

Name Kamran

ID 14628

Paper Political Communication

Question 1

Write a note on elements of Political Communication

Answer

elements of Political Communication

This introduction serves several important goals. It lays out both the research objective and theoretical framework placing this study on an interdisciplinary foundation that combines work from political science, American political development, mass communication, history, and diffusion studies. It introduces the core concepts of the book, concentrated around a recurring multistage process called the political communication cycle (PCC). The three stages of the PCC, detailed in the following chapters, include the information and communications technology (ICT)–focused technological imperative phase; the political choice phase, which emphasizes the behavioral process central to innovation; and stabilization through the establishment of new norms, regulations, and institutions. This process has repeated throughout history, where long periods of relative stability, known

as political communication orders (PCOs), are disrupted by shorter periods of permanent change, identified as political communication revolutions (PCRs). The introduction concludes by introducing the three claims that are used throughout the book
Who has run for political office?

Who has run a political campaign?

Who uses social media?

Personal Contact

TV

Direct Mail

Social Media

Traditional media was a one-way push

Shared messages via news releases, interviews and debates

Candidates don't dictate the news cycles

Campaigns do not control websites, broadcast ads and direct media (mailers, telephone calls, etc.)

Elections Are Won Locally

Play Good Cop, Bad Cop - Makes Attacks Worse

Generate specific outcomes or effect in a relative large number of people

Usually within a specified time period

Through an integrated set of communication activities and procedures

political messages in various media formats. It is not a rule book; rather, it is a set of guidelines to facilitate effective political communication. Its purpose is to bridge the gap between two distinct styles to create pragmatic, clear, and useful information to establish a consistent tone, style, and format between all of the messages you or your organization produces.

It is meant as a practical guide for anyone, regardless of political affiliation, and it is organized in such a way that a person new to political communication can learn to create convincing and thought-provoking op-eds, letters to the editor, press releases, social media posts, website content, and spoken messages

Question 2

Explain Agenda Setting ?

Answer

Agenda setting

What issues are important to you? Why are these issues of importance? Media coverage not only directs what we think but also shapes how we think. This influence provides media with a powerful tool to influence government and the way people view it.

Agenda setting occurs through a cognitive process known as "accessibility". Accessibility implies that the more frequently and prominently the news media cover an issue, the more instances of that issue become accessible in audience's memories. When respondents are asked what the most important problem facing the country is, they answer with the most accessible news issue in memory, which is typically the issue the news media focused on the most. The agenda-setting effect is not the result of receiving one or a few messages but is due to the aggregate impact of a very large number of messages, each of which has a different content but all of which deal with the same general issue. Mass-media coverage in general and agenda-setting in particular also has a powerful impact on what individuals think that other people are thinking, and hence they tend to allocate more importance to issues that have been extensively covered by mass media. This is also called schemata theory. In psychology and cognitive science, a schema (plural schemata or schemas) describes a pattern of thought or behavior that organizes categories of information and the relationships among the . we

learned the purpose and methods of setting agendas. Additionally, we learned the importance of setting an agenda, technology and agenda setting, and the effects of agenda-setting on audiences. Answer the following questions to test your mastery of this subject. When major news happens, the world's mass media organizations take notice.

Whether it's the President of the United States making an announcement or a severe storm battering a region, when it's a story that affects people, the news media is on alert to cover it, providing viewers with the facts and information they need to understand what is happening.

But sometimes it may seem, with so much media focus and scrutiny on a single event, that the mass media is missing or even ignoring other important stories. This is the crux of the agenda-setting theory.

This theory refers to how the media's news coverage determines which issues become the focus of public attention.

First introduced in 1972 by college professors, Maxwell McCombs and Donald Shaw, they found in surveying North Carolina voters during the 1968 U.S. presidential election that what people thought were the most important issues were what the mass media reported as the most critical.

Thus, agenda-setting theory was born, built on the notion that the mass media sets the agenda for what people should care about.

Question 3

Write and Explain Authoritarian Theory in the context of Pakistan?

Answer

Authoritarian theory

Authoritarian theory describe that all forms of communications are under the control of the governing elite or authorities or influential bureaucrats.

Authoritarians are necessary to control the media to protect and prevent the people from the national threats through any form communication (information or news). The press is an instrument to enhance the ruler's power in the country rather than any threats. The authorities have all rights to permit any media and control it by providing license to the media and make certain censorship.

If any media violate the government policies against license, then the authority has all right to cancel the

license and revoke it. The government have all right to restrict any sensitive issues from press to maintain peace and security in the nation

Practically from the moment of its creation in 1947, Pakistan has been plagued by ethnic tensions, mismanagement, and corruption. The profound incompetence of its civilian rulers in the first decade of independence created a political vacuum filled by the generals, who have ruled or dominated Pakistan, directly or indirectly, for much of its history. The country's dismal political record and lackluster socioeconomic development are all the more remarkable when contrasted with the relative success of its gigantic neighbor to the east. To be sure, India has also encountered ethno-religious conflicts, widespread poverty, and many other challenges, but it has remained a functioning democracy with an increasingly promising economic future. Why has Pakistan failed where India succeeded? Why has it become an authoritarian state? Why have its armed forces been able to dominate its political life?

To place Pakistan's predicament in the proper perspective, we should consider the roots of its sovereign statehood — the colonial past, the circumstances of its founding, and the early years of its independence — and trace the evolution of its principal political player, the military. Three points are

key. First, the political legacies of British colonialism impacted India and Pakistan differently. Second, the circumstances of British India's 1947 partition and the events of the immediate post-partition period suggest several reasons for the different political trajectories of its two successor states. Finally, within the first decade of its independence, the authoritarian mold of Pakistan's political system was cast, and since then we have witnessed different permutations of that early prototype. Thus, the Pakistani experience supports the argument that the fate of political transitions is frequently determined in the first few years after the fall of the ancien régime.

Feudal Culture

Most of the military and political elite of Pakistan hail from feudal ranks. The role of feudal culture in Pakistani politics needs to be more explicitly worked on although feudal mentality will slowly change as the demographic composition of the Pakistani army undergoes a subtle change.

A large majority of eminent Pakistani leaders such as Liaqat Ali Khan for example hailed from the ranks of the landed aristocracy and thus had no real stake in nation building. This feudal mentality still colors the political culture of Pakistan.

US Role

President Truman was clueless about the realities of Pakistan. His administration seemed to be firmly convinced about the geo-strategic importance of Pakistan in controlling oil routes of the Middle East as also by Pakistani leaders such as Liaqat Ali Khan's attempt to prop up Pakistan as a bulwark against communism.

The American role in Pakistani politics is not all that benign for they perceived military dictatorships as relatively easier to engage with than a messy democracy. A cursory glance at various Congress committee reports between 1948-1954 clearly defies any semblance of US innocence in supporting authoritarian regimes in Pakistan.

The US held up Pakistan as a model of economic growth, the irony being that this growth never percolated down and led Mehboob-ul-Haq to propound his famous 'twenty four families' thesis. While the US cannot be held responsible for the structural roots of authoritarianism in Pakistan, it nonetheless has enough sins in not doing much to forestall authoritarianism.

Much of the ideological thrust in Pakistani politics came from the bureaucracy and military which used the idea of an 'existential threat' from India alive to keep the flow of desperately needed US aid.

Historical Roots of Authoritarianism

Authoritarianism goes back to the days of Syed Ahmad Khan whose voice reeks of contempt for the poor. He vociferously argued against the idea of 'one man one vote' for communities such as the *chamars* for instance who he argues were incapable of judging what was in their best interest.

The Pakistani political system has followed the course of the viceregal system that prevailed under the British, lucidly illustrated by Jinnah's inclination to step into the shoes of the Governor General as also his disposition towards having a strong Presidential office.

The basis of the Pakistani constitution i.e. the Government of India Act of 1935 also helped in the drift towards authoritarian rule. Jawaharlal Nehru commenting upon the nature of the act opined 'We have been given a car with brakes but no engine'.

Democracy: A Western Preserve?

From Khyber to Suez, there are no democratic regimes with India being the notable exception in this regard. Max Weber talked about the legitimate monopoly force being in the hands of the state. Thus, one could argue that authoritarian rule is a natural characteristic of a state while democracy is an aberration that requires explanation.

The concepts of Western democracy are inherently flawed. Democratic political culture was conspicuous by its absence during the inter-war years in Italy, while

Spain and Portugal were under the sway of authoritarian regimes till the 1970s. In Britain too democracy was strengthened through three successive acts to enfranchise the population. While the US claims to be the world's oldest democracy, it truly emerged as a democracy as late as 1964 after it granted equal rights to the blacks. In fact, the eight years that have followed 9/11 have witnessed a considerable recession of democratic laws and civil liberties in the US.

The idea of democracy as a Western preserve needs to be made historically contingent. In India for instance democracy cannot be regarded as a British legacy that was bequeathed to the Indians. If that were the case, what explains the political trajectory of other former British colonies like Malaysia, Kenya, Nigeria and Pakistan. The answer lies in the difference in the organization, structure and ideology of the national movements of India and Pakistan. Although nationalist leaders of India drew upon Western ideas but they rooted them in the soil and inculcated them amongst the ranks and file of the movement.

The Future Course

At present, the judiciary, which in 1958 had been complicit in bestowing legitimacy to military rule under the Doctrine of Necessity, is on the right track following the ousting of Chief Justice Iftikhar Mohammad Choudhary. These developments, in turn,

have also provided a boost to civil society in Pakistan that is still in its nascent stages, but want to see democracy take strong roots in Pakistan.

The establishment of sound democratic governance in Pakistan faces three key challenges. Firstly, intense political squabbling amongst the political elite has paralyzed the country as personal interests triumphing and dictating the agenda while the economy continues to be in shambles. Secondly, Pakistan desperately needs leadership to add a sense of purpose and civility in its top echelons of governance. One hopeful sign has been the reluctance of the army brass to intervene in the current political crisis facing the country. Thirdly, much depends upon the decisions taken by the Pakistani elite as also the attitude of the new US administration towards them.

Question 4

What is Propaganda? Explain Anticommunism as 5th Filter of the Propaganda Model

Answer

Propaganda

the term propaganda, writing it as: “the expression of opinions or actions carried out deliberately by individuals or groups with a view to influencing the

opinions or actions of other individuals or groups for predetermined ends and through psychological manipulations. is communication that is used primarily to influence an audience and further an agenda, which may not be objective and may be presenting facts selectively to encourage a particular synthesis or perception, or using loaded language to produce an emotional rather than a rational response to the information that is presented. Propaganda is often associated with material prepared by governments, but activist groups, companies, religious organizations, the media, and individuals can also produce propaganda

So I think when we talked about the "fifth filter" we should have brought in all this stuff -- the way artificial fears are created with a dual purpose... partly to get rid of people you don't like but partly to frighten the rest. Because if people are frightened, they will accept authority. The fifth and final news filter that Herman and Chomsky identified was 'anti-communism'. *Manufacturing Consent* was written during the Cold War. Chomsky updated the model as "fear", often as 'the enemy' or an 'evil dictator' such as Colonel Gaddafi, Paul Biya, Saddam Hussein, Slobodan Milosevic, or Vladimir Putin. This is exemplified in British tabloid headlines of 'Smash Saddam!' and 'Clobber Slobba!'. The same is said to extend to mainstream reporting

of environmentalists as 'eco-terrorists'. *The Sunday Times* ran a series of articles in 1999 accusing activists from the non-violent direct action group Reclaim The Streets of stocking up on CS gas and stun guns. Anti-ideologies exploit public fear and hatred of groups that pose a potential threat, either real, exaggerated or imagined. Communism once posed the primary threat according to the model. Communism and socialism were portrayed by their detractors as endangering freedoms of speech, movement, the press and so forth. They argue that such a portrayal was often used as a means to silence voices critical of elite interests. Chomsky argues that since the end of the Cold War (1991), anticommunism was replaced by the "War on Terror", as the major social control mechanism: "Anti-communism has receded as an ideological factor in the Western media, but it is not dead... The 'war on terror' has provided a useful substitute for the Soviet Menace Following the events of September 11, 2001, some scholars agree that Islamophobia is replacing anti-communism as a new source of public fear

Question 5

What is a Political Communication? Explain role of Media in a Political System.

Political Communication

Political communication concerns the creation and exchange of ideas and opinions between citizens, public officials, political institutions, and related entities, such as the media. It includes discourse throughout the political process in local, state, national, and international political systems, as well as how political information can be leveraged for political gain or to achieve political goals. Individuals with an education in political communication might work in political consulting, foreign service, market research, public relations, journalism and digital media, community organization, lobbying, political campaigning, or other related fields

Role of Media in a Political System.

Media in the United States comprises several different types of widespread communication: television, radio, cinema, newspapers, magazines, and Internet-based websites (especially blogs). Many of these networks are controlled by large, for-profit corporations that reap revenue from advertising, subscriptions, and the sale of copyrighted material. American media conglomerates tend to be leading global players, generating substantial revenue, not to mention fierce opposition in many parts of the world. Further deregulation and convergence are under way, suggesting more mega-mergers, greater concentration of media ownership, and the emergence of

multinational media conglomerates. Critics allege that localism (local news and other content at the community level), media spending and coverage of news, and diversity of ownership and represented views have suffered as a result of such processes.

Theories on the success of such companies note a reliance on certain policies of the American federal government as well as a natural tendency to produce monopolies in the industry. Many prominent news organizations such as CBS, ABC, and Fox News are often criticized for creating political and corporate monopolies to boost popularity.

The organization Reporters Without Borders compiles and publishes an annual ranking of countries based on its assessment of their press freedom records. A smaller score on the index corresponds to greater freedom of press. Reporters Without Borders is careful to note that the index only addresses press freedom and does not measure the quality of journalism. In 2011-12 the United States was ranked 47th out of 179 countries, which was a setback from the preceding ye

