

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

A PASTORAL STATE: THE MORGENTHAU PLAN AND THE DEBATE OVER
GERMANY'S POSTWAR FUTURE

NICHOLAS LABECKI
SPRING 2019

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for baccalaureate degrees
in History and Political Science
with honors in History

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Michael Milligan
Teaching Professor of History
Thesis Supervisor

Cathleen Cahill
Associate Professor of History
Honors Adviser

* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the Morgenthau Plan, proposed—and conditionally agreed upon by British Prime Minister Winston Churchill and United States President Franklin D. Roosevelt in mid-September 1944 at the Second Quebec Conference held in Quebec City, Canada. The brainchild of Henry Morgenthau Jr., Secretary of the Treasury to President Roosevelt, the Plan called for the full deindustrialization of Germany following the Allied victory in the Second World War as well as the partition of the country into separate North and South German states. Morgenthau's Plan represented a great departure from the general consensus within the Roosevelt administration that favored rebuilding Germany after the war, believing it to be a vital part of the European economy and necessary to reconstruct the continent as a whole. The British government had likewise come to favor a moderately strong Germany in the postwar period. Nonetheless, in the leadup to the Second Quebec Conference, Morgenthau convinced Roosevelt to support German deindustrialization. After reviewing the postwar planning process for both the American and British governments, this thesis examines the reasons why Winston Churchill felt compelled to accept the Morgenthau Plan at Quebec, examining closely the personalities involved at the Second Quebec Conference, British desires to extend the Lend-Lease program, the threat of Soviet postwar expansion, and the state of the Anglo-American Special Relationship by the late summer of 1944. This thesis further attempts to evaluate how the Morgenthau Plan serves as a broader illustration of the direction of Anglo-American relations following the conclusion of the Second World War.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 British Postwar Policy Development: The Coalescence Around Support for a Moderately Strong Germany	7
Fredrick Lindemann, 1 st Viscount Cherwell: An Oxford Don's Unusual Path to Influence	8
Crafting British Postwar Policy Towards a Defeated Germany: The Interdepartmental Committee on Reparations and Economic Security	12
Towards Support for a Strong Germany: Churchill and Eden.....	19
Chapter 3 American Postwar Policy Development: Division and the Emergence of the Morgenthau Plan.....	25
Henry Morgenthau Jr.: The Architect of the New Deal.....	26
American Wartime Foreign Policy and the Struggle for Influence: Cordell Hull, Sumner Welles, and Harry Hopkins	33
A Pastoral State: The Genesis of the Morgenthau Plan and its Implications on the Postwar Future of Germany	45
Chapter 4 The Rise and Fall of the Morgenthau Plan: Acceptance at Quebec Followed by Backlash on Both Sides of the Atlantic	55
Churchill and Roosevelt: The Partnership at the Heart of the Special Relationship	56
The Second Quebec Conference and the Debate Over Germany's Future.....	63
Backlash and Abandonment: The Death of the Morgenthau Plan.....	71
Chapter 5 Churchill's Reversal: Assessing the Reasons for Churchill's Change of Heart at Quebec	77
The Personalities: The Impact of Lord Cherwell and Morgenthau	78
The Impact of Lend-Lease on British Decision-Making at Quebec	81
The Soviet Factor and the Specter of Communism	86
The Junior Partner: The Morgenthau Plan as a Case Study for the Future of Anglo-American Relations.....	90
Epilogue The Suez Crisis and Britain's Lingering Junior Partner Status	98
BIBLIOGRAPHY	107
Primary Sources	107
Secondary Sources	108

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It would have been impossible to complete this thesis without the aid and support of numerous professors on both sides of the Atlantic. First, I would like to thank Dr. Tatiana Seijas. Dr. Seijas taught my HIST 302 research paper class in the fall of 2017 and encouraged me to delve further into my research on Quebec City. From my research, I discovered the two wartime conferences held in Quebec, leading to my fascination with the Morgenthau Plan and the events of the Second Quebec Conference. I would also like to thank Dr. Stephen Tuck, a fellow of Pembroke College at the University of Oxford. During my time as a visiting student at Oxford in the spring of 2018, Dr. Tuck served as my tutor for a series of tutorials focusing on the Anglo-American Special Relationship. Dr. Tuck permitted me to conduct research for this thesis as a part of my course requirements, leading me to find the *Cherwell Papers* at the Nuffield College Library, which provided the basis for a large portion of my research on British planning for the postwar period. I am also thankful for the aid and guidance of Dr. Cathleen Cahill, my honors advisor. I am incredibly indebted to Dr. Michael Milligan. Dr. Milligan is one of the main reasons I came to Penn State. As a junior in high school, I visited Penn State to meet with Dr. Milligan, discuss the honors college, and sit in on a few history classes. As my honors advisor for two years, Dr. Milligan was an invaluable advisor academically and helped me to prepare for my future after Penn State. As a thesis advisor, Dr. Milligan continuously challenged me to further my research and improve my thesis. Lastly, I would like to thank my parents for their love and support. They taught me to love Penn State from an early age, and I cannot imagine having spent these four years anywhere else. For the Glory.

Chapter 1

Introduction

By the late summer of 1944, the tide of the Second World War in Europe had turned for good. The successful Allied invasion of Normandy, coupled with the steady advance of the Soviet Red Army on the Eastern Front, doomed Adolf Hitler's dream of a "Thousand-Year Reich." The question had now become how quickly the Nazi German domination of Europe would be brought to an end. With the realization that absolute victory was in reach, Allied planning for the postwar period accelerated in earnest. Allied planning for a postwar defeated Germany had, in fact, been in progress for years. Even as bombs rained down on London during the Blitz in 1940, with Britain left alone to stand against the Nazi war machine, a British planning committee met to formulate plans for a victorious postwar period. With the United States entering the war as a result of the Japanese surprise attack at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941—followed by Hitler's declaration of war against the U.S. four days later—the United States, too, began to develop postwar plans should the Allied cause prove successful.

The Allied leaders likewise met at a number of tripartite conferences from 1943-1945, with Franklin Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, and Joseph Stalin meeting in at Tehran and Yalta, while Harry Truman replaced the deceased Roosevelt at Potsdam. Additionally, Roosevelt and Churchill held a number of joint conferences over the course of the war, beginning with the Atlantic Conference, which resulted in the signing of the Atlantic Charter in August 1941, four months prior to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. With the war entering a new phase

following the success of the Normandy landings in June 1944, the Anglo-American conferences increasingly focused on the issue of crafting policy towards a defeated Germany at war's end.

In the months prior to the Second Quebec Conference in September 1944, a unique plan took shape in the upper echelons of the American government. At the time, the predominant opinion held by members of both the British and American high commands was in favor of a strong, rebuilt Germany. While a goal of preventing an aggressive Germany in the future was desirable, the importance of maintaining the German economy as an anchor in Central Europe was recognized by Anglo-American planners. This was especially prevalent to those who were beginning to warily eye the Soviet Union's expansion in Eastern Europe. This view was not held, however, by Henry Morgenthau Jr., the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury. Under Morgenthau's direction, a plan was drafted during the summer of 1944 that detailed a harsh course of action that would have crippled Germany for decades to come, if not longer. Under the recommendations of what would become known as the Morgenthau Plan, Germany would have been divided into north and south German states, while the industrial and natural-resource rich Rhineland was to be detached and administered as an "International Zone." Additionally, the Plan called for the removal of all heavy industry from Germany with the goal of returning the country to a "pastoral state."

The Plan was understandably controversial among the American high command. Nonetheless, Roosevelt accepted the Plan and added it to the agenda to be discussed in Quebec. Among the other major issues to be debated during the Conference were the increased involvement of the British armed forces, and in particular the Royal Navy, in the war against Japan in the Pacific as well as the continuation of American Lend-Lease aid to Britain. While the Royal Navy involvement in the Pacific Theater was discussed at length, it was the latter of these

two issues that was of more vital importance. Alongside the debate over the Morgenthau Plan and the postwar fate of Germany, the future of Lend-Lease dominated much of the discussions at Quebec as the program's continuance was crucial for the British war effort, with the country nearly bankrupt by the late summer of 1944.

While the opinion within the American high command and government was relatively fractious, this was not the case on the British side. On the whole, the British position developed over the course of the war was in favor of a strong Germany. Churchill, Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden, and others in Whitehall were adamant leading up to the Second Quebec Conference that Britain would not agree to any plan that permanently weakened Germany, fearing Soviet expansion into Central Europe as a consequence. There was a small contingent that favored the harsh postwar treatment of Germany, however, notably including Frederick Lindemann, 1st Viscount Cherwell, Churchill's Paymaster General as well as his close personal friend and advisor. Despite strong support in favor of maintaining at least a moderately strong Germany, by the conclusion of the Conference on September 16, Churchill had agreed to the Morgenthau Plan, severely reversing British policy. What caused this reversal of policy?

A number of factors influenced the decision-making process at the Second Quebec Conference, leading to the tentative approval of the Morgenthau Plan. The first factor is the personalities involved in the debate over the postwar treatment of Germany. With the Conference initially set to focus solely on military matters, Henry Morgenthau Jr. and Lord Cherwell were the only cabinet officials from either government present. Cherwell and Morgenthau had never met before the Conference but quickly struck up a friendship as they debated Germany's future. Importantly, Cherwell had a long-standing personal friendship with Churchill dating back to his days as a professor of physics at the University of Oxford. Likewise, Morgenthau's friendship

with Roosevelt began in the late 1910s when the two owned neighboring farms along the Hudson River in New York. The two men also crucially shared the view that Germany should be sternly dealt with in the postwar period. The presence of Lord Cherwell and Henry Morgenthau Jr. in Quebec in September 1944 cannot be understated when attempting to understand Churchill's reversal.

The second factor to be considered is Churchill's desire to secure the extension of the Lend-Lease program. With Britain nearly bankrupt, Churchill recognized that the extension of Lend-Lease was vital if Britain hoped to continue the war. Presidential historian Michael Beschloss argues in his book, *The Conquerors*, that Roosevelt may have recognized Britain's vulnerability at the time, leading him to pressure his British counterpart to accept the Morgenthau Plan in return for a favorable agreement to extend Lend-Lease. With an agreement for the extension of Lend-Lease in hand, there would still be time for changes to Anglo-American policy towards Germany before the war's conclusion. This indeed was the case, in reality, with public backlash to the Morgenthau Plan in the aftermath of the Second Quebec Conference leading Roosevelt and Churchill to abandon the Plan moving forward.

The third factor that loomed large over the discussions at Quebec was the potential threat posed by Soviet expansion into Central Europe as the Eastern Front crept closer to Germany's own borders. The "Big Three" alliance fostered by Roosevelt, Churchill and Soviet Premier Joseph Stalin had proven extremely successful in the war against Germany. Though some hoped to ensure the perseverance of the alliance in the coming decades, the tensions that would eventually divide east and west in an ideologically-based Cold War were already making an impact on the postwar planning process, with Soviet goals differing greatly at times with their Anglo-American allies. The potential for future problems with the Soviets was recognized more

so by Churchill and members of the Prime Minister's cabinet than the Roosevelt Administration. Churchill argued at Quebec that a rebuilt Germany was vital to the postwar European economy and a necessary bulwark against Soviet expansion. Meanwhile, Roosevelt never came to see the Soviet Union in the same light. Morgenthau, echoing the views of many close to Roosevelt, argued in his 1945 book *Germany is our Problem* that the post-World War I "Red Scare" proved that the expansion of communism was not a real threat to the West, while German rearmament posed a very real threat if not properly checked. This difference of views proved a key point of contention at Quebec, but ultimately Roosevelt and Morgenthau's dismissal of the Soviet threat won out in the interim.

The final, overarching factor that influenced the outcome of the debate over the Morgenthau Plan was the state of the so-called "Special Relationship" by the late summer of 1944. By the time of the Conference, the Special Relationship was not truly an equal partnership. The sheer economic and military power available to the United States had made the U.S. the *de facto* "senior partner" in the relationship, while Britain's bankruptcy and reliance on American manpower in both Europe and Southeast Asia had relegated the country to the "junior partner" status. Recognizing this reality is crucial to understanding the events surrounding the Morgenthau Plan and the other issues debated at the Second Quebec Conference. The other factors discussed above were all greatly affected by the evolution of the Special Relationship. Churchill's negotiating position was weak by September 1944, with the extension of Lend-Lease and continuation of American military support crucial to the British war effort. Likewise, the incongruity of Roosevelt and Churchill's views of the Soviet Union was a sticking point, with Churchill ultimately setting aside his concerns when agreeing to the Morgenthau Plan. The acceptance of the Plan can further be viewed as a case study for the future of the Anglo-

American Special Relationship. From then on, the United States, as one of the two postwar superpowers, would increasingly serve as the “senior partner” of the alliance.

Chapter 2

British Postwar Policy Development: The Coalescence Around Support for a Moderately Strong Germany

Despite the bleak outlook of British prospects for victory in 1940, as the British Expeditionary Force retreated beside its French allies across Northern France, the British government was in the early stages of crafting British postwar policy towards Germany should Britain and her allies prove victorious. The crafting of British policy was fluid throughout the course of the war. Some members of the British government supported the harsh treatment of Germany with the goal of preventing German remilitarization in the future, favoring measures similar in scale to the crippling sanctions leveled under the Treaty of Versailles. Over time, however, a vocal majority within Winston Churchill's government came to realize the dangers inherent in crippling the German economy in the postwar period, recognizing Germany's vital position in serving as the economic engine of Central Europe as well as a bulwark to the rising specter of the Soviet Union to the east. Among other forums, many of the debates over the crafting of British postwar policy were held in the Interdepartmental Committee on Reparations and Economic Security, which brought together representatives from each of the relevant departments that comprised Churchill's cabinet. While a general coalescence around support for at least a moderately strong Germany was achieved in the committee, led generally by Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden, there were a number of notable dissenters to such a policy. Most important among these dissenters was Paymaster General Lord Cherwell, who also happened to be Churchill's closest friend and one of his most trusted advisors. Thus, while Churchill came to

accept his cabinet's preference for a moderately strong Germany after the war's conclusion, Lord Cherwell's proximity to Churchill provided him with a unique opportunity to influence Churchill's views in a direction that would lead to harsher treatment of Germany.

Frederick Lindemann, 1st Viscount Cherwell: An Oxford Don's Unusual Path to Influence

Of the most senior members of the British government and high command that shaped British postwar policy towards Germany, Frederick Lindemann, 1st Viscount Cherwell, was perhaps the most unlikely. Rather than rising through the ranks in Parliament, Lindemann held a position as a professor of physics at the University of Oxford from 1919 until the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939. Nonetheless, Lindemann was corralled into government service by his longtime friend Winston Churchill. Beginning as the government's leading scientific advisor, Lindemann was later promoted by Churchill to Paymaster General in 1942, granting him a seat on the cabinet. It was thus that Lindemann was positioned to be a central player in the debate over Nazi Germany's postwar future.

Frederick Lindemann was born to Adolph Friedrich Lindemann, a naturalized British subject of Alsatian descent, and Olga Lindemann (née Noble), an American, in Baden-Baden, Germany, on April 5, 1886.¹ His German birth served as an annoyance to Lindemann for years to come, with his efforts to apply for a commission in 1916 stymied, while his political opponents regularly used the fact of his foreign birth in attempts to discredit him. Lindemann's early years were to be spent in comfort at his family's large country home in Devonshire. At the age of 11,

¹ G.P. Thomson, "Frederick Alexander Lindemann, Viscount Cherwell, 1886-1957," *Biographical Memoirs of Fellows of the Royal Society* 4 (1958): 45, Accessed September 17, 2018. <http://rsbm.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/roybiogmem/4/45.full.pdf>.

however, he left Devonshire behind with his parents electing to enroll him at boarding schools to obtain his education, beginning at Blair Lodge in Scotland. In addition to providing an education, Blair Lodge sought to prepare cadets for Royal Military Academy Sandhurst. As such, Lindemann was exposed to extensive physical training during his time in Scotland.² In 1902, Lindemann opted to return to Germany to complete his schooling, enrolling in the Real-Gymnasium in Darmstadt. It was in Darmstadt that Lindemann turned the focus of his studies to the sciences. After distinguishing himself in Darmstadt, he was accepted into the *Physikalisch Chemisches Institut* at the University of Berlin, completing his PhD in 1910 under the tutelage of Walther Nernst, who would go on to win the 1920 Nobel Prize in Chemistry.³

Over the coming decade, Lindemann began to make a name for himself via his own research. In 1911, he was the youngest invitee to the distinguished Solvay Conference in Brussels, which was attended by numerous renowned figures, including Albert Einstein, Ernest Rutherford, and Madame Curie, among many others.⁴ It was the outbreak of the First World War, however, that first brought Lindemann great recognition. Lindemann was playing tennis in Germany at the war's outbreak, necessitating his flight from the country in order to avoid internment. Returning to Britain, Lindemann spent the war years on the staff of the Royal Aircraft Factory in Farnborough. During his time in Farnborough, Lindemann developed a theory relating to aircraft spin recovery. In the infant years of manned flight, airplanes that entered a spin rarely recovered, meaning almost certain death for the pilot. Lindemann's theory sought to solve this issue. Rather than relying on others to test his theory, however, Lindemann

² Frederick Smith, Second Earl of Birkenhead, *The Prof in Two Worlds: The official life of Professor F.A. Lindemann, Viscount Cherwell* (London: Collins, 1961), 16-19.

³ Thomson, 45.

⁴ Smith, 51.

learned how to fly. Lindemann's flight tests proved that spin recovery was possible and paved a path towards safer flight for pilots as the First World War dragged on.⁵

With the war coming to a close in November 1918, Lindemann embarked on his professorial career at Oxford, a position that would gain him the nickname that he would bear for the rest of his life, "Prof." In addition to his research, Lindemann worked to increase the university's support for the study of physics. Upon Lindemann's arrival in 1919, the Clarendon Laboratory was in poor condition, with an inadequate water supply and lighting was still provided by gas rather than electricity. Additionally, funding for the study of physics was limited, leading to a threadbare department when compared to Clarendon's prestigious counterpart at Cambridge, the Cavendish Laboratory. Though a long process, Lindemann's efforts were ultimately successful. In addition to the construction of a new Clarendon Laboratory, during the twenty years prior to the beginning of the Second World War, the department staff increased from two to 20 and the number of undergraduates from six to 25, thus ensuring a more prolific future for physics research at Oxford.⁶

It was at the beginning of his tenure in Oxford, in 1919, that Frederick Lindemann first met Winston Churchill. The two met thanks to a mutual acquaintance, Frederick Smith, the 1st Earl of Birkenhead, who had invited Lindemann to his home to play tennis. The friendship that blossomed following this first encounter had a profound impact on the direction of Lindemann's life. Throughout the first half of the 1920s, Lindemann and Churchill exchanged correspondence, with Churchill enamored by Lindemann's intellect, especially given Churchill's own lack of knowledge in the sciences. It was the 1926 general strike that drew the pair closest, with both

⁵ *ibid.*, 70-71.

⁶ *ibid.*, 88-92.

vehemently opposing the strike. During the strike, Churchill, then serving as the Chancellor of the Exchequer, served as the editor of the *British Gazette*, a short-lived broadsheet published by the government in opposition to the strike. Lindemann lent his support to Churchill's efforts by overseeing the production of numerous copies of the paper at the hands of his students.⁷

Though involved in Conservative politics in Oxford, Lindemann resisted the urgings of Churchill to run for a seat in Parliament. However, with a vacancy for the Oxford University constituency, Lindemann stood as a candidate for the 1937 by-election as an independent Conservative candidate. Lindemann's candidacy did not gain the official backing of the Conservative Party, however, with the Party's support instead going to Farquhar Buzzard. With two Conservatives on the ballot, the vote was sufficiently split, permitting independent candidate Arthur Salter to capture the seat.⁸ Despite this setback, Lindemann's desire to enter the political fray continued to grow.

With the outbreak of the Second World War in September 1939, Churchill's so-called "wilderness years" officially came to an end as he was once again appointed to the position of First Lord of the Admiralty. With confidence in Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain nonexistent following the failure to slow the German *blitzkrieg* in the early months of 1940, Churchill was selected as his successor, just hours before the German invasion of France via the Low Countries. Churchill's ascension in the government led to Frederick Lindemann's own elevation, as Churchill sought the advice of his longtime friend.⁹ At the request of Churchill during his time as First Lord of the Admiralty, Lindemann oversaw the creation of a statistical branch (S-Branch). S-Branch was composed of a small group of economists that compiled data

⁷ *ibid.*, 127-130.

⁸ *ibid.*, 150-155.

⁹ Thomson, 58.

and prepared reports used to advise Churchill on various matters. When Churchill moved to 10 Downing Street, S-Branch followed, becoming the Prime Minister's Statistical Section and remaining in operation until Churchill's government was defeated in the July 1945 general election.¹⁰

Lindemann likewise remained with Churchill following his becoming Prime Minister, being appointed lead scientific advisor. Lindemann's influence within Churchill's wartime government extended far beyond scientific matters, including advisement on economic issues and strategic planning for air defense.¹¹ As Lindemann's role and influence grew, he was raised to the peerage as Baron Cherwell in July 1941. Churchill likewise rewarded Lindemann with a position on his cabinet as Paymaster General in 1942. It was with this growth of influence in Churchill's government that Lindemann came to have an impact on British policy development towards a defeated Germany in the postwar period. As a member of the of the Interdepartmental Committee on Reparations and Economic Security, the longtime professor of physics became one of a handful of men who crafted British policy towards Germany.

Crafting British Postwar Policy Towards a Defeated Germany: The Interdepartmental Committee on Reparations and Economic Security

The Interdepartmental Committee on Reparations and Economic Security was created in the early years of the war to oversee British policy development towards Germany, should Britain and her allies prove victorious. The Committee, under the chairmanship of Sir William Malkin, was composed of the various cabinet secretaries of Churchill's government, including

¹⁰ Smith, 211.

¹¹ *ibid.*, 212.

Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden and Lord Cherwell as Paymaster General, among many others, providing for the consideration of a broad expanse of issues, from economic to military to diplomatic. Prior to advanced American involvement in postwar planning, the committee served as the primary source for the development of British policy. Over the course of the war, the Committee produced numerous reports detailing recommendations for reparations to be sought from a defeated Germany as well as other economic and industrial sanctions to be placed on the country. Despite some within the government desiring a harsh approach towards Germany, a general consensus emerged among the members of the Committee in favor of maintaining at the very least a moderately strong Germany following the war's conclusion.

The coalescence around support of a strong postwar Germany is evidenced in various reports issued by the Committee as well as draft minutes of Committee sessions. Members of the Committee recognized at an early stage the risks of adopting the post-First World War concept of reparations. A memorandum produced by the Treasury Department entitled "Compensation to be Required from the Enemy," dated December 5, 1941, notes that "In short we would not demand reparations as the term was understood after the last war. If this seems too mild a policy, it could be answered that this alone may well exceed Germany's capacity to transfer within a reasonable period."¹² Indeed, the reparations imposed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles crippled the German economy, leading to hyperinflation and causing the Weimar government to regularly default on reparations payments. The defaults, in turn, led to an occupation of the heavily industrialized Ruhr Valley by France and Belgium, which only deepened the Weimar Republic's financial crisis. In addition to the economic instability created throughout Central

¹² Memorandum by Her Majesty's Treasury, "Compensation to be Required from the Enemy," December 5, 1941, *Cherwell Papers*, Nuffield College Library, The University of Oxford, Oxford, England.

Europe by Germany's economic turmoil, the crisis engendered considerable resentment amongst the German people towards the Allied powers, opening the door to the rise of Hitler and the Nazi Party. With memories of the failure of Versailles in mind, many members of the Committee were wary of imposing such crippling sanctions should Britain again prove victorious. Rather, the task at hand required finding a reasonable balance between compensation for Germany's victims and ensuring the survival of a strong German economy as a bedrock of the Central European economy as a whole.

There were likewise concerns about another key aspect of the policy advocated by those in favor imposing harsh sanctions on Germany at war's end: the partition of Germany as well as the potential "truncation" of different parts of the country for distribution to Germany's aggrieved neighbors. An undated memorandum entitled "Future of Germany" addresses the many problems inherent in enforcing a policy of dismemberment. Any enforced partition of Germany, the memorandum notes, would be unlikely to prove lasting should the German people wish to remain united. "These states," it is argued, "would co-operate secretly in re-armament. . . . Their combined propaganda would be stronger and more convincing as a result of a fresh grievance. We must not allow ourselves to be mesmerized by artificial frontiers."¹³ Moreover, any enforced partition would require "the United Nations to take military action as soon as danger becomes apparent," while the resolve of the Allied powers to maintain such pressure on Germany was "not likely to remain strong for an indefinite period."¹⁴

Lord Cherwell echoed concerns about "truncation" in his own report to the Committee entitled "Economic Aspects of Security." Contrary to the assertions of some that various

¹³ Memorandum of the Interdepartmental Committee on Reparations and Economic Security, "Future of Germany," [Undated], *Cherwell Papers*, Nuffield College Library, The University of Oxford, Oxford, England.

¹⁴ *ibid.*

borderlands regions of Germany should be separated from the whole at war's end, Lord Cherwell noted that there were numerous complications that would arise should this plan be undertaken. While it would be "comparatively simple" to transfer control of East Prussia to Poland or the Soviet Union, any transfer of more industrialized regions, such as the Saar, would prove much more difficult. Remembering the issues caused by the existence of German-speaking populations outside of Germany, the transfer of these regions would ideally include the transfer of population as well, with Germans in the territory being relocated to areas within Germany's new postwar borders, whatever they might be. This posed an issue in industrial regions like the Saar, where a shortage of skilled labor, including miners and steelworkers would make any forced relocation of the local German population fraught with difficulties.¹⁵

With these issues in mind, the "Future of Germany" memorandum continues to outline a "reasonable" policy. First, the Allies should strive to convince the German people that her defeat was military and not the result of a "stab in the back," as one of the myths propagated following the First World War claimed. To ensure this outcome, the Allies should only negotiate with the German military commanders and not with any civilian authority. Secondly, following Germany's capitulation, the Allied powers should occupy Germany for a period of five to ten years, noting that a longer period of occupation would likely not be viewed favorably by the British public. In this time period, the Allies would try war criminals, liquidate the Nazi Party, prevent rearmament, and generally ensure that the German people were left with unpleasant memories of the war and its immediate aftermath. Then, after Germany was properly rehabilitated, the country should be allowed to participate in the numerous economic

¹⁵ Memorandum by Lord Cherwell, "Economic Aspects of Security," September 28, 1943, *Cherwell Papers*, Nuffield College Library, The University of Oxford, Oxford, England.

partnerships that the Allies would create in the years after the war. Lastly, while voluntary disintegration of Germany into smaller independent states would be desirable, the Allies should not attempt to force that disintegration. The policy does permit that “truncation” of certain areas, namely Austria, Upper Silesia, East Prussia, and the Ruhr, could be deemed reasonable, but would need to be considered at a later date.¹⁶

Importantly, though, the “Future of Germany” memorandum notes that the political situation following the years of occupation would be crucial to consider when making a determination of whether or not to maintain control of the German armament industry. The resultant shift of the balance of power could indeed necessitate a moderately strong Germany. Rather presciently, the memorandum notes that “Population and production trends show that the future will lie largely with Russia, and Germany may never again be able even to contemplate a war on two fronts. Our supreme object must be to remain on good terms with Russia in order to prevent a Russo-German alignment.”¹⁷ Thus, while the Committee was focused on crafting policy towards Germany, many in the British government were already viewing the Soviet Union with a watchful eye, concerned about the implications of an enlarged and empowered Soviet bear to the east.

It must be noted, however, that not all members of the Committee were in favor of policy that would result in at least a moderately strong Germany following the war’s conclusion. Hugh Dalton, the President of the Board of Trade, argued strongly against limiting the scope of reparations against Germany. Dalton pointedly stated that Germany’s victims “will expect very solid compensation indeed for all the unspeakable maltreatment they have suffered,” while

¹⁶ *Cherwell Papers*, “Future of Germany.”

¹⁷ *ibid.*

advocating for “a large Army of Occupation in Germany for a long time, including not only soldiers but economic controllers and re-educators.”¹⁸ Dalton also argued in favor of deindustrializing Germany following the war. Contrary to concerns about destabilizing the Central European economy, Dalton claimed that by deindustrializing Germany while, in turn, industrializing neighboring states, particularly to the east, a greater balance could be created, bettering the lot of Germany’s neighbors and preventing Germany from ever becoming too powerful again in the future.

Lord Cherwell likewise was in favor of harsher treatment of Germany. Despite his report about the potential issues related to dismembering Germany following the war’s conclusion, Cherwell took issue with the recommendations of many of his colleagues, viewing them to be too lenient. In a memorandum to the Committee about the transfer of German workers to other countries as a form of postwar reparations, Cherwell conceded that at war’s end Britain may not desire German workers should the country have too many of its own people unemployed. However, he noted, it had been suggested by a former member of the Gosplan (the Soviet State Planning Committee) that approximately 10 million German workers would be needed to rebuild Europe at war’s end, with about 5 million required in the Soviet Union alone.¹⁹ As such, Cherwell argued, the lenient policies being advocated by the majority of the committee were bound to rankle Britain’s Allies.

This hardline stance towards Germany was hardly a unique position for Lord Cherwell to assume. With the British government discussing changes to Royal Air Force (RAF) bombing

¹⁸ Memorandum by the President of the Board of Trade, “Reparations: Memorandum by the President of the Board of Trade,” August 28, 1942, *Cherwell Papers*, Nuffield College Library, The University of Oxford, Oxford, England.

¹⁹ Memorandum by Lord Cherwell, “Multilateral Transfers Under Reparations,” October 5, 1943, *Cherwell Papers*, Nuffield College Library, The University of Oxford, Oxford, England.

strategy in early 1942, Cherwell presented Churchill his recommendations, contained within what would become known as the “dehousing” paper. Cherwell’s memorandum suggested that rather than primarily targeting factories, the RAF should switch its focus to residential areas that housed German workers. At this point, precision bombing still faced many deficiencies, especially with British raids primarily conducted at night. The strategy advocated in the dehousing paper, known as area bombing, posed a solution to this problem. By focusing raids on densely built-up residential areas, the RAF could impede the German war effort while requiring far less accuracy for any given raid to be successful. In the process, the German people would face hardship because of a war of their own government’s making. Cherwell’s position met approval from Foreign Secretary Eden and others in the cabinet and high command. Indeed, Arthur T. Harris, commander of RAF Bomber Command, emphasized the selection of population centers of more than 100,000 residents rather than industrial centers as potential targets for British raids.²⁰ Lord Cherwell’s tendency to favor harsher treatment of Germany was thus not limited to postwar policy but permeated his wartime policy recommendations as well.

Despite the opinions of Dalton, Lord Cherwell, and some others on the Committee, the members generally began to move towards support for a policy of a strong Germany. Nonetheless, members of the Committee recognized the necessity of imposing some reparations payments, along with a period of occupation and general disarmament. Importantly for members of the Committee that came to support the strong Germany policy, their views increasingly came to be shared by Winston Churchill and British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden. While both believed that Germany should never again have been able to drag the continent into war,

²⁰ Uta Hohn, "The Bomber's Baedeker - Target Book for Strategic Bombing in the Economic Warfare against German Towns 1943-45," *GeoJournal* 34, no. 2 (1994): 220, Accessed October 20, 2018, <http://www.jstor.org.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/stable/41146287>.

Churchill and Eden's vision for a strong, secure, and peaceful future for both Britain and Europe involved a rebuilt, at least moderately strong Germany.

Towards Support for a Strong Germany: Churchill and Eden

Despite the Interdepartmental Committee on Reparations and Economic Security's charge to craft British postwar policy towards a defeated Germany, the most important figures in deciding the ultimate direction of British policy were Winston Churchill and Anthony Eden. Churchill's career was shaped by his failure at Gallipoli during the First World War while serving as First Lord of the Admiralty, when his planned invasion of the Dardanelles resulted in disaster for the British and Empire forces. Despite years spent "in the wilderness," Churchill's calls of warning against German rearmament positioned him as a leader of the anti-appeasement members of Parliament. Indeed, Churchill rose to the premiership in 1940 in large part because of the belief that he was the only man suited to the job at that particular moment in time. With the appeasement policies of his predecessor Neville Chamberlain having resulted in abject failure, Churchill set out to shape a new direction for British foreign policy, all while Britain struggled to fend off the might of Hitler's Nazi war machine. In Anthony Eden, Churchill found the man best suited to implement his vision for the future of Europe.

Anthony Eden reassumed the position of Foreign Secretary in December 1940, having previously served in the role from December 1935-February 1938. Eden's resignation in 1938 was due to his opposition to Chamberlain's policy of maintaining friendly relations with Italy, whom Eden viewed as an enemy. In the period following his resignation, Eden came to lead a group of Conservative dissenters to Chamberlain's government known as "the Glamour Boys."

While not aligned with Churchill until the beginning of his premiership, Eden's willingness to take a stand against appeasement attracted the attention of Churchill.²¹ As such, Churchill first rewarded Eden with the position of War Secretary in his reshuffled cabinet before reappointing Eden to his former office as Foreign Secretary later that year.

Eden's views of the postwar future of Germany were apparent at an early stage. During a visit to the Soviet Union shortly following the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, Eden and Soviet Premier Joseph Stalin discussed Allied policy objectives for Central and Eastern Europe following the war's conclusion. In his memoirs, Eden noted that, even at this early stage, British hopes of containing Russian territorial ambitions would be in vain. With a goal of obtaining the "most tangible physical guarantees for Russia's future security," Stalin laid out a series of proposals that would radically redraw the borders of Eastern Europe in the event of an Allied victory. Under the Soviet plans, Poland would expand westward, annexing various parts of Germany as a result. Austria would likewise have its independence reestablished, while the Rhineland and potentially Bavaria would be partitioned from the rest of Germany.²²

As for the Soviet Union, its pre-1941 borders with Finland and Romania would be reestablished, while the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania would once again be absorbed into the union following just two decades of independence. The USSR's border with Poland would also have been shifted westward under the Soviet proposals, though not as far west as the border established under the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of 1939. Stalin also raised the question of reparations to be demanded from Germany as well as how the Allies would ensure European peace in the future. For his part, Stalin suggested the creation of an Allied council to

²¹ Elisabeth Barker, *Churchill and Eden at War* (New York: St. Martin's, 1978), 17-18.

²² Anthony Eden, *The Memoirs of Anthony Eden, Earl of Avon: The Reckoning* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965), 335.

oversee the continent's reconstruction, with a military force at the council's disposal to ensure compliance.²³

In his response, Eden conceded that the British people agreed that Germany would need to be punished for her aggressions and that every possible measure to preserve peace in the future should be taken. Eden also agreed that some sort of joint Allied military occupation of Germany would be necessary following the war's conclusion. Unlike Stalin's definitive statements about the postwar future of Europe, Eden took a more cautious approach. The British government was not opposed to a partition of Germany, nor the separation of the Rhineland or Bavaria, while the government was certainly in favor of reestablishing Austrian independence. However, Eden noted that it was too early to commit to any such plans, while the United States and the other Allied powers would need to be consulted as well. As for reparations, Eden echoed the position taken by other members of the British government, opposing any monetary reparations in an effort to repeat the mistakes of Versailles.²⁴

As the war progressed, Eden's role as Britain's "chief diplomat" positioned him well to have an outsized role in the crafting of British policy for the postwar period. Indeed, as a member of the Interdepartmental Committee on Reparations and Economic Security, Eden circulated numerous papers within the Committee outlining the priorities and recommendations of the Foreign Office. The undated memorandum entitled "Future of Germany" referenced in the previous section was in part a response to the recommendations of the Foreign Office. Eden's policy initiatives as outlined in the memorandum were as follows:

- a. Restoration of the territories seized by Germany since 1937.
- b. The cession to Poland of East Prussia, Danzig and the Oppeln district of Silesia.
- c. Transfer of the control of the Kiel Canal to the United Nations.

²³ *ibid.*

²⁴ *ibid.*, 335-336.

- d. Some form of international control of industry generally and particularly in the Rhineland.
- e. Encouragement of spontaneous separatist movements.²⁵

The policies outlined in the memorandum adequately display Eden's general views of how Germany should be treated in the postwar period. Eden was certainly in favor of punishing Germany and ensuring that the German people would never again be able to drag the whole of Europe into a World War. Nevertheless, the demands show restraint. Eden was in favor of separating various regions of Germany from the whole in an effort to weaken the country. Likewise, the Foreign Office recommendation of encouraging "spontaneous separatist movements" acknowledges the perceived benefits should the country split into separate states. However, Eden's reluctance to call for enforced partition of the country or the institution of crippling sanctions or deindustrialization displays an awareness of the important role the German economy played in Central Europe. Eden recognized that Germany must be punished for her aggressions during the Second World War, but he also realized that attempting to cripple the country in a matter similar to that attempted under the terms of the Treaty of Versailles stood to dangerously destabilize the country and potentially the entire region, while enforced partition could thwart efforts to prevent German rearmament and aggression in the future.

Eden's performance as Foreign Secretary and his success in outlining a British foreign policy that was robust and beneficial to Britain's postwar future greatly improved his standing with Churchill. By the summer of 1944, Eden had firmly established himself as Churchill's most important confidant for foreign affairs and policy advice. With Churchill unable to leave Britain for many meetings with other Allied leaders, it was Eden that represented the government, laying out a European postwar future that punished Germany's aggressions while acknowledging the

²⁵ *Cherwell Papers*, "Future of Germany."

impossibility of permanent dismemberment of the country and destruction of the German economy.

It must be remembered, however, that the development of British policy for the postwar period was not occurring in an echo chamber. As Eden noted during his December 1941 discussions with Stalin in Moscow, “ultimately, for the purpose of the peace treaty, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and the United States of America must all come in and agree with one another on the principal of world affairs.”²⁶ The policy objectives of the other Allied powers, namely the United States and the Soviet Union, needed to be taken into consideration as well. And while British policy could have been expected to differ fairly significantly from that of the Soviet Union, the policy objectives of Britain and the United States were expected to align significantly along the ideals espoused in the Atlantic Charter.

The Second Quebec Conference, held in September 1944, served as a test to the assumed policy alignment between the Western Allies. The Morgenthau Plan, introduced at the Conference by U.S. Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau Jr., called for the enforced partition of Germany, along with the pastoralization of the country to prevent the reconstitution of heavy industry and impede Germany’s ability to ever again drag the continent into war. At the Conference, Churchill bucked the foreign policy that had been outlined by Eden and Foreign Office since the early years of the war, instead agreeing to join Roosevelt in support of Morgenthau’s Plan. Churchill’s reasons for backing the Plan are not entirely clear. Another issue of importance at the Conference was the renegotiation and extension of the Lend-Lease program to sustain Britain on the frontlines and the home front through the war’s conclusion. Again, Lord Cherwell’s influence on Churchill comes to the forefront, with Eden and numerous others

²⁶ Eden, *The Reckoning*, 336.

reporting that Lindemann lobbied Churchill on behalf of Morgenthau's proposals. Numerous other reasons may have influenced Churchill's decision-making. However, in order to understand the situation at the Second Quebec Conference, it is important to outline the development of American policy for the postwar period in the years prior to the September 1944 Conference as well as the genesis of the Morgenthau Plan.

Chapter 3

American Postwar Policy Development: Division and the Emergence of the Morgenthau Plan

American policy development for the postwar period began in earnest in the months following the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. The rapid series of losses that followed the attack, coupled with Hitler's declaration of war against the United States, created a frenzied atmosphere throughout the first months of 1942, similar to that faced by the United Kingdom as the Nazi German *blitzkrieg* demolished Allied opposition in Western Europe in 1940, leaving Britain to fend for herself for more than a year until Hitler's invasion of the Soviet Union in September 1941. However, unlike their British allies, there was no significant reshuffle of the upper echelons of the United States government after the war's commencement. Rather, by 1941 many of the key members of Franklin Roosevelt's cabinet had been in office for the better part of the past decade. Veterans of the Great Depression and Roosevelt's "New Deal" programs, the administration now faced a daunting series of tasks.

The United States economy needed to be transformed to meet wartime production quotas. Millions of American men and women needed to be trained for combat and other roles in support of the American war effort. Meanwhile, the Japanese drive across the Pacific needed to be halted, while a joint Anglo-American effort would be needed to strike the first blow against Hitler's "Fortress Europa." All the while, Roosevelt's administration faced the necessity of shedding the nation's isolationist shell while developing foreign policy for the postwar period that would avoid the failures of the Treaty of Versailles and prevent another conflagration that

would plunge the European continent into turmoil. Among the members of Roosevelt's cabinet that came to play a significant role in the development of American policy towards a defeated Germany was his Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau Jr. While Morgenthau's authority was primarily over issues related to both domestic and Allied trade and economic policy, he also came to play a role in the development of American foreign policy for the period after the war's conclusion.

Morgenthau's insertion into the realm of foreign policy was made possible due to the absence of leadership within the Roosevelt administration in regards to foreign policy by 1944. Roosevelt never entrusted his Secretary of State Cordell Hull with directing the country's foreign policy during the war, instead relying on a group of close advisors that traveled in Roosevelt's place to meet with the other Allied leaders and shaped policy development within the American government. The exit of two of these men in particular, Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles and foreign policy advisor Harry Hopkins, from Roosevelt's inner circle by the end of 1943, coupled with Hull's marginalization, created a gap atop Roosevelt's foreign policy apparatus. Owing to his close relationship with the President, Morgenthau was well-positioned to influence Roosevelt's decision-making when advocating for the harsh treatment of Germany following the war's conclusion, leading to the creation of the Morgenthau Plan for the postwar division and deindustrialization of Germany in the summer of 1944.

Henry Morgenthau Jr.: The Architect of the New Deal

Henry Morgenthau Jr. was born in New York City on May 11, 1891, the son of Henry Morgenthau Sr. and Josephine Sykes. Morgenthau's father was born in Mannheim, Germany,

where his father Lazarus owned a cigar-manufacturing company. With Abraham Lincoln's imposition of tobacco tariffs during the American Civil War, Morgenthau's business collapsed. As a result, the family immigrated to the United States in 1866, settling in New York. Lazarus Morgenthau's business acumen did not improve in his new homeland, however, continuing to mire the Morgenthau family in financial difficulty. Nevertheless, Henry Morgenthau Sr. found success in his new homeland. Following graduation from Columbia Law School, Morgenthau Sr. began a series of shrewd investments in real estate and industrial companies that would enrich his family and enable him to take his place among the New York City elites, becoming one of New York's most prominent Jewish residents in the process. In addition to notable acts of philanthropy, the great wealth Morgenthau Sr. accumulated over the last decade of the 19th Century likewise permitted him to begin patronage of the Democratic Party. Despite his desire to obtain a cabinet position, his contributions to the Party and in particular Woodrow Wilson's 1912 presidential campaign were rewarded when Wilson appointed him Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, a post in which he would serve throughout the first two years of the First World War before resigning in 1916.²⁷

Henry Morgenthau Jr. initially struggled to live up to his father's outstanding reputation and success. His father's wealth enabled young Henry to attend the Phillips Exeter Academy in New Hampshire, a private boarding school that had long educated the nation's White Anglo-Saxon Protestant (WASP) elite. Despite the elder Morgenthau's good intentions, his son would face blatant anti-Semitism at school as he struggled to adapt to the rigorous academics of the

²⁷ Peter Moreira, *The Jew Who Defeated Hitler: Henry Morgenthau Jr., FDR, and How We Won the War* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2014), 24-26.

Academy.²⁸ Though Henry eventually made friends at the school, his academic struggles continued over the coming years. In letters home, Henry regularly reported grades of “C” and “D” to his parents on examinations in subjects ranging from Algebra to Latin. Writing in June 1906, Henry relayed “a rather good piece of news,” that his final marks were “as follows: Latin D-E, German D (I am pretty sure I will get a C), English composition D, English Literature C-, Mathematics D.” Apologizing he noted that “some of the marks I will perhaps be able to raze [sic], [but] at least I am not a failure all together.”²⁹

Morgenthau Jr.’s son, Henry III, contended later that he thought his father to be dyslexic. Without a proper diagnosis at the time, however, Henry Morgenthau Sr. was left with nothing but disappointment with his son’s performance at the Academy. With his homesickness and poor academic performance taking its toll, the younger Morgenthau withdrew from the Academy in 1907, enrolling in the Sachs Collegiate Institute to complete his studies before applying for admission to the architecture program at Cornell University.³⁰ Despite the efforts of the tutor the elder Morgenthau hired to aid his son in his studies, Henry Jr. faced similar difficulties at Cornell. With poor grades and his failure at gaining acceptance in a fraternity, Henry Morgenthau Jr. withdrew from Cornell in the Spring of 1911.³¹

Following a brief return to Cornell to study agriculture, Morgenthau finally abandoned his education, deciding instead to turn to a life of farming. With the aid of his father, Morgenthau Jr. purchased a thousand-acre parcel of land called Fishkill Farm south of Poughkeepsie, New York, up the Hudson River from New York City, for \$55,000. In 1916, Morgenthau married

²⁸ Herbert Levy, *Henry Morgenthau, Jr.: The Remarkable Life of FDR’s Secretary of the Treasury* (New York: Skyhorse Publishing, 2015), 48-49.

²⁹ *ibid.*, 62.

³⁰ *ibid.*, 66.

³¹ *ibid.*, 69-70.

Elinor Fatman, a member of the Lehman family, who, as founders of the financial firm Lehman Brothers, were another prominent Jewish family in New York.³² Through splitting his time between Fishkill Farm and New York City, Morgenthau increasingly became involved in local and state politics. One person in particular served to pull Morgenthau into the political arena: the still young, up-and-coming Democratic politician Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Within the first few years of Morgenthau's residence at Fishkill Farm, he struck up a friendship with Franklin Roosevelt, who lived at the Roosevelt family's nearby Hyde Park estate. About ten years Morgenthau's senior, Roosevelt began to exercise an almost fatherly influence on Morgenthau. Somewhat removed from the influence of his father while in the Hudson Valley, Morgenthau instead came to fall under the sway of Roosevelt's charm. Though declining Roosevelt's efforts to enlist him to run for sheriff of Dutchess County, Morgenthau's relationship continued to grow over the succeeding years. Elinor Morgenthau and Eleanor Roosevelt likewise developed a lifelong friendship, working side-by-side in various charitable and educational efforts in the county. It was Roosevelt's polio affliction in 1921 that would make the two couples inseparable, however. Following the attack, Roosevelt and Morgenthau spent numerous days together playing board games and discussing politics and other interests. Their mutual concern for the common farmer was one factor in Morgenthau's decision to purchase the *American Agriculturalist* magazine in 1922, which he used to advocate for proper land reclamation and conservation as well as advances in scientific farming.³³

³² Moreira, 26.

³³ Dean L. May, "Morgenthau, Henry, Jr. (1891-1967), secretary of the treasury." *American National Biography* (February 2000), Accessed October 25, 2018
<http://www.anb.org/view/10.1093/anb/9780198606697.001.0001/anb-9780198606697-e-0600452>.

Morgenthau's time at Fishkill Farm was not a profitable one. Though he presented a picture of a successful farmer to the public, Fishkill Farm lost money almost every year under Morgenthau's ownership. Indeed, by 1932, Morgenthau had lost a cumulative amount of \$168,690 due to the costs of operating the farm, more than three times the amount that Morgenthau Jr. and his father initially paid to purchase the property. The *American Agriculturalist* was likewise unprofitable during the period. As such, Henry and Elinor Morgenthau lived primarily off of the collective wealth of their families.³⁴ However, despite the unprofitability of his ventures, Henry Morgenthau Jr.'s life at Fishkill Farm was ultimately a successful one due to his close friendship with Franklin Roosevelt. It was this friendship that would set the course of Morgenthau's nearly two decades of public service.

Overcoming the crippling effects of polio, Franklin Roosevelt was elected Governor of New York in 1928. Morgenthau followed Roosevelt to Albany, being appointed chairman of the Agricultural Advisory Committee, while also being tasked with increasing the strength of the Democratic Party in the rural, economically-depressed areas of New York. Following Roosevelt's reelection in 1930, Morgenthau was then shifted to the role of Commissioner of Conservation where he oversaw various projects, including a state reforestation project that employed thousands of workers in the troubled early years of the Great Depression.³⁵ With Roosevelt's landslide victory in the 1932 Presidential Election, Morgenthau again followed his friend to a new position. Though not appointed Secretary of Agriculture as he had hoped, Morgenthau ardently took on the job as head of the Federal Farm Board, which was renamed the Farm Credit Administration (FCA) in May 1933. As Governor of the FCA, Morgenthau

³⁴ Moreira, 26-27.

³⁵ May.

attempted to halt the rapid rate of farm foreclosures nationwide. Under his guidance, the FCA refinanced one-fifth of all farms in the United States within 18 months.³⁶

Morgenthau's desire to hold a cabinet position was soon fulfilled, however. The incumbent Secretary of the Treasury, William Woodin, resigned due to terminal illness, leaving Roosevelt free to choose Morgenthau to fill the position in late 1933.³⁷ Though his career at the Treasury Department began with numerous doubts, with many questioning Roosevelt's choice of a farmer to head the department, Morgenthau aptly directed the Department's policy throughout the 1930s. Morgenthau oversaw the implementation of Treasury's bond program that raised the funds necessary to finance Roosevelt's New Deal programs, while keeping interest rates on the bonds below 3 percent. Morgenthau also increasingly grew into the role of statesman, crafting a tripartite currency-stabilization deal with Britain and France in 1936, succeeding where numerous others before him had failed since the end of the First World War. It was the 1937 recession that nearly ended Morgenthau's time as Treasury Secretary, with Morgenthau's fiscally conservative argument in favor of a balanced budget being ignored as Roosevelt and other liberals in the administration instead choosing to increase public works spending in an effort to end the recession. Following a discussion with Roosevelt, Morgenthau reconsidered his resignation and remained in his post, ensuring his role as chief financier of United States involvement in the looming Second World War.³⁸

It was indeed Morgenthau who was tasked with funding the American war effort following United States entry to the war in December 1941. In addition to encouraging the American public to purchase war bonds, Morgenthau also oversaw the implementation of Lend-

³⁶ Moreira, 30.

³⁷ *ibid.*, 30-31.

³⁸ *ibid.*, 33-34.

Lease aid to Britain and other Allied aid recipients. Another task he completed was assisting with the creation of the War Refugee Board which aided in the resettlement of Jews and other refugees of the war in Europe. Morgenthau's greatest contribution to the postwar world order would come via the 1944 Bretton Woods Conference through the establishment of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank, which were tasked with providing a sound basis for a strong, predictable currency system.³⁹

Henry Morgenthau's close relationship with the President did gain him a number of rivals within the government, however. Morgenthau and Roosevelt lunched together every Monday while in Washington.⁴⁰ Morgenthau also enjoyed a proximity to Roosevelt unlike any of his counterparts. The Treasury Building in Washington, D.C., sits adjacent to the White House on Pennsylvania Avenue, enabling Roosevelt to easily summon Morgenthau on a moment's notice. When Roosevelt retreated to his Springwood estate in Hyde Park, Morgenthau was always nearby at Fishkill Farm, enabling a similar rate of response should the President call on him. Simply, no other cabinet member enjoyed the level of access to Roosevelt as did Morgenthau, engendering ill-feelings and suspicion by others in the government.⁴¹

Morgenthau's status as one of the chief members of Roosevelt's inner circle likewise positioned him to shape American policy towards a defeated Germany for the postwar period. Morgenthau benefited in particular from the declining influence of Secretary of State Cordell Hull by 1944 due to ill health and growing differences of opinion with Roosevelt. Hull's recession from influence over the direction of American postwar foreign policy opened the door for Morgenthau to craft his own plan for the postwar treatment of Germany. The plan which

³⁹ May.

⁴⁰ *ibid.*

⁴¹ Moreira, 35-36.

would bear his name, proposed at the Second Quebec Conference in September 1944, was a significant departure from the previous American tendency towards favoring a strong Germany. Nevertheless, the Morgenthau Plan was initiated by Roosevelt and Churchill at Quebec before being abandoned following official and public backlash in the succeeding weeks.

The Morgenthau Plan, however, owed Roosevelt's support in large part due to the absence of a handful of key foreign policy advisors to the President. Though Morgenthau enjoyed an especially close relationship with Roosevelt, his influence was normally limited to fiscal matters. Rather, two men in particular, Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles and former Commerce Secretary Harry Hopkins, served as the chief advisors to the President in terms of foreign policy. Both men left the administration and Roosevelt's inner circle for different reasons in 1943. The void created by the departure of Welles and Hopkins was largely left unfilled by Roosevelt's longtime Secretary of State Cordell Hull, however, who was both hindered by illness and a frosty relationship with the President. In the end it was under these conditions that Morgenthau's plan was able to take shape and become a part of the agenda at Quebec in the September 1944.

American Wartime Foreign Policy and the Struggle for Influence: Cordell Hull, Sumner Welles, and Harry Hopkins

Though Henry Morgenthau Jr. influenced certain aspects of American foreign policy as Secretary of the Treasury, largely pertaining to fiscal issues, he was not the primary architect of American foreign policy during the Roosevelt administration. Rather, Morgenthau's outsized influence in drafting the Morgenthau Plan for Roosevelt to present at Second Quebec Conference usurped the authority supposedly held by Secretary of State Cordell Hull. An original member of

Roosevelt's cabinet, Hull had notably overseen the implementation of Roosevelt's "Good Neighbor Policy" in Latin America as well as the failed negotiations with Japan prior to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. In the early years of the war, Hull helped to create a number of committees tasked with developing American policy for the postwar period. Despite twelve years of service as Roosevelt's Secretary of State, Hull never achieved the same kind of close relationship with Roosevelt that Morgenthau had. Indeed, for much of Roosevelt's presidency, Hull was a marginalized member of the administration, maintained as an olive branch to the old guard of the Democratic Party. Hull and Roosevelt's frayed relationship, coupled with Hull's failing health throughout the 1940s, opened the door to Morgenthau and his harsh plan for the postwar treatment of Germany while also making way for others within Roosevelt's inner circle, namely Sumner Welles and Harry Hopkins, to influence the crafting of American postwar policy.

The story of Cordell Hull's rise to Franklin Roosevelt's cabinet is much more conventional than that of Henry Morgenthau Jr. Like many renowned American politicians and statesmen before him, Cordell Hull was born in a log cabin in Olympus, Tennessee, on October 2, 1871, the third of five sons born to William Hull and Elizabeth Riley. In his mid-teens, Cordell's academic achievements at Montvale Academy in the county seat of Celina and his impressive oratorical skills caught the attention of one of his teachers, Joe McMillin. McMillan was the younger brother of Benton McMillin, a dominant figure in Democratic politics in Tennessee, representing the state in Congress for twenty years before being elected Governor at the end of the century. Recognizing Hull's potential, the McMillin brothers recommended that he attend the Normal School at Bowling Green, Kentucky, and later the National Normal University

in Ohio.⁴² While excelling in a number of subjects, Hull chose to pursue a career in law. After reading law for a number of years, Hull began his formal education at the Cumberland Law School in Lebanon, Tennessee. After passing a set of entrance exams, he was permitted to enroll directly in the senior class, skipping the first five-month course and instead being required to pass only the second five-month course. Graduating in June 1891, Hull was sworn in as a member of the bar at just 19 years old.⁴³

Practicing law in Celina, Tennessee, Cordell Hull's ambitions to enter the political fray continued to grow. Hull's first electoral victory came in November 1892 when he was elected to the Tennessee state legislature just one month after he became eligible to vote on his 21st birthday.⁴⁴ Service in the legislature taught Hull important lessons, from the function of the legislative body to the science of campaigning, lessons that Hull utilized during his later campaigns for the U.S. House and Senate. Following his second term in the legislature, however, Hull returned full-time to his law practice.

This return to law was short-lived, however, due to the outbreak of the Spanish-American War. After the sinking of the *USS Maine* in Havana Harbor in February 1898, Hull raised a company of men from Clay County, Tennessee, as well as a number of neighboring counties, with Hull commissioned as the company's captain. As part of the Tennessee 4th Regiment, Hull's company waited to be called up for months. When the call finally came, the regiment did not sail for the Philippines as Hull claimed the men wanted but was instead sent to Cuba. With the war in Cuba already concluded, Hull and his men did not see combat but were instead relegated to

⁴² Harold B. Hinton, *Cordell Hull: A Biography* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Doran, & Co. 1942), 27-28.

⁴³ Cordell Hull, *Memoirs of Cordell Hull* (New York: Macmillan, 1948), 26-27.

⁴⁴ *ibid.*, 28-29.

garrison duty for approximately five months.⁴⁵ While he did not face combat during the war, in his memoirs Cordell Hull claimed to “owe a certain debt to the Spanish-American War. It brought me into contact with Latin America, the first of what were to become literally thousands of contacts. It gave me a better idea of the wider problems of relations to the world which would face the Republic from then on.”⁴⁶

Upon returning to Tennessee, Cordell Hull continued to practice law, all while attempting to broaden his knowledge beyond the law and local matters. He served as a local judge in Middle Tennessee from 1903 to 1907. Hull’s entry to the national political stage came in 1906 with his election to Congress from Tennessee’s 4th Congressional District, the same seat previously held by Hull’s mentor Benton McMillin. Serving in Congress from 1907-1921 and again from 1923-1931, Hull became one of the leading figures in the national Democratic Party. Hull worked closely with President Woodrow Wilson to reform the tariff structure and implement the first national income tax, which was permitted under the recently ratified 16th Amendment to the Constitution.⁴⁷ During his brief stint out of Congress after losing to the Republican challenger, Hull served as chairman of the Democratic National Committee (DNC), a position he maintained until 1924, despite returning to Congress in 1923. By 1928, Hull was a minor contender for the Democratic presidential nomination, with the nomination won by Al Smith who went on to lose to Herbert Hoover in the 1928 election.⁴⁸

Following Hull’s election to the Senate in 1930, he grew increasingly close with Franklin Roosevelt, then governor of New York. Hull was opposed to the policies of high tariffs and

⁴⁵ *ibid.*, 33-34.

⁴⁶ *ibid.*, 36.

⁴⁷ Hinton, 135-136.

⁴⁸ *ibid.*, 183-184.

prohibition repeal being championed by Al Smith and DNC chairman John Raskob. In Roosevelt, Hull found an ally. While the two disagreed on a number of issues, Hull largely saw in a Roosevelt a visionary of similar ilk as Woodrow Wilson. Utilizing lessons learned as DNC chair, Hull played a large role in steering the Democratic convention towards Roosevelt, whipping votes from various state delegations and cutting deals to ensure Roosevelt's nomination as the party's presidential candidate in 1932.⁴⁹ Following Roosevelt's election, Hull was rewarded with an appointment to serve as Secretary of State, a post which would occupy the last dozen years of his life of public service.

Throughout much of the 1930s, Hull's actions as Secretary of State served largely to improve American ties with Latin America, implementing Roosevelt's "Good Neighbor Policy." Drawing on his experiences in Cuba during the Spanish-American War, Hull represented the administration in negotiations with Latin American leaders, seeking to assure these leaders that the age of American intervention in Latin America was at an end. Hull likewise served as the diplomatic mouthpiece of the Roosevelt administration in negotiations with Japan and Europe, continuing to be a leading voice for lower tariffs and increased international trade.

Despite his achievements during the 1930s, Hull's time as Secretary of State will always be remembered in large part in relation to the Second World War. While Hull remained the face of American diplomacy in the early 1940s, declining health and a split with Roosevelt began to sap his tangible influence on foreign affairs, influence which was assumed by his Undersecretary Sumner Welles. Hull never particularly liked Welles, but Welles' longstanding personal friendship with Roosevelt, dating back to childhood, prevented Hull from any attempt to replace

⁴⁹ Hull, 150-154.

him.⁵⁰ Welles, like Morgenthau, benefitted greatly from his family prestige and upbringing. Welles' great uncle was Charles Sumner, the celebrated abolitionist senator from Massachusetts. Growing up on Long Island, Welles' mother was close friends with Eleanor Roosevelt, even carrying Eleanor's wedding train as former President Theodore Roosevelt walked her down the aisle. Welles also attended Groton School, where Franklin Roosevelt attended about a decade prior, before again following in Roosevelt's footsteps and attending Harvard. Following graduation, Welles determined to enter the diplomatic corps, working his way up through the State Department in the decade and a half prior to Roosevelt's election in 1932.⁵¹

With Hull periodically incapacitated by tuberculosis and complications from diabetes for large stretches beginning in mid 1941, it was Welles who became the de facto head of American diplomatic efforts. While Hull returned in late 1941 for discussions with Japanese diplomats in Washington, he remained prone to exhaustion and severe symptoms. Hull was again bedridden from November 27-28 and December 1-3, just days prior to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.⁵² Following the attack, Hull found himself accused of withholding information that could have prevented or lessened the impact of the attack, a charge which he vehemently denied. While Roosevelt and others in the cabinet publicly supported Hull, however, Roosevelt began to have private doubts, questioning his competency in the position. Hull also had rivals within Roosevelt's cabinet. Henry Morgenthau Jr. had actively utilized his position within the Treasury to oppose the State Department's official positions dating back to the mid-1930s. One example included Morgenthau's support of the Spanish Republicans in their struggle against Francisco

⁵⁰ Julius W. Pratt, "The Ordeal of Cordell Hull," *The Review of Politics* 28, no. 1 (1966): 90-91, Accessed November 5, 2018, <http://www.jstor.org.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/stable/1405525>.

⁵¹ Irwin F. Gellman, *Secret Affairs: Franklin Roosevelt, Cordell Hull, and Sumner Welles* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 59-60.

⁵²*ibid.*, 267-268.

Franco's Nationalists. Prevented from granting a loan to the Republicans due to American neutrality, Morgenthau instead authorized the sale of \$14,000 worth of silver coins, directly flouting Hull's State Department.⁵³

Indeed, historian Julius Pratt has contended that Hull increasingly grew frustrated about his marginalization, especially during the war years. Hull and the State Department were increasingly bypassed on matters pertaining to crafting postwar foreign policy. Aside from the other cabinet secretaries, Hull faced competition with the various new agencies and committees that formed to shape planning for postwar issues. Other than Welles, Hull also took issue with Henry Wallace, the Vice President and chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, who frequently skirted Hull's authority. Wallace traveled to Latin America and China in 1943 and 1944, respectively, with his 1944 trip to China aiming to reconcile the Nationalists and Communists.⁵⁴ Though Wallace's trips failed to achieve what Wallace desired, Hull was angered that Wallace would usurp his own authority, believing that "no person outside the State Department and the White House could break into these affairs without serious risk of running amuck, so to speak, and causing harmful complications...."⁵⁵ Despite these protests, however, Hull grew increasingly powerless and marginalized as the war continued.

Nonetheless, Hull remained extremely popular with the public after Pearl Harbor as well as the elder statesman of the Democratic Party, making it nearly impossible for Roosevelt to replace him. However, with Roosevelt questioning Hull's ability to continue to direct American foreign policy, Hull's continued illness only further isolated the Secretary of State from his former position of influence. When a Pan-American conference was organized for January 1942

⁵³ Pratt, 80.

⁵⁴ *ibid.*, 93-94.

⁵⁵ Hull, 1154-1157.

to coordinate a hemispheric response Axis aggression, Hull was again too sick to travel, requiring Welles to go in his stead.⁵⁶ With Hull again absent in 1942, Welles was temporarily installed as the acting Secretary of State. It was in 1942 that Welles began to truly exert his influence on American foreign policy, setting U.S. policy towards the Vichy government, in relation to European Jews, and on a number of other matters.⁵⁷

It was also at this time that Welles played a leading role in creating a number of committees designed to craft American policy for the postwar period. One such committee, established in February 1942, was the Advisory Committee on Postwar Foreign Policy. The Committee was divided into subcommittees that assessed political and economic concerns, including postwar territorial transfers and reparations, as well as early planning for a postwar international organization, what would become known as the United Nations. In addition to Hull and Welles, the Committee included Hull's assistant and director of the Division of Special Research Leo Pasvolsky and Army Chief of Staff George C. Marshall, among other prominent members. Other members of the Committee included Alger Hiss and Morgenthau deputy Harry Dexter White, both of whom were later accused by the House Committee on Un-American Activities of working for the Soviets. Though the Committee only existed for a little more than a year, due to Cordell Hull's preference for smaller groups, it was the Committee subcommittees that would survive and play the largest role in crafting American postwar foreign policy.⁵⁸

By late summer 1943, one of the chief concerns of the various subcommittees was the issue of partitioning Germany at war's end. A memorandum prepared for Secretary Hull prior to the First Quebec Conference in August 1943 outlined the numerous problems the Allies faced

⁵⁶ Gellman, 274-275.

⁵⁷ *ibid.*, 286.

⁵⁸ *ibid.*, 287-288.

with any effort to divide Germany, including increased resentment towards the Allies and greater difficult welcoming these new Germany states, or a reunited Germany in the future, back to the family of nations.⁵⁹

Another memorandum prepared by the Interdivisional Country Committee on Germany on September 23, 1943, entitled “The Political Reorganization of Germany,” again addressed partition, unanimously recommending the United States oppose partition. This recommendation grew out of the desire to render Germany incapable of waging such a destructive war in the future, which the Committee believed would be easier to achieve when having to control one state rather than several. The Committee also argued that imposed partition would require external force in order to succeed, requiring an Allied presence in the country for years to come.⁶⁰ The Committee also advocated for the implementation of a democratic government in Germany following an Allied victory in an attempt to thwart a return to authoritarianism while also favoring decentralization, believing that “the potential threat of Germany might be reduced by a decentralization of political structure that would deprive the government of the means of conducting a strong policy internally and abroad.”⁶¹ The document displays the overall trend of American foreign policy experts at the time in favor of at least a moderately strong Germany following the war’s conclusion, eschewing the more radical and harsh recommendations that some would advocate for in the coming year.

As his influence on American foreign policy grew in 1942 and 1943, Roosevelt’s reliance on Sumner Welles likewise increased. When a conference of foreign ministers and diplomats

⁵⁹ “Germany: Partition,” August 17, 1943, Harley A. Notter, ed., *Postwar Foreign Policy Preparation: 1939-1945* (Washington: Department of State, 1950), 554-557.

⁶⁰ “The Political Reorganization of Germany,” September 23, 1943, Harley A. Notter, ed., *Postwar Foreign Policy Preparation: 1939-1945* (Washington: Department of State, 1950), 558.

⁶¹ *ibid.*, 559.

was organized for late 1943 in Moscow, Roosevelt initially selected Welles to attend in place of Hull. Welles' influence was at a peak, but his time as Roosevelt's chief foreign policy advisor was about to come to a rapid conclusion in a cloud of scandal. For much of the early 1940s, rumors about Welles' sexuality spread around Washington, dating back to an alleged incident of homosexual solicitation of a pair of African-American porters on a train in September 1940.⁶² Angered by his marginalization since the outbreak of the war, Hull eagerly participated in fanning the flames, as did others in the cabinet. By late summer 1943, Roosevelt deemed the rumors to be a potential security threat, necessitating Welles' prompt exit from the administration.⁶³ Despite being forced out of the administration, Welles apparently did harbor hopes of a return should Roosevelt be reelected to a fourth term in 1944. In an August 1944 discussion with Morgenthau about postwar planning and other topics, Hull lamented that Welles was "going around telling everybody that he (Welles) will be in the saddle right after the election and not to pay any attention to anything Hull does."⁶⁴ Nonetheless, Welles' intentions went unrealized, and his exit from the administration proved final.

Welles was not the only member of Roosevelt's inner circle to enjoy greater influence over the administration's foreign policy than Hull, however. Like Hull, Harry Hopkins was a member of the Roosevelt administration from its first days, serving as the administrator of the Works Progress Administration and two other New Deal agencies established to combat the Great Depression. Hopkins also served as Roosevelt's Commerce Secretary from December 1938 until September 1940. Hopkins' resignation from the Commerce Department was forced by

⁶² Gellman, 235.

⁶³ *ibid.*, 307-309, 317.

⁶⁴ Henry Morgenthau Jr., "August 18, 1944 (Dictated in presence of Messrs. D.W. Bell and White, and Mrs. Klotz)," August 18, 1944, *Diaries of Henry Morgenthau, Jr., April 27, 1933-July 27, 1945*, Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library, Hyde Park, NY, Volume 763, August 16-18 1944, 204.

a diagnosis of stomach cancer in the summer of 1939. Despite his resignation, Hopkins remained a key advisor to Roosevelt, even living in the White House for more than three years beginning in May 1940. By living in the White House, Hopkins gained a unique level of access to the President that even exceeded that of Morgenthau, garnering the nickname of “listener in chief” throughout the early years of the war.⁶⁵ As Oliver Harvey, a visiting diplomat from Eden’s Foreign Office noted, Hopkins “does everything here. He is like the secretary to the Cabinet, the private secretary to the President and general coordinator all in one. He has this unique position because there is literally no contact between different departments or ministers and no Cabinet control as we have it.”⁶⁶

As Roosevelt’s confidence and trust in Hopkins grew, Hopkins’s portfolio expanded beyond the bounds of domestic policy to include great influence on Roosevelt’s foreign policy. Hopkins visited Britain in early 1941 at the behest of Roosevelt, planting the seeds of what was to become a great friendship with Winston Churchill. Hopkins close relationship with both men served to further the development of the Special Relationship, while also providing a convenient backchannel for the two leaders. The relationship also led Hopkins to become one of the leading voices in support of the Lend-Lease Act, shepherding the legislation through Congress and later pushing for the eligibility of the Soviet Union to receive armaments from the United States following Hitler’s invasion of the country in July 1941.⁶⁷ Over the coming years, Hopkins continued to travel to London and Moscow while also accompanying Roosevelt to many of the inter-Allied conferences with the other Allied leaders.

⁶⁵ Lehrman, 82.

⁶⁶ John Harvey, ed, *War Diaries of Oliver Harvey, 1941-1945* (London: Collins, 1978), 233.

⁶⁷ Lehrman, 84-88.

Hopkins' command of Roosevelt's confidence irked others within the administration, much in the same way that some were jealous of Morgenthau's close relationship with the President. In addition to Hull's obvious displeasure with being sidelined for much of the war, even Morgenthau was jealous of Hopkins' wartime relationship with the President, writing in his diary in August 1944 "I couldn't help but flash through my mind to how, a couple of years ago, the President said, 'You and I will run this war together,' and then it was... Hopkins and himself, and me out on my ear."⁶⁸ Ultimately, however, Hopkins' relationship with Roosevelt declined after Hopkins remarried in the summer of 1943, leading him to also move out of the White House. Hopkins also became the subject of much gossip in Washington, partly owing to his marriage and also due to his association with the New Deal that many still despised. These issues, coupled with recurring health complications related to his stomach cancer, led Hopkins to increasingly withdraw from the scene as 1943 drew to a close.⁶⁹

The exit of Sumner Welles and Harry Hopkins from roles of influence within the administration created a space at the head of the crafting of American foreign policy. As such, with Welles and Hopkins gone, Cordell Hull was desperate to finally reenter the diplomatic fray. Angrily reflecting Roosevelt's efforts to sideline him in the early years of the war, Hull admitted to Morgenthau in August 1944, "I am not told what is going on. That's on a higher level... When they talk about the state of Germany, I am not consulted." Indeed, the solitary act of Allied diplomacy Hull had been permitted to take part in was the aforementioned Third Moscow Conference.⁷⁰ Thus, while Hull was somewhat liberated from his isolation of the previous three

⁶⁸ Beschloss, 94.

⁶⁹ Lehrman, 92-93.

⁷⁰ *ibid.*, 81.

years with Welles' resignation, the totality of his marginalization created a virtual foreign policy vacuum in Washington. A vacuum which Morgenthau soon exploited.

A Pastoral State: The Genesis of the Morgenthau Plan and its Implications on the Postwar Future of Germany

In the leadup to the Second Quebec Conference, scheduled for September 1944, Franklin Roosevelt asked Henry Morgenthau Jr. to outline a list of policy proposals for Allied treatment of Germany following her defeat. The Morgenthau Plan, as the memorandum detailing Morgenthau's proposals came to be known, radically departed from the previous preference within both the American and British governments for a strong Germany after the war's conclusion. The Plan went beyond the usual suggestion of a period of Allied occupation, general disarmament, and a series of reparations, instead calling for a division of the country and the complete deindustrialization of the country. In effect, the goal was to return Germany to a "pastoral" nature. Morgenthau's proposals not only stood to greatly weaken Germany but would have crippled the German economy and ability to make war potentially forever.

The genesis of the Morgenthau Plan is actually owed to a memorandum approved by the Executive Committee on Economic Foreign Policy—one of the various successor committees to the advisory committee formed over the course of the war—on August 4, 1944. The memorandum stated that the United States was not interested in receiving reparations itself but was interested in whether those desired by European countries would "aid or hinder the achievement of general economic, political, and security objectives of the United States." As paraphrased by historian John Chase, the memorandum identified American security objectives as being:

preserving peace by collective security; early return to multilateral international trade; reconstruction of war ravaged areas; high levels of employment and living standards; and, with regard to Germany, limited control of the German war economy, destruction of Germany's economic domination in Europe, Germany's eventual reintegration into the world economy, and the establishment of free democratic institutions, including trade unions, in Germany.⁷¹

To achieve these goals, the memorandum recommended a period of five years immediately after Germany's capitulation in which reparations were to be collected by the Allied nations of Europe. These reparations were to be collected in kind, avoiding a repeat of the crisis created by monetary reparations in the aftermath of the First World War. The bulk of these reparations in kind would come via current production rather than capital, permitting the German economy to rebuild and recuperate during the period. Finally, it was recommended that a Reparations Commission be established to oversee the program to ensure compliance by both sides.⁷²

Morgenthau first read the memorandum during a trans-Atlantic flight to Britain in August 1944. Being handed a copy of the recently approved memorandum, Morgenthau found himself appalled by the memorandum's inability to answer what he believed to be the "basic question—the establishment of condition which would prevent Germany from imposing devastation and terror upon a helpless Europe for a third time in a single century."⁷³ One of Morgenthau's aides who made the trip later recalled that "Morgenthau was sure that the Germans were a war-loving race, and possibly incurable."⁷⁴ Any proposal that made German remilitarization a possibility in the future was unacceptable to Morgenthau. By the end of the 22-hour flight to Britain,

⁷¹ John L. Chase, "The Development of the Morgenthau Plan Through the Quebec Conference," *The Journal of Politics* 16, no. 2 (May 1954): 327, Accessed August 17, 2018, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2126031>.

⁷² *ibid.*, 328.

⁷³ Henry Morgenthau, Jr., "Our Policy Toward Germany," *The New York Post*, November 24, 1947, 2.

⁷⁴ Beschloss, 71.

Morgenthau set about crafting his own plan as a rebuttal to the Committee's memorandum, while also seeking to ascertain the position of Supreme Allied Commander of the European Theater, General Dwight D. Eisenhower, as well as Churchill, Eden, and others within the British leadership.

Morgenthau dictated an August 18, 1944, entry to his diary which summarized his retelling of these discussions to Cordell Hull earlier that same day. Morgenthau recalled how Eisenhower stated that "his impression was that they should be treated sternly and that they should be allowed to stew in their own juice."⁷⁵ Morgenthau also recounted gaining a similar impression from Churchill, leading him to believe that Britain too favored harsh treatment of Germany following an Allied victory. Despite Eisenhower and Churchill's seemingly congruent positions, however, Morgenthau was dismayed by his discussions with John Gilbert Winant, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Kingdom, which centered on the aforementioned memorandum. Morgenthau feared that no studies had been undertaken under the assumption of the harsh treatment of Germany, while arguing that when reviewing the current proposals "I found that from all appearances it seemed that the Germans were going to be treated in a manner so that they could be built up over a number of years to pay reparations, and that at the end of 10 years they would be prepared to wage a third war."⁷⁶ With these discussions in mind, Morgenthau tasked his advisors with beginning the process of drafting what would eventually become the Morgenthau Plan later that same summer.

⁷⁵ Henry Morgenthau Jr., "August 18, 1944 (Dictated in presence of Messrs. D.W. Bell and White, and Mrs. Klotz)," August 18, 1944, *Diaries of Henry Morgenthau, Jr., April 27, 1933-July 27, 1945*, Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library, Hyde Park, NY, Volume 763, August 16-18 1944, 202.

⁷⁶ *ibid.*

Morgenthau's proposals were specifically outlined in a memorandum entitled "Program to Prevent Germany from starting a World War III." Morgenthau proposed the complete demilitarization of Germany, including the "removal or destruction of other key industries which are the basis of military strength."⁷⁷ Morgenthau next called for the redrawing of Germany's borders, with various regions, including East Prussia and the Saar, being granted to bordering states, while also calling for the partition of Germany into separate North and South German states, with the Rhineland once again serving as an international zone. All industrial equipment in the Ruhr Valley, the industrial heartland of Germany, was to be "completely dismantled and transported to the Allied Nations as restitution," while the productive mines of the regions were likewise to be shuttered.⁷⁸ In terms of reparations, Morgenthau called for material and territorial reparations as well as forced German labor outside of Germany rather than the monetary reparations imposed following the First World War. The other points of the memorandum included recommendations for the political decentralization, land redistribution, and punishing war criminals.

As Morgenthau contended in his book *Germany is Our Problem*, published the next year, in 1945, defending his plan after the war's conclusion, his plan consisted, "in its simplest terms, of depriving Germany of all heavy industries.... Without them, no matter how savage her aggressive aims may be, she cannot make war."⁷⁹ Morgenthau's concerns about German aggression were not unfounded, with many of his counterparts likewise believing that the German people were naturally prone to aggression and were reinforced by Germany's actions in

⁷⁷ Henry Morgenthau Jr., "Program to Prevent Germany from starting a World War III," *Cherwell Papers*, Nuffield College Library, The University of Oxford, Oxford, England.

⁷⁸ *ibid.*

⁷⁹ Henry Morgenthau Jr., *Germany is our Problem* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1945), 16.

the previous three-quarters of a century since the Prussian-led unification of Germany in 1871. Thus, Morgenthau outlined a two-pronged process of deindustrialization. First, Germany's arms factories should be demolished and prevented from regenerating in the future. Second, heavy industry needed to likewise be eliminated, due to Morgenthau's belief that "the German plan of aggression was and will be economic blitzkrieg." In the prewar period, "[t]he heavy hand of German power was laid upon the economy of her neighbors—and throughout Europe industries withered, scarcity grew, fear multiplied."⁸⁰

The Ruhr Valley factored heavily into Morgenthau's proposals. In addition to general manufacturing industries in the region, the Ruhr Valley accounted for between 70 to 80 percent of German coal production, a vital ingredient for steelmaking and numerous other industries crucial to Germany's ability to make war. Since the coal could not be removed other than by mining, Morgenthau argued that it was necessary to be "taken away" from Germany, with Germans living in the region relocated to within Germany's new postwar borders. "Most of them probably would become workers on the land, and as such a far less potent force for war than they have been these last two generations."⁸¹ Under international control via the United Nations, the coal could not then be used to rearm Germany in the future. Morgenthau also worried about the corrupting influence of Germans who remained in the Ruhr should it be internationalized, noting the case of the Saar plebiscite of 1935, a term of the Treaty of Versailles, which permitted the Saarland to return to Germany rather than be annexed by France. In the end, Morgenthau believed that "the world cannot afford to have such a dangerous weapon as the Ruhr in German hands."⁸²

⁸⁰ *ibid.*, 16-17.

⁸¹ *ibid.*, 24.

⁸² *ibid.*, 20-23.

Despite the severity of the Morgenthau Plan's calls for deindustrialization, considered fairly radical even by the standards of the time, his suggestions of German dismemberment were not entirely novel. Dismemberment had been a goal of French planners since before the beginning of the First World War. As mentioned in the previous chapter, English planners were divided for a time over the question of whether Germany should remain united in the postwar period. Indeed, many foreign policy experts believed the recentness of German unity made division possible, while the crucial role Germany played in causing each of the World Wars pointed to the necessity of enforcing some type of dismemberment.⁸³ However, despite the belief by members of both the American and British governments that a division of Germany would be preferable, many recognized the potential issues should Germany be forcibly divided by the Allied powers, as was suggested by Morgenthau.

Recognizing support of Britain as vital to gaining approval for the Plan, Morgenthau and his advisors likewise went to considerable lengths to convince Churchill and the rest of the British delegation at Quebec that Morgenthau's proposals would be in Britain's best interest. A memorandum written by Morgenthau and advisor R.E. McConnell dated September 10, 1944, outlined the proposals included in the Morgenthau Plan while also anticipating and responding to various counterarguments against the provisions of the Plan. One section of the document, entitled "How British Industry Would Benefit by Proposed Program," lists numerous ways Britain would prosper via the deindustrialization of Germany. For instance, the deindustrialization of the Ruhr Valley and the loss of the region's 125 million tons of coal produced annually, it was argued, would have permitted the British coal industry to recover from a decades-long depression by gaining new markets throughout Europe. The memorandum also

⁸³ *ibid.*, 7.

noted that German deindustrialization would virtually eliminate competition with British exports, stating that “Not only will England be in a position to recapture many of the foreign markets she lost to Germany after 1918, but she will participate in supplying the devastated countries of Europe with all types of consumer and industrial good for their reconstruction needs.”⁸⁴ The memorandum further outlines other benefits Morgenthau’s proposals would have provided to Britain following the war’s conclusion, including the transfer of German commercial and naval shipping to Britain, the strengthening of sterling’s foreign exchange position, and the stability and security that would result from a victorious war effort and a new era of global peace.⁸⁵ As evidenced by the September 10 memorandum, Morgenthau and his allies in the Roosevelt administration realized the importance of appealing to Britain’s postwar ambitions and goals rather than just the President’s in order to gain approval for the Plan at Quebec.

Morgenthau’s motivations in designing the Plan have long been subject to questions and criticism. There has been much debate about whether his Jewishness played a role, with the punitive measures of the Plan revenge for the Nazi Holocaust. Presidential historian Michael Beschloss contends in his book *The Conquerors* that Morgenthau was indeed radicalized by the events of the Holocaust, influencing his views on the severity of Germany’s postwar treatment. Morgenthau, Beschloss notes, lived a largely secular life, not even attending a Passover seder despite being fifty-two years of age in 1943. This secular lifestyle was instilled by Morgenthau’s parents from an early age. When five-year-old Henry asked his mother what to answer when asked what his religion was, she told him to “Just tell them you’re an American.” Though they

⁸⁴ Memorandum by R.E. McConnell and Henry Morgenthau Jr., “How British Industry Would Benefit by Proposed Program,” September 10, 1944, *Diaries of Henry Morgenthau, Jr., April 27, 1933-July 27, 1945*, Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library, Hyde Park, NY, Volume 771, September 9-14, 1944, 26.

⁸⁵ *ibid.*

did not reject their Jewishness, the Morgenthau's never subscribed to Zionist principles, the elder Morgenthau arguing that "We Jews of America have found America to be our Zion."⁸⁶

Despite living a largely secular life, Beschloss argues that Morgenthau was distraught at reports of the atrocities carried out against the Jewish people at the hands of the Nazis, seeking to take action to punish Germany for these acts. Beschloss points to two factors in particular that radicalized Morgenthau in favor of the harsh treatment of Germany. First was the information Morgenthau received from Rabbi Samuel Wise, a reform Rabbi and Zionist from New York. Rabbi Wise spared Morgenthau no details during a 1943 meeting with Morgenthau, with Morgenthau's aide Henrietta Klotz later recalling that the Treasury Secretary "'grew paler and paler, and I thought he was going to keel over."⁸⁷ The second factor was the unwillingness of Assistant Secretary of State Breckinridge Long and others in the administration to take steps to save Jews and other affected groups from slaughter. At the State Department, Long stymied efforts to facilitate the movement of money, information, and passports that could have aided the escape of Jews from the continent.⁸⁸ With these factors influencing his views, Beschloss contends that Morgenthau increasingly used his position in the American government and close relationship with Roosevelt to push a harder stance towards Germany's postwar future.

Nevertheless, others dispute the fact that Morgenthau's stance towards Germany was motivated principally by his Jewishness. Historian Warren F. Kimball has contended that Morgenthau was indeed motivated by animus towards Germany. Convinced as Morgenthau was that "Naziism [sic] represented the logical conclusion of German nationalism, racism, and anti-Semitism," Morgenthau sought to prevent the ability of the German people to make war in the

⁸⁶ Beschloss, 46.

⁸⁷ *ibid.*, 43.

⁸⁸ *ibid.*, 53.

future. However, the crippling effects of the Morgenthau Plan were not designed to starve the German people as some argued. Rather, Kimball has contended, Morgenthau, drawing on his own life as a proud gentleman farmer, “assumed that reestablishing contact with the land would turn the Germans into good, honest, democratic yeomen farmers, the Jeffersonian ideal.”⁸⁹

Likewise, the Morgenthau Plan was not designed as an olive branch to the Soviet Union, as some suggested at the time. Harry Dexter White, one of Morgenthau’s chief subordinates in the Treasury Department, was even accused by members of some Congressional investigating committees in the postwar period of creating the Plan at the direction of Moscow. While vehemently denied at the time, in recent years, evidence has come to light that Harry Dexter White was indeed in contact with Soviet intelligence agents during his time in the State Department, raising some doubts about his motivations in crafting American postwar policy.⁹⁰ Nonetheless, the evidence simply does not support any such accusations against Morgenthau. Morgenthau and others in his Department did ascribe to the goal of Franklin Roosevelt to cultivate closer ties with the Soviets in hopes of maintaining the alliance into the postwar period. In the end, however, Morgenthau’s efforts to spread liberal capitalism, as evidenced by the institutions created at the Bretton Woods Conference in the summer of 1944, belie any suggestions of collusion with the Soviets.⁹¹

Regardless of the motivations behind the genesis of the Morgenthau Plan, Roosevelt took the memorandum with him to Quebec for his conference with Winston Churchill in September 1944. The Plan was one of many things to be discussed at Quebec, including, crucially for

⁸⁹ Warren F. Kimball, *Swords or Ploughshares?: The Morgenthau Plan for Defeated Nazi Germany, 1943-1946* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1976), 25.

⁹⁰ Beschloss, 152.

⁹¹ *ibid.*, 26.

Britain, the extension of the Lend-Lease program and the involvement of the Royal Navy in the Pacific Theater. Its inclusion in the discussions at Quebec created friction between the various parts of the American and British governments, with the majority within each government having gravitated towards support for at least a moderately strong Germany at war's end. Nevertheless, after hours of tedious debate, Morgenthau's memorandum was indeed initialed at Quebec. Roosevelt and Churchill's support for the Plan set off shock waves that reverberated through the Anglo-American high commands, governments, and public, placing Henry Morgenthau Jr. in the crosshairs of not only his rivals in the American government, but also that of the press and even Nazi propaganda.

Chapter 4

The Rise and Fall of the Morgenthau Plan: Acceptance at Quebec Followed by Backlash on Both Sides of the Atlantic

As the first major Anglo-American conference since December 1943, the September 1944 Second Quebec Conference permitted Winston Churchill, Franklin Roosevelt, and the Combined Chiefs of Staff to address a number of lingering issues as the war in Europe was rapidly approaching its conclusion. Britain was nearly bankrupt and in need of further financial and material support from the United States. The war in the Pacific continued to rage on, while Allied advances in the Mediterranean freed the Royal Navy to relocate part of its strength to aid the U.S. Navy in the war against Japan. Finally, with the realization that Germany might capitulate at any point, the issue of the treatment of Germany following the war's conclusion, which had been debated in the upper echelons in both Washington and Westminster, came to the forefront. In addition to initial agreements on the constitution of postwar occupation zones, the Morgenthau Plan, which proposed the complete deindustrialization of Germany and return to the country's pastoral past, was chief among the issues to be discussed in Quebec.

To fully understand the debate that ensued over the Morgenthau Plan at Quebec, one must first consider the relationship between Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt. Though one of the most famed friendships in diplomatic history, by the later summer of 1944 their relationship had begun to strain, in large part due to Churchill's continued reluctance to open a second front in France. At the Conference, the Morgenthau Plan initially faced stiff resistance from Churchill, but Morgenthau benefited from the changing dynamic of the Special

Relationship towards an American-dominated alliance, permitting Roosevelt to pressure Churchill into accepting otherwise undesirable policy outcomes. Finally, the debate over the Plan and the fight that ensued in the aftermath of its acceptance at Quebec provides a window into not only the divides within the United States and British governments at the time but also serves as a case study for the direction of the Anglo-American relationship by the summer of 1944.

Churchill and Roosevelt: The Partnership at the Heart of the Special Relationship

Much has been written about the legendary friendship between the two great leaders of the Western Allies, Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt. Both men came from patrician backgrounds. Among the similarities, Churchill's mother had also been a rich American heiress, a fact which the Prime Minister often promoted in the early days of the Anglo-American alliance. Both had a great passion for naval warfare and strategy, giving rise to Churchill's playful codename "Former Naval Person," with which he signed all of his correspondence to Roosevelt throughout the course of the war. In the face of Nazi domination of continental Europe, coupled with near isolation from the other major Allied leader, Joseph Stalin, for much of the early years of the war, Churchill and Roosevelt's close partnership was vital to the construction of a combined Anglo-American war effort. Despite their close personal friendship, however, the two heads of the Anglo-American alliance often held differing opinions on matters of joint policy and did not always maintain the rosiest of relationships. This reality of their partnership would be fully evidenced by the events of the Second Quebec Conference in September 1944.

One of the world's most famous friendships and partnerships did not have the most auspicious beginning. Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill first met in July 1918 at a reception at the banquet hall of the Gray's Inn in London. Roosevelt, then the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, was the guest of honor, representing the American government as American doughboys increasingly swelled the Allied ranks along the Western Front as what was to be the final summer of the First World War still raged. Churchill, then serving as the Minister of Munitions, was one of the many guests in attendance. Many years later, Churchill could not recall his first meeting with the young Roosevelt. Roosevelt, however, remembered Churchill very well, and not particularly fondly. Sharing his view of Churchill with the American ambassador to the United Kingdom Joseph P. Kennedy during a conversation in 1939, "I always disliked him since the time I went to England in 1917 or 1918... At a dinner I attended he acted like a stinker."⁹² Despite Roosevelt's ill views of Churchill just prior to the outbreak of war, Churchill's elevation to Prime Minister in May 1940 necessitated the fostering of improved relations between the world's two great English-speaking leaders. Churchill actually took the first steps towards fostering such a relationship by opening a line of correspondence with Roosevelt early in his presidency before increasing the quantity of contact beginning in September 1939 when he returned to his old post as the First Lord of the Admiralty. Though then Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain declined to open his own line of communication with Roosevelt, Churchill maintained contact for the coming months, laying the groundwork for a broader partnership once Churchill succeeded Chamberlain the following May.

⁹² Jon Meacham, *Franklin and Winston: An Intimate Portrait of an Epic Friendship* (New York: Random House, 2003), 4-5.

The first steps toward a broader alliance were taken in the second half of 1941 with the “destroyers for bases” agreement and the passage of the Lend-Lease Act. The “destroyers for bases” deal, officially agreed in September 1940, saw the transfer of fifty older American destroyers to the Royal Navy for use in the defense of the British Isles. In exchange, Britain granted the United States 99-year leases on naval bases in Newfoundland and a number of different British possessions throughout the Caribbean. Though the deal could be seen as a bargain for the United States, Britain was desperate for any resources that would aid in the defense of the British Isles, yet even this agreement was attacked by isolationist forces in the United States.⁹³ Shepherded through Congress by Harry Hopkins and other close confidants of the President, the Lend-Lease Act represented a massive break with the isolationist doctrine that had dominated the past decade of American foreign policy. Though Roosevelt realized he could not yet commit American manpower to the struggle against Nazi domination, the President likewise recognized the dire threat to democratic governance posed by a potential German victory. With the fall of its continental allies, Britain stood alone against Hitler. Nearly bankrupt, Britain needed American support to survive. As Churchill wrote to Roosevelt as 1940 drew to a close:

The decision for 1941 lies upon the seas. Unless we can establish our ability to feed this Island, to import the munitions of all kinds which we need, unless we can move our armies to the various theatres where Hitler and his confederate, Mussolini, must be met, and maintain them there, and do all this with the assurance of being able to carry it on till the spirit of the Continental Dictators is broken, we may fall by the way, and the time needed by the United States to complete her defensive preparations may not be forthcoming.⁹⁴

⁹³ *ibid.*, 70-71.

⁹⁴ Martin Gilbert, ed., *The Churchill War Papers: Never Surrender, May 1940-December 1940* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1995), 1190-1191.

Facing the impending fall of the British Isles to Nazi domination, Roosevelt resolved to transform the United States into the so-called “arsenal of democracy.” Through the sale of munitions and military equipment, Britain’s survival was ensured until the United States eventually entered the war following the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in December 1941.

In August 1941, the Anglo-American alliance took another step forward via the agreement of the Atlantic Charter. The Charter outlined the postwar goals of the Western Allies, namely calls for self-determination for all peoples and global free trade. Notably these stated goals threatened the present structure and function of the British Empire, which featured protectionist trade policies within the Empire. Nonetheless, Churchill realized that he had little recourse but to accede to Roosevelt’s wishes and hope for a reconsideration of the terms following the war’s conclusion.⁹⁵ Without the foresight to know that Japan would pull the United States into the war before year’s end, Churchill had nevertheless assured Britain’s survival and sparked the beginning of a vital partnership with the United States that would come to fruition over the coming years.

Despite their close friendship and cooperation during the course of the Second World War, Roosevelt and Churchill did not always see eye to eye on the issues confronting the Western Allies. One such strategic dispute between the Anglo-American leaders was over the opening of a second front in Western Europe. Throughout 1942 and 1943, Churchill persistently opposed Stalin’s call for a second front, splitting from Roosevelt in the process. While Roosevelt favored opening a second front in France as soon as possible, Churchill believed that the Allied cause would be better served by liberating North Africa first. With American troops untested and the nation still mobilizing, Roosevelt acquiesced. With the success of Allied operations in North

⁹⁵ Meacham, 120.

Africa, the President again set his eyes on the creation of a second front in France. Codenamed “Operation Round-up,” the Combined Chiefs of Staff set about planning for a cross-channel Anglo-American invasion of France tentatively set for August 1943. While giving the British contingent at the chiefs of staff permission to participate in planning for a cross-channel invasion, however, Churchill was still opposed to such an operation and hoped to convince Roosevelt that the Germans were still too strong in numbers in Northwest France to risk an invasion.⁹⁶ At the Casablanca Conference in January 1943, Churchill’s view won out as the massive British contingent that traveled to the Conference convinced Roosevelt and the Americans that a cross-channel invasion should be delayed for the time being while resources should instead be devoted to “peripheral” operations in the Mediterranean, setting the course for Churchill’s preferred approach of invading Europe via its “soft underbelly,” Italy.⁹⁷

While Churchill was able to successfully delay the invasion of France despite Roosevelt’s preference, his actions drew the ire of the President to a certain extent. Though Roosevelt understood a cross-channel invasion would result in mass casualties, he also appreciated the sacrifices being made by the Soviet Union as the Red Army advanced across Eastern Europe. Roosevelt worried that should Churchill and he hold a tripartite conference with Stalin in the coming months—a reality which would come to fruition at Tehran from November 28-December 1, 1943—Churchill’s opposition to the second front could irreparably damage the Allied cause.

As historian Nigel Hamilton has noted:

If Churchill, in a tripartite meeting, were to begin talking in front of Stalin of dumping the invasion of France and concentrating Allied efforts instead in the Mediterranean and the Balkans, the Soviets—preparing at that very moment for the onslaught of *fifty-nine* concentrated German divisions aimed toward Kursk—would rightfully be

⁹⁶ Nigel Hamilton, *Commander in Chief: FDR's Battle with Churchill, 1943* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2016), 73.

⁹⁷ *ibid.*, 75-76.

incensed: vitiating any hope of the Third Reich being defeated any time soon, or of Russian assistance in the war against Japan, or of arriving at a common postwar security agreement.⁹⁸

Churchill's reluctance to readily agree to the opening of the second front ultimately played a role in changing the nature of his relationship with Roosevelt as well as of Britain's partnership with the United States. One of the main points of discussion scheduled for the August 1943 First Quebec Conference was Operation Overlord, the Anglo-American cross-channel invasion of France. Knowing that Churchill would oppose the Plan at Quebec, Roosevelt prepared an ultimatum. 1943 had been a year of breakthroughs for the Manhattan Project, bringing the Anglo-American allies closer to possessing an atomic bomb. Though Britain and the United States had initially begun separate programs, with the British parallel to the Manhattan Project known as "Tube Alloys," the Allies discussed merging their efforts. At Quebec, however, Roosevelt determined to attach British access to the bomb to Churchill's support for Operation Overlord. Should Churchill refuse to commit Britain to a cross-channel invasion in 1944, Roosevelt threatened to withhold the bomb from Britain and instead sign an agreement to share further atomic research and weapons production with the Soviets, threatening Britain's great power status moving forward. Left with no choice, Churchill agreed to a 1944 invasion of France.⁹⁹ While Britain would remain a great power, Roosevelt had struck the first blow to the idea that the Anglo-American Special Relationship was an equal partnership, setting the stage for further American dominance of the alliance in the coming years.

One last issue of importance to explore before considering the Second Quebec Conference and the Morgenthau Plan is the general health of both Churchill and Roosevelt in the

⁹⁸ *ibid.*, 244.

⁹⁹ *ibid.*, 313-314.

summer of 1944. Churchill had suffered from various chronic ailments for much of the previous few years. Returning from a trip to Italy, Churchill spent the beginning of September 1944 bedridden with a fever of 103 degrees and fighting off recurring bouts of pneumonia. He would remain ill even as he departed for Canada aboard the *Queen Mary en route* to the Conference.¹⁰⁰ Roosevelt's health, meanwhile, was in rapid decline, and the President had approximately eight months to live. As presidential historian Michael Beschloss noted in his book *The Conquerors*, Roosevelt's declining physical condition by the summer of 1944 impaired his effectiveness as a decision-maker. Roosevelt's "approach to leadership was to play Cabinet members off against one another, hold a dozen conflicting ideas in his head at any one time, and to keep the mechanics of control firmly in his grasp."¹⁰¹ As the President began to fade both physically and mentally as he entered the last year of his life, he could no longer maintain such a style and effectively ensure his cabinet secretaries carried out their roles within his administration. Enforcing this view, Cordell's Hull's deputy, Edward Stettinius, remarked that Roosevelt was "increasingly difficult to deal with because he changed his mind so often."¹⁰²

The grand friendship and partnership at the heart of the Special Relationship was indeed strong. This did not mean that it was not subject to occasional disagreements, however. As the war dragged on through the summer of 1944, this increasingly proved to be the case. Lend-Lease, the future of Germany, the war in the Pacific, and a number of other topics needed to be settled. With September would come a chance to further address these issues as well as the chance to consider a radical new approach towards the postwar treatment of Germany: the Morgenthau Plan.

¹⁰⁰ Meacham, 295, 297.

¹⁰¹ Beschloss, 84.

¹⁰² *ibid.*

The Second Quebec Conference and the Debate Over Germany's Future

As the summer of 1944 was drawing to a close, Roosevelt and Churchill felt it necessary to meet once again to assess the changing situations in both theaters of the war since their last joint conference at Cairo in December 1943. With the success of the Normandy landings in June and the Allied advance across France, coupled with continued Soviet victories on the Eastern Front, Churchill and Roosevelt knew it would only be a matter of time before Germany's final capitulation. Without knowing how much longer Germany would continue the fight, it was necessary to come to a consensus on the Anglo-American approach towards the postwar treatment of Germany, including any possible partition of the country. Likewise, with the war in Europe seemingly drawing to a close, attention was to be paid to shifting manpower and resources to the Pacific Theater, especially among the Royal Navy and Royal Air Force as the struggle against Japan was expected to last much longer. It was with the postwar future of Germany in mind that Roosevelt asked Henry Morgenthau to draw up his own proposal for the future of Germany, a matter that would be hotly debated among the many other issues considered in Quebec.

Quebec was not initially intended to host the September 1944 Inter-Allied conference. The rapidly changing conditions throughout the summer of 1944 convinced both Roosevelt and Churchill and Roosevelt that another joint conference was necessary to formulate Allied strategy and policy goals as Germany neared capitulation. Considering the last tripartite meeting had been held at Tehran from late November to early December 1943, both Churchill and Roosevelt agreed that Stalin should attend the conference too, if possible. As such, the originally proposed location for what was then known as EUREKA II (in reference to the EUREKA Conference at Tehran the previous fall) was Scotland. Churchill offered to make arrangements for a meeting at

the northern port of Invergordon, suggesting that each leader could use a battleship as his own personal headquarters. Alternatively, Churchill suggested that King George VI would entertain the three leaders at either Langwell Estate or Balmoral Castle in conjunction with the meetings in Invergordon.¹⁰³

Ultimately, Stalin declined to attend the conference, leading to a reconsideration of the location. With his health continuing to decline and an election looming in November, Roosevelt was concerned about traveling to Scotland with Stalin not in attendance. Instead, Roosevelt suggested Churchill and he should consider a smaller-scale conference in Bermuda.¹⁰⁴ While Bermuda was initially favored to host the conference, Churchill telegraphed Roosevelt on August 10 to inform him that the weather in Bermuda would be “extremely hot and steamy whether ashore or afloat.” In its place, Churchill recommended a return to Quebec, which had served an agreeable location the previous August.¹⁰⁵ With Roosevelt’s approval the Conference was tentatively scheduled for the middle of September.

While the postwar future of Germany was one of the major agenda items for the Second Quebec Conference, a number of other crucial issues were discussed at the Conference. While much of the focus remained on Europe, the Anglo-American Allies also faced to the need to further outline their strategy for the Pacific Theater. Indeed, the issue of British involvement in the war against Japan was to become a tense issue between the Western Allies. Beginning in mid-1943, Churchill advocated for the detachment of a British naval unit to the Pacific following the defeat of the Italian fleet in the Mediterranean. Churchill recognized that as a global empire,

¹⁰³ Telegram from Winston Churchill to Franklin Roosevelt, July 16, 1944, *Churchill and Roosevelt: The Complete Correspondence, Vol. III*, ed. Warren Kimball (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 249.

¹⁰⁴ Telegram from Franklin Roosevelt to Winston Churchill, August 8, 1944, *Churchill and Roosevelt: The Complete Correspondence, Vol. III*, ed. Warren Kimball (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 266-267.

¹⁰⁵ Telegram from Winston Churchill to Franklin Roosevelt, August 10, 1944, *Churchill and Roosevelt: The Complete Correspondence, Vol. III*, ed. Warren Kimball (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 270.

Britain had to be seen as being able to defend her numerous colonial holdings in Southeast Asia. British imperial ambitions also led into the creation of the South East Asia Command, which was headed by Lord Louis Mountbatten, the chief British military officer in the Pacific. A running joke among the American forces stationed in Southeast Asia quipped that the acronym SEAC actually stood for “Save England’s Asian Colonies.”¹⁰⁶

However, Churchill’s request faced opposition from the Americans. At the time of Churchill’s 1943 request to discuss the transfer of a Royal Navy detachment to the Pacific, Roosevelt responded that, “There will be no specific operation in the Pacific during 1944 that would be adversely affected by the absence of a British Fleet Detachment,” while also adding that no such reinforcement would be required before the summer of 1945.¹⁰⁷ While Roosevelt’s choice to decline the British offer could be dismissed as a simple reading of the strategic situation in the Pacific, it must also be considered that one of Roosevelt’s chief naval advisors, and member of the Combined Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Ernest King was widely considered to be Anglophobic. The biographer of British Pacific Fleet commander Admiral Bruce Fraser relayed one narrative that referred to “anglophobic [*sic*] Admiral Ernest King’s...determination to keep the Limeys out of the picture so that the US Navy should have the sole honor and glory of...avenging Peral Harbor.”¹⁰⁸ Though the extent to which King’s Anglophobia affected his decision-making in regards to Allied strategy in the Pacific is unclear, King’s reluctance to include the Royal Navy in operations in the Pacific Theater posed an impediment to Churchill’s desire to maintain Britain’s projection of strength in the region.

¹⁰⁶ Michael Coles, “Ernest King and the British Pacific Fleet: The Conference at Quebec, 1944 (“Octagon”),” *The Journal of Military History* 65, no. 1 (January 2001): 113, Accessed November 2, 2018, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2677432>.

¹⁰⁷ Telegram from Franklin Roosevelt to Winston Churchill, March 13, 1944, *Churchill and Roosevelt: The Complete Correspondence, Vol. III*, ed. Warren Kimball (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 40.

¹⁰⁸ Coles, 105.

Most crucially for the future of Anglo-American relations, the Second Quebec Conference also featured tense discussions over the extension of the Lend-Lease Act. By the late summer of 1944, Britain was nearly bankrupt. Without knowing how long the war would continue in both theaters, it was crucial for the country to receive an extension of American Lend-Lease aid. In the lead-up to the Conference, Churchill repeatedly mentioned his desire to have in-depth discussions regarding “Stage II” alongside the military discussions to be held at the Conference. “Stage II” referred to the second stage of Lend-Lease, which would see an extension of the program and provide Britain with aid between Germany’s defeat and Japan’s final surrender in the Pacific. Despite Roosevelt’s close relationship with Churchill, Lend-Lease was one topic on which the President suspected Churchill was not completely truthful. When Morgenthau recapped his early August trip to Britain for the President, Morgenthau shared that Churchill had confided in him that Britain was truly broke. Roosevelt reacted incredulously to this statement, believing that Churchill was only maneuvering for more Lend-Lease aid.¹⁰⁹ Nonetheless, Roosevelt agreed to discuss Lend-Lease at Quebec. Coincidentally, this provided Morgenthau an opening to attend the Conference as the chief overseer of Lend-Lease.

While the Morgenthau Plan sought to address the long-term reconstitution of the German state and German society, the British and Americans also hoped to finalize Germany’s immediate postwar future, namely the zones of occupation to be created and occupied by each of the major Allied powers. The location of these zones was a controversial topic in the American government in the leadup to the Conference. In a memorandum to Edward Stettinius dated February 21, 1944, Roosevelt expressed his concerns about the proposed American occupation zone, arguing:

¹⁰⁹ Beschloss, 84.

I do not want the United States to have the post-war burden of reconstituting France, Italy and the Balkans. This is not our natural task at a distance of 3,500 miles or more. It is definitely a British task in which the British are far more vitally interested than we are.... [O]ur principle object is not to take part in the internal problems in southern Europe but is rather to take part in eliminating Germany at a possible and even probable cost of a third World War.¹¹⁰

While recognizing Roosevelt's concern about entangling the United States in European affairs for years to come, it is interesting to note the contrast to his later support of the Morgenthau Plan considering the large amount of American involvement that was implied in such a proposal.

Roosevelt was likewise concerned about the proposal to locate the American zone in Southwestern Germany, noting the difficulty of transporting supplies across the Atlantic without adequate seaport access. Despite Roosevelt's apprehension about the occupation zones, the Combined Chiefs of Staff agreed at Quebec to delegate Britain control of Northwestern Germany following Germany's capitulation, while the United States received responsibility for Southern Germany. Acceding to Roosevelt's concerns, however, the chiefs granted the United States control of the city of Bremen and the nearby port city of Bremerhaven.¹¹¹

While these and other topics dominated the early days of discussion at Quebec, Roosevelt reserved consideration of the Morgenthau Plan for the end of the Conference. Though standing by should Roosevelt require his service at Quebec, Morgenthau did not initially accompany the President on his journey north. On the evening of September 12, Roosevelt wired Morgenthau, requesting his presence in Quebec by September 14.¹¹² With Morgenthau's hardline plan for the

¹¹⁰ Memorandum from Franklin Roosevelt to Edward Stettinius, February 21, 1944, ed. Warren F. Kimball, *Swords or Ploughshares?: The Morgenthau Plan for Defeated Nazi Germany, 1943-1946* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1976), 80.

¹¹¹ Memorandum by the Combined Chiefs of Staff, September 16, 1944, Office of the Combined Chiefs of Staff, *Octagon Conference, September 1944: Papers and Minutes of Meetings, Quebec, 12-16 September, 1944* (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Combined Chiefs of Staff, 1944), 32.

¹¹² Memorandum from Franklin Roosevelt to Henry Morgenthau Jr., "Memorandum for the Secretary of the Treasury," September 12, 1944, *Diaries of Henry Morgenthau, Jr., April 27, 1933-July 27, 1945*, Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library, Hyde Park, NY, Volume 771, September 9-14, 1944, 140.

postwar treatment under consideration, the Treasury Secretary benefited from the conditions of the Conference. Roosevelt and Churchill's agreement to include a lesser number of staff at Quebec meant that the President and Prime Minister were accompanied by military leaders and a small team of advisors, in addition to their wives. The President's party, excluding his secret service detail, included just 23 members.¹¹³ Thus, when Morgenthau was called to Quebec, he became the only member of Roosevelt's cabinet at the Conference. Coincidentally, for much of the Conference, Lord Cherwell, one of the chief supporters of harsh postwar treatment of Germany, was the only British cabinet official in attendance, though Roosevelt suggested that Churchill arrange for Anthony Eden to come to Quebec to participate in the final discussions.

To be frank, it is not completely clear why exactly Roosevelt came to support the Morgenthau Plan. It is true that the President requested that Morgenthau draw up his own proposal for the postwar future of Germany following Morgenthau's return from his August trip to Britain. Yet, Roosevelt's early response to the Plan seemed to be rather dismissive. It was not until early September that the President agreed to present the Plan at the upcoming Conference in Quebec. Escaping from the Washington summer heat, both Roosevelt and Morgenthau retired to their estates in the Hudson Valley. On September 2, the Roosevelts drove from Hyde Park to Fishkill Farms to visit the Morgenthaus. During the afternoon, Roosevelt and Morgenthau discussed the future of Germany in great detail, with Roosevelt eventually making his commitment to present the Plan at Quebec. Misreading their British counterparts, however, the pair believed that it would be possible to convince Eden of the Plan's validity, while "It will be tough sledding with Churchill."¹¹⁴

¹¹³ Grace Tully, *The President's Log for the 1944 Quebec Conference: September 9-21, 1944*, FDR Presidential Library, ii.

¹¹⁴ Beschloss, 102.

Presidential historian Michael Beschloss has posited two theories as to why Roosevelt pressed Churchill to agree to the Plan. First, Roosevelt was concerned that the Soviets might at some point choose to make a separate piece with the Germans rather than continue the war until the unconditional surrender of Germany could be achieved. While probably an ill-founded fear, Roosevelt nonetheless believed that the memorandum in support of the Morgenthau Plan would be a strong statement to Stalin that the Western Allies planned to punish Germany and would not themselves seek a separate peace. Secondly, Beschloss argues that Roosevelt worried that officials from his own administration would combine with British cabinet officials similarly in favor of a softer postwar treatment of Germany to subvert the President's preference for punishing Germany, even if not to the extremes Morgenthau desired. Thus, even if the non-binding Quebec memorandum were later weakened, it would still serve as a "bulwark against the soft-on-Germany crowd in Washington and London."¹¹⁵

With Morgenthau in Quebec by the evening of September 13, his Plan was discussed first over dinner. Reflecting on the dinner about one week later, Morgenthau recalled that, "the first reception by Mr. Churchill on this thing was violent opposition. He was violent in the most foul language. He said it was like chaining his body to a dead German, and it was cruel, un-Christian, and everything else."¹¹⁶ Historian Michael Beschloss has further noted that Churchill was concerned that Roosevelt would attempt to use the Morgenthau Plan to justify a decrease in future support via Lend-Lease, believing that the destruction of Germany industry would bolster British industry, rendering extensive American aid unnecessary.¹¹⁷ Morgenthau was stunned by

¹¹⁵ *ibid.*, 131.

¹¹⁶ Treasury Department Meeting Transcript, "Report on the Quebec Conference," September 19, 1944, *Diaries of Henry Morgenthau, Jr., April 27, 1933-July 27, 1945*, Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library, Hyde Park, NY, Volume 772, September 15-19, 1944, 208.

¹¹⁷ Beschloss, 126.

Churchill's reaction, but Roosevelt encouraged him to continue advocating for the Plan, while also suggesting that he discuss the Plan further with Lord Cherwell the next day.

In Lord Cherwell, Morgenthau found his greatest ally. After browsing a copy of the Plan, Cherwell voiced support for the Plan and reassured Morgenthau that the Plan could be “dressed up” in a way that might prove attractive to the Prime Minister. Cherwell explained that Churchill was largely concerned about having Germany as a check on the expansion of Soviet power into Central Europe. Indeed, the previous night Cherwell had already discussed the Plan briefly with Churchill after dinner. Cherwell told Churchill that the Morgenthau Plan “would save Britain from bankruptcy by eliminating a dangerous competitor” and ensure that Britain would not be made to suffer for Germany's aggression.¹¹⁸ In the end, Cherwell's support for the Plan proved enough to get Churchill on board with the Plan. Following a midday meeting between Churchill, Roosevelt, Morgenthau, and Cherwell on September 14, Churchill changed his tune from the previous night, supporting the Plan and saying that the Allies were “entitled to make sure Germany could not commit wanton acts of aggression.”¹¹⁹

With Churchill's support, the last potential roadblock for agreement on the Plan was the late-arriving Anthony Eden. Arriving late in the day on September 14, Eden was aware of Morgenthau's hardline views in advance but was not fully briefed on the Plan until the morning of September 15. Upon hearing the proposals, Eden was vehemently opposed to the Plan, especially in light of Churchill and his own statements in favor of maintaining a moderately strong Germany in the postwar period. As Eden later recalled in his diaries, “This was the only occasion I can remember when the Prime Minister showed impatience with my views before

¹¹⁸ *ibid.*, 128.

¹¹⁹ *ibid.*, 129.

foreign representatives. He resented my criticism of something which he and the President had approved, not I am sure on his account, but on the President's."¹²⁰ Responding to Eden's dissention, Churchill retorted "The future of my people is at stake, and when I have to choose between my people and the German people, I am going to choose my people."¹²¹ With Eden ignored, Roosevelt and Churchill initialed a memorandum detailing the specifics on the Morgenthau Plan. At least for the time being, the Morgenthau Plan represented the official Allied policy for the postwar future of Germany.

Backlash and Abandonment: The Death of the Morgenthau Plan

The Second Quebec Conference resulted in an initial victory for Henry Morgenthau Jr., Lord Cherwell, and others in favor of the harsh treatment of Germany in both Washington and London. Churchill and Roosevelt's agreement, however, did not reflect the majority consensus within both of their governments, which instead favored a moderately strong Germany in the postwar period. Opposition to the Morgenthau Plan began even before the Conference's conclusion. Backlash from cabinet officials in both governments as well as the press was fierce, with the Plan even becoming an issue on the presidential campaign trail as Roosevelt ran for a fourth term in 1944. In the end, however, though debate raged in Washington and Westminster, the Morgenthau Plan would succumb to the reality of the situation on the ground in Germany. Simply, Allied forces could not possibly hope to successfully rebuild and govern Germany in the postwar period if the harsh proposals promoted by Morgenthau were ever implemented.

¹²⁰ Anthony Eden, *The Memoirs of Anthony Eden, Earl of Avon: The Reckoning* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965), 552.

¹²¹ Beschloss, 130-131,

Opposition in Washington began in earnest when it became clear to other members of the cabinet what exactly Morgenthau proposed, with Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson taking the lead in criticizing the Morgenthau Plan. In a September 9 memorandum, Stimson argued that “it is not a question of soft treatment of Germany or a harsh treatment of Germany. We are all trying to devise protection against recurrence by Germany of her attempts to dominate the world. We differ as to method.”¹²² Stimson continued that internationalization of the Ruhr industries could be beneficial to Europe and the world as a whole by attempting to address the economic desolation caused by nearly six years of war. The destruction of these industries, however, could “provoke sympathy for the Germans that we would create friends both in this country and abroad for the Germans,” potentially turning aligned countries against the Allied postwar new world order.¹²³ Later, when Stimson learned that Morgenthau had been called to Quebec, he was outraged. He later complained to his diary, “Here the President appoints a committee...and when he goes off to Quebec, he takes the man who really represents the minority and is so biased by his Semitic grievances that he really is a very dangerous adviser to the President at this time.” Concerned about Morgenthau being the sole voice from the cabinet in Quebec, Stimson even considered calling an emergency meeting of the Cabinet Committee on Germany in an attempt to thwart the Morgenthau Plan. In the end, however, he was rebuffed by Cordell Hull, leaving the cabinet to wait for the outcome of the Conference.¹²⁴

On September 29, Cordell Hull followed up with his own appraisal of Allied objectives for the postwar treatment of Germany. Hull agreed completely with Morgenthau’s assertions

¹²² Memorandum from Henry Stimson to Franklin Roosevelt, September 9, 1944, ed. Warren F. Kimball, *Swords or Ploughshares?: The Morgenthau Plan for Defeated Nazi Germany, 1943-1946* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1976), 111.

¹²³ *ibid.*, 112.

¹²⁴ Beschloss, 127.

about the demilitarization of Germany, dissolution of the Nazi Party, and controls on the German education system, among other proposals. On the issues of partition and economic objectives, however, Hull's views differed greatly from Morgenthau. On partition, Hull opposed making a decision without knowing the internal situation when postwar occupation commenced. If support for "spontaneous partition" arose, it should not be discouraged, but artificial partition posed potential problems. Economically, Hull stated that the two chief goals of the Allied powers should be to ensure that Germany could never again wage war and that the German economy might never again dominate Europe. To achieve this, Hull recommended that the Allies oversee the transition of German industry to peaceful pursuits but did not call for the complete destruction of heavy industry advocated by Morgenthau.¹²⁵ Opposition from within the United States government can perhaps best be summarized by a November 22 memorandum by Edward Stettinius, who was just days away from replacing the fading Cordell Hull as Secretary of State. "In the long run, we should look forward to a German economy geared into a liberal world economy on the basis of efficient specialization.... This may prove to be unattainable, but for the present we should take no action which would permanently preclude peaceful development of Germany."¹²⁶

Churchill's rapid reversal in Quebec invited similar backlash across the Atlantic.

Realizing that Roosevelt had shifted his view towards favoring harsh treatment of Germany, the British War Cabinet forwarded Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden a message to take to Churchill at Quebec. Arguing against allowing Germany to "stew in her own juice," the Cabinet laid out a

¹²⁵ Memorandum from Cordell Hull to Franklin Roosevelt, September 29, 1944, ed. Warren F. Kimball, *Swords or Ploughshares?: The Morgenthau Plan for Defeated Nazi Germany, 1943-1946* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1976), 126-127.

¹²⁶ Memorandum from Edward Stettinius to Franklin Roosevelt, November 22, 1944, ed. Warren F. Kimball, *Swords or Ploughshares?: The Morgenthau Plan for Defeated Nazi Germany, 1943-1946* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1976), 144.

set of arguments in opposition to a new hardline approach to Germany in the postwar period.

First, the task before the occupation forces would be made more difficult and could require more forces to be sent to Germany. Second, the middle and working classes would suffer the most from the destitution caused by harsh treatment. Third, “Our name would be associated with avoidable and purposeless suffering, not just with retribution.” Finally, destroying the German economy would prevent German participation in the reconstruction of Europe, negatively impacting the entire continent rather than just Germany.¹²⁷ Ultimately, the advice of the cabinet went unheeded, as Churchill was persuaded to support the Morgenthau Plan.

By December 1944, the British Foreign Office had drafted a full rebuttal to the proposals of the Morgenthau Plan. One issue of particular concern to the Foreign Office was the resulting mass unemployment that would be faced by the shuttering of all German heavy industry. Its report noted that about 2 million out of the prewar population of 6.5 million in the Rhineland, Saar, and Westphalia would be deprived of their livelihood. In addition, between 3 to 5 million workers from the former German territories expected to be ceded in the east would likewise need to find employment. The report concluded that “The capital investment needed for this and for the development of new industries to absorb the remainder would be very substantial, and its provision would be made even more difficult by the repercussions of the proposals on Germany’s exports and her balance of trade.” The Foreign Office, echoing Hull’s arguments, further argued that “The destruction would tend to impoverish not only Germany but the world as a whole.”¹²⁸

¹²⁷ Telegram from British War Cabinet to Anthony Eden, September 14, 1944, ed. Warren F. Kimball, *Swords or Ploughshares?: The Morgenthau Plan for Defeated Nazi Germany, 1943-1946* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1976), 120-121.

¹²⁸ Memorandum by British Foreign Office, December 27, 1944, ed. Warren F. Kimball, *Swords or Ploughshares?: The Morgenthau Plan for Defeated Nazi Germany, 1943-1946* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1976), 141-142.

The death of the Morgenthau Plan was long and drawn out. As word of the Plan made it to the press in October 1944, Morgenthau became the subject of much criticism. Capitalizing on the public backlash, Republican Thomas Dewey, Roosevelt's opponent in the 1944 election, seized on the Plan as the campaign entered its final weeks. In addition to criticizing Roosevelt's decision to take Morgenthau to Quebec rather than Hull or Stimson, Dewey also echoed reports that Joseph Goebbels was utilizing the Plan to inspire the German people to fervently defend their homeland in order to prevent the destruction of their way of life.¹²⁹

Ultimately the death knell for the Morgenthau Plan did not come until April 1945, when the internal situation in Germany could finally be assessed by the Allied forces on the ground. A letter from General Lucius Clay to Assistant Secretary of War John McCloy provides a window into the desolation that greeted Allied troops and the struggles that laid ahead. "[T]he industry which remains, with few exceptions, even when restored will suffice barely for a very long minimum living standard in Germany.... If this is to be provided, we must have sufficient freedom here to bring industries back into production for that purpose." Anticipating the potential criticism for not treating Germany harshly enough, Clay added, "I hope you won't think from above that I am getting soft. I realize the necessity for stern and spartan treatment. However, retribution now is far greater than realized at home...."¹³⁰ In summary, if the Allies hoped to avoid a repeat of the aftermath of the First World War, they could not seek to ruin the German economy in such a devastating fashion but had to rebuild the country from the ground

¹²⁹ Beschloss, 160.

¹³⁰ Letter from Lucius Clay to John McCloy, April 26, 1945, ed. Warren F. Kimball, *Swords or Ploughshares?: The Morgenthau Plan for Defeated Nazi Germany, 1943-1946* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1976), 162-163.

up. The Morgenthau Plan was simply unfeasible when the reality on the ground was taken into consideration.

Chapter 5

Churchill's Reversal: Assessing the Reasons for Churchill's Change of Heart at Quebec

The Second Quebec Conference saw agreements concluded regarding a number of issues, ranging from increased British involvement in the Pacific, to Lend-Lease, to the Morgenthau Plan and the postwar future of Germany. The decision that had perhaps the least actual effect on the postwar world, due to its later abandonment, proved to be the approval of the Morgenthau Plan. Despite the Plan's ultimate abandonment, a variety of factors affected the Plan's approval at Quebec. First, as the only cabinet secretaries present at the Second Quebec Conference, while also maintaining close personal friendships with Churchill and Roosevelt, respectively, Lord Cherwell and Henry Morgenthau Jr. enjoyed unparalleled influence over the negotiations regarding the Morgenthau Plan at Quebec. Second, Britain was nearly bankrupt after a half decade of global conflict. The required agreement over extension of Lend-Lease aid provided the United States with substantial leverage at Quebec. Third, British and American opinions about the threat posed by Soviet postwar expansion differed greatly. The debate over the Soviet factor for the postwar period shaped much of the discussion over whether the Morgenthau Plan was even feasible. Lastly, and most importantly, by the late summer of 1944 the evolution of the Special Relationship had been completed, leaving Britain as the junior and the United States the senior partner. On a wide array of issues, ranging from Lend-Lease to grand strategy, Britain simply was no longer in a position from which to dictate joint Allied policy. This reality would

grant Roosevelt much of the leverage he needed to force through an agreement on the Morgenthau Plan at Quebec.

The Personalities: The Impact of Lord Cherwell and Morgenthau

Before considering the broader factors that impacted the acceptance of the Morgenthau Plan at Second Quebec Conference, it is important to consider how the specific people involved in the negotiations at Quebec in September 1944 influenced the outcome of the Conference. The opinions of Churchill and Roosevelt are obviously of most importance, considering each was required to sign off on any agreement before it would be carried out or explored further. However, in this instance it is similarly important to understand how both Churchill and Roosevelt's advisors influenced decision-making at Quebec. As the Conference was intended to focus on primarily military matters, only three cabinet officials attended the Conference. Lord Cherwell, Churchill's close friend and advisor as well as the British Paymaster General, traveled to Quebec with Churchill aboard the *Queen Mary*. Henry Morgenthau Jr. came to Quebec at Roosevelt's request after the Conference had already commenced to present his plan for the postwar treatment of Germany. Lastly, Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden arrived on the eve of the final day of the Conference when a discussion of Germany's future was added to the agenda. The position of Cherwell and Morgenthau as the only cabinet officials at Quebec, until Eden's late arrival at least, coupled with each man's close personal friendships with the Prime Minister and the President, respectively, uniquely positioned them to shift opinion in favor of accepting the Morgenthau Plan.

It has previously been noted in this thesis that both Lord Cherwell and Morgenthau were fervent supporters of the harsh treatment of Germany in the postwar period. Lord Cherwell was in the distinct minority in Whitehall that believed a strong German economy to be a necessary component of the successful postwar reconstruction of Europe. Similarly, Morgenthau and his subordinates in the Treasury Department argued that it was a “fallacy that Europe needs a strong industrial Germany.”¹³¹ Despite these two key figures sharing these views, Morgenthau was better placed to attempt to exert his influence on the matter. While British policy had generally coalesced around support for at least a moderately strong postwar Germany, opinion with the Roosevelt administration was much more fractious. Secretary of State Cordell Hull held little sway over postwar planning, while Harry Hopkins, Sumner Welles, two of the President’s chief advisors on matters of foreign policy, had largely lost their influence by the summer of 1944.

Crucially, when considering the influence wielded by Cherwell and Morgenthau at Quebec, both men enjoyed uniquely personal relationships with Churchill and Roosevelt, respectively. As discussed in the first chapter, Cherwell’s friendship with Churchill began during Cherwell’s time as a professor at Oxford in the early 1920s. Morgenthau’s friendship with Roosevelt began only a few years prior when the two were neighbors along the Hudson River, north of New York City. Though both Churchill and Roosevelt had a multitude of advisors, Cherwell and Morgenthau possessed truly unique access to their respective boss while in government, often drawing the ire of others within the cabinets. Cherwell’s attendance at Quebec was not for any practical purpose in relation to the Conference but was largely as a friend (though Churchill did hope Cherwell could take part in some discussions over the extension of

¹³¹ Memorandum by R.E. McConnell and Henry Morgenthau Jr., “It is a fallacy that Europe needs a strong industrial Germany,” *Diaries of Henry Morgenthau, Jr., April 27, 1933-July 27, 1945*, Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library, Hyde Park, NY, Volume 771, September 9-14, 1944, 23.

Lend-Lease aid). Morgenthau's attendance, obviously, was due to the plan he intended to propose, rather than as a friend, but it is questionable whether any other man serving in the role of Secretary of the Treasury could have proposed such a bold plan that was clearly beyond the scope of his responsibilities within the cabinet.

Did Cherwell and Morgenthau's presence at Quebec influence the outcome of the discussions over the Morgenthau Plan? The answer in regards to Morgenthau is undoubtedly yes. The Treasury Secretary understandably stumped for the plan that came to bear his name at Quebec. Morgenthau's close personal friendship with the President provided him with unique access to Roosevelt as the Plan was debated. Importantly, as the only American cabinet secretary in Quebec, he received minimal pushback to his Plan from the American contingent in Quebec, leaving the British to convince Roosevelt against the Plan.

As for Lord Cherwell, the answer is more complicated but remains in the affirmative. Like Morgenthau, Cherwell was the only British cabinet official in Quebec, excepting Anthony Eden's late arrival in the evening hours of September 14. Also, like Morgenthau, his friendship with Churchill permitted him more leeway when discussing the matter with the Prime Minister. Morgenthau certainly thought Cherwell influenced Churchill's decision-making. Writing to Cherwell in 1948, Morgenthau reflected on the negotiations at Quebec, saying "I have no way of knowing what happened between Mr. Churchill and you after we had all had dinner together, but it was always my feeling that it must have been you who won him over to my plan for Germany."¹³² Cherwell's biographer, Frederick Smith, 2nd Earl of Birkenhead, later disputed Cherwell's support of the Morgenthau Plan, however, arguing that "Although he was in favour

¹³² Letter from Henry Morgenthau Jr. to Lord Cherwell, July 15, 1948, *Cherwell Papers*, Nuffield College Library, The University of Oxford, Oxford, England.

of depriving Germany of her capital industrial machinery so that she would not be in a position to start another war, he considered that the Morgenthau Plan went much too far and could only result in our having to support Germany.”¹³³ Whatever the truth of the matter, it is certain that Cherwell took a more hardline stance towards Germany than most of his counterparts in the British government, while Cherwell and Churchill definitely discussed the matter at dinner the night of September 13, with Churchill’s change of heart becoming apparent the next morning. Undoubtedly, Cherwell and Morgenthau’s influence on the proceedings at Quebec were not the main factor in gaining approval for the Morgenthau Plan. It is important, however, to note the influence each man had on the negotiations.

The Impact of Lend-Lease on British Decision-Making at Quebec

By the summer of 1944, Britain was indeed on the verge of bankruptcy. Without American aid via the Lend-Lease Act, Britain likely would not have survived on her own in the period between the fall of France in May 1940 and the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in December 1941. As discussed in the previous chapter, Winston Churchill and his cabinet considered the continuance of Lend-Lease vital to British economic security for the remainder of the war, with the issue featuring prominently among those discussed at the Second Quebec Conference in September 1944. With Britain dependent on continued aid from the United States, it is understandable that Churchill became worried at the prospect of Franklin Roosevelt attempting to use the issue to force British approval of various American proposals at Quebec, especially including the Morgenthau Plan. Did the extension of Lend-Lease aid to Britain

¹³³ Frederick Smith, Second Earl of Birkenhead, *The Prof in Two Worlds: The official life of Professor F.A. Lindemann, Viscount Cherwell* (London: Collins, 1961), 268.

influence British willingness to accept the Plan? While one could dispute whether Churchill ever truly supported the Plan, the specter of decreased American aid to Britain undoubtedly influenced the Prime Minister's decision to accept the Morgenthau Plan at Quebec.

The Second Quebec Conference was initially intended to focus almost solely on military matters, leading to the exclusion of almost all cabinet officials. Nonetheless, Henry Morgenthau Jr. made the trip at Roosevelt's request in order to present his plan for the postwar treatment of Germany, while Lord Cherwell, Churchill's Paymaster General and close personal friend, accompanied the Prime Minister to Quebec. While both men attended the Conference for reasons other than to discuss Lend-Lease, it cannot be discounted that Morgenthau and Cherwell were two of the foremost players on the matter of Lend-Lease negotiations. In his position as Paymaster General, Lord Cherwell was tasked with overseeing the British government's accounts and making payments on the government's behalf. Displaying the importance of further American aid, on the morning of September 14, Cherwell preempted his discussion of the treatment of Germany with Morgenthau by informing Morgenthau that Churchill desired to know how much Lend-Lease aid the United States government intended to extend to Britain before he could make any commitments towards the future of Germany. Only after Morgenthau suggested that about \$6 billion of aid would be made available did Cherwell move on to consideration of the Morgenthau Plan.¹³⁴

While Cherwell played an important role as a cabinet minister and one of Churchill's closest advisors, Morgenthau was especially central to both the extension of Lend-Lease and the broader discussions held at Quebec. As the Secretary of the Treasury, Morgenthau held an

¹³⁴ Michael Beschloss, *The Conquerors: Roosevelt, Truman and the Destruction of Hitler's Germany, 1941-1945* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2002), 129.

inordinate amount of sway over the extension of Lend-Lease as well as the amount of financial aid the United States would make available to Britain. This reality was not lost on Churchill and the various members of his cabinet. During Morgenthau's early August 1944 visit to Britain, Churchill went to great pains to impress upon his guest the severity of Britain's economic plight. Contrasting with American beliefs about continued British opulence, Churchill described Britain's "very, very dark" future prospects, saying that British soldiers returning home after the war would be greeted by a bankrupt nation with "no future" to offer her defenders for their wartime sacrifice.¹³⁵ Anthony Eden similarly caved to Morgenthau's demands during the August 1944 visit when Morgenthau enquired about postwar planning for the treatment of Germany. Not realizing that Morgenthau had not been briefed on the agreements made at the Tehran Conference in late 1943 relating to Germany's future, Eden told Morgenthau that Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin had tentatively agreed to dismember Germany following the war's conclusion. When Morgenthau asked to see the records of these agreements, Eden acquiesced. As presidential historian Michael Beschloss has contended, with the extension of Lend-Lease still undecided, Eden was hardly in a position to refuse Morgenthau's request.¹³⁶

Upon review, Churchill's efforts to sway Morgenthau towards support for greater financial aid to Britain seem to have been successful. As previously noted in the second chapter, the Treasury Department's arguments in support of the deindustrialization of Germany included a number of proposals specifically designed as overtures to address British postwar concerns. The British coal industry stood to reap the benefits of the elimination of the German coal industry in the Ruhr Valley. British exports would increase due to less German competition.

¹³⁵ *ibid.*, 75.

¹³⁶ *ibid.*, 78.

Increased exports also stood to shore up the pound sterling in the foreign exchange market. Peace and security would, above all, ensure security for Britain's massive maritime trade network.

Expanding beyond the economic realm, the Treasury Department played on Churchill's concerns about the Conservative Party's electoral future in Britain, arguing that British "political stability would be reinforced by her increased ability to meet the insistent domestic demands for economic reform resulting from the assurances of security and of an expansion of her exports."¹³⁷

While Morgenthau went to great lengths to describe how his Plan would benefit Britain economically in the postwar period, Churchill remained unconvinced. Churchill noted Morgenthau's argument that the deindustrialization of Germany would eliminate competition for British goods, increasing British exports and aiding the postwar reconstruction of the British economy and society. Churchill also recognized the potential pitfalls to Morgenthau's proposal. What was to stop the United States from decreasing vital postwar financial aid once British exports increased? Striving to avoid this possibility, Churchill maintained that Morgenthau's proposals could not be an alternative to continued aid but rather had to be considered in conjunction with aid if Britain were to agree to the Plan. Churchill even threatened to close off British markets to the United States should Roosevelt prematurely terminate postwar aid.¹³⁸ Churchill was obviously concerned that Roosevelt might choose to utilize the extension of Lend-Lease to coerce British acceptance of the Morgenthau Plan, an outcome which the Prime Minister would attempt to prevent at all costs.

¹³⁷ Memorandum by R.E. McConnell and Henry Morgenthau Jr., "How British Industry Would Benefit by Proposed Program," *Diaries of Henry Morgenthau, Jr., April 27, 1933-July 27, 1945*, Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library, Hyde Park, NY, Volume 771, September 9-14, 1944, 26.

¹³⁸ Beschloss, 126.

Ultimately, the negotiations at Quebec led to a preliminary agreement for \$3.5 billion in munitions and \$3 billion in non-munitions aid to be provided by the United States to Britain in the time between V-E Day and V-J Day.¹³⁹ Yet, even as Churchill and Roosevelt prepared to initial a memorandum that would authorize further negotiations, Churchill's angst about Lend-Lease shone through. Drastically changing course, the President began telling stories, leaving Churchill to worry that Roosevelt might try to avoid signing the memorandum. Referencing Roosevelt's dog, Churchill exclaimed, "What do you want me to do? Get on my hind legs and beg like Fala?"¹⁴⁰ Churchill got his wish, and the memorandum was signed. Nonetheless, his exasperation further displays how desperate he was to gain an extension of Lend-Lease aid.

So, what impact did negotiations over the extension of Lend-Lease have on British agreement to the Morgenthau Plan? Churchill and Eden's interactions with Morgenthau during his August 1944 visit to Britain exemplify that the issue was without a doubt at the forefront of their minds. Both men recognized the economic peril in which Britain found itself and realized that further financial aid from the United States was crucial to Britain's survival. While other factors may have impacted Churchill's decision to accept the harsh treatment of Germany at Quebec, British concerns about Lend-Lease were omnipresent at the Conference despite its supposed status as being strictly a military conference. Lord Cherwell's first question for Morgenthau on the morning of September 14 concerned Lend-Lease, not the Treasury Secretary's proposals for the future of Germany. Likewise, at dinner on September 13, Churchill argued that the promise of increased British exports included in the Morgenthau Plan could in no

¹³⁹ Randall B. Woods, "The Politics of Diplomacy: Winston S. Churchill and the Second Quebec Conference" *Canadian Journal of History* 22, no. 3 (December 1987): 372, Accessed August 17, 2018, <http://ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=5332170&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.

¹⁴⁰ Beschloss, 130.

way serve as a substitute for continued American financial aid to Britain. Lend-Lease likely was not the only reason why Churchill initialed a memorandum signifying his approval of the Morgenthau Plan. Nonetheless, it is impossible to ignore the fact that Churchill viewed the extension of Lend-Lease as vital to Britain's future, meaning he may have been willing to agree to an otherwise unfavorable plan for the harsh treatment and deindustrialization of Germany following the war's conclusion.

The Soviet Factor and the Specter of Communism

The other factor which loomed large over the Anglo-American negotiations over the postwar future of Germany was the Soviet Union and the potential for the expansion of communism into Central and Eastern Europe following Germany's capitulation. While both Churchill and Roosevelt viewed Stalin and the Soviet Union as a valuable and necessary partner in the war against Germany, the pair differed on their visions of what a postwar partnership between the United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union would look like. Overall, Roosevelt, held a much more optimistic view of postwar relations with the Soviets, as evidenced by his thinly veiled threat to Churchill at the First Quebec Conference when he suggested the United States might share progress on the atomic bomb with the Soviets rather than Britain if Churchill did not agree to the Normandy landings. Churchill, meanwhile, believed that the Soviets—and communism—posed nearly as great of a threat to the economic and political stability of Europe in the coming decades as Germany had over the previous decade. This is not to say that these views were held uniformly on either government, but nevertheless the views held by Roosevelt and Churchill influenced postwar planning on both sides of the Atlantic. The Soviet factor was

especially central to the debate over the Morgenthau Plan and the postwar treatment of Germany, forming the main point of British contention against the contents of the Plan. Ultimately, the threat of Soviet expansion in Central and Eastern Europe factored into the termination of the Morgenthau Plan as a plausible approach to the postwar treatment of Germany.

Henry Morgenthau Jr.'s 1945 book *Germany is Our Problem* provides critical insight into the Secretary's thinking when he designed and proposed his Plan for the postwar treatment of Germany. Morgenthau devoted an entire chapter to the Soviet question, titled "Germany as an Anti-Russian Smoke Screen." As the title suggests, Morgenthau disagreed vehemently with the assertion by many in the American and British governments that a relatively strong and stable Germany served as a necessary bulwark against communism. In the chapter, Morgenthau recounted the mistakes made by the Allied powers following the conclusion of the First World War, arguing that the Allies were blinded by fear of the spread of communism to Germany. Morgenthau offered as evidence a memorandum by former British Prime Minister David Lloyd George presented during the Paris Peace Conference which suggested, "If we are wise, we shall offer to Germany a peace, which, while just, will be preferable for all sensible men to the alternative of Bolshevism." This fear of communism, Morgenthau argued, altered Allied views of an acceptable settlement and led to modifications that lessened the damaging aspects of the Treaty of Versailles and favored Germany in the long run.¹⁴¹

Morgenthau argued that the United States had little to fear from the Soviet Union, and that, instead, Germany was the real enemy to be held at bay. Evoking numerous acts of aggression by Germany over the previous three decades, Morgenthau stated that:

Americans know that it is Germany they have had to fight twice in a quarter of a century, not Russia. They know that our soldiers were killed and our civilians torpedoed

¹⁴¹ Morgenthau, *Germany is our Problem* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1945), 91-92.

by Germans, not Russians. They know that our own industries have been hog-tied by German cartels, not Russian. They know that plans for the subjection of the Western Hemisphere were laid by Germans, not Russians.¹⁴²

Morgenthau was not naïve enough to presume that the Soviet Union and the United States were natural allies. Rather, Morgenthau truly believed that Germany's aggressive tendencies could not be abated easily but had to be crushed by force. Otherwise, given time to rebuild, Germany would yet again plunge the world into a brutal war. Any attempt to use Germany as a buffer against the spread of communism was doomed to failure. As Morgenthau contended later in the same chapter, "If our policy is designed to buttress Germany as a bulwark against Russia, it will do more to breed another world war than any other single measure we could adopt in the whole conduct of our foreign affairs."¹⁴³ Lastly, Morgenthau argued that the Western Allies need not worry about the spread of communism because no democracy had ever overthrown its political system in favor of communism. Fascism, however, had already proven to be a threat to democracy throughout Europe and had led to the deadliest war in human history. Of which ideology, then, should the Allies have been wary?¹⁴⁴

Morgenthau's stance did not go without criticism, however. Many within the United States government began to question whether Morgenthau and his subordinates at the Treasury Department were actually working on behalf of the Soviets. State Department official Howard Trivers recounted later:

Later, I wondered whether they also had been acting under Soviet instructions, if they really were members of a Communist cells [*sic*]. It would have been typical Soviet policy and practice to instruct American Communists to support vocally the

¹⁴² *ibid.*, 91.

¹⁴³ *ibid.*, 96.

¹⁴⁴ *ibid.*, 98-99.

dismemberment and pastoralization of Germany and to seek to determine American policy along these lines.¹⁴⁵

As previously mentioned, Morgenthau deputy Harry Dexter White was later accused of secretly working for the Soviets, with evidence to support the accusation coming to light decades later. Others suspected the Treasury Department of leaking stories to the press that aided supporters of the Plan and, in effect, the Soviets. With the harsh proposals of the Morgenthau Plan in the open, German resistance on the Western Front could be expected to stiffen. Indeed, German propaganda quickly seized on the Plan in an attempt to rally the German people and slow the Allied advance. The chief beneficiary of stiffened resistance on the Western Front stood to be the Soviet Red Army as it advanced from the east, permitting the Soviets to penetrate deeper into the heart of Central Europe.¹⁴⁶

British views of Soviet intentions were far more skeptical. By 1944, Anthony Eden and other members of Churchill's cabinet had come to a general consensus that at least a moderately strong and rebuilt Germany was a necessary precondition for the overall recovery of the European economy. While many in the cabinet hoped to maintain positive relations with the Soviet Union, Soviet actions increasingly alarmed those in the government. The Chiefs of Staff likewise recognized the threat posed by Soviet expansion, arguing that "it would be crucial to bring a de-nazified but re-armed Germany into a Western European bloc," if the Soviets pursued expansionist policies following the war's conclusion.¹⁴⁷ As noted in the first chapter, Lord Cherwell was one of the few outliers who opposed the reconstruction of Germany in the postwar period. Yet, acting as Churchill's representative in meeting with Morgenthau at Quebec, even

¹⁴⁵ John Dietrich, *The Morgenthau Plan: Soviet Influence on American Postwar Foreign Policy* (New York: Agora Publishing, 2013), 52.

¹⁴⁶ *ibid.*, 52-53.

¹⁴⁷ Woods, 375.

Cherwell acknowledged that Churchill's primary concern was that the void left by Germany's absence not be exploited by the Soviets in the years to come.

Differences of opinion over Soviet intentions for the postwar period loomed large over the negotiations at the Second Quebec Conference. Ultimately, however, Churchill's fear of being cut off from further American financial aid led the Prime Minister to ignore his advisors and agree to the Morgenthau Plan. Nonetheless, the fears over the spread of communism did not abate as the debate over the Morgenthau Plan continued to rage in the coming months. In the end, the severe material deprivations found within Germany by Allied commanders ended any hope of the implementation of Morgenthau's radical proposals. As General Lucius Clay reported in March 1946, noting that the Soviet zone planned to feed its residents 1500 calories per day, "there is no choice between becoming a Communist on 1500 calories and a believer in democracy on 1000 calories. It is my sincere belief that our proposed ration allowance in Germany will not only defeat our objectives in middle Europe but will pave the road to a Communist Germany."¹⁴⁸ Though British views of the Soviets failed to win the day at Quebec, they would thus be vindicated in the end.

The Junior Partner: The Morgenthau Plan as a Case Study for the Future of Anglo-American Relations

Negotiations over the extension of Lend-Lease and the threat posed by Soviet expansion into Central Europe greatly affected the debate over acceptance of the Morgenthau Plan at the

¹⁴⁸ Telegram from Lucius Clay to Echols and Peterson, March, 27, 1946, ed. Warren F. Kimball, *Swords or Ploughshares?: The Morgenthau Plan for Defeated Nazi Germany, 1943-1946* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1976), 166.

Second Quebec Conference. Another issue that played a central role in the discussions at Quebec was the state of the Special Relationship itself. By the summer of 1944, the Special Relationship was no longer an equal partnership. The United States required time to mobilize for war, but by 1944 the military and economic might of the United States had been fully asserted with the country finally beyond the crippling years of the Great Depression. Britain, meanwhile, was bankrupt. Without Lend-Lease aid and a military alliance with the United States, Britain likely would not have survived. Thus, the Special Relationship developed into a partnership with junior and senior partners. Britain's status as the junior partner severely limited its ability to steer joint policy in its favor, therefore subjecting it to the will of the United States. Ultimately, Britain's status as the junior partner in the Special Relationship limited the amount of leeway Churchill enjoyed while considering Germany's postwar future. The debate over the Morgenthau Plan also serves as a useful case study for the future of Anglo-American relations in the decades after the conclusion of the Second World War.

For more than a century prior to the outbreak of the Second World War, Britain had been considered the greatest military power in the world. The Royal Navy's dominance of the seas was unparalleled, while the British Army was likewise a formidable force. By the time the United States entered the fray in December 1941, however, the veneer of British dominance had been removed. The German *blitzkrieg* forced the British Expeditionary Force from the continent, and while the Royal Navy maintained control of the seas in Northwest Europe, the German U-boat fleet harassed shipping lanes and left Britain susceptible to being cut off from vital supplies for the home front. Though the United States aided in breaking the stranglehold on Britain itself, Britain was no longer positioned to dominate the globe economically or militarily, a situation which Winston Churchill realized all too well. While obviously seeking to maintain Britain's

place as a great power, Churchill was not blinded to the United States' burgeoning superpower status. Desiring the completion of the "destroyers for bases" agreement and American financial aid, Churchill compromised when agreeing to the Atlantic Charter, allowing the inclusion of language that stood to threaten Britain's empire should the Allies have proven victorious.

Churchill was likewise very deferential to Roosevelt's judgement on a variety of issues. One example of Churchill's deference is evident in a relatively minor incident involving Charles De Gaulle in November 1942. Operation Torch, the Anglo-American invasion of French North Africa, commenced on November 8, 1942. Facing only Vichy French resistance, the Allies concluded a truce with the Vichy commander. In exchange for Vichy French cooperation, Admiral François Darlan was named the High Commissioner of the Vichy government in North Africa. Charles De Gaulle, the leader of the Free French, was outraged at the Allied willingness to negotiate with a man whom he deemed to be a traitor and requested that Churchill permit him time to broadcast a message condemning Darlan on the BBC. Before granting permission, Churchill discussed the matter with General Dwight Eisenhower to ascertain the American view of the situation. Eisenhower expressed his, and the President's, concerns that such a broadcast could hinder Allied operations should Darlan withdraw his support. After speaking with Eisenhower, Churchill telegraphed Roosevelt that he had denied De Gaulle's request. Making a point to note his deferral to Roosevelt's judgement, Churchill added, "If your view was that broadcasts of this kind were undesirable at the moment, being your ardent and active Lieutenant I should bow to your decision without demur."¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁹ Telegram from Winston S. Churchill to Franklin D. Roosevelt, November 22, 1942, *Churchill & Roosevelt: The Complete Correspondence, Vol. II*, ed. Warren Kimball (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 29-30.

Churchill's deference spread beyond diplomatic matters to include a number of military matters. When assigning commands, American officers were tasked the most coveted positions. Though British Field Marshal Henry Maitland Wilson served as the Supreme Allied Commander for the Mediterranean beginning in January 1944, it was American General Eisenhower who was rewarded with the title of Supreme Allied Commander Allied Expeditionary Force, thus overseeing the invasion of Normandy and the subsequent Allied drive towards Berlin. To be sure, Wilson's command was vital to the Allied war effort, with hundreds of thousands of troops committed to the struggle and Rome itself not falling under Allied control until just days before the Normandy landings. Nonetheless, the more glamorous of the two positions, especially after June 6, 1944, promised to be Eisenhower's command. Likewise, the Pacific Theater featured predominantly American leadership. General Douglas MacArthur served as Supreme Commander, Southwest Pacific Area while Admiral Chester Nimitz oversaw naval operations for the Theater. The chief British commander in the Pacific was Lord Louis Mountbatten, who served as the Supreme Allied Commander, South East Asia Command. Just as Wilson's command in the Mediterranean played a secondary role in the European Theater, Mountbatten's command was largely relegated to the periphery of the war against Japan.

Nonetheless, Churchill had good reason to defer to the United States militarily. The British Empire, the empire on which the sun never set, spanned the globe, encompassing approximately 25 percent of both the world's landmass and population at its peak. Despite the massive amount of manpower at Britain's disposal, the multi-theater nature of the Second World War and the disruption of shipping lanes caused by the German U-boat fleet prevented Britain from ever truly mobilizing the Empire. Even if Britain had been more capable of mobilizing its global empire, the white population of the empire, which would likely have been most desired

for service in Europe, only amounted to half of the United States' population.¹⁵⁰ The United States, once fully mobilized, simply had an overwhelming manpower advantage over their British allies, leaving Churchill little opportunity to resist complying with Roosevelt's requests.

This did not prevent Churchill from despairing at American dominance of the chief military commands. On August 17, 1944, about one month prior to the Second Quebec Conference, Churchill wrote to his wife Clementine, complaining:

We have three armies in the field. The first is fighting under American Command in France, the second under General Alexander is relegated to a secondary and frustrated situation by the United States' insistence on this landing on the Riviera. The third on the Burmese frontier is fighting in the most unhealthy country in the world under the worst possible conditions to guard the American line over the Himalayas into their very over-rated China. Thus two-thirds of our forces are being mis-employed for American convenience, and the other third is under American command.¹⁵¹

Ultimately, there was little that Churchill could do but accept American dominance of joint strategy and positions of command.

This did not mean that Churchill was completely unsuccessful in shaping Allied wartime policy. Particularly early in the war, prior to full American mobilization, the inexperience of the American troops in the field, coupled with momentary British superiority in numbers, granted Churchill more leeway to dictate policy. Churchill's greatest influence over Allied policy, of course, came in delaying the opening of the second front in France until the summer of 1944. The invasions of North Africa, Sicily, and the Italian Peninsula did significantly weaken the Axis stranglehold over the region, while also providing vital combat experience for the Allied forces.

¹⁵⁰ Keith Sainsbury, 1994, *Churchill and Roosevelt at War: The War They Fought and the Peace They Hoped to Make* (New York: New York University Press), 11.

¹⁵¹ Jon Meacham, 2003, *Franklin and Winston: An Intimate Portrait of an Epic Friendship* (New York: Random House), 294-295.

Nevertheless, the repeated delays angered both Roosevelt and Joseph Stalin, aiding in the erosion of Churchill's ability to direct policy in the war's later years.

As previously discussed, Churchill's continual attempts to delay a cross-channel invasion of France angered Roosevelt to the point that the President finally began to assert his status on the senior partner in the Special Relationship. This evolution would not end with the success of the Normandy landings, however. In the immediate aftermath of D-Day, Roosevelt pushed forward with plans for Operation Anvil (later to be renamed Dragoon), a proposed invasion of the French Riviera to liberate key port cities in the South of France. Roosevelt believed the invasion to be of paramount importance moving forward, but Churchill disagreed. The Prime Minister believed that the operation was largely unnecessary and that the resources necessary to conduct the operation could be better spent furthering Allied efforts in Italy or in a drive to reach Austria before the Soviets. Despite Churchill's dissenting view, Roosevelt reminded the Prime Minister that Anvil had been agreed by the Big Three at Tehran as part of the larger Allied strategy, and that nothing had sufficiently changed that required the plan to be reconsidered. Churchill reacted in furor. As General Alan Brooke, Churchill's lead military advisor, recalled in his diaries, after reading Roosevelt's response, Churchill looked as though he wanted to fight the President. Brooke noted that he eventually managed to talk Churchill down, bringing him around to his own outlook that, "All right, if you insist on being damned fools, sooner than falling out with you, which would be fatal, we shall be damned fools with you, and we shall see that we perform the role of damned fools damned well!"¹⁵² The invasion went ahead as planned, proving a minor success as the Allies faced little resistance from the undermanned German forces in the region. Once again, Churchill faced the reality that his status as the junior partner in

¹⁵² Meacham, 284-285.

the Special Relationship usurped his ability to influence matters of Allied grand strategy moving forward.

Indeed, by the Second Quebec Conference, the development of the roles of senior and junior partner had been fully formed. Without the ability to delay the opening of a second front any longer, along with Britain's financial problems and shortage of manpower compared to the United States, Churchill found himself with virtually no ability to apply leverage on the issues discussed at Quebec. Churchill went to Quebec facing the necessity of gaining Roosevelt's support for an extension of Lend-Lease aid. Though Churchill ultimately succeeded in this goal with the signing of a preliminary agreement for further Lend-Lease aid, the agreement came at the cost of British concessions on other matters, with the Morgenthau Plan chief among them. Despite a strong consensus within the British government and high command in favor of rebuilding Germany after the war's conclusion, Churchill was pressured to accept Morgenthau's proposals for the complete dismantlement of Germany industry and the return of the country to a pastoral state.

One could argue the extent to which Roosevelt seemed to have blackmailed (for lack of a better term) his British counterpart over an extension to Lend-Lease. However, it is important to note that the preliminary agreement for Lend-Lease extension had not yet been initialed when Roosevelt began to pressure Churchill over the Morgenthau Plan, a fact that Lord Cherwell reminded Churchill of following dinner on the night of September 13. Cherwell reminded Churchill that without American aid, severe austerity measures would be required to prevent total economic collapse, a prospect which would have effectively doomed Churchill's Conservative Party in the first postwar election. Thus, while Churchill was reluctant to go against the recommendations of his policy advisors and Chiefs of Staff, he was compelled to accept the

Morgenthau Plan, at least for the time being.¹⁵³ As historian Randall Woods has contended, “What is significant is that the Prime Minister’s fear of a Labour-socialist takeover in Great Britain had profound implications for international affairs in the fall of 1944. Quite simply, Winston Churchill, when push came to shove, proved willing to sacrifice diplomatic considerations for domestic ones.”¹⁵⁴

Churchill’s concessions at Quebec are certainly significant in understanding Anglo-American relations by the latter part of the Second World War. The agreements made at the Quebec Conference can be further extended, however, to examine the future of Anglo-American relations. With the defeat of both Nazi Germany and Japan on the horizon, the United States stood to be one of the world’s new great powers. British power, meanwhile, was in continual decline across the globe. Britain’s inability to adequately protect its Southeast Asian colonies began the process of decolonization in the region. In Europe, the continued presence of American troops following the war’s conclusion, combined with Soviet expansion in Eastern Europe, left Britain as a secondary player in the future of the continent. For much of the coming decades, while the Special Relationship was maintained in theory, the partnership between Britain and the United States remained especially unequal. Thus, the bullying nature of Franklin Roosevelt’s diplomacy at the Quebec Conference was not a standalone event, but rather represented a new normal in Anglo-American relations moving forward.

¹⁵³ Woods, 376.

¹⁵⁴ *ibid.*, 380.

Epilogue

The Suez Crisis and Britain's Lingering Junior Partner Status

Perhaps no alliance in world history, and certainly none during the 20th Century, has been as celebrated as the Special Relationship. The Anglo-American partnership fostered by Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill freed Western Europe from German domination, defeated Japanese imperialism in the Pacific, and created a system of institutions that formed the nucleus of a new world order in the postwar period. While the rhetoric used by the leaders of both countries has usually depicted an equal, mutually beneficial partnership, the reality has often proven to be quite different. Over the course of the Second World War, the Special Relationship evolved from an equal partnership into a relationship that featured a junior partner (Great Britain) and a senior partner (the United States). Indeed, by the time of the Second Quebec Conference in September 1944, Britain was no longer positioned to dictate policy or strategy, leading Churchill to largely defer to Roosevelt's judgement on most matters in hopes of receiving continued financial aid and military support from the United States.

Though Britain eventually recovered from her wartime malaise, Britain never truly regained its status as a great military and economic power. This left Britain's postwar leaders in a difficult position when it came to matters of preserving the Empire and safeguarding British interests globally. With the onset of the Cold War, Britain's leaders were forced to consider how their actions would be viewed in Washington and Moscow. The views of the United States were of particular concern with the Americans providing both the military and economic might that prevented Soviet aggression in Western Europe. As the junior partner, British leaders tended to

cooperate with the United States, providing support for the Korean War as well as backing American diplomatic efforts around the world.

Britain did not always rely on the United States to lead the way, however. For instance, when the United States ceased sharing atomic weapons research following the conclusion of the Second World War, Britain initiated its own program. The successful test of Britain's first atomic bomb on October 3, 1952, off the Western Coast of Australia made Britain the world's third nuclear power, joining the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union.¹⁵⁵ British desires to protect its global interests sometimes led to conflict with Washington, however. One particular incident especially displays the senior and junior partner relationship that emerged by the Second Quebec Conference: the Suez Crisis of 1956.

While much attention was paid to the Cold War conflicts fought in Korea and Southeast Asia, the Middle East became a key battleground between East and West. Following the Second World War, Britain and France slowly relinquished their control over the region. In addition to the pressures of creating a new balance of power in the region as the imperial tide receded, tensions were high in the region due to the creation of the State of Israel. The Israeli War of Independence, fought from 1947-1949, granted Israel territory beyond the boundaries proposed during the 1947 United Nations partition plan and left residual hostility between the new Jewish state and her neighbors, Egypt in particular. In the new postwar world order, Egypt remained of vital importance to British trade interests due to the location of the Suez Canal within its borders. Though officially an autonomous tributary state of the Ottoman Empire, Egypt had come under de facto control of the United Kingdom for much of the latter half of the 19th Century. Following

¹⁵⁵ Anthony Eden, *The Memoirs of Anthony Eden: Full Circle* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960), 412.

the collapse of the Ottoman Empire at the end of the First World War, Egypt officially became a British protectorate. This brief period in the Anglo-Egyptian relationship came to an end in February 1922 with the British government's issuance of the Unilateral Declaration of Egyptian Independence.¹⁵⁶

Despite this nominal independence, and fierce Egyptian opposition, British troops remained in Egypt for more than three decades, largely in an effort to maintain control of the Suez Canal. The Cold War and the increasingly ominous threat of nuclear war forced Britain to rethink its strategy in Egypt. Pan-Arab nationalism swept Egypt in the years following the Second World War, led by the charismatic future President of Egypt, Gamal Nasser. At the same time as Anglo-Egyptian relations were deteriorating, the Soviet Union successfully tested its first hydrogen bomb, increasing the possibility that a single strike could eliminate the entire British garrison at the canal base should the Soviets feel provoked. Fearing continued military presence in the Canal Zone would push Egypt towards the Soviets, the Conservative government under Winston Churchill determined to negotiate with the Egyptians, striking a deal in October 1954 to withdraw all British troops from Egypt within two years, with Egypt promising to respect British interests in the Canal Zone in return.¹⁵⁷

Despite British efforts to prevent Nasser from turning towards the Soviet Union, the Egyptian leader slowly fostered relations with the Soviets. The first blow to the West came in February 1955 following an Israeli raid in the Gaza strip that killed 28 Egyptians. Angered by the raid, Nasser requested an arms shipment from the United States to respond to future Israeli

¹⁵⁶ Steve Morewood, *Reassessing Suez 1956*, Simon C. Smith, ed. (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2008), 18-19.

¹⁵⁷ *ibid.*, 28-31.

provocations. When he was rebuffed by United States President Dwight Eisenhower, Nasser turned to the Eastern bloc, sealing an arms deal with Czechoslovakia in September 1955 that saw Soviet arms flow into Egypt.¹⁵⁸ At the same time, Nasser was in discussions with Western leaders to secure funding for a \$1.3 billion project to construct a dam at Aswan, which was projected to increase the amount of arable land in Egypt by about 25 percent. As historian Cole C. Kingseed has contended, “If Nasser was the key to cordial relations with Egypt, the dam was the key to Nasser’s good will.” Initially, Nasser accepted the West’s offer, which consisted of loans of \$200 million from the World Bank, \$54 million from the United States, and \$14 million from Great Britain, leaving Egypt to pay the balance of more than \$900 million itself.¹⁵⁹ Later, Nasser turned on the West, verbally attacking Britain and the United States and again turning to the Soviets for support, torpedoing support for the loans in the West and leading both countries to withdraw their financial support in July 1956. With the prospect of Anglo-American financial gone, Nasser was forced to find an alternative to offset these losses. The last British troops having withdrawn from Egypt in June 1956, Nasser found his answer. On July 26, Nasser announced the nationalization of the Suez Canal Company.¹⁶⁰

Nasser’s provocations brought relations with both Britain and the United States to a breaking point. Over the coming months, Eisenhower and British Prime Minister Anthony Eden discussed how to properly respond to the situation. Writing to Eisenhower on July 27, Eden attempted to impress on Eisenhower the necessity of a prompt response, arguing that, “If we do not [take a firm stance], our influence and yours throughout the Middle East will, we are

¹⁵⁸ Cole C. Kingseed, *Eisenhower and the Suez Crisis of 1956* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1995), 32-33.

¹⁵⁹ *ibid.*, 34.

¹⁶⁰ *ibid.*, 40-41.

convinced, be irretrievably undermined.” Eden later continued, “As we see it we are unlikely to attain our objective by economic pressures alone.... My colleagues and I are convinced that we must be ready, in the last resort, to use force to bring Nasser to his senses.”¹⁶¹ Though recognizing the necessity of resolving the matter, Eisenhower responded with caution in regards to resorting to a military option. Rather, Eisenhower believed that every possible diplomatic option should be considered first before resorting to force. Writing to Eden on July 31, Eisenhower informed Eden of this apprehension, saying that, “Public opinion here and, I am convinced, in most of the world, would be outraged should there be a failure to make such [diplomatic] efforts. Moreover, initial military successes might be easy, but the eventual price might become far too heavy.”¹⁶²

Eden’s response to Eisenhower’s July 31 letter attempted to draw parallels between Nasser and the fascist threat that faced Europe two decades prior. Eden noted that Nasser was active not just in Egypt but held sway “wherever Muslims can be found.” Moreover, Eden said that while he did not believe Nasser to be a Hitler, “the parallel with Mussolini is close. Neither of us can forget the lives and treasure he cost us before he was finally dealt with.” Due to the threat Nasser posed to the entire region, Eden argued that while a diplomatic effort to solve the crisis should certainly be made, the West must be prepared to replace Nasser with a regime sympathetic to Britain and the United States. Further, Nasser, backed by the Soviets, would

¹⁶¹ Telegram from Anthony Eden to Dwight Eisenhower, July 27, 1956, *The Eden-Eisenhower Correspondence, 1955-1957*, Peter G. Boyle, ed. (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 154.

¹⁶² Letter from Dwight Eisenhower to Anthony Eden, July 31, 1956, *The Eden-Eisenhower Correspondence, 1955-1957*, Peter G. Boyle, ed. (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 156.

likely make efforts to divide the West at any potential diplomatic conference, something to be avoided at all costs.¹⁶³

The potential conference the two leaders discussed was held from August 16-23, 1956, in London but resulted in no resolution to the crisis. Eden and Eisenhower both came away from the conference with greater belief that Nasser was acting at the direction of Moscow, though they differed in their assessment of the next steps. Eden continued to believe that Nasser could not be appeased but had to be dealt with before his ambitions spread beyond Egypt. Eisenhower, in turn, countered Eden's stated desire to act swiftly to regain control of the Canal Zone. In a September 8 letter, Eisenhower cautioned that the West must first provide more evidence of Nasser's intentions before acting with force: "Unless it can be shown to the world that he is an actual aggressor, then I think all Arabs would be forced to support him, even though some of the ruling monarch might very much like to see him toppled." Further, Eisenhower again warned that public support in the United States for military intervention to resolve the matter remained low, an especially important factor for the President who faced reelection in November 1956.¹⁶⁴ Simply put, while Eisenhower may have supported intervention in principle, he could not support such intervention in the present political climate.

With the situation in Egypt not resolved, Eden determined to move ahead without Eisenhower. Eden had been secretly planning a military operation in conjunction with the French and Israelis for weeks. Under the plan agreed to by the leaders of the three nations, Israel would

¹⁶³ Letter from Anthony Eden to Dwight Eisenhower, August 5, 1956, *The Eden-Eisenhower Correspondence, 1955-1957*, Peter G. Boyle, ed. (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 158-159.

¹⁶⁴ Letter from Dwight Eisenhower to Anthony Eden, September 8, 1956, *The Eden-Eisenhower Correspondence, 1955-1957*, Peter G. Boyle, ed. (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 168.

invade the Sinai Peninsula. Britain and France would then deploy an expeditionary force, citing the threat to international trade posed by conflict near the Canal Zone.¹⁶⁵ Eisenhower was furious. Cabling Eden on October 30 to ascertain the situation, Eisenhower reminded Eden of the Tripartite Agreement of 1950—signed by Great Britain, France, and the United States—that called for the maintenance of the 1949 territorial status quo in regards to the borders of Israel. “Without arguing the point as to whether or not the tri-partite statement should be outmoded, I feel very seriously that whenever any agreement or pact of this kind is in spirit renounced by one of its signatories, it is only fair that the other signatories should be notified.”¹⁶⁶ Eden defended British actions later that same day, arguing that:

We have never made any secret of our belief that justice entitled us to defend our vital interests against Nasser’s designs.... Egypt has to a large extent brought this attack on herself by insisting that the state of war persists, by defying the Security Council, and by declaring her intention to marshal the Arab States for the destruction of Israel.¹⁶⁷

As the situation developed, Britain and France issued Nasser an ultimatum to allow temporary Anglo-French occupation of the Canal Zone, otherwise it would be carried out by force. Eden attempted to reassure Eisenhower that the move was “not part of a harking back to the old Colonial and occupational concepts.”¹⁶⁸ Nonetheless, Eisenhower remained opposed to the use of force, reminding Eden that the situation was under consideration by the UN Security Council as they spoke. Without American support for the intervention, Britain and France slowly

¹⁶⁵ Kingseed, 82.

¹⁶⁶ Telegram from Dwight Eisenhower to Anthony Eden, October 30, 1956, *The Eden-Eisenhower Correspondence, 1955-1957*, Peter G. Boyle, ed. (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 176-177.

¹⁶⁷ Telegram from Anthony Eden to Dwight Eisenhower, October 30, 1956, *The Eden-Eisenhower Correspondence, 1955-1957*, Peter G. Boyle, ed. (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 178-179.

¹⁶⁸ Telegram from Anthony Eden to Dwight Eisenhower, October 30, 1956, *The Eden-Eisenhower Correspondence, 1955-1957*, Peter G. Boyle, ed. (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 181.

succumbed to the pressure. On November 5, Eden wrote to Eisenhower to express his “great grief...that the events of the last few days have placed such a strain on the relations between our two countries.” He continued by saying that the British and French believed they should hold their position until the UN could take over the situation and attempt to mediate the dispute between the Israelis and Egyptians. “We do not want occupation of Egypt, we could not afford it, and that is one of the many other reasons why we got out of Suez two years ago.”¹⁶⁹ The next day, Britain and France called for a ceasefire and began the process of withdrawing from the canal zone. The Suez Crisis was over.

Though often overlooked in the United States due to the greater impact that Korea, Vietnam, and other Cold War hotspots had on the American public, the Suez Crisis remains a seminal event in British history. The crisis and the international backlash to the government’s actions, coupled with ill health, led to Eden’s resignation as Prime Minister. Further, the Suez Crisis showcased the evolution of the Special Relationship over the course of the Second World War, which was firmly established by the time of the Second Quebec Conference in September 1944. The Anglo-American partnership was not equal, but rather Britain increasingly assumed the role of the junior partner. Britain undoubtedly remained a great power following the war’s conclusion. Yet, Suez displayed the limits of British power. Eden failed to gain American support prior to approving the Anglo-French occupation of the canal zone. With this support, Britain likely would not have been humiliated and could have achieved its goals in protecting its trade interests. Instead, Nasser’s position was assured, and Eden left office in disgrace. Little had

¹⁶⁹ Telegram from Anthony Eden to Dwight Eisenhower, November 5, 1956, *The Eden-Eisenhower Correspondence, 1955-1957*, Peter G. Boyle, ed. (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 182-183.

changed since the end of the Second World War, and little would change in the decades to come. The Special Relationship undeniably had one senior and one junior partner. Moreover, Britain's ability to unilaterally project strength around the globe was well and truly at an end. The sun was setting on the British Empire, and there was little Britain's leaders could do to prevent it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Boyle, Peter G., ed. *The Eden-Eisenhower Correspondence, 1955-1957*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005.

Cherwell Papers. Nuffield College Library, The University of Oxford. Oxford, England.

Diaries of Henry Morgenthau Jr., April 27, 1933, July 27, 1945. Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library, Hyde Park, NY. [Accessible online:

<http://www.fdrlibrary.marist.edu/archives/collections/franklin/index.php?p=collection/s/findingaid&id=535&q=&rootcontentid=189777>. First Accessed October 14, 2018].

Eden, Anthony. *The Memoirs of Anthony Eden: Full Circle*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960.

Eden, Anthony. *The Memoirs of Anthony Eden, Earl of Avon: The Reckoning*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965.

Gilbert, Martin, ed. *The Churchill War Papers: Never Surrender, May 1940-December 1940*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1995.

Harvey, John Harvey, ed. *War Diaries of Oliver Harvey, 1941-1945*. London: Collins, 1978.

Hull, Cordell. *Memoirs of Cordell Hull*. New York: Macmillan, 1948.

Kimball, Warren, ed. *Churchill & Roosevelt: The Complete Correspondence, Vol. II-III*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Kimball, Warren F. *Swords or Ploughshares?: The Morgenthau Plan for Defeated Nazi Germany, 1943-1946*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1976.

Morgenthau, Henry Jr. *Germany is our Problem*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1945.

Notter, Harley A., ed. *Postwar Foreign Policy Preparation: 1939-1945*, Washington: Department of State, 1950.

Office of the Combined Chiefs of Staff. *Octagon Conference, September 1944: Papers and Minutes of Meetings, Quebec, 12-16 September, 1944*. Washington, D.C.: Office of the Combined Chiefs of Staff, 1944.

Tully, Grace. *The President's Log for the 1944 Quebec Conference: September 9-21, 1944*. FDR Presidential Library. Hyde Park, NY. [Accessible online: <http://www.fdrlibrary.marist.edu/archives/collections/franklin/?p=collections/findingaid&id=509&rootcontentid=144443&q=second+quebec+conference#id144600>. First Accessed October 14, 2018].

Secondary Sources

Barker, Elisabeth. *Churchill and Eden at War*. New York: St. Martin's, 1978.

Beschloss, Michael. *The Conquerors: Roosevelt, Truman and the Destruction of Hitler's Germany, 1941-1945*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2002.

Chase, John L. "The Development of the Morgenthau Plan Through the Quebec Conference." *The Journal of Politics* 16, no. 2 (May 1954): 324-359. Accessed August 17, 2018. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2126031>.

- Coles, Michael. "Ernest King and the British Pacific Fleet: The Conference at Quebec, 1944 ("Octagon")." *The Journal of Military History* 65, no. 1 (January 2001): 105-129. Accessed November 2, 2018. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2677432>.
- Dietrich, John. *The Morgenthau Plan: Soviet Influence on American Postwar Foreign Policy*. New York: Algora Publishing, 2013.
- Gellman, Irwin F. *Secret Affairs: Franklin Roosevelt, Cordell Hull, and Sumner Welles*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.
- Hamilton, Nigel. *Commander in Chief: FDR's Battle with Churchill, 1943*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2016.
- Hinton, Harold B. *Cordell Hull: A Biography*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Doran, & Co, 1942.
- Hohn, Uta. "The Bomber's Baedeker - Target Book for Strategic Bombing in the Economic Warfare against German Towns 1943-45." *GeoJournal* 34, no. 2 (1994): 220. Accessed October 20, 2018. <http://www.jstor.org.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/stable/41146287>.
- Kingseed, Cole C. *Eisenhower and the Suez Crisis of 1956*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press.
- Lehrman, Lewis E. *Churchill, Roosevelt & Company: Studies in Character and Statecraft*. Guilford, CT: Stackpole Books, 2017.
- Levy, Herbert. *Henry Morgenthau, Jr.: The Remarkable Life of FDR's Secretary of the Treasury*. New York: Skyhorse Publishing, 2015.
- May, Dean L. "Morgenthau, Henry, Jr. (1891-1967), secretary of the treasury." *American National Biography* (February 2000). Accessed October 25, 2018.

<http://www.anb.org/view/10.1093/anb/9780198606697.001.0001/anb-9780198606697-e-0600452>.

Meacham, Jon. *Franklin and Winston: An Intimate Portrait of an Epic Friendship*. New York: Random House, 2003.

Moreira, Peter. *The Jew Who Defeated Hitler: Henry Morgenthau Jr., FDR, and How We Won the War*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2014.

Morewood, Steve. *Reassessing Suez 1956*. Simon C. Smith, ed. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2008.

Pratt, Julius W. "The Ordeal of Cordell Hull." *The Review of Politics* 28, no. 1 (1966): 76-98. Accessed November 5, 2018.

<http://www.jstor.org.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/stable/1405525>.

Sainsbury, Keith. *Churchill and Roosevelt at War: The War They Fought and the Peace They Hoped to Make*. New York: New York University Press, 1994.

Smith, Frederick, Second Earl of Birkenhead. *The Prof in Two Worlds: The official life of Professor F.A. Lindemann, Viscount Cherwell*. London: Collins, 1961.

Thomson, G.P. "Frederick Alexander Lindemann, Viscount Cherwell, 1886-1957." *Biographical Memoirs of Fellows of the Royal Society* 4 (1958): 45-71. Accessed September 17, 2018. <http://rsbm.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/roybiogmem/4/45.full.pdf>.

Woods, Randall B. "The Politics of Diplomacy: Winston S. Churchill and the Second Quebec Conference." *Canadian Journal of History* 22, no. 3 (December 1987): 367-382. Accessed August 17, 2018.

<http://ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=5332170&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.

ACADEMIC VITA

NICHOLAS C. LABECKI

nclabecki@gmail.com

EDUCATION

The Pennsylvania State University | Schreyer Honors College
College of the Liberal Arts | Bachelor of Arts in History
College of the Liberal Arts | Bachelor of Arts in Political Science

University Park, PA
Class of 2019

The University of Oxford | St. Catherine's College
Visiting Students Program

Oxford, England, UK
January 2018-June 2018

EXPERIENCE

Centre County Planning and Community Development Office

Intern

Bellefonte, PA

August 2017 – December 2017

- Researched historic properties in Centre County
- Documented historic properties to help create flood prevention plans
- Updated Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission information sheets originally created in the 1970s

U.S. Army Heritage and Education Center

Intern

Carlisle, PA

May 2017 – July 2017

- Conducted primary source research for curriculum development in the use of military history
- Created lesson plans for secondary educators utilizing the U.S. Army's archives
- Drafted press releases promoting upcoming events

Penn State All-Sports Museum

Intern | Volunteer

University Park, PA

January 2016 – May 2017

- Researched and authored a paper on the 211 Penn State lettermen who served in the First World War
- Assisted the museum director in creating *Field to Front: Nittany Lions at War, 1917-1919*, an exhibit which was featured from April 2017-December 2018, winner of Institutional Achievement Award from PA Museums

Bravo Group

Government Relations Intern

Harrisburg, PA

May 2016 – July 2016

- Assisted the Government Relations Team with legislative and client meetings during the state budget process
- Attended legislative committee meetings to report House and Senate activities for the Government Relations team
- Prepared an election report for update and distribution to Bravo's clients

LEADERSHIP AND INVOLVEMENT

Pennsylvania State University Presidential Leadership Academy

Member

University Park, PA

Spring 2016 – Present

- One of 30 students in the Class of 2019 selected by the university president and dean of the Schreyer Honors College to participate in an elite, four-year leadership and critical thinking skills development program.

Schreyer Honors College Student Council

Recruitment Chair | Tour Guide

University Park, PA

January 2016 – December 2017

- Conducted information sessions for prospective applicants to the honors college
- Provided tours of honors housing and other facilities available to scholars

Eagle Scout

New Cumberland, PA

September 2013-Present

HONORS

- Phi Beta Kappa, Evan Pugh Scholar Award, President Sparks Scholar Award, President's Freshmen Scholar Award, Phi Alpha Theta: National History Honor Society, Pi Sigma Alpha: National Political Science Honor Society, Kim Anderson Memorial Scholarship, Charles Wyndham Flanagan Memorial Award, Gene Bloch Memorial Award, Walter L. Peterson Department of History Award