

**CHAPTER 6**

**PTI AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC  
DEVELOPMENT**

## **PTI AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

News agencies have had a privileged role in the development of national and international communication systems, particularly at the periphery of capitalism, being primarily responsible for circulation in the information economy. In countries of Africa, South Asia, Eurasia and Latin America, they constituted prioritized foundations whilst building the institutional structure of the state, designed to boost development. Different models supplied determinants to policies in those countries, such as the choice between public or private ownership, independence or links to global agencies, import or export of information. Taking into account these paradigms and their hybrids, this chapter examines the various roles of constitution and operation of news agencies in general and PTI in particular that were adopted in emerging countries like India after independence.

### **6.1 PTI AND DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE**

PTI, at first, was privileged by government of free India in its national development strategies, at the expense of mass media (newspapers, TV, radio), because of some particular services they facilitated. Among them, centralization and control over the information was one of the motives to support the PTI, which was felt very important to form favorable public opinion and present a progressive image of the country in front of the world.

Thus, in the age before Internet, up until the 1980s, establishing a news agency had strategic and economic implications, such as saving costs in public spending and increasing the power of reach of the information that was intended to be spread. Then, not only were news agencies to become mouthpiece and showcase of their respective governments before the media (and, indirectly, the public) around the world, but also domestically, they would exert control over the flow of foreign information to the local press.

“Governments may sometimes prefer to use broadcast media as national news outlets, and this may mean that the broadcast media will act as primary news sources for the world agencies. The usefulness of broadcast media in practice is often low by comparison: a national agency provides an immediate written record of an

announcement or an event, whereas a broadcast station has to be monitored by the world agency, which much arrange to tape key bulletins. This consumes extra manpower, although both agency and broadcasts may sometimes can be monitored. Radio may be more important than other media for a government which is communicating directly to its people, many of whom may not be reached by any alternative media-form; but in communicating with its own media or with those of other countries, a government will often find a national news agency to be a more sophisticated policy-communicating instrument”. (BOYD-BARRETT, 1980, p. 205).

By feeding the media, domestic and foreign, public or corporate, news agencies have the potential of multiplying content for spreading information and discourses that may respond to the planning for national development. As distributors of mass information to the media, these companies always had a quantitatively insurmountable power to disseminate information and opinions (there including propaganda), all elements of strategic importance to states in an incipient phase of nation-building. The permanent distribution of news services by state-owned agencies, as well, was the antithesis of the free-market in the field of communication, materialized in the ‘free-flow doctrine’, especially when they had a monopoly on this type of service to the press (something usual in several developing countries, in the context of Cold War). They were seen as analogous to strategic industries, which were also nationalized – such as oil, electricity, banking, airlines – to ensure economic activity in favour of their own national interests and not imperial ones.

In the vision of the ideologues of autonomous development, news agencies are political tools for construction of the symbolic space through the circulation of information. This power was quickly noticed by the Indian government and used to meet specific demands created during the process of de-colonization. With independence, the country gained responsibility for its defence, investments and maintenance costs, formerly held by its colonial powers. Achieving sovereignty in these areas was a strategic and permanent goal for the new government. So, they suddenly had to look after replacements in the broad universe of world economy, obviously by starting in disadvantage. Therefore, in order to make themselves present toward the international public sphere and the imaginary of civil society – mainly among certain elites as “opinion leaders” – distributing news was a quick and relatively inexpensive tactic in this strategy.

The development strategy pursued by country ascribed to agencies the function of publicizing their achievements and demands, to defend their stances, to record their actions and, perhaps in a lesser level, to inform the public and stakeholders about global geopolitical events and the daily process of nation building. Ultimately, it was about making themselves present in a world where the communication channels were already extremely concentrated and controlled by corporations based within the great powers, back in the day when there was no Internet. In such a context, PTI got the role (both noble and questionable at the same time) to be representatives of the peoples who were struggling for national freedom – not just a political one, but also economical, technological, scientific and cultural.

At the same time, domestically, another factor which prompted the development of the structure of the PTI was the government demands at various levels (from the national top to local branches) for reliable and quick information to facilitate decision-making, faster than waiting for publishing by the press or broadcasting. “Governments must also be well informed to govern well. They need to be well informed about international news, and about their own country.” (BOYD-BARRETT, 1980, p. 203) Therefore much of the activity of global news agencies is associated with the “transmission of news about governments, and governments are among their most avid consumers” (ibid).

Schramm (1965), a representative of the diffusionist wing within communication for development, of a classical liberal frame, says that “the national development process” remarkably illustrates how “free” information has social effects for liberating a society “from ignorance and unilateral manipulation.” According to him, “the *amount of information available* and the *wideness of its distribution* is thus a key factor in the speed and smoothness of development” (op.cit.) – that is, so that development happened not only in the fastest way, but also the most peaceful and less conflicting one. At the same time, since developing countries have a disadvantageous status regarding possibilities for distributing information (LERNER &SCHRAMM, 1967, pp. 37-38), the importance of intermediaries for national-local communication is increased in the Global South (SCHRAMM, 1965, p. 141-142). Hence the strategic importance of news agency as ideal tools to distribute information under precarious infrastructural conditions in de-colonized countries is immense.

“Our point is that communication is always at the very center of existence, for any society, developing or not. Wherever dangers or opportunities need to be reported, decisions need to be made, new knowledge needs to be distributed, or change is imminent - there information flows. These needs are especially urgent and widespread in developing countries, where the tasks assigned to the communication media are vastly greater than before the time of development. If the flow of information and the channels of communication are not adequate to these tasks, they must be built up to the level of need”. (SCHRAMM, 1965, p. 15)

With this goal established, PTI was perceived by the State as efficient tools to perform such “adequate flow of information,” taking into account some needs as mass diffusion of content, standardized and codified in different languages (or in one single language accessible to elements in several groups, usually that of their respective tribal or local elites). Thus, PTI was taken by government by performing both the role of information exporters (spreading news abroad about their country), and importers (domestic distribution of foreign news), and only secondarily cared about circulating national news to the media of their own country. Back in the late 70s, the international content represented at least half of the total production of the vast majority of national agencies, both large and small (BOYD-BARRETT, 1980, p. 193). Particularly in India, thanks to the strategy of the lawful monopolies on subscribing and redistributing wires of foreign agencies, PTI kept the primary filter on what was happening and being said in the world especially when concerning its own country. A national agency was the hand of the state closing and opening the gates of news as true gatekeepers, at a time when there were no available news aggregators nor online search tools for mapping, searching, or finding other sources of information.

## **6.2 PARADIGMS OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATION**

Different paradigmatic models established by each country for their national news agencies are mainly related to their structural position in the world-system of communication – core, peripheral, semi-peripheral, in a Wallersteinian scheme which ultimately refers to their role in the international division of labour. Since at least the 1970s, critical studies on international communication and global media have found

that imbalances in international flows of information largely matched those in the global trade of tangible goods, which in turn extended hereto some concepts such as structural underdevelopment and dependence (THUSSU, 2006, pp. 46-51).

A sequence of theoretical schools came and fought for hegemony in the field of international communication studies (now more often 'global media studies') throughout the Cold War, not only to explain such imbalances but also proposing ways to correct them. The synthesis of such struggle, according to Mattelart (1994), varied around two types of determinisms: that of the *technology* and that of *modernization*, both presented as sufficient to boost development on their own.

The conception of development that drove communication initiatives of the rich countries toward societies in de-colonization (or from multilateral organizations to these), as pointed out by Mattelart (1994, pp. 185-186), was the paradigm of modernization. It regarded the reproduction of techniques, processes and values of Northern (industrialized) nations by those in the Global South (developing or underdeveloped countries) as something 'natural', while disregarding the particularities and priorities of the latter.

“Futures receptacles of a progress introduced from outside, these societies, labeled 'traditional' were reduced to waiting for the revelation of the *dei ex machina* charged with spreading the good cosmopolitan word. There was a mirror-and-screen effect: development-modernization theory incited societies on the one hand to see the image of their future in the ideal model embodied by modern societies of urban and industrial North, and on the other to consider their own cultural heritage as a handicap on the road to social and economic evolution” (MATTELART, 1994, pp. 201-202 [1994, p. 172])

Among the theories of modernization, the diffusion is approach clearly argued that the process of development would spread from the core to the periphery, then demanding not just an infrastructure to convey it but also super structural values, ideologies, relations of production and power. In the words of its main representative, Everett Rogers (apud MATTELART, 1994, p. 159), “development is a type of social change in which new ideas *are introduced into* a social system in order to produce higher per-capita incomes and levels of living through more modern production methods and improved social organization” (my emphasis)<sup>1</sup>.

Such ideas and values, as Dantas highlighted (2002, pp. 129- 131), were also conveyed by the news agencies, since they conducted a continuous, unidirectional North-South flow through regular coverage of the political, economic and cultural processes of the “First World. News agencies provided and keep providing, to those elites, a single framework of the world with which everyone must identify, if they want to look ‘developed’. Even the most critical reformers in local elites eventually resigned to reduce their political and historical options to the boundaries previously designed by the hegemonic colonial culture”. (DANTAS, 2002, pp. 130-131)

This was often reinforced by their own national agencies, in the agreements they signed with global agencies (or “world news agencies”, a nomenclature used by Boyd-Barrett in his seminal work of 1980). Given that the government apparatus in these countries had neither equipment nor qualified human resources in a sufficient scale to operate their news agencies to meet the required output volume to feed the national press and foreign media, in many cases these same apparatuses set “partnerships” with news agencies from developed countries (including the Soviet Union, in the context of the Cold War) to promote “cooperation” and exchange dispatches in a relationship that Boyd-Barrett and Rantanen (2002) classified as being as much dependent as that of other economic sectors.

“The world agencies do not control the distribution of their own product to all their ‘retail’ newspapers, broadcast and other clients. An important intermediary in many countries and for at least some clients in most countries is the national news agency, and nowhere is this more the case than in the developing countries of the Third World. Where dependence on the global agencies is already great, therefore, the scope for news selection by the individual retail media organization is further reduced by the intervention of a third party”. (BOYD-BARRETT, 1980, p. 192)

Such a relation of dependency and asymmetry was denounced by studies in international communication conducted in developing countries, particularly in Latin America and India. Global agencies were the “main target” of these studies (MATTELART, 1994, pp. 212-213), which aimed to quantify the concentration of sources for the information circulated in those countries, whilst economic research identified the concentration of capital in the Third World in the hands of multinational companies. By this analogy, there emerged the theory of *media imperialism*, that

Boyd- Barrett (apud MATTELART, 1994, p. 209) defined as “the process whereby ownership, structure, distribution, or content of the media in any one country are singly or together subject to substantial external pressure from the media interests of any other country or countries”. The very idea of media imperialism was largely due to the dominance exerted by global news agencies and the “unequal partnerships” that these established with national agencies of developing countries.

“The concept ‘imperialism’ denotes an imbalance of power relationship between nations. The first agencies emerged among the great imperial powers of the nineteenth century and their relationship with agencies of other countries was and is to some extent still a reflection of the imperial balance of power. It should be understood, however, that this imbalance was not often completely unidirectional. The agencies did not everywhere impose their own news-gathering and distribution machinery. Rather, they established relations with local independent agencies. The essential characteristic of this relationship was the principle of news-exchange it embodied, although the exchange was rarely equal”. (BOYD-BARRETT, 1980, p. 195)

“The national agency is in a sense a convenient revenue device, whereby revenue is assured to the global agencies from media which individually might be unable to afford global agency services, but which collectively, or through government help, can afford them. For that reason many national agencies have emerged in close relationship with one or more world agencies.” (BOYD-BARRETT, 1980, p. 193)

Boyd-Barrett (1980, p. 194) remarked that one of the structural causes related to the imbalance in the international flow of information (including the “disrupted image” effect of poor countries in the news of the rich countries) was a severe lack of resources of the national agencies from developing countries, and that “national agencies are generally important news sources for the world agencies.” However, he noted, this failure reflected “the basic problem, which is the non-existence or impoverishment of local markets in most Third World regions.”

“The arrival of the news agencies to what would become the Third World was not devoid of serious political and cultural consequences. Their wires determined which events were relevant in the day-to-day of each nation and how they should be reported. Obviously, they did so according to criteria and priorities, often ethnocentric or even racist, of their reporters and editors. These agencies have internationalised a



type of journalism, then rising in the United States and Europe, which focus on the instantaneous, the extraordinary, the sensational, the superficial, the bizarre, ignoring correlations of facts, social processes, cultural and historical differences between peoples. (DANTAS, 2002, p. 130)”

This situation was a sample of the big picture of underdevelopment, as described in diagnoses by structuralist economists such as Raúl Prebisch and Celso Furtado. In a quest for overcoming this hurdle, following the precepts of *developmentalism*, several countries opted for a pure statism in their communication strategies, especially when it came to news agencies.

“Governments soon became involved in agency newsgathering and dissemination. For this, they used a variety of means or combinations of methods that included direct ownership, control, tariff concessions for use of state communication facilities, intervention in news content, and overt or covert subsidy or direct financing of news agencies”. (SHRIVASTAVA, 2007, p. 7)

Opting for the state, however, was not a novelty and did not begin in the Third World: it was first done by the imperial powers themselves in the 19th century. Thus (2006, p. 9) reminds that the first three European news agencies – Havas, Wolff, and Reuters – were subsidized by their respective governments, while Shrivastava (2007, p. 153) says that Reuters, specifically, was “a national and imperial institution.” The State took part in creating the global communications network also with subsidies, not just to the agencies properly, but mainly to telegraph companies, building the hardware infrastructure to be used by the information transmitters.

Building such infrastructure was an obvious imperial interest (THUSSU, 2006), drawing the flow of information along the same lines of international trade in early capitalism. According to Dantas (2002, p. 129), telegraph wires, both terrestrial and submarine, as well as radio and later technologies, followed “the routes of ships and railroads that conveyed the wealth of the colonies and dependent countries to Europe and the United States.” The author explains that “in the peripheral countries, as a result of their own technological and industrial submissive condition, (...) networks have been established and placed under the control of foreign companies, specialized in international communications” (idem).

“Transport and information infrastructures of the peripheral countries served basically to the international insertion of their economies, source of cheap raw materials and manpower to core countries. Secondly, they provided telegraph or telephone networks to wealthy classes. In these countries, there were never talks, at the time, about universalising communications”. (DANTAS, 2002, p. 129)

It would not be a surprise, therefore, that the global distribution of these flows, even decades later, reflected the international division of labour, with its asymmetries, its imbalances, and its centripetal structure both to material goods and to information as a commodity.

Historically, the first movement to try to reverse those figures has been the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), formed in 1961 by the first nations to be decolonised in Asia and Africa (India, Indonesia, Ghana), plus Egypt and Yugoslavia. Not only did they use international fora (where the principle of “one nation, one vote” was hallowed, equalling them to military and economic powers) to expose and challenge the international division of labour, but they also questioned the communication order derived from it. In fact, in the 1970s, at the NAM conferences in Algiers (1973) and Colombo (1976), the Non-Aligned countries blinded the appeal for a New International Economic Order (NIEO) to a parallel New World Information and Communication Order (NWICO).

In this process, the institutional tool chosen by the Non- Aligned, as representatives of the Third World (developing countries, especially newly-decolonised, presently referred as the Global South) to bring about systemic change was the same that had been used by the colonial powers in the 19th century: the state. It was up to the state, in the developmental strategy adopted by the poor countries, the task of overcoming problems in their national infrastructure to meet their own demands of development, no longer those of their colonisers. The state was also entrusted with the mission of organizing the new information systems (the national news agencies) to operate in accordance to endogenous interests of the new countries.

Once the national units of this system were formed, the Non- Aligned Movement sought to articulate a broader network: the Non- Aligned News Agencies Pool (NANAP), that, at least between 1975 and 1980, constituted a counter-hegemonic scheme for the international news flow among developing countries (for that matter,

consult AGUIAR, 2010). The initiative of the Non-Aligned pool, formed exclusively by state-owned agencies, responded to the demand for “decolonising information” and the configuration of the NWICO (MATTELART, 1994, p. 212), until it was demobilised by various internal and external factors in 1980 (and later converted into the Non-Aligned News Network in 2005).

The model of news agencies belonging to the state, not private ones, clearly seemed to be the best – if not the only – to be adopted in developing countries, even by those with market-friendly and strongly anti-socialist regimes, because public information was treated as a strategic area. Just as sovereign development was sought, they also strived for “information sovereignty”, which would be effective in the operational and productive autonomy of national agencies relatively to the global agencies. As much as natural resources or civil aviation, the continuous flow of information carried by news agencies was seen as decisive to national sovereignty, a politically sensitive business, and therefore as naturally subject to state monopoly.

The intention, however, hardly ever came true. Developing nations, even bestowed with political and administrative autonomy, remained hostages to the transnational capital. Thus, they retained a relationship of dependency to their former colonial powers (MATTELART, 1994, p. 202), and their economies kept directing their infrastructure and logistics to the needs of their major clients – once more, the central powers of capital – frustrating the intended escape from the international division of labour as a less likely prospective. Just like the continuity of exports of raw materials kept railways, ports and roads heading the same ways as in the imperialist times, so did the information flows remain in North-South and South-North courses, and almost nothing on the South-South course.

It is never enough to remind that all the historical period of Cold War, de-colonisation and foundation of national news agencies in these countries happened between the 1940s and 1980s, before the revolution in information and communication technologies (ICTs), but the digitization and convergence expanded the role of news agencies, rather than contracting it (Paterson, 2005). After the end of the Cold War, like all industries of the economy in developing countries (especially the strategic ones), the state-led systems of public information suffered a strong setback with the rise of neoliberalism as an hegemonic ideology of governance. Back then,

international conferences and seminars abandoned the issue of the imbalance of news flows and turned eyes to the matter of editorial independence in the context of post-statism, as Shrivastava documented (2007, p. 164-167). In 1996, a meeting of the International Press Institute in Warsaw issued a statement demanding editorial independence for state-owned news agencies and restored the doctrine of “free-flow.” An identical statement was made the following year at the European Seminar on Independent and Pluralistic Media in Sofia, Bulgaria. In 2001, a workshop by UNESCO, “News Agencies in the Internet Age”, in Amman (with Boyd-Barrett as one of the leading consultants), drew attention to the frailty of the sector with the waves of privatization and deregulation.

At the same time, the ICT revolution broke out, triggering the processes of digitization, networking and convergence, in parallel with the cultural-political-economic phenomenon of globalization, which broadened the field of action of the news agencies. Today, by cutting costs with the digitization of their operations and reaching a much wider array of clients by networking the distribution of their content, agencies have much more presence than at the time of their creation.

But the phenomena of digitization and convergence, in parallel with the neoliberal wave (globalising, privatising and deregulating) far from relieving the North-South dependence and concentration, have deepened it in some scenarios, while they expanded influence and tightened ties with transnational capital in others. Among the news agencies from peripheral countries, a few were privatized (particularly in former socialist states), others deepened their dependence on global agencies by becoming merely echoers of foreign content, and eventually some went extinct due to lack of capacity or interest of states to keep them (especially in Africa).

Therefore, we can design four models derived from the paradigms adopted in different countries regarding their respective industries of news agencies, according to Table 1.

**Table 1: Models of national news agencies in developing countries**

Models	Features
Private Industrialised (liberal)	private national news agency, with market goals international or transnationally information export and import (from/to North and South) nominal free competition ( <i>de facto</i> monopoly/oligopoly)
Private Underdeveloped (colonial)	private national agency dependency on a global agency (of former colonial power) reproduction of transnational models free competition, but weak market
Statist	state-owned national agency information export and import (from/to North) monopoly on content delivery from global agency to domestic media
Hybrid (modernizing)	private or state-owned national agency (or formerly, privatised) information export and import (from/to North) reproduction of transnational models and market control

The neoliberal trend remained up until the second half of the 2000s, when the international financial crisis and the success of neodevelopmentalist experiences based on strengthening the state (mainly in Latin America but also in parts of Asia and Africa) have checkmated the privatised and deregulated model. Although they could not have foreseen this turnaround, governments in poor countries that overcame the neoliberal vague realized it and are now using news agencies to boost their new development strategies. For example, within the context of the “Turn to the Left” in Latin America, in the early 21st century, some interesting experiences came forth with news agencies newly-founded or reformed by the progressive governments elected in the region, such as in Venezuela (AVN, re-founded in 2005), Ecuador (Andes, founded in 2009) and Paraguay (IP Paraguay, in 2009).

In a second wave, some middle-income countries whose governments had resisted or reversed the neoliberal trend in time (whether democratic or authoritarian, with or without transfer of power) managed to develop greater immunity to the crisis and took off as “emerging powers” in the global hegemonic scenario. Among them, frequently featured are Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa, Mexico, and Turkey. Of these, the first five have formed a core institutional cooperation group called BRICS.

Although not exactly investing in new experiences as the aforementioned agencies in Latin America, the BRICS countries have different models of owning and operating their own national news agencies, which shall be described henceforth.

### **6.3 INDIA**

India has a model which was born in a similar way, and very early, but took a different course. The first agency established in the country was also a subsidiary of Reuters, even in 1905, but it developed in relative autonomy. The British agency already worked in India, then a British colony, since 1866, and four years later a submarine telegraph cable connected Mumbai to London. In 1910, same birth year of SAPA, Keshab Chandra Roy founded the Press Bureau, which soon defaulted. Asked by representatives from Reuters, Roy was convinced to create a new agency, named the Associated Press of India (API), and obtained an exclusive mandate to syndicate the services of the British agency and then consolidated it as the main Indian news agency.

India's independence in 1947 turned this dependency an inconvenient model, as the main distributor of news of the newly-born country was in practice subject to the agency of the same imperial power from which India had been freed. The solution was found in creating the Press Trust of India (PTI), also formed as a cooperative of Indian newspapers just 12 days after the proclamation of independence.

“The evolution of the concept of a national news agency was the direct consequence of the spirit of independence that swept the country since the days of the Quit India Movement. The desire to shake off the imperial domination in the field of news supply was at the heart of this evolving thought”.(GOENKA and SHRIVASTAVA, 2007, p. 45)

According to Shrivastava (2007, p. 45) the creation of PTI was both a business and political decision, to which forefathers of Indian independence like Jawaharlal Nehru and Sardar Patel intermediated negotiations with owners of newspapers, journalists and representatives of Reuters. The London-based agency tried to keep a monopoly in the country even after the British decision to grant independence, and was pressured to give it up both by the Labour government of Clement Attlee, by the first Indian

government (with a personal intervention by Patel), but mainly by the native press, which gathered in a consortium to form PTI. The new agency inherited the syndication contracts of API with the British agency (later cut off in 1952) and became the first national agency of independent India, to this day. According to the same author (idem, pp. 154-155), it was by order of Nehru himself that the distribution of foreign news to the Indian press was banned to foreign agencies (nominally Reuters) and left to domestic ones (then mostly PTI), setting the pattern for the Third World model of redistribution of content from global agencies through “partnership” arrangements with national agencies.

Today, the scenario is diversified, with thematic and regional agencies operating in conjunction with PTI, many of them founded in the years following independence: Hindustan Samachar (1948), Eastern India News Agency (1949), Near & Far East News (1952), Indian Press Agency (1957), Indian News and Features Alliance (1959) and United News of India (1961).

PTI is often in almost in all political and power circles regarded as the national agency of the India. By achieving this status agency has played its role in the socio-economic development of the nation by controlling the flow of the information. PTI has tradition of supporting goals of the state by giving or prioritize information. As a member of the NAM PTI prefers to circulate information of national importance. By doing this agency not only helps in highlighting the information related to development but also provides suggestions or option to the news subscribers to set their lead and framing of the news.

The role of PTI in socio-economic development of the nation can be summarized into the following ways-

1. The creation of PTI was both a business and political decision, to which forefathers of Indian independence like Jawaharlal Nehru and Sardar Patel intermediated negotiations with owners of newspapers, journalists and representatives of Reuters.
2. PTI has had a privileged role in the development of national and international communication systems

3. PTI was privileged by government of free India in its national development strategies.
4. The evolution of the concept of a national news agency was the direct consequence of the spirit of independence that swept the country since the days of the Quit India Movement
5. The strategic importance of news agency as ideal tools to distribute information under precarious infrastructural conditions in de-colonized countries is immense.
6. A national agency was the hand of the state closing and opening the gates of news as true gatekeepers, at a time when there were no available news aggregators nor online search tools for mapping, searching, or finding other sources of information.
7. By feeding the media, domestic and foreign, public or corporate, PTI has the potential of multiplying content for spreading information and discourses that may respond to the planning for national development.
8. In order to make themselves present toward the international public sphere and the imaginary of civil society – mainly among certain elites as “opinion leaders” – distributing news was a quick and relatively inexpensive tactic in this strategy and it motivated government to engage PTI in the dissemination of information of the national importance.
9. PTI got the role (both noble and questionable at the same time) to be representatives of the peoples who were struggling for national freedom – not just a political one, but also economical, technological, scientific and cultural.
10. PTI was perceived by the State as efficient tools to perform such “adequate flow of information,” taking into account some needs as mass diffusion of content, standardized and codified in different languages or in one single language
11. Thus, PTI was taken by government by performing both the role of *information exporters* (spreading news abroad about their country), and



*importers* (domestic distribution of foreign news), and only secondarily cared about circulating national news to the media of their own country

12. in India, thanks to the strategy of the lawful monopolies on subscribing and redistributing wires of foreign agencies, PTI kept the primary filter on what was happening and being said in the world – especially when concerning its own country.
13. PTI is often in almost in all political and power circles regarded as the national agency of the India.
14. Agency has played its role in the socio-economic development of the nation by controlling the flow of the information.
15. PTI has tradition of supporting goals of the state by giving or prioritize information.
16. As a member of the NAM PTI prefers to circulate information of national importance.
17. PTI provides suggestions or option to the news subscribers to set their lead and framing of the news.