



Steven Casey

The campaign to sell a harsh peace for Germany to the American public, 1944–1948

Originally published in History, 90 (297). pp. 62-92 © 2005 Blackwell Publishing.

You may cite this version as:

Casey, Steven (2005). The campaign to sell a harsh peace for Germany to the American public, 1944–1948 [online]. London: LSE Research Online.

Available at: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/archive/00000736>

Available online: 12 April 2006

LSE has developed LSE Research Online so that users may access research output of the School. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LSE Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute the URL (<http://eprints.lse.ac.uk>) of the LSE Research Online website.

This document is the author's final manuscript version of the journal article, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer review process. Some differences between this version and the publisher's version remain. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

The Campaign to Sell a Harsh Peace for Germany to the American Public, 1944-1948¹

Steven Casey

London School of Economics and Political Science

Abstract:

In the spring of 1944, a group of prominent US opinion makers launched a campaign aimed at convincing the American public of the need for a harsh peace for Germany. By exploring the dynamics of this campaign, which revolved around the activities of the Writers' War Board and the Society for the Prevention of World War III, this article focuses on an episode that has generally been neglected in the historiography of US post-war plans for Germany. It also adds a new dimension to the literature on the domestic mood in the US during the crucial period between the end of World War II and the onset of the Cold War, by first demonstrating how these anti-German spokesmen worked successfully to generate a hardening of popular opinion during 1944 and 1945, before charting how they found it increasingly difficult to sustain their campaign during 1946 and 1947. This failure was not simply a product of the natural cooling of popular passions or even the emergence of the Cold War. It also stemmed from the lobby's inability to sustain the networks it had created during World War II, not to mention its tendency to overreach and oversell at key moments.

On 22 April 1944, a page-long advert appeared in the *New York Times*. Placed by a new pressure group, the Society for the Prevention of World War III (SPWW3), it warned readers

not to be misled by ‘a group of German political exiles … working overtime to form a so-called council of democratic Germans in this country.’ ‘We have been fooled once by so-called German “democracy,”’ it stressed. ‘Must we be fooled again? This is no time for Americans to work on the manufacture of a device for Germany’s escape.’ Complementing this advert, the SPWW3 began distributing 100,000 copies of a free book to Congress, newspapers, radio stations, the clergy, and colleges. Entitled *Know Your Enemy*, this collated statements by Germans of all political persuasions in order to show how the German people have always been ‘in their aggressive militarism and fanatic war spirit … a permanent threat to all peaceful nations.’ At the same time, the SPWW3 also began making a list of German exile professors working in the US to weed out any ‘Pan Germans,’ as well as compiling a file of books, magazines, and newspapers that ‘carry “Pan-German” expressions.’ As newspapers across the country soon reported, all this activity was the first indication ‘that the US is to undergo a full-scale propaganda war’ concerning the shape of the forthcoming peace with Germany.²

This effort to sell a harsh peace to the American public would continue after the fighting in Europe had ceased. Ultimately, of course, it failed, for within three years of the war’s end the Truman administration was pushing for the revival of the western zones of Germany in order to kick-start a wider European recovery, while opinion polls found that most Americans supported a more positive policy towards the former enemy.³ Perhaps because of this failure, historians have given scant attention to the activities of the harsh-peace lobby. Indeed, the historiography on America’s response to the German problem focuses almost exclusively on private government debates. When the domestic dimension is briefly discussed, a picture emerges of a US public who firmly hated the German enemy by the end of World War II. By 1945, writes John L. Snell in one of the first treatments of the subject, Americans had ‘an ignorant animus against Germany.’ By the end of the European conflict, agrees Carolyn Eisenberg in a more recent work, polls ‘showed the American public to be sympathetic to a tough peace.’⁴ Yet the individuals attracted to the harsh-peace lobby were not

so confident. Indeed, in 1944 their main motive for launching a propaganda campaign was to try to put an end to the persistent American habit ‘of setting the Nazis apart from the German people’; a year later, although riding high in the wake of the concentration camp revelations, they continued to worry that the public might be insufficiently committed to keeping Germany weak.⁵ The first aim of this article is thus to explore a neglected aspect of the American domestic mood in the last months of the war, by describing the work of this lobby, its origins, its aims, and above all the tactics it employed to try to shift popular opinion. At the core of this campaign was the SPWW3, which in turn was closely related to, and in many respects a direct outgrowth from, the Writers’ War Board (WWB). The WWB had been established in 1942 in order to coordinate the work of thousands of writers across the country, ensuring that their output helped to generate and sustain support for the war effort. Ostensibly a private organization headed by the detective novelist Rex Stout and containing prominent figures such as the Book-of-the-Month Club editor Clifton Fadiman, the journalist William Shirer, and the Broadway lyricist Oscar Hammerstein II, the WWB had forged close connections with the Roosevelt administration, and had increasingly filled the void in the government’s information efforts left by Congress’ decision to muzzle the Domestic Branch of the Office of War Information (OWI) in the summer of 1943.⁶

The second goal of this article is to shed light on the ‘transmission process’ by which arguments, ideas, and images are placed on the public agenda.⁷ Although historians of the 1940s have increasingly focused their attention on ‘state-private’ networks, exploring the connections that the US government forged with nongovernmental organizations in order to sell particular policies,⁸ the literature on public opinion and foreign policy still tends to posit a simplistic relationship between officials and their domestic audience, often neglecting the role of intermediate institutions that occupy a strategic position between them. When it comes to the German problem towards the end of World War II, for example, historians frequently assume that the attitudes of both the government and public opinion hardened at a similar rate, as a natural and almost inevitable product of a tendency ‘to think negatively of the entire

enemy nation' in time of war.⁹ Yet, by focusing on the role of quasi-governmental organizations like the WWB, not to mention the activities of leading pressure groups like the SPWW3, what becomes clear is that there was nothing natural or inevitable about this development. Rather, it was at least partly the result of a conscious effort by the SPWW3 and WWB, working in tandem with certain individuals and institutions in official Washington, to refashion the whole debate. It is therefore important to explore the process by which anti-German arguments started to dominate the public discourse in the last months of the war.

After 1945, the harsh-peace case went into swift decline. Although the extant literature is again not terribly clear why this happened, one development naturally looms large: the Cold War. The assumption often made is that, with relations between the US and USSR deteriorating rapidly, the public's attention shifted promptly from one enemy to another. As it did, 'hard-line anti-Germanism' was not merely viewed as anachronistic now that the Soviet Union posed a clear threat; increasingly, it was also deemed to be dangerous, even 'un-American,' 'at best a devilishly sly way of maintaining the wartime alliance with the Soviets, at worst a formula for promoting the Bolshevisation of Germany.'¹⁰ Of course, the Cold War did play an significant role in the demise of the lobby, for it created an obvious chasm between senior officials who increasingly viewed the whole German problem through the prism of developing tensions with the USSR, and harsh-peace advocates who remained wedded to the conviction that Germany still posed the greatest menace to peace and stability. But the Cold War was not the whole story. Indeed, even before the US-Soviet tensions erupted in earnest in 1947 the harsh-peace lobby was decidedly on the defensive, needing to counteract their loss of influence with the administration after Truman replaced Roosevelt, having to battle against a different type of news story once the media shifted its gaze from Nazi crimes to German squalor, and often hampering their own cause with overly radical proposals that were too easily caricatured as beyond the pale by their rivals. As early as 1946, then, harsh-peace advocates no longer had such an easy entrée into government departments like the Treasury and the US Army, not to mention influential circles in both Congress and the

media. This article ends with an assessment of how the lobby tried to adapt to the new Cold War environment, especially during the Marshall Plan debate of 1947-1948. But, unlike other works on the domestic mood of this period, which focus almost exclusively on the Soviet angle,¹¹ it is also an attempt to explore some of the elements of the popular debate in the brief interregnum between World War and Cold War, a time when a degree of ambiguity remained on whether the central menace was Germany or the USSR.

I

The sudden appearance of the SPWW3's *New York Times*' advert in April 1944 was the product of three main concerns. The most obvious was the fact that, despite almost two-and-a-half years of war, the public's attitude towards the German enemy remained distinctly benign. Indeed, throughout 1943 and the first months of 1944, opinion polls consistently revealed that an overwhelming majority of Americans viewed only the Nazi leadership as the enemy. In September 1943, for instance, one poll found that less than a quarter of Americans thought that the Germans were inherently warlike. A short while later, another survey revealed that 71 percent felt 'the German government is the chief enemy,' with only 9 percent considering 'the German people as our main foe'; almost two-thirds of the public also confidently believed that the Germans wanted to get rid of their Nazi masters. The contrast with popular attitudes towards the Asian enemy was particularly striking, and explained the lobby's determination to focus on Germany rather Japan. As surveys found, more than half the American public believed the Japanese would 'always want war,' whereas only about a quarter of the population felt the same way about the Germans.¹²

That Americans hated the Japanese more than the Germans was hardly surprising given that Japan had attacked Pearl Harbor while the European war remained a somewhat distant affair; that the press had lavished far more attention on acts of Japanese savagery like the Bataan death march while generally neglecting the Holocaust; and that there was a racial undertone to the way in which many Americans viewed the Pacific war.¹³ But for members of

the harsh-peace lobby, two other factors seemed far more germane. One was the Roosevelt administration's failure to educate the public out of such attitudes. The President himself had repeatedly emphasised that Germans would be treated fairly after the war, hoping that this would weaken the Germans' will to resist.¹⁴ In the OWI, propagandists had tended to focus on the ideological threat posed by Nazism; some had also fretted that a campaign to arouse hatred against the Germans as a whole would have 'unfortunate results at the peace table.' Officials in the State Department had generally agreed; in their opinion, once the Nazi regime was eradicated it would be necessary to reintegrate Germany back into a multilateral framework, as the Atlantic Charter suggested, and so they recognized the wisdom of not drumming up popular resentment against each and every German.¹⁵

With the government unwilling to launch an anti-German campaign, harsh-peace proponents fretted that the way had been left open for Pan-German apologists to work their spell. Particularly pernicious were the current activities of groups like the Friends of Free Germany, which was supported by Reinhold Niebuhr, or the American Friends of German Freedom, headed by Paul Hagen, not to mention the campaigning of Dorothy Thompson, who used her radio broadcasts and *New York Herald Tribune* column to push a distinctly pro-German view. But the problem also had even deeper roots. As Rex Stout insisted in March 1944:

organized German propaganda has been so forceful in business circles, in the universities of our country, and in all walks of life, for the past decades, that there has been created a false picture of Germany's position in world affairs. According to a well-prepared and well-executed plan, started by Bismarck, Germany has used the universities as a basis to inculcate and to exaggerate in the youth of our country the importance of Germany's contribution to world culture. The result of this organized propaganda is the existence of an undeserved and widespread sympathy for Germany and the Germans.¹⁶

Rex Stout was to prove a particularly pivotal figure in the organization of the harsh-peace lobby. Perhaps befitting of a member of the liberal intelligentsia, his anti-Germanism

sprang not from any first-hand experience of the country but from his own reading about the people and their culture, particularly those works that placed the blame for both world wars squarely on Germany's shoulders. Although best known as the author of the popular Nero Wolfe detective stories, since Pearl Harbor Stout had committed himself full time to projects aimed at generating and sustaining domestic support for the war effort, and during 1943 he had issued periodic warnings about the perils of letting Germany off the hook once the war was over.¹⁷

In the spring of 1944, Stout proved highly effective in recruiting others to the cause largely because as chairman of the WWB he already had at his disposal an extensive network of leading writers, journalists, and commentators. Although the Board itself was confined to twenty members, all of whom lived in vicinity of New York City and so could attend its daylong meetings each Wednesday, its Advisory Council had no geographic base and contained a host of prominent figures, including Frederick Lewis Allen, Pearl S. Buck, Edward R. Murrow, and William L. White. The vast bulk of the Board's work—perhaps as much as 85 percent—was undertaken at the specific request of the US government, and included recruitment drives for the less glamorous parts of the US Army or campaigns attacking the black market in gasoline. For this reason, the WWB had a liaison office with the OWI, as well as close connections with the Treasury Department, whose periodic War Loan drives reached huge audiences, not to mention both the US Army and Navy. In addition, the Board had developed close ties with a variety of important media outlets, including the National Enterprise Association (NEA), which was one of the largest newspaper syndicates serving more than 600 local newspapers, the House Organ mailing, which reached about 2,700 industrial house papers, and the main debate shows on the three radio networks: Mutual's 'American Forum of the Air,' CBS's 'People's Forum,' and NBC's 'Town Meeting of the Air.'¹⁸

Although Stout was determined to use this impressive network to champion the anti-German cause, relying solely on the WWB had obvious drawbacks, especially the need to

obtain consensus on any policy statement, which tended to water down the finished product. As a result, in the spring of 1944 Stout also became the driving force behind the SPWW3, which had been founded the previous June and whose sole purpose was to launch public polemics on the subject of Germany and its post-war future. A non-profit organization funded partly by the proceeds of its publications, partly by donations from concerned citizens, and partly by Isidore Lipschutz, a long-standing opponent of the Third Reich and frequent contributor to a string of prominent causes, the SPWW3 was basically a direct spin-off from the WWB.¹⁹ Indeed, both were headed by Stout, both were based in New York City, and both had similar organizational structures. Moreover, the SPWW3's main publication, the monthly magazine *Prevent World War III*, often simply republished many of the articles, editorial pieces, and cartoons that the WWB had originally commissioned.

Those who were willing to line up under the SPWW3 banner tended to come from six overlapping groups. First, there were a group of liberal intellectuals, writers, and artists, mainly based in New York City, who already shared a common belief in the need for US membership of an international organization and racial equality at home. This is not to say, of course, that all liberals endorsed the SPWW3. On the contrary, American liberalism at this time had a distinctly 'protean character,' and a number of strands of this disparate group had long found it difficult to hate the Germans as a race. During World War I, for instance, progressive publicists had periodically highlighted Germany's much-vaunted penchant for efficiency, while Wilsonian liberals had sometimes been willing to distinguish between aggressive authoritarian leaders and the more pacific German public. Since then, liberals associated with the Roosevelt administration's propaganda campaign had distrusted the 'ballyhoo methods' that had been employed by George Creel's Committee on Public Information (CPI) during the last war, confident that the public could best be educated by a 'strategy of truth' rather than brazenly anti-German atrocity material. Meanwhile, other liberal opinion formers, from the Union for Democratic Action's James Loeb to the *Nation* and *New*

Republic, distrusted anything that smacked of anti-German racism, while professing a faith in the possibility of a democratic German revolution.²⁰

Yet the liberals attracted to Stout's campaign strongly challenged all these assumptions. Many were drawn into the fold by Stout's personal magnetism, enormous energy, and impressive organizational skills. This was certainly important for the likes of the editor, writer, and broadcaster Clifton Fadiman, the poet and author Christopher LaFarge, and the Broadway lyricist Oscar Hammerstein II. As Fadiman later explained, Stout 'was for many years my guru. To him, more than anyone else, I owe what basic understanding I have of World War II. He understood the Germans long before most of us did. And he knew the significance of the War was to be found in the German character.' In Stout's opinion, recent experience demonstrated that German political culture was peculiarly unsuited to democracy; he also inclined to the view that nations, like individuals, had their own free will and must face the consequences of their actions. Nor was Stout troubled with the CPI experience in World War I, believing that a measure of exaggeration and blunt talking were essential to grab the public's attention.²¹

Stout also quickly attracted support from a second group: those who harked back to 1918-1919, and were particularly convinced that recent problems stemmed from the fact that the last peace had been too soft. Indeed, Stout even brought George Creel into the SPWW3 fold, and the old propagandist was not slow to reprise his claim that 'never, in the course of German history have "good Germans" constituted anything but a pitiful, ineffectual minority.' A third group of recruits were those who had more recent experience of Germany, having witnessed Hitler's regime at first hand. Edgar Ansel Mowrer, for instance, had the distinction of being the first American journalist expelled from the Third Reich, while William Shirer and Sigrid Schultz had reported on Germany for different radio networks throughout the 1930s. A fourth component were some of the old 'warhawk interventionists' of 1940-41, who had been quick to recognize the German danger before Pearl Harbor and who now believed that this criminal nation should be firmly controlled once the war was over. Stout himself was a trustee

of Freedom House, which the Fight for Freedom Committee had been instrumental in establishing in October 1941 in order to bring all the interventionist groups under one umbrella. And he now prevailed upon the likes of the noted military commentator Major George Fielding Eliot to join the new campaign. A fifth group were the German-speaking émigrés who firmly rejected the pro-German ethos of the Hagen group, figures such as Emil Ludwig, the noted biographer of Bismarck, Wilhelm II, and Hindenburg, whose congressional testimony on the German character had caused quite a stir the previous year; T.H. Tetens, the author who had gathered an enormous archive of Pan-German propaganda; and Frederich W. Foerster, perhaps the most valued of all the new recruits because of a past that included imprisonment by the Hohenzollern regime in 1895, the nomination by a group of German intellectuals for a brief and doomed campaign for the Weimar presidency in 1926, and the publication of a string of academic books on the German problem.²²

These German émigrés had been at the core of the Society when it first emerged in summer of 1943, and they now found it somewhat difficult to adjust to the influx of new members from the world of media and the arts, fretting that some of the new recruits were insufficiently committed to keeping Germany weak.²³ But while there was a degree of tension amongst some of the SPWW3's constituent groups, Stout believed that the expertise of the German émigrés was vital to shield the organization from the charge that it was full of extremists and idealistic writers whose simplistic conception of the enemy had little grounding in German history, culture, or politics. In fact, the idea that the Society was made up of 'a permanent body on experts on international politics and economics' was at the core of the image it tried to present to the public. At the same time, Stout was also careful to send drafts of any key statements to other German experts like Frederick Schuman, Bernadotte E. Schmitt, and Edward Meade Earle, asking them to vouch 'for its truth as historical fact.'²⁴

Some harsh-peace advocates worried that this image of expertise sat somewhat uneasily next to the final group that was attracted to the SPWW3—those Americans whose anti-Germanism stemmed from a growing realization the Germans were exterminating Jews in

occupied Europe. Indeed, at a time when polls showed that a pervasive, if relatively shallow, anti-Semitism still pervaded America, some prominent figures in the lobby were quick to distance themselves from any ‘emotional’ commitment to European Jews, for fear that this might tarnish the whole enterprise. Fadiman, for instance, was anxious to stress that he did not bear any ill will against the Germans ‘because of their murder of the Jewish people’; his main gripe was with the ‘profoundly evil in the system they have elected to live under.’ Yet there was an obvious affinity between Stout’s project and those who believed that the American public had to be made more aware of Germany’s crimes. And, although Jewish-Americans and leading opinion formers alike were often divided on how to respond to the Holocaust, Stout was quick to bring on board figures from two of the organizations that had been most aggressive in publicizing Nazi savagery. Thus, the likes of Louis Bromfield, Harry Louis Selden, and Sigrid Unset, had all played a role in the Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People of Europe since the summer of 1943; figures such as Julius L. Goldstein, James H. Sheldon, and Isidore Lipschutz were all members of the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League, which had been attempting to highlight the plight of Jews under the Nazis since 1933.²⁵

II

Before the spring of 1944, apart from the occasional article, Stout’s main effort to shape domestic opinion on the German problem had been confined to championing particular books: Sigrid Schultz warnings that *Germany Will Try It Again*, Emil Ludwig thoughts on *How To Treat the Germans*, and Paul Winkler on Germany’s *Thousand-Year Conspiracy*.²⁶ But with polls continuing to reveal stubborn levels of support for a soft peace, by the spring of 1944 Stout and his lieutenants worried that this approach was proving too stuffy and intellectual to reach a mass audience. As Fadiman explained to Foerster when he proposed another such tome, an anti-German book would now ‘have less utility today than it would have had a year or so ago, and that what is needed is constant controversy, the proper use of the radio, journalism, and well-timed propaganda.’²⁷

Using the WWB's access to numerous media outlets, Stout was now particularly keen to push the work of prominent non-Americans, prodding the *Reader's Digest* to publish the propaganda tirades of the notorious Soviet Germanophobe Ilya Ehrenburg, drumming up a wider audience for Lord Vansittart's *Lessons of My Life*, and even arranging a special fifteen minute radio program on WOR-Mutual to showcase Noel Coward's 'Don't Let's Be Beastly to the Germans.'²⁸ The summer of 1944 also proved a propitious time to amplify the anti-German angle of a string of prominent news stories, as German 'V' bombs hit London, the Soviets liberated the Majdanek death camp, and the 20 July bomb plot highlighted the belated and ineffectual nature of the anti-Nazi opposition. In this environment, the WWB and SPWW3 tried hard to find an even wider audience for stories by commentators like Walter Lippmann, who now emphasized the need to keep Germany 'disarmed and demilitarised'.²⁹ But above all, Stout sought to use his WWB network to encourage a wide range of media outlets to take pieces by SPWW3 authors.

The examples of such prompting were legion. In June, for instance, the Board prevailed upon the National Enterprise Association to circulate short editorials to its 600 or so newspapers on subjects like 'How the Germans Expect to Work a Negotiated Peace' by Emil Ludwig and 'Aren't There Any Good Germans' by Cecil Brown. Throughout the summer, the *American Legion Magazine* took a variety of similar articles; one by the historian Allan Nevins, for instance, 'lambasting the revisionist school of historians, which tried to persuade us after the last war that it really wasn't Germany's fault at all, and who are beginning to raise their heads and squawk about the same thing about this war.'³⁰ At the same time, the radio networks were encouraged to air town hall debates on issues like the perils of German self-government and whether all Germans were Nazis. Even comic strips were targeted, with Standard Magazines Comic Division agreeing to run several strong anti-German pieces. These must be 'very simple, easy-language stuff,' the Board directed, which 'must leave a sting and it must be shocking in the way it portrays the brutality of the Germans.'³¹

One of the most successful relationships the WWB established was with Sumner Welles, President Roosevelt's ex-foreign-policy adviser, who published *Time for Decision* in the summer. This became an instant bestseller, leaping to the top of the *New York Times'* list in August, helped in part by the fact that WWB members worked to ensure that it was adopted as a Book-of-the-Month Club selection. The Board was particularly interested in Welles' anti-German chapter, which traced the long ancestry of Germany's forceful expansion and argued that partition was the only way to subdue this aggressive nation. And Board members therefore worked hard to help Welles reproduce this argument in a variety of forums—in a snappy 700-word article for the *American Legion Magazine*, in an even sharper 200-word op-ed piece for 1,000 industrial house organs, and in another short piece for Army newspapers and magazines.³²

As well as using the WWB's extensive network to persuade the media to air more anti-German sentiments, Board members also tried to obstruct the publication of anything deemed likely to create sympathy for a post-war Germany. Thus, the WWB pointedly failed to find outlets for pieces revealingly titled 'Too Hard a Peace May be Brittle' or 'Hitler Has a Keen Sense of Humour,' which, as the WWB's Executive Secretary explained, 'might mislead the public into readiness to make a soft peace.' Throughout the summer, the Board not only successfully got certain journals to withdraw patently pro-German items, but also repeatedly protested to book publishers and newspaper editors whenever they published Pan-German pieces.³³ When the inevitable complaints came back, Stout hastened to try and stress that his aim was not censorship. There was a difference, he claimed, between freedom of expression and the right to be published. And no one, Stout insisted, ought to be allowed to publish Pan-German ideas because, while experts might be 'sufficiently informed' to pick out the fallacies in such pieces, 'the general public is by no means well equipped.'³⁴

This basic pessimism about the public's susceptibility to soft-peace ideas also encouraged Stout to come out into the open, with a clear and hard-hitting manifesto that would grab everyone's attention. In June, he prevailed upon 19 of the 20 Board members to

sign a statement calling for a peace harsh enough to convince the Germans that their master-race ideas could never work. By that time, he had also pushed the SPWW3 into the public eye, and it quickly began launching a string of polemical attacks. Already, a stinging pamphlet by Foerster and Tetens accusing Victor F. Ridder, the publisher of the *New York Staatszeitung*, of ‘un-American’ and ‘Pan-German’ activities had engaged the interest of libel lawyers. Now, the SPWW3’s organ, *Prevent World War III*, quickly became a forum for colourful, even intemperate, statements, with Stout himself setting the tone with an attack on those

moist-eyed sentimentalists who, when they are told that the Germans have murdered five million civilians, prattle of Beethoven and Goethe; those who, told that the Germans have plundered the rest of Europe to the tune of eighty billion dollars, murmur that German housewives have the cleanest kitchens in the world; those who, learning that the Germans have deliberately shelled out hospital on the Anzio beach, speak nostalgically of the romantic beauty of the Rhine.³⁵

As SPWW3 members then began a series of town hall debates, their efforts were rarely restrained. At one gathering in New York City in June, the police even had to be called as tempers flared and ‘violent differences of opinion developed among the members of the audience.’ As the *New York Times* reported, many were particularly angry that Dorothy Thompson’s soft line was ‘attempting to free the Germans from all war guilt.’³⁶

Despite generating such public controversy, Stout also hoped to use his connections at the WWB to bring important elements of official Washington into the anti-German campaign. Until now, to be sure, such institutions as the State Department and the OWI had generally shied away from rousing hatred against each and every German. But the sprawling Roosevelt administration was hardly a united monolith, and by the summer of 1944 there were growing signs that the anti-German campaign now had some natural allies in government. In the Justice Department, for instance, anti-cartel sentiment was no longer as rife as it had been in the late 1930s when Thurman Arnold had headed the Antitrust Division, but there nevertheless remained a few key individuals who viewed the expansionist activities of

German cartels like IG Farben with particular alarm. One of the most vocal was Norman M. Littell, the assistant attorney general, who in July began a campaign to educate the public about German economic penetration of the Western Hemisphere. The WWB quickly stepped in to help Littell disseminate his ideas through organizations like the National Committee Against the Persecution of the Jews.³⁷ Even more encouragingly, in August, Littell's boss, Attorney General Francis Biddle, entered the fray, when he appeared before Senator Harley M. Kilgore's subcommittee on Military Affairs. Kilgore was a liberal New Dealer from West Virginia who was convinced that German big business posed a very real menace, and had begun hearings on the role they had played during the years of Hitler's expansion. In this forum, Biddle bolstered Kilgore's efforts by describing German cartels as 'departments of the German government' and calling for their eradication once the war was over.³⁸

The US Army was another area where the SPWW3 found some important allies. At the top, of course, the dominant tone was clearly set by Secretary of War Henry Stimson, who firmly believed that Germany should be handled leniently after the war, as well as by senior generals planning the occupation, who thought that the Germans would be easier to govern if they were treated well. But different views also existed. Since the start of the war, officers in charge of training new recruits had tended to hold few qualms about using hate to foster a fighting spirit amongst GIs.³⁹ In the summer, numerous training officers now wrote to the SPWW3, praising it for producing Tetens' *Know Your Enemy* and asking to be placed on the organization's mailing list for future material. The WWB also arranged for speakers like Samuel Grafton and Louis Nizer to address troops about the need for a harsh peace, as well as persuading leading reporters like Ernie Pyle to write anti-German pieces for Army newspapers.⁴⁰

By the summer of 1944, perhaps the most controversial official connection that Stout had forged was with the OWI. Although this propaganda organization was now merely a shell of its former self, its domestic budget having been slashed the previous year, the WWB still maintained a liaison office with the OWI, which served as a clearinghouse for authors who

wanted to help the war effort in some way. True to form, Stout was not slow in using this to help spread his message—a fact that the journal *Common Sense* latched onto in May. Launching a stinging attack, it insisted that Stout’s campaign raised the distinct ‘danger that we will come through this war victims of rampant racism—hating Germans as Germans, crying for blind vengeance.’ *Common Sense* was particularly appalled by the WWB’s close contacts with the OWI, and it pointedly asked Elmer Davis, the head of the bureau, whether the continued relationship between the two organizations denoted ‘government approval of Mr. Stout’s vendetta.’ Until now, Davis had indeed been content to publicly differentiate between Nazis and Germans. But forced to respond to these charges, the head of the OWI declared that he preferred ‘to be regarded as a friend of the ten other European peoples whom the German people have wantonly attacked and atrociously oppressed... If the German people want anybody’s friendship, they had better do something to earn it.’⁴¹

Bolstered by this revealing change of emphasis from certain official quarters, the SPWW3 expanded its efforts during the summer. To broaden its base, it opened branches in Chicago, Des Moines, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle, and Spokane. Its members also began privately lobbying senior officials in Washington. In June, the President’s top military aide attended a talk by Foerster, which not only focused on the fact that the Nazi philosophy ‘has been accepted and developed by the entire German people,’ but also advocated dismemberment. By now, Roosevelt himself was privately convinced that some form of harsh peace would have to be imposed on the entire German nation, and was even inclining towards ideas like dismemberment.⁴² He was therefore sympathetic to the broad thrust of the SPWW3 message, and invited Stout to the White House on a couple of occasions for informal chats. Moreover, although highly cautious in his public statements, and still hoping to postpone a detailed public discussion about the peace until the war was won, during the summer Roosevelt also began emitting subtle public hints that he endorsed much of what the WWB and SPWW3 were trying to do. FDR certainly did not mind that Stout and the Board were in the process of producing a series of campaign pamphlets for the Democrats, some of which

focused upon the militaristic nature of the German enemy and the need for unconditional surrender.⁴³ Small wonder, then, that opponents of a harsh peace were starting to complain that the WWB and SPWW3 were at the hub of a burgeoning ‘state-private’ network, which was engaged in a wide-ranging effort to lay the groundwork for the forthcoming debate on post-war peace plans.⁴⁴

III

At the start of September 1944, as this anti-German campaign began to take off, the State Department’s Office of Public Affairs (PA) recorded ‘a general stiffening of attitude towards Germany ... in current opinion surveys, newspapers, and radio comment,’ no doubt reflecting all the Board’s efforts. Polls were certainly moving in the lobby’s direction, with Gallup finding in August that 73 percent now advocated keeping Germany as a third rate power, while 67 percent wanted the Allies to supervise German re-education; 51 percent also opposed rebuilding any German industry that could be used for producing weapons (up from 31 percent in January).⁴⁵ Yet, not all opinion formers were so eager to endorse the WWB and SPWW3. As well as the attack in *Common Sense*, back in June Dorothy Thompson had tried to block the WWB statement on the German problem. And throughout the summer, the CBS network had remained consistently hostile, its news correspondent, Quincy Howe, calling Stout’s views ‘racist,’ while its radio executives had refused to give Stout airtime for what it considered a one-sided discussion of the German issue.⁴⁶

In September, news that the President was contemplating the radical Morgenthau Plan to ‘pastoralise’ Germany suddenly gave these opponents the perfect opportunity to launch a sustained campaign of criticism. Quite independently of the SPWW3, over the summer Henry Morgenthau Jr. and his senior aides in the Treasury Department reached the conclusion that the Germans would have to be treated severely after the war, particularly in the economic sphere. At the Quebec Conference on 15 September Morgenthau then prevailed upon Roosevelt and Churchill to endorse a version of his program, which looked forward to

‘eliminating the war-making industries in the Ruhr and in the Saar’ in order to convert ‘Germany into a country principally agricultural and pastoral in character.’⁴⁷

Although recent media surveys had noted some hardening of opinion, when word of this decision leaked to the press the immediate reaction was savage. Morgenthau was personally vilified for possessing ‘a feverish mind from which all sense of realities had fled.’ His proposal was variously depicted as foolhardy and counterproductive, for it would implant ‘a festering sore … in the heart of Europe,’ would result in the mass starvation of the German people, and would undoubtedly prove ‘too severe to win the approval of the American public.’⁴⁸ In this environment, Stout’s opponents quickly tried to link the SPWW3 with the Morgenthau Plan, with Dorothy Thompson charging that both ‘have been furnishing Goebbels with his most effective propaganda.’ In the popular debate, ‘Morgenthauism’ thus swiftly became a major handicap for harsh-peace advocates, since it was a useful buzzword that critics could use to characterize the whole lobby as a bunch of dangerous extremists whose views were totally beyond the pale.⁴⁹

For Stout, who had worked hard to line up German experts behind the cause, it must have been particularly galling that Morgenthau was widely portrayed as an ill-informed dilettante trespassing onto territory he clearly failed to understand. But Stout and his supporters were also alarmed by their sudden loss of influence inside key areas of the administration. True to form, Roosevelt was certainly quick to distance himself from a controversial subject in the midst of a tight election campaign, ostentatiously taking the Treasury out of the planning for Germany’s future and swiftly breaking all the budding links he had developed with the SPWW3. Indeed, at one stage the President had contemplated inviting Stout to the White House to reassure the SPWW3 chairman about his vision for post-war Germany. But in the middle of October his appointment secretary suddenly called Stout and ‘suggested [that he] wait [until] after the election when [there would be] more time to talk at length.’ In response, the SPWW3 sent a public letter to the White House, calling on the President not to abandon the Morgenthau Plan because of media pressure.⁵⁰ It also forged

links with the Treasury, who turned to Fadiman and Stout to see whether they could line up prominent names to drum up support for pastoralisation. But, in a disturbing indication of the drift of sentiment, Fadiman soon had to report back apologetically that all the people of calibre were suddenly unavailable to help out.⁵¹

The one saving grace was that the Morgenthau Plan leak had at least concentrated the public mind on the whole German problem, and although there was little support for Morgenthau's specific pastoralisation proposal, the media was now more interested in discussing Germany's future. One of the WWB's biggest breaks came in October, when the *March of Time* devoted a whole newsreel to the question of 'What to Do with Germany?' Clearly echoing the Board's basic line, this concluded that 'Germany's crimes are the direct responsibility of the German people.' Naturally delighted, the WWB worked hard to find the largest possible audience for this newsreel, arranging previews and urging editors and newspaper columnists to run pieces on it in the print media.⁵² The next month, the Board also lined up speakers for a series of radio debates on reparations, a hot topic in light of the Morgenthau Plan. Its position in all these broadcasts was simple, and closely mirrored the Treasury position. 'The Soft Peace Boys think we should collect reparations,' the WWB explained. 'The Hard Peace Boys say no reparations because we would have to rebuild German industry, re-establish her credit, etc., in order to make it possible for her to pay.'⁵³

Throughout the winter of 1944-1945, a number of developments helped the harsh-peace lobby to launch a counterattack. One was Senator Kilgore's report, released five days after the election, which provided a new, more moderate, rallying point with its emphasis on 'the dismantling and removal' of just Germany's metallurgical and chemical industries. Morgenthau was ecstatic about this, telling Kilgore that 'I thought you got out a swell report.'⁵⁴ After his re-election, Roosevelt also seemed more susceptible to such ideas. Indeed, although leery of anything that smacked of extensive deindustrialisation, in preparing for the Yalta Conference the President nevertheless included some SPWW3 literature in his 'trip file.'⁵⁵ On his return from Yalta in March, Roosevelt then spoke publicly of Germany as the

number one problem of ‘vital political consequence,’ calling for complete disarmament and extensive reforms to eradicate the evils of militarism from the German body politic. The SPWW3 was quick to applaud the fact that Yalta ‘has made one thing crystal clear’: ‘The theory that Nazism and Nazism alone was responsible for the aggressive character of the German nation is completely discredited once and for all time.’ A few weeks later, it then issued its own policy statement, which clearly echoed the line taken by Kilgore—and perhaps implied by Roosevelt—with its emphasis on the need to separate the Ruhr, Rhineland, and the Saar completely from Germany, to ensure there was no heavy industry under German ownership.⁵⁶

Another development working in the anti-German lobby’s favour during this period was the growing public awareness of the full extent of the Nazi crimes. In November the Board started to become more aggressive in this sphere, not only urging commentators like Walter Winchell to ‘popularise’ the word ‘genocide’ to describe Nazi crimes, but also helping to disseminate a War Refugee Board report that used eyewitness accounts to provide official confirmation of the Nazis’ unprecedented ‘campaign of terror and brutality.’⁵⁷ Then, in the spring of 1945, after the US Army liberated a series of concentration camps in the heart of the Reich, the WWB and SPWW3 were finally given the opportunity truly to exploit the atrocity angle.⁵⁸ Across the country, the WWB pressed 177 cities to set up showings of an Army Signal Corps newsreel that presented explicit scenes of the camps. On 22 May the SPWW3 also hosted a large rally at Carnegie Hall, which significantly attracted an impressive array of keynote speakers from across the political spectrum, including Senators Alben Barkley (D-KY) and Leverett Saltonstall (R-MA), Congressman Dewey Short (R-MO), the publisher Joseph Pulitzer, and Mayor Fiorelli LaGuardia. Many of these opinion formers had been invited by the Army to witness the German concentration camps at first hand. And all were now anxious to stress the whole German nation’s culpability for these crimes. ‘It would tax the incredulity of any normal intelligent human being,’ declared Barkley in a typical

statement, ‘to ask him or her to believe that these things existed without widespread knowledge among the German people themselves.’⁵⁹

As the war in Europe came to an end, all the momentum suddenly seemed to be with the harsh-peace lobby. In Congress, Kilgore began a new round of hearings, replete with secret documents purporting to show German plans to rearm in the near future and even testimony from harsh-peace opponents in the State Department conceding that Germany would ‘try again for a position of world dominance.’⁶⁰ At the same time, polls now demonstrated a marked shift in the popular mood. Whereas as late as March 70 percent had still been willing to believe that the German government was the chief enemy, this figure now plunged to 53 percent, while 55 percent held the mass of Germans in some way culpable for all these atrocities.⁶¹ Perhaps indicative of the prevailing mood, in the New York Supreme Court the SPWW3 even won a \$100,000 libel verdict, the judge upholding its claim that Ridder, the editor of several newspapers and journals, was the leader of the Pan-German conspiracy in the US. It was a victory that seemed to confirm Stout’s contention that pro-German propagandists had been at work trying to distort the American mind. But it was also a victory that would prove to mark the high-tidewater mark of the harsh-peace campaign.⁶²

IV

Part of the problem the harsh-peace lobby faced in trying to maintain this momentum stemmed from the demise of the WWB. Through this organization, Stout had developed an extensive network of media contacts, which had been exploited to the full to place the anti-German message firmly on the public agenda. But after VJ Day, the WWB swiftly came to an end. Although Stout tried to keep a successor organization going, without the urgency of war he was no longer able to motivate and mobilize writers, who were soon caught up in the general desire for demobilization, normalcy, and a return to peacetime pursuits. The SPWW3 did remain intact, but because it was a single-issue group, which lacked the extensive media connections and respectability of the WWB, and because its radical polemics and close

association with the Morgenthau Plan had already engendered deep suspicions in certain quarters, the SPWW3 was in a far weaker position to shoulder the whole burden.

Nor was the SPWW3 able to maintain the network of relationships that Stout and his lieutenants had constructed with important elements of official Washington. This, too, was partly a product of the end of the war, which placed German policy more firmly in the hands of those individuals in the US Army like General Lucius D. Clay who were determined to make the economy operational. But the most important shift occurred with Roosevelt's death on 12 April. His successor, the inexperienced Harry S. Truman, was instinctively opposed to a harsh peace, particularly in the economic sphere, believing that Germany would require 'some industry' after the war. Privately, the new President also considered Morgenthau to be a 'blockhead, nut,' and in May he rebuffed the Treasury Secretary's proposal to publicize JCS 1067, the harsh directive that formed the basis of American occupation policies, 'while the American people were aroused over the German atrocities.' The next month, Truman then tried to get Kilgore to postpone his hearings until after the Potsdam Conference, and when this proved impossible he first moved to prevent Morgenthau from testifying, before excluding the Treasury from internal policy debates on Germany, and then firing Morgenthau on the very eve of the Big Three Conference.⁶³

Morgenthau's departure stemmed in large measure from his views on Germany, which were clearly at odds with the new President's. But Truman also favoured neat and tidy lines of bureaucratic responsibility, and he firmly believed it was the State Department's task to advise on issues like the future of Germany. This swiftly enhanced the influence of a group of officials who were instinctively hostile to the liberal ideas that tended to permeate the Treasury and SPWW3. As Carolyn Eisenberg points out, these State Department officials tended to share an elite background and pro-business mentality; they brought to 'their work a perspective akin to that of industrialists, bankers, and Wall Street lawyers,' and were naturally hostile to anything that smacked of extensive deindustrialisation, believing firmly that German industry would be vital to any future reconstruction of Europe. Soon after Roosevelt's death,

James F. Byrnes was also appointed to head the State Department. Pragmatic rather than business oriented, at the Potsdam Conference in July Byrnes backed away from the harsher line Roosevelt had favoured earlier in the year. Indeed, convinced that a ‘clean separation’ between East and West was the best way to avoid tension with the Soviets over Germany, Byrnes wanted to ensure that the western zones would retain sufficient industry so that the Germans—and not the US taxpayer—would finance necessary imports.⁶⁴

Yet, during the summer of 1945, the administration’s new orientation was not always readily apparent to its domestic audience. In fact, in his public speeches and statements, the new President proved to be a consummate politician. All too aware of the drift of public opinion, on his return from Europe Truman clearly accentuated the punitive aspects of the Potsdam Protocol, placing the blame for the war squarely on the German people and stressing that the structure of the German economy would have to be radically altered with ‘chief emphasis … on agriculture and peaceful industry.’⁶⁵ Similarly, in October, as news stories about the Army’s ‘lackadaisical attitude’ towards the German occupation found their way into influential newspapers and opinion polls recorded that 52 percent believed the US occupation was ‘not hard enough,’ the President even decided to publicize JCS 1067, with its injunctions against taking any steps ‘designed to maintain or strengthen the Germany economy.’ Harsh-peace advocates were naturally delighted. Morgenthau even wrote to Truman, praising him for this decision. Such an action, he insisted, would ‘give the American public the opportunity to back you up in seeing that the Potsdam agreement is carried out.’⁶⁶

As this statement reveals, the harsh-peace lobby quickly seized on the Potsdam agreement to symbolize how Germany ought to be treated in the future. Potsdam, they hoped, would neutralize the charges of extremism associated with ‘Morgenthauism’ and place their cause squarely in the mainstream of political debate. After all, Potsdam seemed to denote that tough terms remained the policy of those at the very top of government. It also appeared to offer the best path to continued Big Three unity. Yet, what they could not foresee was that the media would soon turn against Potsdam, while at the same time the new administration’s

basic suspicion of a harsh peace would slowly start to exert an influence, albeit often indirectly, on the public debate.

Indeed, after the autumn of 1945, the President suddenly dropped out of the public debate on the whole subject of Germany's future, while a number of public signals emanating from different parts of official Washington now seemed to suggest that it would be a mistake to impose an excessively harsh peace. In private, to be sure, there remained much wrangling over the whole German problem, as different individuals and institutions engaged in a protracted debate over America's position for the Level of Industry discussions and the extent of both denazification and decartelisation. Yet what filtered out to the public was a series of reports on initial conditions inside occupied Germany that all seemed to point in roughly the same direction—the Hoover Report by the chairman of the German Standard of Living Board; the Colmer Report by six members of the House Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy; the Price Report by the President's special representative; Eisenhower's regular reports on the progress of occupation; and finally, the State Department's policy paper on reparations and the peacetime economy. Although they all differed on key details, the central thrust of their conclusions was that the stern measures envisaged by Potsdam and JCS 1067 were unworkable, and that key elements of the German economy would have to be rebuilt otherwise the Germans would starve.⁶⁷

As winter descended, media and congressional opposition to any policy that suggested 'planned economic chaos' began to intensify. Increasingly, news stories about Germany no longer focused on concentration camps or echoed the WWB's line about the culpability of the whole nation. Instead, the overwhelming emphasis was now on the destruction and chaos, the hunger as the daily calorie intake fell well below 1,500 calories mandated by JCS 1067, the cold and enforced idleness as wartime destruction remained unrepaired and the economy languished. Eyeing this environment with mounting concern, a growing number of leading figures began to press for a relief package for the German people. In Congress, a group of Republicans led by Senator Kenneth S. Wherry (R-NE) and Representative Harold Knutson

(R-MN) introduced resolutions for the appointment of a congressional committee to investigate ‘famine’ conditions in Germany. In a separate development, 34 senators petitioned the President to provide relief aid and more food. In Germany itself, the American Military Government (AMG) was increasingly keen to counter media criticism of the occupation, and throughout 1946 it launched a propaganda offensive, which included showing leading media figures what conditions were like on the ground. After one such visit in the spring, a delegation of some of the most influential media men, including Henry Luce, Frank Gannett, and Eugene Meyer, returned home to urge that all four American broadcasting networks hold a radio show that would present the full facts about this food shortage to the American people.⁶⁸

Many opinion makers now blamed Potsdam for this state of affairs, linking it to a familiar bugbear. ‘The present level of German production was so low (and so likely to drop further),’ *Time* pointed out in the spring of 1946, ‘that not even the most vindictive Morgenthau-er could reasonably object to emergency measures.’ An editorial in the *New York Times* went even further. The Potsdam agreement, it declared, ‘which provides for planned unemployment … and sentences all of Europe to long-standing impoverishment,’ might easily spawn a German resistance movement ‘born of helplessness and desperation.’ The US, agreed those like Dorothy Thompson, the *Washington Star*, and *US News* who had always opposed a harsh peace, must do something soon to halt the ‘drastic economic dismantlement of Germany.’⁶⁹

Sensing the clear drift of opinion away from Potsdam, the SPWW3 reacted angrily, lashing out in typically virulent fashion at ‘the prophets of doom’ who were conjuring

all kinds of terrifying pictures about the Potsdam decisions. Germany was the victim of a ‘plot’; the Morgenthau’s were out for German ‘blood; the German children were going to be ‘starved’; Germany was going to be cut up in little bits and thrown to the ‘sharks’; German ‘Kultur’—German industry, the very backbone of Europe, would be broken. ‘Poor Germany!’ ‘Poor Europe!’ ‘Poor world!’⁷⁰

Harsh-peace spokesmen also dissented from the view that was starting to dominate both official and media circles in two specific respects. First, while most journalists now focused on the appalling conditions inside Germany, reporters linked to the SPWW3 like Shirer and Mowrer concentrated more on the unrepentant Germans who dwelt amongst the rubble. ‘Even in traditionally anti-Nazi Berlin,’ recorded Mowrer in a typical comment, ‘too few Germans as yet saw anything amiss in their late government.’ Second, while officials involved with the occupation tried to emphasize the depth of destruction to Germany’s economic capacity in the hope of generating support for positive policies, harsh-peace spokesmen worked hard to challenge the claim that Germany was on its knees. ‘The photographs which we have seen of the destruction of German cities have left us with a feeling that now Germany’s potential for war has surely been demolished,’ Kilgore wrote in an article for the *New York Times* magazine in August 1945. But this, he hastened to add, ‘is not the case.... The basic power of German industry remains—and remains a potential dangerous fact for war.’⁷¹

Yet, increasingly, the harsh-peace lobby found it difficult to get this message across. The SPWW3 now clearly lacked allies in the administration. Indicative of its changing fortunes was the ‘roll of honour’ it compiled in February 1946, praising all those who supported the anti-German cause. Gone were the days when the SPWW3 could list leading figures inside the White House, OWI, Treasury, and Justice Department in its corner. Now, the roll of honour included just three congressmen, two industrialists, and the former First Lady, while the three individuals who had previously worked in government had all now resigned.⁷²

A harsher environment also existed on Capitol Hill, as Kilgore discovered in the summer of 1946, when his subcommittee’s budget was slashed by the Senate Committee on Audit and Control. Powerful critics of Kilgore’s crusade against German cartels, including Republicans like Wherry, H. Styles Bridges (R-NH), and William C. Revercomb (R-WV), had worked hard to secure this budget cut. But they were also abetted by one of the harsh-peace lobby’s perennial errors: the tendency to overreach. Just as Morgenthau had

overreached in terms of what he had included in his economic Plan, so Kilgore had now overreached in terms of jurisdiction. His subcommittee was meant to be investigating cartel practices in the US, the auditors concluded, but it had increasingly ‘engaged in activities foreign to its authority,’ and was therefore being forcibly reigned in. The outcome of the 1946 midterm elections then made matters worse. Although Republicans campaigned largely on domestic issues, such as an end to wartime price controls, some leading GOP spokesmen also focused intermittently on the German problem, charging that both the Potsdam agreement and the Morgenthau Plan were responsible for the current plight in Germany. When the Republicans emerged victorious, Kilgore’s influence waned still further, most noticeably when a new GOP-appointed counsel to his Committee, George Meader, who had close contacts to officers under Clay’s command, issued a report on US occupation policy that was far milder than Kilgore and his allies would have liked.⁷³

V

That the SPWW3 had few friends either in Congress or in many areas of the media would prove a distinct boon to senior Truman administration officials, who by 1947 were firmly convinced that Germany’s western zones would have to be placed on a self-supporting basis in order both to reduce the costs of occupation and to prevent the prevailing economic chaos from becoming a perfect breeding ground for communism. Even in 1945, many senior officials in the White House, State Department, and Army had been privately convinced of the wisdom of allowing Germany to revive as a major industrial player, and a series of reports published in the autumn of that year had indicated to the public the drift of this thinking. Byrnes’ Stuttgart speech in September 1946, with its emphasis on permitting the Germans to enjoy the fruits of ‘industrial growth and progress,’ had then made the government’s retreat from Potsdam crystal clear. In 1947, as the economic situation in Europe continued to deteriorate and as senior officials became increasingly convinced of the threat posed by the USSR and communism, the new the Secretary of State, George C. Marshall, went even further

by formally discarding JCS 1067 and calling for a European Recovery Programme (ERP) to reconstruct Europe, including the western zones of Germany.⁷⁴

The SPWW3 responded to this development with alarm, its members privately bemoaning that all their worst predictions had come true.⁷⁵ But what could be done? In certain respects, the organization simply continued with its efforts to lobby elite and mass opinion—albeit in a far more anaemic form than during the war years. Throughout 1946, despite its outsider status, the SPWW3 had consistently pressed for a harsh peace in the economic sphere, privately asking the State Department to clarify America's position on reparations, as well as trying to place public pressure on the government to ensure the tough implementation of laws aimed at liquidating Germany's foreign assets.⁷⁶ In 1947, *Prevent World War III* now implored Marshall to rehabilitate Europe by distributing Germany's excess industrial capacity amongst its neighbours. SPWW3 members were also encouraged to write letters to the White House and State Department, urging officials 'to abide by the Potsdam agreement.'⁷⁷ And in March the SPWW3 leadership helped to organize a National Conference on the German Problem, held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City. Attended by 185 prominent figures, including Eleanor Roosevelt, Albert Einstein, Henry Morgenthau, Edgar Mowrer, Sumner Welles, Emil Ludwig, Friedrich Foerster, Louis Nizer, and Eugene Rostow, the Conference drafted a set of resolutions that were then sent to Truman and Marshall. Although the SPWW3 did not entirely agree with everything the Conference came up with, 'in the interests of creating unity' it nevertheless signed up to a declaration that charged that 'any plans to resurrect the economic and political power of Germany ... [were] dangerous to the security of the world.'⁷⁸

In the changed environment of 1947, however, the SPWW3 also underwent significant changes itself. One was the target of its enmity. Whereas in 1944 Stout had been particularly anxious to counteract the effects of decades of Pan-German propaganda, now the main threat seemed to be those pro-business elites working in key positions inside the Truman administration, who had close business contacts inside Germany and who wanted to revive its

economy simply to make a profit. Of course, these suspicions were not entirely groundless, given that leading officials such as Dean Acheson, John McCloy, or Robert Lovett did all have connections with Wall Street banking and law firms, while up and coming planners like George Kennan and Paul Nitze had a natural affinity with Germany and the Germans, dating back to childhood travels and an immersion in the language and culture. But for such officials, it was clearly a desire to contain Soviet influence rather than base economic interests or cultural identification that underpinned their policy choices—a fact that the SPWW3 basically ignored as it labelled significant developments as the work of ‘key experts … who have personal business ties with Germany.’ Nitze, in particular, was singled out as a guiding light of US policy on the grounds not just of his German-American heritage but also because he had German business associates dating back to his Wall Street days, not to mention the fact that he had perhaps used his work on the Strategic Bombing Survey to get ‘in thick with the Krupps, etc.’⁷⁹

That the SPWW3 had resorted to such a charge against a rising star in the State Department demonstrated how low its influence had fallen in official circles—and Nitze soon threatened to sue.⁸⁰ But this was not its only hostile audience. By 1947, the SPWW3 also had a more fraught relationship with the media, largely because a number of anti-German reporters and liberal commentators were starting to fall foul of their editors, publishers, and broadcasting executives. One of the first victims was Raymond Daniell of the *New York Times*, who was recalled from Germany in 1946 after writing a string of critical pieces about the soft nature of US occupation policy. In January 1947, Raymond Gramm Swing then made his last broadcast for the Blue Network; in the spring William Shirer was forcibly retired from CBS, going the same way as other liberals like John Vandercook, whose views had attracted the hostility of powerful network advertisers.⁸¹

The fate of such liberals foreshadowed the experience of many on the left of the political spectrum in the coming years, particularly those associated with Henry Wallace’s Progressive Citizens of America (PCA). At the start of 1947, the disparate liberal movement

was fractured in two, as Wallace and his supporters attacked US policy for deliberately provoking a break with the Soviets, while the Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) became the focal point for staunchly anticommunist liberals. At first glance, the effect on the SPWW3 of this split would seem to be straightforward enough. After all, leading liberals attracted to the ADA banner, such as Niebuhr and Loeb, had long been hostile to the anti-German campaign; now they were even more convinced that Germany would have to be revived as a bulwark against communist expansion. In stark contrast, the anti-German cause chimed neatly with the Wallace position. After taking over as editor of the *New Republic* in October 1946 (after being sacked by Truman for his outspoken pro-Soviet views), Wallace was certainly quick to warn that many Germans ‘still harbour Nazi beliefs’ and that there was a distinct danger that any German rehabilitation ‘may simply lead to a revived German war machine.’⁸² As WWB chairman, Stout had also recruited widely amongst the ranks of writers and artists, and some like Normin Corwin, Oscar Hammerstein II, and Mark Van Doren were also members of the Independent Citizens’ Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions (ICC/ASP), an organization that quickly gravitated behind the Wallace banner. Some of these figures would later get caught up in the Red Scare. The ICC/ASP, for instance, was soon placed on the Attorney General’s list of communist front organizations, while the likes of Guy Emery Shipley, former President of the Associated Church Press and Chairman of the SPWW3 back in 1945, was identified by *Life* magazine in 1949 as ‘one of the prominent people who, wittingly or not, associate themselves with a Communist-front organization and thereby lend it glamour, prestige or the respectability of American liberalism.’⁸³

But while both the division in liberal ranks and the accusations of pro-communism helped to weaken the anti-German cause, it would be a mistake to view the SPWW3 as a close ally of Wallace or a simple victim of domestic Cold War politics. For one thing, the Society’s Board was consciously drawn from a broad spectrum, and conspicuously continued to contain a number of retired military men and prominent established names—such as Mrs J. Borden Harriman, a former US Minister to Norway and Herbert Pell, a former Minister to

Portugal and Hungary, and America's representative on the War Crimes Commission—to protect it from claims that it was full of idealistic writers. For another, as the National Conference on the German Problem demonstrated, the anti-German coalition continued to straddle, albeit somewhat uneasily, the growing divide between the PCA and ADA. Many of the SPWW3's leading spokesmen were certainly able to reconcile their anti-German views with a staunch anti-communism. Stout and Foerster, in particular, were keen to emphasize that they were neither communists nor in agreement with Soviet policy. Mowrer, who became SPWW3 vice chairman in 1947 and one of its leading spokesmen on the ERP, was also a founder member of the ADA. His efforts to square the circle between containing communism and keeping Germany down were fairly typical. In Mowrer's view, it was vital to contain the new Soviet menace. But he was also unconvinced by the administration's confidence that the recent destruction of the German industry together with future monitoring of the German activity, including supranational controls over the Ruhr, would be sufficient to stop Germany from again threatening its neighbours.⁸⁴ Instead, Mowrer firmly believed that the US had 'to make certain that ERP does not become an instrument for the revival of those predatory forces in Germany which have always looked with scorn upon democracy,' by ensuring that France, Holland, and Belgium were fed and revived first, even if this meant giving them important components of German industry.⁸⁵

As the debate on the ERP got underway, the SPWW3's problem was not so much that it was now discredited as excessively pro-Soviet. Rather, its difficulties stemmed more from the fact that the close connections it had forged with government and the media during the war had proved impossible to maintain—and this was largely the product of Roosevelt's death, a shift in the media gaze to German squalor, and the lobby's public association with the radical Morgenthau Plan, all of which predated the emergence of new Cold War political alignments. Still, whatever the cause, the ERP debate now threw the SPWW3's basic weakness into particularly sharp relief, especially when its efforts were compared to those of a new pressure group, the Committee for the Marshall Plan to Aid European Recovery (CMP). Indeed, while

the CMP began a publicity barrage in the press and on the radio, the SPWW3 no longer had access to a large network of media outlets. While the CMP liaised closely with senior figures in the Truman administration, the SPWW3 was now something of a pariah in official circles and was even rebuffed when it tried to ‘to arouse the interests of prominent members of the Democratic Party, such as [Robert] Hannegan.’ And while the CMP was remarkably active on the Hill, providing numerous witnesses and briefings throughout the duration of the congressional hearings, the SPWW3 was forced to work with just a few legislators, such as Adolf J. Sabath (D-IL), Michael J. Mansfield (D-MT), and Helen Gahagan Douglas (D-CA) in a vain effort to ‘organize the liberal forces in Congress to offset the avalanche of propaganda now heard everywhere.’⁸⁶

That the SPWW3 was now hopelessly outgunned by the CMP clearly underlined how far its standing had fallen since 1945, and its obvious inability to influence the ERP debate proved to be a vital and symbolic moment for the organization. Although its activities continued after 1948, particularly in the areas of protesting against lax sentences handed down to war criminals or campaigning against the re-emergence into the German mainstream of leading industrialists associated with the Nazis, the Marshall Plan and its successful implementation shifted the mainstream debate away from the wartime concern with emasculating German industry. From now on, the SPWW3 was even more at the margins, its negligible influence indicated by the fact that many of the leading names who avoided the excesses of the Red Scare began to focus their energies elsewhere. Stout and Mowrer, for instance, increasingly devoted more time to the cause of international federation and world government, which in their view now seemed to offer the best method of preventing World War III in the Cold War era.⁸⁷

Yet their anti-German campaign had not been entirely without significance. In the last stages of World War II, the WWB and SPWW3 had played an important role in fostering a more hostile environment towards Germany in both official and media circles. Moreover, even the SPWW3’s failure by 1948 had had an important consequence on the political

debate—albeit in an unintended, negative, and ironic way. For as the Truman administration embarked upon the tricky course of generating popular support for the ERP, one of the few problems it did not have to worry too much about was vehement and overwhelming domestic opposition to the prospect of reviving the western zones of Germany. ‘The American foreign-policy mood is permissive,’ noted the political scientist Gabriel A. Almond a short while later.⁸⁸ On the subject of Truman’s German policy this was certainly true. It was also a by-product of the failure of the harsh-peace campaign in the years since 1945—a failure that stemmed not just from the end of World War II and the natural cooling of popular passions, or even the emergence of the Cold War and the focus on a new enemy. Instead, it also resulted from the harsh-peace lobby’s inability to sustain its alliances with both influential media figures and leading government officials, together with its tendency to oversell and overreach at key moments.

NOTES

¹ The author would like to thank the Truman Library for the award of a travel grant and the staffs of the Truman Library, the Roosevelt Library, the Library of Congress, and the US National Archives for their helpful assistance. I would also like to thank Mary Osielski at the University of Albany Library for helping me to track down material from the Tetens Papers.

² SPWW3 ‘It is High Time to Call a Spade’ *New York Times*, April 22, 1944; Tete Harens Tetens, *Know Your Enemy* (New York, 1944), p.109; Sigrid Arne, ‘Battle Looms Over Rival Peace Plans,’ *Washington Post*, 2 April 1944.

³ By January 1947, 72 percent of Americans endorsed US aid ‘to help get Germany’s peacetime industry going again’; by July, less than one-tenth of the population was opposed to rebuilding Germany because of the part she had played in the last war. State Department, Office of Public Affairs, ‘Fortnightly Survey of American Opinion on International Affairs,’ Survey No.67, 22 January 1947, entry 568L, box 11; University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, ‘Public Attitudes Toward American Foreign Policy: A Nationwide Survey,’ July 1947, copy in entry 1587, box 39; both in RG 59, National Archives II, College Park, MD [cited hereafter as NAII].

⁴ John L. Snell, *Wartime Origins of the East-West Dilemma Over Germany* (New Orleans, 1959), p.13; Carolyn Eisenberg, *Drawing the Line: The American Decision to Divide Germany* (Cambridge, 1996) [hereafter Eisenberg, *Drawing the Line*], p.45, p.244. See also, John L. Snell, ‘What to Do with Germany?’ in *The Meaning of Yalta: Big Three Diplomacy and the New Balance of Power*, ed. John L. Snell (Baton Rouge, 1956), p.38; John Morton Blum, ‘United Against: American Culture and Society During World War II,’ *The Home Front and War in the Twentieth Century*, ed. James Titus (USAAF, 1982), p.8; Jost Hermand, ‘From Nazism to NATOism: The West German Miracle According to Henry Luce,’ *America and the Germans: An Assessment of a Three-Hundred Year History*, ed. Frank Trommler and Joseph McVeigh [hereafter *Americans*, ed. Trommler and McVeigh] (Philadelphia, 1985), p.75, p.80. Others also imply that the US public was in a stern mood. For instance, Warren F. Kimball asserts that FDR believed the Morgenthau plan would command domestic support; see *Swords or Ploughshares? The Morgenthau Plan for Defeated Nazi Germany, 1943-1946* [hereafter Kimball, *Swords or Ploughshares?*] (Philadelphia, 1976), p.42.

⁵ SPWW3, ‘Statement of Policy,’ *Prevent World War III* [hereafter PWW3], i (June-July 1944), i.

⁶ Thomas Howell, ‘The Writers’ War Board: US Domestic Propaganda in World War II,’ *Historian*, lix (1996-97) [hereafter Howell, ‘The WWB’] 795-97.

⁷ Nancy Bernhard, ‘Clearer Than Truth: Public Affairs Television and the State Department’s Domestic Information Campaigns, 1947-1952,’ *Diplomatic History*, xxi (1997), 546.

⁸ See, for instance, Mark Lincoln Chadwin, *The Hawks of World War II* (Chapel Hill, 1968); Richard H. Steele, *Propaganda in an Open Society: The Roosevelt Administration and the Media, 1933-1941* (Westport, 1985); Michael Wala, ‘Selling the Marshall Plan at Home: The Committee for the Marshall Plan to Aid European Recovery,’ *Diplomatic History*, x (1986) [hereafter Wala, ‘Selling the Marshall Plan’], 247-65; Howard Schonberger, ‘The Japan Lobby in American Diplomacy, 1947-1952,’ *Pacific Historical Review*, xxxvii (1977), 327-59; Samuel F. Wells, ‘Sounding the Tocsin: NSC 68 and the Soviet Threat,’ *International Security*, iv (1979), 116-58; Nancy Bernhard, *US Television News and Cold War Propaganda* (Cambridge, 1999).

⁹ Benjamin Alpers, *Dictators, Democracy, and American Public Culture: Envisioning the Totalitarian Enemy, 1920s-1950s* (Chapel Hill, 2002), pp.208-9

¹⁰ Frank Ninkovitch, *Germany and the United States: The Transformation of the German Question since 1945*, updated edn. (New York, 1995), p.33. Other works that briefly discuss the domestic mood in this vein include John Gillingham, ‘From the Morgenthau Plan to the Schuman Plan: America and the Organization of Europe,’ *American Policy and the Reconstruction of West Germany, 1945-1955*, ed. Jeffery M. Diefendorf, Axel Frohn, and Hermann-Josef Rupieper (Cambridge, 1993), p.133; Carl C. Hodge and Cathal J. Nolan, “As Powerful as We Are”: From

the Morgenthau Plan to Marshall Aid,' *Shepherd of Democracy? America and Germany in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Carl C. Hodge and Cathal J. Nolan (Westport, 1992), p.155; Robert Gerald Livingston, 'Germany's Role in America's Containment Mission: 1945-1954,' *German-American Interrelations: Heritage and Challenge*, ed. James F. Harris (Tübingen, 1985), pp.111-15; Richard M. Freeland, *The Truman Doctrine and the Origins of McCarthyism* [hereafter Freeland, *Truman Doctrine*] (New York, 1985), pp.7-9.

¹¹ See, for example, Ralph B. Levering, *American Opinion and the Russian Alliance, 1939-1945* (Chapel Hill, 1976); Louis Liebovich, *The Press and the Origins of the Cold War, 1944-1947* (New York, 1977).

¹² OWI, 'Current Surveys,' No.48, 29 March 1944, entry 149, box 1715, RG 44, NAI; 'Treatment of the Enemy,' *Public Opinion Quarterly*, viii (1944), 296-97; State Department, 'Public Attitudes on Foreign Policy: Post-war Treatment of Japan,' Special Report No.47, 7 December 1944, entry 568J, box 1. NAI.

¹³ John Dower, 'Race, Language, and War in Two Cultures: World War II in Asia,' in Lewis A. Erenberg and Susan E. Hirsch, *The War in American Culture: Society and Consciousness during World War II* (Chicago, 1996), pp.169-70; Christopher Thorne, *The Issue of War: States, Societies, and the Far Eastern Conflict of 1941-1945* (London: 1985), p.60.

¹⁴ Welles to FDR, 6 October 1942, PSF (Diplomatic): GB: Winant, FDRL, Hyde Park NY; FDR to Hull, 17 January 1944, PSF (Departmental): State: Hull, FDRL; FDR to Hull, 5 April 1944, PSF (Departmental): State, FDRL; Warren F. Kimball, ed., *Churchill and Roosevelt: The Complete Correspondence* (3 vols., London, 1984), ii. 652.

¹⁵ Steven Casey, *Cautious Crusade: Franklin D. Roosevelt, American Public Opinion and the War against Nazi Germany, 1941-1945* (New York, 2001) [hereafter Casey, *Cautious Crusade*]. Minutes CWI Meeting, 12 May 1942, and attached memorandum, 'Pros and Cons on Hate Atrocities,' entry 6E, box 11, RG 208, NAI; OWI, 'Radio Background Material, Our Enemies: The Nazis,' 12 January 1943, entry 43, box 3, RG 208, NAI. 'Bases of the Foreign Policy of the United States,' Press Release No.88, 21 March 1944, box 144, Cordell Hull Papers, Library of Congress [hereafter LC], Washington DC.

¹⁶ Stout to Roberts, 21 March 1945, Letters of Praise folder, box 5, Society for the Prevention of World War III Papers [hereafter SPWW3], Butler Library, Columbia University; Stout, 'SPWW3,' undated, box 88, Tete Harens Tetens Papers, Grenander Department of Special Collections, University of Albany, NY.

¹⁷ Stout, 'We Shall Hate, or We Shall Fail,' *New York Times Magazine*, 17 January 1943, p.16; John McAleer, *Rex Stout: A Biography* [hereafter McAleer, *Stout*] (Boston, 1977), pp.302-5.

¹⁸ WWB, *Second Annual Report* (January 1944); Howell, 'The WWB,' pp.795-813.

¹⁹ Committee for the Prevention of World War III, Certificate of Incorporation, June 1943, box 88, Tetens Papers.

For an example of how the SPWW3 was funded, see invoices of the donations from the likes of J. Goldwurm, Goldmuntz Bros., A.C. Litton, and H. Untermans; Lipschutz to SPWW3, 24 January 1944, box 88, Tetens Papers. Lipschutz was in demand to fund a variety of causes, from the American Veterans Committee to the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League.

²⁰ Gary Gerstle, ‘The Protean Character of American Liberalism,’ *American Historical Review*, 1c (1994), 1043-73; John A. Thompson, *Reformers and War: American Progressive Publicists and the First World War* (Cambridge, 1987), pp.105-8; Brett Gary, *The Nervous Liberals: Propaganda Anxieties from World I to the Cold War* (New York, 1999), p.5, p.153; Frank A. Warren, *Noble Abstractions: American Liberal Intellectuals and World War II* (Columbus, 1999), pp.55-57.

²¹ McAleer, *Stout*, pp.289-90.

²² Edgar Ansel Mowrer, *Germany Puts the Clock Back* (New York, 1933); Biographical Material, undated, box 109, Mowrer Papers, LC. Sigrid Schultz, *Germany Will Try It Again* [hereafter Schultz, *Germany*], pp.vii-xi. US House of Representatives, Committee on Foreign Affairs, *Testimony of Mr. Emil Ludwig, The German People*, 78th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington DC, 1943), pp.1-23. PWW3, i (September 1944), 34. Frederich W. Foerster, *Europe and the German Question* (London, 1941), pp.ix-x; Foerster, *Comments and Documents* (New York, 1944), p.3. Foerster, *Erlebte Weltgeschichte, 1869-1953: Memoiren* (Nuernberg, 1953), pp.640-50. On the divisions amongst German émigrés in the US, see Christof Mauch, *The Shadow War Against Hitler: Covert Operations and America's Wartime Secret Intelligence Service* (New York, 2003), pp.79-84.

²³ Foerster, Ludwig, Tetens, Winkler to SPWW3, 13 January 1944, box 88, Tetens Papers.

²⁴ Committee for the Prevention of World War III, Certificate of Incorporation, June 1943; ‘Proposed Objectives of the SPWW3 Inc.,’ undated; both in box 88, Tetens Papers. Fadiman to Schuman, 29 June 1944; Fadiman to Schmitt, 6 July 1944; both in box 116; Fadiman to Earle, 6 July 1944, box 111; all in WWB Papers.

²⁵ Fadiman to Thompson, 3 April 1944, box 116. Deborah E. Lipstadt, *Beyond Belief: The American Press and the Coming of the Holocaust* [hereafter Lipstadt, *Beyond Belief*] (New York, 1986), p.127. Ritchie, ‘On the Staff of Guy Gillette,’ Oral History Transcript, Senate Historical Office, Oral History Project; David S. Wyman, *The Abandonment of the Jews* (New York, 1984), pp.141-47.

²⁶ Schultz, *Germany*; Emil Ludwig, *How to Treat Germans* (New York, 1944); Paul Winkler, *The Thousand-Year Conspiracy: Secret Germany Behind the Mask* (New York, 1943); ‘Recommended Reading,’ *Prevent World War*, i (May 1944).

²⁷ Fadiman to Foerster, 16 May 1944, box 112, WWB Papers, LC.

²⁸ Fadiman to Huddleson, 8 February 1944, box 112; Stout to Dashiell, 22 March 1944, box 111; Klopfer to Preston, 16 May 1944; all in WWB Papers. Vansittart, 'Hell of a Country,' *PWW3*, i (October 1944).

²⁹ Trout, CBS, 24 July 1944; Hill, CBS, 7 August 1944, reprinted in War Department, BPR, 'Radio Digest,' 8 August 1944, Entry 497, box 4, RG165, NAII; Lippmann, 'The Flying Bombs Over London,' *New York Herald Tribune*, 8 July 1944.

³⁰ Fadiman to Brown, 20 June 1944, box 109; Fadiman to Ludwig, 28 June 1944, box 113; Fadiman to Gardiner, 12 May 1944; Fadiman to Nevins, 12 May 1944; both in box 112, WWB Papers

³¹ OWI, Radio Bureau: Allocation Division, 'WJZ and Blue Network, War Effort Reports,' June 1944, Entry 120, box 715, RG 208, NAII. SH, WWB file memo, 15 August 1944, box 116, WWB Papers. See also Fadiman to Gaines, 30 June 1944, box 112, WWB Papers. For a summary of SPWW3 activities see 'On the Air from Coast to Coast,' *PWW3*, 1 (November 1944), p.21.

³² Sumner Welles, *Time for Decision* (London, 1944). In May, Fadiman was appointed a senior judge at the Book-of-the-Month Club. Fadiman to Welles, 19 May 1944, box 116; Fadiman to Gardiner, 12 May 1944, box 112; both in WWB Papers.

³³ Barach to Barrett, 17 April 1944, box 109; Fadiman to Stevens, June 21, 1944, box 116; Barach to Gause, October 28, 1944, box 112; Fadiman to Reid, June 30, 1944, box 116; all in WWB Papers.

³⁴ Stout to Sloane, 19 June 1945, box 112, WWB Papers.

³⁵ LaFarge to Gannett, 23 June 1944, box 112, WWB Papers. *Open Letter to the 'Loyal Americans of German Descent'* (New York, 1943); Farmer to Lipschutz, 19 and 21 May 1943, box 88, Tetens Papers. Stout, 'Sense or Sentiment,' *PWW3*, i (May 1944), 3.

³⁶ 'Forum in Turmoil Over Reich's Guilt,' *New York Times*, 13 June 1944.

³⁷ Fadiman to Gardiner, 1 July 1944, box 108; Green to Littell, 8 August 1944, box 114; Green to Peterson, box 114; all in WWB Papers. *PWW3*, i (September 1944), 34. On the Justice Department and cartels, see Ellis W. Hawley, *The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly* (Princeton, 1966), pp.283-382.

³⁸ US Congress, Senate, Committee on Military Affairs, Subcommittee on Military Affairs, *Scientific and Technical Mobilisation, Hearings*, 78th Congress, 1st sess. (Washington DC, 1944), p.1944, p.1966. See also Robert F. Maddox, *The Senatorial Career of Harley Martin Kilgore* (New York, 1997), pp.176-77.

³⁹ Michaela Hönicke, "‘Know Your Enemy’: American Wartime Images of Germany, 1942-1943," *Enemy Images in American History*, ed. Ragnhild Fiebig-von Hase and Ursula Lehmkuhl (Providence, 1997), pp.268-69.

⁴⁰ See the Army Letters folder, box 1, SPWW3 Papers. See also Barach to Moore, 21 June 1945, box 113; Green to Derda, 7 November 1944, box 108; all in WWB Papers; Green to Grafton, 7 November 1944, box 112; Green to Frogley, 19 January 1945, box 112; Stout to Pyle, 17 October 1944, box 114; all in WWB Papers.

⁴¹ Editorial, 'The Shame of American Writers,' *Common Sense*, xiii (May 1944), 187; Davis, Letter, *ibid.* (June 1944), 206.

⁴² Leahy Diary, 26 June 1944, p.51, box 6, Leahy Papers, LC; *Foreign Relations of the United States: Conferences at Cairo and Tehran, 1943* [hereafter *FRUS*] (Washington DC, 1961), pp.300-3.

⁴³ Casey, *Cautious Crusade*, pp.131-41; Stout to Wilson, 9 May 1944, Miscellaneous, 1932-48: WWB folder, Democratic National Committee Papers, FDRL; FDR, *Press Conferences*, No.963, 15 August 1944, 24, pp. 49-50; McAleer, *Stout*, p.316.

⁴⁴ Thompson, 'On the Record,' *New York Post*, 19 August 1946.

⁴⁵ State Department, 'Public Attitudes on Foreign Policy: Treatment of Germany, August 1944,' No.33, 9 September 1944, entry 568J, box 1, RG59, NAI.

⁴⁶ 'American Writers on Germany,' *Common Sense*, xiii (June 1944), 208; 'Paul Kesten, Rex Stout Line Up In Opposish Re Controversial Airings,' *Variety*, 13 September 1944, p.26.

⁴⁷ Morgenthau, 'Our Policy Towards Germany,' *New York Post*, 24 November 1947; J. Blum, *From the Morgenthau Diaries* [hereafter Blum, *Morgenthau Diaries*] (Boston, 1967); Kimball *Swords or Ploughshares?*; W. Mausbach, *Zwischen Morgenthau und Marshall: Das wirtschaftspolitische Deutschlandkonzept der USA, 1944-47* (Düsseldorf, 1996), pp.55-66.

⁴⁸ 'Samson In the Temple,' *Washington Post*, 26 September 1944. Twohey Associates surveyed 'the editorial pages and front pages of newspapers serving all sections of the US and representing over 20 percent of total daily newspaper circulation.' Of these, only 15 percent approved of the Morgenthau Plan. See *Twohey Analysis of Newspaper Opinion*, vi (30 September 1944), 1.

⁴⁹ 'Rex Stout Quits Freedom House,' *New York Times*, 21 October 1944; 'Freedom House Won't Let 2 Quit,' *New York Times*, 25 October 1944.

⁵⁰ Tully to Watson, 6 October 1944; Watson to Stout, 10 October 1944; Stout to Watson 11 October 1944, and accompanying notations; all in OF 5160, FDRL. Stout to FDR, 29 September 1944, OF 2527, FDRL.

⁵¹ Morgenthau Diary, 28 September 1944, 776: 187-95; 30 September 1944, 777: 177. WWB, Agenda, 27 September 1944, box 108; Fadiman to Morgenthau, 6 October 1944, box 114; both in WWB Papers.

⁵² 'What to Do With Germany?' *March of Time*, vol.11, no.2 (October 1944), RG 200 MT 11.2, Audiovisual Division, NAI; Barach to Pringle, 21 October 1944, box 114, WWB Papers.

⁵³ Green, to Silberberg, 21 October 1944, box 116; Subjects and Speakers on Town Meeting of the Air, undated, box 116; Green to Granik, 13 December 1944, box 108; all in WWB Papers.

⁵⁴ US Senate, Committee on Military Affairs, Subcommittee on War Mobilization, *Cartels and National Security*, 78th Congress, 2nd sess., 1944, (Washington DC: GPO, 1944), pp.8-9. Blum, *Morgenthau Diaries*, p.391.

⁵⁵ FDR, Memorandum for Boettiger, 16 January 1945, PSF (Diplomatic): Germany, FDRL.

⁵⁶ Stout, *PWW3*, i (December 1944), 3. ‘Crimea Tells the Germans’; ‘Our Platform for Defeated Germany’; both in *PWW3*, ii (March-April 1945), 3

⁵⁷ Fadiman to Winchell, 21 November 1944, box 116, WWB Papers; Barach, WRB Board Release, 12 December 1944; Barach to Pehle, 28 November 1944; both in box 116, WWB Papers. On the WRB Report, see Lipstadt, *Beyond Belief*, pp.263-65.

⁵⁸ Robert H. Abzug, *Inside the Vicious Heart: Americans and the Liberation of the Concentration Camps* (Oxford, 1985), p.30, pp.128-39; US Congress, Joint Committee on Conditions in Concentration Camps in Germany, *Atrocities and Other Conditions in Concentration Camps in Germany*, 79th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington DC, 1945).

⁵⁹ Barach to Perez, 1 June 1945, box 115; Dimitzman to Stout, 10 June 1945, box 111; both in WWB Papers. ‘Lest We Forget,’ *PWW3*, ii (May-June 1945), 11. Shipler, ‘What Do You Think of the Atrocity Pictures,’ 12 May 1945, Study of the German Problem for Senators folder, box 7, SPWW3 Papers.

⁶⁰ UP, ‘German Staff to Be Kept in Exile; Kilgore Reports Third War Plot,’ *New York Times*, 22 June 1945. US Congress, Senate, Committee on Military Affairs, Subcommittee on Military Affairs *Elimination of German Resources for War, Hearings*, 79th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington DC, 1945), pp.1-28, pp.30-33, pp.143-92, pp.1106-16. AP, ‘Halt Reich Efforts to “Rebuild” Abroad,’ *New York Times*, 26 June 1945.

⁶¹ *The Fortune Survey*, xxxi (March 1945), 254; State Department, ‘Fortnightly Survey of American Opinion on International Affairs,’ Nos.25, 26, and 28, 24 April, 9 May, and 9 June 1945, entry 568L, box 11, RG 59, NAI. Grew to Truman, ‘Latest Opinion Trends in the US,’ 5 June 1945, folder 2, PSF 175; Reinsch to Connelly, 4 May 1945, OF 144; both in Truman Papers.

⁶² ‘\$100,000 For Libel Won in Ridder Case,’ *New York Times*, 20 June 1945; ‘Professor Frederic [sic] W. Foerster vs. Victor F. Ridder,’ *PWW3*, ii (July-August 1945), 2.

⁶³ Eisenberg, *Drawing the Line*, p.9, p.72, pp.80-81; Alonzo Hamby *Man of the People* (New York, 1995), p.306; Michael Beschloss, *The Conquerors* (New York, 2002), pp.219-20, pp.236-37, pp.247-50. Robert. Ferrell, ed., *Off the Record* (Columbia, 1980), p.174; Morgenthau, Presidential Diary, 9 May 1945, 13 June 1945, 18 June 1945. McKin, Memorandum to the President, 28 May 1945, OF 198, HSTL.

⁶⁴ Marc Trachtenberg, *A Constructed Peace* (Princeton, 1999), pp.22-33; Eisenberg, *Drawing the Line*, pp.16-17, p.122; Melvyn Leffler, *A Preponderance of Power* (Stanford, 1992), p.67. *FRUS: Conference at Potsdam*, 2:296-97, 428-31.

⁶⁵ *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Harry S. Truman, 1945* (Washington, 1961), 1, p.203, 207. Eisenberg, *Drawing the Line*, p.118

⁶⁶ State Department, ‘Fortnightly Survey,’ Nos.36, 37, and 39, 5 and 19 October, and 19 November 1945; Morgenthau to Truman, 18 October 1945, OF 198, HSTL.

⁶⁷ US Congress, House of Representatives, Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning, *Economic Reconstruction in Europe, 8th Report*, 79th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington DC: GPO, 1945); Price to Truman, 9 November 1945, OF 198, HSTL; Wolfgang Schlauch, ‘Representative William Comer and Senator James O. Eastland and the Reconstruction of Germany, 1945,’ *Journal of Mississippi History*, xxxiv (1972), pp.193-213. On the private bureaucratic debate see Eisenberg, *Drawing the Line*, pp.177-84.

⁶⁸ ‘The Sins of the Fathers,’ *Time*, xxxxvi (22 October 1945), 27; ‘Winter of Discontent,’ *Time*, xxxxvi (17 December 1945), 26; State Department, ‘Fortnightly Survey,’ No.44, 7 February 1946; Ross to Connelly, 4 June 1946, OF 190, HSTL; Joseph Alsop, ‘I’ve Seen the Best of It’: *Memoirs* (New York, 1992), 291-92; Eisenberg, *Drawing the Line*, pp.266-67.

⁶⁹ State Department, ‘Fortnightly Survey,’ Nos.48 and 49, 4 and 19 April 1946; ‘Potsdam Product,’ *Time*, xxxxvii (20 May 1946), 22; ‘Potsdam Revisited,’ *New York Times*, 7 September 1946.

⁷⁰ ‘A Blueprint for Security,’ *PWW3*, iii (February-March 1946), 4.

⁷¹ Edgar Ansel Mowrer, *Triumph and Turmoil* [hereafter Mowrer, *Triumph and Turmoil*] (London, 1970), pp.366-67; William L. Shirer, *Twentieth Century Journey* (3 vols., Boston, 1990), iii. 32-34. Kilgore, ‘Germany Is Not Yet Defeated,’ *New York Times Magazine*, 12 August 1945. ‘Germany’s Industrial Power,’ *PWW3*, iii (April-May 1946), 8. The SPWW3 also distributed Kilgore’s statement, ‘Can We Afford to Revive Nazi Industry,’ 21 December 1945, copy in box 88, Tetens Papers.

⁷² ‘Hats Off!’ *PWW3*, iii (February-March 1946), 8.

⁷³ ‘What about the Kilgore Committee?’ *PWW3*, iii (August-September 1946), 4. *Congressional Quarterly*, iii (1947), 610; ‘Taft Pledges Vote for Interim Relief But Hits US Policy,’ *New York Times*, 29 November 1947. Susan B. Hartmann, *Truman and the 80th Congress* (Columbia, 1971), pp.3-26; Eisenberg, *Drawing the Line*, pp.264-68

⁷⁴ The calculations behind the Marshall Plan have, of course, generated an enormous literature. On the administration’s softening stance towards Germany in 1945, see footnotes 63 and 64 above. Traditional accounts of

the ERP, which stress anticommunism and US generosity, include Harry B. Price, *The Marshall Plan and Its Meaning* (Ithaca, 1955); Joseph M. Jones, *The Fifteen Weeks* (New York, 1955); Robert H. Ferrell, *George C. Marshall* (New York, 1966). John Gimbel, *The Origins of the Marshall Plan* (1976) focuses on bureaucratic conflict and the costs of occupation; Scott Jackson, “Prologue to the Marshall Plan,” *Journal of American History*, lxxv (1978-79), 1043-68 points to a ‘complex network of motivation,’ but concentrates on the worsening economic situation in Europe in 1947. For works that view the ERP as part of a longer-term push for an integrated European economy, see, for instance, Freeland, *Truman Doctrine*, pp.151-87; Michael Hogan, *The Marshall Plan* [hereafter Hogan, *Marshall Plan*] (Cambridge, 1987), 26-40.

⁷⁵ Pajus to Clapper, 5 September 1947, Correspondence on Cartels folder, box 1, SPWW3 Papers.

⁷⁶ Stuart to Byrnes, 15 January 1946; Kindleberger to Stuart, 30 January 1946; Lipschutz to Kilgore, 9 August 1946; all in box 88, Tetens Papers. ‘A Telegram to President Truman,’ *PWW3*, iii (October-November 1946), 9. Paul to Stout, 28 May 1946; Byrnes to Sheldon, 12 June 1946; Pajus to Lipschutz, 4 September 1946; all in German Steel folder, box 5, SPWW3 Papers.

⁷⁷ ‘The Marshall Plan and German War Potential,’ *PWW3*, iv (October 1947), 7-8. Memorandum, ‘Action Now,’ July 1947 Correspondence on Cartels folder, box 1, SPWW3 Papers

⁷⁸ ‘Mrs. Roosevelt Hits Scheme for Germany,’ *New York Times*, 1 January 1947; ‘To Discuss Germany,’ *New York Times*, 4 February 1947; ‘Program Drafted for German Peace,’ *New York Times*, 7 March 1947. ‘The National Conference on the German Problem,’ *PWW3*, iv (April-May 1947), 18-19. Nixon to Lifshitz [sic] 19 March 1947, Correspondence on Cartels folder, box 1, SPWW3 Papers.

⁷⁹ On the background of leading officials, see John Lamberton Harper, *American Visions of Europe* (Cambridge, 1994), pp.142-48; Paul H. Nitze, ‘Foreword,’ in W. Smyser, *From Yalta to Berlin* (New York, 1999), pp.xiii-xv. ‘A Blueprint for Security,’ *PWW3*, iii (February-March 1946), 4; ‘Paul Nitze of Dillon, Read, and Co.,’ *PWW3*, v (May-June 1948), 14-15.

⁸⁰ Memo for the File, ‘When Nitze “Sank the Normandy,’” 6 October 1981, Subject File: SPWW3, box 150, Nitze Papers, LC.

⁸¹ Eisenberg, *Drawing the Line*, 266-67; Meeting of Secretaries of State, War, and Navy, 16 October 1945, entry 106, box 3, RG 107, NAII. Shirer, *Twentieth Century Journey*, iii. 93-94.

⁸² ‘Germany on the Eve of the Moscow Conference’; Wallace, ‘The Moscow Conference Can Succeed’; both in *New Republic*, cxvi (10 March 1947), 13; ‘The Constructive Alternative,’ *New Republic*, cxvi (19 May 1947), 12. See also A. Hamby, *Beyond the New Deal* (New York, 1973), pp.130-35, pp.207-8; Richard Pells, *The Liberal Mind In a Conservative Age* (New York, 1985), pp.65-68; Lawrence S. Wittner, *Rebels Against War* (Philadelphia,

1984), pp.184-85; Graham White and John Maze, *Henry A. Wallace: His Search for a New World Order* (Chapel Hill, 1995), pp.181-83, pp.242-46.

⁸³ Richard J. Walton, *Henry Wallace, Harry Truman, and the Cold War* (New York, 1977), pp.75-76; 'Red Rumpus: Dupes and Fellow Travellers Dress Up Communist Fronts,' *Life*, 5 April 1949; McAleer, *Stout*, p.321, p.369.

⁸⁴ On the administration's arguments, see Hogan, *Marshall Plan*, pp.90-91; see Charles Maier, 'Production and Rehabilitation: The Economic Bases for American Sponsorship of West Germany in the Postwar Atlantic Community,' *Americans*, ed. Trommler and McVeigh, pp.65-67; Warburg, 'The US and the World Crisis,' 20 October 1947, Political and Governmental File: Marshall Plan Committee Press Releases, box 4, Acheson Papers, HSTL.

⁸⁵ Foerster, 'Russia and the German Problem,' *PWW3*, iii (October-November 1946), 27; US Congress, Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, *European Recovery Program, Hearings*, 80th Congress, 2nd sess. (Washington DC, 1948) p.1049, p.1055; Mowrer, *Triumph and Turmoil*, 369-70.

⁸⁶ Wala, 'Selling the Marshall Plan,' pp.247-65; Pajus to Clapper, 18 July 1947; memorandum, 'Action Now,' July 1947; Pajus to McGovern, 22 August 1947; Pajus to Mansfield, 14 November 1947; Pajus to Douglas, 14 November 1947; Pajus to Sabath, 21 November 1947; Pajus to Folger, 30 June 1948; all in Correspondence on Cartels folder, box 1, SPWW3 Papers.

⁸⁷ McAleer, *Stout*, p.328, pp.360-61; Mowrer, *Triumph and Turmoil*, 369-70.

⁸⁸ Gabriel A. Almond, *The American People and Foreign Policy* (Westport, 1950), p.88.