

The Operational Art of Political Transformation: General Lucius D. Clay, Post World War II Germany, and Beyond

A Monograph

by

MAJ Matthew A. George
US Army



School of Advanced Military Studies
US Army Command and General Staff College
Fort Leavenworth, KS

2018

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE					Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
<p>The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.</p> <p>PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.</p>						
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 24-05-2018		2. REPORT TYPE Master's Thesis		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) JUN 2017 - MAY 2018		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE The Operational Art of Political Transformation: General Lucius Clay, Post-World War II Germany, and Beyond.				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER		
				5b. GRANT NUMBER		
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		
6. AUTHOR(S) Major Matthew A. George				5d. PROJECT NUMBER		
				5e. TASK NUMBER		
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) US Army Command and General Staff College ATTN: ATZL-SWD-GD Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2301				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Advanced Military Studies Program				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)		
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)		
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release, Distribution is Unlimited						
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES						
14. ABSTRACT <p>There are salient ideas on aspects of operational art and the leadership of the operational artist that pertain to indigenous political transformations during stability efforts. During the post-World War II US occupation of Germany, General Lucius D. Clay, the commander of the Office of Military Government United States was an operational artist. General Clay affected policy by interacting with policymakers, and connected ways and means toward peace building in post-war Germany. He helped to consolidate gains, secure the peace, and was an example of successful political transformation in support of democratization.</p> <p>To achieve socio-political change, the commander must understand the complexities of the target population social and political systems, then visualize an approach integrating the military options, ways, and means available to achieve the strategic aims. Clay's execution of the denazification program resonates with implications on how the US and Army civil affairs forces may attempt to affect socio-political change of another state.</p>						
15. SUBJECT TERMS Denazification, democratization, operational art, OMGUS, Lucius D. Clay, Complexity, Political Transformation, Education						
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT (U)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 54	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Major Matthew A. George	
a. REPORT (U)	b. ABSTRACT (U)	c. THIS PAGE (U)			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code)	

Reset

Monograph Approval Page

Name of Candidate: MAJ Matthew A. George

Monograph Title: The Operational Art of Political Transformation: General Lucius Clay,
Post-World War II Germany, and Beyond

Approved by:

_____, Monograph Director
Ricardo A. Herrera, PhD

_____, Seminar Leader
Richard A. Martin, COL

_____, Director, School of Advanced Military Studies
James C. Markert, COL

Accepted this 24th day of May 2018 by:

_____, Director, Graduate Degree Programs
Robert F. Baumann, PhD

The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the student author and do not necessarily represent the views of the US Army Command and General Staff College or any other government agency. (References to this study should include the foregoing statement.)

Fair use determination or copyright permission has been obtained for the inclusion of pictures, maps, graphics, and any other works incorporated into this manuscript. A work of the United States Government is not subject to copyright, however further publication or sale of copyrighted images is not permissible.

Abstract

The Operational Art of Political Transformation: General Lucius Clay, Post-World War II Germany, and Beyond, by MAJ Matthew A. George: 54 pages.

There are salient ideas on aspects of operational art and the leadership of the operational artist that pertain to indigenous political transformations during stability efforts. During the post-World War II US occupation of Germany, General Lucius D. Clay, the commander of the Office of Military Government United States was an operational artist. General Clay affected policy by interacting with policymakers, and connected ways and means toward peace building in post-war Germany. He helped to consolidate gains, secure the peace, and was an example of successful political transformation in support of democratization.

To achieve socio-political change, the commander must understand the complexities of the target population social and political systems, then visualize an approach integrating the military options, ways, and means available to achieve the strategic aims. Clay's execution of the denazification program resonates with implications on how the US and Army civil affairs forces may attempt to affect socio-political change of another state.

Acknowledgements

Dr. Ricardo Herrera, my monograph director and fellow Bruin, provided me guidance and tutelage beyond this the scope of the monograph itself, and encouraged the continued development of a fledgling historian. My seminar leader, Colonel Richard Martin, provided dedicated attention to this monograph, as well as to my overall development during the academic year. Also, thank you to the School of Advanced Military Studies leaders and staff who keep the wheels of the program turning.

I would like to thank my wife Jennifer and our sons Jackson and Elias, for enjoying a second year of fun at Fort Leavenworth. This has been an illuminating experience, and one that I will always treasure.

Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Acronyms	vi
Introduction	1
Background and Significance.....	3
Scholarly Resources in support of the Examination.....	8
Operational Art.....	11
Lucius D. Clay: Post-World War II Germany	14
Lucius Clay: Building the Experience of an Operational Artist.....	17
The Operational Artist at Work: Clay’s Interaction with Policy and Policymakers	18
Clay and Policy: Joint Chiefs of Staff Directive 1067	20
Clay and His Staff: The Mind and Body of the Organization	23
Clay, OMGUS, and the Ways of Democratization	26
Education.....	28
Phasing and Transition	30
Planning Political Transformation Amidst Complexity	34
Systems Perspective	37
Education: Formal and Informal Mechanisms	40
Conclusion.....	42
Bibliography	44

Acronyms

ADP	Army Doctrine Publication
ADRP	Army Doctrine Reference Publication
CARL	Combined Arms Research Library
DoD	Department of Defense
DoS	Department of State
FM	Army Field Manual
JCS	Joint Chiefs of Staff
JP	Military Joint Publication
OMGUS	Office of Military Government United States
PKSOI	Army Peace Keeping and Stability Operations Institute
SHAEF	Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force
UN	United Nations
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USFET	United States Forces, European Theater
USIP	United States Institute of Peace

Introduction

Here we are brought to the fundamental difference between strategy and grand strategy. Whereas strategy is only concerned with the problem of winning military victory, grand strategy must take the longer view—for its problem is the winning of the peace. Such an order of thought is not a matter of ‘putting the cart before the horse,’ but of being clear where the horse and cart are going.

—B.H. Liddell Hart, *Strategy*

One knows where a war begins but one never knows where it ends.

—Prince Bernhard von Bulow, as quoted in John Ikenberry, *After Victory*

Peace may or may not be a “modern invention,” but it is certainly a far more complex affair than war.

—Sir Michael Howard, *Invention of Peace*

The United States and its allies share a long history of transforming occupied governments and social institutions after major combat operations, counterinsurgencies, and small wars of liberation.¹ Despite the “paradox of democratization by force,” socio-political transformation is sometimes a matter of US national interest.² In World War II Germany, the murderous nature of the Adolf Hitler Nazi Party regime and its genocidal policies justified post-war regime change and forcible political transformation.³ Furthermore, the Allies sought to ensure that the former regime could not reconstitute with the capability to commit further crimes.⁴ This meant fully dismantling Hitler’s government and Nazi Party regime, and establishing a new political system. Army General Lucius D. Clay, the Military Governor of Germany, was the leading figure for US efforts toward political transformation in post-war Germany.

¹ Nadia Schadlow, *War and the Art of Governance: Consolidating Combat Success into Political Victory* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2017), 14-23.

² The paradox of democratization by force is an important comment by mid-twentieth century military government scholar Carl D. Friedrich, circa 1948. Friedrich was one of Clay’s staff officers at OMGUS, and will be discussed later in this work; Carl D. Friedrich, *American Experiences in Military Government in World War II* (New York: Rinehart, 1948), 22.

³ Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations* (New York: Basic Books, 2006), ix-xi.

⁴ *Ibid.*, x-xi.

As the world emerged from war against Nazi Germany and the Axis Powers in the spring and summer of 1945, a key aim of the peace settlement was to prevent Germany from rising from the ashes of defeat with the militarism and aggressiveness that followed World War I. Among the policies to emerge from the Crimean and Potsdam Conferences in February and July 1945, was that of denazification. While initially this was just one component of a comprehensive systemic change of the German socio-political landscape toward liberal democratic principles, denazification became emblematic of the post-war occupation and transformation of German institutions.

Denazification ultimately entailed successfully transforming German politics, society, economic, judicial, and other related institutions. This was an intricate and difficult undertaking due to the complexity of the systems that comprised the socio-political landscape, and the degree of interconnectedness of the system of state and political control over nearly every facet of German life. Accordingly, President Franklin Roosevelt and theater commander General Dwight D. Eisenhower asked quite a lot from General Lucius D. Clay, whom they chose to undertake this difficult mission. Clay led the effort to achieve what would become one of the most important strategic aims of Post-World War II Europe: the mission of denazifying Germany.

The legacy of General Lucius D. Clay is long and distinguished. At the personal request of General Eisenhower, Clay supported Operation Overlord sustainment efforts by doubling the logistics inflows to the Cherbourg beachhead in only one day. He was responsible for executing the Berlin Airlift in 1949 and served in key roles in establishing the US Interstate Highway System in 1955.⁵ These accomplishments demonstrated his skill as an engineer and planner, and were reflective of his experiences managing civil projects under the New Deal program during the interwar period. However, his performance as Deputy Commander of the Supreme

⁵ Highway History, "General Lucius D. Clay: The President's Man," Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, accessed 2 February 2018, <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/infrastructure/Clay.cfm>.

Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Forces (SHAEF) and US Forces European Theater (USFET), then Commander, European Command, demonstrated his skill as a leader.⁶

General Lucius D. Clay demonstrated skill as an operational artist by materially contributing to the achievement of the policy objectives of denazification and democratization in post-war Germany. He interacted with US national policy-makers and strategic leaders while sequencing tactical actions to achieve strategic aims. Through this interaction, he worked beyond simply translating policy to tactical action, and actually influencing strategy. To organize his operational approach, Clay employed concepts of lines of effort, and phasing and transitions, which current Army doctrine terms “elements of operational art.” Clay effectively secured the peace by employing his civil affairs and military government forces denazify Germany, reform the German education system, towards the goal of democratization. Clay saw that education was a critical variable in the German socio-political system.⁷ He also understood that a more rapid transition of denazification to German institutions was important. Anticipating a demobilization of US forces in Europe after the Japanese surrender and these effects on Germany occupation forces, he also believed that Germany agency over governance would in the immediate counter Soviet influence and maintain Germany’s progress toward liberal democratization. Clay’s execution of the denazification program resonates with implications on how the US and Army civil affairs forces may attempt to affect socio-political change of another state.

Background and Significance

The US Army has played a key role in securing the peace through occupation activities in nearly every major conflict in which it has participated dating back to General Winfield Scott’s Mexico City Campaign.⁸ In some cases, the leaders tasked the Army with conducting political

⁶ Jean E. Smith, *Lucius D. Clay: An American Life* (New York: Henry Holt, 1990), 195.

⁷ Dietrich Dörner discussed the idea of a critical variable as it related to how it affects other aspects of a system. See Dietrich Dörner, *The Logic of Failure* (New York: Basic Books, 1996), 75.

⁸ Schadlow, *War and the Art of Governance*, 14-23.

transformations, which can be broad-based and are an important military option available to the National Command Authority. Current army and joint doctrine classify this type of effort as a component of Peace Building, which is a subcomponent of Peace Operations and Stability.⁹ Political change efforts at the scale of post-war Nazi Germany required the employment of vast US civilian and military capabilities, along with the other Allied states.¹⁰ However, the concepts and approach may be optimized and scaled for application to unconventional warfare to destabilize a sitting regime, as well as other special warfare and small-scale interventions.¹¹ US Army efforts towards political transformation during post-war transitions has a lineage that started well before World War II.

History shows that the United States has experience with post-war occupations dating back to before the founders signed Declaration of Independence. While the nation's earliest experience during the American occupation of Quebec in 1775 did not feature direct political transformation, General David Wooster's inability to secure the peace through effective occupation governance resulted in the Continental Congress missing an opportunity to politically separate the Canadians from the British crown, which could have added Quebec as a 14th Colony.¹² US Army experience with the concepts of political transformation took evolutionary steps during the nineteenth century. During the post-Mexican War occupation of California in

⁹ For Joint Doctrine on Peace Operations including Peace Building, see US Department of Defense, Joint Staff, Joint Publication (JP) 3-07.3, *Peace Operations* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2012); US Department of Defense, Joint Staff, Joint Publication (JP) 3-07, *Stability* (Washington, DC: 2016); for Army Doctrine on Stability, see US Department of the Army, Field Manual (FM) 3-07, *Stability* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2014); the Army previously had Peace Operations Doctrine dating back to 1994: US Department of the Army, Field Manual (FM) 100-23, *Peace Operations* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1994).

¹⁰ In 1945, the US had 1.7 million soldiers in the American Zones of Occupation; James Dobbins, Michele A. Poole, Austin Long, and Benjamin Runkle, *After the War: Nation Building from FDR to George W. Bush* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 2008), xiii.

¹¹ US Department of the Army, Army Doctrine Reference Publication (ADRP) 3-05, *Special Operations* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2012), 1-1.

¹² Stanley Sandler, *Glad to See Them Come and Sorry to See Them Go: A History of U.S. Army Tactical Civil Affairs/Military Government, 1775-1991* (Fort Bragg, NC: Army Special Operations Command History and Archives Division, 1994), 1-3.

1847, Brigadier General Stephen Watts Kearny, the military governor, worked to democratize the newly acquired territory by vetting and lustrating former *Californios* and Mexican officials for participation in the new American government. The most significant nineteenth century example was post-Civil War Reconstruction.

Leading up to the Reconstruction era after the Civil War, President Andrew Johnson was known as a hard-liner towards former Confederates. However, in late May 1865, President Johnson issued Proclamations 134 and 135 that granted amnesty to some former Confederate Government members, and also set the conditions for constitutional governments, starting with North Carolina. These proclamations were less extreme than the public expected, demonstrating a discontinuity with Johnson's previous perspective. However, instructions to the military were not sufficient to provide strategic aims, and therefore military commanders independently matched existing antebellum laws with those that appeared consistent with the Proclamations.¹³

Over President Johnson's veto, Congress passed the First Reconstruction Act in March 1867. This Act finally provided the military with clear strategic direction, which featured continued Army-led military occupation of Confederate states that did not ratify the Fourteenth Amendment.¹⁴ The Act also designated five zones of occupation, with Army Generals as the military governor. The Second Reconstruction Amendment essentially provided end state conditions to terminate the occupation.¹⁵ Like Kearny in California beforehand, military governors were examples of operational artists during political transformation. Moving forward, twentieth century occupations featured political transformations during post-war peace building efforts.

¹³ Mark L. Bradley, *The Army and Reconstruction: 1865-1877* (Washington, DC: Center of Military History, 2015), 10-14.

¹⁴ The Fourteenth Amendment provided legal protections to former slaves; see the Library of Congress Archives, accessed 2 March 2018, <https://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/14thamendment.html>.

¹⁵ Bradley, *The Army and Reconstruction*, 30-35.

The US Army occupied the German Rhineland during the post-war settlement after World War I, the Treaty of Versailles. The Rhineland occupation of 1918 through 1923 was the most complex to date, as US strategic decisions were affected by inter-Allied debate. This occupation differed from the post-World War II occupation in a few key aspects, though. General Clay's World War I counterpart, General Henry Allen, directed US occupation operations as the Officer in Charge of Civil Affairs, Third US Army. In contrast to Clay's efforts in the post-World War II occupation, Allen's goals were not to transform Germany politically through direct administration efforts. More narrowly focused, Allen focused on public health and the welfare of the German populace, while conducting the occupation through indirect administrative control. This meant that US Army officers did not administer German political organizations, but instead used Germans as proxies for occupation governance.¹⁶

Another difference between World War I and World War II outcomes stemmed from differing long-term political objectives and strategic aims. The Versailles Treaty dictated terms of peace were not accepted by German society, which generally considered the peace terms as unjust and too harsh.¹⁷ Generally, perceptions of justness and popular legitimacy of occupations impact acceptance by the occupied and has implications for further political transformation efforts.

Acknowledging the importance of trained civil affairs staffs and units of action from the World War I experience, the Department of War established institutional civil affairs structures in preparation for participation in World War II. Among the newly-established organizations were the School for Military Government in Charlottesville, VA, in 1940, and the Civil Affairs Division in the Army General Staff in 1943.¹⁸ During operations in Germany, as the offensive

¹⁶ Louis A. DiMarco, "Restoring Order: The U.S. Army Experience with Occupation Operations, 1865-1952," (PhD diss, Kansas State University, 2010), 186-212.

¹⁷ Donald M. Snow and Dennis M. Drew, *From Lexington to Baghdad and Beyond: War and Politics in the American Experience* (New York: M.E. Sharpe, 2010), 102.

¹⁸ Earl F. Ziemke, "Civil Affairs Reaches Thirty," *Military Review* (December 1972), 130-133.

action phases transitioned to occupation, trained and experienced civil affairs officers and formations switched form and function to operate as military governors and detachments. US military actions in Korea, Vietnam, and Panama further demonstrated the requirement for and employment of civil affairs expertise, providing the community with further experience. More recently, civil affairs forces participated in operations Iraqi Freedom, Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan, and Inherent Resolve in Iraq and Syria.¹⁹ However, the post-World War II occupation of Germany is considered the “Gold Standard” of democratic nation building and provides an important case study for the examination of US Army-led political transformation efforts.²⁰

The post-World War II experience in Germany is arguably the most significant and complex political transformation undertaking in which the United States has participated. As compared to the experience in World War I, where the United States helped tip the scales of war in favor of the Allies, in World War II the US Army carried the weight of the effort in the Western front.²¹ The United States leveraged its economy and industrial base and thrust large parts of the domestic population into service. The Allies changed nearly the entire German socio-political systems, suggesting a thorough and complete effort.²² Additionally, cooperation in planning the respective occupation efforts amongst the Allies took place amidst the backdrop of emerging competition for influence and a balance of power in Europe between the Soviets and the West. Furthermore, there was great angst as to how to treat the Germans in light of the failure 25 years prior, and how to prevent another resurgence of a militant and capable Germany.

¹⁹ Dobbins, Poole, Long and Runkle., *After the War*, 2; Roman David, *Lustration and Transitional Justice: Personnel Systems in the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 1-3; Sandler, *Glad to See Them Come*, i-iv; CJTFOIR, “Coalition and Partnered Syrian Forces Repair An Tanf Water Well,” Operation Inherent Resolve website, accessed 2 March 2018, <http://www.inherentresolve.mil/News/Article/1185870/coalition-and-partnered-syrian-forces-repair-an-tanf-water-well>.

²⁰ Dobbins, et al., *After the War*, xiii.

²¹ Snow and Drew, *From Lexington to Concord*, 112.

²² Dobbins, et al., *After the War*, xiii.

Scholarly Resources in Support of the Examination

Field-Marshal Viscount William Slim, the British General who defeated the Japanese in Burma during World War II, commented on generals who write war memoirs for publication. He explained that there is value in a general officer writing about their own participation, as it informs the public as to their decisions.²³ Slim's work, *Defeat into Victory* is treasured as an important component in the canon of military history. Fortunately for the student of Lucius D. Clay, scholars have an equally important source in the form of *Decision in Germany*. This text, coupled with a variety of other primary sources support scholarship on Clay, and his role in denazification.²⁴

In *Decision in Germany*, Clay explained how he understood, visualized and directed the course the United States and other Allied powers followed toward the goal of securing the post-war peace through democratization and other political transformational measures. Clay described his perspective as supporting larger denazification efforts and policies, while balancing US national security policy and strategic interests. These descriptions provide important insight into Clay's contribution to the operations process. However, memoirs present only one first-person perspective, which may be biased and certainly incomplete. There is a small but important collection of other primary resources to help balance and flesh out what Clay wrote, and what he actually did, and informs our understanding of Clay's effectiveness as an occupation commander.

General Clay's longtime biographer Jean E. Smith published Clay's papers in a two-volume set. These documents include correspondences with policymakers, his commander, General Eisenhower, and other key influencers in the denazification process. It is through this collection, *The Papers of Lucius D. Clay*, where the scholar truly sees the influence Clay had on policymakers such as Secretary of State James Byrnes, Secretary of War Henry Stimson, who

²³ Field-Marshal Viscount William Slim, *Defeat into Victory* (London: Macmillan, 1986), preface.

²⁴ Lucius D. Clay, *Decision in Germany* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1950).

nominated Clay for his assignment as Eisenhower's Deputy at SHAEF, and others.²⁵ Equally important, however, are the reports that Clay produced when he commanded the Office of Military Government United States (OMGUS) from 1945 through 1949.

One of the central components of Clays' command at OMGUS and as the deputy, then military governor of the US Zone in Germany, were the *Weekly* and *Monthly Reports of the Military Governor*. The periodic reports provide insight into what Clay thought was important, as well as valuable qualitative and quantitative reporting on the activities by the military government detachments. Areas of focus included the plans, execution and outcomes of the various societal and political transformational programs, and how German populations responded to US and Allied policies. The Executive Summaries, as well as the structure and ways the reports were organized, also help focus our study of Clay's perspective. OMGUS staffs organized the sections in the reports by lines of action or what contemporary doctrine would call lines of effort and reflect a systematic approach to denazification and democratization. Among the many sections and areas of focus were education, information control, commerce, and other related areas.

Another important aspect of these reports was Clay's observation of the tendency of military headquarters to unnecessarily overclassify documents. Clay directed his staff that there should have been very few documents from OMGUS that should be classified secret or top secret. General Clay surmised that these classifications caused operational frictions and were largely unnecessary.²⁶

For instance, the minutes of the OMGUS weekly staff meetings were initially labelled "Secret," but changed to a "Confidential" classification in the 5 August 1945 report. The subject

²⁵ Lucius D. Clay, *The Papers of Lucius D. Clay, 1945-1949*, vol. 1, ed. Jean E. Smith (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1974).

²⁶ OMGUS, "Staff Meeting US Group CC, 1130 n 1 September 1945," in *Minutes of the Division Staff Meetings of the U.S. Group Control Council for Germany and the Office of Military Government for Germany, July 1944-August 1949* (Washington, DC: National Archives, Combined Arms Research Library, Hereafter, CARL microfilm D0001033), 2.

of the over-classification of documents is a contentious and ongoing aspect to interagency and multinational operations in the current operating environment. The insight evident in these documents allows the scholar to grasp Clay's perspective and value he placed on certain aspects of the occupation.²⁷ More recently, a notable body of academic and US government scholarship addresses political transformation from a more conceptual perspective.

The US Institute of Peace (USIP), the US Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute, and the United Nations all provide publications and scholarly research toward changing societies.²⁸ However, these publications are largely conceptual in nature, and oriented at intricacies of tactical-level activities. The Department of State published the *Post Conflict Essential Tasks Matrix*, a series of tasks that in whole, constitute Stability, Security, Transition and Reconstruction activities. Army Doctrine Reference Publication and Field Manual *Stability* (ADRP and FM 3-07) compares stability tasks with the State Department matrix. However, the doctrine reads as more of a suggestion of ideas, than providing an understanding of the underlying concepts.²⁹

The historic case study of post-World War II Germany places concepts related to peacebuilding into context through the modern interpretations and lessons of political transformation and recasting society. While there is a plethora of other peacebuilding and regime change case studies available, US efforts toward denazification following World War II

²⁷ OMGUS Staff Meeting, US Control Group 1130 on 1 September, 1945, 2.

²⁸ High Commissioner for Human Rights, "Rule-of-Law Tools for Post-Conflict States: Vetting: An Operational Framework," United Nations, accessed 5 March 2017, <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/RuleoflawVettingen.pdf>; Garland G. Williams, *Engineering Peace: The Military Role in Postconflict Reconstruction* (Washington, DC: US Institute of Peace, 2005), 199-202; David, *Lustration*, 1-3.

²⁹ US Department of the Army, Army Doctrine Reference Publication (ADRP) 3-07, *Stability* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2012); US Army, FM 3-07, *Stability* (2014); US Department of State, *Post Conflict Reconstruction Essential Task Matrix* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, April 2005), accessed 12 November 2017, <https://2001-2009.state.gov/s/crs/rls/52959.htm>.

represented perhaps the most significant and successful effort the US military has undertaken to change a society during occupation.

Operational Art

Operational art, according to ADRP 3-0, *Operations*, is the “the cognitive approach by commanders and their staffs, supported by their skills, knowledge, experience, creativity, and judgement—to develop strategies, campaigns and operations to organize and employ military forces by integrating ends, ways, means and risks.” Thus, operational art links strategic objectives to operations, by bridging strategy and tactics.³⁰ Implicit from the definition, there are two important aspects to consider when studying operational art. The first are the military activities, be they major operations, campaigns, or other similar efforts, which may be evaluated through a variety of army and joint doctrinal lenses and frameworks. The other aspect worth consideration is the examination of the decisions of the operational artist, the commander.

The commander, or the operational artist, “provides the vision that links strategic objectives to tactical tasks.”³¹ Otherwise described, the artist is the individual who attempts to understand the operational environment, then visualizes and describes an operational approach to link strategic aims tactical actions. The operational artist then resources, controls, and commands the means required to accomplish the mission. This role in attaining the means suggests a negotiation with the national leaders who inform strategic aims through policy, as well as the organization with the capabilities to achieve the mission.³² Thus, General Dwight D. Eisenhower was an operational artist because of his placement between policy and tactics as the commander,

³⁰ US Department of the Army, Army Doctrine Reference Publication (ADRP) 3-0, *Operations* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2017), 2-1.

³¹ US Department of Defense, Joint Staff, Joint Publication (JP) 5-0, *Joint Planning* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2017), IV-4.

³² G. Stephen Lauer, “The Tao of Doctrine,” *Joint Forces Quarterly*, no. 82 (3rd Quarter 2016): 118-124.

Supreme Headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Force.³³ However, Clay also emerged as an operational artist. While the evaluation of General Clay is generally bound within the framework of operational art, the interplay of the operational artist with strategists and policymakers necessarily draws from a concept known as strategic art.

According to US Joint Doctrine, strategic art is “the ability to understand the strategic variable and to conceptualize how the desired objectives set forth in strategic-level guidance can be reached through the employment of military capabilities.” There are two very important components within the definition, the importance of strategic level guidance and the employment of military capabilities. Effective strategic guidance and shared understanding results from the interplay and interaction of military strategists and policy makers.

It is incumbent upon military professionals to provide policy makers insight into the socio-political-military problem at hand to inform strategic guidance development. Drawing from their insights, military commanders can provide context surrounding a wicked problem, as well as strategic and operational solutions to such a problem. Strategic recommendations help policymakers develop effective strategic guidance and aims to guide planning. Simultaneously, recommendations and insights provide decision makers with an understanding of how the military instrument of national power may address a particular situation, in effect, operationalizing policy.³⁴ Absent this interchange, strategic level guidance during a crisis may be elusive, a “mythos” of sorts.³⁵

³³ Lauer, “Tao of Doctrine,” 122.

³⁴ US Department of Defense, Joint Staff, “OSD Planning Review Process White Paper,” Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Defense Policy, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Policy, June 2015, 1-2.

³⁵ Matthew C. Gaetke, “Certainty is an Illusion: The Mythos of Strategic Guidance” (monograph, School of Advanced Military Studies) 2015, iii.

Military capabilities are a function of the ways and means available to achieve strategic aims. For army and joint forces, the means available include time, space, and resources.³⁶ Military practitioners often refer to the military instrument of national power when considering means to conduct operations. However, in the realm of political transformations, the US interagency and interdepartmental communities, non-governmental organizations, international organizations such as the United Nations, as well as the target state itself provide strategists and operational planners with a wide array of options.

Ends, within the strategic framework of ends, ways, and means, link to and support strategic objectives. These are clearly defined, attainable goals, and fall in the realms of military, economic, political, aspects of the environment.³⁷ Strategic aims provide the operational artist and the force the purpose of their activities. In turn, the purpose of all tactical actions must support the strategic aim.

With regard to the arrangement of tactical actions, the elements of operational art provide tools for commanders and staffs to understand the operational environment, then visualize and describe their operational approach.³⁸ Accordingly, an examination of an operation or campaign through the lens of the elements provides a way to understand the nuances in planning and execution. Of the ten elements of operational art, there are two which are particularly relevant to the examination of Clay's execution of denazification and political transformation efforts. These are phasing and transitions, and lines of effort. Similarly, Army Doctrine Publication series on Stability explains that lines of effort are particularly informative and relevant.³⁹ Considering that

³⁶ US Joint Staff, JP 5-0, *Joint Planning* (2017), I-3.

³⁷ For the definition of *objective*, see US Department of the Army, Army Doctrine Reference Publication (ADRP) 1-02, *Terms and Military Symbols* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2016), 1-68.

³⁸ US Department of the Army, Field Manual (FM) 3-0, *Operations* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2017), 1-20.

³⁹ The ten elements of operational art include end state, center of gravity, decisive points, lines of operations and effort, operational reach, culmination, basing, tempo, transitions, and risk; US Army, ADRP 3-07, *Stability*, 4-5.

political transformations and peace operations are nested as a component of stability, both stability and peace operations doctrine benefit those examining denazification, and provide a few of the many doctrinal and theoretical lenses.⁴⁰

The establishment of a power-war order by industrialized democracies draws upon many other theoretical lenses. Political scientist John Ikenberry argues that there is a balance between these lenses. Post-war belligerents look through the realist lens when attempting to determine the power structure and agency within international and domestic political systems. Conversely, democracies often draw upon internal institutions to rebuild order. While Ikenberry's discussions on the post-war approach by industrialized democracies centers on the rebalance of power post-war with an eye towards coalition building, there are insights to how democracies build peace.⁴¹

Lucius D. Clay: Post-World War II Germany

During occupation warfare, the role of administrator or military governor is typically the purview of the Theater or Joint Forces Commander, both in current and World War II US Army doctrine.⁴² General Dwight D. Eisenhower, the US European Theater and Supreme Allied Commander, was fully engaged in prosecuting the war across Europe. In an attempt to delegate military governance efforts, Eisenhower requested that Clay serve in the SHAEF G-5 staff for governance and civil affairs, thereby leading planning efforts.⁴³

For the sake of this examination, occupation and denazification policies that guided military government and civil affairs operations in Germany may be categorized into three major phases. The first phase started with the arrival of the first US Army combat units to the German

⁴⁰ US Joint Staff, JP 3-07.3, *Peace Operations*, I-8.

⁴¹ Ikenberry, *After Victory*, xiii.

⁴² US Department of War, Field Manual (FM) 27-5, *United States Army and Navy Manual of Military Government and Civil Affairs* (Washington, DC: US War Department, 1943), 23; US Joint Staff, JP 3-07, *Stability* (2016), D-3.

⁴³ On 15 February 1944, General Eisenhower's deputy, Lieutenant General Walter Bedell Smith, converted the COSSAC Civil Affairs Division into the SHAEF G-5 section (Civil Affairs) through Staff Memorandum No 2; see Ziemke, *U.S. Army in the Occupation of Germany, 1944-46*, 45.

border in September 1944 and ended in April 1945. Inter-Allied decisions during this period included The Argonaut Conferences at Malta and Yalta, whereby the Allies finally decided on how to divide Germany into occupations zones to be administered by each Ally.⁴⁴ Policies in this phase reflected the combination of an army doctrinal publication, Field Manual 27-5, *US Army and Navy Manual of Military Government and Civil Affairs*, and initial Combined Chiefs of Staff directives. The policies addressed the tactical problems of how to care for the German people in the wake of the war, with only limited reference to the exclusion of Nazis from public office.

The second phase of occupation policy started in April 1945, when the Joint Chiefs of Staff issued JCS directive 1067 and ended with Potsdam Agreement in August 1945. The basic principles behind JCS 1067 instructed the occupation forces to treat Germany as not a liberated country, but a defeated one. JCS 1067 directives reflected Secretary of Treasury Henry Morgenthau's more strict goals of completely deindustrializing Germany. Furthermore, no economic revival was to occur beyond what was necessary to feed the populace, and all Nazi party organization was to be dissolved.⁴⁵ In contrast, the third phase of occupation policy, which ran from August 1945 with the meeting at Potsdam, and continued through 1947 and 1948, when the Allied powers slowly turned denazification over to the Germans.

The Potsdam "Terminal" conference in August 1945 between President Truman, British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and Soviet Premier Joseph Stalin, known as the "Big Three," represented the last of a series of Inter-Allied conferences to finalize the post-surrender plan for the administration of Germany.⁴⁶ Policy agreements from the conference proceedings became known as the four "D's." These were democratization, demobilization of German security forces

⁴⁴ Office of the U.S. Secretary of the Combined Chiefs of Staff, "Argonaut Conference: January – February 1945," in *World War II Allied Conferences*, eds. Joint Chiefs of Staff, (Washington, DC: Joint History Office, 2003, CARL Electronic Archives.), 5-8.

⁴⁵ Friedrich, *American Experiences in Military Government in World War II*, 38.

⁴⁶ US Department of Defense, Joint Staff, *World War II Inter-Allied Conferences* (Washington, DC: Joint History Office, 2003, CARL Electronic Archives), 1-2.

and military, decentralization of the economy and German industrial war capacity, with denazification of government and society running throughout all efforts. While the initial Potsdam Protocol called for negative and punitive measure listed above, the ultimate goal was more positive and constructive describing political transformation from militant Nazism toward liberal democratic ideals.⁴⁷ The conference was an inflection point at two levels. There was a shift towards a more positive outlook to democratization, along with a more explicit description of denazification.

Denazification and democratization were the primary objectives of the occupation of Germany. Denazification in particular, had three subordinate aims: to support democratization, provide security, and to punish Nazis. While the Potsdam Agreement on 2 August 1945 officially stated the Inter-Allied goals for denazification in each members' respective zones of occupation, the document really reflected prior US policy in JCS 1067 of April 1945. JCS 1067 in turn, echoed previous SHAEF directives that provided Allied military commanders guidance for the treatment of Nazis from the Normandy Invasion onward.⁴⁸ The following text is from the Potsdam Agreement, which guided the occupation period at the end of hostilities through the end of the Allied control over Germany:

Nazi leaders, influential Nazi supporters, and high officials of the Nazi organizations and institutions and any other persons dangerous to the occupation or its objectives shall be arrested and interned.

All members of the Nazi Party who have been more than nominal participants in its activities and all other persons hostile to allied purposes shall be removed from public and semi-public office, and from positions of responsibility in important private undertakings. Such persons shall be replaced with persons, who, by their political and

⁴⁷ The four "D's" of Potsdam included demilitarization, denazification, decartelization, and democratization, in Michael R. Beschloss, *The Conquerors: Roosevelt, Truman, and the Destruction of Hitler's Germany* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2002), 273; Earl F. Ziemke, *The U.S. Army in the Occupation of Germany: 1944-1946* (Washington, DC: Center for Military History, 1975) 342.

⁴⁸ Potsdam Conference Directives, as quoted in OMGUS, "Denazification Cumulative review," in *Report of the Military Governor: 1 April 1947 through 30 April 1948*, No 34, (Frankfurt am Main: US Forces European Theater, 1948), 1.

moral qualities, are deemed capable of assisting and developing genuine democratic institutions in Germany.⁴⁹

The Potsdam Conference agreements demonstrated that the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union each shared a perspective as to their vision of the immediate future for Germany.

Lucius Clay: Building the Experience of an Operational Artist

An important component of operational art is the importance of the commander and their staff's experience and education. General Clay had a long and diverse military career leading up to his assignment as General Eisenhower's deputy commander for military governance of SHAEF. A deeper understanding of his personal background and education are important toward understanding the person and perspective behind the decisions.

Lucius D. Clay was born in Marietta, Georgia in 1898. His father, US Senator Alexander S. Clay, served in Georgia state politics from 1884 through 1894, and in national politics as a senator from 1896 to 1910. Alexander Clay was a staunch Reconstructionist who advocated fervently for continuing to bring his home state back into the fold of the United States. Additionally, Senator Clay served on the Senate Committee for women's suffrage, further demonstrating his liberal ideals of inclusion. While it is unclear as to the nature of the relationship between the father and son, it is likely that the Senator's perspective influenced Lucius' keen political astuteness and decisiveness. General Clay attended the United States Military Academy at West Point, which further informed his perspective and approach.⁵⁰

Lucius Clay studied engineering at West Point and graduated at the top of his class in history and English. However, Clay was most famous for his discipline issues, which won him bottom graduate for behavior. His longtime biographer Jean Smith described Clay as a "maverick," similar to General Grant, because Clay rebelled against rote exercises and the strict

⁴⁹ Potsdam Conference Directives, 1.

⁵⁰ Jean Edward Smith, interview by Brian Lamb, 24 September 1990, "Lucius Clay: An American Life," C-SPAN Archives, accessed 16 January 2018, <https://www.c-span.org/video/?15031-1/lucius-clay-american-life>.

nature of Academy life. Allegedly, Clay never opened up a textbook after his first year at the Academy, as Clay was bored with the course materiel. Upon graduation and commissioning, Clay joined the Corps of Engineers.⁵¹

Throughout Lucius Clay's military and later civilian careers, he was known for completing his assigned tasks with aggressiveness and intelligence. He was responsible for a host of New Deal-era, Works Progress Administration efforts, including the Dennison Dam, a large project in Texas sponsored by House majority leader Sam Rayburn. Clay was also responsible for the rapid construction of 450 airports throughout 1940 through 1941, including National Airport in Washington, DC.⁵² Clay's fervent support to the Works Progress Administration programs helped Harry Hopkins, President Roosevelt's chief advisor, operationalize the New Deal plans. These accomplishments influenced Clay's standing in political circles. During the War Department reorganization after the Pearl Harbor attacks, Clay became the director of the Army's procurement program, an acknowledgement of his keen business and engineering acumen.⁵³ During his tenure, he procured 299 million pairs of pants, 2.3 million trucks, and "billions" of ammunition rounds. These achievements garnered the attention of policymakers and generals alike.⁵⁴

The Operational Artist at Work: Clay's Interaction with Policy and Policymakers

As Clay prepared to join Eisenhower's command in the spring of 1945, he met with several policymakers and War Department officials. The most important meeting was with President Roosevelt, in March of 1945. During what Clay described as one-sided discussions,

⁵¹ Smith interview.

⁵² National Airport was renamed the Reagan National Airport in 1998 in honor of President Reagan. Sam Rayburn was the Speaker of the House from 1940 to 1947, and his namesake lives on in the Rayburn Building, the office and administration building for the US House of Representatives.

⁵³ Smith interview.

⁵⁴ Highway History, "General Lucius D. Clay – The President's Man."

Roosevelt outlined his priorities for Germany in terms of Clay's assignment, the stakeholder for military governance. Roosevelt also described his childhood and attendance in German schools and expressed his distaste for German "arrogance." He explained the importance of "developing a more inquisitive mind in German youth." These comments related to education helped to inform Clay's view that education was fundamental to change in the German socio-political system, or what German theorist Dietrich Dörner would later term the critical variable.⁵⁵ Unfortunately, this was Clay's only engagement with Roosevelt, as President Roosevelt died a few weeks later on 12 April 1945, just four days after Clay arrived in theater.⁵⁶

Throughout his experience in the European theater from April 1945 through 1948, General Clay interacted with a variety of other influential policymakers at nearly every echelon. After the initial discussions with President Roosevelt, he regularly discussed occupation policy with General George C. Marshall, who was the Chief of Staff of the Army before becoming Secretary of State. Clay also sought guidance from President Truman somewhat indirectly both at the Potsdam Conference in July 1945, as well as through cables to various presidential cabinet members. Clay also accommodated the parade of Congressmen who would tour Germany throughout the years. Among the more influential lawmakers with whom Clay interacted were senators Arthur Vandenberg and Thomas Connally. Vandenberg and Connally accompanied Secretary Byrnes to Stuttgart during Byrnes's famous speech "Speech of Hope," to the German people regarding occupation policy.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ Dörner, *The Logic of Failure*, 75.

⁵⁶ In his memoirs, Clay reported that when James Byrnes brought Clay to see Roosevelt, Byrnes warned Clay that the president would ask him a "test question." Roosevelt never asked the question, but it would have been about what Clay's reaction would have been should US Soldiers be murdered in German cities by unknown accomplices. Clay surmised that he would not have had a good answer to the question; Clay, *Decision in Germany*, 4-5.

⁵⁷ For video of the Byrnes speech, see <https://archive.org/details/ADC-6219b>, accessed 17 February 2018.

Secretary of States James Byrnes was one of the most influential policymakers with whom Clay liaised. After working closely with President Roosevelt after the outbreak of World War II, Byrnes was appointed as President Truman's Secretary of State in July 1945. In that capacity, Byrnes attended the Potsdam Terminal Conference as part of the US delegation, contributed to what we would now call the interagency planning process, and helped to build the postwar order. By virtue of Clay's relationship with Byrnes from a prior assignment with the Office of War Mobilization, Clay had an open line of communications with not only the presiding Secretary of State during denazification planning, but to the President as well. Access to the President was a benefit Clay exercised regularly.⁵⁸ The details of Clay's exchanges with Byrnes are evinced in the *Papers of Lucius D. Clay*, as well as through descriptions of the exchanges in Clay's oral history with the President Truman Library. The subject of discussion were often the interpretation and implementation of policy, including JCS 1067, as well as denazification more broadly.

Clay and Policy: Joint Chiefs of Staff Directive 1067

The United States policy in Germany has as its objectives the destruction of the war potential of Germany, the re-education of the German people to a liberal philosophy of life and government, the re-establishment of self-responsibility for government in Germany under democratic procedures, and the eventual acceptance of a German nation thus re-constituted among the United Nations of the world on terms of equality.

—Lucius D. Clay, policy recommendation to the US Department of State

President Truman, policymakers such as Secretary of Treasury Morgenthau, and the greater American public generally advocated for a punitive occupation of Germany in accordance with the policies as represented in JCS 1067. However, Clay, Secretary Stimson, and the Deputy Secretary of War, John McCloy shared the views that the harsh and punitive measures in the pre-

⁵⁸ Richard D. McKinsey, "Oral Interview with Lucius D. Clay," oral interview, Independence, MO: President Harry S. Truman Presidential Library, accessed 6 February 2018, <https://www.trumanlibrary.org/oralhist/clayl.htm>.

Potsdam JCS 1067 would retard the ability of Germany to recover economically and rejoin the community of nations. Considering this measured attitude, Stimson helped Clay understand that he should support the tenets of the policy to the extent that it allows Clay to attend to the immediate needs of the German populace and facilitate an economic recovery. He was also mindful that to be too restrictive would push Germans in the US zone of occupation toward the Soviet zones, and presumably Communism, should US policy not provide for the wellbeing of the populace as compared to the Soviet administrators.⁵⁹

Clay initially viewed the denazification policies set forth from the Yalta then Potsdam Conferences, as well as the conceptual antecedents in JCS 1067, as a strict constructionist. He understood that Allies viewed Germany as a defeated nation, and should be governed “under a just, firm and aloof administration which would discourage fraternization.”⁶⁰ Major General John Hilldring, the Commanding General of the Civil Affairs Division at the War Department echoed Clay’s perspective, “It [JCS 1067] is at present the policy of the United States, approved on the highest level, and so long as that is true, we will, of course, *as good soldiers*, base our plans on it.”⁶¹ At the same time, Hilldring and Secretary of War Stimson, a former US Military Governor of the Philippines, agreed that the Morgenthau Plan-inspired JCS 1067 provisions were simply too punitive in nature to truly rebuild Germany. All agreed that the spirit, not the letter of the policy, should be Clay’s way forward in Germany.⁶²

Similarly, because Clay was uncomfortable with the directives within the April 1945 JCS 1067, he turned to his staff to provide insight into how to appropriately implement the policy.

⁵⁹ Beschloss, *The Conquerors: Roosevelt, Truman, and the Destruction of Hitler’s Germany*, 273.

⁶⁰ Clay, *Decision in German*, 17.

⁶¹ “Letter from Hilldring to Smith,” 24 Feb 45, SHAEF SGS 334 in Ziemke, *U.S. Occupation of Germany*, 209.

⁶² According to contemporaneous 1943 doctrine, The Civil Affairs Division, Office of the Chief of Staff, “informs and advises the Secretary of War on all matters within the purview of the War Department . . . and has the responsibility for the formulation of broad War Department policies with regard to military government and the employment of civil affairs,” US Department of War, FM 27-5 (1943), 23. For Clay’s discussions with General Hilldring, see Clay, *Decision in German*, 17.

This included his attempt to integrate the US interagency effort into occupation operations and leverage his political advisor and State Department representative, Robert Murphy. However, it became apparent that the Department of State was neither interested in, nor had the manpower to manage the occupation, and instead was focused on developing German international relations.⁶³ As of the summer of 1945, Clay sought to set the conditions for the eventual transfer of authority to a civilian corps, be they Department of State or otherwise. Upon returning to his headquarters after the Potsdam Conference in July, he engaged in one of his most significant policy efforts.

Upon his return from the Potsdam Conference, General Clay attempted to influence the translation of the new policy into strategic aims and objectives for OMGUS execution. This entailed an effort to draft the post-Potsdam replacement for JCS 1067. General Eisenhower entrusted Clay to draft a proposed policy to incorporate the “military perspective” on the outputs and results of the Potsdam Conference. The tone of the draft policy placed less emphasis on denazification, and a greater emphasis on the creation or re-establishment of German political and economic machinery to promote liberal democratic principles. Furthermore, Clay suggested that education programs in US zones be “directed to a reorientation of German thought.”⁶⁴

In order to prevent misunderstanding or confusion as to the continuities and changes from the Potsdam Conference amongst his OMGUS elements, Clay scheduled a Military Government forum in Berlin for 27-29 August 1945, with General Eisenhower as the key-note speaker. Access to General Eisenhower would provide the military government detachment commanders a common understanding of not only the JCS 1067 revisions as reflected in the Potsdam Agreement, but also the personal views of General Eisenhower as it related to governance. This active leadership is demonstrative of how Clay valued a shared understanding of the operational

⁶³ Smith, *Lucius D. Clay: An American Life*, 234-235.

⁶⁴ Lucius D. Clay, “Secret Memorandum from Clay for the Secretary of State,” in *The Papers of General Lucius D. Clay*, vol. 1, 56.

environment, and the importance of providing the theater commander a venue to describe his visualization of the operational approach.⁶⁵

Military governance reporting throughout 1945 reflected Clay and his staff's professionalism. The August 1945 *Monthly Report of the Military Governor* subtly highlighted the tensions between the previous policy in the US zones through JCS 1067 as it pertained to the expansion of denazification to include individuals of influence in public and private institutions and organizations, against the somewhat more positive tone from the Potsdam agreements. The August report states that, "The German people [had] the opportunity to prepare for the eventual reconstruction of their life on a democratic and peaceful basis." However, OMGUS also reported that despite the directives of the Potsdam Conference in July 1945, no development of democratic organizations at the *Kreis*, or local levels, had occurred throughout August 1945. The OMGUS report compared the US zone of occupation against the Soviet zone, where democratic political party formation was authorized on 10 June 1945, actually predating Potsdam. The OMGUS report implied that the US zone was behind the Soviets in rebuilding Germany because of the lag in US policy decisions in the wake of the Potsdam Conference.⁶⁶ The verbiage reflecting a lag behind Soviet efforts echoed Clay's attempts in July to affect policy through his aforementioned memo to the State Department.

Clay and His Staff: The Mind and Body of the Organization

The employment of the means available for military campaigns and operations is one of the defining characteristics of the operational artist.⁶⁷ The artist must first determine if the means apportioned or allocated by the National Security Council through the Secretary of Defense

⁶⁵ OMGUS, "Staff Meetings of the Division Directors of US Group CC Held at 0930 Hours on Saturday, August 5, 1945," in *Minutes of the Division Staff Meetings of the U.S. Group Control Council for Germany and the Office of Military Government for Germany, July 1944-August 1949*, 2-3.

⁶⁶ OMGUS, *Monthly Report of the Military Governor, September 1945*, 4.

⁶⁷ Lauer, "The Tao of Doctrine," 121.

render the strategy feasible. In other words, can the force achieve the mission with the means available. If the means are insufficient, or do not support the ways envisioned and described to achieve the ends, the artist must successfully negotiate with policymakers to obtain sufficient means or change the strategy.⁶⁸ For General Clay, this meant building his staff accordingly to reflect his approach and realigning the OMGUS to SHAEF command structure and relationships.

As General Clay prepared to assume duties in Europe, he carefully selected his staff and cadre of advisors. He appointed Brigadier General William H. Draper, an accomplished industrialist, to be his economic advisor and lead decartelization efforts.⁶⁹ Clay also hired Colonel John Taylor, PhD, the president of Louisville University, to head the OMGUS Education Branch.⁷⁰ Later, while OMGUS commander, General Clay recruited Carl Friedrich, PhD a Harvard University political scientist of German-American heritage, to advise on constitutional matters, and James Pollock, PhD, an advisor to the US Army's School of Military Governance and president of the American Political Science Association, to advise on politics and German government.⁷¹ This core staff of advisors reflected Clay's acknowledgement of the strength of highly educated military officers and civilians, while setting the conditions for a transfer of military governance responsibilities to a civilian corps.

The way in which Clay interacted with his staff was just as remarkable as the members of the staff itself. Major General William Whipple, Clay's chief of staff at OMGUS described that when the situation called for it, General Clay comported himself like an army general should. Conversely, when sitting around the table with his trusted staff, Whipple described the meetings as "freewheeling." Whipple perceived that Clay often knew just as much as the experts in his staff about topics such as German politics, economics, and religion. This academic and

⁶⁸ Lauer, "The Tao of Doctrine," 121.

⁶⁹ Clay, *Decision in Germany*, 6.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 299.

⁷¹ Smith, *Lucius D. Clay: An American Life*, 231.

intellectual astuteness in an important capability that effective operational artists should have to be able to interact with both military commanders and influential civilian leaders at the highest levels of government.⁷² Beyond organizing an effective staff, Clay also realigned the command relationships of OMGUS and the military government detachments, with SHAEF and its subordinate divisions, corps and field armies.

Observing the discontinuity of military government policy and uneven execution between the maneuver commands, Clay began the process of consolidating power at the headquarters. Almost immediately when he arrived in theater in April 1945, Clay influenced General Eisenhower, the SHAEF Commander, to elevate the billet with responsibilities over OMGUS from a staff position in the G-5 Directorate to that of a deputy theater commander. This meant that Clay reported directly to Eisenhower, and not to Lieutenant General Walter Beddell Smith, the Chief of Staff.⁷³ With greater influence in the command structure, Clay focused on realigning the command authorities and relationships over the tactical military government detachments themselves.

January 1946, Clay successfully realigned the responsibilities for governance the theater and Army maneuver commands, to full OMSUG control.⁷⁴ This meant that the 1st and 3rd US Armies no longer had command over the OMGUS detachments, but relinquished authority to General Clay and OMGUS. In April 1946, Clay and OMGUS assumed command authority over the tactical military government units and the Offices of Military Government for Bavaria, Wuerttemberg-Baden, and Greater Hesse. The consolidation of control over occupation efforts

⁷² Whipple felt that the only reason he was allowed to remain in the room during these meetings was not because he was an active duty army general, but that he was a Rhodes Scholar with academic credentials of his own; Smith, *Lucius D. Clay: An American Life*, 335.

⁷³ Lucius D. Clay, "Letter to Eisenhower, 11 April 1945," in *The Papers of General Lucius D. Clay: Germany 1945-1949*, vol. 1, 4-5.

⁷⁴ Earl F. Ziemke, "The Formulation and Initial Implementation of U.S. Occupation Policy in Germany," in *U.S. Occupation in Europe After World War II: Papers and Reminiscences from the April 23-24, 1976, Conference Held at the George C. Marshall Research Foundation, Lexington, Virginia*, ed. Hans A. Schmitt, 27-44 (Lawrence: The Regents Press of Kansas, 1978), 35.

continued in March 1947, when Clay assumed command duties as the theater commander over the new European Command (Formerly USFET) from Eisenhower's successor, General Joseph McNarney. Unlike his predecessors who delegated occupation and military governance responsibilities to the deputy, Clay maintained control over the Office of Military Government and administration of Germany even while serving as the theater commander.⁷⁵

Clay, OMGUS, and the Ways of Democratization

Examination of the way the *Monthly Report of the Military Governor* organized the interior chapters and sections makes it apparent that occupation activities followed what 1941 Army operational doctrine termed "lines of action," and relates to what current doctrine terms lines of effort.⁷⁶ In Germany, the highest echelon lines of effort may be interpreted to be the aforementioned strategic objectives of denazification, decentralization of the German economy, demobilization and democratization. Subordinate lines support the higher order efforts, and included displaced persons and refugees, finance, industry, transportation, information control and communications, and education.⁷⁷

Clay understood the American public's desire to punish Nazis for their atrocities. Accordingly, they saw the denazification efforts as a gauge of the occupation's success.⁷⁸ Military government detachments needed a methodical way to gain insight into the German populace, while demonstrating to US policymakers and the public the results of the efforts. The *Fragebogen* became the questionnaire that OMGUS officers used to register and vet Germans

⁷⁵ Both General Dwight D. Eisenhower and General Joseph T. McNarney, Commanders of SHAEF and USFET, respectively, delegated responsibility over military governorship; Clay, *Decision in Germany*, 60-65.

⁷⁶ US War Department, Field Service Regulation Field Manual (FM) 100-5, *Operations* (Washington, DC: Government Publishing Office, 1941), 25.

⁷⁷ These chapters typically addressed discussed how denazification policy progressed, was applied in the US Zone of occupation, and was received by the German populace.

⁷⁸ Ziemke, "The Formulation and Initial Implementation of U.S. Occupation Policy in Germany," 34.

who wanted to serve in government, the public sector, and positions of significant public influence.⁷⁹

The insight into the statistics of registration information and Nazi Party affiliation from the *Fragebogen* helped OMGUS report hard statistics to ameliorate US anger and demonstrate progress towards the strategic aims. These reports provided statistics on how many Germans OMGUS investigated for participation in the Nazi Party, as well as the outcomes of investigations, tribunals and related lustration activities. These statistics reflected measures of performance in the registration effort but did not necessarily speak to the near-term effectiveness of the program.

Clay established a team to evaluate the performance of the vetting and lustration of government officials.⁸⁰ As robust a program as the denazification was, initial results of registration did not necessarily imply long-term effectiveness and systemic change. Only time would tell as to the extent that Germany was actually democratized and free from Nazi influence and militarism.⁸¹ Effects aside, it was evident in the typical OMGUS reports, the extent to which concepts and discussion of denazification cut across all major programs and lines of effort.

For example, the Communications section in the OMGUS reports described how denazification affected available pool of non-Nazi personnel available to work in the German mail and postal activities. Similarly, the information control sections addressed how OMGUS leveraged censorship and information operations to denazify public media. Information operations through the media, in turn, supported informal denazification efforts through strategic

⁷⁹ Although vetting and registration began with only government servants and German administrators, the denazification and subsequent registration programs using the *Fragebogen* expanded to other components of society in accordance with both JCS 1067 of April 1945 and Military Government Law for the Denazification of German Society, Number Eight, June 1945; Smith, *Lucius D. Clay: An American Life*, 240; for more information on the *Fragebogen*, see William Mikkell Dack, “Questioning the Past: The *Fragebogen* and Everyday Denazification in Occupied Germany,” (PhD diss, University of Calgary, January 2016).

⁸⁰ OMGUS Staff Meeting, US Control Group 1130 on Saturday June 30, 45.

⁸¹ Smith, *Lucius D. Clay: An American Life*, 240.

and mass communications.⁸² OMGUS leveraged 16mm and 35mm film production capabilities to restart the German film industry, while employing radio media industry to extend the reach of denazification messaging to educational efforts. The Education Branch sections described how OMGUS deployed media and film into the primary school systems to buttress formal and informal youth educational activities.⁸³

Education

Reflective of General Clay's spring 1945 discussions with President Roosevelt and his own approach to democratization of Germany, Clay viewed education as a critical factor.⁸⁴ At his earliest OMGUS division commander's meeting in April 1945, he fielded requests for information to his staff to gain an understanding of the operational environment. Among the many topics that related to manpower, command and support relationships, and the location of the OMGUS headquarters, he especially emphasized education. Clay wanted a clear understanding of means available to launch his education reform in terms of funding, US manpower, and the available of denazified Germans to reform the system.⁸⁵

In the formal educational system, OMGUS sought to change the education system itself through materiel and non-materiel solutions. Predictably, Nazi-era mathematics textbooks reflected rampant militarism and cultural superiority. Math problems often employed counting guns and bullets to teach arithmetic, as military terms and logistics were placed throughout the texts. However, even pre-Nazi-era textbooks reflected cultural and racial superiority, deemed as

⁸² OMGUS, "Communications" in *Monthly Report of the Military Governor, U.S. Zone, December 20, 1945* (US Forces European Theater, 1945, CARL N-11566), 1-2; and OMGUS, "Information Control" in *Monthly Report of the Military Governor, U.S. Zone, December 20, 1945*, 3-6.

⁸³ OMGUS, "Education and Religious Affairs," in *Monthly Report of the Military Governor, U.S. Zone, December, 1946* (US Forces European Theater, 1945, CARL N-11566), 6-7.

⁸⁴ Clay, *Decision in Germany*, 40.

⁸⁵ OMGUS, "Staff Meetings of the Division Directors of US Group CC Held at 0930 Hours on Saturday, 28 April 1945," *Minutes of the Division Staff Meetings of the U.S. Group Control Council for Germany and the Office of Military Government for Germany, July 1944-August 1949*, 2.

inappropriate as Nazi-era materials.⁸⁶ OMGUS reached back to the United States to provide new textbooks, leveraging US industrial capacity.⁸⁷ An example was when OMGUS arranged for the US Smithsonian Institute to donate and distribute 100 tons of textbooks to German science students at a number of universities.⁸⁸

Non-materiel solutions also set the conditions for changing society through formal education. Denazification of the formal educational system involved vetting the teaching staff at primary and secondary schools, and the professoriate at post-secondary institutions. The Reorientation Branch, Civil Affairs Division, US Department of War, sponsored a project to create documentary films on education. The films were used to realign German education institutions and educators on democratic ideals, while distancing these institutions from Nazism. Beyond traditional primary, secondary and university educational systems, Clay directed his educational staff to ensure that even vocational schools for adult education emphasized democratic and social sciences principles.⁸⁹

Education had prominent placement in the *Monthly Report of the Military Governor* documents, and clearly described both short and long-term efforts. Within the “Education and Cultural Affairs,” from the 1945 reports, Clay and his staff described issues such as the status of the schools closed during the early combat phases of the war, as well as during the early denazification efforts. Therein OMGUS described one its most significant efforts, reopening the schools as soon as possible.⁹⁰ An initial goal throughout 1945 was to reopen all elementary or grade schools no later than 1 October 1945, and three Medical schools by 15 August 1945.

⁸⁶ Clay, *Decision in Germany*, 299.

⁸⁷ Sandler describes that text books from the imperial era reflected German views on racial superiority. See Sandler, *Glad to See Them Come*, 243-245.

⁸⁸ OMGUS, *Monthly Report of the Military Governor*, December 1946, 21.

⁸⁹ OMGUS, “Education and Religious Affairs,” in the *Monthly Report of the Military Governor*, December 1946, 21.

⁹⁰ OMGUS, “Communications” in *Monthly Report of the Military Governor*, U.S. Zone, December 1945, 3.

Agricultural schools, which would inherently would pay dividends in terms of education, commerce and supporting the German populace with foodstuffs, also underwent significant denazification efforts throughout 1945.⁹¹ As the Military Government reports progress throughout 1946, discussions of education took on a more dynamic role, and became both a way and a means to effect political and social change.⁹²

Phasing and Transition

General Clay understood that there were would be three distinct phases of denazification and democratization: the US military control through OMGUS, US civilian control, then full control by Germans. Eager to transfer authority from OMGUS through a US civilian corps or Department of State organization to the Germans themselves, he set the conditions early. He identified the US State Department as the likely successor to the Army and War Department and began his campaign as early as 1945 to transfer responsibility.⁹³

In a May 1945 memo to Major General John Hilldring, Chief of the Civil Affairs Division in the War Department, Clay discussed the importance of employing a civilian cadre to the OMGUS and G-5 (civil affairs) division at SHAEF to set the conditions for the eventual turnover of military governance to the State Department.⁹⁴ Later that year during the Potsdam Conference, General Clay joined General Eisenhower for an engagement with President Truman. Through Eisenhower, Clay pushed for a rapid transfer of authority for military governance from the Department of War to the Department of State. Clay proposed that this could occur as early as

⁹¹ OMGUS, "Special Meeting, US Group CC, 1000 hours on 01 August 1945," *Minutes of the Division Staff Meetings of the U.S. Group Control Council for Germany and the Office of Military Government for Germany, July 1944-August 1949*, 6.

⁹² OMGUS, "Communications" in *Monthly Report of the Military Governor, U.S. Zone, December 20, 1945*, and *Monthly Report of the Military Governor, U.S. Zone, June 1946*.

⁹³ Clay, *Decision in Germany*, 53.

⁹⁴ Clay, "Letter from Clay to Hilldring, 07 May 1945," in *The Papers of Lucius D. Clay, 1944-1949*, vol. 1, 10.

July 1946. However, after consultation with Eisenhower's Chief of Staff, General "Beetle" Bedell Smith, Clay opted to table the recommendation temporarily.⁹⁵

Meanwhile, the State Department stood in opposition to this plan as it claimed that it lacked manpower. In response, Clay executed a two-pronged approach. He worked with General Eisenhower, Major General Hilldring, and other leaders to socialize the concept of a transfer of authority to the State Department. Secondly, to address the Department's objection due to manpower shortages, he worked tirelessly to reduce his staff footprint and eliminated billets to set the example of efficient operations.⁹⁶ He also continued his efforts to more rapidly mature US occupation policy toward one that would eventually facilitate turning over responsibility to responsible Germans.

On 19 July 1946, General Clay sent a memorandum to the Departments of State and War for concurrence on a draft policy for the future of Germany. Clay detected that there was significant discussion in German politics and society over Soviet diplomat Vyacheslav Molotov's memo at the recent 10 July 1946 Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers. Molotov's message was conciliatory in tone and suggested the Soviet stance of welcoming Germany back into the international system of nations as quickly as possible.⁹⁷ Given the competition with the Soviets and the desire to at least maintain parity, Clay recommended a similar policy shift and public announcement on behalf of the United States. The summary of his draft policy introduced a general statement on the US perspective on Germany, through details of how the occupation

⁹⁵ Clay, *Decision in Germany*, 53.

⁹⁶ Historians John Gimbel and Earl Ziemke quoted in a conference, see Donald R. McCoy and Benedict K. Zobrist, *Conference of Scholars of the Administration of Occupied Areas: April 10-11, 1970 at the Harry Truman Library, 1943-1955* (Independence, MO: The Harry S. Truman Library Institute for National and International Affairs, 1970), 63-64.

⁹⁷ Viascheslav Molotov, as quoted in Department of State, *Occupation of Germany: Policy and Progress, 1945-6 First Edition* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1947), accessed 2 March 2018, https://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/2003/1/10/1a764b04-2068-4a44-97c5-38bd4e168fd1/publishable_en.pdf.

may continue to guide Germany reconstruction in the political, financial, educational and other realms. The draft memo concluded with the following:

No Country can regain its self-respect nor progress to maturity in democratic processes in the presence of large occupying forces...Basically, the most important objective to the pace of the world is to create a democratic state in Germany which can be received in confidence as a member of the United Nations...Allied control over Germany should be exercised at the earliest possible date through *leadership* and not through *command*.⁹⁸

Unfortunately, the State Department largely rejected the memo. True to form, Clay did not let this setback stop his efforts. He visited Secretary Byrnes directly drive his suggestions through the system. This engagement appeared successful, as it set the conditions for Byrnes' "Speech of Hope" on 6 September 1946.⁹⁹ This attention to policy reflected Clay's ambitions to continue to evolve US policy, and thereby moved the occupation to a new phase.

Clay attempted to transition aspects of governance responsibilities to reformed German control as soon as the situation permitted. Contemporaneous US Army Military Government doctrine underscored the importance of transitioning governance activities back to the occupied nation when conditions allowed.¹⁰⁰ Furthermore, Clay acknowledged that American popular support for the occupation would not continue indefinitely. He also felt that the Germans would ultimately serve their society in a deeper and more meaningful way.¹⁰¹ The transition of denazification responsibilities from OMGUS to Germans started on 5 March 1946, with the Law of Liberation from National Socialism and Militarism or the *Befreiungsgesetz*. The Law of Liberation was actually a German law, whereby Germans took agency over political self-

⁹⁸ Lucius D. Clay to Major General O.P. Echols, "U.S. Policy in Germany," 19 July 1946, in Clay, *The Papers of Lucius D. Clay*, vol. 1, 236-243; "No Country" quote on 243; author added emphasis.

⁹⁹ John Gimbel, "Cold War Historians and the Occupation of Germany," in *U.S. Occupation in Europe After World War II: Papers and Reminiscences from the April 23-24 1976, Conference Held at the George C. Marshall Research Foundation, Lexington, Virginia*, ed. Hans A. Schmitt, 86-102 (Lawrence: The Regents Press of Kansas, 1978), 94.

¹⁰⁰ US Department of War, FM 27-5, (1943), 1-4.

¹⁰¹ Clay, *Decision in Germany*, 243.

determination, democratization, and denazification. Of course, OMGUS retained oversight of German activities.¹⁰²

The Germans who lived under Clay's occupation administration appreciated his liberal democratic ideals. He regularly demonstrated his traditional values, and a respect for the economic and social values that pre-dated Nazism. He respected human rights and dignity, while he simultaneously working to democratize German society.¹⁰³ Clay understood how aspects of US policy attenuated German civil liberties, specifically with regards to denazification of society, education, and the legal system through censorship and the plethora of justice tribunals. However, he worked to ameliorate these impacts when possible.¹⁰⁴ This balance of traditional values and mission focus marked Clay's performance in Germany.

The effects of the US democratization efforts in Germany were difficult to measure. In terms of the measures of performance of the program, military government detachments registered 11 million Germans using the Fragebogen, while OMGUS denazification staff reviewed 1,252,364 cases. The results of these reviews yielded 308,000 Nazis and former Nazis excluded from public influence.¹⁰⁵ However, these results are simply raw numbers, which do not explain if the goals of denazification were actually achieved. The determination of a successful socio-political change, outside of its greater context of democratization, ignores the interconnectedness of the socio-political systems.

As the effects of German democratization efforts in the post-1946 era emerged, conditions in the operational environment became suitable for the transfer of occupation authority

¹⁰² John G. Kormann, *U.S. Denazification Policy in Germany, 1944-1950* (Bad Godesberg-Mehlem: Historical Division, Office of the Executive Secretary, Office of the US High Commissioner for Germany (HICOG), 1952) 64; William E. Griffith, "Denazification in the U.S. Zone of Germany," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 267 (January 1950), 70.

¹⁰³ Smith, *Lucius D. Clay: An American Life*, 395.

¹⁰⁴ Clay, "Letter to Eisenhower, 11 April 1945," in *The Papers of General Lucius D. Clay: Germany 1945-1949*, vol. 1, 225.

¹⁰⁵ OMGUS, "Denazification: Cumulative Review," In *Report of the Military Governor: 1 April 1947 through 30 April 1948*, 3.

and responsibilities from OMGUS to a US State Department organization. This transfer reflected one of Clay's original goals during the early days of the occupation.¹⁰⁶ The US High Commissioner for Germany, known as HICOG, took control in September 1949. Germany regained independence in 1955, and the United States established formal diplomatic and political relations with the newly democratized and reformed state.¹⁰⁷ This represented a medium-term measure of effectiveness, with long-term effects measured in decades.

On a broader scale, US democratization efforts in Germany planted the seed for continent-wide efforts throughout Europe and helped to inform policy. Based on US government successes in Germany, the rest of Europe would follow. Clay ultimately viewed the record of his achievements through the lens of successful democratization of post-war Germany.¹⁰⁸

Planning Political Transformation Amidst Complexity

One does not aim to settle with the enemy, but defeat and punish them, abolish the tyranny of war, at least to reduce the probability of future oppression.

—Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars*

The more intent you appear to impose a peace entirely of your own choosing, by conquest the stiffer the obstacle you will raise in your path.

—Liddell Hart, *Strategy*

Planning is the art and science of understanding a situation, envisioning a desired future, and laying out effective ways of bringing that future about.

—Army doctrinal definition of planning, *The Operations Process*

¹⁰⁶ Kormann, *U.S. Denazification Policy in Germany*, 140.

¹⁰⁷ High Commissioner for Germany, "Records of the High Commissioner for Germany," Civilian Agency Records, National Archives Website, accessed 18 February 2018, <https://www.archives.gov/research/holocaust/finding-aid/civilian/rg-466.html>.

¹⁰⁸ Friedrich, *American Experiences in Military Government in World War II*, 22.

There is a key lesson in helping the commander understand the operational environment in the context of political transformations and societal changes. When planning a campaign, consideration to the desired end state of the host nation government and disposition of the society is poignant. If the strategic aims dictate destruction of the government systems, infrastructure and indigenous populations and institutions, then the air, maritime and land components of the campaign will facilitate rapid destruction through joint fires and other joint effects. Conversely, anything short of absolute destruction calls for a metered response. In pursuit of a more nuanced approach than total destruction, the operational artist must have already visualized and described the operational approach for major combat operations, including the associated stability tasks. Efforts may include shaping the operational environment before operations commence, immediate humanitarian relief during combat, and post-hostilities democratization and other peace building efforts. Furthermore, the complex systems that predicate human-centric warfare may introduce wicked, unfamiliar and unsolvable problems. The ability to form a deep understanding of complexity of the target systems is vital.

Broadly speaking, US policy has historically supported democratization efforts.¹⁰⁹ Toward these efforts, there are a number of ways to understand societies' susceptibility to democratization efforts. The Economist Intelligence Unit democratization indicator provides data that depicts the extent to which democratic ideals of popular representation exist in a target society.¹¹⁰ This may help analysts and planners determine the immediate feasibility of democratization programs. A society's social construction and interpretation of their reality, also informs how democratization may take hold. The likelihood that a regime, political system, and underlying related components and actors of the larger social system may change with systemic

¹⁰⁹ Dobbins, *After the War*, xi-xxix.

¹¹⁰ The Economist Infographics Unit, "Economist Intelligence Unit Democracy Index," The Economist Online, accessed 2 November 2017, <https://infographics.economist.com/2017/DemocracyIndex/>; the *CIA World Factbook* is accessible at <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook>.

inputs or replacement, and is informed by understanding the society's construction. The seminal work in the field of social theory is the *Social Construction of Reality*, by Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann.

According to Berger and Luckman, there are two primary mechanisms through which individuals and populations interpret their environment. The first is understanding the key influencers who espouse and propagate knowledge. The other is an awareness of the social construction as determined by primary and secondary socialization, as well as the intersubjective sedimentation of reality, knowledge, and language in everyday life.¹¹¹ There are important temporal and social considerations that must be evaluated to determine the level and deepness of a society's objective political reality.

The degrees of time and space between a society's experience with a desired socio-political system to the current undesirable regime may have impacts on the ability for the society in question to actually receive change. Temporally, if there are few generations if any between the former desired and the current undesirable societal and political construct, then the social system may be more amenable to inputs and changes. The spatial influences may amount to the structure of the international system and geopolitics. A society that exists adjacent to one that is constructed consistent with the desired conditions may also carry some influence depending on the public's perception of their neighbors. Furthermore, an undesirable regime may be one that is complicit in atrocities and habitually violates the sovereignty of its neighbors.¹¹²

Army doctrine provides some insight into political transformations and a systems perspective. Specifically, operational art provides cognitive tools to help commanders understand

¹¹¹ Peter L. Berger, and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (New York: Doubleday, 1966), 67, 134.

¹¹² History provides a wealth of examples of regimes that feature authoritarian dictatorial control. These include Joseph Stalin in the Soviet Union, Robert Mugabe in Zimbabwe, Anastasio Somoza and his sons in Nicaragua from 1937 through 1979, Saddam Hussein in Iraq, and Adolf Hitler, the leader of the Nazi Party, Chancellor and Fuhrer of Germany from 1934 through 1945.

the operational environment and visualize an operational approach to affect the drivers of instability within a system. In addition to the elements of operational art discussed above, decisive points support a systems approach to political transformation.¹¹³

Decisive points may represent critical vulnerabilities of a center of gravity the force is attempting to affect. Critical vulnerabilities are the subcomponents of a system that are susceptible to influence. In view of the German example, these may include achieving full illustration of government officials, completion of assessments of the school curricula, or the identification of key influencers in a community who may shoulder greater informal governance efforts. Within the operational approach, lines of effort tie the decisive points and other stability tasks into a logic of sequence. The lines of effort and supporting decisive points focus to achieve certain conditions that the adversary, friendly forces, or the civilian institutions contribute to the operational environment. When certain conditions are met, the desired end states will have been achieved, thus setting the conditions for achieving strategic ends and political aims.¹¹⁴

Systems Perspective

When assessing a society and its underlying social system, the science of complexity informs an understanding. Attempting to affect change in a system as complex as governance or politics requires an initial awareness of the character of the system, as well as its structure, function, process and purpose. Furthermore, the planner must ascertain the degree of interconnectedness and interdependence of the system, as it informs its level of complexity. The extent to which the various actors and institutions are interdependent with or dependent from one another determines the degrees of change when one node is affected. The higher the level of interdependence means that an event in one place or a stimulus to one node in a system or

¹¹³ US Army, ADRP 3-07 (2012), 4-5 to 4-8.

¹¹⁴ US Army, ADRP 3-0 (2017), 2-4 through 2-10

network affects nodes elsewhere.¹¹⁵ In common military parlance, this is referred to as “order of effects.” If one change is made, many more changes may occur.

Another key aspect of the systems analysis for occupations and political transformations is the nature of the desired peace. In the case of post-war Germany, generals Eisenhower and Clay worked with a German population that had accepted defeat, formally, by treaty. Furthermore, the populace was resigned to the fact it comprised a defeated nation. This perspective, coupled with the large occupation forces across the Allies, made the German populace significantly more open to political change and re-education than may have otherwise been the case. Accordingly, as reported from the OMGUS perspective in September 1945, “active and organized opposition [to occupation policies] is almost totally absent.”¹¹⁶

As General Clay embarked on democratizing German politics and society, there were key considerations which made his case unique as compared to what the US military might face in other circumstances. This was, that the US policy specifically, and the broader policy towards Germany, featured a full socio-political systemic change. While a difficult endeavor that necessitated a keen understanding of the interconnectedness and structure of the German social and political systems, a full systemic change could be considered less complicated than attempting to surgically alter particular aspects of the system. In the light of democratization efforts, Clay suspected that the Germans could democratize, and that German society would be able to absorb and internalize the efforts sooner than later. However, this will not always be the case.

The decision to design and introduce democratic institutions by changing the complex adaptive system of domestic governance is wrought with challenges. Bureaucratic systems and

¹¹⁵ Yaneer Bar-Yam, *Making Things Work: Solving Complex Problems in a Complex World* (Cambridge, MA: Knowledge Press, 2004) 49, 61; Jamshid Gharajedaghi, *Systems Thinking: Managing Chaos and Complexity* (Burlington, MA: Elsevier, 2011), 89-104.

¹¹⁶ OMGUS, *Monthly Report of the Military Governor, September 1945*, 2.

supporting subsystems familiar to the intervening organizations provide an important touch-point and interface for engagement. This can mitigate racism, paternalism, parochialism and other potentially systemic and problematic socio-political limitations to the indigenous system. However, there is a tension between liberal democratization, the historic strategic aim of US post-war political transitions, and what may appear appropriate for the target society, vis-à-vis its indigenous institutions.¹¹⁷ Peace Studies scholar Roger MacGinty argues that a romanticism for indigenous institutions must be tempered with the reality that the system in its most recent form required intervention.¹¹⁸

The decision to either assign indigenous agency for local and national institutions reform through indirect administration or to execute systemic change through direct control is an important consideration for the operational artist.¹¹⁹ Local agency could ensure sustainability over the process and outcomes if the agents are largely representative of the constituency, and if the emergent policies and systems are consistent with international norms and standards. This approach may be consistent with jus post bellum perspectives, as it puts responsibility in the hands of the governed. Conversely, the risk of leveraging local agency is that malevolent components of the former system may re-emerge. This risk and concern always ran in the background for General Clay and OMGUS, as they attempted to properly vet influencers and local governors. For planners in the future, the original proximal cause for the intervention likely informs the decision over local agency. An ineffective or misguided effort could put populations at risk with the re-emergence of suffering, while reintroducing conditions requiring future interventions.

¹¹⁷ Dobbins, *After the War*, xi-xxix.

¹¹⁸ Roger MacGinty, *Routledge Handbook of Peacebuilding* (New York: Routledge, 2013), 5.

¹¹⁹ Annika Hansen and Sharon Wiharta, "From Intervention to Local Ownership: Rebuilding a Just and Sustainable Rule of Law After Conflict," in *Jus Post Bellum: Towards a Law of Transition from Conflict to Peace*, edited by Carsten Stahn and Jann Kleffner (The Hague: TMC Asser Press, 2008), 137-142.

Education: Formal and Informal Mechanisms

When considering political transformation during the US denazification experience, President Roosevelt and General Clay identified education as an important component, or the critical variable, to changing the German socio-political system. This was demonstrated by US efforts in both the formal education realms, as well as through informal education initiatives. Key at-risk populations were the former *Hitlerjugend* and *Bund Deutscher Maedel*, the boys' and girls' youth groups. Hitler took a significant interest in cultivating German youth as the future of the Nazi party.¹²⁰ The centrality of education to change is echoed more recently in a variety of scholarly research into the subject, some of which is described further.

Philosopher and just war theorist Brian Orend surveyed the coercive, international post-war regime changes over the twentieth century, and suggests a blueprint of sorts for conducting political transformations. His analysis reflects a synthesis of James Dobbins' influential works on post-war occupations, *America's Role in Nation Building: From Germany to Iraq*, and *The United Nations' Role in Nation-Building*. Orend identifies ten concepts to comprise his blueprint for change, however educational reform cuts across all efforts.¹²¹

The *Guiding Principles Handbook* of the US Institute for Peace describes formal and informal education as a place where dialogue may occur on social matters. If guided properly, forces stabilizing a state after regime change and during political transformation may use education to help change society. USIP recommends a community-based approach to bringing

¹²⁰ Office of the Military Government, United States, "Denazification: Cumulative Review," in *Report of the Military Governor, 1 April 1947 through 30 April 1948*, 4; for information on the Hitlerjugend and BundDeutscher Maedel, see Historical Division, European Command. *The U.S. Armed Forces German Youth Activities Program, 1945-1955* (US Army Europe, 1956, CARL 940.5338015 G373p), 2.

¹²¹ Brian Orend, "Jus Post Bellum: A Just War Theory Perspective," in *Jus Post Bellum: Towards a Law of Transition from Conflict to Peace*, edited by Carsten Stahn and Jann Kleffner (The Hague: TMC Asser Press, 2008), 45-49.

reforms to education.¹²² Generally speaking whether education reform is centralized in the case of OMGUS efforts in Germany or at a community-based level, there are two primary mechanisms for educational reform: formal and informal.

Formal educational modalities include primary and secondary schools, including universities and vocational institutions. Schools teach students how to comport themselves, as well as about the socio-cultural history of the state or society.¹²³ Accordingly, school texts, lesson plans, and interviews with teachers and administrators can inform planners with an understanding of the socio-political fabric of the population, or in the least, how the population views itself. In the case of Germany, the Nazi regime coopted the teaching profession into party membership, the effects of which were reflected in educational materials that OMGUS encountered. In cases of intervention followed by regime change due to civil war or internal conflict, civil affairs forces will likely encounter evidence of pre-existing social cleavages resident within the educational system. Cleavages may be in the form of socio-economic stratification, ethnic tensions, gender issues, and other socio-ethnic problems.¹²⁴

Informal education provides opportunities for social and political change. For children, extra-curricular activities and programs can help bolster the narrative developed during the formal educational processes. Just as the *Hitlerjugend* helped Hitler propagate Nazism for the future of Germany through widespread youth programs, similar US-sponsored German Youth Activities had an offsetting effect.¹²⁵ Additionally, informal programs are more inclusive, as they can incorporate a wider breadth of the target audience beyond those who participate in the formal

¹²² US Institute of Peace and U.S. Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute, *Guiding Principles for Stabilization and Reconstruction* (Washington, DC: US Institute of Peace Press, 2009) 10-173.

¹²³ Patricia A. Maulden, "Education and Learning," in *Routledge Handbook of Peacebuilding*, edited by Roger MacGinty (Oxon: Routledge, 2013), 289.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 289.

¹²⁵ Historical Division, European Command, *The U.S. Armed Forces German Youth Activities Program, 1945-1955*, 2

education programs.¹²⁶ Informal education provides access that transcends age, gender, socio-economic status, beyond that which formal education provides. Other informal educational opportunities are through seminars, workshops and advising. In range of US military options, this translates to security force assistance and building capacity to govern and secure. The particularities of formal education are wrought with complexities in terms of its relationship to socio-economic issues, as well as the transference of knowledge of the nation-states' political and social history.¹²⁷

The US Institute of Peace suggests that education should represent a line of effort *during* a humanitarian response in the early phases of conflict. The Institute's *Guiding Principles* handbook explains that educational opportunities can provide a means and way for children and families to "cope with conflict and its aftermath."¹²⁸ Furthermore, addressing the immediate needs of children, and helping to isolate them from the social and military conflict provides an opportunity for civil affairs forces to assess the curriculum. Examining educational curriculum provides insight into the target society, the extent to which a deposed regime influenced the educational institution, and important insight US forces assessing the feasibility of political transformation.

Conclusion

The operational artist must connect policy makers and the strategic aims to purposeful tactical actions. As leaders plan and execute campaigns, operations in time, space and resources to achieve strategic aims, they must always consider the political and strategic risks associates with mission failure. They must think like strategists, balancing the application of means to ways to achieve the desired end state conditions. Concerning regime change and political

¹²⁶ Maulden, "Education and Learning," 291-292.

¹²⁷ Ibid., 287-288.

¹²⁸ USIP, *Guiding Principles*, 10-173.

transformation, this implies a thorough understanding of the tools available to the force, the ways to change a system of systems as complex and dynamic as a political regime, and what constitutes mission accomplishment.

Lucius D. Clay demonstrated the qualities of the archetype soldier-diplomat and operational artist. He understood the strategic impacts of policy on occupation and administration duties in Germany. Furthermore, his ability to influence both US policymakers, his commanders, and the Germans alike, marked his performance as Deputy Commander of SHAEF and USFET, and Military Governor of Germany. He respected the dignity of the German people and maintained a keen focus on his mission to transform Germany into a liberal democracy. Clay achieved his mission during arguably one of the most complex and difficult periods in US military history.

Bibliography

- Bar-Yam, Yaneer. *Making Things Work: Solving Complex Problems in a Complex World*. Cambridge, MA: Knowledge Press, 2004.
- Berger Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Doubleday, 1966.
- Beschloss, Michael R. *The Conquerors: Roosevelt, Truman, and the Destruction of Hitler's Germany*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2002.
- Bradley, Mark L. *The Army and Reconstruction: 1865-1877*. Washington, DC: Center of Military History, 2015.
- Clay, Lucius D. *Decision in Germany*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1950.
- . *The Papers of General Lucius D. Clay: Germany, 1945-1949*. Vol. 1. Edited by Jean E. Smith. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1974.
- David, Roman. *Lustration and Transitional Justice: Personnel Systems in the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.
- DiMarco, Louis A. "Restoring Order: The U.S. Army Experience With Occupation Operations, 1865-1962." PhD Dissertation, Kansas State University, 2010.
- Dobbins, James, Michele A. Poole, Austin Long, and Benjamin Runkle. *After the War: Nation Building from FDR to George W. Bush*. Santa Monica: RAND, 2008.
- Dörner, Dietrich. *The Logic of Failure: Recognizing and Avoiding Error in Complex Situations*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 1996.
- The Economist Infographics Unit. "Economist Intelligence Unit Democracy Index." The Economist Online. Accessed 2 November 2017.
<https://infographics.economist.com/2017/DemocracyIndex/>.
- Highway History. "General Lucius D. Clay: The President's Man." Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation. Accessed 2 February 2018.
<https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/infrastructure/Clay.cfm>.
- Friedrich, Carl D. *American Experiences in Military Government in World War II*. New York: Rinehart, 1948.
- Gaetke, Matthew C. "Certainty is an Illusion: The Mythos of Strategic Guidance." Monograph, School of Advanced Military Studies, 2015.
- Gharajedaghi, Jamshid. *Systems Thinking: Managing Chaos and Complexity*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier, 2011.
- Griffith, William E. "Denazification in the U.S. Zone of Germany." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 267 (January 1950): 68-76. Accessed 17 November 2017. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1026728>.

- Hansen, Annika, and Sharon Wiharta. "From Intervention to Local Ownership: Rebuilding a Just and Sustainable Rule of Law After Conflict." In *Jus Post Bellum: Towards a Law of Transition from Conflict to Peace*, edited by Carsten Stahn and Jann Kleffner, 131-153. The Hague: TMC Asser Press, 2008.
- Hart, B. H. Lidell. *Strategy*. London: Faber and Faber, 1967.
- High Commissioner of Germany. "Records of the High Commissioner for Germany." Civilian Agency Records, National Archives Website. Accessed 18 February 2018.
<https://www.archives.gov/research/holocaust/finding-aid/civilian/rg-466.html>.
- High Commissioner for Human Rights. "Rule-of-Law Tools for Post-Conflict States: Vetting: An Operational Framework." United Nations. Accessed 5 March 2017.
<http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/RuleoflawVettingen.pdf>
- Historical Division, U.S. Army Europe. *The U.S. Armed Forces German Youth Activities Program, 1945-1955*. U.S Army Europe, 1956, Combined Arms Research Library Reference Document, 940.5338015 G373p.
- Howard, Michael. *The Invention of Peace*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Ikenberry, G. John. *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order after Major Wars*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- Kormann, John. *U.S. Denazification Policy in Germany, 1944-1950*. Bad Godesberg-Mehlem, Germany: Historical Division, Office of the High Commissioner for Germany, 1952.
- Lauer, G. Stephen. "The Tao of Doctrine." *Joint Forces Quarterly*, no. 82 (3rd Quarter 2016): 118-24.
- Maulden, Patricia. "Education and Learning." in *Routledge Handbook of Peacebuilding*, edited by Roger MacGinty, 287-295. Oxon: Routledge, 2013.
- McCoy, Donald R., and Benedict K. Zobrist. *Conference of Scholars of the Administration of Occupied Areas: April 10-11, 1970 at the Harry Truman Library, 1943-1955*. Independence, MO: The Harry S. Truman Library Institute for National and International Affairs, 1970.
- McKinsey, Richard D. "Oral Interview with Lucius D. Clay." Oral Interview. Independence, MO: President Harry S. Truman Presidential Library. Accessed 6 February 2018.
<https://www.trumanlibrary.org/oralhist/clayl.htm>.
- Molotov, Viascheslav, as quoted in Department of State, *Occupation of Germany: Policy and Progress, 1945-6 First Edition*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1947. Accessed 2 March 2018, https://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/2003/1/10/1a764b04-2068-4a44-97c5-38bd4e168fd1/publishable_en.pdf.
- Office of the Military Government, United States. *Minutes of the Division Staff Meetings of the U.S. Group Control Council for Germany and the Office of Military Government for Germany, July 1944-August 1949*. Washington, DC: National Archives, CARL Microfilm D0001033.

- Office of the Military Government, United States. *Monthly Report of the Military Governor, U.S. Zone, September 1945*. Germany: US Forces European Theater, CARL N-11566.
- . *Monthly Report of the Military Governor, U.S. Zone, December 1945*. Germany: US Forces European Theater, CARL N-11566.
- . *Monthly Report of the Military Governor, U.S. Zone, December 1946*. Germany: US Forces European Theater, CARL N-11566.
- . *Monthly Report of the Military Governor, U.S. Zone, August 1945*. Germany: U.S. Forces, European Theater, CARL N-11566.
- . *Monthly Report of the Military Governor, U.S. Zone, December 1947*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: US Forces, European Theater, CARL N-11566.
- . *Monthly Report of the Military Governor, U.S. Zone, 1945-49*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: US Forces, European Theater, CARL N-11566.
- . *Report of the Military Governor, 01 April 1947 through 30 April 1948*, Frankfurt am Main, Germany: U.S. Forces European Theater, CARL N-11566.
- Orend, Brian. "Jus Post Bellum: A Just War Theory Perspective." In *Jus Post Bellum: Towards a Law of Transition from Conflict to Peace*, edited by Carsten Stahn and Jann Kleffner, 31-52. The Hague: TMC Asser Press, 2008.
- Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute. *Handbook for Military Support to Governance, Elections and Media*. Unified Action Handbook Series, Book Two. Carlisle Barracks, PA: US Army War College, 2016.
- Sandler, Stanley. *Glad to See Them Come and Sorry to See Them Go: A History of U.S. Army Tactical Civil Affairs/Military Government, 1775-1991*. Fort Bragg, NC: US Army Special Operations Command History and Archives Division, 1994.
- Schadlow, Nadia. *War and the Art of Governance: Consolidating Combat Success into Political Victory*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2017.
- Schmitt, Hans A., ed., *U.S. Occupation in Europe After World War II: Papers and Reminiscences from the April 23-24, 1976, Conference Held at the George C. Marshall Research Foundation, Lexington, Virginia*. Lawrence: The Regents Press of Kansas, 1978.
- Slim, Field-Marshal Viscount William. *Defeat into Victory*. London: Macmillan, 1986.
- Smith, Jean E. Interview by Brian Lamb, Washington, DC. "Lucius Clay: An American Life." C-SPAN Archives. Accessed 16 January 17. <https://www.c-span.org/video/?15031-1/lucius-clay-american-life>.
- . *Lucius D. Clay: An American Life*. New York: Henry Holt, 1990.
- Snow, Donald M., and Dennis M. Drew. *From Lexington to Baghdad and Beyond: War and Politics in the American Experience*. New York: M.E. Sharpe, 2010.

- United Nations. "Responsibility to Protect." Office on Genocide Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect, United Nations. Accessed 12 December 2017.
<http://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/about-responsibility-to-protect.html>
- US Department of Defense, Joint Staff. Joint Publication 5-0, *Joint Planning*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2017.
- . Joint Publication 3-07.3, *Peace Operations*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2012.
- . Joint Publication 3-07, *Stability*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2016.
- . "OSD Planning Review Process White Paper," Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Defense Policy, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Policy. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2015.
- . *World War II Inter-Allied Conferences*. Washington, DC: Joint History Office, 2003, CARL Electronic Archives.
- US Department of State. Post Conflict Reconstruction Essential Task Matrix. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, April 2005. Accessed 12 November 2017, <https://2001-2009.state.gov/s/crs/rls/52959.htm>
- US Department of the Army. Army Doctrine Publication 5-0, *The Operations Process*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2012.
- . Army Doctrine Reference Publication 3-0, *Operations*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2017.
- . Army Doctrine Reference Publication 3-05, *Special Operations*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2012.
- . Army Doctrine Reference Publication 3-07, *Stability*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2012.
- . Army Doctrine Reference Publication 1-02, *Terms and Military Symbols*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2016.
- . Field Manual 3-0, *Operations*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2017.
- . Field Manual 100-23, *Peace Operations*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1994.
- . Field Manual 3-07, *Stability Operations*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2014.
- US Department of War. Field Manual 27-5. *United States Army and Navy Manual of Military Government and Civil Affairs*. Washington, DC: War Department, 22 December 1943.
- US Department of War. Field Service Regulation Field Manual 100-5, *Operations*. Washington, DC: Government Publishing Office, 1941.

US Institute of Peace, and U.S. Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute. *Guiding Principles for Stabilization and Reconstruction*. Washington, DC: US Institute of Peace Press, 2009.

Walzer, Michael. *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations*. New York: Basic Books, 2006.

Williams, Garland H. *Engineering Peace: The Military Role in Postconflict Reconstruction*. Washington, DC: US Institute of Peace, 2005.

Ziemke, Earl F. "Civil Affairs Reaches Thirty." *Military Review* (December 1972): 130-133.

———. *The U.S. Army in the Occupation of Germany: 1944-1946*. Washington, DC: Center of Military History, US Army, 1975.