Gönderim Tarihi: 26.08.2018

Kabul Tarihi: 31.10.2018

PRAVDA: A PROPAGANDA SHEET IN DISGUISE OF NEWSPAPER?

Pravda: Gazete Kisvesi Altında Bir Propaganda Aracı mı?

Sedat BAY

Dr. Öğretim Üyesi, Sivas Cumhuriyet University, the Faculty of
Letters, Department of English language and Literature
sedatbayoglu@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9118-2775

Çalışmanın Türü: Araştırma

Abstract

Much as not accepted legally as a part of the political system, the media, Fourth Estate, is an industry that exerts an indirect still huge effect on society. The most usually perceived piece of the fourth domain is the news media or the press. Pravda, the winner of the 1985 Evening Standard Best Play Award, is a satirical play by David Hare and Howard Brenton which explores this issue and shows what the genuine role of journalism must be in society. Our study deals with the mid-1980s daily newspaper industry in Britain, specifically the ones owned by the Australian media and press baron Rupert Murdoch, and why so many English newspapers choose to behave as if they were propaganda sheets in disguise of newspapers.

Keywords: Pravda, Howard Brenton and David Hare, the Press, Propaganda

Öz

Yasal olarak siyasi sistemin bir parçası olarak kabul edilmese de, Dördüncü Güç olan Medya, dolaylı da olsa toplum üzerinde büyük bir yönlendirme gücüne sahip bir endüstridir. Medyanın en sık karşımıza çıkan şekli ise haber medyası veya basındır. 1985 Evening Standard Best Play Ödülü'nü kazanan Pravda, David Hare ve Howard Brenton'un bu konuyu araştıran ve gazeteciliğin gerçek rolünün toplumda ne olması gerektiğini gösteren hiciv dolu bir oyundur. Bu çalışmamız, 1980'lerin ortalarında İngiliz basınının ve özellikle de Avustralyalı medya ve basın baronu Rupert Murdoch'un sahip olduğu günlük gazetelerin gazete kisvesi altında neden ve nasıl propaganda aracı olarak kullanıldıklarını ele alıyor.

Anahtar kelimeler: Pravda, Howard Brenton ve David Hare, Basın, Propaganda

1. INTRODUCTION

Pravda, A Fleet Street Comedy written by Howard Brenton and David Hare is an attack on the commercial degradation of the British newspaper that is both lively and funny, and fascinatingly prophetic, which still lives for two very good reasons: it creates a seductive monster and it has a clear vision of where journalism is going.

This article explores the validity of Howard Brenton's interrogative sentence that "English newspapers aren't government propaganda sheets. The question is, why do so many of them choose to behave as if they are?" (Brenton, 1985) in *Pravda*. We will try to analyse the play to figure out

whether the press as reflected in *Pravda* is really turned out to be a means of different types of propaganda or not. To do this, we will first give some information about the playwrights who are generally regarded to be political writers. In the second part we will give some information about the etymology, origin and history of the term propaganda and its use for various purposes. In the third part, we will analyse the play *Pravda, A Fleet Street Comedy* to determine to which extent the press in Britain can be considered to be a propaganda sheet rather than a paper in a classical sense. In the last part, we will give the conclusions we have reached and will explain how we reached them.

2. PROPAGANDA

In *The Oxford Handbook of Propaganda studies* (2013) edited by Jonathan Auerbach and Russ Castronovo, it is asserted that “The scope of propaganda is biblical” (p.1). God’s order against spreading wrong reports provoked consequent commentators to caution against “propagators of calumny” whose sin comprises in sowing seeds of disagreement and doubt that anticipate the foundation of peace on soil (p.1). However, the term propaganda is generally accepted to have been first used in the sociological sense by the Roman Catholic Church, for the spreading of ideas that would not occur naturally, but only via a cultivated or artificial generation (Black, 2011, p. 121).

In the course of time the term took more negative connotations. Qualter (1962) maintained that the expression “the deliberate attempt” was the crucial to his notion of propaganda, because, he had unarguably established that everything might be used as propaganda and that nothing belongs solely to it. For him, “The significance was that any act of promotion can be propaganda only if and when it becomes part of a deliberate campaign to induce action through the control of attitudes” (p. 27)

Ellul (1965) defined propaganda as “a set of methods employed by an organized group that wants to bring about the active or passive participation in its actions of a mass of individuals, psychologically unified through psychological manipulations and incorporated in an organization” (p. 61). For him, Propaganda is the inevitable result of the various mechanisms of the industrial society, and plays so central a role in the life of that society that no economic or political development can come about without the effect of its great influence. “The need for psychological influence to spur allegiance and action is everywhere the decisive factor, which progress demands and which the individual seeks in order to be delivered from his

own self" (p. 160).

It seems to Merrilland & Lowenstein (1971) that propaganda is related to an attempt which implies intent on the part of somebody to manipulate or control not only the attitudes of others but also their actions. The propagandist is inclined to cause others to think in a certain way, with the intention of making them, on some cases, take a certain action (p. 214).

Ted Smith (1989), editor of *Propaganda: A Pluralistic Perspective*, defines propaganda as "Any conscious and open attempt to influence the beliefs of an individual or group, guided by a predetermined end and characterized by the systematic use of irrational and often unethical techniques of persuasion" (p. 80).

As for Jowett & O'Donnell (2006), propaganda is a deliberate and systematic effort to form views, control insights, and direct behaviour to attain a reply servicing the desired objective of the propagandist. Its systematic nature necessitates longitudinal research of its development. Since the core of propaganda is its deliberateness of purpose, extensive investigation is required to learn what the real purpose is (p. 269).

There is a close relation between propaganda and the press. Sometimes it is presented in the guise of unbiased information since the journalist is not adequately competent — or clever enough to identify it for what it is. "Sometimes the newspaper is a conscious propagandist—in news and headlines both" says Casey (2018) and stresses that "sometimes propaganda is so obviously news, and so obviously a matter of importance to the newspaper's readers, that the paper presents it knowing that the readers themselves will recognize it for what it is and evaluate it for themselves" (Casey, 2018).

3. POLITICAL PLAYWRIGHTS: HOWARD BRENTON AND DAVID HARE

Both Howard Brenton and David Hare have generally been considered "political dramatists." Though the expression "political writers" is stacked with potential positive and negative undertones, there is most likely that being political in their plays is something the two men have never maintained a strategic distance from. Both are individuals from a similar age. Brenton was born in 1942, Hare in 1947. Both started composing for marginal theatres that were occupied with parody and social change. In any case, in 1974, Brenton stated, "the fringe has failed . . . what happens is that the 'alternative society' gets hermetically sealed and surrounded . . . and, in

the end, is strangled to death.” (Megson, 2012, p. 156). Independently, Hare and Brenton searched out new gatherings of people in mainstream theatres, not on account of they needed to compose business theatre, but rather in light of the fact that they needed the human topic of their non-elitist theatre to contact a more extensive group of audience and the only way to do that was to perform their plays on these theatres.

David Hare who got famous through the satires that he wrote for the fringe theatre, utilizing what he himself called the “democratizing elements of public laughter (Hare, 1999) caught up with bigger creations, *Knuckle and Plenty*, at the National Theatre. Hare quit writing in the mid-1980's. He said he “felt trapped in the theatre, and I went through a period of intense bitterness and self-pity” (Hare, 1999).” During the early Thatcher years, Hare lived in wilful outcast in New York until the point when he understood that, despising England is definitely not an adequate motivation to live in America. *Pravda*, which appeared in 1985, became a means for him to return to England.

4. PRAVDA IN HISTORY

Pravda meaning truth was a Bolshevik revolutionary paper founded in 1912, and therefore was the frequent target of censorship by the Tsarist police. Vladimir Lenin who was forced to live in exile was among the early newspaper contributors who published 265 articles in it (Kenez, 2003, p. 27). Seth states (2015) that in an effort to appeal the working classes, the language used in *Pravda* was kept simple and easy to understand; by means of the articles published regularly, labour strikes were encouraged and different ideas and theories related to communism were provided. After the Revolution of March 1917, the Provisional Government offered *Pravda* and all newspapers freedom of the press. However, by November 1917, the Bolshevik Revolution had occurred, and the same paper that was hounded by Tsarist police was one of the few not shut down by Lenin's Press Decree. Non-Bolshevik papers were closed or taken over, and soon all papers were publishing only articles approved by the party. *Pravda* editors rather than the Central Committee enforced the party line both for themselves and for other Soviet newspapers.

The fortunes of those working for *Pravda* followed those of the political leaders they covered. Nikolai Bukharin, the editor of *Pravda* under Lenin, was removed in 1929, shortly after Joseph Stalin came to power (Cohen, 1975, p. 301). The newspaper Bukharin had once edited ran an article condemning his errors. The government executed Bukharin in 1938

and no public recognition remains of his years of editorship (Larina, 1993) .

The Soviet press represented mainly by Pravda did not reveal the worries of the expansive populace. It was over every one of the mouthpieces for spreading the administration's authentic political outlooks and for communicating the administrative class' points of view on the reasonable usage of the official strategies (Tarschys, 1979, p. 183).

Throughout the history of newspapers, a limited number of owners or corporations have controlled multiple newspapers. For example, William Randolph Hearst “was the foremost news media mogul in the United States and throughout the world” (Procter, 2007, p. 3) in the first part of the twentieth century. All the other important media moguls of history like the Astors, Rupert Murdoch, Robert Maxwell and others were regularly the subject of acclaim or feedback for their huge news property. At the point when daily papers have been sold, the adjustment in proprietorship and editorship was regularly open and agonizing. A standout amongst the most noticeable changes in proprietorship shook all of Fleet Street, the British daily paper locale.

The most striking sale in the newspaper industry was the sale of the British papers, *The Times* and the *Sunday Times* to Australian Rupert Murdoch’s News Corporation in 1981. Clashes between Fleet Street administration and the printing associations over new innovation brought about a yearlong close down between 1978-1979. According to Leapman (2011), the papers eventually surrendered to the requests of the National Graphics Association, however *The Times* and *the Sunday Times* had lost cash and were left helpless. After the offer of the daily papers, Murdoch supplanted The Times editorial manager William Rees-Mogg with Sunday Times editor Harold Evans. The fight amongst Murdoch and his editors was plugged in the news with the enthusiasm of writers covering their own kind.

“Again, the classic narrative about journalism and truth in the Soviet Union is well known. It is captured by an old Soviet dissident joke: “There is no izvestia in Pravda, and there is no pravda in Izvestia,” where Izvestia and Pravda are the names of Soviet newspapers and izvestia means “news” and pravda means “truth.” (Roudakova, 2017, p. 4)

5. PRAVDA: A PROPAGANDA SHEET IN DISGUISE OF NEWSPAPER

Pravda, written for the National Theatre in 1985 (which means truth in

Russian), is a comic drama of excess (Leapman, 2011) which put current Fleet Street on the phase-out of the blue. It is a sharp parody on the unfeeling daily paper culture of the 1980s, specifically, a voracious media baron (Pravda, 2018) Lambert Le Roux who uses any means and person, especially the papers he has, in order to derive personal benefits. The play is an ideal case for the clarification of the components by which privileged group or groups control the media further bolstering their good fortune by now large literature on government and corporate impact on the media.

The antagonist of the play is a rough estimate of Murdoch in the individual of Le Roux, a heartless South African media magnate, and his mischievous Australian sidekick Eaton Sylvester. They begin first by moving on a local title, *the Leicester Bystander*, and then continue with the *Daily Victory*, one of the biggest papers of the UK. According to Leapman (2011) “in their odyssey, they degenerate everybody and all that they experience, including the board of trustees of the immense and great who should secure the *Victory's* article autonomy (p.32).”

Le Roux appoints Andrew, a man who adores daily papers so much that he won't print adjustments since they ruin the page, as the editor of the paper when he buys the paper and fires almost everyone. In his view, there is no point in having a qualified workforce as his aim has never been to publish a good paper. The only thing that is important to him is how many papers are sold and how much money is earned. He believes that the bad ones that use a certain kind of propaganda which is employed characteristically by demagogues, that is to say, demagoguery, sell better. Demagogue as described by Plato in his Book 8 of *The Republic* is the person who creates a state of chaos and fear and then presents himself as “the people's protector” much as his only aim is to abuse them (Stanley, 2015, p. 41). This shows Brenton-Hare thesis that newspapers must not be turning into propaganda sheets though most of them show the signs that they are on the way to becoming. Journalists attach great importance to their own credibility and interests rather than conveying facts to their readers or informing them correctly. The best example of this is the effort made by a woman whose son has wrongly been reported to have been arrested for selling cocaine by Bystander.

MOIRA. My name is Moira Patterson, and on page five you'll see I'm identified as the owner of a health food shop whose son Mark Patterson has been convicted of selling cocaine.

ANDREW. I'm sorry to hear that.

Andrew states that he is sorry for the situation of the lady, but he does not even care what happened in reality. The woman is desperate to know that this news is wrong because she claims that she does not have a son and requests that the next day's paper be published with a reprint or correction.

MOIRA. But I have no son. For that reason, I'm afraid you have the wrong Patterson. Could you arrange a retraction? To undo it? Since eight o'clock this morning I've had no customers.'... and if you could just publish a retraction in tomorrow's paper... [16]

But this is neither possible nor important for Andrew because the media have long taken for granted the idea that messages spread through the media can, and naturally, do have a key effect in shaping the public opinion. It is not important if they are really true or not because when they are printed they turn out to be true in the eyes of the readers. That's why, to print corrections or to arrange a retraction will damage their credibility and reputation in the eyes of readers. This case can be a good example to the falsity condition of propaganda which is "the claim that something is propaganda because it communicates something false, either by expressing it directly or by communicating it indirectly" (Stanley, 2015, p. 42). Andrew expresses their understanding of journalism as follows:

ANDREW. Look I'll be frank ... it isn't very easy. You will find on most newspapers a policy, you see. The Bystander ... sorry, 'we'. . . don't publish corrections. Because we don't like them. I'll be honest. They don't look good on the page. If every time we got something wrong, we published a correction then a newspaper would just be a footnote to yesterday's newspaper and yesterday's a footnote to the day before's. In fact, going further, now thinking about it, as I see it, look . . . a newspaper isn't just a scrap of paper, it's something that people feel they have to trust. And if they can't trust it, why should they read it? A thing is true or it isn't. So by definition, what is printed must be true — otherwise, why print it? And if we apologise and correct, how can the readers know what is true and what is not? [17]

The assumption normally functions as follows: if consumer trust in the press is strong, then propaganda originating from within that system will be more operative in manipulating the opinions and ideologies of readers; on the contrary, if public trust in the press is quite fragile, the press propaganda could be less believed or substantial to those who follow the news (DiMaggio, 2008). In other words, if the public, by and large, does not trust

the press, then there is no reason for them to bother spending money for them. Thus, the first thing that the media in general and the press in particular propagate is that they are trustworthy and their only aim is to reflect the truth to them as a mirror held up to nature really does. However, the thing they do is to hold a magical mirror to the nature that shows everything as they want to reflect.

On stage, Le Roux appears as a monster, though his power and inevitability of purpose are exceedingly attractive (Sierz & Lee, 2006). He states that what he does is a natural thing, it is natural for him to have a desire for making money (p.27). He becomes a role model for an explanation of the tools whereby the privileged group or groups take the control of the media to their advantage to the by now a large literature on government and corporate effect on the media. However, it is almost certain that the groups that control the resources will control the prevailing public narrative. When the ideology of the groups that control the resources is one of their own superiority, which is a consequence of the claim that resource control is distributed by importance, this will be the dominant public narrative. And some of the iconic studies in social psychology are devoted the dominant public narrative to explaining why people tend to accept something presented by “expert” authority figures as the official narrative. (Stanley, 2015, p. 246)

It is not very important whether the Propaganda is used for political, social, economic or religious purposes or not, but it has to use certain means and methods to influence people's views and attitudes. Casey (2018) says that the most important of these tools can be said to be "suggestion" or "stimulation". Propagandists encourage others to accept their views without having to take their own claims or they force them tentatively to behave as they wish. The idea of using suggestion or stimulation as a propaganda device leads to accepting a proposal, even though it has no logical reasons for the public to accept it. The propaganda usually tries to put the critical reaction side by side from the target group, so the proposal is considered one of the most important tools.

That's the reason why there has always been a mutual relationship between media and politicians. Media workers and proprietors need the support of politicians and vice versa. The collaboration between politicians and the media moguls can be seen clearly in the relation between Quince, Member of Parliament, and Le Roux. Quince describes the relation between the press and the politicians as “A delicate relationship. Too close, and danger ensues” and he confesses that “there must be an essential exchange of

information. Creative leaks, a discreet lunch, interchange in the lobby, the art of the unattributable telephone call, late at night..." (p.36). This relation which takes its roots from insincerity and falsity must depend on mutual interests.

QUINCE. ... 'A source close to the Prime Minister', meaning 'the Prime Minister'. Yes. This mutual relationship is a good thing, and if it can be made concrete, formalized by an actual commercial arrangement... If I, for instance, were to offer you my private skill and influence, and in return you were to guarantee me access to your newspapers, if the channels of free expression were to be . . . (He pauses.) . . . channelled in my direction, if 'Man of Steel' were to be a regular feature, a column, written by myself, by me then democracy would be safeguarded. And we would have a very satisfactory deal (p.36).

As a necessity of mutual interest relations, Le Roux publishes an article praising Quince in his own *The Daily Tide*. Because the more important Quince is in the field of politics, the better it will be for Le Roux. *The Daily Tide* which is supposed to be a newspaper that informs the public turns out to be a means of propaganda when Le Roux says: "That's the nice thing about having picked up one or two foreign newspapers. They are a way of doing some favours to my friends. [28]".

QUINCE. As you say.

There is a moment between them.

I do have to thank you for that marvellous article.

LE ROUX. Think nothing of it.

QUINCE. In The Daily Tide.

LE ROUX. It's a pleasure. 'Man of Steel'. (LE ROUX smiles.)

QUINCE. Very good picture. Slightly minimal prose. I do think of all the hard-hitting tabloids in Fleet Street yours is much the most deliciously down-market (p.28).

Quince helps Le Roux, who is originally from South Africa, to have papers in Britain and in return for this, Le Roux publishes articles to support his political position. Both of them use propaganda to strengthen their position. Seemingly this is a mutual win-win situation for both of them, however, this is not a sincere relationship that depends on mutual trust. This reminds Stanley's assertion that "propaganda must be delivered insincerely"

(Stanley, 2015, p. 42). In reply to Quince's thanks for the article about him, Le Roux says "It's nothing. I am a businessman, first and foremost (p.29) and accepts that he made an article published in one of his papers praising Quince only because he needs Quince's political power to reach his own aims. As he himself says he is a businessman, first and foremost (p.29). The diversity of his business interest bewilders Quince and all the other people who know him. He has hotels, newspapers and international sportswear companies (p.29). As a businessman who owns sportswear companies, he is very interested in the Olympic Games which will be held in London in 1988. The newspaper he has purchased and the ones that he plans to have in the near future will help him to make business relations with the countries, especially Britain, taking part in the Olympics, on the issue of sportswear that they will use during the Olympics.

QUINCE. Well you've certainly chosen the dominating position. Your sportswear stand is resplendent.

SYLVESTER. We're putting down a running track. Sandpit. We've taken over areas seventy-one and seventy-two. All of that is ours.

LE ROUX. The prime sites.

QUINCE. Tremendous.

SYLVESTER. We're here for six days.

LE ROUX. Eaton is expecting to have done all significant business before the Trade Fair opens tomorrow. Eaton is a genius at selling.

SYLVESTER. I like money passing through my hands.

LE ROUX. He knows both sides. He worked for the Australian Government.

The sports fair which is held for the Olympic games is an opportunity for Le Roux to create business relations with the countries taking part in the Olympics and he is able to have the prime sites for his stands with the help of both his relations in Britain and his business manager Eaton Sylvester who knows both sides as he once worked for the Australian Government. It is a good opportunity for them to advertise their products that some teams in amateur sports teams use the sportswear produced by Le Roux's companies. Quince reveals the relation between them saying: "Like all amateur sport we need money — and if the price is wearing some of this beautiful clothing . . . (p.31).

The use of Dennis Payne, the former captain of the British Cricket

team as the advertising face, is another method of propaganda for Le Roux. An advertisement that uses, for example, the ideal of a perfect cricket player in the service of selling a product that undermines the real quality of the product is propaganda and counts as such according to Stanley's characterization (2015). For example, an advertisement that uses pictures of a famous athlete to sell a sport wear of poor quality or and pretend as if there were a connection between his/her performance and the sportswear he/she uses in the service of a goal that can be easily seen to undermine it. So these types of advertisements simply are examples of propaganda though generally propaganda is considered to be directed to political purposes but advertisement is to business. It is propaganda since this class of commercials looks to connect an objective with a perfect that is essentially insignificant to that ideal. For instance, notices standardly utilize stylish beliefs to advance an item, ownership of which is unessential to the further acknowledgment of that tasteful ideal. A commercial that recommends that obtaining a specific sort of car will make people more alluring is a case of this. On the off chance that we remember that numerous things we would call "ads" are clearly occasions of propaganda, it is as yet helpful to segregate a hypothetical classification of discourse that catches this class of ads: "Advertising: A contribution to public discourse that is presented as an embodiment of certain ideals, but in the service of a goal that is irrelevant to those very ideals" (Stanley, 2015, p. 56) .

In the course of time Le Roux takes also the control of the *Victory* which is one of the most important newspapers of the United Kingdom, with the help of Quince who is the son of one of the biggest shareholders of the newspaper. Le Roux obligates Quince to make his own propaganda to all the other shareholders. For Quince, there is not another choice except helping him because he owes his current and possible future political position to him.

QUINCE. Just like that? There are trustees. With a veto on ownership. Do you suppose they'd ever let you in?

LE ROUX. But what if they did? And you were the man who had helped me? Some backbench lobbying? The right word here and there? You've not much to lose. And if we succeed, a friendly Victory will assist your career.

QUINCE. I see.

LE ROUX. As a politician? Not even a politician, no longer a politician, with The Daily Victory behind you, a statesman, [p.35]

When Le Roux buys *The Victory*, the first thing he does is to change the editor of the paper, Fruit-Norton, the current editor of the paper, because he and some of the other staff demand that editorial independence is the essential quality of the paper saying that “for us to make a balanced, sane, mature judgement, independent of party or personal whim” (p.44). Norton adds “but what guarantees that you won’t interfere with the paper?” (p.48). It is because “even the economic theory of democracy requires an open media and honest politicians; that is, it requires voters to have reliable access to the information that will enable rational decision making on the basis of self-interest.” (Stanley, 2015, p. 82). However, open media system is not something that Le Roux is interested in; on the contrary, he desires a media by which he can propagate the distorted truths that he can use for his own interest. Andrew, the editor of the local paper, *Bystander*, reveals what Le Roux understands from a successful editor and freedom of press. Andrew says that “by a marked increase in sales. Up 12.7 - thanks to my community policy, which I have been left at liberty to pursue” (p.49). If the editor is able to increase the rates of the sales, whether the editorial board is free or not or whether what they publish is true or not is not important.

After Fruit-Norton is dismissed and Andrew becomes the editor of the *Victory*, it is really possible to see the real intent of the new proprietor. He controls almost every news and articles and he either changes them in accordance with his own purpose or fires the ones who are responsible for them. As an illustration, when he sees a journalist with a double crown poster which is an advertisement for the paper, he starts screaming:” What the fuck is happening? What the fuck is going on here? Christ I’ve never read such a load of fucking shit!” and he continues shaking the paper angrily in his hand. “It’s shit! It’s shit! What a load of fucking shit! God who writes this fucking rubbish?” and he tears the paper into shreds and points at a journalist. “You! What do you do?” [p. 55]. The problem with the poster is the slogan on it, ‘THE VICTORY IS YOURS’?” (p. 56). He considers the slogan as communistic propaganda and fires all the people who are responsible for the poster and the slogan.

On a nightshift, one of the journalists make news about a group of women who have recently formed a peace camp on Loch Fergus where the building of the new Fork Lightning missile is soon to begin. They are attacked by two hundred policemen and they are hurt. The police mount their attack at night in full riot gear and destroy the camp in twenty-five minutes. Twenty-seven women have been charged with various alleged minor offences and subsequently are to spend the night in cells at Loch Fergus

police - station. However, when the Night Editor Doug Fantom revise the text, the news transforms into something just the opposite of the events that occurred during the day. The news turns out to be propaganda of the state officials and the victims are shown as if they were the criminals.

FANTOM. Quite.

The two men look at each other without humour. There is a short silence.

This is just a professional exercise. To maintain standards, that's all.

LARRY hands the copy back to him, silently. FANTOM puts it on the desk in front of him and takes a Mont Blanc fountain pen (p. 61).

Women. What sort of women? (He writes.) Middle-aged women. Peace. Camp. Peace on this paper is always in inverted commas. You'll find that in the style book. Peace camp. Camp? Camp implies facilities, showers, toilets, camps are things you take the family to in Brittany. Call it a peace — inverted commas — squat. Better. 'Middle-aged women who squatted illegally...' Better. Do police really 'Mount an attack'? Surely they're defending us"? Society? Themselves? So it's 'Police defending themselves'. (He makes a great mark across the paper.) 'Destroyed*? No. Cleared the site. In twenty-five minutes . . . that's 'Quickly and efficiently'. This Mary Kingham. Do we know she's still with her husband? Left her children I suppose, to squat all over the road (p.62).

It clarifies how government limitations on the media and private industry and oligarchic control of the media associate together to display specifically controlled data. The purposeful publicity display clarifies how every hub in the exchange of data from world to gathering of people by means of the media must be cleared through a sort of checkpoint: the data exchanged must have first the approval of the national government, then that of local government approval, corporate proprietorship, and at last that of the corporate sponsor and this provides guarantee of the corporate benefits. Given the reliance of the hubs, these weights have a tendency to loan themselves to mixing around an unpleasant example of uniform interests. "The interdependence also allows the whole media system to be rapidly deployed in the service of propaganda in times of supposed emergency". (Stanley, 2015, p. 241).

The influence of the government limitations shows itself clearly again in Act II, Scene One when Rebecca, a journalist working for the Victory and also the lover of Andrew, reaches some information about the possible

dangers of the nuclear power stations in Britain. Though Ministry of Defence has persistently asserted that the flasks are safe even when they drop at the height of fifteen metres on to the concrete, there is a strong possibility that they can leak even when they are drop from twenty meters (p.67). All the journalists and even Andrew, the editor of Victory, gets very excited about the news. Bill expresses his excitement as “finally something that’s real! And magnificent! That’s not about traffic, or councils, or weddings!”(p.69). Much as Andrew wants to publish this news, he is in dilemma because it is highly possible that this news is regarded as a breach of the laws. The document given to Rebecca has been gathered illegally and this news may mean betraying the interests of the state, as the news reveals the secrets of the state and contains claims that are not approved by the authorities, but on the other hand, the possible leakage in a nuclear power station may mean a horrible disaster for all the society. As a member of free media it is their duty to inform the public, and it is also their duty to form the public opinion on this critical issue. However, as Herman and Chomsky (2002, p.1) state, in the countries in which all the levers of the power are controlled by the state bureaucracy, the monopolistic control over the media, regularly supplemented by official censorship, openly shows that the media serve the closes of a prevailing first class. It is much more troublesome to see a purposeful publicity framework at work where the media are private and there is no formal censorship. This can be particularly genuine where the media effectively compete, intermittently assault and uncover corporate and administrative malice, and forcefully portray themselves as representatives for free speech and the common community interest.

QUINCE. ... The Minister emphasises that the publication of a leaked memorandum in The Daily Usurper raises no issues relating to the nuclear industry. But does, however, raise important issues of loyalty in public service. To whom is the Civil Service accountable? London or Moscow? Thank you, ladies and gentlemen (p.80).

Though Le Roux pretends to be supporting the journalists and the editor, Andrew, to publish the shattering news for the sake of the public saying that he admires an Editor who delivers him a scoop and scoops are their life blood (p.74), his real intention is to use this situation to strengthen his position in the eyes of the state bureaucracy. He declares that they will send back the document unread and will publish the name of the person who gave it to them so they can go to gaol (p.75). He not only refuses to publish the documents, but also propagates that the ones who are responsible for the documents about the leakage of the nuclear materials from the flasks are the

criminals and it is their duty to help the government to catch them. It is also spectacular and gives a big chance to them to have a big headline. He will either publish the reality as it is and inform the public as it should be or he will propagate that all these people are the criminals who try to harm the peace and prosperity of the country. He chooses the latter because making propaganda of the state and hiding the realities from the public are much more suitable for the mutual interests of both the media mogul and the government.

When Le Roux fires Andrew he explains the formula of a good newspaper which is really a sheet of propaganda rather than a newspaper in the real modern sense:

LE ROUX. ... (He picks up a copy of the Victory.) It worked in South Africa. Page one, a nice picture of the Prime Minister. Page two, something about actors. Page three, gossip, the veld, what you call the countryside, a rail crash if you're lucky. Four, high technology. Five, sex, sex crimes, court cases. Then it's editorials, then letters. All pleasingly like-minded, all from Kent. Then six pages of sport. Back page, a lot of weather and something nasty about the opposition. There you are. (He closes the paper.) The only bit I hate is all those foreign correspondents. They're totally out of your control. They bring you extraneous suffering, complexity. Even now I never look at their little half page (p.76).

Though the ministry of the defence does everything that is necessary not to publish the news about the nuclear flasks, *the Daily Usurper*, the only newspaper which is not under the control of the state bureaucracy publishes it. The news can never make the desired effect on the public because all the other state supported media make propaganda that the *Daily Usurper* is the home of the anti-propaganda against the government and almost everyone who support this paper is against the government and they lose almost everything they have.

Quince's news conference and the things that he said reveal the influence of the state bureaucracy: "On behalf of backbench opinion I have spoken to the Minister. Who at the moment for reasons of National Security is not available to speak to you. Although off the record I may say..." (p.80). Though all the news is true and the public is under the danger of being face to face with the nuclear leakage, they transform the matter into the loyalty to the public service and the ones who are responsible for the news are accused of being dangers to the survival of the state.

Le Roux accomplishes having the control of almost all the Fleet Street, but there are lots of ex-journalists, politicians, writers, shareholders etc. who were either fired by Le Roux or lost their status in the society just because of his papers, and they are ready to do everything to take him down. These people may express their ideas and inform and warn the public about this media mogul of non-English origin by only *The Daily Usurper*, almost the only newspaper which was free from the influence of Le Roux. Now his only aim is to have *the Daily Usurper*, and it is the most suitable time for him to bid for it because the shareholders of the paper decide to sell it because of the oppression of the government and the economic trouble due to the lawsuits opened in their rights. However, all the people such as Andrew, Rebecca, Quince etc., who were ruined by le Roux, come together and decide to take the control of the newspaper outbidding Le Roux with the help of Sylvester, who is Le Roux's business manager. At first, they hesitate to believe in Sylvester as he is the one who supports Le Roux for years, but he makes them believe that he wants to take revenge from him as he cannot tolerate being humiliated by Le Roux anymore. Having *The Daily Usurper* becomes the last hope they can hold on to so that they can continue to reach the public and advocate their ideals. Andrew expresses the importance of it as "We stand for something. And we need institutions. We must have the means and the courage to buy the means. And that's what we're doing" (p.99).

Interestingly, the consortium they create becomes successful in outbidding Le Roux and having the *Daily Usurpers*. Sylvester claims that he may sell them the dirt on Lambert Le Roux that can be used to take him down:

ANDREW. *What sort of stuff?*

SYLVESTER. *There's a first wife in Manila.*

ANDREW. *I didn't know that.*

SYLVESTER. *A house prisoner. Her story alone. His early days, in South Africa. Blood was spilt.*

ANDREW. *I knew it!*

SYLVESTER. *He didn't do anything himself. He hired other people. Youths with knives. We burnt down a couple of warehouses. Print my story and you'll put a bolt through his head. [98]*

News about Le Roux creates a great sensation in the country and

Andrew has once again managed to become an important figure in the press. With each passing day, the claims about Le Roux continue to increase, and Le Roux's silence against this allegation further encourages Andrew and his friends. When le Roux and Andrew meet to speak about the subject, Andrew is almost sure that le Roux will offer him money to get him to stop publishing (p.101). However, Le Roux reveals that everything that Andrew and his friends believe is an illusion created by him and he also reveals that he has planned everything and directed them to publish all news and articles in order to make them go bankrupt through suing them. He says "You printed lies about me, and now you must pay" (p.106).

At the end of the play Andrew, the young liberal journalist who believes so-called freedom of press succumbs to Le Roux when he is trapped by him. In the national press as seen by the two, where economic interests take precedence over matters of truth and moral responsibility, the only way for him to be a part of the press is to work for Le Roux and to obey him as everyone does. Thus, he becomes one of those who are charged with shaping our view of the world in our imaginations with no consideration for whether they form a real or an illusory view. La Roux's unethical abusing and propaganda as a form of manipulation verify a struggle for Andrew's ethics, and at the end of the play he loses both his self-respect and his relationships with those closest to him.

6. CONCLUSION

In modern society, the increase in literacy rates after the emergence of historical and social phenomena such as industrial revolution, urbanization, the dizzying developments in the field of technology based on the proliferation of inventions, mass-communication and transportation, and easier accessibility to information have increased the pace of change (Mazlum, 2017) and has made propaganda the inevitable result of all these developments. It plays such a vital role in the life of people that no economic or political development can exist without the influence of its great power (Ellul, 1965, p. 160).

Pravda is a play which mainly focuses on people's reliance on media to get information in any circumstances and the fact that this reliance can be abused by the media. Brenton and Hare question the culture and ethics of the British press, which, in their own words, has turned into propaganda sheets. Though it is generally asserted by the defenders of the press that every action to impose external policing and regulation will threaten freedom of speech and undermine the vital role a free press plays in a democratic society, the

play gives the impression that their understanding of freedom is not freedom to transmit the truth as they are without being influenced by anyone, but freedom to transmit or propagate events as they wish. That's why, Andrew, the editor of *the Leicester Bystander*, and all the other journalists ignore the demand of a lady, who is identified as the owner of a health food shop whose son Mark Patterson has been convicted of selling cocaine, that this news be either corrected or removed. By this anecdote Brenton and Hare gives the impression that journalists attach great importance to their own reliability and benefits more willingly than conveying facts to their readers or informing them correctly. The financial pressure on the press may have created a culture whereby morals and ethics are secondary to doing whatever it takes to get a story that will sell.

The mutual relation between power and news is a very important theme in the play. The ones who have the power, especially politicians who are eager to have power or strengthen their position in the political area, need the support of press and vice versa. This mutual relation shows itself when Le Roux decides to buy a local newspaper, *the Leicester Bystander*. As a businessman who is originally from South Africa he needs someone who will help him to be a British citizen and have the control of the paper. Quince, an effective politician, makes his propaganda and Le Roux publishes articles on Quince which make his propaganda. However, this relation is not a real or sincere relation because the most important characteristic of propaganda is its falsity both in the ideals that are propagated and the relations created by it. When their mutual interest ends, the collaboration ends as it happened in the case of the relation between Quince and Le Roux. On taking the control of the press, Le Roux sees that he does not need Quince anymore, he gives an end to their relation and makes anti-propaganda about him as he knows that Quince will also make the same thing.

The play shows that power and news go together not only in the field of policy but also in the field of business. For Cain (1993) the news industry and British capitalism expanded hand-in-hand. "Access to rapid and correct information – through the financial press, for example – was a key component in the global success of the City-based financial service sector." (p. 21). The press is not only able to provide an access to rapid and genuine information but it is also able to make suggestions about what is true, useful, necessary for the publics. That's why it is the most influential tool of propaganda in almost every field of life. Le Roux, the media mogul of the play, is a businessman who has companies in different industrial areas

including sportswear and he uses the power of the media he controlled to make business agreements with the countries that will take part in the Olympic games that will be held in London in 1988. He makes the propaganda of the politicians who help him and he uses the commercials in his papers to make the propaganda of his own products.

The play also shows, as some political theorists' have asserted, that "even in a liberal democracy, it is acceptable for the news media to endorse obedience to authority in times of existential emergency though even this is clearly undemocratic" (Stanley, 2015, p. 243). It is the main duty of the media in a liberal democracy, regardless of claims of emergency by political or economic elites, to police those claims. "It is hard to see that a venue is a liberal democratic news media at all if it does not fulfil this, its central function" (Stanley, 2015, p. 243). Therefore, Le Roux refuses to publish the news about the possible leakage in the nuclear flask in Britain and on the contrary he forces Andrew and Rebecca, who takes the documents about it from an unknown source, to reveal the name of their source. In this so-called emergency, he follows with all the power a policy of publication in accordance with the legal policies of the state and the government, and propagate that all claims are a lie and some terrorists-like figures are trying to give harm to the future of the state. It is not important what happened in reality, it is important which method of publication is true for the sake of the state and the government.

Another economic characteristic which can be found all over the play is an increasing concentration of media ownership. "Commercial objectives are becoming more important to the detriment of democratic shared objectives (Czepek, Hellwig, & Nowak, 2009, p. 17). It is also very possible to see this in the play concerning resources for journalistic work, for example fewer journalists are forced to provide more content, and editors are fired and replaced by underpaid freelancers just as in the case of Andrew at the end of the play. As a result of all these, they need less time for research and fact-checking and they are able to have mostly conventional matters and press-relations material. Though the Article 19 of the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights states: "Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; the right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media regardless of frontiers", the authors imagine a world in which upmarket and downmarket newspapers will gradually converge; Le Roux finally merges the newsrooms of his two papers with different life views. And, on claiming that newspapers are "the universal scapegoat for everyone

else's evasions and inadequacies" (p.104), Le Roux tells again the extent to which they have transformed into an easy fall guy (Billington, 2006).

In conclusion, the play deals with problem of how one could grow up innocently into adulthood in a state which is claimed to have liberal democratic ideals, but in which there is devastatingly illiberal practice. To maintain stability, the liberal democratic ideals may be transformed into propagandistic use of realities. This is the type of propaganda that centrally concerns the authors in this play, "the kind that characteristically masks the gap between the given ideal and reality by the propagandistic use of that very ideal. Failures of democracy could be hidden by the propagandistic use of the very vocabulary of liberalism" (Stanley, 2015, p. 51). It can be said that even in liberal democracies as in the case of Britain, politicians and businessmen come together in some, possibly unconscious, way with the media to mislead the public into acting on false, and this can be called as propaganda.

In a politically competitive democracy and a commercially competitive free enterprise system, mass communication functions by allowing a competitive arena in which the advocates of all can do battle. What many call propaganda therefore becomes part of that open marketplace of ideas; it is not only inevitable, but may be desirable that there are openly recognizable and competing propagandas in a democratic society, propagandas that challenge all of us—producers and consumers—to wisely sift and sort through them (Black, 2011).

7. REFERENCES

- "Pravda". (n.d.). "Pravda". *Encyclopedia of Russian History*. Retrieved June 21, 2018, from <http://www.encyclopedia.com/history/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/pravda>
- Bay, S. (2010). *Howard Brenton'ın tiyatro eserlerinde şiddet ve boyutları (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation)*. Erzurum: Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Black, J. (2011). Semantics and ethics of propaganda. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics: Exploring Questions of Media Morality*, 121-137.
- Casey, R. D. (2018, May 12). *What are the tools of propaganda?* Retrieved from The American Historical Association: [https://www.historians.org/about-aha-and-membership/aha-history-and-archives/gi-roundtable-series/pamphlets/em-2-what-is-propaganda-\(1944\)/what-are-the-tools-of-propaganda](https://www.historians.org/about-aha-and-membership/aha-history-and-archives/gi-roundtable-series/pamphlets/em-2-what-is-propaganda-(1944)/what-are-the-tools-of-propaganda)
- Cohen, S. F. (1975). *Bukharin and the Bolshevik revolution: A political biography, 1888-1938*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

- Combs, J. E. (1993). *The new propaganda: The dictatorship of palaver in contemporary politics*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Czepek, A., Hellwig, M., & Nowak, E. (Eds.). (2009). *Press freedom and pluralism in Europe concepts and conditions*. Malta: Gutenberg Press.
- DiMaggio, A. R. (2008). *Mass media, mass propaganda examining American news in the "war on terror"*. Plymouth: Lexington Books.
- Ellul, J. (1965). *Propaganda: The formation of men's attitudes*. New York: Knopf.
- Hare, D. (1999, FEBRUARY 7). And Another Thing From David Hare. (S. Lyall, Interviewer) Retrieved 5 2018, from <https://www.nytimes.com/1999/02/07/magazine/and-another-thing-from-david-hare.html>
- herman, E. & chomsky, N. (2002). *Manufacturing consent*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Jowett, G. & O'Donnell, V. (2006). *Propaganda and persuasion*. London: Sage Publications.
- Kenez, P. (2003). *The Birth of the propaganda state Soviet methods of mass mobilization, 1917-1929*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Larina, A. (1993). *This i cannot forget the memoirs of Nikolai Bukharin's widow*. London: Random House Ltd.
- Leapman, M. (2011, June). Second time around: Classics revisited - casualties of time. *British Journalism Review* vol.22 no.2 june 2011, 22(2), 92-94.
- Livingstone, S. (2003). On the challenges of cross-national comparative media research. *European Journal of Communication*, 18:4, 477-500.
- Megson, C. (2012). *Modern British playwriting the 1970s*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Merrilland, J. C., & Lowenstein, R. (1971). *Media, messages, and men: New perspectives in Communication*. New York: McKay.
- Pravda*. (2018, 5 22). Retrieved from Drama Online: <http://www.dramaonline.library.com/plays/pravda-iid-132577>
- Procter, B. (2007). *William Randolph hearst final edition, 1911-1951*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Qualter, T. H. (1962). *Propaganda and psychological warfare*. New York: Random House.
- Roudakova, N. (2017). *Losing Pravda ethics and the press in post-truth Russia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Savka, V. & Yatsyshyn, U. (2015). Media as actors of propaganda influence. Portrayal of the Russian-Ukrainian armed conflict in Ukrainian religious media. *MEDIA I SPOŁECZEŃSTWO*, 65-74.
- Seth, R. V. (2015). The language of the press in Soviet and post-Soviet Russia: Creation of the citizen role through newspaper discourse. *Journalism* 13(1), 53-70.

- Sierz , A. & Lee, M. (2006, August 26). *Return to the street of shame*. Retrieved from The Telegraph: <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/3654834/Return-to-the-street-of-shame.html>
- Smith, T. J. (1989). *Propaganda :A pluralistic perspective*. NewYork:: Praeger.
- Stanley, J. (2015). *How propaganda works*. Oxfordshire: Princeton University Press.
- Tarschys, D. (1979). *The Soviet political agenda. problems and priorities 1950–1970*. London: Macmillan.