

## **POLITICALIZING AS PROPAGANDA: ANALYSIS AND APPLICATION IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY POLITICS**

**DAVID NANDI ETIKA<sup>\*</sup>, FRANCIS AKOBO AGBOR<sup>\*</sup>, OPUSUNJU VICTOR ROBERT<sup>\*</sup>**

### **ABSTRACT**

Without being polemic, propaganda is seemingly controversial in nature and scope. Many people view it to be deceptive, while some held a positive view on the concept. Whatever the case may be, propaganda is employed at different levels of the society. Ranging from political, social, cultural and religious parlance. The study examines politicalizing as propaganda: analysis and application in the 21<sup>st</sup> century politics. Significant literature were reviewed, the theory of political propaganda was used for the article to give it a theoretical perspective. Qualitative method was adopted and sources of data used for the study was journals, books and personal observation. The study concluded that Political aspirants in Nigeria and around the world are known for using propaganda during electioneering campaigns to seek for mandates in their sundry positions. Propaganda is quite persuasive and superlative. Inherently, propaganda should be considerably seen as a positive tool that effectuates social or societal change rather than what is being used for.

**KEYWORDS:** Propaganda, Analysis And Application, Century, Politics And Political Campaign.

### **INTRODUCTION**

Propaganda seems to be translucent in its motive, though its applicability has made it to become contradicting, as people perceived it to be a manipulative tool. It is employed in different segments of life for personal aggrandisement or interest. Organisations, corporate bodies, communities, guilds and well-meaning individuals consciously or unconsciously used propaganda at different fora, symposiums or workshops, including

religious gathering and even during Parliament or plenary. The three categories of Propaganda appears to pinpoints the true motive of Propaganda. Though the originator of this concept aimed to achieve certain motives that were beneficial to the church when their fallen brethren's fallout from the Roman Catholic Congregation to propagate faith, established by Papa bull in 1662 to suppress the protestant reformation.

---

<sup>\*</sup>Department of Mass Communication, Cross River University of Technology Calabar.

**Correspondence E-mail Id:** editor@eurekajournals.com

Sproule (1994, p. 11) Asserted that the expression propaganda has a checkered history. Although propaganda lacks a negative connotation in Romance languages, the English language treats the term as a sinister sister to legitimate persuasion.

This linguistic anomaly is attributable to the early connection of the term propaganda with the Roman Catholic Church. The word originates from the Congregation de propaganda fide (Society for the Propagation of the Faith), an organization having charge of the missionary work of the Roman Church. Given the antipathy toward Catholicism in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England and among the English residents of the American colonies, it is not surprising that the term became, in the English-speaking world, a synonym for suspicious and disreputable persuasion, or worse.

The Oxford English Dictionary logs many nineteenth-century instances wherein propaganda was used, for instance, as "a term of reproach to secret associations for the spread of opinions"; however, it was not until World War I that political commentators found a context for using propaganda as a pointed theoretical concept to understand modern society. During the war, Americans discovered the covert persuasive efforts of the Central Powers (Germany and Austria) and, after the war, those of the Allies (Britain and France) also came to light. These exposures of hidden persuasion shaped the context in which propaganda entered general parlance.

During the 1920s, a variety of further conditions transformed propaganda into an especially apt concept for understanding the march of modern society. Propaganda, with its focus on the strategic cultivation of persuasion by organizations, seemed a term particularly suited to explain social influence, given the rise of radio, the solidification of powerful

governmental and commercial institutions, the increasing activities of organized interest groups, and the spread of transnational political ideologies, such as fascism and communism. Further, propaganda was a useful concept in an era that saw the decline of the great orator, the persuasive power of great speeches, and the direct-influence effect of pamphleteering, three vehicles characteristic of social suasion in the early nineteenth century. Propaganda fit the new phenomenon of mass persuasion whereby large groups and institutions seemed newly able to surround the public with symbols conveying synthetic, made-up meaning.

All propaganda, according to Ellul (1973), relies to some degree on one of two basic psychological devices: (1) the conditioned reflex (or the automatic, knee-jerk response), and (2) the democratic myth "Let's put it to a vote!" Stereotypes such as that of the prissy English schoolboy, the emotional Italian, the authority-driven German, or the inscrutable Japanese might also be used to evoke conditioned responses. By a "myth," Ellul meant "an all-encompassing image: a sort of vision of desirable objectives . . . [which] pushes a man to action precisely because it includes all he feels is good, just, and true" (p. 30). Examples might be the myths of race, progress, wealth, and productivity.

According to Ellul, both the conditioned reflex and the myth are part of a pre-propaganda phase in which people are prepared for action by being conditioned to accept the values of a culture. When the time comes for action, the leader or the "establishment" can prompt a reflex response by appealing to people's mythic beliefs. For example, our American culture treasures the myth of democracy, according to which the wisdom of the people, when operating in a democratic fashion, leads to the best decisions and will prevail. The assumption is that democracy, coupled with a free marketplace, will reverse the economic and

political slavery experienced by other countries. Events seem to demonstrate that the answer isn't nearly that simplistic, yet our trust in the myth of democracy continues to lead us to recommend democracy as the "best" political system for other countries.

## OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study centred on the analysis and application of propaganda in the 21st century politics with emphasis on the use of propaganda manipulation in persuading electorates during elections is assessed.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### ORIGIN OF PROPAGANDA

The concept of propaganda is as old as man, propaganda is considerably useful at every spheres of humans endeavour. Traced back 1662 when propaganda was first used by apostolates to woo their fallen brethren who fallouts to other denominations to come back to them. Marshall (1944, p.19) in Ineji and Bibiana (2017, p.154) reports that:

*Difference on religious and political matters gave rise to propaganda and counter propaganda. The strong-minded Athenians though lacking such tools as the newspaper, the radio, and the movies would use other powerful engines of propaganda to mould attitudes and opinions. The Greeks had games, the theatre, the assembly, the law court and the religion festivals, and this gave opportunity to propagandizing ideas and beliefs.*

Propaganda from the outset was designed to mobilize groups and social interests to achieve certain goals. Propaganda was used by society to foster common knowledge and common interest. Marshall (1944) in Ineji and Bibiana (2017, p.155) informed that as early as the sixteenth century, nations used methods that were somewhat like those of modern

propaganda. It is believe that in the days of the Spanish Armand's (1588) both Philip II of Spanish and Queen Elizabeth of England organized propaganda in a quite modern way. Marshall further explains that in its origin, propaganda is an ancient and honorable word and religious activities which were associated with Propaganda commended the respectful attention of mankind until the later times that the world came to have a selfish, dishonest and subversive association and connotation.

From the forgoing, it is a truism that propaganda is as old as man, antecedent has it that, propaganda was employed to achieve certain personal motives and attitudes reformation in the society. Political elites, writers, groups, and corporate Organisations utilized propaganda directly or indirectly for social and societal reorientation and personal benefits.

Political aspirants in contemporary era are associated with Propaganda. They employ the concept during political campaigns before elections. These aspirants tells electorates all sorts of words to lure and hoodwink them to vote for them. And after being votes for the office, they tend to neglects the people. This trend has made the public to tag them as Propagandists. They seems to disbelieve them. Tenure after tenure, dispensation after dispensation, they come in their numbers, in various constituencies and make unrealistic promises to the people and seek for mandates and after achieving their ill-motives, they turned back at the people. These promises are realizable though, but out of selfish aggrandisement, they bluntly disserted and distances themselves from the people who gave them their votes. More recently, activists and social commentators have reiterated the need for people to shun money politics as 2019 elections draw nearer because it is doing the masses no good.

## THE CONCEPT OF PROPAGANDA

The concept of Propaganda is perceived from disparity angles based on Scholars point of view, professionals in different areas such as Mass Communication, Sociology, Psychology and other related disciplines have had their take on propaganda. Jowett and O'Donnell (2012, p.1) in Ineje and Bibiana (2017, p.154) stated that "propaganda has been studied as history, journalism, political science, sociology and psychology, as well as interdisciplinary perspective".

In the context of the forgoing, a historian would examine the practices of Propagandists as events and the journalist profession would consider propaganda in terms of how news managements or "spin" shapes information, emphasizing positive ones, casting institutions in favourable light, a political scientist would analyze the ideologies of the practitioners and dissemination and impact of public opinions. To approach propaganda as sociology is to look at social movements and the counter-propaganda that emerges in position: while to investigate Propaganda as psychology is to determine its effects on individuals. In the same vein, viewing Propaganda in the light of interdisciplinary perspective, Burnet (1989) reported that propaganda can be seen as a purveyor of ideology which implies a study of how dominant meanings are construed within the mass media. Viewing Propaganda as nebulous and imprecise, Kamalipour (2007, p.23) avers that:

The term propaganda is not simple to define, nor is it always easy to identify. Activities traditionally referred to as propaganda today, may further be labeled as public reactions efforts, image consulting, the news, and information sharing by organization spin doctors. Even advertising may considered propagandistic in nature. Simply put the purpose of propaganda is to persuade and

convert by using intentionally selective and biased information.

Walton (1997,p392) Intimated that Similarly, the goal of propaganda is basically to get compliance for action, or action itself, and surely the success or failure of the propaganda ought to be judged by this criterion. Persuasion by logical reasoning designed to rationally convince the audience is not necessarily involved although it could be used in some cases-even though persuasion of a sort is involved as part of the *modus operandi*. In section nine, the idea of a dialectical shift is introduced, where a sequence of argumentation starts out as being part of one type of dialogue, and then changes to being part of a different type of dialogue. The argument used for one purpose, initially, may have to be judged by a different standard when a dialectical shift has taken place. Propaganda then is a mixed type of dialogue that does not fit any of - the six normative models of dialogue exactly, but seems to be a distinctively different type of discourse altogether, even though it can, directly involve some elements of at least five of the six types of dialogue. Propaganda is best seen as a type of goal-directed discourse in its own right that has ten essential, identifying characteristics. As such, it can function in its own right as a normative structure in which arguments can be evaluated as used correctly or incorrectly (provided the other normative models of dialogue are also used) in a given case.

Like deliberation dialogue, it is directed towards recommending a course of action, like persuasion dialogue, it works by using the commitments of the audience to gain their acceptance for a standpoint, and like eristic dialogue, it is aggressively partisan and emotional.

From the forgoing, propaganda is perceived as a concept used to foster dialogue by way of

employing persuasive messages. This tool is used at every level of human life, including government and individuals as well as corporate bodies. It is seen as a type of goal directed instrument. For example, advertisers employed it to allure customers to purchase their products. There are certain elements that propagandists used to encapsulate their target audience such as, superlative words and persuasion.

Sproule (1994, p.12) Stated that Propaganda is an attempt to persuade people without seeming to do so. Whereas the direct persuasion of a speech alerts our critical faculties that someone is trying to win us over, propaganda's covertness hides the manipulative element in mass communication. Ivy Lee, a founder of the field of public relations, recognized the connection of covertness and propagandistic communication when he argued that "the essential evil.

Walton (1997, p.394) the ultimate goal of propaganda is to get the respondents to fake a particular course of action. Many definitions of 'propaganda' postulate that the goal of propaganda is to change the respondents' beliefs, or to persuade the respondents to accept some proposition as true (or false). But these goals, although they are typically part of propaganda, are secondary to the ultimate goal, which is always (as a matter of practical politics) to get the respondents to do (or abstain from doing) something. These secondary goals are always means to the ultimate end of propaganda, which is action, or compliance with action.

In persuasion dialogue, the proponent's goal is to use the commitments of the respondent as premises in order to persuade the respondent to also become committed to some particular proposition he previously had doubts about accepting. According to the description given in Jowett and O'Donnell (1986, p. 24), persuasion,

when it is successful, elicits a reaction of the form, "I never saw it that way before. This process of persuading a respondent to accept some particular proposition as true is tied in with how propaganda is used. And therefore, many conclude that propaganda can be defined essentially as a type of persuasion dialogue.

In consonance with the above submission, it is quite voracious that propaganda have been very pivotal to man, and it has been utilized at every spheres of life. Organizations, individuals, clusters, civil societies and communities have employed the concept of Propaganda. The originator of propaganda does not solely meant to misuse the word. It was targeted towards unison of perceived fallen brethren. But in recent time, the concept of Propaganda is misused and misconstrued by political elites, clergy men and women, politicians, groups and individuals. Its usage have made it to be seen as something awkward.

## **TYPES OF PROPAGANDA**

### **WHITE PROPAGANDA**

White propaganda, which is overt, where sponsorship is acknowledged directly and which is considered to be truthful. White backfire, in which perpetrators take action that can potentially backfire on them, without attempting to attribute it to anyone else (though the perpetrator may attempt to hide the attack or deny responsibility). Examples include Abu Ghraib, the beating of Rodney King, the beating of protesters during the 1930 salt march campaign in India, and the 1991 Dili massacre (Martin, 2007).

### **BLACK PROPAGANDA**

Sproule (1994,p.13) opined that black propaganda, more often known now as "disinformation," is the product not only of a considerable effort to conceal the source of the information but also employs a significant

number of distortions or outright falsehoods. For instance, the CIA manufactured a variety of bogus leaflets that were presented as having been written by Vietnamese communists during the time when Americans fought in that country. A visiting American newspaper columnist, Joseph Alsop, once picked up such a leaflet which stated that many South Vietnamese were to be sent to China to work on the railways there. Believing that the CIA's leaflet had been written by the communists, Alsop used it as a reference point in his newspaper columns. Black propaganda, which refers to untruthful activities, where the origin of the activities is falsified or the activities are covert.

Gray, T. and Martin, B. (2007,p.9) Black backfire, in which a perpetrator takes an action designed to generate outrage against the target, by making the target appear to be the perpetrator of an attack. Examples include agent provocateurs, black radio stations (Soley and Nichols, 1987), and the US Phoenix Program during the Vietnam war (Valentine, 1990). Black Backfire in late August 1939, as Hitler was poised to invade Poland, he deployed a plan to hoodwink people to go for war .In late August 1939, as Hitler was poised to invade Poland, he deployed a plan to hoodwink the world. A select group of German soldiers, who were able to speak Polish, were dressed in Polish uniforms and executed an attack on a German radio station. The aim was to convince the German people and other governments that Polish troops had attacked Germany, thereby giving a pretext for the German offensive. In other words, the idea was to give the appearance of a Polish attack that would be seen as unfair and backfire against the Polish government (Burleigh, 2000: 407-408; Evans, 2005: 699-700).

### **GREY PROPAGANDA**

Grey propaganda, situated between white and black propaganda, where there is no clear

indication of origin or the origin is attributed to an ally, and where the truth of the information is uncertain. Grey backfire, in which an incident of unrelated or uncertain origin is treated as an attack by the target, which backfires against the target. The uncertainty surrounding the incident may be genuine or manufactured. Examples include the 1933 Reichstag fire (Tobias, 1964) and the 1964 Tonkin Gulf incident (Moise, 1996).

### **THE POLEMICAL APPROACH TO PROPAGANDA**

Sproule (1994,p.46) opined that The polemical approach to propaganda, a fifth major school of thought on modern social influence, originated after World War I, and it became powerful in the late 1940s and 1950s. Polemical propaganda critics scrutinize public communication for the purpose of keeping important social forums free from influence and control by their ideological opponents. Polemical writers on propaganda tend to fall into two camps. "Hard" polemicists are active politicians who use criticism as a weapon to discredit opposing partisans, thus to change the political world. "Soft" polemicists are intellectuals whose more carefully reasoned essays and books are nevertheless closely affiliated with political movements. As contrasted to progressive propaganda critics, "soft" polemicists are less likely to advocate education and professional self-restraint as solutions to propaganda; they more often favor direct political action.

### **HARD POLITICAL POLEMICS**

Sproule (1994, p.47) opined that the polemical school of thought first became significant during World War I with the effort of the government to suppress anti-war communications. The CPI developed a campaign to combat rumors illustrated by its popular advertisement, "Spies and Lies." This advertisement had the Creel Committee

requesting that citizens avoid serving as a "tool of the Hun" by circulating "the malicious, disheartening rumors which he so eagerly sows." What to do? "Report the man who spreads pessimistic stories, divulges or seeks confidential military information, cries for peace, or belittles our efforts to win the war." Postwar Senate investigations of German and Bolshevik propaganda by the Overman Committee similarly showed that American politicians were concerned by the apparent successes of ideologically-anathematized groups in spreading their messages. The Overman Committee used a one-dimensional polemical attack to tar all pre-1917 peace efforts with the brush of German propaganda because Germans had encouraged various neutralist sentiments.

### **CHARACTERISTICS OF PROPAGANDA**

Walton (1997, p.396) posited the following ten essential characteristics of propaganda as a type of discourse are set out, and there follows a discussion of some other incidental characteristics.

#### **DIALOGUE STRUCTURE**

Propaganda has the form of a dialogue (communicative discourse) between two participants. The one party, who can also be a group, or a person representing a group, is called the proponent, and is the speaker, or sender of the message. The other party, called the respondent, and who is generally a mass audience of people, is the receiver of the message. Typically, the proponent is the active participant while the respondent is a passive receiver of the message sent out by the proponent. But this asymmetrical relationship is not characteristic of all cases of propaganda. In some instances, the respondent group do engage in a bilateral dialogue exchange by responding positively or negatively to the proponent's message, or even by questioning

or criticizing it-information that the proponent can use as feedback to craft her message more persuasively. Also, propaganda has a dialogue structure in that the argumentation of the proponent is based on (what she takes to be) the commitments of the respondent, in order to alter the convictions or actions of the proponent in a particular direction or towards a particular view which is different from the one the respondent already has.

#### **MESSAGE CONTENT**

The content of the proponent's message is an argument, expressed in a verbal discourse and/or in other means of altering convictions that are not verbal in nature. The message can be purely verbal, as in a speech, but it can also be pictorial. Or it could be a mixture of these, as in the case of a news reporter commenting on videotaped clips. Propaganda frequently involves props like drums and flags, and it may also use music or drama, or be conveyed in a dramatic format like a film or a novel. In some cases, propaganda can be conveyed by coins, statues, or even by costumes and settings that convey the values of a particular life style or social class.

#### **GOAL-DIRECTED STRUCTURE**

Propaganda is essentially goal-directed as a type of dialogue exchange. The proponent's goal is to get the respondent to carry out a particular action or to support a particular policy for action. This purposive aspect of propaganda is so marked that it is frequently described as "manipulative" in nature. As well as there being a goal for the proponent, against which the success or failure of the proponent's argumentation can be evaluated, there is also a general goal for propaganda as an institutionally recognizable type of dialogue. The general purpose is to support the existence, aims and interests of a particular regime, organization, viewpoint or interest group.

Frequently, the purpose of propaganda is to support the interests of a country, or of a political party, government or regime that directs the affairs of the country. But other groups or individuals, like religious groups, political action groups, advertisers, and so forth, can also engage in propaganda.

### **INVOLVEMENT OF SOCIAL GROUPS**

Propaganda is not just any argumentation meant to persuade or to get action. The respondent is a mass audience (Jowett and O'Donnell, 1986, p. 21). And while the message may be delivered by an individual speaker, she always represents some broader agency or organized group who have interests or views that bind them together.

### **INDIFFERENCE TO LOGICAL REASONING**

The goal of propaganda is to move a mass audience in a certain direction, and its success or failure as argumentation used in a context of discourse should be judged in relation to how well (or badly) it performs in fulfilling this purpose. If methods of logical reasoning are useful for this purpose, then they should be used in propaganda, otherwise not. Thus propaganda is not, as a structure of discourse, either for or against using logical reasoning and relevant evidence. If appeals to emotion, of a kind that would be judged dubious or even fallacious by logical standards of good reasoning, work better than rational evidence to achieve the goal of argumentation used in propaganda, then such appeals are appropriate and should (normatively speaking) be used by good propaganda.

### **ONE-SIDED ARGUMENTATION**

Propaganda is a kind of advocacy dialogue that uses partisan argumentation to advocate one side of an issue, and to present the arguments in favor of that side as strongly as possible. Propaganda is not an attempt to rationally

deliberate on the wisdom or prudence of a course of action by looking at all the alternatives and weighing them judiciously or fairly. Neither is it an attempt to critically discuss an issue by openly considering all the arguments on both sides. Instead, it is inherently one sided as a type of discourse in which argumentation is used.

### **INVOLVEMENT OF PERSUASION DIALOGUE**

The primary goal of propaganda is to get an audience to support the aims, interests and policies of a particular group, by securing the compliance of the audience with the actions being contemplated, undertaken, or advocated by the group. The goal of the propagandist then is not just to persuade or "re-educate" the audience to change their beliefs, but also to gain their commitment to the extent that they will act on the basis of the new viewpoint they have come to accept, or to take part in or support actions in line with or justified by this viewpoint. So persuasion is involved, but more than just a change of the beliefs of the audience is the speaker's goal in propaganda. The proponent's fundamental goal in propaganda is to move the masses to action (to go to war, to buy a product, etc.) or to comply with action, or to accept, and not oppose a certain line of action. But persuasion is involved in a secondary but essential way, because the means used to get action, or support for action, is that of persuading the audience to become committed to a particular point of view they did not accept (or did not fully embrace) before.

### **JUSTIFIED BY RESULTS**

Because the central purpose of propaganda is to get action, propaganda as a socially organized activity is justified by the results it is supposed to achieve (both normatively and, in fact, by its defenders, in particular instances). In fact, propaganda is justified by the supposed value of bringing about a particular outcome



said to be necessary for a good end, like public safety, or the saving of human lives in war. Propaganda is generally justified by citing a danger to the group, and then stressing that the adoption of a particular point of view is needed to combat or guard against that danger. Such a justification balances the costs of engaging in one-sided or even deceptive argumentation against the danger or loss of life that might result from an open-minded rational discussion that might turn up good arguments for the other side. The justification of propaganda is, in this respect, similar to the justification of lying in ethics, illustrated by case 6 below. Not only is propaganda justified, as a matter of fact, in terms of its consequences, by those who try to justify or excuse its use, but also, from a normative point of view, propaganda ought to be justified by such a use of argumentation from consequences, for its goal is to lead to actions. The reader needs to be warned here, however. This form of justification is not the extreme form of consequentialism it may appear to be, as will be shown in section nine, when the idea of a dialectical shift is introduced.

### **EMOTIVE LANGUAGE AND PERSUASIVE DEFINITIONS**

An essential part of all propaganda is the use of emotively charged words and phrases that make the advocated viewpoint take on a highly positive coloration, and any opposed viewpoint take on a highly negative coloration. For example, supporters of the advocated view may be called "freedom fighters" which supporters of the opposed viewpoint are designated as "terrorists." A whole new vocabulary may be invented, and all kinds of pejorative words and phrases may be used to denote the opposed viewpoint. Another characteristic of propaganda is the use of persuasive definitions, as defined by the theory of evaluative meaning of Stevenson (1944).

According to Stevenson's theory, the purpose of a persuasive definition is to engender a favorable or unfavorable attitude towards something by changing the descriptive meaning of the word for that thing while leaving the evaluative meaning the same. Hurley (1994, p. 92) offers some illustrative examples:

Case 1: "Abortion" means the ruthless murdering of innocent human beings. "Abortion" means a safe and established surgical procedure whereby a woman is relieved of an unwanted burden.

Case 2: "Liberal" means a drippy-eyed do-gooder obsessed with giving away other people's money. "Liberal" means a genuine humanitarian committed to the goals of adequate housing and health care and of equal opportunity for all of our citizens. Persuasive definitions tend to be deceptive as used in argumentation (and objects of suspicion, from a logical point of view) because, as Hurley (p.92) points out, they conceal the approving or condemning of something by masquerading as an honest assignment of meaning to a word.

### **ERISTIC ASPECT**

Propaganda has a structure of argumentation like that of the quarrel, or eristic type of dialogue. It postulates a dichotomy for the audience: "We are the good guys. If you are not for us, you must be against us. All those opposed to our view are the bad guys." Often the words 'fight' or 'struggle' are used in propaganda. The implication is that any means required to fight against the "evil" or danger posed by the "enemy" is justified. Propaganda is most visible and has been most studied as used in war. In time of war, the participants become caught up in an emotional attitude of hate and bitterness that is not conducive to what Thouless (1942) calls "calm thinking" of the kind that dispassionately weighs up the evidence on both sides of an issue. However, it

is not just in time of war that propaganda is used. Even when used outside war, propaganda often paints the picture of an emergency or danger\_ of a kind that provokes fear and panic. The circumstances are portrayed as like that of a war, where a "fight" is needed to combat the danger facing the group.

Propaganda is a systematic, calculative and tactical approach of alluring, inducing, hoodwinking, and manipulating people's understanding of a particular issue in the society, by way of deception rather than persuasion. Both Political actors and political elites utilized this concept of propaganda during electioneering campaigns to actualize their personal gains or ambitions. The distinction between propaganda and other advocacy or campaigns is the tactical and readiness of propagandist to atone people's belief or perception via confusion or deceit.

## **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

### **THE THEORY OF POLITICAL PROPAGANDA**

American Political Science Association (1927, p.628) asserted that this theory postulated that Propaganda is the management of collective attitudes by the manipulation of significant symbols. The word attitude is taken to mean a tendency to act according to certain patterns of valuation. The existence of an attitude is not a direct datum of experience, but an inference from signs which have a conventionalized significance. We say that the voters of a certain ward resent a negro candidate, and in so doing we have compactly summarized the tendency of a particular group to act toward a particular object in a specific context. The valuation patterns upon which this inference is founded may be primitive gestures of the face and body, or more sophisticated gestures of the pen and voice. Taken together, these objects which have a standard meaning in a group are called significant symbols. The elevated eyebrow, the

clenched fist, the sharp voice, the pungent phrase, have their references established within the web of a particular culture. Such significant symbols are paraphernalia employed in expressing the attitudes, and they are also capable of being employed to reaffirm or redefine attitudes. Thus, significant symbols have both an expressive and a propagandist function in public life.

The idea of a "collective attitude" is not that of a super-organic, extra natural entity. Collective phenomena have too often been treated as if they were on a plane apart from individual action. Confusion has arisen principally because students have been slow to invent a word able to bear the connotation of uniformity without also implying a biological or metaphysical unity. The anthropologists have introduced the notion of a pattern to designate the standard uniformities of conduct at a given time and place, and this is the sense of the word here intended.

Thus the collective attitude, as a pattern, is a distribution of individual acts and not an indwelling spirit which has achieved transitory realization in the rough, coarse facts of the world of sense. Collective attitudes are amenable to many modes of alteration. They may be shattered before an onslaught of violent intimidation or disintegrated by economic coercion. They may be reaffirmed in the muscular regimentation of drill. But their arrangement and rearrangement occurs principally under the impetus of significant symbols; and the technique of using significant symbols for this purpose is propaganda.

The theory of political propaganda is very important and supportive to this study, this theory stressed the need for propaganda to be used to influence attitude in a positive light. The theory postulated that Propaganda is the management of collective attitudes by the manipulation of significant symbols.

## CONCLUSION

The tendency for propaganda to work through ostensibly neutral public forums means that much propaganda is an attempt to diffuse an ideology rather than to articulate a specific socio-political position. Put another way, propaganda does not always explicitly advance an aim; often its aim is to sell a general system of ideas (an ideology) or a visual background (an image) that implicitly supports an action or policy. Sproule (1994).

Propaganda is very sacrosanct to every discipline. Since it was first used in 1662, its relevance is found across every facets of life, incorporating political, religious and social milieu. However, it may not have served its purpose because of the awkward usage of the concept. Although many people have employed it knowingly or unknowingly at some point. Political aspirants in Nigeria and around the world are known for using propaganda during electioneering campaigns to seek for mandates in their sundry positions. Propaganda is quite persuasive and superlative. Inherently, propaganda should be considerably seen as a positive tool that effectuates social or societal change rather than what is being used for.

From the analysis of this study, it is quite glaring that propaganda is employed more on a negative parlance than positive, across every levels of life. More importantly, political actors should desist from using propaganda in a bad light but should rather utilized it to project development and effectuate social change as the case may be.

## POLICY IMPLICATION

Propaganda has been misconstrued in general context, the concept of propaganda has been

misuse and people held gruesome perception contrary to what it is. Propaganda can be intentionally utilized to effects changes in the society. This change is sometimes geared towards personal interest or selfish gains. These class of people that use propaganda should be circumspect in using this concept because its true meaning has been misunderstood by the public and people seems to view it in a negative light than positive. Whereas, its outcome sometimes may be fantastic and terrific.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. American Political Science Association (1927). *The theory of political propaganda: The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 21, No. 3 (Aug., 1927), pp. 627-631.
- [2]. Ellul, J. (1973). *Propaganda: The formation of men's attitudes*. New York: Vintage Books
- [3]. Gray, T. & Martin, B. (2007). *Backfires, white black and grey: School of Social Sciences, Media and Communication University of Wollongong, Australia*.
- [4]. Inej, P. and Bibiana, I. (2017). *Sermonizing as propaganda: Analysis and application of A.J. Mackenzie's seven secrets of Propaganda*, CRUTECH Journal of communication Vol.1 No.1
- [5]. Sproule, M. (1994) *Channels of propaganda*: EDINFO Press and ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading, English, and Communication Carl B. Smith, Director Indiana University P.O. Box 5953N Bloomington, IN 47407.
- [6]. Walton, D. (1997). *What is propaganda, and what is exactly wrong with it?* University of Winnipeg. Vol.11.No.4.