BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg

PROPAGANDA AND INFORMATION POLICY IN WORLD WAR II: MECHANISMS, INSTITUTIONS, AND STRATEGIC OUTCOMES

Muhriddin Turakhonovich A'lokhanov
Lecturer at the National Pedagogical
University of Uzbekistan named after Nizami
muhriddin.history@gmail.com
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20422517

Abstract.
World War II represented an unprecedented convergence of industrial warfare and mass communication, transforming propaganda from a supplementary political tool into a central instrument of state power. This article examines the propaganda systems of the principal belligerent powers — Nazi Germany, the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union — through the analytical lens of institutional design, message construction, and audience targeting. Drawing on primary documentation and established historiography, the study argues that effective wartime propaganda was not merely the product of ideological conviction but of sophisticated bureaucratic organization, psychological insight, and technological deployment. The article further explores the intersections between information policy and military strategy, demonstrating that the management of public perception was treated by all major powers as operationally equivalent to battlefield preparation. Findings suggest that propaganda efficacy depended on the alignment between the message and the lived experience of the target audience, a condition that varied significantly across different national contexts.

Keywords: World War II, propaganda, information policy, psychological warfare, mass media, wartime communication

1. Introduction

The Second World War was the first truly total war in which the mobilization of civilian populations was considered as strategically essential as the deployment of armed forces. Governments on both sides of the conflict recognized early that sustaining the will to fight — among soldiers, industrial workers, and the general public — required systematic management of information and emotion. Propaganda, broadly defined as the deliberate shaping of attitudes and beliefs through selective communication, became a primary instrument of this management [1].

The scale and sophistication of World War II propaganda distinguished it sharply from its predecessor in the First World War. By the late 1930s, governments had access to mass-circulation newspapers, national radio broadcasting networks, and cinema as tools of mass persuasion. These technologies, combined with the administrative capacity of modern states, enabled the construction of elaborate information ecosystems in which every medium — from official communiqués to popular entertainment — could be aligned with strategic objectives [2].

This article is organized around four central questions. First, how did the major powers institutionalize their propaganda efforts, and what organizational models proved most effective? Second, what were the dominant ideological and psychological frameworks through which propaganda messages were constructed? Third, how did information policy interact with military and diplomatic strategy? Finally, to what extent did propaganda achieve its intended effects, and by what criteria might these effects be evaluated? The article proceeds through a comparative

examination of Nazi Germany, the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union, concluding with a synthetic assessment of the broader lessons that the wartime experience offers.

2. Theoretical and Methodological Framework

The study of wartime propaganda sits at the intersection of political communication, military history, and social psychology. The intellectual tradition relevant to this field begins with Harold Lasswell's foundational work on propaganda technique, which identified the core functions of wartime communication as the mobilization of hatred toward the enemy, the preservation of allied unity, the cultivation of friendly neutrals, and the demoralization of the opponent [3]. These four functions provide a useful analytical framework because they correspond to the distinct audiences — domestic, allied, neutral, and enemy — that all major belligerents were simultaneously attempting to influence.

More recent scholarship has added institutional and organizational dimensions to this framework. The work of Nicholas Cull on public diplomacy, David Welch on German propaganda, and Susan Brewer on American wartime communication has demonstrated that the organizational structures through which propaganda was produced and distributed were not secondary details but primary determinants of outcome [4]. Bureaucratic rivalries, competing institutional mandates, and the professional cultures of different agencies shaped the content of propaganda as profoundly as the ideological preferences of political leaders.

Methodologically, this article draws on the established historiographic record rather than original archival research. It prioritizes peer-reviewed scholarship and primary sources that have been subjected to rigorous scholarly evaluation, treating propaganda materials themselves — posters, radio scripts, film content — as primary sources whose form and content require interpretation within their original context.

3. Results

The propaganda system of the Third Reich was among the most elaborately institutionalized in the history of modern states. The Reich Ministry of Public Enlightenment and Propaganda, established on March 13, 1933, under the direction of Joseph Goebbels, represented an attempt to place the entire cultural and informational life of a nation under unified political direction [5]. The Ministry's jurisdiction extended across press, radio, film, theater, music, fine arts, and eventually architecture — domains that had previously existed in relative autonomy from the state.

The institutional architecture was reinforced by the Reich Chamber of Culture, also created in 1933, which organized all practitioners of cultural production into professional guilds membership in which was mandatory for anyone wishing to work in their field. Jews, political opponents, and others deemed ideologically unreliable were excluded from membership, effectively expelling them from cultural life. This system of negative control — determining who could not communicate — complemented the positive control exercised through the Ministry's direction of content.

Goebbels operated with considerable tactical flexibility within the strategic framework set by Hitler. He understood intuitively that propaganda that appeared too obviously as propaganda was self-defeating, and he consistently argued for the maintenance of some entertainment content and apparent diversity within the media landscape in order to preserve the credibility of the system as a whole. This tension between total ideological control and the need to preserve communicative credibility was a defining feature of Nazi information policy throughout the war.

Radio occupied a position of special importance in Nazi propaganda strategy. The Volksempfänger, a low-cost radio set introduced in 1933, was specifically designed to expand radio ownership among working-class Germans who could not afford existing sets. By 1939, Germany had one of the highest rates of radio ownership in the world, with approximately 70 percent of

households possessing a receiver [6]. This infrastructure enabled the regime to communicate directly with the German population, bypassing the mediating institutions of church, family, and community that had traditionally filtered political messages.

Film was employed with equal deliberateness. The German film industry produced not only overt propaganda films but also a substantial volume of entertainment features whose ideological content was more subtly encoded. Leni Riefenstahl's Triumph of the Will (1935) and Olympia (1938) represented the aesthetic apex of the regime's documentary ambitions, employing innovative cinematographic techniques to construct a visual mythology of National Socialist power. The emotional impact of these films derived not primarily from explicit argument but from the manipulation of scale, movement, music, and crowd psychology.

A distinct and morally singular dimension of Nazi propaganda was its systematic deployment of antisemitic content. From the earliest days of the regime, propaganda portrayed Jews as the source of Germany's national misfortunes and as an existential biological threat. Julius Streicher's newspaper Der Stürmer represented the most virulent expression of this tendency, but antisemitic imagery and argument permeated all media from children's books to feature films [7]. The relationship between this propaganda and the eventual implementation of the Holocaust remains a subject of scholarly debate, but it is clear that the regime regarded the systematic dehumanization of Jewish people as a necessary precondition for the public acceptance of increasingly extreme persecution.

The early months of the Ministry were marked by considerable organizational dysfunction. Successive ministerial appointments failed to establish effective coordination with the service departments, the Foreign Office, and the BBC, and the MOI became the object of considerable public and parliamentary criticism. The appointment of Brendan Bracken as Minister of Information in 1941 brought greater organizational coherence, though the fundamental tension between the Ministry's functions of domestic morale management and overseas propaganda remained incompletely resolved throughout the war.

The British Broadcasting Corporation occupied a uniquely important position in the Allied propaganda system. Established as a public broadcaster with a constitutional commitment to accuracy and impartiality, the BBC brought to wartime communication a reservoir of credibility that no purely governmental institution could have possessed. BBC World Service broadcasts in German, French, and dozens of other languages reached audiences across occupied Europe and provided an alternative to Axis-controlled media [8].

The BBC's insistence on reporting British military reverses as well as victories — notably the fall of Singapore in February 1942 — distinguished it from Axis broadcasters and established a reputation for reliability that made its positive reporting more persuasive. German listeners, aware that the BBC acknowledged setbacks, found it difficult to dismiss BBC accounts of German defeats as mere propaganda. This strategy of calculated honesty represented a sophisticated understanding of the long-term dynamics of credibility.

The most significant of these operations was the Gustav Siegfried Eins (GS1) station, which claimed to be a rogue German military broadcaster and delivered a mixture of genuine military information and demoralizing content to German audiences. The effectiveness of such operations was difficult to measure but their operational sophistication demonstrated the extent to which information warfare had become a recognized military discipline by the middle years of the conflict [9].

American entry into the war in December 1941 confronted the Roosevelt administration with the challenge of transforming a public that had substantial isolationist sentiment into a population

committed to a global military effort. The Office of War Information (OWI), established by executive order in June 1942, was the primary instrument of this transformation. Under the direction of journalist Elmer Davis, the OWI coordinated government communication across all media, establishing a policy that, like the British MOI, emphasized accurate information as the foundation of sustainable public support.

The OWI operated in a more complex political environment than its British counterpart. Congressional opposition to what critics characterized as New Deal propaganda limited the agency's domestic mandate, and the OWI was eventually restricted primarily to overseas operations. Domestically, the task of public persuasion was distributed across a wider range of institutional actors, including the War Advertising Council — later the Advertising Council — which mobilized the commercial advertising industry in support of wartime messaging [10].

Frank Capra's Why We Fight series, commissioned by the Army Chief of Staff General George C. Marshall, represented the most intellectually ambitious American attempt to explain the war's origins and purposes to a mass audience. Capra assembled documentary footage, animation, and expert commentary to construct a narrative of Axis aggression and democratic resistance that was distributed first to military personnel and subsequently to civilian audiences [11]. The series demonstrated that the documentary form could be employed for sustained ideological education rather than merely emotional manipulation.

American wartime propaganda faced a structural contradiction that its practitioners acknowledged only incompletely. The United States was waging a war ostensibly on behalf of freedom and democracy while maintaining a legally enforced system of racial segregation and interning approximately 120,000 Japanese Americans without due process. Nazi propagandists exploited these contradictions explicitly, broadcasting accounts of American racism to both domestic and international audiences.

The OWI was aware of this vulnerability and made some effort to include African American subjects in its promotional materials, producing images of Black soldiers and workers as contributors to the national effort. These efforts were, however, systematically undermined by the insistence of Southern congressmen on excluding content that might challenge the racial status quo. The result was a propaganda system that simultaneously mobilized African Americans for the war effort and denied the legitimacy of their claim to full democratic citizenship [12].

The Soviet propaganda system drew on organizational structures and ideological frameworks that predated the war, having been developed during the Bolshevik consolidation of power in the 1920s and the Stalinist industrialization drives of the 1930s. The Main Political Directorate of the Red Army coordinated political education within the military, while Agitprop — the Department of Agitation and Propaganda — managed the broader civilian information environment. These institutions gave the Soviet state capabilities for mass political mobilization that were in some respects more developed than those of any other belligerent.

The German invasion of June 1941 precipitated a significant shift in the content, though not the mechanisms, of Soviet propaganda. The ideological framework of international proletarian solidarity was rapidly supplemented by an appeal to Russian national identity, historical memory, and patriotic self-defense that drew on pre-revolutionary traditions the Bolsheviks had previously sought to suppress. Stalin's radio address to the Soviet people on July 3, 1941 — in which he addressed his listeners as "brothers and sisters" and invoked the memory of Russian resistance to Napoleon — signaled this fundamental reorientation [13].

The reframing of the conflict as the Great Patriotic War represented a sophisticated act of historical memory construction. By linking the struggle against Nazi Germany to the defense of the

Russian homeland against Napoleon's invasion in 1812, Soviet propaganda activated a reservoir of national sentiment that transcended ideological affiliation. The invocation of figures like Alexander Nevsky and Mikhail Kutuzov — tsarist military heroes who had previously been ideologically problematic — demonstrated the pragmatic flexibility with which the regime was prepared to manage its historical narrative.

Soviet propaganda also placed particular emphasis on the documentation and dissemination of German atrocities against Soviet civilians. The Extraordinary State Commission for the Investigation of German Fascist Crimes, established in November 1942, collected evidence of mass killings, forced labor, and the systematic destruction of Soviet cities and infrastructure. This material served both the domestic purpose of sustaining hatred of the enemy and the international purpose of building the case for the postwar accountability of the German state [14].

Soviet cultural policy during the war mobilized the artistic and literary establishment with a comprehensiveness that reflected both the tradition of socialist realism and the genuine patriotic commitment of many Soviet artists. The siege of Leningrad, which lasted from September 1941 to January 1944, became a particular focus of cultural production. Dmitri Shostakovich's Seventh Symphony, composed during the siege and broadcast from besieged Leningrad on August 9, 1942, was understood both domestically and internationally as an act of cultural defiance. The broadcast was carefully staged as a propaganda event, with the performance relayed to German lines as a demonstration of Soviet cultural vitality.

The question of whether and how much wartime propaganda achieved its intended effects is methodologically challenging. Public opinion data from wartime populations were collected inconsistently, and the causal attribution of attitude change to specific propaganda inputs is complicated by the simultaneous operation of direct experience, social interaction, and economic conditions as competing determinants of belief and behavior [15]. What can be assessed with greater confidence is the institutional capacity of different propaganda systems and the degree to which their messages were consistent with verifiable reality.

All major belligerents devoted significant resources to propaganda aimed at enemy forces. German psychological warfare operations against Allied forces evolved considerably over the course of the war. The broadcasts of Mildred Gillars — an American national known to Allied troops as "Axis Sally" — and the Japanese-American Iva Toguri — known as "Tokyo Rose" — were designed to undermine Allied morale through a mixture of entertainment, false military reports, and appeals to homesickness [16]. Contemporary evidence suggests that these broadcasts had limited effect on military effectiveness, though they were widely listened to for their entertainment content.

Allied leaflet campaigns against German forces were more systematically organized and better calibrated to exploit the specific anxieties of German soldiers. By 1944, the Allied Psychological Warfare Division was producing hundreds of millions of leaflets that were delivered by artillery shell and aircraft. These leaflets typically combined accurate military information about Allied advances with practical guidance on safe surrender procedures — a combination that addressed both the informational and behavioral dimensions of the desired response.

The competition for the sympathy and support of neutral nations — particularly the United States before December 1941, and subsequently Turkey, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland — represented a distinct front in the information war. British propaganda in the United States was carefully calibrated to appeal to American democratic values while avoiding the appearance of pressure or manipulation that had generated considerable resentment during the First World War.

The British Security Coordination, operating under the direction of William Stephenson from offices in New York, conducted covert influence operations in the United States designed to undermine isolationist sentiment and build support for American intervention. These operations included the placement of planted news stories, the financing of pro-intervention organizations, and the provision of intelligence to sympathetic journalists [17]. The ethical dimensions of a foreign government conducting covert influence operations in a neutral democratic state were acknowledged by the BSC's own participants, though they were deemed justified by the strategic stakes.

The relationship between propaganda and military operations extended beyond morale management to encompass systematic strategic deception. Operation Bodyguard, the Allied deception campaign designed to conceal the location and timing of the Normandy landings in June 1944, represented the most elaborately constructed strategic deception operation in the history of warfare. The campaign employed a range of informational tools — double agents, false radio traffic, fabricated unit designations, and carefully managed press coverage — to convince German commanders that the main Allied invasion would strike the Pas-de-Calais rather than Normandy.

The success of Operation Bodyguard demonstrated that information management could achieve effects of direct military significance. German forces that might have been deployed to reinforce the Normandy beaches were held in reserve awaiting an invasion that never came, contributing materially to the Allied breakout from the beachhead [18]. This operational integration of information management with kinetic military planning represented a conceptual development whose implications extended well beyond the specific circumstances of the Second World War.

The role of signals intelligence — particularly the Allied exploitation of German ENIGMA communications through the ULTRA program — in shaping information policy was significant but necessarily covert. The need to protect the ULTRA secret placed constraints on Allied propaganda, as the use of intelligence derived from decrypted German communications could only be acknowledged after the war. Propaganda claims that appeared to anticipate German military decisions with uncanny accuracy risked revealing the source of Allied intelligence, requiring propagandists to construct plausible alternative explanations for information whose true provenance could not be disclosed.

The Second World War's propaganda systems left multiple legacies that shaped subsequent developments in political communication, international law, and the theory of public diplomacy. The Nuremberg Trials explicitly addressed the criminal dimensions of Nazi propaganda, treating Julius Streicher's incitement to racial hatred as a crime against humanity — a precedent that contributed to the subsequent development of international norms against hate speech and incitement to genocide.

The institutional experience of wartime communication agencies also shaped postwar practice in significant ways. The Voice of America, established in 1942 as the overseas radio broadcasting service of the OWI, became a permanent fixture of American public diplomacy. The experience of the BBC World Service in maintaining credibility through accurate reporting in difficult circumstances was consciously emulated by subsequent international broadcasters. The propaganda experience of the war thus contributed directly to the development of public diplomacy as a recognized professional and academic discipline.

The Soviet case illustrated the pragmatic flexibility with which ideological frameworks could be adapted to serve immediate strategic needs, with the Stalinist state proving willing to subordinate Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy to Russian nationalist sentiment when the military situation required it. In all cases, the most effective propaganda was that which operated within the bounds

of the audience's verifiable experience, connecting strategic narratives to the lived realities of the populations it sought to influence.

The wartime experience established that in conditions of total war, information policy is not a supplement to military strategy but an integral component of it. This recognition, institutionalized in the postwar development of psychological operations capabilities, strategic communication doctrine, and public diplomacy as professional disciplines, represents perhaps the most durable legacy of the Second World War's propaganda systems.

References

1. Bernays, E. L. (1928). Propaganda. Horace Liveright.
2. Taylor, P. M. (1995). Munitions of the mind: A history of propaganda from the ancient world to the present era. Manchester University Press.
3. Lasswell, H. D. (1927). Propaganda technique in the World War. Knopf.
4. Brewer, S. A. (2009). Why America fights: Patriotism and war propaganda from the Philippines to Iraq. Oxford University Press.
5. Evans, R. J. (2005). The Third Reich in power, 1933–1939. Penguin Press.
6. Welch, D. (2002). The Third Reich: Politics and propaganda (2nd ed.). Routledge.
7. Bytwerk, R. L. (2001). Julius Streicher: Nazi editor of the notorious anti-Semitic newspaper Der Stürmer. Cooper Square Press.
8. Cull, N. J. (1995). Selling war: The British propaganda campaign against American neutrality in World War II. Oxford University Press.
9. Cruickshank, C. (1977). The fourth arm: Psychological warfare, 1938–1945. Davis-Poynter.
10. Winkler, A. M. (1978). The politics of propaganda: The Office of War Information, 1942–1945. Yale University Press.
11. Doherty, T. (1993). Projections of war: Hollywood, American culture, and World War II. Columbia University Press.
12. Washburn, P. S. (1986). A question of sedition: The federal government's investigation of the Black press during World War II. Oxford University Press.
13. Overy, R. (1997). Russia's war: A history of the Soviet effort, 1941–1945. Penguin Books.
14. Barber, J., & Harrison, M. (1991). The Soviet home front, 1941–1945: A social and economic history of the USSR in World War II. Longman.
15. Qualter, T. H. (1962). Propaganda and psychological warfare. Random House.
16. Shulman, H. C. (1990). The voice of America: Propaganda and democracy, 1941–1945. University of Wisconsin Press.
17. Stafford, D. (1997). Roosevelt and Churchill: Men of secrets. Overlook Press.
18. Howard, M. (1990). British intelligence in the Second World War: Vol. 5, Strategic deception. HMSO.