

# Role of Media and Usage of Films and Documentaries as Political Tool

*DR. VIKRAMJIT SINGH, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR  
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE,  
DAYANAND COLLEGE, HISAR, HARYANA, INDIA*

## Abstract

Now days the usage of print as well as digital media is widely used for the propaganda to have the political advantage by the political parties. A number of movies and documentaries are intentionally released so that the political benefits can be taken. In this manuscript, the case scenarios of such movies and the film based propaganda are addressed so that the overall motive and the goals of the political parties can be identified. In this research paper, the case studies and the scenarios of assorted films and documentaries are cited so that the clear theme can be addressed with the higher degree of references and the proof of the mentioned work. In current scenarios, the political parties whether these are opposition or the ruling they are getting the huge benefits with the exploitations of emotions of the general public with the integration of films to defame or fame the particular person or parties. By this way, the overall scenario and integrity of movies and bollywood is getting affected with the favor of particular political benefits.

Keywords: Propaganda Movie, Role of Media in Politics, Cinema as Political Tool

## Introduction

The filmmakers are now days more focused on polishing the image of particular person or defaming the image of particular parties and these are visible from the assorted movies specifically in the time of elections but it is not the good practices to exploit the image of particular parties.

A publicity film is a film that includes some type of promulgation. Publicity movies might be bundled from multiple points of view, yet are regularly narrative style creations or anecdotal screenplays, that are delivered to persuade the watcher of a

particular political point or impact the suppositions or conduct of the watcher, frequently by giving abstract substance that might be intentionally deceptive.

Udta Punjab (Punjab on a high) is a 2016 Indian dark satire wrongdoing movie co-composed and coordinated by Abhishek Chaubey. It is approximately founded on and rotates around the medication maltreatment by the adolescent populace in the Indian province of Punjab and the different schemes encompassing it. Delivered by Shobha Kapoor and Ekta Kapoor under their standard Balaji Motion Pictures, in relationship with Anurag Kashyap's generation house Phantom Films, it includes a gathering cast comprising of Shahid Kapoor, Alia Bhatt, Kareena Kapoor and, Diljit Dosanjh.

On 4 June 2016, the Central Board of Film Certification looked for a stay on the film's discharge referring to that the subjects managed in the film were unreasonably disgusting for the general group of onlookers. Accordingly, the makers were coordinated to make an aggregate of 89 cuts in the film. In any case, on 13 June 2016, the Bombay High Court struck down the remain and gave authorization for the film's national discharge, yet with a solitary cut in the screenplay. The film was discharged worldwide on 17 June 2016. Made on a financial plan of dollars 470 million (US\$6.5 million), Udta Punjab was a normal grosser locally and earned around 960 million (US\$13 million) worldwide. It was basically acclaimed, and at the 62nd Filmfare Awards, the film won four honors, including Best Actress (Alia Bhatt) and Critics Award for Best Actor (Shahid Kapoor).

### List of Movies and Films Released intentionally for Political Benefits

Aaytha Ezhuthu	Sarkar Raj	Kaya Taran
Hebbet Ramakka	Janta V/S Janardan - Bechara Aam Aadmi	Raajneeti
Kissa Kursi Ka	MLA Fatakeshto	Pavitra (film)
Aashayam	Sri Ramulayya	Egaro
Gour Hari Dastaan	LKG (film)	Ore Raththam
Saguni	Lal Salam (1990 film)	Aaj Ka M.L.A. Ram Avtar
Irandu Mugam	Aasphota	Gulaal (film)
Netaji Subhas	Pakarnnattam	Tulkalam

Chandra Bose: The Forgotten Hero		
20va Sathabdam	Kavan (film)	Kodi (film)
Ek Bura Aadmi	New Delhi Times (film)	Oru Mexican Aparatha
Sarkar 3	Satyagraha (film)	Unaru
Jaane Kyun De Yaaron	My Name Is Khan	Sarkar (2005 film)
Arasiyal	Campus Diary	Avasthe
Pudhupettai	Desiya Geetham	Yaman (film)
Adimakal Udamakal	Marana Mrudanga	Vicharana
Minister Fatakeshto	Iruvar	Ji (film)
Miral	Nayak (2001 Hindi film)	Veendum Kannur
Viva Zapatero!	Amaidhi Padai	Shorgul
Dirty Politics (film)	Dusari Goshta	Awam (film)
Hazaaron Khwaishein Aisi	Nagaraja Cholan MA, MLA	Orange Valley
Palaivana Rojakkal	Padhavi Paduthum Paadu	Shanghai (2012 film)
Thackeray (film)	Vangaveeti (film)	Ko (film)
The Accidental Prime Minister (film)	Leader (1964 film)	Shool
En Uyir Thozhan	The Great Leader Kanshiram	Shantham
Adhineta	Mudhalvan	Agni vs Devi
Antha (film)	Enaini Panjari	Satta (film)
Priyappetta Nattukare	Aarakshan	Jai Bolo Telangana
Kanneshwara Rama	Moolniwasi Shudra To Khalsa	Left Right Left (film)
Yuva	Rakthasakshikal Sindabad	Haque (film)
Humble Politician	Khakee	Sakhavinte

Nograj		Priyasakhi
Love Aur Rajneeti	Sarrainodu	Madras Cafe
Sivaji (film)	Bharat Ane Nenu	Indu Sarkar
Nam Naadu (2007 film)	Sarkar (film series)	Inqilab
Makkal En Pakkam	Aandhi	Fire in the Blood (2013 film)
Newton (film)	Amu (film)	Lucifer (film)
Theevandi	Rakta Charitra	Randidangazhi (film)
Aajcha Divas Majha	Bharat Bandh	Shiva Sainya

Purposeful publicity is the capacity "to create and spread fruitful messages that, when sown, will sprout in huge human societies." However, in the twentieth century, "another" promulgation rose, which spun around political associations and their need to impart messages that would "influence applicable gatherings of individuals so as to suit their plans". First created by the Lumiere siblings in 1896, film gave an exceptional methods for getting to substantial groups of onlookers without a moment's delay. Film was the principal general mass medium in that it could all the while impact watchers as people and individuals from a group, which prompted it rapidly turning into an instrument for governments and non-state associations to extend an ideal ideological message. As Nancy Snow expressed in her book, Information War: American Propaganda, Free Speech and Opinion Control Since 9-11, promulgation "starts where basic reasoning closures."

Film as a publicity instrument in the Bollywood and Globe

Film is an exceptional medium in that it recreates pictures, development, and sound in an exact way as it wires significance with evolvement over the long haul in the story portrayed. Dissimilar to numerous other works of art, film delivers a feeling of promptness. Film's capacity to make the deception of life and reality, opening up new, obscure viewpoints on the world, is the reason films, particularly those of obscure societies or spots, are taken to be exact portrayals of life.

Some film scholastics have noticed film's incredible fanciful capacities. Dziga Vertov asserted in his 1924 declaration, "The Birth of Kino-Eye" that "the film eye is film truth." To summarize Hilmar Hoffmann, this implies in film, just what the camera 'sees' exists, and the watcher, lacking elective points of view, ordinarily takes the picture for the real world.

Movies are compelling promulgation apparatuses in light of the fact that they set up visual symbols of recorded reality and cognizance, characterize open frames of mind of the time they're delineating or that at which they were taped, activate individuals for a typical reason, or point out an obscure reason. Political and authentic movies speak to, impact, and make chronicled cognizance and can mutilate occasions making it an influential and conceivably deceitful medium.

About all debates Hindi movies fought were identified with governmental issues. Regularly the fracas was made coincidentally, on occasion deliberately. In either case, the film increased moment advance and a decent opening amazing movie producer Martin Scorsese once stated: "Film involves what's in the edge and what's out." This has turned out to be valid in a more strict sense than what he more likely than not implied, in the Indian setting. Throughout the decades, films, particularly Hindi movies, have needed to fight discussions of the thoughtful that were out of the edge just as those inside. Regularly the fracas got made accidentally, now and again purposefully. In either case, the film being referred to increased moment request and a decent opening in the cinematic world; the movie producer and those related with the film, as well, got their due snapshots of magnificence in the media.

Almost these contentions have had to do with legislative issues. Movie producers and performers (with prominent exemptions like Prakash Jha) love to state that they don't comprehend legislative issues and wish to have nothing to do with it, and that they are inventive individuals who put stock in opportunity of articulation. The new age, particularly, is delicate about the issue. But then, regardless of whether out of structure or coincidentally, they encroach upon legislative issues.

Obviously, there is likewise a developing clan of prejudiced individuals and associations that sees trick in consistently film to hurt its sensitivities. This has

unquestionably infringed upon the space that movie producers need to make the sort of movies they need, inside the parameters set somewhere near law. Be that as it may, some place inside the range — toward one side of which are makers, executives, and performing artists, who trust that rough stun and shock is comparable to opportunity of articulation, and at the opposite end are the hordes that are prepared with sticks and stones to crush screens and maul dissidents — are those movie producers who are consistent with their craft and touchy to general assessment too.

The essential inquiry which emerges is this: What is that red line which producers must not cross? On its substance, there is a basic answer. When a film is ensured by the Central Board of Film Certification (CBFC), it's fit to be viewed by whichever area of the group of onlookers the affirmation is ordered for. That is the law. Yet, can films, which have maybe the largest reach than any visual medium in the nation, be sufficiently inflexible to stick to simply this paradigm, overlooking open assumptions of the moment? Karan Johar's as of late discharged film, *Ae Dil Hai Mushkil*, makes for a decent contextual investigation.

The discharge was coordinated a long time after the assault by Pakistan-based activists at an Army camp in Uri, Jammu and Kashmir. The film highlighted a Pakistani on-screen character. The shock against Pakistan was across the country. Pakistani performing artists working in India had in the past denounced fear assaults that had occurred in different parts of the world, yet had neither done that for Uri's situation nor had they communicated the significant misery over the loss of lives which they did on account of, state the assaults in Paris or Brussels. Different interests to these on-screen characters to at any rate sentence the strike neglected to evoke any reaction.

Detecting a chance, Raj Thackeray's Maharashtra Navnirman Sena (MNS) reported that it would not enable Johar's film to discharge in Maharashtra, and positively not in Mumbai. The MNS additionally undermined to show a thing or two to movie producers who kept on working with Pakistani performing artists. Despite the methods Thackeray had chosen to utilize, his outrage was shared by a large number of individuals the nation over — even by the individuals who for the most part despised his governmental issues. Johar exacerbated the situation by making

articulations which appeared to mock the possibility of aggregate shock against the Uri assault.

In any case, understanding that his rant would sink his film on the discharge day itself on the off chance that it didn't see the light of day in Mumbai, he, alongside an appointment of movie producers, connected with the MNS supremo. The now-renowned gathering was held among Thackeray and the assignment within the sight of Maharashtra Chief Minister Devendra Fadnavis, who played the 'arbiter'. The MNS yielded after Johar consented to not work with Pakistani artistes till India-Pakistan ties standardized, issued a solid explanation guaranteeing the general population of his enthusiasm, and said the forfeit of our fighters was any day more important than the business interests of his film. To top it up, he declared a whole of Rs 5 crore to the protection welfare subsidize out of the film's profit.

What completes one make of this deal? Did Johar surrender to pressure? Or did he just act from his heart which had dependably been in the correct place yet appeared to be to some degree uprooted according to his opponents? Whatever, it was an instance of legislative issues and film getting blended. However, Johar has little motivation to whine toward the day's end; his film has done great business, however recognizing watchers returned frustrated from the theaters.

In the event that *Ae Dil Hai Mushkil* kept running into inconvenience since it had a Pakistani on-screen character at the wrong time, Parzania kicked up a discussion since it depended on the 2002 savagery in Gujarat. It didn't keep running into edit inconvenience in light of the fact that the leaders of the time, in 2007, were the Congress and its partners, and they cherished the portrayal as it suited their political advantages. The plot of the film depends on a genuine story — that of an individual whose 10-year-old child disappeared amid the collective mobs. Whatever its different benefits, the film unquestionably seemed to have the motivation of anticipating one side of a story that merited a reasonable methodology. It was appropriately restricted in Gujarat, which was administered by a BJP Government.



## References

- Dwyer, R., & Pinney, C. (2002). *Pleasure and the nation: the history, politics and consumption of public culture in India*. Oxford University Press.
- Kaviraj, S. (Ed.). (1997). *Politics in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Dickey, S. (1993). The politics of adulation: Cinema and the production of politicians in South India. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 52(2), 340-372.
- Dennison, S., & Lim, S. H. (Eds.). (2006). *Remapping world cinema: identity, culture and politics in film*. Wallflower Press.
- Woods, P. (2001). From Shaw to Shantaram: The Film Advisory Board and the making of British propaganda films in India, 1940-1943. *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 21(3), 293-308.
- Hardgrave, R. L. (1973). Politics and the Film in Tamilnadu: The Stars and the DMK. *Asian Survey*, 13(3), 288-305.
- Ahmed, A. S. (1992). Bombay films: The cinema as metaphor for Indian society and politics. *Modern Asian Studies*, 26(2), 289-320.
- Prasad, M. M. (1999). Cine-politics: on the political significance of cinema in south India. *Journal of the Moving Image*, 1(Autumn), 37-52.
- Pandian, M. S. S. (2015). *The image trap: MG Ramachandran in film and politics*. SAGE Publishing India.
- Mazzarella, W. (2009). A torn performative dispensation: the affective politics of British Second World War propaganda in India and the problem of legitimization in an age of mass publics. *South Asian History and Culture*, 1(1), 1-24.
- Velayutham, S. (2008). *Tamil cinema: the cultural politics of India's other film industry*. Routledge.
- Rajagopal, A. (2001). *Politics after television: Hindu nationalism and the reshaping of the public in India*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mankekar, P. (1999). *Screening culture, viewing politics: An ethnography of television, womanhood, and nation in postcolonial India*. Duke University Press.
- Vohra, P. (2011). Dotting the I: The politics of self-less-ness in Indian documentary practice. *South Asian Popular Culture*, 9(01), 43-53.
- Rasul, A. (2016). Filtered violence: Propaganda model and political economy of the Indian film industry. *Journal of Media Critiques [JMC]*, 1(6).
- Weigold, A. (2010). *Churchill, Roosevelt and India: Propaganda During World War II*. Routledge.