if it even deserves this designation, is tied to the personal. The feudal lord and estates create the public sphere by means of their very presence.
as the prince and the estates of the realm still “are” the land, instead of nearly functioning as the deputies for it, they are able to “represent” they represent their power “before” the people instead of for the people.

The feudal authorities (church, princes, and nobility), to which the representative public sphere was first linked, disintegrated during a long process of polarisation. By the end of the eighteenth century they had broken apart into private elements on the one hand, and into public elements on the other. The position of the church changed with the Reformation: the link to divine authority which the church represented, that is, religion became a private matter. So-called religious freedom came to insure what was historically the first area of private autonomy. The church itself continued its existence as one public and legal body among others. The corresponding polarisation within the princely authority was visibly manifested in the separation of the public budget from the private household expenses of the ruler. The institutions of the public authority, along with the bureaucracy and the military, and in part also with the legal institutions, asserted their independence from the privatised sphere of the princely court. Finally, the feudal estates were transformed as well: the nobility became the organs of public authority, parliament, and the legal institutions; while those occupied in trades and professions, in so far as they already established urban corporations and territorial organisations, developed into a sphere of bourgeois society which would stand apart from the state as a genuine area of private autonomy.

The representative public sphere yielded to that new sphere of “public authority” which came in to being with national and territorial states. Continuous state activity (permanent administration, standing army) now correspond to the permanence of the relationships with which the stock exchange and the press had developed within the exchange of the commodities and information. Public authority consolidated into a concrete opposition for those who merely subject to it and who at first found only the negative definition of themselves within it. These were the “private individuals” who are excluded from public authority because they held no office. “Public” no longer referred to the “representative” court of a prince endowed with authority, but rather to an institution regulated
according to competence, to an apparatus endowed with the monopoly on the legal exertion of authority. Private individuals subsumed in the state at whom public authority was directed now made up the public body.

Society, now a private realm occupying a position in opposition to the state, stood on the one hand as if in clear contrast to the state. On the other hand, that society had become a concern of public interest to the degree that the production of the life in the wake of developing markets economy had grown beyond the bounds of private domestic authority. The bourgeois public sphere could be understood as the sphere of private individuals assembled into a public body, which almost immediately laid claim to the officially regulated "intellectual newspapers" for use against the public authority itself. In those newspapers, and in moralistic and critical journals, they debated that public authority on the general rules of social intercourse in their fundamentally privatised yet publicly relevant sphere of labour and commodity exchange.

**THE OPERATIONAL PUBLIC SPHERE**

The medium of this debate - public discussion - was unique and without historical precedent. Hitherto the estates had negotiated agreements with their princes, settling their claims to power from case to case. This development took a different course in England, where the parliament limited royal power, than it did on the Continent, where the monarchies mediatised the estates. The third estate then broke with this form of power arrangement, since it could no longer establish itself as a ruling group. A division of power by means of the delineation of the rights of the nobility was no longer possible within an exchange economy - private authority over the capitalist property, is after all, apolitical. Bourgeois individuals are private individuals. As such, they do not "rule". Their claims to power are vis a vis public authority were thus directed not against the concentration of power, which was to be "shared". Instead, their ideas infiltrated the very principle on which the existing power is based. To the principle of existing power, the bourgeois public opposed the principle of supervision- that very principle which demands that proceedings be made public (publizitat). The principle of supervision is thus a means of transforming the nature of power, not merely one basis of legitimation exchanged for another.
In the first modern constitutions, the catalogues of fundamental rights were a perfect image of the liberal model of the public sphere: they guaranteed the society as a sphere of private autonomy and the restriction of public authority to a few functions. Between these two spheres, the constitutions further insured the existence of a realm of private individuals assembled into a public body that as citizens transmits the need of bourgeois society to the state, in order, ideally, to transform political into “rational” authority within the medium of this public sphere. The general interest, which was the measure of such rationality, was then guaranteed, according to the presuppositions of a society of free commodity exchange, when the activities of the private individuals in the market place were freed from social compulsions and from political pressure in the public sphere.

At the same time, daily political newspapers assumed an important role. In the second half of the eighteenth century, literary journalism created serious competition for the earlier news sheets, which were mere compilations of the notices. Karl Bucher characterised this great development as follows, “newspapers changed from mere institutions for the publication of news into bearers and leaders of public opinion- weapons of party politics. This transformed the newspapers business. A new element emerged between the gathering and publication of news: the editorial staff. But for the newspaper publisher it meant that he changed from vendor of recent news to a dealer in public opinion”. The publisher’s insured the newspapers a commercial basis, yet without commercialising them as such. The press remained an institution of the public itself, effective in the manner of a mediator and intensifier of public discussion, no longer a mere organ for the spreading of news but not yet the medium of a consumer culture.

This type of communication and journalism can be observed above all during period of revolution, when newspapers of the smallest political groups and organisations spring up- for instance, In Paris in 1789. Even in the Paris of 1848 every half way eminent politician organise his club, every other his journal: 450 clubs over 200 journals were established there between February and May alone. Until the permanent legalisation of a politically functional public sphere, the appearance of a political newspaper meant joining the struggle for freedom and public opinion, and thus for the public sphere as a principle. Only with the
establishment of the bourgeois constitutional state was the intellectual press relived of the pressure of its convictions. Since then it has been able to abandon its polemical position and take advantage of the earning possibilities of a commercial undertaking. In England, France, and the United States, the transformation from a communication and journalism of conviction to one of commerce began in the 1830’s at approximately the same time. In the transition from the literary journalism of private individuals to the public services of the mass media, the public sphere was transformed by the influx of private interests, which received special prominence in the mass media.

THE PUBLIC SPHERE IN FUNCTIONAL DEMOCRACY

Although the liberal model of the public sphere is still instructive today with respect to normative claim that information be accessible to the public,\(^{80}\) it cannot be applied to the actual conditions of an industrially advanced mass democracy organised in the form of the social welfare state. In part, the liberal model had always included ideological components, but it is also in part true that the social preconditions, to which the ideological elements could at one time at least be linked, had been fundamentally transformed. The very forms in which the public sphere manifested itself, to which supporters of the liberal model could appeal for evidence, began to change with the Chartist movement in England and the February revolution in France. Because of the diffusion of the press and propaganda, the public body expanded beyond the bounds of the bourgeoisie. The public body lost not only its social exclusivity; it lost in addition the coherence created by the bourgeois social institutions and a relatively high standard of education. Conflicts hitherto restricted to private sphere now intrude in to the public sphere. Group needs which can expect no satisfaction from a self–regulating market now tend toward a regulation by the state. The public sphere, which must now mediate these demands, becomes a field for the competition of interests, competitions which assume the form of violent conflict. Laws which obviously have come about under the “pressure of the street” can scarcely still be understood as arising from the consensus of private individuals engaged in public

\(^{80}\) Here it should be understood that Habermas considers the principle behind the bourgeois public sphere, but not its historical form, as indispensable.
discussion. They correspond in a more or less unconcealed manner to the compromise of conflicting private interests. Social organisations which deal with the state act in the political public sphere, whether through the agency of political parties or directly in connection with public administration. With the interweaving of the public and private realms, not only do the political authorities assume certain functions in the sphere of commodity exchange and social labour, but, conversely, social powers now assume political functions. This lead to a kind of "refeudalisation" of the public sphere. Large organisations strive for political compromises with the state and with one another, excluding the public sphere whenever possible. But at the same time the large organisations must assure themselves of at least plebiscitary support from the mass of the population through an apparent display of openness (demonstrative Publizitat). \(^81\)

The political public sphere of the social welfare state is characterised by a peculiar weakening of its critical functions. At one time the process of making proceedings public (publizitat) was intended to subject persons or affairs to public reason, and to make political decisions subject to appeal before the court of public opinion. But often enough today the process of making public simply serves the arcane policies of special interests; in the form of "publicity" it wins public prestige for people or affairs, thus making them worthy of acclamation in a climate of nonpublic opinion. The very words "public relations work" (Offentlichkeitsarbeit) betray the fact that a public sphere must first be arduously constructed case by case, a public sphere which earlier grew out of the social structure. Even the central relationship of the public, the parties, and the parliament is affected by this change in function.

Yet this trend towards the weakening of the public sphere as a principle is opposed by the extension of fundamental rights in the social welfare state. The demand that information be accessible to the public is extended from organs of the state to all organisations dealing with the state. To the degree that this is realised, a public body of organised private individuals would take the place of the

\(^81\) It must be distinguished between Habermas’s concept of "making proceedings public" (publizitat) and the "public sphere" (Offentlichkeit). The term Publizitat describes the degree of public effect generated by a public act. Thus, a situation can arise in which the form public opinion making is maintained, while the substance of the public sphere has long ago been undermined.
now-defunct public body of private individuals who relate individually to each other. Only these organised individuals could participate effectively in the process of public communication; only they could use the channels of the public sphere which exist within parties and associations and the process of making proceedings public (publizität) which was established to facilitate the dealings of organisations with the state. Political compromises would have to be legitimised through this process of public communication. The idea of the public sphere, preserved in the social welfare state mass democracy, an idea which calls for a rationalisation of power through the medium of public discussion among private individuals, threatens to disintegrate with the structural transformation of the public sphere itself. It could only be realised today, on an altered basis, as a rational reorganisation of social and political power under the mutual control of rival organisation committed to public sphere in their internal structure as well as in their relations with the state and each other.

David M. Rasmussen described the public sphere by Habermas in a more adaptable and rational way, He denotes public sphere as “specific institutions, agencies, practices; however, it is also a general social horizon of experience in which everything that is actually or seemingly relevant for all members of society is integrated.”82 So public sphere is something that concerns everyone and that realises itself only in people’s mind, in dimension of their consciousness. It not only paved the way for self-expression, but in fact had become a platform for airing one’s opinions and agendas for public discussions. The public sphere commanded by the societal interests can perform political criticism, but only if it becomes a public sphere in the true sense. Different streams of organisations, different ideologies (extremist or moderate), different movements (non-violence or non-cooperation) different tools or weapons of protests, different nationalist/political leaders, different languages used, different ways, means and modes of protest/agitations used in the Indian Independence struggle used slogans which has the ultimate denotative meaning of freedom and independence. These political slogans of freedom were epitomised in the peoples mind and consciousness. The spirit of the freedom movement through the slogans

awakened the mass of Indian about the need to communicate their opinions and air their opinions in the public. Hence nationalist slogans were a forum of self expression in a collective manner.

Habermas described public sphere as not a virtual or imaginary community; which does not exist necessarily in any identifiable space. In its ideal form he illustrated that public sphere is “made up of private people gathered together as a public and articulating the needs of the society with the state”. Public sphere give due emphasis to the most esteemed personal qualities, such as independence, will to freedom, sympathy and the sense of justice, are social as well as individual virtues. Consequently, the emancipation of the individual is not emancipation from society, but the deliverance of society from atomisation..... that may reach its peak in periods of collectivisation and mass culture. Through the acts of assemblage and dialogue, the public sphere generates opinion and attitudes which serve to affirm or challenge therefore, to guide-the affairs of the state. In ideal terms public sphere is the source of public opinion needed to “legitimate authority in any functioning democracy”. Indian Independence struggle slogans collected and gathered; the dispersed and gathered Indian spirit and population to a common plat form of independence. These nationalists’ political slogans articulated the aspirations and dreams of the people for Independence and assembled them in a common platform to protest and act against the Imperialist rule in India. So Indian freedom struggle slogans straight away formed a political public sphere in the Indian soil in a conscious, purposeful and deliberate manner. Political public sphere existed during freedom struggle had a realm of discussion and action. In fact political public sphere was the sphere of freedom and permanence, where distinctions and excellence were also possible. This political public sphere formed with the help political slogans argued for a legitimate democracy and responsible governance by the native and the leaving of foreigners from the Indian soil. Indian nationalist freedom fighters never bothered about the personal emancipation in their process of collectivisation. The only spirit guiding them was the spirit of patriotism and benevolence to their mother land.

Paul Ruthford elaborates the concept of Public sphere with a universal approach. He remarks that “the public sphere remains a site for the production of public opinion that is given concrete form of different kinds of protests, agitations, revolts and representations and which to a degree, actually fashion the opinion through the process of raising and asking questions. Because of an excess of goods and risks competing for attention, the sphere continues to be a contested arena; however much of the excess is manufactured by people and institutions with mass, moral clout, or other forms of power. The mass play out a double roll here, both as a vehicle for competitive spectacles and as a reflection of public opinion for the discourse”. Nationalist movements through different forms and modes of communication tools including political slogans tried the core to raise the public opinion against the British Imperialism. These forms of communications used in the Independence movements were raising interrogations and investigations against the words and deeds of the ruling British. The political slogans were amassing the attention of the popular public to the spirit of Independence.

Habermas believed that public sphere can be most effectively constituted and maintained through dialogue, acts of speech, proclamation of slogans, through debate and discussion. In ‘Further Reflections’, Habermass claims that “public debate on an issue or motto can be animated by opinion forming association”- voluntary associations, social organisations, groups of concerned citizens, grassroot movements, trade unions-to counter or refashion the functioning and messages of the authority. Habermas believes that the reassertion of an authentic public sphere is possible and necessary. Its success depends on the ability of the public to engage with and debate new technology and specialised bureaucracy such as the complexities of new weapons, technology or finance. Indian freedom movement was the complimentary effort of the same combination of groups and citizens which had only one communicative rationality and aim-Freedom from the British tyranny. These freedom fighters too

---


experimented new weapons and technology against the well armed foreign rule. So the theoretical political public sphere of Jurgen Habermas intersects with the Indian Nationalism to a great extent as a critical theory. Habermas suggested that Public sphere will only be successful and possible on the following situations, they are:

- The extent of access (as close to universal as possible)
- The degree of autonomy (the citizens must be free to coercion)
- The rejection of hierarchy (so that each might participate on equal footing)
- The quality of participation (the commitments to the ways of logic)
- The rule of law (particularly the subordination of the state)\(^{87}\)

During the period of Indian independence struggle both the state and the citizenry experienced the above five conditions illustrated by Habermas for a successful democracy. Majority of the freedom fighters and nationalist leaders rejected either the social hierarchy or the political hierarchy while involving in the participation of freedom movement. Even though English East India Company tried to restrict the accessibility and autonomy of the princely states and the peoples they overcame the above by the advantages of geographical entity, language multiplicity, cultural ethnicity and regionalisation. Sublime parallel movements, underground revolutionary activities, parallel organisations etc for underground operations with the sole aim of Indian independence also sprouted up during the Indian independence struggle. Habermas’ writings also speak about the formation of such parallel groups and societies along with the mainstream actions. He narrates that “secret societies will eventually develop into exclusive associations that separated them from the public sphere. All these types of societies and associations have certain criteria in common. (a) The members of these groups ignore their status in the social relations; all that mattered was the authority for the better argument. (b) They discussed previously unquestioned areas. (c) The public became in their principle inclusion. Everyone had to be able to participate. Indian freedom movement has great many revolutionary underground organisations and groups in operation and practice. Many had

---

accepted martyrdom but they were not recognised in the public sphere because
of the above three postulates suggested by Habermas in studying a group
activity. Habermas was studious enough in highlighting all the elements and
groups in a society while elaborating the Public sphere and its domain. For
Habermas, the success of the public sphere was founded on rational-critical
discourse-where everyone is an equal participant and the supreme communication
skill is the power of argument. The medium of this political confrontation was the
public use of reason.

Habermas develops the normative notion of the public sphere as a part of
social life where citizens can exchange views on matters of importance to the
common good, so that the public opinion can be formed. This public sphere
comes into being when people gather to discuss issues of political concern. Indian
freedom movement is too identical with Habermas’ normative notion for the
formation of a public sphere. Freedom movement became an inevitable part of
the social life of every Indian and they exchanged their views, ideas and opinions
on the basis of it. Above and over the concept of social life, Indian independence
struggle was purely the end product of a political concern and economic reason
too. The importance of this political concern lies in the process of discussion,
which must take the form of rational-critical debate. The debate has asset of rules
which include the use of emotion or emotive language, and focus on the
rationality of the contents too. Participants should have a common interest in
truth, which means that they bracketed status differentials (so the participants
speak as if they are equal)Criticism is vital to this process, so that the proposals
being put forward can be tested, but also that the participants can discover a
meaning together as a result of the process itself.88 Indian Independence slogans
genenerated a discussion in the public sphere which was solely for the truth
‘Independence’. The discussions generated by the slogans were rational to the
core of human freedom and vehemently critical against the ill-doings of foreign
rulers. In the process of sloganeering they efficiently shattered their bracket s of
status difference.

88 Thornton, Alinta., Does Public Sphere Create Democracies?, Unpublished Master’s thesis on MA
in Journalism, University of Technology, Sydney. 2006.
Slogans of the freedom movement performed multiple roles and functions and they were vehicles of publicity and tools of public opinion formation. They collected and gathered individual opinions to the broader framework of public opinion. For Habermas, a person’s individual opinion, when solicited does constitute the public sphere, because it enclose a process of opinion formation.  

Freedom movements and the tools of communication used in the freedom movements were working with a sole aim of forming and strengthening public opinion against the British Raj. Communication in this regard means not just finding out what individuals have previously decided or learned; it is a process in which opinion is created by the process of debate itself. Political slogans of freedom movement were generating and creating discussion against the economic policies of the East India Company, inhuman social attitude of the rulers against the native Indians, the western aggressions against the rich traditional, cultural and religious heritage of India. Slogans were creating a multifaceted publicity as a struggle to reclaim the public sphere and centers on an attempt to make publicity a source of reasoned consensus formation instead of a site for manipulating popular opinion.

Habermas makes clear distinction between public opinion and publicity. He considered public opinion as a critical authority balancing political and social power, and public opinion is something than publicity can manipulate to support people, institutions, products or programmes. Public opinion, on the other hand, is associated with rational-critical debate. By linking it to the most powerful aspect of the state, one could legitimate the claim that the state was not a dominant force. So public opinions in most cases will be termed as anti-incumbency. Indian independence movements were also fuelled and ignited by the public opinion of anti-incumbency against the British rule. Habermas’ political intent was to further “the Project of Enlightenment” by the reconstruction of a public sphere in which reason might prevail, not the instrumental reason of much modern practice but the critical reason that represent the best of the democratic traditions. His
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definition of public sphere can be defined and elaborated as a domain of uncoerced conversations oriented towards a pragmatic accord. As the British East India Company began to take on more and more functions, it affected the people’s lives more directly in adverse manner. This involvement provided the basis for the foundation of critical thoughts and debates which Habermas also incorporated in his theoretical attributes for the conditions necessitating critical thoughts. Habermas argues that in complaining about tax officials, or debating with minor officials, people began to learn how to use their reason publically and critically. It is claimed that public sphere is always formed against the ruling class and engage in debate over general rules in a privatised manner at first. The medium of this political confrontation was the public use of reason.

Indian Independence Slogans exhibited and promoted a debate with a sense of public authority neglecting the blood and iron measures of the British rulers. To quote from Habermas it can be a discussion in the formation of social and institutional structures of the public sphere. Citizens from different cultural and geographical social status in India during the British raj transformed into the institution of Indian independence movement and became the public sphere of an awakened civil society who argue and demand for their natural rights. Habermas describes the public sphere as private people transformed into a public. Private people come from different economic sphere of labour and exchange, but also for the family, and they oppose or debate with public authority. Their use of reason is "public" for three reasons as cited by Habermas: (a) because it occurs in public (b) because it is practices by a public (c) because it is opposed to the actions of the public authority. Indian freedom movement can be portrayed as the typical example of a public sphere because of the above three postulates. Indian Independence struggle slogans were instrumental in creating a pure political public sphere. In the words of Habermas political public sphere is, where the public challenged and criticised state authority, developed from its political leaders. In political public sphere, those who were involved are fully unconcerned with social status, address unthinkable questions and were guided by the principle

of inclusion. Freedom fighters and nationalist leaders performed the similar actions and deeds even though it was stated as illegal and unlawful by the ruling British class. Habermasian theory also sees the roots of this transition in the political discussions in the traditional questioning of absolute sovereignty and the power of kings. The Independence struggle political public sphere is not merely discussion about politics but it was a concerted, rational discussion about the political questions that affected different sessions of people residing in the Indian subcontinent during the British Raj. Habermas philosophy also sees these kinds of discussions as the ideas and needs of civil society being represented before the public authority.

The public acts in the political sphere to secure own demands, and to emerge as a powerful force. This force is “Public Opinion”. Public opinion has different meanings depending on whether it acts as a critical authority in connection with a mandate that power be subject to publicity, or whether it acts as a moulded object of staged display. As its demand is based on rational argument and criticism, public opinion can claim a kind of authority; Habermas calls this both as “moral authority” and “authority for better argument”. Habermas analyses the socio-psychological and theoretical interpretations of public opinion. Public opinion became a socio-psychological analysis of group processes. Once public opinion is reduced to group behaviour the articulation of the link between group opinion and public authority is left to the auxiliary science of public administration. The degree to which opinion is public depends on the degree to which it emerges from the intra-organisational public spheres of an organisation’s members, and the extent to which that sphere communities with another public sphere formed by the instruments of communication between the state and the society. Political public sphere represents a critical voice that analysed and often opposed governmental action, and prevented domination by the powerful state. Indian independence movement and the public opinions formed on the basis of discussions, debates, conferences, protests, agitations,
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strikes, revolts etc were strongly backed by the moral authority to fight for the freedom and argue for the betterment through independence of the subcontinent.

The actual functions of the public sphere can be understood only in relation to a specific phase in the development of civil societies, where individual freedom is placed in the highest podium. Civil societies were born as a corollary of the depersonalised state authority. The public sphere as an element in the political realm was given the status of an organ for the self-articulation of civil society. The functions of public sphere were often spelled out in legislation. Basic rights were established; they concerned debate, individual freedom and property transactions. Basic rights guaranteed the public and private spheres, the institutions of the public sphere (press and political parties) and the foundations of the autonomy (family, property). The order that "all power come from the people” shows the character of the constitutional establishment of the political public sphere as an order of domination. After gaining full freedom from the British, India too enunciated constitutional postulates of individual freedom, right to property and transactions and fully becomes sovereign by legislative means; attaining the title of sovereign, socialist and secular, democratic republic in all contexts.

Many civil societies too were formed in India after the independence. Habermas borrowed the term ‘civil societies’ from Hegel. Civil society is the sphere of production and exchange, which forms part of the private realm and is distinct from the state. It operates according to its own laws, but is able to represent its interests to the state through the public. Habermas established a link between civil societies and the public sphere. A chain is established. The public sphere depends on civil society, because it articulates its interests, and civil societies depends on a liberalised social norm. Civil societies in these periods are free from governmental interventions and are governed by its own laws. The public spheres on civil societies depend on the principle of universal accesses. A political consciousness developed in civil societies that articulated the demand for general laws and eventually asserted itself as the only legitimate source of these laws. This was public opinion in the contemporary world. Public opinions strongly
generated discourses. Indian Independence struggle slogans enunciated public discourses by framing and forming public opinions to a large scale.

Habermas states that “discourses become democratic through the “non-coercively unifying, consensus building force of a discourse in which participants overcome their at first subjectively biased views in favour of a rationally motivated agreement”. By looking to the rationality, he hopes to produce democratic judgments which can have universal application while remaining anchored within the practical realm of discourse among individuals. For Habermas, the public sphere too is a discursive arena that is home to citizen’s debate, deliberations agreement and actions. Here individuals are able to freely share their views with one another in a process which closely resembles the true participatory. In the real sense Indian nationalist slogans were encouraging a discourse for the participation to over throw the might with majority. Slogans rationally motivated, unified, built consensus, argued for the truth through the Indian masses to over throw the undemocratic tyrannical rule. Indian freedom struggle slogans can be substantiated with the theoretical interpretations of Habermas in the phenomenon of discourse production through public opinion.

The openness created by the Independence struggle slogans can be equated with the ‘ideal speech situation’ illustrated by Habermas while describing the processes of discourses in public sphere. Ideal speech situation presupposes that (a) every subject or individuals with the competence and capability of speech can participate in the debate and act is allowed to take part in a discourse (b) all individuals have equal rights to give their reasons for their stated position, (c) no individual can be denied the right to participate in the debate (d) every subject is allowed to question any ascertains whatever, (e) everyone is allowed to introduce any assertion whatever into the discourse; and (f) everyone is allowed to express his attitudes, desires and needs. These are the necessary and universal conditions for the ideal speech community because they guarantee the force of better rational argument will prevail. Ideal speech situation is believed to be the
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inevitable conditions needed for the social change. It is an outline of the necessary but general conditions for the communicative practice of everyday life; that will enable the participants to realise concrete possibilities for a better, less threatened life, on their own initiative and in accordance with their own needs and insights. Slogans performed the rapid exchange and production of information during the movement; as that of an ideal speech situation prevailing. Slogans created a group feeling among the freedom fighters and instilled the spirit of courage and bravery in them for challenging, questioning, arguing and threatening the mighty British Empire. As that of Ideal speech situation slogans of Indian Freedom movement also protested the domination of capital and the state power of the East India Company. The outcome of the protest was defensible because it was true, right and sincere. Slogans also prevailed the ideal speech situation by allowing all the freedom fighters to sensitise, represent, participate and to empower. They were free and equal to genuinely raise their own reasons of rationale.

Throughout the Indian nationalist movements majority of the freedom fighters and nationalists leaders enjoyed and experienced the ideal situation of speech. It is because of this ideal speech situation which prevailed; Indian Independence struggle movements experienced different thoughts, ideologies, and imbibed different means and methods for freedom. Ideal speech situation is therefore politically important in providing the foundation for the full realisation of human needs and interests. The very nature of communication in the ideal speech community is one of mutual trust and comprehension rather than the achievement of instrumental ends. According to Habermas in an ideal speech situation ‘undistorted communication’ will exist. Undistorted communication refers to the condition under which social goals and values can be discussed on a rational, egalitarian basis so that a consensus can be reached on the ends and values to be pursued. Undistorted rational communication occurs when the “peculiar constraint free force of the better communication and argument

prevailed.99 Even though the British forces tried their level best to mechanically interrupt and distort the communication networks prevailed among the freedom fighters, they overcome all the hurdles by their mental force of rationality, undistorted firm belief to save their motherland from the foreign regime. There was an intra-undistorted communication which prevailed in the minds of the freedom fighters. The languages of the political slogans in the freedom period were a significant factor which contributed to the undistortedness of communication on the way to emancipator practices.

Communications during the Indian Independence movement in the form of Political slogans were not simply reaching an understanding; it is also about social interaction and social integration. Communication through political slogans involves interaction that “develop, confirm and renew’ an individual’s group membership and personal identity. Communication which prevailed through slogans at times of freedom movement not only involves social interaction and integration but also the process of interpretation in which cultural knowledge is tested against the foreign transnational cultural invasion. This situation can be equated with the phenomenon of Habermas theory of ‘Communicative Competence’. Communicative competence refers to the everyday world of taken-for-granted assumptions that structure understanding of how the world is and how individuals can act in that world.100 Habermas believed that communicative competence can develop new way of normative consensus. Habermas believed that communicative competence is dependent on validity claims. Validity claims are on the basis of intelligibility, truth, moral rightness and sincerity. Indian freedom fighters undoubtedly had all these four virtues to succeed their valid claim of freedom through communicative competency.

Communicative competence shown by Indian freedom fighters can be interpreted as the purposeful and deliberate means of identity formation during the British Raj. The sole intentions of the communications of Indian freedom fighters were to reach a consensus about their valid claim for Independence. They believed that this claim can be achieved when they gain strength, momentum,
spirit and equal access to unconstrained dialogue; so that their forces of better arguments prevail. Analysing the context of Indian nationalist movement, we can say that Public sphere formed by the freedom fighters through the different means of communication were purely political in traits. The discourse by slogans of nationalism took place in a reformed public sphere, creating an ethics, or set of guidelines. For this discourse was a preventive measure against the disintegration of Indian princely states. Relativism and inherent pluralism in India often created difficulties for the discourse by slogans but it was overcome by the common desire and dream for freedom.

As members of the defined public sphere are rational beings, the basis for establishing consensus is on the strength of argument, which comes from within the self of the participants, as opposed to material power defined by certain groups from the outside. Yet though particular interests are respected in the ideal speech situation, participants also give attention to the concrete, practical needs of their fellow human beings. "The 'solidarity' which springs from this attention to one another concerns the welfare of consociates who are intimately linked in an inter-subjectively shared form of life and this also to the maintenances of the integrity of this forms of life itself."101 The public sphere, therefore, manages to generate a political space which respects the rights of the individual and strengthens the community. Because the communication which takes place in the 'ideal speech situation' is free of institutional coercion, dialogues in the public sphere can institute democratic discourses at the grassroots level. Even though majority of the citizens who participated the freedom struggle were illiterate masses, they equated the truth and objectivity of the slogans they raised through the rationality which was gained by them in their experience of day today life. The belief on religion, ethics, values and morals among the freedom fighters effectively played a role in maintaining the plurality of the population and built solidarity on the basis of consensus during the Independence struggle.

Indian freedom struggle slogans exhibited a character of mass communication which paved the way for an action either physical or psychological
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among the freedom fighters. It transpires like a trickle down model of communication to grass root population. They identified and equated their hopes and dreams of Independence with these wide spread slogans as it transpires from minds to minds and territories to territories. Habermas introduces the notion of ‘communicative action’, which he understands “as a medium of ‘sociation’ through which the symbolic reproduction of society occurs”.\(^{102}\) Communicative action is based on the use of reason and the uniqueness of humanity. Communicative action is what we would be doing. Instead of simply taking actions that we perceive will be of benefit to us as individuals, we must act in accordance with communicated societal interests. Individual interests are dispassionately compared with the interests of others.

All communicative action is made on the basis of validity claims created through ethical discourses. Therefore, communicative action is distinguished from other more self interested forms of action like institutional or strategic action. The communicative actions which all Indians experienced irrespective of their heterogeneity was the one in which participants are free to raise and challenge claims of the leaders without fear of coercion, intimidation, deceit, or the like, in which all have equal chances to speak, to make assertions, self presentations, and normative claims and to challenge others. Participant of the freedom movement thematise a problematic validity claim and, relieved of the pressure of action (violent or non-violent) and experience, in a hypothetical attitude, test with reasons, and only with reasons, whether the claim defended by the British proponents rightfully stands or not.

It is through the communicative action that the structures and norms of the ‘life world’ are produced and reproduced. Systems in contrast reproduce materially, which causes them to “interfere in the process of the symbolic reproduction of daily life”. Life world is life as we live it, with all our beliefs, hopes, expectations, and desires. It is the manifest in individual personalities and, in a large sense, in cultures and sub cultures. It is the cultural store house …… a source of expectations about the ordering of social relations, and a milieu out of
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which individual competences for speech and action are formed. Freedom struggle slogans were symbolically reproducing a life world among the Indians to fight against the British rule. It was creating a socialisation phenomenon in short. On certain occasions political slogans of the freedom movement became the inspiration and hope of their culture and sub culture in the process of the renaissance of the Indian social system under the British Imperialism. Life world created by the slogans of the freedom struggle created many dynamic actions among the freedom fighters at the moments of spiritedness and commitment to the motherland. Habermas’ public sphere is part of that space in which ‘communicative action’ takes place, as opposed to the functionalistic theory. Immanuel Kant and Jurgen Habermas agree on a common plat form i.e. “the public use of one’s reason must always be free, and it alone can bring about enlightenment among men. The private use of reason, on the other hand, may often be very narrowly restricted without particularly hindering the progress of enlightenment”. Indian political slogans too were encouraging more public reasoning in order to achieve the aim of communication action and public sphere through the process of enlightenment.

Slogans of the freedom movement provide a public space, as quoted by Seyla Banhabib, ”slogans are the effect of collective action in concert will be to put ever new and unexpected items on the agenda of public debate”. It is learned that Indian Independence struggle slogans were performing a series of chain reactions if observed through the theoretical interpretations of Jurgen Habermas. Political slogans of freedom period through the element of communicative objectivity and rationalist created collectivism and a responsible and reactionary public sphere. Through this public sphere slogans worked for collective actions which finally lead to the Independence of India. Indifferent from these western theories it is possible to identify certain other important areas of concern which were the inherent feature of the Indian Freedom movement and political slogans that catalysed the final aim of Independence. They are:

(a) The Indian sphere of moral and religious consciousness.

(b) The free flow of communication relations irrespective of diversities.

(c) The intimate cultural sphere which binds the Indian public psyche.

(d) The Indian openness to accept and tolerate the new comings.

(e) The freedom to make public use of one’s reason in all matters.

(f) The Indian philosophy of promoting the actions with rationalism.

(g) The Indian social ability to imbibe the different steams of thought.

The Public sphere and communicative action are coming in the domain of public critical attention which is inevitably needed for a legitimate and responsible democracy. Public sphere assumes that any topic of general concern can be raised by any participant and will be rationally debated until consensus is achieved. Habermas account of communicative rationality begins as the employment of language in contexts of interaction produce mutual agreement on a course of action, a fact in the world, an aesthetic evaluation or an expression of intention, desire, need or the like. He claimed that language have the ability to coordinate action in a consensual or cooperative way as opposed to a forced or manipulative one. Language has the ability to achieve mutual understanding and coordinate action in a consensual or cooperative way because its original, communicative use involves raising validity claims and supporting them if challenged. Freedom struggle slogans were truly expressive self presentations in linguistic manner which raise the valid claim to freedom, truthfulness or sincerity on consensus and cooperation. Claims to the truth of statements and rightness of actions or norms of action require a discursive justification to which the claims to truthfulness and sincerity are not subject. Ultimate and complete freedom of mother India was the discursive justification which the political slogans were able to deliver during the freedom struggle.

The model of public sphere and communicative action were valuable models in interpreting the multidimensionality of Indian freedom struggle slogans because it encouraged an idealised model for public debate, social communication and responsible democracy in the Indian context.