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ABSTRACT

Since the end of the Second World War, a debate has raged among historians over the Allies' treatment of the German opposition. One school of thought, represented by Richard Lamb and Gerhard Ritter, asserts that the opposition would have been in a better position to oust Hitler had the Allies been more forthcoming with aid and encouragement. This would have resulted in shortening the war, with the requisite saving of lives and lessening of destruction. The other school, represented by John Wheeler-Bennett, asserts that the Allies were correct in refusing to deal with the opposition prior to a successful coup in Germany. However, the fact that this debate also raged within Allied government circles during the war itself is often ignored. And most important, the effect of the Allies' effective abandonment of their unconditional surrender formula in the case of Italy on their treatment of the German opposition has yet to be studied. By re-examining the memoirs and diaries of the principals involved, the diplomatic papers of the British and Americans, and the public speeches and comments of the Western Allied leaders, it is possible to get a better picture of the Western Allies' attitudes towards the German and Italian opposition movements and their views on surrender policy.

Faced with a war which his planners stated would last at least three years, it is easy to see why Chamberlain clung to his pre-war appeasement mode of thought, if it could be applied to a non-Nazi Germany. As a result, he ignored those who advocated a hardline position on Germany and authorized contacts with the opposition through the Netherlands and the Vatican. However, Hitler's escalation of the war in April, 1940 and the opposition's failure to act against him illustrated the bankruptcy of Chamberlain's policy.
Whereas Roosevelt viewed the war as a moral crusade which did not allow for "good" Germans, Churchill's attitude was more ambivalent. He wanted to use Germany as a buffer against the Soviet Union but did not want to aid the German opposition. However, both leaders viewed Italy more favourably which led them to soften their demands on Italy once Mussolini had been removed from power. Churchill later expressed the hope that the German opposition would draw the obvious lesson from Italy's "very favourable" treatment during surrender negotiations.

The Allied demand for unconditional surrender did not prevent the Germans from acting to remove Hitler, as the March, 1943 bomb plot shows. In addition, by the time of the July 20, 1944 attempt on Hitler's life, the opposition leadership had accepted unconditional surrender as a given condition.

Finally, the assertion that Allied encouragement would have helped the German opposition to succeed is untenable. Not only were the Allies unwilling to repeat Woodrow Wilson's mistake by giving assurances prior to the end of hostilities and were determined to keep the Soviets in the Allied camp, but also the opposition leadership in Germany was determined to act without any such assurances. In the end, no Allied assurances would have helped Stauffenberg's bomb to kill Hitler, nor would they have prevented the bungling on the part of the conspirators in Berlin which led to the failure of the enterprise.

The debate between the hard and soft-liners was rendered mute by the failure of the July bomb plot. However, it did show that there were some in Allied circles who worked to change the official policies of "absolute silence," "no contacts," and "unconditional surrender."
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

President Franklin D. Roosevelt's announcement at the conclusion of the Casablanca Conference of January, 1943 that the Allies were resolved to require unconditional surrender by the Axis powers, Germany, Italy, and Japan, was resolute and uncompromising. Yet paradoxically, only eight months later, after Benito Mussolini’s Fascist regime had been overthrown, this policy was effectively abandoned. In September, 1943, an armistice with surprisingly lenient terms was negotiated with the new Italian regime. The explanation for this seeming contradiction requires an examination of the factors which had prompted the issuing of the Casablanca Declaration, and, more specifically, of the attitudes amongst the Allied policy makers towards proposals for negotiating with the enemy - or refusing to do so. In particular, this paper seeks to examine the reasons why no similar change of policy was adopted towards Germany, and why no parallel steps were taken which might have lent encouragement to the hopes of the German opposition movement that Germany would receive the same treatment as its former ally south of the Alps.

This paradox has not so far been fully elucidated. Anne Armstrong\(^1\) deals with the Allied attitude towards and the surrender of Italy only in passing. She makes no attempt to show what impact these negotiations had on the continuing and often heated debates within the British and American governments about their future stance towards Germany. She also fails to convey just how intense the opposition within certain Allied circles was to the hardline adherence to the unconditional surrender demand. Peter Hoffmann, in his masterly study of the entire German resistance movement,\(^2\)
concentrates principally on the tactics and strategies employed within Germany and makes little reference to the ambivalences of the British and American governments caused by their treatment of Italy. Similarly, Lothar Kettenacker and John Wheeler-Bennett deal only with the German case. On the other hand, Richard Lamb deals in great detail with both the surrender of Italy and the Allied treatment of the German opposition. However, he too fails to bring the two together. Therefore, the purpose of this paper will be to bridge this gap by examining the evolving plans between 1939 and 1944 by which the Allies intended to end the war and how these plans related to the Allies’ treatment of the opposition forces in Italy and Germany. In particular, my purpose is to show why and how the divergence of policy in dealing with Italy and Germany arose and to examine the political circumstances which led to this differentiation.

The paper will be divided into three sections. The first section will cover Neville Chamberlain’s wartime Premiership from September, 1939 to May, 1940. Having failed to prevent war, Chamberlain sought to prevent it from becoming total. To this end, he was still willing to entertain the idea of negotiating with various emissaries from Germany through intelligence contacts and through diplomatic channels, most notably the Vatican. However, his efforts were more a product of his wishful thinking than a realistic assessment of their practicability. Once war had been declared, a totally new climate prevailed. The British people were immediately aroused to wartime fervour, obliged to enlist for military service, and asked to make sacrifices for the war effort. The inescapable result was to raise the stakes: the greater the sacrifices, the harsher the
ultimate peace would have to be. Thus, Chamberlain was the first Allied leader to face the central dilemma involved in all subsequent attempts to deal with possible "peace feelers" including those from the German opposition: demanding harsh terms would alienate the Germans but offering softer terms would alienate the British public. Though often overlooked by later historians, the evidence suggests that this debate within the Allied governments was both continuous and controversial. Its implications were to be of striking significance in the differing solutions later found for achieving peace.

The second section will cover the period from Winston Churchill’s assumption of the Premiership in May, 1940 to the issuing of the Casablanca declaration in January, 1943. This period is characterized by Churchill’s dilemma over his declared intention to win the war and Britain’s inability to do so. Churchill was also given to wishful thinking in believing that his strategy of aerial bombardment, naval blockade, and attacking the Axis from the periphery would bring Hitler down. At the same time, he prohibited any contact with opposition elements in Germany and, after an abortive attempt to get Italy out of the war, in Italy as well. The year 1941 saw the addition of the Soviet Union and the United States to the Allied cause. While this considerably improved the military prospects for Britain, Churchill and his Cabinet would henceforward have to share their influence over political considerations with their new allies. This new arrangement eventually was to lead to Roosevelt’s announcement at Casablanca.

The third section will cover the period from the Casablanca declaration in January, 1943 to the failure of the German opposition’s coup attempt of July 20, 1944.
This section will trace the origins of the demand for unconditional surrender and its effective abandonment in the case of the Italian surrender. The notion that the demand for unconditional surrender both lengthened the war and hindered the efforts of the German opposition will be challenged. Instead it will be shown that both Churchill and Roosevelt became more flexible as D-day approached and that a successful German coup might well have been viewed favourably by both.
CHAPTER II: 1939-1940

After declaring war on Germany on September 3, 1939, Anglo-French strategic planning was guided by an awareness of the limits of their military power and their economic weaknesses. Both governments knew that no decisive military campaign could be launched against Germany in 1939 or 1940. Therefore, in September, 1939, the British Cabinet decided to make plans based on the belief that the war would last at least three years, the first of which could only be one of preparation. In this way, the specific manner in which the war was to be won could be avoided for the time being. In the meantime, Germany was to be weakened through a tight economic blockade and a vigorous propaganda campaign to convince the Germans that they had no chance of victory.

With such a bleak strategic outlook, it is easy to see why Chamberlain clung to his pre-war appeasement mode of thought. He had failed to prevent a war in Europe but he was now determined to prevent it from spreading, especially if it was to last at least three years. Since dealing with Hitler was now out of the question, Chamberlain’s efforts at appeasement could only be directed at other sections of the German population. His sentiments are best expressed in a letter of September 10, 1939:

There is such a widespread desire to avoid war, and it is so deeply rooted, that it surely must find expression somehow. Of course the difficulty is with Hitler himself. Until he disappears and his system collapses, there can be no peace. But what I hope for is not a military victory - I very much doubt the feasibility of that - but a collapse of the German home front. For that it is necessary to convince the Germans that they cannot win.
In order to bring about this hoped for internal German collapse, Chamberlain turned to propaganda. In fact, until May, 1940, millions of propaganda leaflets, not bombs, were dropped on Germany in an attempt to convince the Germans that they could not win the war and that they should overthrow Hitler.

To complement this propaganda tactic, Chamberlain's public statements were carefully worded to distinguish between the German people and the Nazi regime. In the House of Commons on September 1, 1939, he declared that "we have no quarrel with the German people, except that they allow themselves to be governed by a Nazi government." He went on to say that the existence of and the methods employed by the Nazi regime were the barrier denying peace to Europe and that "we are resolved that these methods must come to an end." And on September 4, he stated that Britain was not in this war to fight the German people, "for whom we have no bitter feeling," but to fight "against a tyrannous and foresworn regime" which had betrayed both Germany and Western civilization. While this latter speech was meant to justify Britain's going to war with Germany, its wording conveys Chamberlain's conciliatory frame of mind.

At the same time, however, Chamberlain also made it clear that Britain would only settle for what he would term a real peace. To obtain this real peace, a new German government was needed, one whose actions did not betray its words and one which was prepared to work in a spirit of co-operation to solve the problems faced by the world. To this end, Chamberlain's October 12 speech also contained a message for the German people. He stated that Britain had no intention of excluding Germany "from
its rightful place in Europe" and that the British government felt that any peace settlement could only succeed if "reached through the method of negotiations and agreement." He concluded by declaring that Britain wanted nothing from Germany which would offend its "self-respect." Instead, Britain's aim reached beyond victory to the founding of "a better international system which will mean that war is not the inevitable lot of every generation." Chamberlain was therefore prepared to negotiate with a new German government. However, he also needed to have secure and meaningful assurances that such a new regime in Germany would abandon the aggressive policies adopted by the Nazis. Public opinion in Britain would require no less. He reinforced this position later that fall when he wrote, "If we can achieve our purpose without a holocaust, what a relief! But we must not abandon the purpose for the sake of the relief."15

With these words, Chamberlain had set out the dilemma he faced. As the war progressed, the sacrifices asked of the British people grew more intensive and, coupled with the effects of anti-Axis propaganda, made it less likely that the British public would accept and any "soft" peace for Germany. At the same time, demanding harsh terms from Germany would alienate any potential German opposition movement. This was the central dilemma faced by the Allies throughout the war.

To complicate matters further, there existed a vocal and influential anti-German lobby, nominally headed by Sir Robert Vansittart. After being replaced as Permanent Undersecretary of State in the Foreign Office in 1938, Vansittart became Special Diplomatic Advisor to the British government. While he no longer had a direct say in
decision making, he remained a very influential figure. A like-minded colleague was Duff Cooper, later to be named Minister of Information by Churchill. On April 23, 1940, Cooper gave a speech in which he stated that the crimes of Germany were not just those of one man or a small gang of thugs but of a whole nation. He called it "wishful thinking and dangerous thinking to believe that we could drive a wedge between the German Government and the German people."16 In the fall of 1940, Cooper assigned Vansittart the task of making a series of radio broadcasts which labelled all Germans as warmongers and called for a harsh peace.

However, there were those in Britain who rejected this hardline position. One such person was Sir Alexander Cadogan, Vansittart's replacement at the Foreign Office, who, in a diary entry of November 29, 1940, referred to Vansittart's broadcasts as "ridiculous (and vulgar)." He also noted that "the Dominion High Commissioners ... are upset about it; and particularly because Van[sittart] threatens more! Told H[alifax] who promised to talk to the ass." And on December 4, Cadogan wrote that these broadcasts "may do a deal of harm."17 So from the beginning, the hardline position was challenged from within government ranks.

For his part, Chamberlain chose to ignore the hardliners. Instead, he sought to reassure himself that his position was the right one by acknowledging only that segment of public opinion which shared his outlook. A letter of October 8, 1939 illustrates this point: "In 3 days last week I had 2450 letters, and 1860 of them were 'stop the war', in one form or another."18 As a result, Chamberlain ignored the body of public opinion which was hardening against Germany and continued to believe that there
existed a non-Nazi element in Germany which would respond to his announced programme for peace.

Nor was Chamberlain content to wait and see if such offers were taken up. It says much for his continued command of his Cabinet that he gained their assent for more active steps to be taken to contact such possible anti-Nazi elements. As Hoffmann rightly points out, such moves would have severely shaken his political credibility if they had been widely known. Nevertheless, despite the initial hesitation of Churchill, then First Lord of the Admiralty, Chamberlain overrode his doubts and authorized contacts through the British Secret Service operating in Holland. By late October, 1939, Captain S. Payne Best and Major R. H. Stevens, British agents stationed in The Hague, were pursuing contacts they had established with someone they mistakenly believed was a representative of the German opposition: Walter Schellenberg, who in fact was a senior Gestapo agent out to collect intelligence with which to embarrass the British government. The British agents had been instructed by London to be sympathetic enough to encourage further confidences from the opposition but non-committal enough not to cause London difficulties should they fail.

To this end, Best and Stevens met with Schellenberg on October 21, 1939 in Arnhem. Of this meeting, Schellenberg would later write:

The British officers assured me that His Majesty’s government were definitely interested in our enterprise and that their government attached the greatest importance to preventing a further extension of the war and to the attainment of peace. They would welcome the removal of Hitler and his regime. Furthermore, they offered us all the aid and support within their power.
Schellenberg’s words attest to the seriousness that Chamberlain attached to this endeavor.

On November 1, after receiving a report from Best and Stevens, Chamberlain informed the War Cabinet of what was happening. As Cadogan noted:

The Cabinet were told of our contact with the Generals and didn’t like it. Told H[alifax] that first impact was bound to be unfavourable and rouse suspicion. He mustn’t listen too much to Winston [Churchill] on the subject of ‘beating Germany.’ We must try every means of helping G[ermany] to beat herself.22

All such considerations were in vain, however, because Schellenberg engineered the kidnapping of the two British agents from the Dutch border town of Venlo on November 9, 1939. The resulting British outrage and growing suspicion of contacts with the German opposition finally forced Chamberlain to take notice of the anti-German faction and led to a hardening of Britain’s position toward a new German government.

This policy shift was outlined in Britain’s response of December 20 to a French aide-memoir of October 23 which urged the British to adopt the position that the removal of Hitler was not sufficient in itself to end the German threat to Europe.23 The British reply took a harsher tone, stressing the need to combat the "aggressive and dominating spirit" of Germany and the need for her to "be rendered harmless." This clearly shows the growing influence of those who subscribed to Vansittart’s views. Yet at the same time, Chamberlain still had hopes that a more flexible policy had a chance of success. The memo concluded:
As regards the future of the German Reich, His Majesty’s Government agree that the removal of Herr Hitler and his entourage will not of itself be a sufficient remedy against the re-emergence of German militarist and expansionist ideas, but it is not at the present possible to tell in what conditions the defeat or surrender of Germany will take place, and any suggestion that it was the intention of His Majesty’s Government and the French Government to seek the political dismemberment of Germany or to disrupt German unity ... would have the immediate effect of rallying the German people behind their present leaders.24

In order to prevent this latter possibility, no specific war aims were to be announced; only general principles were to be spoken of publicly. This was to remain official British policy until the end of the war.

In addition to the backlash caused by the Venlo incident, this tougher British position came about for three main reasons. In the first place, not many leading Britons believed in the existence of a German opposition; of those who did, not many believed it could succeed; and of those who recognised that only the German Army could effect the desired change, not many believed such a regime would be any less aggressive or militaristic than the Nazis.25 Second, as already mentioned, domestic feeling in October which Chamberlain had used to convince himself that the British people wanted to avoid war and were willing to address legitimate German grievances, thereby justifying his continued appeasement policy, began to harden against all Germans. And third, the French desire for effective military guarantees to avoid Allied dependence on German goodwill alone after the removal of Hitler26 helped convince the British they would have to rely on active Allied measures and not on the still-hypothetical action by the alleged opponents of Hitler in the German opposition.
In spite of all these setbacks, Chamberlain was still not prepared to exclude the possibility of dealing with a post-Hitler government. As a result, he was willing to grasp at straws. One such straw presented itself as a consequence of the trip by Adam von Trott zu Solz to the United States in December, 1939. A former Rhodes Scholar, Trott was using his position at the German Foreign Ministry to further the efforts of the opposition. While Trott failed in his attempt to get the Americans to act as an intermediary between the opposition and Britain, he met with greater success as a result of his meetings with Lord Lothian, the British ambassador, and John Wheeler-Bennett, Lothian’s advisor. Wheeler-Bennett was so impressed with Trott that he forwarded the following recommendation to London on December 28, 1939:

A declaration should be made as soon as possible by Britain, France, Poland and the British Dominions at war with Germany guaranteeing that there would be no political division or dismemberment of Germany; that there would be collaboration with a new Germany, large-scale trading facilities, access to raw materials, economic agreements and the limitation of armaments.

This was the kind of encouraging sign Chamberlain was seeking.

Shortly after Wheeler-Bennett’s memo arrived in London, the most substantial avenue of contact established during Chamberlain’s tenure as wartime Prime Minister began in earnest: that through the Vatican. Being a good Unitarian, Chamberlain had little use for the Pope. Consequently, his willingness to use the Vatican shows his desperation. The Vatican exchanges had been initiated from the German side, seeking to use the good offices of Pope Pius XII, early in November, 1939 by Joseph Müller, a
Catholic lawyer from Bavaria. Acting on behalf of the opposition leadership in Germany, Müller had approached the Pope's secretary, Father Leiber, to see if Pius would serve as an intermediary between the German opposition and the British government. These Germans wanted the Pope to become involved because he would be seen by both sides as a trusted mediator. Since the Pope shared Chamberlain's desire to prevent the war from spreading further, he was willing to do what he could to make it happen. However, the effects of the Venlo incident in the same month cut matters short.

The new year, on the other hand, saw a resumption of contacts. On January 11, 1940, Sir D'arcy Osborne, Britain's ambassador to the Vatican, was informed by the Pope that he had seen an emissary of the German opposition who revealed that a planned German offensive in the west was set for February. This might, however, be pre-empted if an honourable peace, that was not "like the Great War armistice, nor Wilsonian in nature", could be arranged. The new government would then be prepared to work out a settlement in eastern Europe which included the restoration of Poland and Czechoslovakia, but not of Austria. Unimpressed, Osborne expressed "the hopeless vagueness of it" and told the Pope that surely Hitler should be overthrown before the opposition talked peace.

Nevertheless, on January 12, Osborne forwarded the proposals to London; even though he felt such a German offer was too vague and ominously reminiscent of Venlo. On January 16, the War Cabinet decided not to pursue these vague proposals. The German opposition must first show that they were serious by acting to
remove the Nazi government and then talking peace. This was to be British policy throughout the war.

However, on February 5, 1940, Osborne was again summoned to a secret meeting with the Pope and was told that a new approach had come from a general who was "sufficiently important to be taken seriously." The Pope showed Osborne a four-page opposition memo which stated that a military dictatorship might be necessary immediately following a coup but that it would later be replaced by "a democratic, conservative and moderate Government," decentralized and federal in shape. The new government would then endeavour to negotiate an honourable peace which included German retention of Austria but the restoration of Poland and non-German Czechoslovakia. Halifax showed Osborne's report of this meeting to Chamberlain and King George VI. Top officials in the Foreign Office, like Cadogan, also saw it, but it was not shown to the Cabinet, to Churchill, nor to Vansittart.

Although Cadogan characterized the information coming from the Vatican as that "to which I don't pay much more attention than I do to all these stories," Chamberlain and Halifax decided to respond without consulting the French. Osborne was instructed on February 17 that the British government was prepared to consider any proposal from intermediaries of the German opposition provided they "had both the intention and the power to perform what they promised" and they offered "a definite programme" which could be "authoritatively vouched for." He was reminded that Britain's prime concern was for "security for the future" and that in this regard, the opposition's suggestion of a decentralized and federal Germany "might be held to go
some way towards a solution of this problem." However, in all matters, the French would have to be consulted.\textsuperscript{42} In the face of Osborne's scepticism and Cabinet opposition, these instructions clearly indicate that Chamberlain and Halifax were, as Chadwick points out, "willing to return to the old policy of appeasement, because they could apply it to a reasonable Germany and not to Hitler"\textsuperscript{43} once he had been removed.

Chamberlain reinforced this position in his speech of February 24. His earlier views about Britain's not desiring "the destruction of any nation" are repeated but it is clear he had incorporated some of the harder, French line into his thinking. He stated that "we must have convincing evidence that the pledges and promises made to us will be kept" and that it is "for the Germans themselves to take the next step and prove to us once for all they have abandoned the doctrine that might is right." His speech also included this hopeful pledge:

\begin{quote}
If Germany is ready to give convincing proof of her goodwill, she will find no lack of goodwill in other nations to aid her to overcome her economic difficulties which must arise during the transition from war to peace.\textsuperscript{44}
\end{quote}

Since Chamberlain realized that time was running short before Hitler attacked in the west, this speech took on something like a last chance appeal to the German opposition to act before it was too late.

Britain's position towards the opposition had been forwarded to the Vatican at the end of February. As the end of March approached, no reply had yet been received. Then on March 27, Osborne was informed by the Vatican that the German opposition
had set aside their plans for the present.\textsuperscript{45} He was hardly surprised. With the German attack on Denmark and Norway, the opposition was discredited because the generals were now waging war against the Allies instead of acting against Hitler. This fact, rather than the Venlo incident, would guarantee a still more sceptical reception to all future opposition overtures.

Lamb states that post-war German writers have placed too much emphasis on the Vatican exchanges because British sources show that Whitehall did not take them seriously.\textsuperscript{46} Certainly, Chamberlain and Halifax were not overly optimistic of success, but nevertheless, they felt that in the face of total war it was their duty to follow up even the slightest opportunity to avoid this disaster.\textsuperscript{47} However, Hitler’s decision to escalate Germany’s aggression in April and May, 1940 and the total failure of any opposition from within Germany doomed Chamberlain’s efforts and revealed the bankruptcy of this policy. In such circumstances, Chamberlain’s tragedy became two-fold: he “had striven to stop war, and war had come; to prevent it spreading, and it had become total.”\textsuperscript{48}
CHAPTER III: 1940-1943

In June, 1940, after the fall of France, Britain stood alone. Her strategic situation became even worse when Italy joined the war on Hitler's side, threatening Britain's position in the Mediterranean and the Near East. Winston Churchill, who had succeeded Chamberlain as Prime Minister a month earlier, was forced to admit to his military advisors that "he did not know how Britain would win the war, and as a matter of principle, he even doubted the efficacy of long-term planning because of the constantly changing face of the conflict." He refused, however, to concede defeat or to follow France's example in suing for peace. Instead, Churchill maintained the strategic plan already adopted in September, 1939: Germany and Italy were to be pressured through a strict blockade and unlimited strategic bombing. In addition, the bulk of British forces were to be sent to the Middle East to attack the Italian forces in North Africa and to capture Sicily, thereby knocking Italy out of the war. Through attrition from the air and sea and by encouraging the occupied peoples of Europe to resist their Nazi occupiers a German collapse could be effected, thereby requiring only small British land units to provide the coup de grace.

With such plans, Churchill showed himself just as capable of wishful thinking as Chamberlain had been. None of the Allied strategies formulated between June, 1940 and January, 1943 — blockade, bombardment, and campaigns in Africa and the Middle East — could bring Hitler down. Yet Churchill continued to exhort the British public to victory even though he had no means to effect it. On such terms, Britain could not win the war.
At the same time, Churchill did not share Chamberlain’s faith in the efforts of the German opposition. As early as June 28, 1940, Churchill instructed Halifax, his Foreign Secretary, regarding the Vatican exchanges:

> I hope it will be made clear to the Nuncio that we do not desire to make any enquiries as to the terms of peace with Hitler, and that all our agents are strictly forbidden to entertain any such suggestions.\(^5\)

These instructions were to apply as well to all feelers from the German opposition. On January 20, 1941, Churchill told Anthony Eden, Halifax’s successor:

> Your predecessor was entirely misled in December, 1939. Our attitude towards all such enquiries or suggestions should be absolute silence.\(^5^2\)

The Foreign Office, however, disagreed. Sir Frank Roberts, head of the Foreign Office’s Central Department from mid-1942, later recalled:

> We in the Department did not like ‘absolute silence’ in response to peace overtures. We felt it was better to go on talking as it would have given us a lot of information. Eden did not bother much about this. We felt it was better to know what was going on.

Roberts viewed Eden as weak for failing to press his department’s view against what he considered to be Churchill’s arbitrary one.\(^5^3\)

Churchill’s resolute determination to fight on led him to prohibit the consideration of any peace feelers from the enemy side. His realism, however, also led him to see the unwisdom of formulating, let alone publishing, any peace aims of his own. He told his
intimates he was sure that the United States would eventually be an active participant in the fighting and that no terms should be outlined before such a time. Britain’s will to fight should not be compromised in any way. Even though the British leaders had publicly called on the German people to revolt against Hitler’s dictatorship, no inducements were to be offered. The memory of Woodrow Wilson’s Fourteen Points was enough to prevent any hint of conciliation.

Churchill also doubted whether the German opposition — if such a force even existed — could engineer a successful coup. For example, on August 1, 1940, he stated:

> Before, however, any such requests or proposals could even be considered, it would be necessary that effective guarantees by deeds, not words, should be forthcoming from Germany which would ensure the restoration of the free and independent life of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium and, above all, France, as well as the effectual security of Great Britain and the British Empire in a general peace.

At a time when Britain had "no sort of success" to hold up,

> the slightest opening will be misjudged. Indeed a firm reply of the kind I have outlined is the only chance of extorting from Germany any offers which are not fantastic.

Such a stance gave solace to Vansittart’s hardliners.

On the other hand, Churchill was a realist. He knew that a defeated Germany must not be treated as an outcast nor made to suffer as it had after the Great War. His thoughts on this matter were recorded by his private secretary at Chequers on December 12, 1940:
We had got to admit that Germany should remain in the European family: 'Germany existed before the Gestapo'...

There must be no war debts, no reparations and no demands on Prussia... There must be no pariahs, and Prussia, though unarmed, should be secured by the guarantee of the Council of Europe.

Only the Nazis, he concluded, "the murderers of 30 June 1934 and the Gestapo, would be made to suffer for their misdeeds." This lesson taught by the previous war had also been learned.

Churchill did, however, share Chamberlain's overconfidence in the use of propaganda, which was widely credited with the success of Nazi fifth columns in Poland, Norway, and western Europe. Churchill believed the same fifth column strategy could be used to encourage "decent" anti-Nazi Germans to topple Hitler's regime. To this end, a Cabinet meeting of July 26, 1940 approved a propaganda policy supporting the idea that not all Germans were Nazis, even though such a stance diluted the hardline position on Germany. Unfortunately, the strategy was untenable, the results minimal.

Nevertheless, Churchill endeavoured to make this position known. In a radio broadcast of November 12, 1939, he stated:

Even in Germany itself there are millions who stand aloof from the seething mass of criminality and corruption constituted by the Nazi party machine. Let them take courage amid the perplexities and perils, for it may well be that the final extinction of a baleful domination will pave the way to a broader solidarity of all the men in all the lands than we could ever have planned if we had not marched together through the fire.
Churchill’s policy had support in the Foreign Office. In July, 1940, Cadogan noted:

I don’t accept the thesis that all Germans are equally wicked, but even assuming it to be true, I maintain — and have always maintained — that it was not very clever to put that in the forefront of our propaganda...

It seems to me that what we want to get into the minds of the Germans is that we do not desire that even they should be denied the right to live in peace, and even comparative plenty, and that it is only Hitler and his system that stands between them and the exercise of that right...

I submit therefore that our propaganda should concentrate against Hitler and the Nazi system.\(^62\)

Cadogan’s reasoning was sound and carried the day at the time. The natural consequence of this position was to envisage making peace with an anti-Nazi government. Even if remote, it was a possibility Britain was willing to consider under certain conditions.

On the night of May 10-11, 1941, Rudolf Hess, Hitler’s deputy, parachuted into Scotland. This incident is noteworthy because it provides the only example of agreement over peace proposals shown by the hard and softliners during the war. Hess claimed to have flown to Britain on a mission of peace. Yet neither side in the debate wanted anything to do with him. The hardliners were not interested because they had no desire to talk peace with any German. The softliners, on the other hand, had different reasons for rejecting Hess. While they were prepared to field peace proposals, only proposals from "acceptable" Germans would be considered. No member of the Nazi Party hierarchy was considered to be "acceptable". As a result, Hess’ peace mission was a non-starter.
Although Churchill forbade any response to peace feelers from the German side, including those allegedly from Hitler's opponents, and assumed a passive wait-and-see policy, he followed an active policy towards Italy in an attempt to get her out of the war. Britain regarded Italy as the weak link in the Axis and the lesser threat in the long run. Consequently, on December 23, 1940, Churchill broadcast to the Italian people, in an attempt to foment rebellion:

One man and one man alone ordered Italian soldiers to ravage their neighbours' vineyard. Surely the time has come when the Italian monarchy and people, who guard the sacred centre of Christendom, should have a word to say upon these awe-inspiring issues? Surely the Italian army, which has fought so bravely on many occasions in the past, but now evidently has no heart for the job, should take some care of the life and future of Italy?63

For the next six months, any approach by opposition groups in Italy would have been well received in London.64 However, none arrived.

One tactic the British employed in an effort to break the Axis sought to induce Italian Navy officers to surrender their ships in Alexandria. To this end, on March 9, 1941, the Foreign Office passed a message for the anti-Fascists in Italy through Stockholm:

If a real effort is made by the Italian Fleet to avoid falling under German control and evidenced by the sending of important units to British overseas ports, this fact would undoubtedly weigh with us when considering the terms of peace with Italy, and we should do our best to save Italy from German domination both before and after the final peace conference.65
Herein was a promise of softer peace terms for opposition elements in Italy; something the British were not prepared to make to the German opposition.

It was, however, to no avail. By June, 1941, no approaches from Italy had been made, and all British attempts to break Italy’s adherence to the Axis alliance had completely failed. On July 18, 1941, the Foreign Office noted that there was little hope of getting a separate peace with Italy, as the war Cabinet was told on August 11:

The chances of knocking Italy out of the war (i.e. a separate peace) can now be discounted since the Germans would certainly forestall any such move in Italy by converting the present moral occupation into a physical occupation of the country. But the more depressed and restless the Italians become the less effective is the Italian contribution to the German effort, and the greater German policing responsibilities in Italy become.

The moral of all this is that even though we cannot now hope to knock Italy out, we should not relax efforts to hit metropolitan Italy by air and from the sea whenever the opportunity occurs. Each blow against Italy is a blow against Germany.66

In other words, British policy had shifted from weakening Germany’s position by depriving them of their Italian ally to weakening Germany’s position by keeping Italy in the war. Italy’s defense would drain off German troops from other fronts. As will be seen, this policy was to have a significant effect on the surrender of Italy in 1943.

While Britain stood alone against Hitler, its military position was precarious. On political matters, Britain was on a sounder footing because only she was involved in setting policy. That changed on June 22, 1941 when Hitler invaded the
Soviet Union. Churchill immediately proclaimed his support for the Soviets. As he told his private secretary:

He [Churchill] had only one single purpose — the destruction of Hitler — and his life was much simplified thereby. If Hitler invaded Hell he would at least make a favourable reference to the Devil!67

Churchill’s typically vivid phraseology could not, however, mask the seriousness of Britain’s military position. As a result, for the time being, Britain could offer its new-found ally little more than moral support.

Hitler’s invasion of the Soviet Union decreased the already slim chances the German opposition had of getting any concessions from the British. Now the sensibilities and the political programs of the Soviets had to be considered by Whitehall. An exchange of September, 1941 between Churchill and Eden is particularly telling. In the two previous months, Carl Goerdeler, former mayor of Leipzig, and the Kreisau Circle, a grouping of prominent opposition members, had made overtures through Switzerland and Sweden respectively. On September 10, Eden reported to Churchill that "such messages occasionally throw interesting light on internal differences and tendencies in Germany. This, however, is the furthest I would go." Churchill replied that he was sure we should not depart from our policy of absolute silence. Nothing would be more disturbing to our friends in the United States or more dangerous with our new ally, Russia, than the suggestion that we were entertaining such ideas. I am absolutely opposed to the slightest contact. If
you do not agree the matter should be brought before the War Cabinet sitting alone.

Eden responded, "I do agree and I am in fact relieved at your decision. The case in favour was, I thought, worth a mention."⁶⁸

Churchill's stance was understandable in light of the political agreement signed with the Soviets on July 21, 1941. One of its provisions read:

They further undertake that during this war they will neither negotiate nor conclude an armistice or treaty of peace except by mutual agreement.⁶⁹

This public obligation only reinforced British determination to refuse all discussion of peace terms with opposition groups in Germany.

When the United States joined the Allies after the bombing of Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, Churchill again welcomed the additional military power the U.S. could provide to the war effort, but recognised he would now have to deal with American political sensibilities as well. Before Pearl Harbor, the German opposition had been informed that Roosevelt's "chief aim was to bring about the downfall of Hitler; if this succeeded, peace would be possible."⁷⁰ However, once the U.S. was an active participant in the war, Roosevelt reversed this strategy. He joined Churchill in refusing to make specific promises for the future. Like her allies, the United States limited herself to generalities. Woodrow Wilson's errors were not to be repeated.

In order to assuage liberal public opinion at home, however, certain general principles were announced. First embodied in the Atlantic Charter of August 19, 1941,
they were repeated as part of the United Nations Declaration of January 1, 1942. Cordell Hull, U.S. Secretary of State, later wrote that such generalities left

the details of boundary adjustments and the like to be settled later. If the principles were strongly enough proclaimed and adhered to, the details would find readier solution when the time came to solve them.\(^\text{71}\)

In any case, the military co-operation of the three anti-Nazi powers could not and should not be endangered by their entering into discussions with any Germans, even if their contacts sought to end the war by overthrowing Hitler.

Suspicion of the alleged German opposition continued throughout 1942. As Eden noted:

The chief strength of this opposition was apparently in the army, that same army which had again and again given way to Hitler against its own better judgement. Successes were acceptable to it so long as they continued. A peacefeeler might therefore only be an attempt to save the German army from destruction and to salvage as much as possible of Hitler's territorial gains.\(^\text{72}\)

Nevertheless, in a public speech in May, Eden reiterated the standard British desire for the opposition to prove it existed:

...If any section of the German people really wants to see a return to a German State which is based on respect for the law and for the rights of the individual, they must understand that no one will believe them until they have taken active steps to rid themselves of their present regime.\(^\text{73}\)
Therefore, despite Churchill’s "absolute silence" directive, it is clear that Eden was trying to convey to the German opposition the message that the Allies were interested not in talk, but in action.\textsuperscript{74}

By making it clear that it wanted the German opposition to act, the British government both contravened Churchill’s "absolute silence" decree and tacitly recognised the existence of opposition elements in Germany. On the other hand, Britain’s American ally was not prepared even to acknowledge the existence of a German opposition. When Louis Lochner, who as the Associated Press correspondent in Berlin had occasion to meet members of the opposition to Hitler, returned to the U.S. in June, 1942, his request to see Roosevelt and his offer of information on the opposition were rejected due to their "most embarrassing nature."\textsuperscript{75} Like Churchill, Roosevelt did not want to grant any concessions before the fact, but even more, he saw the U.S. as fighting not just the Nazi regime but also "a people permeated by an illiberal inhuman ideology who had learned nothing from a fearful defeat in another similarly imperialist war."\textsuperscript{76} Roosevelt’s view of the war as a moral crusade left little or no room for so-called "good" Germans.

Nevertheless, U.S. policy, like its British counterpart, was not unanimous. American political warfare policy did allow some room for manoeuvre. The Office of War Information and the Office of Strategic Services implemented this policy, and it reflected the British line. While the Americans rejected Britain’s over-reliance on inspiring revolts and secret armies to overthrow the Nazis in occupied countries, they did feel that under certain circumstances the German people might be inspired to rise
against Hitler. Interestingly, they included "decent" anti-Nazi Germans with the peoples of occupied nations. Officially, however, American policy refused to recognise the existence of any German opposition.

With the Americans holding to such an inflexible policy, it was the British alone who fielded approaches from the German opposition in 1942. Britain's desire to see some action on the part of the Germans can be seen clearly in its response to information brought from Geneva by Willem Visser't Hooft, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, and by George Bell, the Bishop of Chichester. In May, 1942, Visser't Hooft brought to England a memo from Trott calling on the Allies to consider seriously those elements in Germany fighting against Nazism and expressing concern over the uncertainty of the Allied attitude toward a change in government in Germany. Trott's memo stated that the goals of the opposition were the restoration of the rule of law; the withdrawal of the German army from western and northern Europe; the resolution of Austria's future through a plebiscite; and the termination of relations with Japan.

Visser't Hooft gave this memo to Sir Stafford Cripps, Lord Privy Seal and House Leader and an old friend of Trott's. A week later, Cripps told Visser't Hooft that Churchill had read it and written on it "very encouraging." However, he also said that Germany would have to sign a "definite surrender" accepting defeat. This would be followed by "a positive policy" not "a peace of revenge". He urged that "in the meantime Germans should dissociate themselves from the present regime." There
is no reason to doubt that Cripps’ summary accurately reflected Churchill’s attitude. On the other hand, the Foreign Office now took a much harsher view.

Asked by the Foreign Office to write a brief on Trott, Richard Crossman, then an official at the Political Warfare Executive and a friend of Trott’s from his Oxford days, submitted the following on May 27, 1942:

The private paper which Visser’t Hooft brought from Adam...is an almost perfect specimen of Adam’s thought, ingenuous in its politics and unaware of its intellectual and political dishonesty.

While Crossman accepted the existence of the opposition group Trott claimed to represent, he saw its importance only in regards to Britain’s political warfare effort, stating, "it should be misdirected by us in ways useful to His Majesty’s Government."

If this was not bad enough, on June 6, 1942, Geoffrey Harrison of the German desk at the Foreign Office minuted to Eden that while Trott’s memo "very probably represents the views of certain elements in Germany in the civil service, army, and church," at the moment, "we do not think the time has yet come for us to intervene directly to encourage this group and we should see active signs of its existence before we should believe it was of real significance."81

When Cripps asked Eden for a reply to Trott’s memo, the answer was strongly negative:

The memo is an interesting document, and we believe it is quite likely there are a number of people in Germany who would endorse it. We have, however, no evidence so far that they form an organised group, and there is always the
possibility that in due course they may be used by more hard-headed individuals, for example as cover for peace overtures. We do not ourselves attach much importance as yet to these people, nor do we propose to respond to any overtures from them. Our view is that until they come out into the open and give some visible sign of their intention to assist in the overthrow of the Nazi regime, they can be of little use to us or to Germany.

Eden finished by calling Troll "politically dishonest" because he had "never quite been able to bring himself to pay the price of his convictions and resign from the service of the Nazi regime."82

Cripps was incredulous at this attack on the motives of his friend, and he did not hesitate in letting Eden know so:

I think I probably know von Trott a good deal better than your informant...It is a complete failure to understand either him or what he stands for that dubs him politically dishonest...

...It is not a question of his bringing himself to pay the price of his convictions by resigning from the service of the Nazi regime, which would have been a very simple solution, like that of many emigrés. He paid the far higher price in risk in refusing to join the Nazi regime but going back to Germany to fight for the things which he believed to be right.83

Cripps' generous words were in vain. The Foreign Office and the Cabinet would only be impressed by action.

The efforts of the Bishop of Chichester on behalf of the German opposition met a similar fate. George Bell was a liberal churchman, known for his long-held sympathies towards a "better" Germany. In May, 1942, he had visited Sweden where he met his
old friend and fellow pastor, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, a notable champion of the opposition within the German church. Bonhoeffer told Bell that plans for a coup were under way, giving significant information about those most closely involved. At the same time, he reinforced Trott’s request for information about the Allies’ goals. Would the Allies be prepared to negotiate with a new German government? In Bonhoeffer’s view, "there was little purpose in the resistance movement accepting all the perils to which they were exposed in the pursuit of their aims if the Allied governments intended to mete out to a Germany purged of Hitler and his minions exactly the same treatment as to a Hitler-Germany."84

On his return from Sweden, Bell saw Eden who again was "extremely interested", yet thought the German pastor may have been unwittingly used to put out peace feelers, since similar terms had already come through Turkey and Spain. Eden made it clear that he must not be seen to enter into negotiations with the enemy and had to be able to say so to the U.S. and the Soviet Union without fear of contradiction.85

In private, Eden was more caustic. He felt the bishop had no warrant for meddling in such delicate political affairs and noted on one letter he received from Bell: "I see no reason whatsoever to encourage this pestilent priest."86 As Lamb rightly remarks, Eden "was adamant that no individual apart from those under his direct control at the Foreign Office" should be involved in peace negotiations.87 Therefore, Eden’s official reply was again negative:

> Without casting any reflection on the bona fides of your informants, I am satisfied that it would not be in the national interest for any reply whatever to be sent to them.
I realize that this decision may cause you some disappointment, but in view of the delicacy of the issues involved I feel that I must ask you to accept it.\textsuperscript{88}

Eden hoped this would be the end of it.

Bell, however, was not prepared to abandon his quest. He wrote back to Eden, asking him,

If there are men in Germany also ready to wage war against the monstrous tyranny of the Nazis from within, is it right to discourage or ignore them? Can we afford to reject their aid in achieving our end?\textsuperscript{89}

But Eden, the Foreign Office, and the government were not prepared to change their stance.\textsuperscript{90} Bell finally realized that arguing with Eden would achieve little. His hopes for getting some public statement from the British government were doomed to failure.

Then, in November, 1942, Bell found a new opening, one which he believed would definitively demonstrate the difference between Britain's domestic and foreign propaganda. He learned from German refugee friends that in July, 1942, leaflets dropped on Germany and a B.B.C. broadcast had drawn the distinction between Germany and Hitler's government in much clearer language than anything publicly declared by Churchill or Eden. He then determined to press the government in the House of Lords for a definitive statement on the matter, especially after Stalin drew the distinction in a speech on November 6.

Bell tabled his question for November 29, but was subsequently persuaded to withdraw it. Eden claimed that such enquiries would not be in the public interest: the
contents of the leaflets and broadcasts were "not necessarily suitable for publication in this country," and official statements in Britain on government aims should be made by himself or Churchill. Bell's persistent pressure did, however, oblige the government to state its general policy towards Germany.

On March 19, 1943, Viscount Simon, the Lord Chancellor, announced the official position:

I now say in plain terms, on behalf of His Majesty's Government that we agree with Premier Stalin first that the Hitlerite State should be destroyed and secondly, that the whole German people is not, as Dr. Goebbels has been trying to persuade them, thereby doomed to destruction.

Edwin Robertson states that this announcement "completely destroyed Vansittart's attitude." This claim is not entirely tenable. While Viscount Simon's words gave public voice to the distinction between Germans and Nazis which both Churchill and Cadogan had expressed privately, Roosevelt's declaration at Casablanca just seven weeks earlier shows that the hardliners in both Britain and the U.S. were far from being "completely destroyed." Nevertheless, Viscount Simon's reply was a significant achievement for the softliners, one which was well received in the House and in the British press, and one to which the B.B.C. gave full coverage in its German broadcasts.

Those in Allied circles who sought to obtain concessions on behalf of the German opposition met with limited success in Britain and none in the U.S. By contrast, American policy towards Italy bordered on the benevolent. Hull writes that almost from
the time of Italy's declaration of war on the U.S., he and Roosevelt believed "that we should draw a distinction between the Italians on the one hand and the Germans and Japanese on the other." In 1942, they reached two conclusions on the matter. "First was that Americans had always been friendly with Italians, despite our opposition to the Fascist regime, and that Mussolini had led the people of Italy into an unpopular war without in the slightest consulting them." This contrasts to the American view of the German people as permeated by an "illiberal inhuman ideology". The second conclusion "was that it might be possible to withdraw Italy from the war before the surrender of Germany and Japan, and that this withdrawal would in fact hasten that surrender. Italy's retirement, we felt, would be accelerated if we were to adopt an attitude toward the Italians different from that toward the Germans and Japanese."95

Although Britain had already abandoned efforts in this regard, U.S. Attorney General Biddle took a first step towards driving that wedge between the Italian government and people when he stated in New York on October 12, 1942:

I now announce to you that beginning October 19, a week from today, Italian aliens will no longer be classed as alien enemies. From that time on, the exoneration which they have so well earned will be granted them.96

No such pledge was ever made to German aliens.

A month later, on November 14, Adolf Berle, Assistant Secretary of State, repeated this theme:

The United Nations have made a pledge to Italy, as to the entire world. It was drawn on a warship in the
Atlantic...and proclaimed on August 14, 1941...The pledge was thus given not only to the victors but also to the vanquished.

No American seeks to destroy or impair the nationhood of Italy. When Italy, freed from her Fascist gangsters, is able once more to speak to the world, and as the armies of the United Nations achieve that victory which cannot fail, the pledge of the United Nations will be redeemed. This pledge does not contemplate a punitive peace: the aim is justice, not revenge.\(^97\)

Even though the U.S. apparently considered that the Atlantic Charter applied to Germany as well, no such statement was ever issued with reference to Germany.

It was therefore highly ironic that all approaches made by the Italians were made to Britain when in fact, it was the U.S. which was more sympathetic to Italy, possibly because, as Lamb suggests, Roosevelt was ever watchful of the Italian-American vote.\(^98\) British scepticism about the Italians, however, remained intact. This position was conveyed to the Americans by Halifax on December 4, 1942 when he stated there was "nothing to be gained" by offering inducements to the Italian people to overthrow Mussolini since

a policy of appeals and promises could only be really effective when there was a question of building up some dissident movement or leader which could challenge the established government. At present there is no such leader or movement in Italy nor are there any potential leaders outside of Italy of sufficient calibre.\(^99\)

He concluded by saying only "if and when" there is any sign of such a movement in Italy would it be time to reconsider the matter. Britain's wait-and-see policy regarding
the German opposition, therefore, continued to apply to opposition elements in Italy as well.

The Americans, however, hoped to soften Britain's hardline on Italy. Berle's response to Halifax contained the following:

...as a matter of strict strategy it might be better to hold out a slight degree of hope that the Italians would ameliorate their position if they joined the Allies or got out of the war.\textsuperscript{100}

The British would not be moved.

Britain's hardline position on Italy owed much to Eden's resentment of Mussolini. Whereas Churchill had a soft spot for Italy, Eden was adamantly anti-Italian. Consequently, Eden's response to an initial Italian peace feeler in November, 1942 was decidedly negative:

I had much rather kill this stuff...We don't propose to make peace with Mussolini and these men are his creatures. The only hope in Italy is a revolution which is just what these men want to avoid.\textsuperscript{101}

After a further approach, Eden informed the American and Soviet ambassadors on December 18, 1942:

We have decided not to follow up these openings because the Italians in Lisbon are the slaves of the Fascists, and if we follow up these contacts it will look as if we are not intent on destroying Fascism.\textsuperscript{102}
Eden had misread the situation. According to Lamb, the Italian envoy, Francesco Franzoni, was not a "fascist slave" but an honest patriotic diplomat. Washington, on the other hand, was inclined to take the approach more seriously, calling Franzoni’s move a sign of "important internal political developments."103

On December 12, 1942, Eden informed Churchill that the Duke of Aosta, a cousin of the Italian King, had contacted him to suggest that the Allies land in Italy in conjunction with his planned uprising against Mussolini. Aosta also requested that the Italian fleet remain intact and the King be allowed to retain his throne. In his December 18 report on the matter to the Americans, Eden wrote:

Our view is that this approach is probably genuine. But we are not greatly impressed by the possibilities of making anything of it...

Nevertheless, the prize to be won if we can hasten on the Italian collapse is so great that we have decided that it is worthwhile keeping this line of communication open.104

This was a notable change in thinking on Eden’s part, considering his virulent anti-Italian bias. Since Churchill, like the Americans, was already much more positively inclined towards Italy, he had no trouble agreeing with this position, and the Soviets were also informed. The U.S. then suggested to Britain that they co-ordinate their policy on the acceptability of various Italian anti-Fascist figures. However, Britain was not prepared to go that far at the time, and ultimately, Eden’s dislike of the Americans’ softer view of Italy would scuttle U.S. attempts to soften Britain’s hardline on Italy.105
The close of 1942 was a critical time for opposition elements in Germany and Italy. Both Britain and the U.S. had failed in their efforts to precipitate revolution in Italy. Britain's wait-and-see policy regarding the German opposition had failed to precipitate revolution in Germany. And the efforts of the softliners had failed to precipitate revolution in either of the two Axis nations. Emboldened by these failures, the hardliners decided to press their position and go for broke. Their gambit would be announced by Roosevelt at Casablanca.
CHAPTER IV: 1943-1944

At the conclusion of the Casablanca Conference on January 24, 1943, Roosevelt made an announcement explaining how peace would finally come to the world:

This involves the simple formula of placing the objective of this war in terms of an unconditional surrender by Germany, Italy, and Japan ... Unconditional surrender means not the destruction of the German populace, nor of the Italian or Japanese populace, but does mean the destruction of a philosophy in Germany, Italy and Japan which is based on the conquest and subjugation of other peoples.¹⁰⁶

These words ignited a debate over their merit which continues to this day. What, then, were the origins of this contentious formula?

Contrary to Roosevelt's later claims, the unconditional surrender announcement was not spontaneous. Rather, it was the culminating victory of those who had consistently advocated a hardline policy and opposed any suggestion of peace negotiations. Their victory could already be seen months earlier in a May, 1942 report of the State Department Subcommittee on Security Problems which took a harsh view of past history by declaring that the U.S. "was at war again only because Germany had not been compelled to submit unconditionally at the end of the First World War." Like Churchill and Roosevelt, the State Department wanted to avoid the errors of Wilson's policy. On May 21, the committee adopted this recommendation:

On the assumption that the victory of the United Nations will be conclusive, unconditional surrender rather than an armistice should be sought from the principal enemy states except perhaps Italy.¹⁰⁷
In arguing for unconditional surrender rather than an armistice along 1918 lines, the committee was, however, prepared to give Italy more lenient treatment than Germany. Its findings were forwarded to Roosevelt who was prepared to adopt this advice even though Hull had been left out of the discussion. On January 7, 1943, Roosevelt told a meeting of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that he supported unconditional surrender as "the basic Allied war aim."

Roosevelt's understanding of this concept was based on a flawed example drawn from the American Civil War which led him to equate both the military and political aspects of surrender. It was his failure to differentiate between the two which resulted in the rigidity of his thinking on this matter.

The American readiness to treat Italy differently from Germany was immediately realised by Churchill. On January 20, he sought to persuade his Cabinet of the virtues of such a policy:

> The omission of Italy would be to encourage a break-up there [within the Axis]. The President liked this idea, and it would stimulate our friends in every country.

The War Cabinet, however, disagreed:

> The Cabinet were unanimously of opinion that balance of advantage lay against excluding Italy, because of the misgivings which would inevitably be caused in Turkey, in the Balkans, and elsewhere. Nor are we convinced that effect on Italians would be good. Knowledge of all the rough stuff coming to them is surely more likely to have desired effect on Italian morale.
Eden’s hardline on Italy once again carried the day, and Italy was included in Roosevelt’s January 24 announcement.

In retrospect, Frank Roberts justified this hardline stance as follows:

There was a general feeling prevalent then that this time Germany must be completely defeated so there would be no repetition of the 1918 legend that the German disaster came from a stab in the back from the German socialists, and that this time we should just substitute the anti-Nazis.

He stated that neither Churchill nor Eden were confident that any German opposition group "who might have been attracted by the prospect of terms other than 'unconditional surrender' either would or could deliver the goods." Roberts also stated that the slogan was meant to show to Stalin the Allies’ "toughness", thereby alleviating his suspicions that the Allies might "do a deal with non-communist Germany at his expense" and forestalling any temptation he may have had to make his own deal with Hitler as in 1939.112 Roberts’ words accurately recall the arguments of the hardliners: the experience of 1918 should not be repeated, including the unfortunate episode of Wilson’s Fourteen Points, and nothing should be done to alienate the Soviets.

For his part, Roosevelt wanted to make it clear that "when the war was won it would stay won." In addition, the timing of the announcement was critical. For almost three months, Roosevelt had been criticized for agreeing to use Admiral Francois Darlan to help facilitate the Allied landings in French North Africa. Tainted by his ties to Vichy France, Darlan was seen as an unacceptable partner in the war effort. Only his assassination on Christmas Eve helped mute the outcry. Nevertheless, Roosevelt wanted
to provide some public gesture to refute the suggestion that the deal with Darlan "might indicate a willingness to make similar deals with a Goering in Germany or a Matsuoka in Japan." The Casablanca announcement was such a gesture.

At first glance, the Casablanca declaration seemed to indicate that the hardliners in Britain and the United States had triumphed over those who advocated a more flexible policy. However, while the hardline position had become the stronger of the two, it was still not unopposed. Almost immediately, concern over the Casablanca formula was expressed in Allied nations. Hull felt "it might prolong the war by solidifying Axis resistance into one of desperation." He also "thought that our principle of surrender should be flexible." Another frequent complaint was that the formula was too vague. As a result, both Roosevelt and Churchill were forced to make public statements aimed at clarifying matters. In Washington on February 12, 1943, Roosevelt claimed that

in our uncompromising policy we mean no harm to the common people of the Axis Nations. But we do mean to impose punishment and retribution in full upon their guilty, barbaric leaders.

He repeated this sentiment in a radio address several months later. This latter speech provides the first indication that Roosevelt had realized the defects of the hardline approach and was prepared to deal with a "respectable" new German government. Until such a time, however, he was only willing to clarify his position, not to soften it.
Churchill also did his part to set matters straight. On June 30, 1943 at London’s Guildhall, he too balanced the option of stringent punishment with that of leaving open the hope of future German regeneration. Unconditional surrender, he claimed, was to give the Allies a free hand, not to enslave the German people, but to ensure retribution against the aggressors. He pledged that the Allies would never "stain our victorious arms by inhumanity or by mere lust of vengeance." He repeated this message in the Commons on February 22, 1944. On this occasion, he further declared that the formula meant that "we are not to be bound to the Germans as the result of a bargain struck." This was clearly a reference to the efforts of the German opposition. Nevertheless, despite such sweeping rhetoric, Churchill still left open the possibility of securing an anti-Nazi revolt from within Germany. The B.B.C. was instructed to make appeals to the German Generals to stand up against Hitler — a fact which illustrates Churchill’s continued ambivalence.

The split between "hardliners" and "softliners" over unconditional surrender was similarly mirrored in Allied attitudes towards Italy. In a letter to Hull of January 14, 1943, Eden conveyed Britain’s hardline on Italy when he stated that the Allied goal to remove Italy from the war "could be achieved with almost equal effect" either through a separate peace or a full-scale German occupation. He seemed to favour the latter course:

It may well be in our interest that Italy should, as a member of the Axis, develop into a German commitment and become as such an increasing drain on German strength.
This had been Eden's policy since August, 1941, and he saw no reason to change it. He went on to declare that there was no sign of a viable alternative to Mussolini and that despite the Duke of Aosta's recent approach,

we remain extremely doubtful of the willingness or ability of any of the royal family to lead a revolt against Fascism.

It had taken less than four weeks for Eden to write off the only Italian approach he had initially thought might be promising. He concluded:

A general with sufficient following in the Army, such as General Badoglio, might at the right moment be able to overthrow the government, but our reports do not indicate that dissatisfaction in the Army has yet reached the stage which would make this a practicable possibility.120

Eden's prescience concerning Badoglio is highly ironic in light of a decision taken only four days later by the War Cabinet. On January 18, it received a report from the Special Operations Executive about an approach from Badoglio to take over the government and to co-operate with the Allies. Badoglio asked "for no assurances regarding the future." However, in Churchill's absence, the War Cabinet decided that "no response should be made to Marshall Badoglio."121 The War Cabinet maintained Churchill's declared policy of "absolute silence."

Eden's scepticism applied equally to the question of offering soft peace terms to the Italians. He preferred to wait until circumstances forced the Italians to act either without prior Allied assurances or on the Allies' terms. Thus, the official British policy towards Italy was consistent with that towards Germany: no prior promise of terms
would be made; once the Fascist government was removed, peace would come under Allied conditions.

This stance was not universally shared. Divisions were already apparent in the British Foreign Office. On February 16, 1943, Cadogan expressed the opinion that "I feel we must soon abandon the quite mulish and ostrich-like attitude of... the Department." After two months of meetings with his subordinates to discuss the Italian approaches, Cadogan was exasperated at the unwillingness of Orme Sargent and Bruce Lockhart (both Deputy Under-Secretaries at the Foreign Office) to accept that these approaches had any worth. Churchill also drew back from the hardline stance towards Italy adopted by his Cabinet in January. He now wanted to make use of the Italian opposition groups, arguing on February 13 that

I shall support such a movement to the utmost. I am not going to take the responsibility of carrying on this war a day longer than is necessary to achieve full victory.123

Support for this position was also received from the Americans. Hull for one stressed his belief that

it is not too early to attempt to detach the Italians from the Fascist regime. Mental and spiritual disloyalty already exist to a great extent and if properly appealed to can, we believe, be effective in furthering the disruption of the Axis war effort in Italy.124

Despite Eden's notation that this was "a good letter", he maintained his hardline position on Italy.125
Beginning in April, 1943, voices of dissent were also heard from among the Allies' military elite. Some now called for a modification of propaganda to Italy which they felt quashed any hope for a separate peace by constantly demanding unconditional surrender. For example, the Commanders-in-Chief Middle East felt that propaganda should highlight the differences between German occupation after an Axis victory and fair treatment under the Atlantic Charter. On May 2, the S.O.E. agreed, feeling the Allies should assure Italy that her future status would be protected. On May 18, the Vice-Chiefs of Staff also advocated a softer propaganda line.\textsuperscript{126}

However, the Foreign Office opposed such a course, and Eden was as determined as ever that no one outside his direct control at the Foreign Office should be able to talk about peace terms.\textsuperscript{127} Eden's attitude on this matter had already been made clear in 1942. He strongly attacked the unregulated activities of the S.O.E.,\textsuperscript{128} for example:

\begin{quote}
I confess I find this quite intolerable. I am responsible to Parliament for foreign policy and as long as that lasts I am not prepared to share the responsibility with Mr. Jebb [the head of the S.O.E.] or anyone else... Diplomacy, or the conduct of it, must be exclusively my affair.\textsuperscript{129}
\end{quote}

As a result, Eden was very upset when the R.A.F. dropped leaflets on Rome in June, 1943 which offered the Italians "peace with honour." He instructed Harold Macmillan, Minister Resident at Allied Headquarters in the Mediterranean Theatre, in Algiers: "I hope you will prevent in future the use of similar phrases which are politically ambiguous and therefore undesirable."\textsuperscript{130}
Just how seriously Eden's anti-Italian bias affected his thinking can be shown by his negative reaction to a report he received on July 24, 1943, suggesting that a palace coup in Rome was imminent. Eden noted that those making such a claim "have a lot to learn."\textsuperscript{131} Ironically, within twenty-four hours, without any incentive being offered by the Allies at all, King Victor Emmanuel dismissed Mussolini from office.

Mussolini's dismissal provided the Allied leaders with just the situation they desired: the Fascist regime had been overturned without prior promises from the Allied side. Both Roosevelt and Churchill were now prepared to treat with the new Italian regime. On July 30, Roosevelt cabled Churchill:

\begin{quote}
I told the press today that we have to treat with any person or persons in Italy who can best give us first disarmament and second assurance against chaos, and I think also that you and I after an armistice comes could say something about self-determination in Italy at the proper time.\textsuperscript{132}
\end{quote}

The next day, Churchill replied:

\begin{quote}
My position is that once Mussolini and the Fascists are gone I will deal with any Italian authority which can deliver the goods... We have no right to lay undue burdens on our troops...

I should deprecate any pronouncement about self-determination at the present time, beyond what is implicit in the Atlantic Charter. I agree with you that we must be very careful not to throw everything into the melting-pot.\textsuperscript{133}
\end{quote}

Nevertheless, even though both Allied leaders were prepared to deal with Victor Emmanuel and Badoglio, six weeks were to elapse before the Italians signed an
armistice. Many writers blame this delay on the continuing demand for unconditional surrender.

Hanson Baldwin writes that unconditional surrender "probably delayed the inevitable collapse of Italy four to six weeks", a period in which Hitler was able to send additional troops to Italy to strengthen Germany's military defense there, resulting in the subsequent bitter campaign up the Italian peninsula. Anne Armstrong states that the bad feeling caused by the demand for unconditional surrender delayed the Allied landings in Italy, allowing Germany to occupy Rome and prolong the fight for Italy. And Richard Lamb blames Eden's misreading of the strength of the Italian movement against Fascism for the failure of the Allies to land in Italy immediately following the July 25 coup, thereby forestalling Germany's occupation of Italy.

These views are flawed. The demand for unconditional surrender was not to blame for the failure of the Allies to take advantage of Mussolini's fall and occupy the whole of Italy. This failure had two main causes. First, the Allies knew "next to nothing" of conditions in Italy at the time of Mussolini's fall. In David Ellwood's view, "So complete was Fascism's isolation of the country, so marginal the anti-Fascist opposition — and so poorly organised when abroad — that neither the armies, intelligence services nor the diplomats of Britain and America were able to furnish anything like a complete picture of what they might expect" to Allied planners. Consequently, Eden and others did not have the hard intelligence data from which to take properly informed decisions. This state of affairs begs the question why did the Allies not have an emergency plan to deal with a sudden Italian collapse, along the lines
of "Sledgehammer" and "Rankin" formulated for just such an occurrence in Germany? The answer to this question lies in Allied strategic planning for Italy.

On November 20, 1942, the War Cabinet had approved a memo calling for the Allies to get Italy out of the war as quickly as possible, either by a separate peace or by causing internal disorder on a serious enough scale to precipitate a complete occupation by Germany which would result in Italy's becoming a drain on German strength. This latter option was chosen over that of a separate peace not only because it was felt there was little chance of any party in Italy moving against Mussolini before Germany's capacity to control Italy was severely weakened but also because Italy was seen as being of little use as an ally. This decision and the reasons against making promises of softer peace terms were explained to the Americans in Eden's letter to Hull of January 14, 1943.

Churchill, however, disagreed with this memo. In one of his own sent to the War Cabinet on November 25, he expressed his belief that an internal revolt was still possible and that it would not be in the Allies' best interest for Germany to occupy Italy. He agreed "with the United States policy of trying to separate the Italian people from their Government." On the other hand, he admitted "that we are under no obligation to offer any terms to the vanquished, should they sue for them. That decision must be taken when and if we are offered their surrender..." Nevertheless, since the Cabinet had voted to accept the November 20 memo, Churchill, ever the good parliamentarian, acquiesced in its decision. However, he did not give up his position, providing another example of the divergence of opinion amongst British policy-makers.
For their part, the Americans wanted to avoid entanglements in the Mediterranean in order to concentrate on "Overlord." Because the U.S. wanted to finish the war as soon as possible, it was always wary of Britain’s strategic plans which it saw as containing ulterior, that is political, motives.141 With a majority in Britain not adverse to seeing the Germans take over Italy and the Americans not wanting to get involved in military operations on the Italian mainland, it is not surprising that Churchill’s efforts on behalf of an invasion of mainland Italy were not successful until July, 1943. With Allied forces fully committed to the Sicilian campaign until its conclusion on August 17, there was no chance that further operations against Italy could begin for a number of weeks. Roosevelt put it succinctly on July 28, 1943: "We cannot just pick up the telephone and order a new campaign to start the next week."142 Consequently, it was the lack of proper strategic preparation and the inability to begin an immediate military campaign that explain the Allies’ failure to exploit better the dismissal of Mussolini.

Despite their willingness to treat with the new Italian government, both Allied leaders officially and publicly were bound to the Casablanca formula in asserting Italy’s need to surrender unconditionally. They were, however, prepared to soften the blow for the new government. This concession can be seen in a cable Churchill sent to Eden from Halifax on August 9, 1943:

Merely harping on ‘unconditional surrender’ with no prospect of mercy held out even as an act of grace may well lead to no surrender at all. The expression ‘honourable capitulation’ has also been officially used by the President, and I do not think it should be omitted from the language we are now to use.143
The manner in which to effect this surrender provides another example of the divergence of thinking between the two Allies.

The Americans wanted to gain Italy’s surrender in two stages. The first stage was to be a purely military surrender to end hostilities. The second stage was to cover the political terms demanded of the civil administration. Britain, on the other hand, wanted the Italians to be presented with both the military and the political terms when they sued for peace. In this way, the Italian authorities would be obligated to carry out the military and civilian terms from the start, and the Allies would avoid causing Italian resentment when they were hit with the additional terms which they might consider inconsistent with "honourable capitulation" following their military surrender. Britain felt that if the American plan was followed, once Italy had stopped fighting, they might not agree to other terms, compelling the Allies to occupy and administer Italy on their own.144

The Allied leaders, willing to treat with the new Italian government, yet at the same time insistent that it surrender unconditionally, now had to work their way through this divergence of opinion. In the meantime, their men on the spot, General Dwight Eisenhower, Harold Macmillan, and Robert Murphy, were instructed to clear all matters concerning Italy’s possible surrender through London and Washington. This led Eisenhower to remark "rather wearily that in the old days, before rapid communications, generals were free to do whatever they thought best; nowadays an opportunity could be lost while officers argued back and forth."145

Fearing just such a scenario, on July 30, 1943, Macmillan "quietly proposed that since neither the British nor the Americans could get any policy directive from home we
should draft our own Anglo-American directive to ourselves, and send it via the combined Chiefs of Staff to the White House and Number 10.\textsuperscript{146} This eleven point program was proposed as the short terms of surrender. These quite deliberately avoided the term unconditional surrender because Macmillan saw "no conflict" between it and "honourable capitulation,"\textsuperscript{147} but realized the latter would have more appeal to the Italians. These efforts heartened those who advocated a softer line towards Italy. However, the hardliners were not ready to concede the point. Not until August 18 did Churchill and Roosevelt authorize Eisenhower to present the short terms to Badoglio's emissary, General Giuseppe Castellano, and only after he was to be informed that the economic and political terms were to follow.

Unfortunately for the efforts of Eisenhower and Macmillan, Castellano was not authorized to accept these terms, only being able to promise to convey them to his government. For on August 22 at Quebec, Churchill and Roosevelt finally agreed on the fuller — both military and political — terms that Britain had been advocating from the start. Once formulated, these "long" terms provided the hardliners with the instrument they needed to thwart the Eisenhower-Macmillan initiative. Consequently, on August 27, both Eisenhower and Macmillan were instructed to get Castellano to sign the "long" terms at their August 31 meeting. However, not wanting to scare off the Italians at such a crucial moment, Macmillan informed Churchill:

\begin{quote}
The comprehensive document was wisely kept in reserve since it was felt that its introduction at this stage might only lead to further delays which were not in the military interests of the Allies.\textsuperscript{148}
\end{quote}
As a result, the surrender signed by Italy on September 3, 1943 was only on the "short" terms. The softliners had scored a significant victory.

Although the Allies were guilty of dithering over the surrender terms, the real cause of the extended armistice talks was Italy's inability to resist the Germans at the time of Mussolini's dismissal. Only after they had withdrawn their troops from France and the Balkans and had secured Allied help in protecting Rome, thereby preventing a complete German takeover of Italy, were the Italians prepared to sign an armistice. Consequently, no Italian envoy to the Allies was authorized to sign political or military terms before Castellano's trip to Sicily at the end of August, 1943.

When Italy signed the "short" terms on September 2, she had been advised that there would be further terms to come. On September 13, the hardliners in Britain used this fact to press their demand that Italy now sign the full terms of surrender. Even though many of these clauses had been rendered obsolete by the course of events, Stalin supported the British demand, and Roosevelt had to acquiesce, despite his belief that it was unnecessary. When Badoglio balked after seeing the long terms, Eisenhower wrote him a letter on September 29 in which he stated:

It is to be understood that the terms both of this document and of the short military armistice of September 3rd may be modified from time to time if military necessity or the extent of co-operation by the Italian government indicates this as desirable.
This letter illustrates the continuing dissension in Allied headquarters over surrender policy, one which would also manifest itself the following spring in relation to Germany. With Eisenhower's assurance, Badoglio signed the long terms in Malta that day.

The surrender of Italy was the first test of the Casablanca formula of unconditional surrender. While the Allies had a free hand in Italy after it was signed, the Italian surrender was in fact a conditional one. Not only did Roosevelt, Churchill, and Eisenhower promise the Italians humane treatment, the opportunity to choose their own form of government, and a respected place in post-war Europe, but they also promised concessions based on Italy's help in the war against Germany. One such example is provided by the protocol signed on November 9, 1943 at Brindisi which provided for certain alterations to the text of the long surrender of September 29. One read:

In Article Ia the word 'unconditionally' is deleted. The Article in question therefore reads as follows:
"The Italian land, sea and air forces wherever located hereby surrender."

Not only had the Allies been willing to abandon effectively the policy of unconditional surrender in the case of Italy, but as a result of the above protocol, they were now prepared to do so officially. The softline position had prevailed in the case of Italy because of the Allies' desire to get her out of the war as quickly as possible once Mussolini had been dismissed, and after this had been achieved, to get her co-operation in the continuing fight against Germany. However, the hardline position could not be completely ignored, resulting in the hardliners' success in getting the "full" surrender terms signed by Italy. In addition, the Allies decreed that the terms of the Italian
surrender were to be kept secret until after the war, ostensibly to avoid unrest in Italy over its harsh terms. The Allies, however, also wanted to avoid any protests at home from the hardliners over the limited concessions they were granting the Italians. The power of the hardliners remained influential.

The surrender of Italy had been a triumph for the softliners. However, Stalin was angered at having been left out of the negotiations, and Roosevelt was not eager to repeat the experience in the case of Germany. Consequently, despite their ability to get Churchill to vacillate, the softliners' chances of carrying the Italian policy over to Germany were not good. Nevertheless, they were determined to pursue their efforts.

At the end of 1942, just weeks before the Casablanca Conference, Churchill's "absolute silence" order was, in effect, broken when it was conveyed to Carl Goerdeler through his Swedish intermediary, Jakob Wallenberg, that the Allies were not prepared to make any promises before a coup and that the opposition should go ahead with its plans without Allied assurances. In February, 1943, barely a month after the Casablanca declaration, Goerdeler met with Wallenberg in Berlin and told him that a coup was set for March. This bomb plot miscarried, but it put the lie to the assertion made by Armstrong, among others, that unconditional surrender prevented action against Hitler's regime and was even "a factor in the failure of the plot." As Wheeler-Bennett put it so succinctly, unconditional surrender did not preclude the possibility of lenient treatment for a post-Nazi government, but it did preclude the issuing of preliminary promises of such leniency.
Before Mussolini's dismissal, the Allied attitude to approaches from within both Italy and Germany remained hardline: information would be accepted for its potential benefit to the Allied war effort, but no replies were to be given. Then on August 14, 1943, after reading a report from Turkey that Joachim von Ribbentrop, Germany's Foreign Minister, was about to be replaced and that Hitler would be ousted soon thereafter, Churchill cabled Eden with words reminiscent of those he used five days earlier regarding Italy:

"There is no need for us to discourage this process by continually uttering the slogan "Unconditional Surrender." As long as we do not have to commit ourselves to dealing with any particular new figure or new Government our advantage is clear... I am sure you will agree with me that a gradual breakup in Germany must mean a weakening of their resistance, and consequently the saving of hundreds of thousands of British and American lives."

Churchill was obviously encouraged by events in Italy and hoped for a similar collapse in Germany.

For those in the Foreign Office who opposed the policies of absolute silence and unconditional surrender, it was hoped that this signalled a relaxation in policy. Roberts told Lamb that Cadogan felt strongly about this matter and added "we were ham-handed over unconditional surrender." In response to Churchill's note, Eden approved a message to the British Ambassador in Ankara stating that while unconditional surrender remained the Allies' basic policy, it was now believed to be expedient "not to stress this fact too often, since we did not want to defeat our object by producing a desperate and united block of resistance in Germany."
However, this change of heart was short-lived. Eden was not particularly interested in the views of the Foreign Office dissenters, and when he did rarely present their position to Churchill, he did so "without any force." For his part, Churchill soon changed his mind. On September 21, 1943, he addressed the Commons on the question of applying the policy on Italy to Germany:

I say, 'The case is different'... The core of Germany is Prussia. There is the source of the recurring pestilence. But we do not war with races as such. We war against tyranny, and we seek to preserve ourselves from destruction.

Churchill's declaration that Britain did "not war with races as such" was clearly designed to distance himself from the ideas expressed by Vansittart and was consistent with the March 10, 1943 answer in Parliament to Bishop Bell. Churchill concluded by stating:

Nazi tyranny and Prussian militarism are the two main elements in German life which must be absolutely destroyed. They must be rooted out if Europe and the world are to be spared a third and still more frightful conflict.

Disappointed that the Italian collapse had not fostered one in Germany, Churchill set aside his conciliatory thinking and was once again in a fighting mood. Yet, at the same time, his enunciation of these two Allied goals provided the German opposition with food for thought.

That his above remarks were not intended to discourage opposition elements in Germany can be seen in his notes to Eden concerning the upcoming Moscow Conference. On October 11, 1943, Churchill wrote that the Allies' resolve to extirpate
Fascism from the aggressor countries and replace it with duly elected democratic governments should not exclude measures of military diplomacy or relations with interim Governments which may come into being, so that our main objects may be achieved with the minimum of slaughter especially to the forces of the Allies.¹⁶³

Not only was Churchill willing to work with "interim Governments," he had learned from the surrender of Italy that "military diplomacy" should not be ruled out as a means to achieving his ends as quickly as possible. As he stated for the umpteenth time in a speech of September 21: "I wish to make it clear, that I would not needlessly prolong this war for a single day."¹⁶⁴

Following the Quebec Conference of August, 1943, Allied grand strategy was set for the next ten months, and with victory no longer in doubt, Churchill was able to devote more thought to post-war considerations. On the one hand, he remained adamantly opposed to negotiating a peace with any Germans. On the other hand, he was certainly aware of the dangers of repeating the mistakes of 1919 and hence claimed that he did not want a peace with Germany which was "too vindictive," one which would leave the Germans "so impoverished and hopeless as to become ripe for Communism."¹⁶⁵ Such a view was re-inforced by his growing concern over the Soviet Union. At the War Cabinet meeting of October 5, 1943, he astounded his colleagues by saying:
We don’t know what condition Germany will be in after the war. We mustn’t weaken Germany too much - we may need her against Russia.166

Had Stalin known of these sentiments, his anti-Western suspicions would only have been strengthened.

To alleviate his concern, Churchill was interested in following up a suggestion Stalin had made at Teheran. Making it clear that the Allies must remain united, Stalin declared that unconditional surrender was "bad tactics" as far as Germany was concerned and that instead the Allies should together formulate their terms and announce them to the German people.167 On December 23, 1943, Churchill cabled Eden from Tunisia, saying he would ask Stalin to elaborate his views in the belief that "an agreed public announcement might undermine the position of the Nazi leaders."168 He sent this despite his correct judgement earlier that such statements were dangerous.

So, on January 2, 1944, Churchill cabled Roosevelt for his view on the matter. Roosevelt’s reply on January 6 read:

I prefer to leave things as they are for the time being and we really do not know enough about opinions within Germany itself to go on any fishing expedition there at this time. I hope you and Anthony will agree.169

It was a sign of Churchill’s vacillation that he then reconsidered the matter based on the five points he felt had been agreed to at Teheran: Germany was to be completely disarmed; she was to lose all use of aviation; all war criminals were to be tried in the countries where their crimes had been committed; Germany was to be broken up into
a number of smaller states; and the German General Staff was to be disbanded. Keeping in mind the Soviet desire for four million Germans to work to rebuild the Soviet "Motherland" and Stalin's desire to execute large numbers of the General Staff, Churchill wrote on January 14, 1944:

Enough at any rate is set down above to show that a frank statement of what is going to happen to Germany would not necessarily have a reassuring effect upon the German people, and that they might prefer the vaguer terrors of "unconditional surrender," mitigated as they are by such statements as the President has made.¹⁷⁰

So despite his earlier enthusiasm, Churchill allowed political caution to rule. There would be no public statement of Allied terms to Germany.

Despite Churchill's reversion to a more hardline position, the Foreign Office refused to concede defeat. On February 2, 1944, it drew up a draft declaration for submission to the War Cabinet. It stated that while unconditional surrender could not be abandoned, it would be advantageous not to over-emphasize it in propaganda. A joint statement would be beneficial if issued at the proper psychological moment, provided it contained nothing that would allow for future charges of bad faith. It was hoped the declaration would give some hope to the German people that even after defeat, the future was not entirely bleak. It contained the following points: Germany was to be punished for her aggression; war criminals were to be handed over but there would be no reprisals against the German population; Germany would lose all territory gained through aggression and was responsible for war damage; Germany was to be purged of the Nazi Party, and Prussian militarism was to be prevented from committing
future aggression; and Germany was to be re-established on the basis of the rule of law, after which she would regain her respected place in the world.\textsuperscript{171}

Despite earlier opposition to such initiatives by the softliners, Eden supported this draft and forwarded it to Churchill. Churchill, however, did not like the proposal:

\begin{quote}
The time would be better chosen if we had won a few victories against their Armies. If we are going to take all this territory away from them and shift 6 or 7 million people out of their homes,... I doubt very much whether we are in a position to give these assurances, bleak though they be.\textsuperscript{172}
\end{quote}

Churchill's desire to win victories in the field before making any such announcements was to be central to his thinking in the months preceding the invasion of France. Nevertheless, he allowed the proposal to go before the War Cabinet on March 13, 1944 where his more cautious view prevailed. However, the Cabinet agreed to reconsider the matter at a later, more propitious date.\textsuperscript{173}

In spite of this decision, calls for a declaration to the German people continued from the Foreign Office and Eisenhower's headquarters, echoing what happened with Italy a year earlier. On March 25, 1944, the Joint Chiefs of Staff forwarded a memo to Roosevelt urging a restatement of unconditional surrender based on public comments already made by him and other Allied leaders in order to "establish a favourable condition precedent to Overlord." On April 1, Roosevelt made this reply:

\begin{quote}
I cannot agree with the proposed statement or the advisability thereof...
I think that the simplest way of approaching this whole matter is to stick to what I have already said, (a) that
\end{quote}
the United Nations are determined to administer a total defeat to Germany as a whole, (b) that the Allies have no intention of destroying the German people.\textsuperscript{174}

Roosevelt wanted nothing to do with changing the formula because as General Marshall said, we "were up against an obstinate Dutchman [Roosevelt] who had brought the phrase out and didn't like to go back on it."\textsuperscript{175}

Despite Roosevelt’s decision, Eisenhower’s headquarters continued to call for an announcement of the principles "upon which the treatment of a defeated Germany would be based." Encouraged by this, Cadogan sent a request to Churchill on April 15 asking for War Cabinet advice on the matter for discussions with the Americans. On April 19, Churchill repeated his assertion that any statement of terms would be unlikely to reassure the German opposition and that raising "a timorous cry" prior to a successfully-waged battle would be unwise. He then stated:

On the other hand, they [the Germans] know that Unconditional Surrender was interpreted in a very favourable manner in the case of the Italians.

Clearly, Churchill was ready to apply the Italian precedent to a like situation in Germany and hoped the German opposition would be encouraged by the Allies’ treatment of Italy. However, he concluded by stating that any change to the unconditional surrender policy would have to come from Roosevelt since it was his creation.\textsuperscript{176}

The dilemma grew more acute as the invasion of Europe grew nearer. Militarily, the Allies were prepared and in full agreement. Politically, however, as the following exchanges show, their differences about the future continued. On May 18, 1944,
Roosevelt sent to Churchill a new proposal for a statement to the German people to be issued after D-day. Since he disagreed with his military advisors so rarely during the war, Roosevelt’s proposal was likely the result of their pressure for such a positive statement. While it stressed the inability of Germany to win the war and the certainty that the Nazi philosophy would be destroyed, it held out this hope:

The Allies are seeking the long-range goal of human freedom — a greater true liberty — political, religious and intellectual; and a greater justice, social and economic.¹⁷⁷

The British attitude, however, had stiffened. On May 25, Churchill sent Roosevelt this reply:

Considerable concern was expressed at the tone of friendship shown to the Germans at this moment when troops are about to engage. There was a feeling that the message, if sent before the battle is won, might be distorted by the enemy into a sort of peace appeal ... 

We here earnestly hope that you will not make it in its present form and above all at this present time ...¹⁷⁸

Churchill correctly assessed the British public’s mood about not making such a statement before the battle had been won, thereby avoiding the possibility of its being seen as a sign of weakness. In addition, he wanted no statement issued which might be accepted by the Nazi government. When Stalin supported Churchill’s position, Roosevelt agreed to postpone the matter. The hardline position had carried the day.

The State Department, however, prepared new drafts of this message in both June and July but failed to get Roosevelt’s support. His July 17 explanation to Hull echoed
Churchill's reasons of May when it stated that Allied military progress had not "yet been sufficiently impressive" to effect the desired result and that only after "further and more impressive advances" might the suggestion have "more prospect of advantage to our attack." It is noteworthy that neither side in this debate paid any heed to any prospective help from the German opposition, which in turn had by this time recognized that it must act on its own. Ultimately, the absence of the proposed statement to the German people was of little consequence to the German opposition. Even before the Normandy landings, the plans for the coup attempt had been finalized, and Colonel Claus von Stauffenberg was simply waiting for the best opportunity to strike.

Nevertheless, while these debates were conducted in the Allied capitals, members of the German opposition continued to seek contact with the western Allies. On his December, 1943 trip to Istanbul, Helmuth von Moltke brought with him a memo for Allied consideration. In this memo, he stated that his group accepted "the unequivocal military defeat and occupation of Germany" as morally and politically necessary for Germany's future well-being and that his group accepted the demand for unconditional surrender, realizing "the untimeliness of any discussion of peace terms before this surrender has been accomplished." This was exactly what the Allies, particularly the British, wanted to hear. Unfortunately, these points were undercut by the expressed desire to surrender in the west, yet continue fighting the Soviets in the east. O.S.S. chief William Donovan's report of July 29, 1944 to Roosevelt summarized the situation:

The approach in Istanbul was made at a time when it was clear that our relations with the Russians would not permit negotiation with such a contact ... I directed our
representative in Istanbul to enter into no negotiations with Herrmann [Moltke’s codename] but to keep open the channel of contact.181

When Trott had made a similar approach in October, Harrison at the Foreign Office minuted: "Note the skill with which he propagates the old Communist bogey and generally mixes up fact and propaganda."182 This was not a tactic met with much enthusiasm in London and Washington and only revealed the naivete and political opportunism of the German opposition.

The clearest picture the Americans received of the German opposition came from Allen Dulles, the O.S.S. chief in Switzerland. Through his meetings with Trott, Goerdeler, and others, Dulles was able to report to Washington on January 27, 1944 that despite certain differing opinions amongst German opposition factions,

these groups keep in touch and are very eager to obtain political ammunition from our side. They consider this to be sadly wanting, and they wish it to reinforce their movement at the present time and following the collapse, as well.183

He concluded his report with a request:

I would appreciate hearing of any indication with which you could supply me regarding what you would be interesting [sic] in achieving via Breakers [the opposition’s codename], and could be pursued effectively at this time. I do not understand what our policy is and what offers, if any, we could give to any resistance movement.184
Incredibly, Dulles had been sent to Switzerland to gather information yet had not been given instructions on what he could do to follow it up.

This lack of instructions is explained by the comments Berle wrote on Dulles’ report on February 2, 1944:

This group intimates the possibility of a putsch, followed by a "surrender to the West" and asks for "political ammunition", which, of course, would mean assurances or the like of use to them. O.S.S., of course, is not following this up in any way and has no desire to, which is in line with the consistent policy of the Department.

O.S.S. officials have told me that the cable has been suppressed and that they have no further interest other than to lay it before the Department for its information.185

Clearly, the Americans only wanted information from Dulles, they did not want him to act on it. They were not even prepared to follow up on his reports, so much so that they were to be suppressed. This attitude was wholly consistent with their concept of total war as a moral crusade which did not allow for the existence of opposition elements.186 The State Department maintained Roosevelt’s hardline position.

On the other hand, despite Churchill’s "absolute silence" and "no contact" decrees, the British attitude was more flexible than the Americans’. The British were willing to discuss and utilize the information they gathered, although not for the purposes their German contacts would have hoped. For example, a report on Trott’s March, 1944 trip to Stockholm was used to determine whether unconditional surrender was the best tactic, whereas Trott was hoping it could form a basis for negotiations. This memo was, however, important in that it was the first time that a member of the German
opposition conveyed to the Allies his acceptance of a Soviet role in the post-war occupation of Germany. When this report arrived in London, the Foreign Office was still hoping to get some declaration of peace aims from Churchill. Cadogan was encouraged by it, and even Eden minuted that "this can certainly be examined afresh." However, Churchill’s memo to Cadogan of April 19 (quoted earlier) put an end to the matter.

The final word on this issue prior to D-day came on June 1, 1944 when several departments of the Foreign Office met to discuss whether any advantage could be derived from contacting opposition elements in Germany. Interestingly, no mention was made of its possible effect on Anglo-Soviet relations. The consensus opinion — which, however, downplayed the extensive contacts deployed by the Foreign Office earlier — was that while "a considerable number" of genuinely anti-Nazi Germans existed, "the balance of evidence" indicates "that no organized oppositional group exists in Germany." It concluded as follows:

The only possible conclusion seems to be that, quite apart from considerations of high policy, there is no initiative we can take vis-à-vis "dissident" German groups or individuals, military or civilian, which hold out the smallest prospect of affording practical assistance to our present military operations in the West.

While the report was correct in stating that there was little public support in Germany for a coup, it completely ignored the evidence of an organised opposition provided by Trott and Erich Vermehren, an Abwehr agent who had defected to the British in March, 1944. Vermehren had recommended to the British to "forthwith get in touch with the
opposition."\(^\text{189}\) Despite the wishful thinking of some of the Foreign Office members, his advice was ignored. The hardliners had won.

Yet only a month after D-day both Churchill and Attlee felt secure enough in the Allies' position to make remarks about the German opposition. In the House on July 7, Attlee repeated Eden's words of two years earlier when he stated that if any group in Germany wanted to see the return of a regime which respected international law and individual rights, it "must understand that no one will believe them until they have themselves taken active steps to rid themselves of their present regime."\(^\text{190}\) And on July 12, Churchill replied to a question in the House about his statement to the Germans to overthrow Hitler:

> I am very glad to be reminded of that statement, to which I strongly adhere. I think it has been repeated in other forms by the Foreign Secretary and other Ministers. At any rate, it would certainly be a very well-advised step on the part of the Germans.\(^\text{191}\)

So, even after the Normandy invasion, Churchill maintained his goal of shortening the war through a change of government in Germany, but also his refusal to state his terms to any such new German regime.

Nevertheless, the moderate faction in the Foreign Office did not give up. A Foreign Office report of July 15 stated that while any recognition of a new German government might be criticised, it could be justified:

> It is not the task of the United Nations to face the problems which the Germans' own vices have created; it is only for us to lay down our requirements and ensure that the
Germans carry them out as part of their programme ... Moreover, recognition of a government would not commit us to continue support of it either in its individual acts or in its relation to the future territorial framework of Germany. What it would do would be to provide an essential basis for the beginnings of reconstruction.\textsuperscript{192}

So a mere five days before the coup attempt, the German opposition’s prospects of gaining acceptance from the Allies following a successful take-over were not completely bleak.

On July 20, 1944, at 12:40 p.m., Stauffenberg placed a bomb under Hitler’s conference table in the Wolf’s Lair in East Prussia. Ten minutes later, it exploded. Hitler suffered only minor injuries. Before the day was out, the German opposition’s attempt to overthrow the Nazi regime had failed; its leaders were either dead or under arrest. Despite the significance of this attempt, there is no evidence that the German opposition had informed the Allies when it would happen nor that it expected any concessions from them. The German opposition had acted entirely of its own accord.

Despite the fact that this attempt was exactly what Churchill and Eden had been calling for since 1940 when they demanded "deeds, not words," the Allies were totally unprepared when faced with the coup attempt. A lack of intelligence reports from the S.O.E. gave rise to reactions such as that of Cadogan: "Don’t know what it means. Not very much, I think. Possibly an excuse for a purge."\textsuperscript{193} The hardliners reacted predictably. As Eden recalled in his memoirs, Ernest Bevin, Minister of Labour and National Service, "at once said that it was a Nazi stunt to popularize H[itler]," and Brendan Bracken, Minister of Information, dismissed it as "Goebbels’ work." This lack
of sympathy would lead to the continued denigration of the plotters, both for the rest of
the war and long after it was over. Eden’s reaction was ambivalent. On July 20, he felt
"it was hard to tell so far" what it meant but he did disagree with Bracken’s assessment
of the situation. The next day, he wrote: "Quite sure that my diagnosis of H[itler] business was right and that there has been some real trouble in Germany."194
Nevertheless, Eden had totally failed to prepare for this eventuality. For his part,
Roosevelt made no statement of any kind, in keeping with his refusal even to recognise
the existence of a German opposition.

The softliners were initially encouraged by the news from Germany. On a
meeting with Eden and others, Cadogan made this notation: ":'Others’ rather unduly
excited by it. I threw a few little cold douches."195 Their excitement was also shared
by the British intelligence community.196 However, the hopes of the softliners were
shattered as the news arrived from Berlin of the arrests and the bodies in the
Bendlerstrasse.

Churchill was in France at the time of the coup attempt and consequently, issued
no immediate statement. However, the softliners and the British public had realized the
significance of what had happened in Germany, and so the British government was
compelled to issue a statement of explanation. The hardliners jumped at this chance to
win and prepared two reports to influence Churchill’s speech. The first report was
prepared by the Foreign Office on July 22 and stated:

The immediate practical effect ... of the failure of this coup
... will probably be to rivet the Nazi yoke even more firmly
on the neck of the German people. All ‘unreliable
elements’ will be ruthlessly purged. Himmler’s control will become even more complete. The chances of a successful military coup will have been diminished and the possibility increased, that the German masses ... will go down to chaos with their leaders.  

Wheeler-Bennett, back in London as Deputy Head of Political Warfare, had reversed his earlier, positive view of the German opposition, and his July 25 report to the Foreign Office on the implications of the plot spared no effort to rub it in:

It may now be said with some definitiveness that we are better off with things as they are today than if the plot of July 20th had succeeded and Hitler had been assassinated ... By the failure of the plot we have been spared embarrassments, both at home and in the United States ... and, moreover, the present purge is presumably removing from the scene numerous individuals who might have caused us difficulty, not only had the plot succeeded, but also after the defeat of a Nazi Germany.

Disappointment at the failure of the coup played a part in the hardliners’ reaction, but more so did an anti-German bias with Vansittartian overtones, as exemplified by Wheeler-Bennett’s report. With such source material, it is hardly surprising that Churchill’s August 2 Commons speech echoed the Nazi’s condemnatory words on the German opposition:

Not only are those once proud German armies being beaten back on every front and by every one of the many nations who are in fighting contact with them, every single one, but, in their homeland in Germany, tremendous events have occurred which must shake to their foundations the confidence of the people and the loyalty of the troops. The highest personalities in the German Reich are murdering one another, or trying to, while the avenging Armies of the
Another factor which influenced this speech was Churchill’s ambivalence. Willing to sound hopeful when conditions warranted, these reports and the news from Germany made it clear to Churchill not only that the German opposition had failed in its endeavour but also that those anti-Nazi elements acceptable to the Allies were being ruthlessly purged on Hitler’s orders. Consequently, there was nothing to be gained at that juncture by making positive remarks concerning the German opposition. The course of events had finally placed Churchill squarely in the camp of the hardliners.

In the days and weeks following the coup attempt, the information the Allies received on its aftermath made it clear that Nazi retribution was eliminating the German opposition as a viable force capable of aiding the Allies in shortening the war. Only disgruntled members of the Nazi hierarchy were now in a position to do so. However, not even the softliners were interested in dealing with such figures. As a result, attempts by Himmler and Ribbentrop to negotiate with the Allies in 1945 were rejected out of hand. The only way the war would come to an end would be through the acceptance of unconditional surrender by Germany’s military and civilian authorities. This was finally achieved on May 7, 1945.

During the war, Churchill had been unable to recognise the efforts of the German opposition. However, in 1946, he paid them tribute with these words:

In Germany there lived an opposition which was weakened by their losses and an enervating international policy, but which belongs to the noblest and greatest that the political
history of any nation has ever produced. These men fought without help from within or from abroad — driven forward only by the restlessness of their conscience. As long as they lived they were invisible and unrecognizable to us, because they had to camouflage themselves. But their death made the resistance visible.200

Unlike Churchill’s words, fate was not kind to the German opposition. It is lamentable that Churchill did not come to this conclusion in 1944.
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

The struggle between the hard and softliners began with the war itself in September, 1939. Faced with the prospect of a war lasting at least three years, Chamberlain was more favourably inclined toward the softline position and, as a result, carried his appeasement mode of thought into the war years. This led him to authorize contacts with the German opposition in the Netherlands and through the Vatican. Only after the fiasco at Venlo and French demands for a tougher Allied attitude towards Germany did Chamberlain begin to take notice of the hardline position. Even so, he was still determined to do what he could to keep the war from spreading. The futility of his efforts became clear when Hitler began his attack in the North in April, 1940. Chamberlain’s policy hinged on the German opposition’s acting to remove Hitler. When it failed to do so, not only was Chamberlain’s policy shown to be bankrupt, but the credibility of all future opposition contacts was severely damaged.

In contrast, Churchill’s position towards Germany was one of ambivalence. He wanted to avoid the mistakes of the Great War which resulted in making Germany a "pariah" nation, and he wanted to use Germany as a buffer against the Soviet Union. At the same time, he did not want to be seen as aiding the German opposition, going so far as to prohibit all contacts with it. As a result, Churchill’s attitude often vacillated, being exploited in turns by the hard and then the softliners. Roosevelt was more steadfast in his position on Germany, since his view of the war as a morale crusade against the inhuman ideology of Nazism left no room in his thinking for "good" Germans. Only in the spring of 1944 when his military advisors started pushing for a
more benevolent attitude towards Germany did Roosevelt bend ever so slightly to the softliners' cause. It is notable that Armstrong fails to address the significance of these changing positions, particularly on the part of Churchill.

Both leaders, however, were much more sympathetically inclined towards Italy. Churchill took active steps in 1940 and 1941 in an attempt to get Italy out of the war, and Roosevelt lifted restrictions on Italian aliens in the U.S. in 1942. The most significant indication of their attitude to Italy came in January, 1943 when both leaders wanted Italy excluded from the unconditional surrender announcement at Casablanca. Only the opposition of the War Cabinet in London kept it from being so. Not only were the Allied leaders personally willing to follow a softer line on Italy, it is also clear from Churchill's later stance that he hoped the German opposition would draw the obvious lesson from the "very favourable" treatment Italy had received following Mussolini's ouster. It is this connection which Lamb fails to make.

Despite the assertions of many writers, the demand for unconditional surrender neither prevented the German opposition from acting against Hitler, nor resulted in the Allies' failure to exploit positively the fall of Mussolini. The March, 1943 bomb plot which miscarried shows that unconditional surrender was no impediment to the German opposition. In addition, by the time of the July 20, 1944 attempt on Hitler's life, the opposition leadership had accepted unconditional surrender as a given condition. The failure in Italy had two causes. The first was the divergence in Allied policy. Most policy makers in Britain felt it was preferable for Italy to become a drain on German resources, and the Americans wanted to focus on invading France, not Italy. As a result,
they had no contingency plan in place to exploit a sudden Italian collapse. The second reason was the Italian desire to secure their domestic military situation vis-à-vis the Germans prior to signing an armistice. The Italians’ delaying tactics served only to facilitate the German occupation they sought to avoid.

The assertion by Lamb and Gerhard Ritter, among others, that the German opposition would have been in a better position to bring off a coup had the Allies been more supportive of its efforts is untenable. The Allies were unwilling to repeat the mistake of Woodrow Wilson’s Fourteen Points by giving assurances before the end of hostilities. In addition, Churchill and Roosevelt were determined to keep the Soviet Union firmly in the Allied camp and, as a result, were not prepared to alienate an already suspicious Stalin by negotiating with the German opposition. For its part, the German opposition had at its core a group of men, Beck, Goerdeler, Stauffenberg, and Henning von Tresckow, which was determined to act without prior assurances from the Allies. Contacts were sought to gain a clear picture of how the Allies would react to a coup, and any promises received from or agreements reached with the Allies would have been considered by them as a welcome bonus. In the final analysis, however, no Allied assurances would have helped Stauffenberg’s bomb to kill Hitler, nor would they have prevented the hesitation and bungling on the part of the conspirators in Berlin which led so disastrously to the failure of the enterprise.

The adoption of the unconditional surrender formula was a victory for the hardliners. Its implementation in the surrender of Italy was a victory for the softliners. Once Italy was out of the war, the struggle over the treatment of Germany continued
until the failure of the coup attempt on July 20, 1944. Ultimately, however, the struggle between the hard and softliners was rendered mute by the failure of the German opposition to remove Hitler from power. But it did show that there were those in Allied circles who were willing to work to change the official policies of "absolute silence," "no contacts," and "unconditional surrender." In the case of Italy, their convictions were tried and carried the day. The tragedy in the case of Germany is that the opportunity to try their convictions once again never presented itself.
ENDNOTES

1. Unconditional Surrender: The Impact of the Casablanca Policy upon World War II (New Brunswick, New Jersey; 1961)

2. History of the German Resistance (Cambridge, Massachusetts; 1977)

3. The "Other Germany" in the Second World War: Emigration and Resistance in International Perspective (Stuttgart; 1977)

4. The Nemesis of Power: The German Army in Politics 1918-1945 (London; 1964)


6. Kettenacker, p. 13


10. Kettenacker, p.22


13. In his October 12, 1939 Commons Speech in reply to Hitler’s peace overture of October 6, Chamberlain stated:
   The peace which we are determined to secure, however, must be a real and settled peace, not an uneasy truce interrupted by constant alarms and repeated threats. What stands in the way of such a peace? It is the German Government, and the German Government alone.

15. Feiling, p. 426
17. Dilks, p. 337-8
20. Wheeler-Bennett, p. 476-7
22. Dilks, p. 228
23. Kettenacker, p. 158, quoting F.O. 371/22946/C17105
24. Ibid., p. 159-60, quoting F.O. 371/22947/C20438
26. Kettenacker, p.28-30
27. In large part, this failure was due to the intervention of Maurice Bowra, an acquaintance of Trott’s from Oxford. In June, 1939, Trott met with Bowra in England and told him of his plans for his U.S. trip. Deciding Trott was "playing a double game," Bowra wrote to Felix Frankfurter of the U.S. Supreme Court, warning against any positive consideration by Roosevelt of Trott’s proposals. Frankfurter succeeded in casting doubts on Trott’s motives, thereby dooming his mission. See Henry Malone’s article in Francis R. Nicosia, Lawrence D. Stokes, eds., *Germans Against Nazism: Nonconformity, Opposition and Resistance in the Third Reich* (Oxford; 1990), p.268-70.
31. Conway, p.157
33. Chadwick, p.90
34. Ibid., p.90-1
35. Kettenacker, p.172-3, from an April 14, 1941 Foreign Office memo.
36. Osborne’s report read in part:
   The Pope assured me that the German principals are in no way connected with the Nazi Party. But his confidence may be misguided. Whether the German communication is in good faith or not, I think, it is clear that the Pope’s humanitarian feelings have been played on. And his spontaneous offer, after my expressions of scepticism, to cancel his communication to me shows that he does not relish being used as a channel and that he has little expectation of any result. But he certainly cannot be reproached for acting as he has.
   Quoted by Conway, p.163.
38. Chadwick, p.92
40. Chadwick, p. 93.
41. Dilks, p.255
42. Hoffmann, History, p.161, quoting Feb. 17, 1940 Halifax to Osborne cable. The German opposition had sought to have the French excluded from any negotiations, knowing their position was much more intransigent than that of the British, but here Chamberlain made it clear that was out of the question.
43. Chadwick, p.94
45. Chadwick, p.97
46. Lamb, p.134
47. Woodward, II, p.183
48. Feiling, p.443


50. Ibid., p.504-6


54. Ibid., p.219

55. Austria was not mentioned because it was not until 1943 that the restoration of an independent Austria became Allied policy.


57. Churchill used the term Prussia because he envisioned separating the south German states from the rest of Germany and joining them with Austria and possibly Hungary in a Danubian confederation. This plan would effectively leave Prussia, rather than Germany, as one of Europe’s great powers.


59. Keyserlingk, p.126-7

60. Kettenacker, p.105


62. Dilks, p.316-7


64. Lamb, p.169

65. Ibid., p.163, quoting F.O. 371/29940
66. Ibid., p.169, quoting F.O. 371/29928
67. Gilbert, *Finest Hour*, p.1118-9, quoting Colville’s June 22, 1941 diary entry.
68. Kettenacker, p.59-60

69. Woodward, II, p.14. This point was reaffirmed in Article II of the Anglo-Soviet Treaty of Alliance of May 26, 1942 which read:
   The High Contracting Parties undertake not to enter into any negotiations with the Hitlerite Government or any other Government in Germany that does not clearly renounce all aggressive intentions, and not to negotiate or conclude except by mutual consent any armistice or peace treaty with Germany or any other State associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe.
   Quoted from Leland M. Goodrich, ed., *Documents on American Foreign Relations*, vols. IV-VII (Boston; 1942-46), IV, p.255-6

73. Kettenacker, p.189, from July 1, 1942 Foreign Office memo.
74. Eden repeated this message in a speech in August.

77. Keyserlingk, p.129. One significant example of American propaganda was the series of 1942 broadcasts to the German opposition entitled, "Listen Hans", by Dorothy Thompson. While these broadcasts were not sponsored by the O.W.I., they were sanctioned by it and urged opposition members to prove the existence of "the other Germany" through overt action. When Thompson learned the opposition was restrained by the fear of an unjust peace, she implored its members to repudiate the Nazi regime, thereby allowing for a just peace. See Mary Alice Gallin, *The German Resistance to Hitler - Ethical and Religious Factors* (Washington, D.C.; 1961), p.126-7

79. Kettenacker, p.192, from July 1, 1942 Foreign Office memo.

80. Hooft, p.157

81. Lamb, p.256-7, quoting F.O. 898/412

82. Ibid., p.259-60, quoting F.O. 898/412

83. Ibid., p.260-1, quoting F.O. 898/412

84. Hoffmann, History, p.220, quoting from George Bell’s 1957 article in Vierteljahreshefte für Zeitgeschichte.

85. Jasper, p.270-1

86. Kettenacker, p.70, quoting F.O. 371/39087/C10028

87. Lamb, p.183


89. Ibid., p.671

90. In his August 4 reply to Bell, Eden reminded him that he had called on the German opposition to act in his speech of May 8. No further statement would be useful until it did so since the government had already made it clear that Germany would not be denied a place in the future Europe. This reply echoed his earlier one to Cripps. The importance Eden placed on his May 8 speech is confirmed by a July 1, 1942 Foreign Office report on the German opposition which called the speech "a note of encouragement to dissident elements in Germany." See Earl of Avon, p.334-5; and Lamb, p.261, who quotes Public Records Office 4/100/8.


92. Bethge, p.673


94. Jasper, p.275

95. Hull, p.1548

96. Goodrich, V, p.664-5

97. Ibid., V, p.171-2
98. Lamb, p.170
100. Ibid., 1943 vol.II, p.318
101. Lamb, p.171, quoting F.O. 371/33240
103. Lamb, p.171
104. Foreign Relations, 1943 vol. II, p.316
105. Lamb, p.172
109. Feis, p.109
110. Churchill, IV, p.613
111. Ibid., IV, p.614
112. Lamb, p.223, quoting August 9,1984 letter from Roberts.
114. Hull, p.1570
116. In his December 24, 1943 address, Roosevelt stated: The United Nations have no intention to enslave the German people. We wish them to have a normal chance to develop in peace, as useful and respectable members of the European family. But we most certainly
emphasize that word "respectable" — for we intend to
rid them once and for all of Nazism and Prussian
military and the fantastic and disastrous notion that
they constitute 'the master race'.

Quoted in Rosenman, vol.1943, p.557-8

117. Churchill, IV, p.616
118. Ibid., IV, p.618
119. Kettenacker, p.vi
120. Foreign Relations, 1943 vol. II, p.319
121. Lamb, p.175, quoting P.R.O. 3/249/9
122. Dilks, p.514
125. Lamb, p.187, quoting F.O. 371/37260
126. F.H. Hinsley, British Intelligence in the Second World War: Its Influence on Strategy
and Operations, 3 vols. (London; 1979-88), III i, p. 102
127. Lamb, p.183
128. The S.O.E. had been routinely receiving Foreign Office telegrams concerning Axis
opposition groups in order to aid its efforts to disrupt the Axis war effort.
129. Lamb, p. 184, quoting F.O. 371/33218
130. Ibid., p.189, quoting F.O. 371/37289
131. Ibid., p.191, quoting F.O. 371/3726
132. Francis Loewenheim, Harold Langley, Manfred Jonas, eds; Roosevelt and Churchill-
Their Secret Wartime Correspondence (New York;1975), p.359-60
133. Churchill, V, p.59
134. Hanson Baldwin, Great Mistakes of the War (New York;1950), p.22
135. Armstrong, p.85
136. Lamb, p.191

137. David W. Ellwood, Italy 1943-1945 (Leicester;1985), p.16

138. "Sledgehammer" was the codename given to the Allied plan for a small landing in France to precede the major invasion of Europe in the event of the sudden collapse of either Germany or the Soviet Union. "Rankin" was "Sledgehammer's" successor.

139. Woodward, II, p.462-3

140. Churchill, V, p.51


142. Rosenman, vol. 1943, p.328

143. Churchill, V, p.91

144. Woodward, II, p.475-8

145. Robert Murphy, Diplomat Among Warriors (New York;1964), p. 186


147. Lamb, p.194, quoting F.O. 371/37264

148. Ibid., p.198, quoting P.R.O. 3/249/5

149. Chadwick, p.262

150. For example, one article demanded that the Italians take the measures necessary to prevent any of their former Axis allies from seizing or attacking any Italian military installation. By September 13, all such installations north of Naples were in German hands.

151. United States Department of State, "United States and Italy 1936-1946" in European Series, 17(1946), p.64

152. Feis, p.166

153. European Series, p.65

154. Wheeler-Bennett, p.553
155. Rothfels, p.129
156. Armstrong, p.255
157. Wheeler-Bennett, p.558-560
160. Woodward, V, p.360, quoting as in note 158.
163. Ibid., V, p.252
164. Ibid., V, p.142
165. McNeill, p.410-1
166. Gilbert, Road, p.518, quoting Oliver Harvey’s diary entry of Oct. 6, 1943. Harvey was Eden’s private secretary. These were not isolated thoughts. At a meeting with Macmillan in Gibraltar in November, 1943, Churchill said that while Cromwell had been a great man, he made one fatal error. Born and bred in fear of Spain.... he failed to see in the decline of Spain the rise of France... Will that be said of me? He was clearly alluding to the Soviet Union. His fears about Soviet intentions were confirmed by Stalin’s harsh words at the Teheran Conference. So much so that in December, 1943, he told Lord Moran that "we’ve got to do something with these bloody Russians." Quotations from Horne, p.205, quoting his conversations with Macmillan from 1979-86; and Lord Moran, Churchill: Taken from the Diaries of Lord Moran (Boston;1966), p.155
169. Loewenheim, et al., p.411-2
173. Ibid., V, p.369
175. Dilks, p.620
178. Ibid., 1944 vol. I, p.517-8
179. Hull, p.1581
181. Ibid., p.635-6
182. Lamb, p.265, quoting F.O. 371/34462
185. Ibid., 1944 vol. I, p.496-7
186. As Armstrong states on p.170-1, "Allied admission during the war of the existence of a large-scale anti-Nazi movement within Germany might have threatened the moral basis of Total War pursued to the achievement of Unconditional Surrender."
187. Lamb, p.274, quoting F.O. 371/39059
189. Lamb, p.282, quoting F.O. 371/39087
190. Wheeler-Bennett, p.622, quoting Attlee's Commons speech of July 7, 1944.
191. Eade, IV, p.204
192. Kettenacker, p.207-8, quoting F.O. 371/39116/C9330
199. Eade, IV, p. 165.
200. Lamb, p.301, as quoted by Schlabrendorff and other German writers.
Primary Sources


United States Department of State. "United States and Italy 1936-1946" in *European Series* 17. 1946.


**Secondary Sources**


Articles


Astor, David, "Why the Revolt against Hitler was Ignored." *Encounter* 32. 1969.


Ford, Franklin J. "The Twentieth of July in the History of the German Resistance."  
American Historical Review 51. 1946.


