

The Role of Media in Directing Public Opinion During the Cold War

Mohammed YAICHI

Associate Professor, Department of Literature and English, University of Ahmed Draia, Algeria, yaichimed@univ-adrar.edu.dz

Received: 23/03/2026, **Accepted:** 12/06/2026, **Publication:** 30/06/2026

Abstract:

Propaganda can be defined as a systematic bias on the opinion to accept certain ideas or doctrines, mainly in the political or social field. It has some significant characteristics like the ideology, the means used, the events it uses, its real purpose and impact. This humble work aims at answering the question: How did the superpowers, USA and USSR use propaganda to their advantage in their struggle for hegemony in the Cold War? The primary interest is in both models and ideologies they wanted to export. Then it tries to find out how they made propaganda a science, for the United States, or an art, to the USSR. Finally, it will focus on various forms of propaganda, their goals and their impacts.

Keywords: Propaganda; Ideology; Opinion; Cold War; USA; USSR

INTRODUCTION

Propaganda is defined as a systematic bias on the opinion to accept certain ideas or doctrines, especially in the political or social field. It is characterized by the ideology, the means used, the events it uses, its real purpose and impact. How did the superpowers, USA and USSR use propaganda to their advantage in their struggle for hegemony in the Cold War? We are primarily interested in both models and ideologies they wanted to export. Then we try to find out how they made

propaganda a science, for the United States, or an art, to the USSR. Finally, we will focus on various forms of propaganda, their goals and their impacts.

In 1945, the American model was at its peak. Basking in the prestige acquired during the Second World War in the defense of freedom against dictatorships, it seduces all those for whom freedom is primarily based on the guarantee of rights and freedom of people. Proud to have the oldest written constitution in the world (1787), Americans flatter themselves have organized a strict separation of powers and to have been able to avoid despotism: it is the model of a democratic society. After the Second World War, the seduction offered by the United States is largely due to the abundance of goods they offer to the world. They assure for half of global output, hold three quarters of the world's gold stock and have considerable technological superiority in textiles (nylon), pharmaceuticals (antibiotics), aeronautics, IT and nuclear and efficiency of their organization commands admiration (Carruthers, 2011.)

I- Media in the Conflictual Contemporary World

Conflict is now an ever-present and prominent feature of the contemporary international order. Since the end of the Cold War, there have been innumerable violent confrontations leading to millions of deaths and displacing and traumatizing far greater numbers. Although it is impossible to measure the total human misery created by such conflict, some statistics are shocking in recent decades, for example, levels of child mortality, orphaning and disablement from armed conflict have reached unprecedented levels. The word "conflict" has also been used to describe an increasing number of situations that destabilize the ability of states to provide basic public order and even social services. Studies of major armed conflict such as those from the



Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPR) have identified dozens of such "major" armed conflicts since the end of the Cold War (defined as 1,000 battle-related deaths in a single year, and most of these conflicts have been intra-state in character). The nature of the harms of a prolonged period of violence has resulted in the collapse and morbidly fragile nature of many states: whereas the rule of law would be considered fragile in normal circumstances, law itself withers away when rule of law collapses, public infrastructures are destroyed or simply plundered, and huge populations are internally displaced. These dynamics radicalize poverty, create widespread human suffering, degrade the environment, displace populations en masse, and create almost impossible challenges for the international community.

(Mary Kaldor, *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*, 286)

1.1 Media Amplification, Historical Precedents and Policy Blind Spots

Despite the many episodes of violent conflict, very few have produced a lasting international reaction. Some claims, including the genocide in Rwanda and the wars associated with the break-up of Yugoslavia, produced contested discussions of the obligations of the international community and exposed severe divides within international organizations (such as the United Nations) that complicated operational engagement. These cases saw the media operating in a more damaging manner, in effect playing a constructive role to escalate and, worse still, shape violence. In the Rwandan case,

portions of the media mobilized genocidal rhetoric (with the horrifying example of Radio Mille Collines, which was directly implicated organizing, incitement); in the Yugoslavian case, sizeable portions of the media were (offensively) perpetuating virulent nationalism. The pattern is not purely contemporary; totalitarian governments in the twentieth century, such as in Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union, used mass communications to manufacture and assert dominant narratives that supplied the means necessary to govern politically. In the end, after the inherency of the media is considered, it is rather baffling that policymakers have been so slow to recognize both the vast scale of the impact of the media on violent conflict.

I.2 Limits of Explanation: Understanding Internal Conflict Triggers

Even though democratic states are paying closer attention to states fragility and alienation, and to threats to human security from internal conflicts and corresponding transnational risks including criminality, terrorism, epidemic disease and others, there remains little consensus about the proximate indicators of internal violence. Inter-state wars have long been theorized in geographical terms- that is wars as resource competition or territorial disputes. But when it comes to internal conflict, we still know very little to share in terms of scholarly explanation. The processes by which the conditions of latent instability, social tension or ethnic and social friction suddenly become organised violence remain largely uncharted and poorly understood.



I.3 Selective Coverage and the Geopolitics of News Worthiness

One partial reason for this limited understanding is that media coverage of international conflicts is uneven, due in large part to political salience determining the reactions of governments and controlling editorial priorities. The political reasons of powerful states determine which crises receive the most diplomatic energy, and these political choices affect media coverage. Moreover, the editorial decisions made by the media regarding how to allocate its attention can serve to shape any response by the international community itself. You will note, as I suggested above, that the majority of international reporting is conducted for domestic media outlets, with perhaps the only exception being when we consider international news organisations, and then we are probably only looking at the largest global media outlets that still only primarily have audiences in North America and Europe. (Aronson, J. 1990.) Editors want to find points of identification for their public, so they would take that role very seriously, and the best way to go about this would be to find something that is personally identifiable or easily understandable and then humanise that and grab attention. With this in mind we must note that a number of wars gain global notoriety through extended coverage in the media and will appear more prominent to the world, while others only receive sporadic mention or become almost invisible. There have been countless conflicts in Africa, namely in the Democratic Republic of Congo since 1997, Angola with its renewed civil violence, and interconnected wars

in Sierra Leone, Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea, and Liberia, and the loss of life runs into millions. With respect to these wars the rest of the world pays little attention, sometimes only for a moment. Similar questions arise for the wars suffered in the North and South Caucasus that have caused hundreds of thousands of deaths, all to little or no public or government attention internationally compared even to the number of fatalities in more prominent reported cases such as the second Intifada. (Baran, S. J., and D. K. Davis. 2009.)

I.4 From Episodic Violence to Institutionalised War Economies

Conflicts themselves are hardly amenable to typology in the easy manner. Traditional models of war deal with wars between states, viewed as fixed entities that exhibit beginnings and endings in substantial and strategic terms: a rupture, an intervened phase characterised by organised violence or warfare, and a negotiated or externally imposed outcome. Most of contemporary conflict, particularly intra-state and inter-state conflict, rarely adheres to this clear linear trajectory. Violence may strike and subside unexpectedly, only later to reassert itself at times and in places that seem disconnected from its previous incarnation; often so-called peacekeepers may intervene in a context of larger-scale violence without actually generating the conditions for peace or fully eliminating the possibility of further fighting in any way meaningfully; or for the definitional term 'war' at least. The continuation of violence, behind each event or episodic explosion of violence, has led many to assert the emergence of "institutionalised war economies", self-sustaining systems, where peace and war literally blur together and vested interests, sometimes including



parts of the state, are committed to a continued state of instability. Typical features of these prolonged, self-sustaining conflict cases include:

- Violence is committed by paramilitary groups and non-state actors, either solely or in conflict with state forces (sometimes state forces also “appear” as paramilitaries for purposes of looting etc);
- Conflict is sustained by an informal war economy based on looting, hostage taking, protection rackets, smuggling, seizure of primary commodities – coltan⁴, timber, diamonds, oil and so forth;
- Terror and destabilisation is a predominant tactic, attacks on civilians become the military strategy, and gross and mass violations of human rights are common;
- State authority is weak, collapsed or failing; organised crime and terrorist networks flourish; and there aren’t stable or enduring political institutions
- Media is under physical threat or mobilised for partisan purposes; all media are vulnerable but local media more so; conditions for a stable media environment (rule of law, legal structures, etc) probably do not exist;
- Conflict areas are characterised by human insecurity; violence can erupt or die down rapidly, but threats of violence/ intimidation may be ever present and the “pre/during/post conflict” typology does not apply.

Instead violence flows in different waves of intensity and can disappear or re-appear dramatically.(**International Media Support, 2006**)

I.5 Characteristics of Institutionalised War Economies

State and non-state actors, often acting in parallel or in conjunction with one another, are involved on a massive scale, carrying out acts of violence as agents of the state for coercive or looting purposes; additionally, paramilitary organizations have been involved in violence to varying degrees. There remains an informal war economy of looting, hostage taking, extortion, smuggling, or seizing or trafficking with respect to primary commodities, including but not limited to minerals coltan, timber, diamonds, and oil. The use of targeted acts of terror and destabilization is intentional, targeting civilians for strategy and systematic large-scale human rights abuses taking place in public view. There is also a general absence of an effective state authority, organized criminal groups and terrorist groups are thriving, and durable political institutions are absent. The co-opting or targeting of media, and danger allows for media realization without responsibility for their actions, specifically as it pertains to violence and human rights abuses. Journalists and media outlets are subject to physical threats and mobilization to serve partisan purposes; local media are most at risk, and the structural conditions present for a pluralistically news and media environment, including rule of law and other functioning legal conditions, are often absent. The fluidity of temporal patterns of violence, which makes the framing of a pre, during, and post conflict scenario irrelevant in which cycles of intense violence



alternate with periods of lower intensity but with the persistent threat of violent escalation. (**The Guardian 11 July 1996**)

I.6 Implications for Peacebuilding and Media Strategy

This diagnostic framing has important practice implications for peacebuilding. It is important to deal with the behaviour of combatants, but if we put all of our efforts simply onto this challenge we are in danger of achieving no more than a cessation of violence instead of a long-term, sustainable peace. In other words, any strategy must also include a way to identify and challenge the economic, social, and political frameworks that sustain conflict. Equally important, effective strategies must acknowledge the media as an organic part of belligerents' strategies; it can be leveraged for intimidation, fear, mobilising supporters or finding international sympathy. Controlling local state communications is a consistent aim of conflict parties, therefore ensuring support for the development of independent, pluralistic media must be a main concern for peacemakers. (**Bastiansen, H. G., and R. Werenskjold. 2015.**)

I.7 Policy Security by Media Coverage: A Kurdish Case and Sovereignty Debate

One of the most significant events in the relationship and interdependence of media coverage and international policy occurred after the 1991 Gulf War. After the war, Kurdish uprisings in northern Iraq prompted horrific retribution from Saddam Hussein's regime; once large numbers of Kurdish refugees fled the country, the international media showed horrific images of the refugee flow that resulted in NGO

action and public outrage. Western governments that had led the coalition to expel Iraq from Kuwait did not initially intervene any further in Iraq's internal affairs, choosing to regard the displacement of Kurds simply an internal matter and a problem for the Turkish neighbour. It must also be noted that there was no clear legal basis for intervention due to Westphalian principles on sovereignty. However, influx media exposure, and the internal political pressure it generates, led to a policy reversal; states intervened directly to protect the Kurdish population, imposed no-fly zones for Iraqi air power in the region, and contributed to the establishment of considerable autonomy for Northern Iraq. (2 Media conflict prevention and reconstruction UNESCO June 2004)

I.8 Media, Moral Pressure and the Ethics of Intervention

This incident has informed a much broader and longer discussion about the limitations of state sovereignty, and when (if at all) external entities ought to intervene to protect populations from grievous human rights violations. Although strategic and geopolitical interests will influence interventionist decisions - as indicated in the Iraq case itself - the scope of an international media 'event' can play a role in establishing the moral and political rationale for intervention. Conversely, in instances where media are mainly absent (as the case in Rwanda) state governments have sometimes ineffectively resisted intervention notwithstanding the characteristics of the violations. Thus, the role of the international media raises questions about journalistic responsibility and ethical quandaries that journalists face as bystanders to egregious atrocities. (Belmonte, Laura A. 2010.)



I.9 Journalistic "attachment" and its Consequences in Bosnia

Discussions around such responsibilities intensified during the conflict in Bosnia, where many journalists found the conventions of distanced objectivity challenged by extreme human distress. Some correspondents felt that it would be irresponsible to remain impartial observers; indeed, the moral burden of the abhorrent acts that their international media witnessed prompted to adopt more activist positions. Christiane Amanpour, a CNN correspondent, called Bosnia “a war of our generation,” and she compared its moral weight especially to that of the Vietnam War for previous generations. The UK’s Independent Television News (ITN) reporting of detention camps like Omarska and Trnopolje, played a part in generating support for UN Resolution 770 and humanitarian interventions. Similarly, the reporting of the Sarajevo market mortar strike in February 1994 contributed to NATO ultimatum designed to stop bombardment. ‘Attachment’ journalists such as Martin Bell spoke about it in the recognition that in some contexts journalists become a bit more than record keepers, and participants in the political field surrounding the violence. (Villa, Dana R. 1992)

I.10 Uneven Coverage, Local Resentment and Editorial Constraints

International media involvement can simultaneously hinder peacemaking in a variety of ways. Editorial decisions, coverage inconsistencies, and the blanket use of terms like violence can create

feelings of resentment among populations which may produce conspiracy theories or distrust about the motives behind international media. Communities quickly learn how ephemeral media can be and notice when they are intensely visible one day and entirely hidden the next. This hardness can degrade trust and lead local actors to become jaded or suspicious towards international attention and motivations. Editors have needs too and this acknowledges the very real need of editors to find different ways to cater to and attract their domestic audiences which can result in the unintended consequences on the ground that contribute toward local conceptions of exploitation or misrepresentation. (Bernhard, N. E. 1999.)

I.11 Local Broadcasting as a Catalyst for Communal Division

The violence that unfolded during Yugoslavia's dissolution highlighted the ability of local media to create and fuel division. Mark Thompson's landmark book, *Forging War*, provides evidence of how local media enabled extreme nationalism and enabled public mobilization to take place behind divisive objectives that turned neighbours into enemies. The Yugoslav example illustrates that wars do not need to be an inevitable outcome of political friction, but rather that media campaigns can actively cultivate the social ground for violent conflict by polarising identity narratives and engaging users to accept that violent exclusion is legitimate. The auctioning of media competition between rival outlets became an arena of political contestation that predated the violence to come. Their national leaders seized the state media and extended the policy of nationalism to the media, but resistant media would be marginal and coerced. What



emerged produced a media environment where part of the struggle for the hearts and minds of the public through propaganda, selective reporting, and emotional narratives was as important as territorial contest. (Caute, D. 1978.)

I.12 State Media, Sectarian Rhetoric and Regional Polarization

Similar situations have been noted elsewhere. In Zimbabwe, state media function as tools of state, berating opposition actors to the point of anonymity while simultaneously advancing increasingly conspiratorial, and downright dangerous, allegations. Independent print outlets that resist the assumptions of state media are much smaller and operate in the face of intimidation. In the Middle East, incendiary language on both sides of the Israeli–Palestinian divide has heightened tensions; extremist commentators and player in state outlets across the broader region often resort to dehumanising tropes and conspiratorial allegations that normalize avoiding political compromise altogether. Inflammatory rhetoric churned out by extremist Israeli and Arab media commentators after violent incidents has generated hawkish public sentiment from everyday people thereby consuming the voice of moderate opinion. (The East Timor experience Salvador J XimenesSoares; IMS conference November 2004)

I.13 Toward Constructive Reporting: Peace Journalism and its Critics

Acknowledging the media's potential for exacerbating violence has led to questions around how journalism may be useful in understanding how it can contribute positively in working towards

conflict prevention and peacebuilding. This has raised some very contentious issues: should journalism take a stance of objective reporting, or is it a legitimate part of journalism to adopt a more interventionist "peace journalism" that actively seeks to consider how to reduce opportunities for violence? Proponents of and critical peace journalism argue that reporting can be framed to highlight common interests, to humanise both sides of the issue, and contextualise acts of violence in relation to longer historical and structural patterns to help to create space, reduce polarisation and include negotiation. Critics of peace journalism counter that this 'social responsibility' risks professional integrity, journalist access to belligerents and place journalists in the position of being protected targets. (Reporting for change: a handbook for local journalists in crisis areas IWPR 2004) They highlight the risks of a 'slippery slope' towards ideological commitment, congruent to propaganda.

I.14 Media as Public Sphere and Political Agent

A complicating aspect of this controversy is the contradictory nature of media, where it is both a creator of information, structure, and an actor with interests and effects i.e. agency. In reporting on conflicts journalists are passing along perspectives and grievances of different actors, and yet at the same time editorial choices, framing and institutional factors assist in supporting which voices are represented and which are marginalised. To treat the media as a simple instrument of policy is therefore not useful. Any policy which hopes to influence media behaviour in conflict must acknowledge that media are both part of the public sphere blurring the lines between the channels for citizen



debate and they create the terms of that debate. (**Plato, Alexander von. 2015.**)

I.15 Policy Initiatives and International Engagement in Media Reform

As we entered the late twentieth century, the mass media—as this referred to all formats of broadcasting, print, cinema and now, even digital and mobile—had positioned itself at the centre of the public societies. The media ecology of the early twenty-first century poses challenges for the types of intervention the international community can make: it must balance the realities of mass communication technology and institutions while advocating for a media environment that will facilitate peace. Various organizations and new initiatives have arisen to develop principled approaches for dealing with media in conflict (and post-conflict) situations. One example is a roundtable on conflict reporting convened in Copenhagen, sponsored by the International Media Support (IMS) in October, 2003. (**Cull, Nicholas J. 2008.**)

To encourage a dialogue about how conflict reporting shapes warfare, the conference explored how reporting might be enhanced to improve reporting in conflict situations. The conference addressed the distinction between "peace journalism" and "conflict sensitive journalism," while also exploring how journalists' professional obligations to excluded stakeholders should be reframed in order to avoid treating a framing contest as a zero-sum competition, to disaggregate competing interests or to avoid the contest when journalists can humanize the actors on both sides as appropriate.

I.16 Capacity-building, Content Support and Practical Interventions

Training and capacity-building are widely used policy levers. Organisations like the BBC World Service Trust and the Institute for War & Peace Reporting (IWPR) aim to develop the professional skillset to produce accurate information under duress and basic humanitarian reporting. Some initiatives specifically create peace-related terms of engagement where there is awareness to report on reconciliation projects or to create stories that mitigate stereotyping and demonization. For example, the Canadian Institute for Media Policy and Civil Society (IMPACS) recently developed its peace work with a range of possible peace interventions including training and fast-news and fictional narratives that demonstrate models of peaceful resolution. (Cull, Nicholas J. 2008.) Journalists and conflict resolution practitioners have acknowledged practical similarities in their work and role. Both try to offer voice to combatants and civilian casualties, to assess motives and results, to summarize conflictual episodes, and to provide information that may help clarify the landscape for the parties in a negotiation. If professional journalists are careful, accurate, and contextual, the role they play contributes to conflict mitigation in the world, even if the journalist may not be overtly encouraging advocacy on their part.

I.17 Regulatory Models and Hybrid Approaches to Media Governance

Ultimately, there are ongoing tensions between different models of media governance. Some believe that an unregulated, market-driven media environment (the model that aligns with the United States) is the



best way to organize democratic exchange and human rights. Others assert that regulatory frameworks (the more European style) are required in order to create a media environment that promotes reconciliation and social cohesion. Recent experiences such as the media reforms in Iraq suggest that there are also hybrid approaches that have defined liberal freedoms, while also incorporating regulatory components that create pluralism, while eliminating hate speech and incitement to violence or hatred against vulnerable communities.

II- The USA and the USSR, Two Different Agendas

After the war the Americans fascinated by their lifestyle because of ease and comfort (household appliances, automobile ..): the American way of life. Moreover, embodying liberal democracy, the United States is also the land of capitalism election, the country where the business succeed and make a profit is an end in itself for everyone. Here, freedom of enterprise is considered one of the fundamental freedoms allow bold to both their wealth and consumer happiness. The state should only enforce free competition by preventing monopolies.

By the decisive role it played in the struggle against fascism, the Soviet Union embodies the aftermath of the Second World War, the hope of all those who dream of a new world. In European eyes, the destruction of Nazism is blamed on the edge of the Red Army whose flag over the Reichstag in Berlin on May 2, 1945. To these people, the USSR offers the image. For those who just suffered unemployment of the 30s and the privations of the war, the communist propaganda highlights the social advances that the USSR grants to its citizens: free education and medicine, abundance sports and cultural facilities, early retirement and the lack of unemployment that enables the smooth implementation of the Five Year Plans (**Bernhard, 1999.**)

The arguments put forward by the patriarch of discipline, Wilbur Schramm, put into perspective this minimalist dimension of communication sciences. The Schramm system (such as Leo Strauss) based on antagonism "good guys / bad guys" (the good and the bad). This moral principle (communism symbolized Evil and the US Good) is shared by most intellectuals and scholars working alongside the US government against the expansion of the Soviet Union. In this Manichean struggle neutralism necessarily appears as evidence of treachery. More than convince supporters of communism, the intellectual struggle is to rally the neutral. Daniel Lerner, in an article published by POQ (Public Opinion Quarterly (POQ), the official journal of the supporters of "psychological warfare"), examines the different aspects of neutralism and develops a kind of portrait in this category (**Mikkonen, 2010**).

To the question how do you recognize a neutral, the author responds: "[For a neutral] to choose between the United States and the USSR does not coincide with the choice between freedom and enslavement." There are several symbols of neutralism: "Peace, security, relaxation of international relations." This explains the US offensive policy toward the USSR, although this policy does not result in a direct confrontation (Azar, E.)

Although the constitution, theoretically, gives all power to the people who, by universal suffrage, elects the Supreme Soviet, power is actually exercised by the Communist Party which is defined as "the force that guides and directs Soviet society." In 1945, nearly 6 million members. At its head, the Secretary General is the absolute master of the country. Stalin also knows that he enjoys the blind sympathy of Western countries communists. In December 1949, his seventieth birthday (celebrated by the Communist world in the Bolshoi Theatre in Moscow) is also the "great guide" and the "great mechanic in the history of locomotive" admiring testimonials from the world whole (**Chisem, 2012**).

The Soviet model is an ideological model under construction. His reference ideology is Marxism-Leninism, which is based on the



principle of class struggle and a dialectical materialism (all human actions, individual and collective, are governed by the material conditions of production). Hence the distinction between "formal freedoms" (or "bourgeois" as the freedoms of expression, opinion, assembly) and 'real freedoms "(which exist only in a system from which are banned private ownership of the means of production and capitalism).

The "dictatorship of the proletariat", which should lead to the construction of a "new world" and a "new man" is thus based on a single party ("vanguard of the proletariat") to "guide" the masses their evolution, and eliminate opponents. An obsession of the plan is to frame the individual in all areas of his life: individualism is condemned as contrary to the communist state, which results in the economic field, the abolition of private property and by collectivization of means of production. The production equipment is confiscated by the State must "plan" directions of economic development (**Chisem, 2012**).

Therefore, the USSR was as the host of "real freedom" and "real democracy" camp against the "bourgeois freedoms" and a model of democracy obsolete. Symmetrically American propaganda, Soviet propaganda offers a Manichean world where Good, freedom and peace are the attributes of the USSR as the Evil, imperialism and war are those in the United States, and incidentally their allies.

It is in this sense that one can read the act of creation of the Information Bureau: "Two camps have formed around the world: firstly the imperialist and anti-democratic camp. And secondly, the anti-imperialist and democratic camp, whose main purpose is to undermine imperialism, to strengthen democracy and to liquidate the remnants of fascism. "The socialist propaganda vehicle, as well as state-Stator, hatred of "neutral", and pushes the suspicion towards all those who are not party enthusiasts solid. The principle behind this propaganda is not however to rally the neutral, but to denounce and intern them in gulags and psychiatric hospitals; short, neutralized by fear and repression of any opposition inclination as neutrality, inside the country. Outside the

country, the speech is the members of the various communist parties, to push them to take power in their country to rally governments in Moscow and increase its sphere of influence. The speech includes "neutral" foreign countries, they need to convince them to join the communist cause.

II.1 The Presidents Harry Truman and Dwight Eisenhower Propaganda Strategy

With their experience of the Second World War and, as regards the USSR, dictatorship, are the two major propaganda science for the United States, an art for the USSR. For this, the United States institutionalize the propaganda apparatus. Indeed, this is what the Presidents Harry Truman and Dwight Eisenhower after 1945 with propaganda agencies set up during the Second World War. They assign as their new mission to fight the Soviet Union and its satellites popular republics. The general strategy developed by Truman and his advisers, called "containment", is to block the spread of communism in particular efforts to control national liberation movements that could bring to power pro-Soviet leaders. This ambitious project requires the collaboration of experts capable of providing geographical, economic, cultural, psychological and sociological exploited by the military and the secret services. In this context, some experts of "science" of behavior, some of which have already been requested against the Third Reich, are enlisted in the new propaganda services of the Cold War.

From November 1945, General John Magruder proposed entrusting the military secret service of an ambitious propaganda project "in peace" based on the contribution of the humanities. But his initiative is not enough to convince Truman who decided to dismantle the OSS (Office of Strategic Services, secret intelligence service and external action, set up during World War II, who used social science scholars as Herbert Marcuse or Margaret Mead) led by "Wild Bill" Donovan, Roosevelt protected. By the same logic, the War Information Bureau (OWI: The Office of War Information directed by Elmer

Davis), accused of having favored the reelection of Roosevelt in 1944, is dissolved. In January 1946, Truman moved the Central Intelligence Group (CIG) which became the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) a few weeks later. The unmentionable operations - "propaganda, economic warfare, preventive direct action, sabotage, anti-sabotage, demolition, subversion against hostile States, assistance to clandestine liberation movements, guerrilla support indigenous groups fighting enemies Free World ..." assigned to the OPC (Office of Policy Coordination, structure operating the stay-behind, US network interference), led by former OSS, Frank Wisner. In theory, the fund depends on the CIA; in practice Wisner, weakly supervised by George Kennan, has a significant freedom of action. A significant part of operations "psychological warfare" is supported by the UCI. Wisner recruited in this part of scientists to collect data, convert "neutral" intellectuals and of course develop the Atlanticist propaganda.

However, the US does not stop there. The agreement between a fraction of academics and the Army allows the emergence of a new science conceived as an instrument for the secret services. The communication sciences and the paradigm of "mass communication", financed by the appropriations for the Air Force, Navy, CIA, State Department, provide many useful elements to develop a effective propaganda intended to cross the iron Curtain by different channels (leaflets, radio ...). The field of study of discipline is wide: persuasion techniques, measures of opinion, interviews, political and military mobilization, propagation of ideology.

To meet the demand for science, several centers are funded: The Bureau of Applied Social research (BASR) of Paul Lazarsfeld, based in Columbia University, the Institute for International Social Research (RSSI) of Hadley Cantril, the Center for International Studies (CENIS) of Ithiel de Sola Pool (Massachusetts Institute of technology) with funds distributed by the Ford Foundation actually come from the CIA, the Office of Social Science Research (BSSR) directly financed by the

CIA that wants to improve the interrogation techniques. Torture is thus conceived as a research field of social sciences (**Slaughter, 2012**).

II.2 The USSR Propaganda Strategy

In the USSR propaganda is organized differently. However, it is institutionalized by the creation of the Cominform, Communist Information Bureau which brings together leading European communist parties in 1947. It is a real oversight body and propaganda. Unlike the US, which concentrate on their soil the propaganda apparatus, and seek to reach people through various media and governments by making allies, the Soviet Union delegates some propaganda for parties European communist under its control. Their action is not insignificant, particularly in France. The Stockholm Appeal to ban nuclear weapons from a wide peace movement led by Communist activists around the world between 1948 and 1952 (**Bernhard, 1999**). It was probably to promote peace and international image of the Communist and may be to weaken the Atlantic camp by depriving it of nuclear weapons. What is certain, and visible on the posters is that the appeal was based on the horror of the Second World War, among others on the death camps, to create sympathy for the Communist power.

The Information Bureau, like the CIA, adopts secret services that provide information on the developments of the enemy as well as on how to set up the most effective propaganda. However, more than a science, the USSR made propaganda art: witness their posters and leaflets, remarkably well. We must not forget that under the Stalinist dictatorship, in matters of art socialist realism was appropriate, that is to say an art representing the most likely way a socialist idealized reality. The personality cult of Stalin also played a big role in propaganda. For example, when he celebrated his seventieth birthday the gigantic Bolshoi Theatre in Moscow, accompanied by representatives of the entire communist world on 21 December 1949.

Beyond an institutionalization and internal propaganda system, the United States and the USSR put in place systems of alliances to



ensure their influence in the world and to show power. This is the principle of pactomania the beginning of the Cold War. The United States created a few years: the Marshall Plan June 5, 1947, which involved an addiction and some obedience on the part of those who accept (the USSR, which has banned its satellites, it does is not wrong), the Charter of the OAS in 1948 (with the United States of America), NATO in 1949 (with Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, the Netherlands, Portugal, the UK, Turkey and Greece in 1953 and Germany in 1955), the ANZUS in 1951 (with Australia and New Zealand) and SEATO in 1954 (with Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, Pakistan, France and the United Kingdom). In addition, in June 1948, three American, British and French zones in Germany merge to create the Deutschmark. Stalin, who sees this merger as an assault causes the Berlin blockade, which lasted nearly a year. In this area as with US allies, the economy is reshaped to look like the American model.

The USSR is no exception regarding the pacts. After the Marshall Plan, it creates the Cominform. Then, the "Prague coup" in March 1948 made Czechoslovakia a popular democracy. In January 1949 it sets up Comecon (Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, which distributed the production of goods between the various satellites of the USSR, these countries must then send their products to Moscow that the reallocated). In 1949, she created the COCOM committee to establish the lists of prohibited goods for export to the East. Finally, on 14 May 1955 it set up the Warsaw Treaty with Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania, Albania, Poland and the GDR. The USSR reorganizes these countries at will and strength, on the model of the Communist regime. The USSR also obtains supports Mao Zedong from 1950 to 1958 and that of Fidel Castro. Both politicians adopt a communist regime, one in China and one in Chile.

On the US side as the Soviet side, this alliance system fed propaganda that aims to affirm the power of a model and harass the enemy. One way closer to such propaganda as we know, the leaders of

both countries seek to export their ideas through speeches like that of Truman (speech containment) and that of Zhdanov, who oppose. In 1959, Khrushchev made an official visit to the United States. He is convinced that the communist model is gaining ground in the world, "Your grandchildren will live under communism," he says US viewers. In *My Life* chairman, book published in 1965, Johnson justifies the American involvement in Vietnam.

II.3 The White Propaganda

The white propaganda is, according to the U.S. Army, the "open" propaganda, the one we think first when we think of propaganda. The United States, a country where the press is considered the fourth power, are much used this "psychological weapon." Troy project, clear example of the ways was acquiring the government in terms of white propaganda is to mobilize researchers to define the various means available to spread the "Truth" (the US propaganda) behind the Iron Curtain. Scientists at the Troy project produced a report in which they state that VOA will not be enough to break through the Iron Curtain.

Faced with this failure, they advocate other means. Initially, the Troy project should focus on broadcasting and dropping leaflets by balloon. Exceeding the objectives set by their sponsors - Air Force, Navy and probably CIA -, experts propose other channels for borrowing by the "white" propaganda: university exchanges, publication of books ... and note that the information can spread by mail, through professional journals and other commercial and industrial publications. This study is also accompanied by very specific policy recommendations. In fact, the first major collaboration foreshadows other similar operations.

Specifically, the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the USSR, which collapses under the weight of its internal contradictions, are presented by the US as a final victory of the Western model.

The purpose of the white propaganda during the Cold War to promote the ideology of each camp, to build consensus around a model, to accept a policy like that, ruinous, the arms race, and silence social issues. The international point of view, the white propaganda is a



rallying tool around a common enemy clearly designated as evil, creating a solid block able to face this enemy. This propaganda works because during the first period of the cold war, the hardest, the social consensus is particularly strong in the USSR and the United States, where he remains despite the measures against McCarthyism and freedom of opinion (as registration of communists with the state and the right of the lock in case of threat of attack on the USSR) that ultimately threaten the very foundations of democracy. Today, historians are inclined to interpret in terms of facade of coalition, fragile, from a population that basically would be less adhered to government policy than she let on.

II.4 The Grey Propaganda

Some operations are located at the boundary between the white propaganda, official somehow, and black propaganda, underground, using more reprehensible means, such as torture. An example of gray propaganda is Project Camelot, which consists, in the 60s, to model the process of national revolutions in Third World countries to guide against insurgency operations. Camelot perfectly illustrates the intensification of relations between the behavioral states and the secret services. Launched in 1963, the project aimed at facilitating interventions in Yemen, Cuba and the Belgian Congo, in theory should allow to anticipate and prevent risks of revolutions. It is a propaganda of influencing another country that could eventually switch to communism, if necessary by intervening, it is not totally white propaganda. But this propaganda does not use means like the guerrillas, although nothing is sure regarding the interrogation and torture of indigenous people, technology sometimes used by American propaganda centers at that time. So we cannot really describe it as black propaganda (Carruthers, 2011).

The purpose of the gray propaganda is difficult to define. It must be somewhere between the objectives of the white and black propaganda. Perhaps we can set it as the rallying other countries

through the study of their population and the adaptation of its propaganda to be received with military intervention if necessary.

II.5 The Black Propaganda

The "black" propaganda seems to be a form of underground and violent propaganda; it is that which causes terror. From the Korean War, the BSSR, the main research center of propaganda "black", is responsible for various studies commissioned by the army. These include determining the "targets and vulnerabilities" of the people of Eastern Europe, taking care to define different "aspects of psychological violence". Specifically, the BSSR produced reports on the effects of traditional interrogation techniques of prisoners - electric shocks, beatings, drugs ... These studies funded by the CIA (50% of the total budget of the center) and allow the collection of data, including about Vietnamese and African populations, with the explicit purpose of making more efficient torture. Founded in Taiwan by Chiang Kai-shek, Rev. Moon and Nazi war criminals and Japanese, the World Anti-Communist League (WACL) was first used by Nixon to extend the methods of against insurgency in South Asia -Is and Latin America. Seven heads of state then participating in its work. She had a new vitality under Reagan becoming a joint instrument of the military-industrial complex USA and the CIA in the Cold War (Allen, T. & Seaton, J.) It was then in charge of political assassinations and training-against guerrillas in all conflict zones, including Afghanistan, where it was represented by Osama bin Laden.

The severity can be considered the repression of opinion as a "black" propaganda. In the United States, Senator McCarthy launched a violent anti-communist campaign. Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, accused of espionage in favor of the USSR, were executed in 1953, despite international pressure for them. In the USSR, the repression is not less, on the contrary, all those suspected of opposition to the regime even neutralism, at least during the Stalin period, were interned in the Gulag or in psychiatric hospitals (.)

The purpose of black propaganda is to create terror among the enemy, more broadly among those whose opinion drift too consensus around a two models, using imprisonment, sentencing or execution, as well as torture made more effective by the study on guinea pigs.

CONCLUSION

Whether in the USSR or the USA, the strength of propaganda varies depending on ages. She is very strong during the actual cold war, until the death of Stalin. It is less under Khrushchev: relaxation translates in political terms from 1953 through the end of the "Great Terror" and criticism of the "violations of socialist legality" (the police chief, Beria was arrested, the Minister of Justice takes back the Gulag). And especially in the XX Congress of the secret report submitted to delegations of foreign PC and the US government (but not made official in the USSR), Khrushchev denounced the "mistakes and crimes" of Stalin, which he attributes to two phenomena: the "cult of personality" on one side and "capitalist encirclement" other. On the Atlantic side, Kennedy ends the McCarthyism and restores freedom of the press. It was then that, on both sides, protests are heard, that challenge models: young people, women and ethnic minorities (especially blacks) in the United States, farmers in the USSR. The arrival in power of Brezhnev in the USSR in 1964 and that of Reagan in 1980 in the United States signal a setback in terms of freedom of expression and the beginning of the "cold war." Propaganda and repression started again.

Bibliography

- Allen, T. & Seaton, J. (Eds.) (1999). The media of conflict: War reporting and representations of ethnic violence. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Aronson, J. 1990. The Press and the Cold War. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Azar, E. (1990). The Management of protracted social conflict: Theory and cases. Hampshire, U.K.: Dartmouth Publishing Company.
- Baran, S. J., and D. K. Davis. 2009. Mass Communication Theory: Foundations, Ferment, and Future. Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Bastiansen, H. G., and R. Werenskjold. 2015. Nordic Media and the Cold War. Gøteborg: Nordicom.

- Belmonte, Laura A. 2010. *Selling the American Way: U.S. Propaganda and the Cold War*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Bernhard, N. (1999) '*U.S Television News and Cold War Propaganda, 1947-1960*'. Cambridge: The Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.
- Bernhard, N. E. 1999. *U.S. Television News and Cold War Propaganda, 1947– 1960*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Carruthers, Susan L. (2011) '*Total War*'. (2nd edition) Houndmills: Palgrave
- Caute, D. 1978. *The Great Fear: The Anti-Communist Purge Under Truman and Eisenhower*. London: Secker and Warburg.
- Chapman, J. 2005. *Comparative Media History: 1789 to the Present*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Chisem, J. (2012) '*U.S Propaganda and the Cultural Cold War*' [website] Available from: <http://www.e-ir.info/2012/08/16/u-s-propaganda-and-the-cultural-cold-war/>. Accessed: 12/03/2013
- Cull, Nicholas J. 2008. *The Cold War and the United States Information Agency: American Propaganda and Public Diplomacy, 1945–1989*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cull, Nicholas J. 2008. *The Silenced Media: The Propaganda War Between Russia and the West in Northern Europe*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Doherty, T (2003) '*Cold War, Cool Medium: Television, McCarthyism, and American Culture*' New York: Columbia University Press
- John Pilger, *Heroes, 'Jonathan Cape 1986* Vintage ,2001
- Mary Kaldor, *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era* (3rd edn). Cambridge: Polity Press, 2012, p. 268.
- Mikkonen, S. (2010) '*Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*'. New York: Slavica Publishers.
- Nuti, Leopold, et al., eds. 2015. *The Euromissile Crisis and the End of the Cold War*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Petterson, L. 2011. "Changing Images of the USA in German Media Discourse During Four American Presidencies." *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 14, no. 1: 35–51.
- Plato, Alexander von. 2015. *The End of the Cold War? Bush, Kohl, Gorbachev, and the Reunification of Germany*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Salovaara-Moring, I., and K. Maunula. 2011. "Geographies of Media and Power: The United States in Finnish Media Discourse, 1984–2009." *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 14, no. 1: 91–111.
- Slaughter, A. (2012) '*The Media Cold War*'. [website] Available from: <http://www.project-syndicate.org>

- 
- The East Timor experience Salvador J XimenesSoares; IMS conference November 2004
 - Villa, Dana R. "Postmodernism and the Public Sphere." American Political Science Review, Vol. 86, No. 3 (September 1992)