



# European Review of History: Revue européenne d'histoire

ISSN: 1350-7486 (Print) 1469-8293 (Online) Journal homepage: <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cerh20>

## 'Not on a purely nationalistic basis': the internationalism of Allied coalition warfare in the Second World War

Th. W. Bottelier

To cite this article: Th. W. Bottelier (2020) 'Not on a purely nationalistic basis': the internationalism of Allied coalition warfare in the Second World War, *European Review of History: Revue européenne d'histoire*, 27:1-2, 152-175, DOI: [10.1080/13507486.2019.1705251](https://doi.org/10.1080/13507486.2019.1705251)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13507486.2019.1705251>



© 2020 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.



Published online: 06 Mar 2020.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 56



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



OPEN ACCESS



# ‘Not on a purely nationalistic basis’: the internationalism of Allied coalition warfare in the Second World War

Th. W. Bottelier 

Erasmus University Rotterdam, Netherlands

## ABSTRACT

This paper aims to show that the Allies of the Second World War formed a major, yet largely overlooked site of mid-twentieth-century internationalism. Historians have tended to tell national stories about this coalition, built around its leaders and their bilateral relationships and conflicts, such as the ‘special’ Anglo-American relationship between Churchill, Roosevelt and their generals. The present study, by contrast, foregrounds the military and civilian planners working underneath them, as well as the inter-Allied institutions that facilitated their cooperation. This is a half-forgotten chapter of the war’s history: a series of technical, so-called ‘combined’ organs designed to plan Allied grand strategy and operations, pool their productive resources, and unify their theatre-level military commands, set up by Great Britain and the United States after the latter’s formal entry into the war in December 1941. The planners serving on these boards and committees, the paper furthermore shows, described their work in explicitly internationalist terms. ‘Combination’, as these insiders called it, meant putting the objective needs of Allied strategy ahead of narrow national interests. Its history is more than merely Anglo-American: involving Canadian, French and other European actors, it encompassed the wider trans-Atlantic and foreshadowed the later Atlantic alliance. Indeed, since several key shapers of post-war European integration, notably Jean Monnet, were closely involved in the combined experiment, this paper shines new light on a warlike root of European cooperation. Thus, it opens a dialogue between the history of war, internationalism and Europeanisation.

## ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 1 March 2019

Accepted 12 December 2019

## KEYWORDS

Allies; Second World War; internationalism; transatlantic relations; alliance politics; Grand Alliance

In the Second World War, victory went to the side that, notably, best managed the challenge of global warfare through international cooperation and integration. The Allies did much better than the Axis in this endeavour, through an elaborate system of permanent inter-Allied councils, civil-military boards of technical experts, wartime summits and multinational commands. As Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King, the United States Navy (USN)’s most senior officer,<sup>1</sup> noted some years after war’s end:

In fighting a global war, it is essential that global and comprehensive service points of view be given due weight in the councils which must arrive at well considered global decisions. A point of view focused solely on Europe, solely on the Pacific, solely on land warfare, solely on air warfare, solely on naval warfare, or any point of view which neglected any of the above

**CONTACT** Th. W. Bottelier  [bottelier@eshcc.eur.nl](mailto:bottelier@eshcc.eur.nl)  Erasmus University Rotterdam, History, Burg. Oudlaan 50, Rotterdam, 3000 DR Netherlands

© 2020 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

vital aspects, could scarcely avoid faulty decisions, faulty decisions which would have wasted additional billions of treasure and tens of thousands of lives.<sup>2</sup>

At first sight, King's admonition seems uncontroversial, even unsurprising. In the historiography of the Second World War, however, it is. King is known neither as a globalist nor as a proponent of good inter-service cooperation. An abrasive personality who, it was said, was 'so tough [he] shave[s] with a blow torch',<sup>3</sup> King is above all remembered as a fierce partisan who put the interests of the Pacific War against Japan, and especially those of his own service in it, before those of other theatres and Allies. As one historian observes, it was often hard to tell 'whether King's bitterest enemy was the Japanese, the British or the American army'.<sup>4</sup>

Yet King's words, written in private a few years after 1945, were more than mere rhetoric. As this paper argues, they formed part of a shared discourse among the top planners of the Anglo-American war effort after 1941, an internationalist discourse to which the transcendence of narrow national and service interests through military technocracy was central. Such technocracy lay at the heart of the elaborate war organization set up by Britain and the US after the latter's entry in December 1941. Both proponents of the transnational integration of the Allied war efforts and partisans of national or even individual service war efforts, like King, worked within it. The passage cited earlier refers to the admiral's work as part of the Combined Chiefs of Staff (CCS), the unified forum of the British Chiefs of Staff (COS) and the US Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS), the first truly corporate body of the US military and naval staffs – created, as we shall see, especially to participate in the CCS.<sup>5</sup> It follows a discussion, several pages long, of the Allies' 1943 decision to divert greater resources to the Pacific War than foreseen in earlier strategic plans, which accorded Japan only minor priority as an enemy, and saw Asia and the Pacific as peripheral theatres. Though certainly a USN partisan who saw the Pacific as the only theatre where his service could shine, and a sceptic of close relations with the British, King nevertheless took part in the internationalism of the CCS and other organs attempting to integrate the Allied war efforts, because it provided the legitimating framework for decision-making within these coalition fora.

This special issue is a welcome opportunity to take seriously the internationalism of generals and admirals. 'Internationalism' has in the past three decades emerged as an analytical category 'central to the major political questions and themes of the twentieth century: war and peace, imperialism and nationalism, states and state-building', as Glenda Sluga and Patricia Clavin argue in a recent survey.<sup>6</sup> Meant to both describe and explain the 'movements of people, goods, ideas and practices across national boundaries and continents',<sup>7</sup> the history of internationalism is closely related to transnational and global history. Indeed, historians initially used it as a synonym for the transnational and global turns that began in the late 1980s.<sup>8</sup> This makes it a fuzzy concept that continues to overlap with transnationalism. It can assume multiple meanings, describing both 'the domain of international relations, as formal diplomatic contacts between nations, as much as the movement (both linear and circular) of people and their ideas, networks and imaginations across borders'.<sup>9</sup> This is not necessarily a weakness. As Jessica Reinisch cautions, a 'restrictive focus on definitions and normative prescriptions' for what constitutes 'real' internationalism, and attempts to rigidly define it against transnationalism and global history, are counter-productive. It is more useful to think of "internationalisms", in the

plural', with due attention for the diversity of forms it has taken, including black, women's and other non-elite internationalisms, global religions and even transnational fascism, as well as to the 'dark sides' of mainstream liberal internationalism, including race, force, empire and collaboration with violently anti-liberal regimes.<sup>10</sup>

The Allies of the Second World War formed a major and successful case of transnational cooperation. Recent scholarship has drawn attention to the key role of internationalism in Allied – or, as they were known after 1941, the United Nations' – ideology, propaganda and post-war planning.<sup>11</sup> Yet much of the specialist scholarship on this military alliance continues to follow 'realist' theories of international relations, which emphasize the primacy of national interests, security and power, and consequently depict coalitions as pacts of convenience between fundamentally self-interested states.<sup>12</sup> In the case of the Allies, this has meant an overwhelming focus on the great powers – the so-called Big Three of Britain, the Soviet Union and the US – and on inter-Allied competition. To cite one influential title, the anti-Axis coalition was composed of both 'allies and adversaries'.<sup>13</sup> Alliance politics are, accordingly, depicted as a series of bilateral relationships between closed national units, whose war efforts appear entirely separate and national. A good illustration of this is the 'league tables' found in political-economic accounts, which compare national military spending, production, mobilization and so on.<sup>14</sup> This mode of accounting gives little impression of the global and interdependent character of Allied war finances and production and ignores large parts of both the coalition and the world war. Thus, France drops out after 1940, Britain is reduced to the United Kingdom alone, and major contributors of men, finances, resources and production such as China, India and Canada (the fourth economy of the war) are left out entirely. Diplomatic and military-strategic histories, meanwhile, foreground inter-Allied tensions over the demand for a 'second front' in Europe after 1941, understood as a conflict of national interests, for instance between British colonialism in the Mediterranean and US anti-imperialism and thirst for foreign markets.<sup>15</sup> Specialists of the Western Allies, finally, likewise emphasize national conflict. These readily admit to the unique closeness of Anglo-American cooperation in particular, focusing much attention on the CCS and unified Allied commands, such as General Dwight Eisenhower's Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force (SHAEP) of D-Day fame. Yet their Anglo-American character is taken to mean that they were extensions of the so-called 'special relationship', or arenas for the two powers' competing interests.<sup>16</sup> The first, military-historical volume of the recent *Cambridge History of the Second World War* (2015) contains no chapters considering the CCS or the Allied commands, bar a single study on the British-US Combined Bomber Offensive over Europe.<sup>17</sup> Only quite recently have the military historians David Rigby, Niall Barr and Robert Ehlers considered these bodies as institutions in their own right.<sup>18</sup>

The following pages seek to extend such insights. I focus on the period after the US's formal entry into the Second World War in December 1941 up to the Cairo Conference of November 1943. Rather than political leaders and diplomats, I concentrate on generals, admirals and production experts. Most of these were British and US-born, but they included others, notably Jean Monnet, much of whose post-1945 career can be seen as building on his wartime experience. This fairly limited periodization and cast of characters is deliberate, as these years saw the CCS and many other alliance institutions established and major strategic choices made. A consensus among historians of the war also holds that

the conflict reached a turning point and Allied victory was decided in this period.<sup>19</sup> It also, however, means passing over the time before the Japanese assault on the Euro-American empires across Asia, which was crucial because much of the alliance architecture set up after US entry was modelled on the Anglo-French alliance of the First World War and 1939–40. It also means giving little consideration to the later years of the war, when the receding Axis threat caused alliance politics to change and several key programmes of inter-Allied cooperation, such as US Lend-Lease, were wound down. Nonetheless, it is hoped that revisiting the creation and apogee of the Grand Alliance's institutional infrastructure will indicate that the coalition was greater than the sum of its parts.<sup>20</sup>

This article cannot but make a beginning to recovering the history of Allied internationalism at war. It unfolds in three parts. A first section looks at the origins of the CCS and the other 'combined' organs, and their place within the wider Allied coalition. The article then turns to outlining the various combined boards and committees, focusing on those headquartered in Washington, sketching a brief history of the performance and fate of the Allied war organization. A third and final section turns to the ideas held by those who worked in the combined organs. I argue that to both participants and observers, what was generally termed 'combination' constituted an important example of internationalism during and immediately after the war, one much cited, for example, in the contemporary debate on the future of international politics. Indeed, for some officers and civilian experts involved in organizing the Allied war effort from Washington, including but far from limited to Monnet, combination was a project of waging war beyond the nation, putting the 'objective' needs of Allied strategy before the national interest. This illustrates that the pursuit of the national interest was not the only, or even the most important, driver of alliance politics.

### **'United Nations High Command': internationalism in the Allies' war, 1941–5**

Allied military internationalism reached its apogee after the Second World War went global, following Japan's assault on the Euro-American empires in December 1941. It was not, however, new. It was modelled on the highly integrated mode of coalition warfare pioneered by the Entente during the First World War, which was recreated by Britain and France in 1939. This included a Supreme War Council (SWC), the decision-making forum of the Allied military and political leadership; a Supreme Allied Commander, *Généralissime* Ferdinand Foch, appointed in April 1918; and an agency for inter-Allied import and shipping coordination – in 1917–18, the Allied Maritime Transport Council (AMTC) and, in 1939–40, the Anglo-French Co-ordinating Committee (AFCC).<sup>21</sup> Several major figures of post-1941 inter-Allied cooperation had direct working experience of its First World War predecessor, including Monnet; US President Franklin Roosevelt; US Army Chief-of-Staff General George Marshall; Field Marshal Sir John Dill, the main British military representative in Washington from 1942 onward; and Sir Arthur Salter, the British Ministry of War Transport (MWT)'s main representative in Washington after 1942.<sup>22</sup> The usage of the words 'combined' and 'combination' to mean inter-Allied cooperation, in fact, had originated in the little-known Anglo-French arms import operation in the US, in which Monnet, who chaired the AFCC, was directly involved.<sup>23</sup> This Anglo-French invention began to be translated into top-secret Anglo-American planning in the wake of France's armistice with Germany in June 1940. In March 1941, this produced the so-called ABC-1 war plan, which called urgently for 'the provision of the necessary

machinery along the lines of a Supreme War Council for the co-ordination of the political and military direction of the War.<sup>24</sup>

The combined organs, consisting of seven major bodies, each with its own set of subcommittees, were created in three stages in 1942–3.<sup>25</sup> The first four official combined organs were created following the first Washington conference, codenamed ‘Arcadia’ and held over three weeks between 22 December 1941 and 14 January 1942 between British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, Roosevelt and their staffs.<sup>26</sup> Reflecting, in their military and logistical ambitions, the pressing needs of a coalition now in a global war, they were the CCS, the civil-military Combined Munitions Assignment Board (CMAB) under CCS direction, and the separate Combined Raw Materials (CMRB) and Shipping Adjustment Boards (CSAB).<sup>27</sup> At Arcadia, Churchill and Roosevelt also created the first Allied multinational command, American-British-Dutch-Australian Command (ABDACOM) under the British General Sir Archibald Wavell, which covered the vast area from Burma to New Guinea and Australia. These were followed by the Combined Production and Resources (CPRB) and Food Boards (CFB) at the second Washington conference (‘Argonaut’) of mid-June 1942, set up, respectively, to prevent competitive buying of foodstuffs on the global market, and to attempt ‘combined programming’, that is the integrated planning of the Anglo-American war economies. Canada was included on CPRB in November 1942 and CFB in October 1943, having already sat on the latter’s many commodity subcommittees since 1942. Finally, the first Québec conference of August 1943 (‘Quadrant’) created the Combined Policy Committee (CPC) on the same trilateral basis, with the intent of coordinating atomic bomb research.<sup>28</sup>

That Churchill and Roosevelt resurrected the Anglo-French practice of military internationalism upon the Second World War’s globalization is no coincidence. Waging global war was a monumental task that required international coordination, planning and organization by dedicated bodies of experts. As Churchill wrote FDR while *en route* to Washington, in a letter largely drafted by his senior military planners, the need to ‘set up joint machinery’ to take care of the ‘allocation of joint forces’ and the close coordination of US with British and Allied war economies should be among the ‘main points of the conference’.<sup>29</sup> ‘Unifying the war effort’ was likewise the object of feverish planning within the State Department for Arcadia, with plans for Washington-based supreme political, war and economic councils modelled directly on the Entente of 1917–19.<sup>30</sup> ‘Unity of command’, noted the senior British planner Brigadier Vivian Dykes, was ‘like a King Charles’s head’ among US Army staffers at Arcadia, who meant by the phrase that each Allied theatre should be run by a single ‘supreme commander’ like Foch in 1918, rather than the British practice of running theatre-level commands by inter-service committee.<sup>31</sup> It was largely Marshall’s work that led to Wavell’s appointment as Supreme Allied Commander of the ABDA area.<sup>32</sup> Only after the British and US chiefs-of-staff had drafted a mission directive for Wavell did Roosevelt propose ‘a new “Joint Body” in Washington’ to control and support ABDACOM.<sup>33</sup> This became the CCS. Since the SWC was not recreated, the CCS, in tandem with the intermittent wartime summits, functioned as a sort of *ersatz*.<sup>34</sup>

Despite such behind-the-scenes compromises, contemporary observers were greatly impressed by the outcomes of the first and second Washington conferences. They saw combination as the practical implementation of the ideal of the United Nations, another product of Arcadia. *The Economist* breathlessly summarized the intent behind the Combined Boards:



The details were made known on Tuesday of the most comprehensive system of international association the world has yet seen. The students of post-war leagues and federations would do well to study it; the Axis states no doubt are already giving it their close attention. The problem is to mobilise the resources of all the United Nations.<sup>35</sup>

In June 1942, following Argonaut, *Time* baptized the entire network of boards and committees the 'United Nations High Command'.<sup>36</sup>

Yet combination was far from a utopian project. It also served national interests, and ran counter to the sovereign equality, at least in theory, of the United Nations. When Churchill proposed Arcadia to Roosevelt, he wrote that he wanted to 'review the whole war plan in the light of reality and new facts, as well as the problems of production and distribution'. He had been more candid to his War Cabinet on 8 December 1941, the day the US declared war on Japan: the point was 'to see Roosevelt to ensure that American help to this country does not dry up'.<sup>37</sup> The British COS initially wanted a US commander of ABDACOM, as they 'foresaw inevitable disasters in the Far East' and did not wish Britain to be blamed; their US counterparts, Marshall and King, meanwhile, wanted Wavell to serve directly under the COS, which the latter rejected because of the not unreasonable 'political danger of having all responsibility (and blame) centred in London'.<sup>38</sup> The CCS were created as a compromise.

There was, secondly, a strong element of hierarchy involved. When the other powers involved in the ABDA area – Australia, the Netherlands and New Zealand – heard a joint body would be set up to direct Wavell, they 'naturally put in a claim to be represented'.<sup>39</sup> It is in this context that one should see Australian Labor PM John Curtin's famous claim, in the *Melbourne Herald* of 27 December 1941, that 'Australia looks to America, free of any pangs as to our traditional links or kinship with the United Kingdom' – a statement Curtin prefigured by demanding 'the fullest say in the direction of the Democracies' fighting plan'.<sup>40</sup> The experts at Arcadia had little patience for such demands, which they regarded as the parochialism of lesser powers with no interests beyond their own region. British and US Army planners thought they alone possessed the worldwide interests, coupled with direct access to Churchill and Roosevelt, to direct the war's various theatres on a truly global basis. Giving the lesser Allies a say would only slow down decision-making. In the words of Brigadier Ian Jacob, military secretary to the War Cabinet: 'Only the combined U.S. and British Chiefs of Staff could control the Supreme Commander'.<sup>41</sup> Officials were entirely open about this. 'We use the word "combined" to relate to any body representative of both American and British interests,' Oliver Lyttelton, Britain's Minister of Production, matter-of-factly told the House of Commons in late June 1942.<sup>42</sup>

In the event, other Allies were involved in the CCS and Boards' affairs, but only when the agenda touched on their direct interests. Combination's exclusionary character, as the project of the English-speaking great powers, remained problematic until the war's end and after. The editors of *The Observer*, writing during the Casablanca Conference in January 1943 (on the eve of the relief of Stalingrad) of the failure to involve the USSR, thought there was

... a serious structural gap in the affairs of the United Nations. [...] During 1942 Britain and the U.S.A. have achieved a fairly high degree of co-ordination of strategy and unification of effort. No such claim can be made for the United Nations as a whole. The permanent common organs, which alone can transform a loose alliance into a real war-making unit, exist, as far as Britain and the U.S.A. are concerned [...] They do not exist as organs of the United Nations as such.

But this is a United Nations war. To conduct it as a British-American war, with a separate Russian war running parallel to it, will certainly postpone victory and may jeopardise peace.<sup>43</sup>

As a 1945 pamphlet on post-war relief noted sardonically of the Combined Boards, these were a British–US affair, with a ‘small voice – a ninth part of a larynx, as it were – permitted to Canada’.<sup>44</sup> While, with high hopes for post-war multilateralism, the bilateral Boards were quickly dismantled in 1945, parts of the military alliance infrastructure continued a skeleton existence. As late as 1947, when Field Marshal Bernard Montgomery, by then Chief of the Imperial General Staff (CIGS, head of the British Army), visited Moscow, he was queried by Stalin whether the CCS constituted a military alliance, prompting the US Army’s Plans and Operations branch to prepare their dissolution in case Moscow applied pressure.<sup>45</sup>

### **The Combined Organisation, 1942–5: a sketch of a history**

Was Stalin right to take the by then moribund CCS so seriously? By sketching a brief history of the performance and some of the challenges faced by the combined organs, this section seeks to contextualize the Soviet dictator’s query. It firstly provides a brief outline of each individual combined organ, before considering the many issues and clashes involved in an internationalist experiment of this scope in the midst of a global war. What follows is far from exhaustive and limits itself geographically to Washington, which, as the nerve centre of the world’s largest economy, had the most to add to the common Allied pool.<sup>46</sup>

The most consequential combined organs were the military CCS, the civil-military CMAB, and the largely civilian CRMB, CSAB, CFB and CPRB. These were each further divided into a legion of subcommittees that did the detailed planning work for approval by the main committee. Not all of this took place in Washington. The CCS, for instance, were only formally in session when the British COS and US Joint Chiefs of Staff physically met, which happened a total of 15 times, at the war’s major conferences. At Tehran (November–December 1943) and after, the Soviet chiefs-of-staff (*Stavka*) joined the CCS, but they were never permanent members. In between summits, the Anglo-American staffs were split between London and Washington. Nonetheless, they met weekly thanks to the appointment of a special delegation drawn from the British Joint Staff Mission (JSM) in the US capital, headed until his death in 1944 by Dill, who, before Arcadia, had been CIGS. The Washington-based CCS organization consisted of a Combined Planning Staff and Secretariat, as well as Communications, Intelligence, Military Transport and Meteorological Committees. Participation quite literally forced the US and Washington-based British military staffs to work together, as they shared offices, first in the Federal Reserve Building, and then in the Public Health Service Building on Constitution Avenue, which came to be known throughout the war as the CCS Building.<sup>47</sup>

CMAB, by comparison, formed the hub of a global network of like committees. Together, these formed a global armaments distribution organization that allocated weaponry built by the largest producers, that is, the US and the British Empire.<sup>48</sup> Since the bulk of arms production was needed for the national services, only the surplus went abroad; the US produced by far the largest surplus, making CMAB key. But there were also Munitions Assignment Boards or Committees in Ottawa, London, Delhi and Canberra, which allocated surplus Canadian, British, Indian and Australian production.<sup>49</sup> Washington-based



CMAB was subdivided into Army, Navy and Air Force Munitions Assignment Committees. The distribution of arms with which CMAB and its sister organs in the British Empire were tasked came from national military aid programmes, most importantly the US's Lend-Lease,<sup>50</sup> Canada's 'billion-dollar gift' (January 1942) and War Appropriations (United Nations Mutual Aid) Act (May 1943),<sup>51</sup> and Britain's 'reverse Lend-Lease'. These programmes were central to what remains a very poorly studied chapter of the Second World War – what was known as Mutual Aid, the United Nations' state-controlled global war economy.<sup>52</sup>

The Combined Raw Materials and Food Boards, by comparison, worked more like international cartels, bringing together national ministries to coordinate food production and imports from neutrals, like Argentina, to ensure low prices and constant supplies. They were divided into commodity subcommittees. CFB, moreover, like CMAB, had counterparts in London: the London Food Committee, later Food Council, which channelled CFB recommendations to Empire countries; and a likewise London-based, multinational Tea Allocation Committee, which surveyed the UN's tea supplies and requirements and drafted purchase and allocation plans for CFB.<sup>53</sup> To add to this complexity, there were also special combined committees created to either solve *ad hoc* problems or address joint issues. A good example was the short-lived 'Committee of the Combined Boards', called together by the US State Department in December 1942 to coordinate the provision of food and raw materials to French North Africa following the Allied landings there (Operation Torch). A predecessor to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA), it met until the end of January 1943.<sup>54</sup>

Like the aforementioned AMTC and AFCC, the combined bodies had no permanent personnel and no executive powers of their own. Formally, they were mere fora for national-state organs, who delegated their own personnel, provided the Boards' chairmen and carried out proposed programmes. In a bid to increase their effectiveness, delegates were either the heads of relevant ministries or federal departments or, as was often the case on the British side, senior bureaucrats or officers with a history of involvement in Allied-US collaboration. Thus, CSAB for example brought together Salter, who headed MWT's stateside Merchant Shipping Mission, with the unfortunately named Admiral Emory Land, chief of the US War Shipping Administration (WSA). CMAB and its sister organs worked on the same principle. Besides Chairman Hopkins, the Executive in charge of coordinating its programmes was General James H. Burns, a supply officer who had worked to expedite arms exports to the Anglo-French alliance since 1939. Since 1941, he had been the White House's main adviser on Lend-Lease. *Time* profiled him in June 1942 as the 'munitions man' on the 'United Nations High Command'.<sup>55</sup> The CCS, finally, were a special case, as the corporate body of the British and US staff organizations. Their Washington branch brought together senior officers on both sides, several of whom went on to senior Allied command.<sup>56</sup>

To facilitate combination, a significant branch of the British state was established in Washington. Christened 'overseas Whitehall' by participants,<sup>57</sup> it consisted of very large military, civilian production and supply, and diplomatic missions, which together totalled some 9000 staff at their peak in June 1943 –significantly, also the peak year of US-federal government employment.<sup>58</sup> The military mission, the aforementioned JSM, was the largest, numbering some 3000 employees by late 1942. The British side of the Combined Boards, meanwhile, was drawn from the British Supply Council (BSC), the 'federal' body of British

supply missions in the US, many of which dated back to the Anglo-French alliance. In wartime, the BSC grew to some 1800 employees. Although 9000 was a miniscule number compared to the 505,000 non-industrial members of the British Civil Service at its peak in 1944 or the almost 3 million in the US federal government, and smaller yet compared to the 4.9 million British men and women in uniform by 1945, it was comparable to an average mid-1930s Whitehall ministry and many times larger than the League of Nations Secretariat.<sup>59</sup> To house these employees, His Majesty's Government leased, in whole or in part, 31 buildings in Washington in addition to further offices in New York. The number named here, it bears underlining, does not include the thousands more women whose clerical work as typists, stenographers, switchboard operators etcetera made that of the men possible.<sup>60</sup> Finally, overseas Whitehall was just the largest expatriate community among many, including Australian, Canadian and New Zealand JSMs, as well as Belgian, Chinese, Dutch, French, Soviet and more military-diplomatic missions. Together, these made wartime Washington the second capital of the United Nations after London, the capital of anti-Axis Europe.<sup>61</sup>

Formed to wage war on an internationalist basis yet supervening on the nation-state, the combined war machinery experienced serious teething problems as it grappled with the challenges of global war in 1942–3. Firstly, although clearly intended to further the integration of the Anglo-American war efforts, beyond this general commitment the combined organs' functions were poorly defined. Moreover, they had no clear legal status: the Churchill-Roosevelt agreements that created them never went beyond memoranda of understanding. The leaders published a press release on the first Combined Boards in January 1942, according to which their purpose was 'to further the coordination of the United Nations [sic] war effort'.<sup>62</sup> Similarly, in the secret memorandum on 'post-Arcadia collaboration' that formally instituted them, the CCS were 'to provide for the continuance of the necessary machinery to effect collaboration between the United Nations'.<sup>63</sup> However, while Churchill presented the January 1942 Boards agreements to Parliament as a White Paper, they were never backed by FDR with equivalent Executive Orders.<sup>64</sup>

The combined organs' functions as described in these memoranda were, secondly, vague and hardly uniform. Some had considerably more ambitious missions than others. The CCS' task seemed clear in the post-Arcadia memorandum: '(a) Determine and recommend the broad programme of requirements based on strategic policy; (b) Submit general directives as to the policy governing the distribution of available weapons of war; (c) Settle the broad issues of priority of overseas movements'.<sup>65</sup> In practice, however, agreeing on a correct strategic policy and the relative priority of the war's theatres proved extraordinarily difficult and highly political. Similar problems of interpretation beset the Combined Boards. All operated on the basic principle that the whole 'resources of Great Britain and the United States will be deemed to be in a common pool, about which the fullest information would be interchanged', as the CFB memorandum read.<sup>66</sup> Yet the interpretation of pooling differed per Board, and in more than one case proved contentious. CMAB and its sister organs, as we have seen, only pooled surplus armaments. CRMB and CFB's cartel practices served primarily to pool information about imports. CSAB, as we shall see shortly, could not agree on a technique of pooling. CPRB, finally, had the most ambitious mission: like the AFCC, it was to 'combine the production programs of the [US, UK and Canada] into a single integrated program, adjusted to the strategic requirements of the war'.<sup>67</sup>

The real Achilles' heel of the combined organization, however, was not its unclear mandates, but the role played by British-US national agencies. Both the CCS and each Board, save CRMB, experienced serious difficulties in securing the cooperation of national agencies in 1942-3, owing to conflicts over jurisdiction among them. Crucially, the problem lay primarily within rather than between the two states. It was particularly acute in the US, where a riot of overlapping agencies was established in 1942 to manage the country's effort towards total mobilization. These new agencies, of which the most important were the War Production Board (WPB) and Land's WSA, bitterly disputed the control of mobilization with older departments.<sup>68</sup> Two examples, that of CSAB and the CCS, serve to illustrate the point.

The internal US jurisdictional disputes that beset CSAB resulted in its permanent bypass. The Shipping Board suffered from the fact that, although WSA represented the US because it oversaw the country's merchant shipbuilding programme, control over overseas shipping movements lay with the Army and Navy. Over the course of 1942, Admiral Land tried but failed to wrest control of movements from the armed services. Anglo-American shipping correspondence consequently ran largely outside CSAB's formal meetings, through the British members of the Board's own secretariat. Accordingly, opinion in London on the Washington Board was that it existed primarily 'to bring together the thought of both controlling centres' rather than to actually direct movements, as a late 1942 MWT memorandum put it. Reflecting this attitude, Lyttelton at the end of 1942 cut a deal directly with Roosevelt to reallocate part of WSA's production to Britain. Salter in early 1943 pressed Land to make this bilateral deal CSAB's recommendation. Furious, Land and WSA began stonewalling the Board, to which the British responded by bypassing it entirely. Although it continued to exist on paper, it was replaced in practice by the multilateral United Maritime Authority in 1944, the predecessor of today's International Maritime Organisation.<sup>69</sup>

The CCS also suffered from bureaucratic infighting on the US side. The Army and Navy had a weak tradition of inter-service collaboration and the country lacked an integrated staff organization on the European model, with its own secretariat and jurisdiction over all forces, like the British COS. However, in this case Washington responded early through the creation of the JCS in February 1942, in order to ensure it had a say in combined strategy-making. It took time to overcome Army-Navy disdain and mistrust of each other, just as it took time to overcome the services' practice of drafting separate strategic plans and procurement programmes, and refusing to share dispositions. British planners, used to the more orderly procedures of Whitehall, were shocked by this state of affairs upon arrival in Washington at the end of 1941. 'The American machine of government seems hopelessly disorganised,' Jacob complained at Arcadia, after discovering that the president lacked a cabinet system, a private office and a system of interdepartmental committees with secretariats of their own to coordinate war policy.<sup>70</sup> 'Never have I seen a country so utterly unprepared for war,' Dill thought. 'It seems to me that the whole organisation from a war point of view belongs to the days of George Washington.'<sup>71</sup> It was not until 1943 that the JCS managed to smooth out debilitating Army-Navy conflicts and acquire something like a corporate identity. By this time, the expression 'let's do a Marshall-King', meaning to overcome inter-service difficulties, had entered US military jargon.<sup>72</sup> Reflecting such success, the 1947 National Security Act enshrined the JCS, a relic of wartime internationalism, in the US national

security state. The next and final section turns to investigating the nature of such internationalism among the military and civilian experts that ran the Allies' war.

### **'International and Impartial': the politics of expertise at war, 1942–3**

Conflicts over competence within the CCS and CPRB produced the clearest statements of the political stakes involved in the Anglo-American war organization. These revolved around the verb 'combine' and its derivatives, 'combined' and 'combination', which defined the discourse of the great democracies' military internationalism. Originally used within the Anglo-French supply organization in North America to connote Allied–US cooperation, 'combined' was also used in the British War Office to connote special inter-service operations (e.g. Combined Operations Headquarters, activated July 1940).<sup>73</sup> It was disambiguated at the Arcadia summit, coming to designate international military cooperation only; 'joint' replaced it in its other meaning. As the post-Arcadia memorandum stipulated, 'the word "Joint" [should] be applied to Inter-Service collaboration of one nation and the word "Combined" to collaboration between two or more of the United Nations.'<sup>74</sup> NATO still uses the two terms in this way today.

To some, behind this seemingly technical distinction lay a complete vision of how to wage modern war. Brigadier Dykes, who was one of them, called this the 'combined approach'.<sup>75</sup> According to this technocratic idea, war should be waged functionally, subordinating national interests to the 'objective' requirements of strategy. It formed one pole within a spectrum of expert views on how to organize the Allies' war, ranging through visions of Anglo-Saxon unity, through more practical views of managing an international coalition, to outright sceptics who held fast to the primacy of national sovereignty and interests. Such a diversity of opinion cannot be reduced to straightforward national difference, the framework in which accounts of the Allies in the Second World War have long been placed.

The baseline for the CCS's work was a kind of functional internationalism that placed the demands of global strategy – that is, of all the United Nations – above that of any particular nation. These terms defined the debates on grand strategy that, in 1942–3, followed in the wake of Japan's conquest of Southeast Asia, which drove an 8000-kilometre-wide wedge between the Allies in Asia and Australasia, and stretched their global shipping resources to the limit. Brigadier General Walter Bedell Smith (of later fame as Eisenhower's chief-of-staff), Dykes's US counterpart on the Combined Secretariat, summarized the issue in a letter to Major General Sir Hastings Ismay, Churchill's closest military adviser, on the eve of the Casablanca Conference. He stressed

... the vital necessity for a determination at the earliest possible moment of a major strategy for the United Nations. Unless our great men sit down and reach a definite decision as to whether we exploit the Mediterranean area, push a campaign in the Pacific and Burma, or build up in UK for 'Round-Up' [the invasion of the European continent], we shall continue to flounder and will be absolutely unable to pull together.<sup>76</sup>

Much of the specialist scholarship has focused on these disagreements. Less attention has focused on the broad consensus among the CCS and their staffers on what, conversely, constituted *improper* grounds for strategy: partisan interests. The most common criticism of particular plans was that they put self-interest before the common good of the United

Nations. The Mediterranean war was regularly attacked in US planning circles for being a British imperial concern. 'Some of our officers', Admiral William Leahy, Roosevelt's chief-of-staff in the President's capacity as US Commander-in-Chief and, as such, the JCS's chairman, noted of a White House meeting before the third Washington Conference ('Trident') in May 1943, 'have a fear that Great Britain is desirous of confining allied military effort in Europe to the Mediterranean Area in order that England may exercise control thereof regardless of what the terms of peace may be'.<sup>77</sup>

Such suspicions reached a crescendo in July 1942, when, in opposition to Torch, the US Army and Navy top brass jointly proposed to FDR to 'turn to the Pacific and strike decisively against Japan; in other words, assume a defensive attitude against Germany ... and use all available means in the Pacific'.<sup>78</sup> But the Pacific, too, came in for the same criticism. 'Just because the Americans can't have a massacre in France this year,' Churchill remarked sourly after hearing of the JCS proposal, 'they want to sulk and bathe in the Pacific'.<sup>79</sup> The Army agreed to the Pacific-first proposal merely as a 'bogey' with which to pressure Britain, Smith told Dykes.<sup>80</sup> Most in the War Department regarded the Pacific as the Navy's private enterprise, and so a waste of resources. Encapsulating such thinking, Secretary of War Henry Stimson recorded in his diary in June 1942: 'The Navy has been dead anxious to fight in the Pacific [...] And they have been barely loyal in regard to following out [sic] the [Allied] plans'.<sup>81</sup> The British were well aware of the US Army and Navy's 'fundamental differences of view', as Dill put it to his successor as CIGS, General Sir Alan Brooke, early in May 1942:

In one [Navy] document, this phrase occurred – 'in support of the U.S. Army's Bolero plan [for the build-up of forces in Britain]' [...] The fact is that the two U.S. staffs are as yet unable to reconcile their views and since they do not like to wash their dirty linen in our presence, they naturally do not relish trying to put down United strategy in black and white.<sup>82</sup>

The ideal of combination, namely to transcend national and inter-service partisanship through expert objectivity and impartiality, did not only serve as a source of critique. It also provided the discursive resources with which competing plans could be presented as the true expression of all United Nations' interests. Eisenhower, for example, who was one of the Combined Planners before assuming Supreme Allied Command in North Africa and the Mediterranean, distilled US Army thought on global strategy when, in mid-1942, he wrote privately: 'We've got to go to Europe and fight, and we've got to quit wasting resources all over the world, and still worse, wasting time'.<sup>83</sup> In June 1942 the British Army planner Geoffrey Bourne, who worked in the JSM, accompanied Marshall to London in a failed bid to convince the British COS of the need for a cross-Channel invasion in 1942. He explained British opposition as a failure to come up with 'any definite ideas upon United strategy as opposed to purely British strategy'.<sup>84</sup> Conversely, even those with a reputation for unilateralism and Anglophobia, such as Admiral King, were not unreservedly opposed to combination. In June 1943, King proposed a production scheme to Lyttelton 'to get together to "standardize" equipment ... to the end that they shall become interchangeable – i.e. *not* require to be labeled "British" or "American" but, rather, "Allied"'.<sup>85</sup>

Some working for the CCS and Combined Boards in Washington distilled the type of language King used into a fully fledged ideology. It was not uniform, and proponents varied

in parsing it. All, however, agreed that it meant waging war beyond the nation, inter- or supranationally. Some, like the Australian-American historian of the British Commonwealth and former League employee Duncan Hall, who worked in the British Raw Materials Mission and so for CRMB during the war, saw it as 'a so purely Anglo-Saxon affair' which involved the 'intermeshing' of the British-US states through 'continuous personal interpretation ... on the Commonwealth principle of continuous consultation'. It also involved an element of hierarchy, or, in Hall's words, ranging 'the free nations of the world behind the Great Powers'.<sup>86</sup> Hall's perspective, though shorn of its Commonwealth context, is particularly well preserved among historians of Anglo-American relations in the idea of a 'special relationship'. It contrasted, however, with that of men closer to the action. To the Briton Dykes, for example, 'combined' was a synonym for 'international' and 'objective'. He likened his combined approach to getting 'on partnership terms' or a 'full partnership game', and contrasted it with what he called US 'imperialism', that is, the narrow focus on national interests he perceived within the country. Dykes strongly agreed with the aforementioned US officer, General Burns, who thought that the combined machinery's crucial secretariats 'must be *international* and *impartial*, serving the committee and *not* any one nation'. The two men associated closely with Jean Monnet, who remained in Washington throughout most of the war, working first for the BSC and, after a brief stint in Algiers with the *Comité français de libération nationale*, for the French mission in the US. According to Monnet, 'equipment [should be] allocated by theatres and not on a purely nationalistic basis' and that production be adjusted 'in accordance with [objective] *strategic* requirements'.<sup>87</sup>

The most radical expression of this ideology was made in the context of CPRB. Its mission, as touched upon earlier, was what proponents called the 'Supreme Co-ordination' or 'combined programming' (i.e. planning) of British and North American war production.<sup>88</sup> The Board was first proposed as a 'Joint Production Committee' by Dill in December 1941 at Arcadia, but was not adopted. Dill, seconded by Monnet, who had close links with Roosevelt associates like Felix Frankfurter, continued lobbying for its establishment, succeeding at the second Washington Conference in June 1942. Composed of the British Ministry of Production, the US's WPB and (from November) the Canadian Department of Munitions and Supply, supporters envisioned it as an 'Economic High Command' or a 'Chiefs of Staff for Production'.<sup>89</sup> The most radical adherents of such ideas, it bears underscoring, could be found on the US side, within WPB and among Bureau of the Budget officials tasked with streamlining the federal government's relations with the Combined Boards. WPB, in an August report, projected CPRB's functions as 'long-range planning on an inter-national scope'; to 'develop, promulgate and enforce specific combined programs'; to 'decide appeals' on, among other things, 'violations by national agencies of combined determinations'; and to take over arms allocation powers from the CCS.<sup>90</sup> Fired by such ambition, WPB's Nelson instigated CPRB chief-of-staff General Henry Aurand to redirect 15,000 tons of shot steel from the US Army to the British on combined programming grounds that same month. Aurand agreed, without consulting the Army Supply Forces under his superior, Lieutenant-General Brehon Somervell. Within a week, he was re-assigned, telling Dykes 'because he takes too objective a view – and not sufficiently an American one'.<sup>91</sup> Unsurprisingly, CPRB never became an economic high command. Already by the end of September 1942, BOB officials involved in getting its operations off the ground



complained to Leahy, who controlled access to Roosevelt as his chief-of-staff, of 'the failure to date in utilizing' CPRB.<sup>92</sup> However, it was reconstructed in 1943 to focus on non-military supplies to liberated areas; UNRRA based much of its work on the data and studies of CPRB's commodity subcommittees.<sup>93</sup>

As the Aurand incident indicates, there were of course sceptics of combination. Brooke, Britain's CIGS, was one of them. After the disbandment of ABDACOM in the wake of the Japanese conquest of Singapore and the Netherlands East Indies, he wrote in his diary that 'we can at last ... run the war on a rational basis!' That meant dividing the war into 'two main spheres of interest – An American running the Pacific up to Asia including Australia & New Zealand, & a British one running the opposite way round the globe including Middle East, India, Burma & Indian Ocean'.<sup>94</sup> Rear-Admiral Richmond Kelly Turner, until March 1942 the head of the US Naval War Plans Division, similarly considered the CCS an example of 'large unwieldy bodies ... in which British officials would be given half the total authority for matters now solely under American control'. He thought it unacceptable 'that US interests would be subordinated to the interests of the British Commonwealth', because 'British authorities do not understand the fundamental policies and strategic necessities of the US'.<sup>95</sup> Combination, in short, involved a politics of expertise which needs to be placed alongside narratives of national interest.

## Conclusion

Allied internationalism was the victim of its own success. As noted earlier, most of the combined organization was quickly dismantled after victory, although some of the bodies, notably the CCS, existed on paper until 1947. While certain combined organs, such as SHAEF and the CCS, are well remembered and studied, the internationalism of the Western Allied war organization was forgotten as national accounts of the Second World War began to emerge after 1945.<sup>96</sup> During and immediately after the struggle, by contrast, combination played a significant, if now overlooked role in public debate on the future of international order. The Romanian-British economist and internationalist David Mitrany, for example, cited the Combined Boards ('grouping during the war') as a prominent example of the sort of 'functional approach' to international problems that, he argued, was the future of world politics.<sup>97</sup> Other prominent international thinkers likewise acknowledged the combined organs' significance. E.H. Carr saw in such 'haphazard and empirical expedients' a 'rough approximation' of a new 'system of international security'.<sup>98</sup> The CCS and the Combined Boards were the only genuine examples of the State ceding national sovereignty that another influential contemporary theorist of international relations, Hans Morgenthau, acknowledged in his seminal *Politics among Nations* (1948).<sup>99</sup>

Taking such contemporary appraisals seriously, and approaching inter-Allied cooperation during the Second World War through the prism of internationalism, offers new insights into the alliance's functioning and internal politics. The Allies were not simply an *ad hoc* coalition of self-contained nation-states. An elaborate system of international, so-called 'combined' bodies and commands, modelled on the Entente of 1917–19 and Anglo-French alliance of 1939–40, served to integrate the various national war efforts. The CCS formulated grand strategy, the Combined Boards sought to integrate the war economies, and the Supreme Allied Commanders controlled vast numbers of multinational troops. This system was far from perfect: an Anglo-American creation, it served

to underline hierarchy among the Allies, while several of the Combined Boards in particular failed to fulfil the high hopes vested in them. This was not necessarily, or even primarily, the outcome of clashing national interests. In the CCS's case, for example, US inter-service dynamics, and ideologies of expertise like the 'combined approach', played an equally great role. Key participants in the combined organization, such as Marshall or Monnet, went on to play major roles in post-war trans-Atlantic relations and European integration. Further research will have to bear out the precise connection between their internationalism of war and that of peace.

## Notes

1. King was, uniquely among his peers (and in history), Commander-in-Chief, US Fleet (i.e. of all naval vessels) and Chief of Naval Operations (i.e. of the shore-based Navy staff organization), giving him ultimate control of operations, strategy, procurement and logistics.
2. P. 38, "The Joint Chiefs of Staff Organization, World War II" narrative (n.d., possibly April 1947), Box 35, Ernest Joseph King Papers, Naval Historical Foundation Collection, Library of Congress (hereafter: LOC), Washington, D.C.
3. Buell, *Master of Sea Power*, 223.
4. O'Brien, *How the War Was Won*, 148.
5. King wrote it as part of an outline of the wartime JCS organisation, apparently for the benefit of Lieutenant Grace Person Hayes, USN, who was then writing the official JCS history. King made many comments on draft chapters, which can be found in Box 35, King Papers, LOC.
6. Sluga and Clavin, "Rethinking," 6. See also Mandler, "The New Internationalism."
7. Antic, Conterio, and Vargha, "Conclusion," 359.
8. It was not until the 2000s that they began to disambiguate the concept from its semantic fellow travellers, as doubts arose about the tendency of transnational and global histories to tell Whiggish tales of ever-increasing global integration that elided issues such as the State, nation(alism), power, empire and white supremacy. See esp. Iriye, "The Internationalization of History", *Cultural Internationalism and Global Community*; Tyrrell, "American Exceptionalism"; Rosenberg, "Transnational Currents." Cf. the discussions and critiques of Adas, "From Settler Colony to Global Hegemon"; Clavin, "Defining Transnationalism"; Saunier, "Learning by Doing"; Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line*; Mazower, *No Enchanted Palace and Governing the World*; Sluga, *Internationalism in the Age of Nationalism*; Vitalis, *White World Order, Black Power Politics*; Siegelberg, "Neither Right nor Left."
9. Reinisch, "Agents of Internationalism," 200.
10. Reinisch, "Agents of Internationalism," 199–201 and the other articles in that special issue; Patel and Reichardt, "The Dark Side of Transnationalism"; and also Sluga and Clavin, *Internationalisms*.
11. Shephard, "Becoming Planning Minded"; Plesch, *America, Hitler and Human Rights After Hitler*; Reinisch, "Internationalism in Relief"; Mazower, *Governing the World*, ch. 7; Clavin, "International Organizations"; Imlay, "Western Allied Ideology, 1939–1945."
12. See, for influential statements, Liska, *Nations in Alliance*; Walt, *Origins*; Snyder, *Alliance Politics*; Yeager and Carter, *Pacts and Alliances in History*.
13. Stoler, *Allies and Adversaries*.
14. Overly, *Air War and Why the Allies Won*; Harrison, *Economics of World War II*; O'Brien, *How the War Was Won*.
15. Kolko, *The Politics of War*; Stoler, *Second Front*; Louis, *Imperialism at Bay*; Reynolds, "Roosevelt, Churchill and the Wartime Alliance" and "Diplomacy of the Grand Alliance"; Bellamy, *Absolute War*, ch. 14. See, however, Andrew Buchanan's important revision of the second front debate: *American Grand Strategy*.

16. Thorne, *Allies*; Danchev, *Very Special Relationship*; Dallek, *Roosevelt*, 323–526; Charmley, *Churchill's Grand Alliance* and *On Specialness*; Johnsen, *Grand Alliance*.
17. Biddle, "Anglo-American Strategic Bombing, 1940–45." This compares unfavourably with the French counterpart, Muracciole and Piketty, *Encyclopédie de la Seconde Guerre mondiale*.
18. Rigby, *Allied Master Strategists*; Barr, *Yanks and Limeys*; Ehlers, Jr., *Mediterranean Air War*.
19. Weinberg, *World at Arms*, ch. 6; Overy, *Why the Allies Won*, ch. 1; Bellamy, *Absolute War*, chs 15–16; Edgerton, *War Machine*, 272ff.
20. The term is a coinage of Churchill, *Grand Alliance*.
21. See, on these, Greenhalgh, *Victory through Coalition*; Alexander and Philpott, *Anglo-French Defence Relations*, 186–226. AMTC was a famous example of 'international administration' during the interwar period, on which the League secretariat was modelled: Salter, *Allied Shipping Control*; Holthaus and Steffek, "Experiments in International Administration."
22. Roosevelt had been Woodrow Wilson's Assistant Secretary of the Navy and therefore intimately involved in Anglo-American naval coordination even before US entry in 1917; Marshall had experienced Foch first-hand as a young staffer working for General John Pershing, the United States' most senior Army officer in Europe; Dill had likewise as a senior member of General Sir Douglas Haig's staff after 1917; Monnet had worked in the AMTC secretariat and also chaired AFCC; Salter, finally, had also worked on the AMTC secretariat.
23. See e.g. the usage in Lord Halifax (Foreign Secretary) to Lord Lothian (British ambassador, Washington) [PURCO 16], 16 February 1940, AVIA 38/15, The National Archives (TNA), Kew, London, UK; Box 2, President's Liaison Committee: Records of the Chairman 1939–40, Record Group 169: Records of the Foreign Economic Administration (RG 169), National Archives and Records Administration II (NARA), College Park, MD, USA; Hall, *Supply*, 94 & passim.
24. Para. 6(a), Annex III, ABC-1, 27 March 1941, Records of the Cabinet and War Cabinet (CAB) 121/146, TNA.
25. They were preceded by several so-called 'joint' and top-secret Anglo-American committees, such as the Joint Aircraft Committee (JAC), created August–September 1940, and the Joint Food Committee, set up in May 1941. See Hall, *Supply*, 170–3, 300–1, 464–5; Leighton and Coakley, *Global Logistics*, 36–7.
26. Their first was the so-called Atlantic Conference, codenamed 'Riviera', held off Placentia Bay, Newfoundland, Canada that August.
27. "Post-Arcadia Collaboration" (W.W.16), 14 January 1942, essentially a redraft with minor amendments of the British W.W.8, 8 January, CAB 99/17, TNA; Cmd 6332, *Establishment of the Board: Preliminary Arrangements*.
28. See, on the Combined Boards, Rosen, *Combined Boards*. Rosen was a senior US Bureau of the Budget official, charged with overseeing coordination between US federal ministries and executive agencies and the Combined Boards. On the CPC, see Gowing, *Britain and Atomic Energy*.
29. WSC to FDR, 18 December 1941, Kimball, *Churchill & Roosevelt*, 1: 289–90.
30. Berle to Cordell Hull & Carlton Savage to Hull, 16 & 17 December 1941.
31. 23 January 1941 Dykes, *Diaries*. See also Barr, *Yanks and Limeys*, 196–8.
32. 28–31 December 1941, Diary of Ian Jacob (copies), Papers of Alan Francis, Viscount Alanbrooke (hereafter: Alanbrooke), 6/7/2, Liddell Hart Centre for Military Archives (LHCMA), King's College London, UK.
33. Ibid., Jacob Diary, Alanbrooke 6/7/2; 25–30 December 1941, Dykes, *Diaries*; "HIGH COMMAND," *TIME*.
34. The official historians thought likewise: Gwyer, *Grand Strategy: June 1941–August 1942*, III, i: 366–81; Matloff and Snell, *Coalition Warfare*, 114–26.
35. Quoted in Plesch, *America, Hitler*, 31.
36. "ARMY. Chief of Ordnance."

37. WSC to FDR and replies, 9–12 December 1941, Kimball, *Churchill & Roosevelt*, 1: 283–9; 8 December 1941, Diary of Field Marshal Sir Alan Brooke, Alanbrooke 5/1/5.
38. 28–31 December 1941, Jacob Diary, Alanbrooke 6/7/2.
39. Ibid.
40. Curtin, “The Task Ahead.”
41. 28–31 December 1941, Jacob Diary, Alanbrooke 6/7/2. It should be noted, nonetheless, that Australian-Dutch diplomacy was not without effect. It led to the creation of two Pacific War Councils, one in London and the other in Washington, consisting of all Allied powers involved in Asia (with the exception of the Free French, though including India and the Philippines).
42. Lyttelton quoted in Hall and Wrigley, *Overseas Supply*, 206.
43. “Russia,” *The Observer*.
44. Potiphar, *They Must Not Starve*, 20–2, quoted in Reinisch, “Internationalism in Relief,” 284. Cf. the official historians’ (both of whom worked on the Combined Boards) conclusion that, while they ‘served the United Nations,’ they were strictly British-US-run, ‘until towards the end of the war when problems of the transition to peace began to come to the fore.’ Hall and Wrigley, *Overseas Supply*, 206–7.
45. Eisenhower to Chester Nimitz, 29 June 1946, in Chandler, *Eisenhower Papers*, 1978, VII: 1157–8, fn. 4; & Eisenhower to Montgomery, 20 February 1947, in *ibid.*, VIII:1532, fn. 6. Besides the CCS, several Allied supreme commands continued to function through 1946–7, notably South East Asia Command, which participated in the early stages of both the Indonesian War of Independence and the Indochina War. See Dennis, *Troubled Days of Peace*; McMillan, *British Occupation of Indonesia*.
46. N.B. Washington was only the richest in a worldwide network of cities that hosted organs or multinational staffs that managed the Allied war effort, from Ottawa through London and Cairo to Delhi and Canberra.
47. See, for the CCS and Combined Planners minutes, Box 181–183, Entry 421: “Top Secret ‘American-British-Canadian’ Correspondence” (hereafter: ABC File), RG 165, NARA.
48. For the documents leading to CMAB’s creation see Minutes of SPAB Meeting XVII, 12 December 1941; and William Batt to Beaverbrook, 13 December 1941, *FRUS Washington*, 1:9. For a historical study, in the realist tradition, see Madsen, “Limits of Generosity and Trust.”
49. Llewellyn, “Machinery.”
50. For a contemporary view of this programme, which presents it as a United Nations affair, see Stettinius, *Lend-Lease*.
51. Mackenzie, “Sinews of War and Peace: The Politics of Economic Aid to Britain, 1939–1945”; “Transatlantic Generosity.”
52. There is, to my knowledge, no history of the global economy during the Second World War. Alan Milward’s excellent *War, Economy and Society* limits itself to the great powers (Britain, Germany, Japan, the Soviet Union and the US), while the third volume of the recent *Cambridge History* seeks to take a first step towards such a history. See Geyer and Tooze, “Introduction to Volume III.”
53. Rosen, *Combined Boards*, 204–10.
54. Hall and Wrigley, *Overseas Supply*, 221–2.
55. “ARMY. Chief of Ordnance.”
56. These included Air Marshal Arthur ‘Bomber’ Harris RAF in the main committee, Eisenhower (Chief, Army WPD before becoming SAC, AFHQ), Wedemeyer (later COS, SEAC), Rear-Admirals Richmond Kelly Turner and Charles Cooke (Chiefs of US Naval Plans; later commanders, USN Amphibious Force in the Pacific and Seventh Fleet, respectively) and Major-General Carl Spaatz USAAF (later commander, Strategic Air Forces Europe) on the Combined Staff Planners subcommittee; and Brigadier-General Walter Bedell Smith (later COS, AFHQ and SHAEF) and Brigadier Dykes (previously the War Office’s Director of Plans, 1939–41) on the Combined Secretariat. CPS minutes 1941–43, Box 183, ABC File, RG 165, NARA.

57. Hall and Wrigley, *Overseas Supply*, 313; Danchev, *On Specialness*, 18–19.
58. Rockoff, “World War II and the Growth of the U.S. Federal Government.”
59. Stanley, “Civil Service – Numbers.”
60. For a US-national account of women in wartime Washington, see Gueli, *Lipstick Brigade*.
61. Unfortunately there is no study of wartime Washington to compare to those on London, e.g. Conway and Gotovitch, *Europe in Exile*; Smetana and Geaney, *Exile in London*.
62. Cmd 6332, *Establishment of the Board: Preliminary Arrangements*; Llewellyn, “Machinery,” 158.
63. “Post-Arcadia Collaboration” (W.W.16), 14 January 1942, CAB 99/17, TNA.
64. Cmd 6332, *Establishment of the Board*.
65. Ibid.
66. Rosen, *Combined Boards*, 136–7.
67. Rosen, *Combined Boards*, 205.
68. This is the central point of Koistinen, *Arsenal*.
69. This paragraph is based on Hall and Wrigley, *Overseas Supply*, 215–17; Rosen, *Combined Boards*, 126–30; Lampe, “The ‘New’ International Maritime Organization,” 310–11.
70. 23 December 1941, Jacob Diaries, Alanbrooke 6/7/2.
71. Dill to Brooke, 3 January 1942, John Dill File, Alanbrooke 6/2/1
72. Stanley Grogan to Marshall, 26 January 1944, Box 13, King Papers. For an impression of the chaos on the US side brought on by the Japanese attack, see 7–31 December 1941, Diary of Joseph Stilwell (transcript), vol. 34, Hoover Institution, Stanford, CA, USA.
73. ‘Combination’ also had a much older usage, stretching back to the 1700s, designating a military alliance, which was occasionally also still used. Thus Roosevelt in June 1942 wrote Congress asking for an extension to the Lend-Lease Act, among other things on the grounds that the United Nations ‘declared that they are more than a temporary military combination, and that they will wage the war together for a common victory and a common program of peace aims.’ Plesch, *America, Hitler*, 60.
74. W.W.16, 14 January 1942, CAB 99/17, TNA.
75. 30 May 1942, Dykes, *Diaries*. Dykes did not use the term ‘Combined Chiefs’ before 17 January 1942, speaking instead of ‘joint US/British COS meetings’ or just ‘COS meetings’.
76. Quoted in Barr, *Yanks and Limeys*, 200, 213.
77. 2 May 1943, Box 5, Reel 3, Diaries 1893–1956, William D. Leahy Papers (hereafter: Leahy Diaries), LOC. Alone among the JCS, Leahy held office in the White House; he drafted most of FDR’s messages to Churchill. Long overlooked among the JCS in favour of the more dominant personalities of Marshall and King, Leahy has recently come in for reappraisal. See O’Brien, *How the War Was Won*, 131–3, 142–6 and also his forthcoming *The Second Most Powerful Man in the World*.
78. Quoted in Stoler, “The ‘Pacific-First’ Alternative in American World War II Strategy,” 437.
79. Quoted in Stoler, *Allies and Adversaries*, 88.
80. 13–14 July 1942, Dykes, *Diaries*.
81. Quoted in Thorne, *Allies*, 296.
82. Dill to Brooke, 5 May 1942, Alanbrooke 6/2/1, LHCMA.
83. Quoted in Barr, *Yanks and Limeys*, 168.
84. Quoted in *ibid.*, 172.
85. King to Lyttelton, 25 July 1943, Box 13, King Papers, LOC.
86. Hall, *North American Supply*, 346, 304, 344–5; Fletcher, “Hall, Hessel Duncan (1891–1976).”
87. 17 Jan, 9 & 13 April, 20 May, 21 Jun 1942, Dykes, *Diaries*. (Emphasis original.)
88. See the usage in e.g. Rosen, *Combined Boards*, 99, 168–9.
89. Hall and Wrigley, *Overseas Supply*, 213; Rosen, *Combined Boards*, 164.
90. Stein, “Review of Rosen,” 1175–76. Stein, like Rosen, was a BOB employee working on US federal government-Combined Boards coordination.
91. 30 March–3 April, 30–31 August 1942, Dykes, *Diaries*.
92. 26 September 1942, Box 5, Reel 3, Leahy Diary, LOC.
93. Rosen, *Combined Boards*, 164–83.

94. 22 February 1942, Brooke Diary, Alanbrooke 5/1/5, LHCMA.
95. Quoted in Danchev, *On Specialness*, 15.
96. Thus the British official history of North American supply, despite being essentially a paean to combination, opened with the statement that the United Kingdom (as opposed to the whole British Empire) had supplied 90.7% of British Empire munitions in the first 15 months of the war, and 59.5% throughout the struggle, while the US had supplied only 20% from all sources (purchase and Lend-Lease). Hall, *North American Supply*, 3.
97. Mitrany, *Working Peace System*; "Functional Approach," 362–3.
98. Carr, *Nationalism and After*, 51, 55–6.
99. Morgenthau, *Politics*, 395, 413–14ff.

## Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank David Edgerton, Joe Maiolo, Steven O'Connor, Guillaume Piketty, Ashley Jackson, John Bew, the participants of the 'Foreign Fighters and Multinational Armies' conference held at Sciences Po, Paris on 28 June 2018, and two anonymous reviewers for their constructive criticism of earlier drafts. Previous versions were presented at the NIOD Institute for War, Genocide and Holocaust Studies in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, the King's College London–Oxford History of War Conference, the 2016 Society for the History of American Foreign Relations annual meeting, and the International History Research Seminar (HY509) at the London School of Economics.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

## Notes on contributor

*Th. W. Bottelier* is Lecturer in International History at Erasmus University Rotterdam. He defended his doctorate in History at King's College London in January 2019. His research interests centre on the interrelation of war, democracy, internationalism and political economy in the twentieth century. He is currently working on a book on the topic of alliance in the era of the Second World War. It shows how the anti-Axis coalition formed by the democratic great powers Britain, France and the United States between 1931 and 1943 was not a traditional diplomatic pact of convenience, but a new kind of alliance, created through the transnational organization of war production and organized on principles of internationalism.

## ORCID

Th. W. Bottelier  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8402-7283>

## References

### Unpublished material

- Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. (LOC)  
 Ernest Joseph King Papers, Naval Historical Foundation Collection  
 William D. Leahy Papers  
 Liddell Hart Centre for Military Archives, King's College London (LHCMA)  
 Papers of Field Marshal Alan Francis Brooke, 1<sup>st</sup> Viscount Alanbrooke



- United Kingdom National Archives, Kew, London  
 Records created or inherited by the Ministry of Aviation and successors, the Air  
 Registration Board, and related bodies (AVIA)  
 Records of the Cabinet Office (CAB)
- United States National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) II, College Park, Maryland  
 Record Group 165: Records of the War Department General and Special Staff  
 Entry 421: Top Secret 'American-British-Canadian' Correspondence (ABC File)  
 Record Group 169: Records of the Foreign Economic Administration  
 President's Liaison Committee: Records of the Chairman 1939–40 (PLC:RC)

### **Published material**

- Adas, Michael. "From Settler Colony to Global Hegemon: Integrating the Exceptionalist Narrative of the American Experience into World History." *The American Historical Review* 106, no. 5 (1 December 2001): 1692–1720. <https://doi.org/10.1086/ahr/106.5.1692>.
- Alexander, Martin S., and William J. Philpott, eds. *Anglo-French Defence Relations between the Wars*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002.
- Antic, Ana, Johanna Conterio, and Dora Vargha. "Conclusion: Beyond Liberal Internationalism." *Contemporary European History* 25, no. 2 (2016): 359–371. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960777316000114>.
- "ARMY. Chief of Ordnance." *TIME*, 1 June 1942.
- Barr, Niall. *Yanks and Limeys: Alliance Warfare in the Second World War*. London: Jonathan Cape, 2015.
- Bellamy, Chris. *Absolute War: Soviet Russia in the Second World War, a Modern History*. London: Pan, 2009.
- Biddle, Tami Davis. "Anglo-American Strategic Bombing, 1940–45." In *The Cambridge History of the Second World War*, edited by John Ferris and Evan Mawdsley, 1: 485–526. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Buchanan, Andrew. *American Grand Strategy in the Mediterranean during World War II*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Buell, Thomas B. *Master of Sea Power: A Biography of Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1980.
- Carr, E.H. *Nationalism and After*. London: Macmillan, 1945.
- Chandler, Alfred D. *The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower: The Chief of Staff*. Vol. VII. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press, 1978.
- Chandler, Alfred D., ed. *The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower: The Chief of Staff*. Vol. VIII. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press, 1978.
- Charmley, John. *Churchill's Grand Alliance: The Anglo-American Special Relationship 1940–57*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1995.
- Churchill, Winston S. *The Grand Alliance*, vol. 3, *The Second World War*. London: Cassell, 1950.
- Clavin, Patricia. "Defining Transnationalism." *Contemporary European History* 14, no. 4 (2005): 421–439.
- Clavin, Patricia. "International Organizations." In *The Cambridge History Of The Second World War*, edited by Richard J. B. Bosworth and Joseph A. Maiolo, 139–161. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Conway, Martin, and José Gotovitch, eds. *Europe in Exile: European Exile Communities in Britain, 1940–1945*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2001.
- Curtin, John. "The Task Ahead." *The Herald*. 27 December 1941. <http://john.curtin.edu.au/pmportal/text/00468.html>.
- Dallek, Robert. *Franklin D. Roosevelt and American Foreign Policy, 1932–1945*. 2nd edn. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Danchev, Alex. *Very Special Relationship: Field-Marshal Sir John Dill and the Anglo-American Alliance 1941–44*. London: Brassey's, 1986.

- Danchev, Alex. *On Specialness: Essays in Anglo-American Relations*. New York: St Martin's Press, 1998.
- Dennis, Peter. *Troubled Days of Peace: Mountbatten and South East Asia Command, 1945–46*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987.
- Dykes, Vivian. *Establishing the Anglo-American Alliance: The Second World War Diaries of Brigadier Vivian Dykes*. Edited by Alex Danchev. Oxford: Brassey's, 1990.
- Edgerton, David. *Britain's War Machine: Weapons, Resources and Experts in the Second World War*. London: Penguin, 2012.
- Ehlers, Jr., Robert S. *The Mediterranean Air War: Airpower and Allied Victory in World War II*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2015.
- Establishment of the Board: Preliminary Arrangements*. Cmd 6332. London: HMSO, 1942.
- Fletcher, B.H. "Hall, Hessel Duncan (1891–1976)." In *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, vol. 14. Canberra: ANU Press, 1996. <http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/hall-hessel-duncan-10394>.
- Foreign Relations of the United States: The Conferences at Washington, 1941–1942, and Casablanca, 1943*. Vol. 1. Washington, D.C: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.
- Geyer, Michael, and Adam Tooze. "Introduction to Volume III." In *The Cambridge History of the Second World War*, edited by Michael Geyer and Adam Tooze, 3: 1–18. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Gowing, Margaret. *Britain and Atomic Energy, 1939–1945*. London: Macmillan, 1964.
- Greenhalgh, Elizabeth. *Victory through Coalition: Britain and France during the First World War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Gueli, Cindy. *Lipstick Brigade: The Untold True Story of Washington's World War II Government Girls*. Washington, DC: Tahoga History Press, 2015.
- Gwyer, J.M.A. *Grand Strategy: June 1941–August 1942*. History of the Second World War: UK Military Series. London: HMSO, 1964.
- Hall, H. Duncan. *North American Supply*. History of the Second World War: UK Civil Series. London: HMSO, 1955.
- Hall, H. Duncan, and C.C. Wrigley. *Studies of Overseas Supply*. UK Civil Series: War Production Series. London: HMSO, 1956.
- Harrison, Mark, ed. *The Economics of World War II: Six Great Powers in International Comparison*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- "HIGH COMMAND: E Pluribus Unum." *TIME*, 12 January 1942. <http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,772992,00.html>.
- Holthaus, Leonie, and Jens Steffek. "Experiments in International Administration: The Forgotten Functionalism of James Arthur Salter." *Review of International Studies* 42, no. 1 (January 2016): 114–135. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210515000066>.
- Imlay, Talbot. "Western Allied Ideology, 1939–1945." In *The Cambridge History Of The Second World War*, edited by Richard J. B. Bosworth and Joseph A. Maiolo, 43–67. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Iriye, Akira. "The Internationalization of History." *The American Historical Review* 94, no. 1 (1989): 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1862075>.
- Iriye, Akira. *Cultural Internationalism and World Order*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.
- Iriye, Akira. *Global Community: The Role of International Organizations in the Making of the Contemporary World*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Johnsen, William T. *The Origins of the Grand Alliance: Anglo-American Military Collaboration from the Panay Incident to Pearl Harbor*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2016.
- Kimball, Warren F., ed. *Churchill & Roosevelt: The Complete Correspondence*, vol. 1. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Koistinen, Paul A.C. *Arsenal of World War II: The Political Economy of American Warfare, 1940–1945*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2004.
- Kolko, Gabriel. *The Politics of War: Allied Diplomacy and the World Crisis of 1943–1945*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1969.

- Lake, Marilyn, and Henry Reynolds. *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Lampe, Wilhelm H. "The 'New' International Maritime Organization and Its Place in Development of International Maritime Law." *Journal of Maritime Law and Commerce* 14, no. 3 (1983): 305–330.
- Leighton, Richard M., and Robert W. Coakley. *Global Logistics and Strategy: 1940–43*. US Army in World War II, The War Department 4. Washington, DC: GPO, 1955.
- Liska, George. *Nations in Alliance: The Limits of Interdependence*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1968.
- Llewellyn, J.J. "Machinery of Wartime Cooperation between the British Commonwealth and the United States." *World Affairs* 106, no. 3 (1 September 1943): 157–163.
- Louis, Wm. Roger. *Imperialism at Bay, 1941–1945: The United States and the Decolonization of the British Empire*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- Mackenzie, Hector. "Sinews of War and Peace: The Politics of Economic Aid to Britain, 1939–1945." *International Journal* 54 (1999): 648–670.
- Mackenzie, Hector. "Transatlantic Generosity: Canada's 'Billion Dollar Gift' to the United Kingdom in the Second World War." *The International History Review* 34, no. 2 (1 June 2012): 293–314. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07075332.2011.626578>.
- McMillan, Richard. *The British Occupation of Indonesia 1945–1946: Britain, the Netherlands and the Indonesian Revolution*. Royal Asiatic Society Books. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Madsen, Chris. "Limits of Generosity and Trust: The Naval Side of the Combined Munitions Assignment Board, 1942–1945." *War & Society* 21, no. 2 (1 October 2003): 77–108. <https://doi.org/10.1179/war.2003.21.2.77>.
- Mandler, Peter. "The New Internationalism." *History Today*, 3 March 2012.
- Matloff, Maurice, and Edwin Marion Snell. *Strategic Planning for Coalition Warfare, 1941–1942*. US Army in World War II, The War Department 3. Washington, DC: GPO, 1953.
- Mazower, Mark. *No Enchanted Palace: The End of Empire and the Ideological Origins of the United Nations*. Lawrence Stone Lectures. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Mazower, Mark. *Governing the World: The History of an Idea*. London: Penguin, 2013.
- Milward, Alan S. *War, Economy and Society, 1939–1945*. London: Allen Lane, 1977.
- Mitrany, David. *A Working Peace System: An Argument for the Functional Development of International Organization*. London: RIIA, 1943.
- Mitrany, David. "The Functional Approach to World Organization." *International Affairs (RIIA 1944–)* 24, no. 3 (1948): 350–363. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3018652>.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. 1st edn. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948.
- Muracciole, Jean-François, and Guillaume Piketty. *Encyclopédie de la Seconde Guerre mondiale*. Paris: Éditions Robert Laffont et Ministère de la Défense, 2015.
- O'Brien, Phillips Payson. *How the War Was Won: Air-Sea Power and Allied Victory in World War II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- O'Brien, Phillips Payson. *The Second Most Powerful Man in the World: The Life of Admiral William D. Leahy, Roosevelt's Chief of Staff*. New York: Dutton, 2019.
- Overy, Richard J. *The Air War 1939–1945*. London: Europa, 1980.
- Overy, Richard J. *Why the Allies Won*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1995.
- Patel, Kiran Klaus, and Sven Reichardt, eds. "The Dark Side of Transnationalism." Special Section, *Journal of Contemporary History* 51, no. 1 (2016): 3–90.
- Plesch, Dan. *America, Hitler and the UN: How the Allies Won World War II and Forged Peace*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2011.
- Plesch, Dan. *Human Rights After Hitler: The Lost History of Prosecuting Axis War Crimes*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2017.
- Potiphar. *They Must Not Starve*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1945.
- Reinisch, Jessica. "Internationalism in Relief: The Birth (and Death) of UNRRA." *Past & Present* 210, no. Suppl. 6 (1 January 2011): 258–289. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pastj/gtq050>.
- Reinisch, Jessica. "Introduction: Agents of Internationalism." *Contemporary European History* 25, no. 2 (May 2016): 195–205. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960777316000035>.

- Reynolds, David. "Roosevelt, Churchill and the Wartime Alliance, 1939–1945: Towards a New Synthesis." In *The "Special Relationship": Anglo-American Relations Since 1945*, edited by Wm. Roger Louis and Hedley Bull, 408. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Reynolds, David. "The Diplomacy of the Grand Alliance." In *The Cambridge History of the Second World War*, edited by Richard J.B. Bosworth and Joseph Maiolo, 2: 301–323. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Rigby, David. *Allied Master Strategists: The Combined Chiefs of Staff in World War II*. Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2012.
- Rockoff, Hugh. "World War II and the Growth of the U.S. Federal Government." *Japan and the World Economy* 11, no. 2 (1 April 1999): 245–262. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0922-1425\(98\)00057-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0922-1425(98)00057-7).
- Rosen, S. McKee. *The Combined Boards of the Second World War: An Experiment in International Administration*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.
- Rosenberg, Emily S. "Transnational Currents in a Shrinking World." In *A World Connecting, 1870–1945*, edited by Emily S. Rosenberg, 815–996. *A History of the World* 5. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2012.
- "Russia." *The Observer*. 17 January 1943.
- Salter, Arthur. *Allied Shipping Control: An Experiment in International Administration*. Economic and Social History of the World War. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921.
- Saunier, Pierre-Yves. "Learning by Doing: Notes about the Making of the *Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History*." *Journal of Modern European History* 6, no. 2 (2008): 159–180.
- Shephard, Ben. "'Becoming Planning Minded': The Theory and Practice of Relief 1940–1945." *Journal of Contemporary History* 43, no. 3 (1 July 2008): 405–419. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022009408091820>.
- Siegelberg, Mira L. "Neither Right nor Left: Interwar Internationalism between Justice and Order." *Humanity: An International Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and Development* 6, no. 3 (2015): 465–477. <https://doi.org/10.1353/hum.2015.0027>.
- Sluga, Glenda. *Internationalism in the Age of Nationalism*. Pennsylvania Studies in Human Rights. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.
- Sluga, Glenda, and Patricia Clavin. *Internationalisms: A Twentieth-Century History*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Sluga, Glenda, and Patricia Clavin. "Rethinking the History of Internationalism." In *Internationalisms: A Twentieth-Century History*, edited by Glenda Sluga and Patricia Clavin, 3–14. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Smetana, Vít, and Kathleen Geaney, eds. *Exile in London: The Experience of Czechoslovakia and the Other Occupied Nations, 1939–1945*. Prague: Karolinum, 2017.
- Snyder, Glenn H. *Alliance Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997.
- Stanley, Martin. "Civil Service - Numbers." The UK Civil Service, June 2018. <https://www.civilservant.org.uk/information-numbers.html>.
- Stein, Harold. Review of *The Combined Boards of the Second World War: An Experiment in International Administration*, by S. McKee Rosen. *The American Political Science Review* 45, no. 4 (1951): 1173–1181. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1951258>.
- Stettinius, Edward R. *Lend-Lease: Weapon for Victory*. New York: Macmillan, 1944.
- Stoler, Mark A. *The Politics of the Second Front: American Military Planning and Diplomacy in Coalition Warfare, 1941–1943*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1977.
- Stoler, Mark A. "The 'Pacific-First' Alternative in American World War II Strategy". *The International History Review* 2, no. 3 (1980): 432–452.
- Stoler, Mark A. *Allies and Adversaries: The Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Grand Alliance, and U.S. Strategy in World War II*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.
- Thorne, Christopher. *Allies of a Kind: The United States, Britain, and the War against Japan, 1941–1945*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1978.
- Tyrrell, Ian. "American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History." *The American Historical Review* 96, no. 4 (1991): 1031–1055. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2164993>.

- Vitalis, Robert. *White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of American International Relations*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015.
- Walt, Stephen M. *The Origins of Alliances*. 1st edn. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Weinberg, Gerhard L. *A World at Arms: A Global History of World War II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Yeager, Melissa, and Charles Carter, eds. *Pacts and Alliances in History: Diplomatic Strategy and the Politics of Coalitions*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2012.