



Peace Plans

(Article begins on page 2 below.)

This article is copyrighted by History Nebraska (formerly the Nebraska State Historical Society). You may download it for your personal use.

For permission to re-use materials, or for photo ordering information, see:

<https://history.nebraska.gov/publications/re-use-nshs-materials>

Learn more about *Nebraska History* (and search articles) here:

<https://history.nebraska.gov/publications/nebraska-history-magazine>

History Nebraska members receive four issues of *Nebraska History* annually:

<https://history.nebraska.gov/get-involved/membership>

Full Citation: Addison Sheldon et al, "Peace Plans," *Nebraska History* 23 (1942): 5-39

Article Contents: Addison E Sheldon, "The Peace Plan That Lost Fifty Thousand Dollars"

"The Prize-Winning Plan: Announcement of Award"

Edward W Bok, "The American Peace Award" (Preface)

"The Question to be Voted Upon—Statement of Policy Committee"

Dr. Charles H Levermore, "The Peace Plan That Won Fifty Thousand Dollars"

Bayard H Paine, "A Nebraska View of World Peace Plans"

The Peace Plan That Lost Fifty Thousand Dollars

ADDISON E. SHELDON

November 12, 1923

Any successful plan for world peace must have Europe for its first objective. This is a fact well known—so much so that some statement of the reasons for it must be given in order to plan the first campaign.

Europe has taken the lead in directing the destiny of the human race upon this planet. This direction began about two thousand years ago. About four hundred years ago it took upon

**Europe's
Part in
World
Peace**

itself a new and mighty form—that of colonization.

Since that period a limited area of Western Europe (containing less than a million square miles and having at that time not much more than fifty million people)

has proceeded to discover, colonize and control the rest of the world's surface, an area fifty times as large and having a population thirty times as great as that of Europe.

Europe itself is a mixture in different proportions of the races and peoples of three great continents: Europe, Asia and Africa. The mingling of these peoples has been a process of violence, robbery and murder going on through several thousand years. There was neither logic nor sequence in the series of transactions. It requires a great gift of devout belief to see the divine hand of Providence in these centuries. Yet, in some manner which the wisdom of man cannot yet fathom, these conflicts, invasions, destructions and cruelties have shaped and sharpened the mind of Europe to leadership and supremacy in world affairs.

Western Europe has done something more than rule the world. It has invented and adapted the machines, the processes, the legal rules and the business regulations which have organized man-power throughout the world and given man control over the

millions of units of invisible mechanical power hidden in coal mines, in wandering winds, in chemical reactions, in falling waters, in atomic coherence. It is these things which have given the people of Europe the power they have possessed for over four hundred years—that of dominating the rest of the people upon this globe.

Western Europe has slowly worked out an idea for unifying its people. For more than a thousand years this process has gone on. That long ago every little valley and plain in Western Europe had a separate government hostile to those about it. In the course of a thousand years, chiefly by conquest and violence, partly by economic need and education, the territory of Western Europe has been grouped into five or six chief areas and fifteen or twenty minor areas called nations. These nations have fluctuated in size and population, but the principal units have been in existence about five hundred years, corresponding in time to the period when the people of Western Europe started out to civilize the rest of the world by giving it their counsel, command and control.

The mightiest force (aside from invention) in the history of Western Europe and of the world during the last hundred years has been the creation of what we call capital. Capital, in fact, is the child of invention. In our definition of the word we include that assembly and organization of power, tools, machinery, credit, bookkeeping, and their direction by the human intellect, which enables people possessing them to multiply by a thousand-fold their power of producing things desired and used by the human race. Now the people of Western Europe have so far excelled those of all other countries in the use of capital as to become, during the past two hundred years, the workshop of the world, the source from which other peoples draw their supply of tools, machines, and the trained intellects for their direction. In the last sixty years America has become the rival of Europe in this field and excelled her in some respects.

The advantage and profit of supplying the rest of the world with improved articles and conveniences became so great that rivalry arose between those larger units of Western Europe, called nations, for supremacy in, and even monopoly of this business. This rivalry was greatly promoted and aggravated by

a form of government called monarchy—sometimes becoming dictatorship. The essential thing about monarchy and its relative is, that it added to the natural ambition of the nation the personal ambition of the ruler and his family. So the rivalry grew more intense from decade to decade. Within the last sixty years the ambitions and rivalries of the nations, the desire for profits by merchants and manufacturers, took the form of gigantic rival military establishments. Into these establishments were poured the wealth, the inventive genius, the skilled technique, of the ablest minds in the nation. Every decade saw the invention of new machines of destruction, each more terrible in effect than its predecessor.

The World War was the climax of national ambition, plus personal ambition, plus trade competition, plus patriotism. For the final appeal was to the foundation of the national idea in the popular mind—the noblest and most extolled public sentiment—love of one's country. The instilling of this sentiment into the mind of the child began at mother's knee, was strengthened by father's counsel, increased by school precept, and made glorious by the poets, the orators, the novelists, the dramatists, the priests and the prophets of every land. All literature celebrates that divine attribute which makes a man willing to die for his country—right or wrong. The parent's approval, the maiden's favor, the elder's exhortation, the priest's benediction, have been the rewards of those eager to die for the Fatherland. "*Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori,*" wrote the Roman poet Horace. "Breathes there a man with soul so dead," echoed Walter Scott.

Now patriotism, riveted to trade ambition, to the pride of kings, to the prejudices and animosities of a thousand years, has brought Western Europe, the home of modern civilization, the mother of invention and progress, to the verge of ruin. Worse than that! In the desperate four years' struggle (1914-18) was born a more malignant devil, with proportions of wickedness never before known upon this planet. *Propaganda* is his name: *Propaganda of Hatred!* The business organization of the national spirit in each country during the war devised and supported this addition to the world's miseries. For the first time in the world's history, so far as I know, nation-wide organizations supported by private and public money were formed for the purpose of em-

**Excess National
Patriotism the
Ruin of Europe**

ploying the most skillful literary talent to develop the spirit of national hatred. In our own land we appropriated from the public treasury, at one time, over six million dollars for the purpose. Each of the chief European countries outdid us in expenditure and in talent. What means more grief—propaganda of hatred did not end with the armistice. It is still active in every land. It has demonstrated its potent power to prevent the restoration of peace and of confidence.

Requirements for Peace Program

1. It must reach the hearts of the people and move them with sympathy as well as logic.

2. It must reach the children, possessing their imagination and inspiring their projects.

3. It must utilize the indirect method of picture, of story, of drama, of song and tradition, in addition to the direct appeal through economic and moral argument.

4. It must utilize the appeal (both personal and patriotic) of friendship, kinship, and common experiences.

5. It must employ and stimulate, with rewards of honor and money, the best intellect to be found in every country of the world for the purposes of Peace Propaganda.

6. It must be financed in the same spirit—if not in the same amount that the World War was financed—with determination to spend whatever is needed to attain its purpose.

Financing Peace

Whenever any purpose of large achievement is undertaken in the modern world, the first step after the plan agreed upon is to finance it. It is agreed that the achievement of International Peace upon a firm and enduring basis is the most important achievement undertaken by the human race since the birth of

United States Natural Leader for World Peace

Christ. The United States is the nation of the world best fitted by its cosmopolitan population, by its geographical location, by its status of intelligence and by its financial resources, to lead this movement. Let the Congress of the United States, with the recommendation of the President and upon the petition

and approval of all state governments, civic bodies, political parties, religious and social organizations, appropriate the sum of one hundred million dollars as an initial expenditure toward securing international peace. Let a special department of the government be created, in accordance with the spirit of service and efficiency, to adopt and carry out in detail plans for the work. Let auxiliary gifts and subscriptions be solicited to supplement the national appropriation.

First Steps

Peace Propaganda

Let prizes of honor and money be offered for the production of posters, pictures, songs, stories, editorials, dramas, poems, novels, playthings, and all other means by which the human sympathy and intellect may be reached in all lands for the purpose of creating a universal sentiment which shall support peace and forbid war.

The Service of America's Foreign-Born Citizens

In the United States there are, in round numbers, 14,000,000 white persons of foreign birth. In addition there are 6,000,000 white persons having one or both parents born in foreign countries. These 20,000,000 people represent every country, every province and nearly every district in Europe. Most of them speak and write the language of their home district. Most of them have blood relatives and friends in the homeland whom they can reach by letter, by literature, by personal appeal.

Europe in America

Let there be a systematic canvass of every foreign-born resident in the United States, and a systematic appeal sent by all these people to their own folk in Europe. Let this appeal also be made by the children of foreign-born parents to the children in the European homeland. The form and frequency of these appeals must be determined by the general direction of the campaign. It ought to run through a period of years—long enough to reach from early school-days to mature manhood and womanhood.

One central theme of these appeals may be stated thus:

America expects every country, every province, every dis-

strict in the world to unite, in sentiment and in practice, for peace. America illustrates what it urges. In this land we dwell in peace and fellowship: all the warring peoples, all the jarring factions and sects from every land under the sun. We find our lives happier, our progress more rapid, our children more hopeful and enjoyable because of this practice. Let us tell the people of the homeland that America expects wars to end; disputes to be settled by peaceful methods; co-operation and fel-

**An American
Program
for Peace**

lowship for the common happiness and welfare to be adopted as the principle and policy of every country and every household. Let us tell them

that America will have no patience, no commerce and no fellowship with governments, nations or provinces which continue to live in the old way. Let our propaganda leaflets carry the message: "We ask each of you to aid in this cause, to make it the supreme public and private policy in your country and in your district; to write us of the progress you are making toward this ideal." Every periodical printed in foreign language in America should be asked and aided to join in this movement. Special editions for the old homeland should be prepared and sent across. They should be sent through mails. They should be scattered from planes. They should be broadcast in all radio languages. They should be wrapped in packages of food and confections.

Schol Work

For the schools, new and attractive literature and lessons, adapted to the traditions and ideals of each locality, shall be provided. The Boy Scout movement in America and Europe furnishes much of example and material for this purpose.

Additional Appropriations

The government of the United States shall extend invitations to each and every organized government in the world to make an appropriation of money for financing this movement. The appeal shall be continuing; and, since the United States will furnish the initial and largest appropriation for this purpose, a plan of encouraging other appropriations by sharing in that of the United States shall be devised. There shall be an extension of propaganda from European countries to the world.

The same general plan used in reaching the people of Europe shall be used to reach the peoples of the world. Naturally the nations most progressive and influential will be those where the peace propaganda will be concentrated. Once the leading industrial nations of the world are brought into accord with the plan, its extension to the backward peoples of the world will be more rapid. With America and other leading countries of Europe working together in harmony, people now dependent upon the manufactures of these civilized countries would soon be brought into accord in order to secure the things necessary for their status of living.

The Prize-Winning Plan

The author was Dr. Charles Herbert Levermore of New York City. His competitors numbered 22,164; his entry was Number 1469. The award was made January 6, 1924, but the name of the author remained a secret. Fifty thousand dollars of the prize money was to be paid at once; an equal amount was to be paid if the plan was approved by the United States Senate, or if "an adequate degree of popular support has been demonstrated."

Elihu Root was chairman of the Jury Award. Serving with him were James Guthrie Harbord, Edward M. House, Ellen Fitz Pendleton, Roscoe Pound, William Allen White and Brand Whitlock. Their joint statement illuminates:

"The Jury of Award realizes that there is no one approach to world peace, and that it is necessary to recognize not merely political but also psychological and economic factors. The only possible pathway to international agreement with reference to these complicated factors is through mutual counsel and cooperation, which the plan selected contemplates."

Immediately following announcement of the award a booklet was issued to the press of the country containing a preface by Mr. Bok, a statement of the Policy Committee presenting the questions to be voted upon, and the full text of the plan, all of which appear in the pages following. A ballot carrying "The

The American Peace Award

Created by EDWARD W. BOK

Offering

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$100,000)

This award will be given to the author of the *best practicable plan by which the United States may cooperate with other nations to achieve and preserve the peace of the world.*

The four photostats here reproduced are facsimiles of the circulars sent at request of 22,165 authors of peace plans who, in 1923, competed for the \$50,000 award.—*Editor.*

The American Peace Award

Created by EDWARD W. BOK

Offering ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$100,000)

This award will be given to the author of the best practicable plan by which the United States may cooperate with other nations to achieve and preserve the peace of the world.

THE award is offered in the conviction that the peace of the world is the problem of the people of the United States, and that a way can be found by which America's voice can be made to count among the nations for peace and for the future welfare and integrity of the United States.

THE PURPOSE of the award is to give the American people from coast to coast a direct opportunity to evolve a plan that will be acceptable to many groups of our citizens, who, while now perhaps disagreeing as to the best method of international association, strongly desire to see the United States do its share in preventing war and in establishing a workable basis of cooperation among the nations of the earth.

Four Subsidiary Awards

Since the plan finally selected by the Jury may be a composite of more than one plan, there are also offered, in addition to the main award of one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000), second, third, fourth and fifth awards of five thousand dollars (\$5,000) each for any plans or portion of plans used by the Jury of Award in a composite plan.

If the Jury accepts one plan in full, making no additions to it from other plans, no subsidiary awards will be made.

Conditions of Award

Qualifications of Contestants

The contest is open to every citizen of the United States, by birth or naturalization.

Plans may be submitted either by individuals or by organizations of every kind, national, state or local.

Scope of the Plan

The winning plan must provide a practicable means whereby the United States can take its place and do its share toward preserving world peace, while not making compulsory the participation of the United States in European wars, if any such are, in the future, found unpreventable.

The plan may be based upon the present covenant of the League of Nations or may be entirely apart from that instrument.

Time and Manner of Payment of Award

The purpose of the Award is twofold: first, to produce a plan; and secondly, to insure, so far as may be, that it will be put into operation.

The Award is, therefore, to be made in two payments: fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) will be paid to the author of the winning plan as soon as the Jury of Award has selected it. The second fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) will be paid to the author if and when the plan, in substance and intent, is approved by the United States Senate; or if and when the Jury of Award decides that an adequate degree of popular support has been demonstrated for the winning plan.

The question of whether amendments which may be made in the Senate materially affect the intent of the plan submitted, and

the acceptance or rejection of these amendments are left entirely to the judgment of the Jury of Award.

The second half of the award or fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) shall not be deemed to have been won unless the conditions above mentioned as to the approval of the plan shall be fulfilled on or before March 4, 1925.

The subsidiary awards are to be paid upon the same basis as the principal award; that is, twenty five hundred dollars (\$2,500) will be paid to the author at the time the first fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) is paid, and the remaining twenty-five hundred dollars (\$2,500) if and when the composite plan, in substance and intent, shall have been accepted by the Senate of the United States; or if and when the Jury of Award decides that an adequate degree of popular support has been demonstrated for the winning plan.

Form of Plan

Plans submitted should not be in the form of bills, resolutions, or treaties suitable for presentation to the Senate.

The paper submitted may include not only the exposition of the plan, but also argument for it.

A summary of not exceeding five hundred words must accompany every plan.

Length

The total number of words submitted, exclusive of the summary, must not exceed five thousand (5,000).

Rules for Contestants

Only one plan may be submitted by any one contestant.

Manuscripts *must* be typewritten, and on only one side of the page.

Manuscripts must not be rolled.

They must not be accompanied by letters.

They must not bear the name of the author or contain anything by which the author might be identified. Each manuscript must have attached to it a plain sealed envelope containing the author's name and address. As they are received, the manuscript and envelope will be marked, for identification, with the same number. The envelopes will not be opened until the Jury of Award has made its selections. Hence the receipt of manuscripts cannot be acknowledged.

No manuscripts will be returned. No postage for the return of manuscripts should therefore be included by the sender.

Time Limitation

All manuscripts must be received at the office of the American Peace Award by twelve o'clock midnight on November 15, 1923. Manuscripts received after that time cannot be considered.

It is expected that the Jury will be able to announce the selection of a plan for the first part of the Award in time for the plan to be presented to the Senate early in 1924.

Right of Publication

The submission of any manuscript, whether or not it receives an Award, shall give to the Committee full rights to publish the same in such manner and at such time as it may choose.

Cooperating Council

Working in direct cooperation with the Policy Committee of the American Peace Award are the most prominent and effective organizations, civic, religious, and economic, throughout the United States.

A cooperating council has been formed for the American Peace Award, consisting of one delegate from each of these organizations.

Jury of Award

The personnel of the Jury of Award will be announced as soon after September first as possible.

Policy Committee

The Policy Committee of the American Peace Award consists of the following members:

JOHN W. DAVIS, former Ambassador to Great Britain, now President of the American Bar Association.

LEARNED HAND, Judge of the United States Court for the Southern District of New York since 1909.

WILLIAM H. JOHNSTON, President of the International Association of Machinists and executive officer of the Conference for Progressive Political Action.

ESTHER EVERETT LAPE, Member in Charge, writer.

NATHAN L. MILLER, former Governor of New York State, State Controller and Judge of the Court of Appeals, now practicing law in New York City.

MRS. GIFFORD PINCHOT, wife of the Governor of Pennsylvania, active in political life and many social welfare movements.

MRS. OGDEN REID, wife of the publisher of the New York Tribune and Vice-President of the New York Tribune, Inc.

MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, wife of the former Assistant Secretary of the Navy, who is now head of the American Construction Council; Vice-Chairman of the New York League of Women Voters.

HENRY L. STIMSON, former Secretary of War and United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, now a practicing lawyer.

MELVILLE E. STONE, former general manager, now counselor, of The Associated Press.

MRS. FRANK A. VANDERLIP, wife of the banker; Regional Director of the New York League of Women Voters.

CORNELIUS N. BLISS, JR., is the Treasurer of the Policy Committee.
Please address all inquiries to:

THE AMERICAN PEACE AWARD,
342 Madison Avenue,
New York City.

Plan in Brief" was enclosed, referring the proposal "to the vote of the American people" and seeking to know "whether or not they approve the plan *in substance*."

In this booklet the Policy Committee stated its decision not to disclose the authorship of the plan until early in February, after a referendum had been conducted, in order that the vote might be taken solely upon its merits.

On February 5, in a ceremony at the Academy of Music in Philadelphia, Mr. John W. Davis of the Policy Committee introduced Dr. Levermore as the author of entry Number 1469, which was adjudged "the best practicable plan by which the United States may cooperate with other nations to achieve and preserve the peace of the world."

Long a student of international relations and author of several books on the subject, Dr. Levermore possessed exceptional qualifications for the task. He had been an instructor in various colleges, including the University of California and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and for eighteen years was president of Adelphi College in Brooklyn.

The balloting, however, did not actually close until March 15, 1924. On March 29 a special to the *Evening State Journal* (Lincoln) announced that the national referendum showed 534,177 votes in favor of the plan and 76,381 opposed. Citizens in every state and many abroad were represented. Mr. Bok had declined to tell the Senate committee investigating propaganda the amount he had expended, or was prepared to expend, in arousing American sentiment in favor of the winning plan. No further congressional action had been taken.

Mr. Bok's preface to the booklet on "The American Peace Award," and the statement of the Policy Committee on "The Question to be Voted Upon," follow:

"The American Peace Award"

With deep satisfaction I present for consideration and vote of the American people the plan selected by the Jury as entitled to the American Peace Award under the conditions.

The Award brought forth 22,165 plans. Since many of them were the composite work of organizations, universities, etc.,

a single plan often represented the views of hundreds or thousands of individuals. There were also received several hundred thousand of letters which, while they did not submit plans, suggested in almost every instance a solution of the peace problem.

The Jury had therefore before it an index of the true feeling and judgment of hundreds of thousands of American citizens. The plans came from every group in American life. Some were obviously from life-long students of history and international law. Some were from persons who have studied little, but who have themselves seen and felt the horror of war—or who are even now living out its tragedy.

However unlike, they almost all express or imply the same conviction: That this is the time for the nations of the earth to admit frankly that war is a crime and thus withdraw the legal and moral sanction too long permitted to it as a method of settling international disputes. Thousands of plans show a deep aspiration to have the United States take the lead in a common agreement to brand war in very truth an "outlaw."

The plans show a realization that no adequate defense against this situation has thus far been devised; and that no international law has been developed to control it. They point out that security of life and property is dependent upon the abolition of war and the cessation of the manufacture of munitions.

Through the plans as a whole run these dominant currents:

That, if war is honestly to be prevented, there must be a right-about-face on the part of the nations in their attitude toward it; and that by some progressive agreement the manufacture and purchase of the munitions of war must be limited or stopped.

That, while no political mechanism alone will insure cooperation among the nations, there must be some machinery of cooperation if the will to cooperate is to be made effective; that mutual counsel among the nations is the real hope for bringing about the disavowal of war by the open avowal of its real causes and open discussion of them.

Finally, that there must be some means of defining, recording, interpreting and developing the law of nations.

The Jury of Awards unanimously selected the plan here presented as the one which most closely reflected several of these currents.

The Honorable Elihu Root, chairman of the Jury on Award, then prepared the following forward-looking statement indicating that the mutual counsel and cooperation among the nations provided in the selected plan may lead to the realization of another—and not the least important—of the dominant desires of the American public as expressed in the plans:

“It is the unanimous hope of the Jury that the first fruit of the mutual counsel and cooperation among the nations which will result from the adoption of the plan selected will be general prohibition of the manufacture and sale of all materials of war.”

The purpose of the American Peace Award is thus fulfilled: To reflect in a practicable plan the dominating national sentiment as expressed by the large cross-section of the American public taking part in the Award.

I therefore commend the winning plan as unanimously selected by the Jury of Award, and Mr. Root's statement of the first objective to be attained by the counsel and cooperation provided in the plan, to the interest and the widest possible vote of the American people.

Edward W. Bok.

January, 1924

The Question to be Voted Upon

The substantial provisions which constitute plan Number 1469, selected by the Jury of Award, and upon which the vote of the American people is asked, are hereby submitted as follows:

I. Enter the Permanent Court

That the United States adhere to the Permanent Court of International Justice for the reasons and under the conditions stated by Secretary Hughes and President Harding in February, 1923.

II. Cooperate With the League of Nations Without Full Membership at Present

That, without becoming a member of the League of Nations as at present constituted, the United States Government should extend its present cooperation with the League and propose par-

participation in the work of its Assembly and Council under the following conditions and reservations:

Safeguarding of Monroe Doctrine

1. The United States accepts the League of Nations as an instrument of mutual counsel, but it will assume no obligation to interfere with political questions of policy or internal administration of any foreign state.

In uniting its efforts with those of other States for the preservation of peace and the promotion of the common welfare, the United States insists upon the safeguarding of the Monroe Doctrine and does not abandon its traditional attitude concerning American independence of the Old World and does not consent to submit its long-established policy concerning questions regarded by it as purely American to the recommendation or decision of other powers.

No Military or Economic Force

2. That the only kind of compulsion which nations can freely engage to apply to each other in the name of Peace is that which arises from conference, from moral judgment, from full publicity, and from the power of public opinion.

The United States will assume no obligations under Article X in its present form, or under Article XVI in its present form in the Covenant, or in its amended form as now proposed unless in any particular case Congress has authorized such action.

The United States proposes that Articles X and XVI be either dropped altogether or so amended and changed as to eliminate any suggestion of a general agreement to use coercion for obtaining conformity to the pledges of the Covenant.

No Obligations Under Versailles Treaty

3. That the United States will accept no responsibilities under the Treaty of Versailles unless in any particular case Congress has authorized such action.

League Open to All Nations

4. The United States Government proposes that Article I of the Covenant be construed and applied (or, if necessary, re-

drafted) so that admission to the League shall be assured to any self-governing State that wishes to join and that receives the favorable vote of two-thirds of the Assembly.

Development of International Law

5. As a condition of its participation in the work and counsels of the League, the United States asks that the Assembly and Council consent—or obtain authority—to begin collaboration for the revision and development of international law, employing for this purpose the aid of a commission of jurists. This Commission would be directed to formulate anew existing rules of the law of nations, to reconcile divergent opinions, to consider points hitherto inadequately provided for but vital to the maintenance of international justice, and in general to define the social rights and duties of States. The recommendations of the Commission would be presented from time to time, in proper form for consideration, to the Assembly as to a recommending if not a lawmaking body.

The complete text of the winning entry, as published by the Policy Committee, appears on succeeding pages.

Ah! When shall all men's good
Be each man's rule, and universal peace
Lie like a shaft of light across the land,
And like a lane of beams athwart the sea,
Through all the circle of the Golden Year?

—*Tennyson*

The Peace Plan That Won Fifty Thousand Dollars

DR. CHARLES H. LEVERMORE

**A Plan to Secure Cooperation between
the United States and Other Nations
"to achieve and preserve the peace
of the world"**

Five-sixths of all nations, including about four-fifths of mankind, have already created a world-organization, the purpose of which is "to promote international cooperation and to achieve international peace and security."

There is Not Room for More Than One Organization to Promote International Cooperation

Those nations cannot and will not abandon this system which has now been actively operating for three and a half years. If leading members of the United States Government ever had serious hopes that another Association of Nations could be formed, such hopes were dispelled during the Washington Conference by plain intimations from other Powers that there is not room for more than one organization like the League of Nations.

The States outside the organized world are not of such character that the United States could hopefully cooperate with them for the purpose named.

Therefore, the only possible path to cooperation in which the United States can take an increasing share is that which leads toward some form of agreement with the world as now organized, called the League of Nations.

By sheer force of social international gravitation such cooperation becomes inevitable.

The United States Has Already Gone Far in Cooperation with the League of Nations

The United States Government, theoretically maintaining a policy of isolation, has actually gone far since March 4, 1921, toward "cooperation with other nations to achieve and preserve the peace of the wrld."

The most familiar part of the story is the work of the Washington Conference, wherein President Harding's administration made a beginning of naval disarmament, opened to China a prospect of rehabilitation and joined with Great Britain, Japan and France to make the Pacific Ocean worthy of its name.

Later came the recommendation that the United States should adhere to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

Not long after that action President Harding wrote to Bishop Gailor:

"I do not believe any man can confront the responsibility of a President of the United States and yet adhere to the idea that it is possible for our country to maintain an attitude of isolation and aloofness in the world."

But since the proposed adhesion to the Permanent Court would bring this country into close contact at one time and point with the League of Nations, and since such action is strenuously opposed for exactly that reason, it is pertinent to inquire not only how much cooperation with the League and its organs has been proposed during the life of the present Administration, but also how much has been actually begun.

Officially or Unofficially the United States is Represented on Many League Commissions

The United States Government has accredited its representatives to sit as members "in an unofficial and consulting capacity" upon four of the most important Social Welfare Commissions of the League, viz: Health, Opium, Traffic in Women and Children, and Anthrax (Industrial Hygiene).

Our Government is a full member of the International Hydrographic Bureau, an organ of the League. Our Government was represented by an "unofficial observer" in the Brussels Conference (Finance and Economic Commission) in 1920. It sent Honor-

able Stephen G. Porter and Bishop Brent to represent it at the meeting of the Opium Commission last May.

Our Public Health Service has taken part in the Serological Congresses of the Epidemics Commission and has helped in the experimental work for the standardization of serums.

Our Government collaborates with the League Health Organization through the International Office of Public Health at Paris, and with the Agriculture Committee of the League Labor Organization through the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome.

In February, 1923, Secretary Hughes and President Harding formally recommended that the Senate approve our adhesion to the Permanent Court under four conditions or reservations, one of which was that the United States should officially participate in the election of the judges of the Assembly and Council of the League, sitting as electoral colleges for that purpose.

Unofficial cooperation from the United States with the work of the League includes membership in five of the Social Welfare Commissions or Committees of the League, in one on Economic Reconstruction, and in one (Aaland Islands) which averted a war. American women serve as expert assessors upon the Opium and Traffic-in-Women Commissions.

Two philanthropic agencies in the United States have between them pledged more than \$400,000 to support either the work of the Epidemics Commission or the League inquiry into conditions of the traffic in women and children.

How Can Increasing Cooperation Between the United States and the Organized World Be Secured?

The United States being already so far committed to united counsels with League agencies for the common social welfare, all of which have some bearing upon the preservation of world peace, the question before us may take this form:

How can increasing cooperation between the United States and the organized world for the promotion of peace and security be assured, in forms acceptable to the people of the United States and hopefully practicable?

**The United States Can Extend Its Present Cooperation
with the League's Social Welfare Activities**

Without any change in its present policy, already described, the United States Government could, first, show its willingness to cooperate similarly with the other humane and reconstructive agencies of the League. To four of these agencies that Government has already sent delegates with advisory powers. It could as properly accept invitations to accredit members with like powers to each one of the other welfare commissions. It has already received invitations from two of the latter.

It is, secondly, immediately practicable to extend the same kind of cooperation, whenever asked to do it, so as to include participation in the work of the commissions and technical committees of the Labor Organization. The record shows that such cooperation is already begun.

The single common purpose of all these committees is the collection and study of information, on which may be based subsequent recommendations for national legislation.

All conventions and resolutions, recommended by the first three congresses of the International Labor Organization, have already been laid before the Senate of the United States and, without objection, referred to the appropriate committee. No different procedure would have been followed if the United States were a member of the Labor Organization of the League.

An Immediate Step is Adherence to the Permanent Court

A third immediately practicable step is the Senate's approval of the proposal that the United States adhere to the Permanent Court of International Justice for the reasons and under the conditions stated by Secretary Hughes and President Harding in February, 1923.

These three suggestions for increasing cooperation with the family of nations are in harmony with policies already adopted by our Government, and in the last case with a policy so old and well recognized that it may now be called traditional.

They do not involve a question of membership in the League of Nations as now constituted, but it cannot be denied that they lead to the threshold of that question. Any further step toward

cooperation must confront the problem of direct relations between the United States and the Assembly and Council of fifty-four nations in the League.*

In Actual Operation the League Employs No Force

The practical experience of the League during its first three and a half years of life has not only wrought out, in a group of precedents, the beginnings of what might be called the constitutional law of the League, but it has also shifted the emphasis in activities of the League and foreshadowed important modifications in its constitution, the Covenant.

At its birth the Covenant of the League bore, vaguely in Article X and more clearly in Article XVI, the impression of a general agreement to enforce and coerce. Both of those articles suggest the action of a world-state which never existed and does not now exist. How far the present League is actually removed from functioning as such a state is sufficiently exhibited in its dealings with Lithuania and Poland over Vilna and their common boundary, and with Greece and Italy over Corfu.

Experience in the last three years has demonstrated probably insuperable difficulties in the way of fulfilling in all parts of the world the large promise of Article X in respect to either its letter or its spirit. No one now expects the League Council to try to summon armies and fleets, since it utterly failed to obtain even an international police force for the Vilna District.

Each Assembly of the League has witnessed vigorous efforts to interpret and modify Article X. In the Fourth Assembly an attempt to adopt an interpretation of that article in essential agreement with the Senatorial reservation on the same subject in 1920 was blocked only by a small group of weak states like Persia and Panama, which evidently attributed to Article X a protective power that it possesses only on paper.

Such States, in possible fear of unfriendly neighbors, must decide whether the preservation of a form of words in the Covenant is more vital to their peace and security, and to the peace and security of the world, than the presence of the United States at the council table of the family of nations.

*Fifty-seven States, including Germany, are members of the International Labor Organization of the League. There are about sixty-five independent States in the world.

As to Article XVI, the Council of the League created a Blockade Commission which worked for two years to determine how the "economic weapon" of the League could be efficiently used and uniformly applied. The Commission failed to discover any obligatory procedure that weaker powers would dare accept. It was finally agreed that each State must decide for itself whether a breach of the Covenant has been committed.

The Second Assembly adopted a radically amended form of Article XVI from which was removed all reference to the possibility of employing military force, and in which the abandonment of uniform obligation was directly provided for. The British Government has since proposed to weaken the form of requirement still further.

Articles X and XVI, in their original forms, have therefore been practically condemned by the principal organs of the League and are today reduced to something like innocuous desuetude. The only kind of compulsion which nations can freely engage to apply to each other in the name of Peace is that which arises from conference, from moral judgment, from full publicity, and from the power of public opinion.

The Leadership of the United States in the New World is Obviously Recognized by the League

Another significant development in the constitutional practice of the League is the unwillingness of the League Council to intervene in any American controversy, even though all States in the New World, except three, are members of the League.

This refusal became evident in the Panama-Costa Rica dispute in 1921 and in the quarrel between Chile, Peru and Bolivia, a quarrel which impelled the last two States to absent themselves from the Third Assembly, wherein a Chilean was chosen to preside.

Obviously the League intends to recognize the leadership of the United States in the New World precisely as the United States claims it. This is nothing less than the observance of an unwritten law limiting the powers and duties of the League Council, defined in Article XI of the Covenant, to questions that seem to threaten the peace of the Old World. When the United States is willing to bring the two halves of the world together for friendly consideration of common dangers, duties and needs, it will be

possible to secure, if it is desired, closer cooperation between the League organizations and the Pan-American Union, already a potential regional League. It is conceivable that the family of nations may eventually clearly define powers and duties of relatively local significance which may be developed upon local associations or unions. But the world of business and finance is already unified. The worlds of scientific knowledge and humane effort are nearly so. Isolation of any kind is increasingly impossible, and the world organization, already centralized, is no more likely to return to disconnected effort than the United States is likely to revert to the Calhoun theory of States' Rights and secession.

In Actual Operation, if not in Original Conception, the League Realizes the Principle and the Hopes of the Hague Conferences

The operation of the League has therefore evolved a Council widely different from the body imagined by the makers of the Covenant. It can employ no force but that of persuasion and moral influence. Its only actual powers are to confer and advise, to create commissions, to exercise inquisitive, conciliative and arbitral functions, and to help elect judges of the Permanent Court.

In other words, the force of circumstances is gradually moving the League into position upon the foundation so well laid by the world's leaders between 1899 and 1907 in the great International Councils of that period. The Assemblies of the League and the Congresses of the International Labor Organizations are successors to the Hague Conferences.

The Permanent Court has at least begun to realize the highest hope and purpose of the Second Hague Conference.

The Secretariat and the Labor Office have become Continuation Committees for the administrative work of the organized world, such as the Hague Conference lacked resources to create but would have rejoiced to see.

The Council, resolving loose and large theories into clean-cut and modest practice, has been gradually reconciling the League, as an organized world, with the ideals of international interdependence, temporarily obscured since 1914 by the shadows of the Great War.

No one can deny that the organs of the League have brought

to the service of the forces behind those ideals an efficiency, scope and variety of appeal that in 1914 would have been incredible.

It is common knowledge that public opinion and official policy in the United States have for a long time, without distinction of party, been favorable to international conferences for the common welfare, and to the establishment of conciliative, arbitral and judicial means for settling international disputes.

There is no reason to believe that the judgment and policy have been changed. Along these same lines the League is now plainly crystalizing, as has been shown, and at the touch of the United States the process can be expedited.

In no other way can the organized world, from which the United States cannot be economically and spiritually separated, belt the power of public opinion to the new machinery, devised for the pacific settlement of controversies between nations and standing always ready for use.

The United States Should Participate in the League's Work Under Stated Conditions

The United States Government should be authorized to propose cooperation with the League and participation in the work of its Assembly and Council under the following conditions and reservations:

I. The United States accepts the League of Nations as an instrument of mutual counsel, but it will assume no obligation to interfere with political questions of policy or internal administration of any foreign state.

The United States Will Maintain the Monroe Doctrine

In uniting its effort with those of other States for the preservation of peace and the promotion of the common welfare, the United States does not abandon its traditional attitude concerning American independence of the Old World and does not consent to submit its long-established policy concerning questions regarded by it as purely American to the recommendation or decision of other powers.

The United States Proposes that Moral Judgment and Public Opinion be Substituted for Force

II. The United States will assume no obligations under

Article X, in its present form in the Covenant, unless in any particular case Congress has authorized such action.

The United States will assume no obligation under Article XVI in its present form in the Covenant or in its amended form as now proposed, unless in any particular case Congress has authorized such action.

The United States proposes that Articles X and XVI be either dropped altogether or so amended and changed as to eliminate any suggestion of a general agreement to use coercion for obtaining conformity to the pledges of the Covenant.

**The United States Will Assume No Obligations Under the
Versailles Treaty**

III. The United States Government will accept no responsibility and assume no obligation in connection with any duties imposed upon the League by the peace treaties, unless in any particular case Congress has authorized such action.

**The United States Proposes that Admission be Assured to
Any Self-Governing State**

IV. The United States Government proposes that Article I of the Covenant be construed and applied (or, if necessary, re-drafted) so that admission to the League shall be assured by any self-governing State that wishes to join and that receives the favorable vote of two-thirds of the Assembly.

**The Continuing Development of International Law Must
Be Provided For**

V. As a further condition of its participation in the work and counsels of the League, the United States asks that the Assembly and Council consent—or obtain authority—to begin collaboration for the revision and development of international law, employing, for this purpose, the aid of a commission of jurists. This commission would be directed to formulate anew existing rules of the law of nations, to reconcile divergent opinions, to consider points hitherto inadequately provided for but vital to the maintenance of international justice, and in general to define the social rights and duties of States. The recommendations of the commission would be presented from time to time, in proper

form for consideration, to the Assembly as to a recommending if not a lawmaking body.

Among these conditions Numbers I and II have already been discussed. Number III is a logical consequence of the refusal of the United States Senate to ratify the Treaty of Versailles, and of the settled policy of the United States which is characterized in the first reservation. Concerning Numbers IV and V this may be said:

Anything less than a world conference, especially when Great Powers are excluded, must incur, in proportion to the exclusions, the suspicion of being an alliance rather than a family of nations. The United States can render service in emphasizing this lesson, learned in the Hague Conference, and in thus helping to reconstitute the family of nations as it really is. Such a conference or assembly must obviously bear the chief responsibility for the development of new parts of the law of nations, devised to fit changed and changing conditions, to extend the sway of justice, and to help in preserving peace and security.

The elimination of selfish interests is essential to good government. In other words, the ideal can only be obtained when God rules in the affairs of men. No nation has a monopoly of saints or sinners.

—*Sir Wilfred Grenfell*

Plans for World Peace

DWIGHT GRISWOLD

Governor of Nebraska

It is my belief that the United States must prepare now to play an important part in World affairs of the future. Certainly we have discovered during the past twenty-five years that we must make use of our position of world leadership in time of peace if wars are to be avoided. When the Axis is defeated, it will be caused by the industrial production of this nation, properly used by the fine young men who are in the service. The power of that industrial production and those same young men must be used to help guide the world. We cannot again withdraw into our own shells and avoid our responsibilities for World leadership. We are not interested in World conquest for ourselves or for any other people, and if we but use the power that is ours, we should be able to work mightily in behalf of peace.

Nothing will ruin the country if the people themselves will undertake its safety; and nothing can save it if they leave that safety in any hands but their own.

—*Daniel Webster*

A Nebraska View of World Peace Plans

BAYARD H. PAINE

Justice of Nebraska Supreme Court

The membership of the Nebraska State Historical Society will be delighted to examine the two peace plans presented in this issue and to file them away for future study.

Dr. Sheldon invited me, at the last moment, to give these plans a cursory examination, comment on them briefly, and then to discuss peace plans generally.

Sarcastic comments appear in newspapers occasionally, ridiculing Dorothy Thompson and others who are continually considering the kind of peace which will follow this war, and saying that we must win the war first and then there will be plenty of time for peace discussion.

Every editor or historian who discusses this subject does so on the basis that the allies will win an absolute, unconditional victory. If we lose, the plans which will take effect will be those that were set out clearly some years ago in *Mein Kampf*. Remember what Seneca said: "We punish an individual who is guilty of murder, but the massacre of a people is a glorious deed!"

It may be admitted that this war may continue until Britain is practically bankrupt and the other nations of Europe, except Russia, will be facing starvation and must be fed, clothed, hospitalized, and necessary reconstruction financed. While that is taking place the United States and Britain will be required to eliminate violence and to police nations that have no adequate organized army.

Facing such conditions abroad will take courage when there will be greater unemployment at home than has ever been known, but our nation will be willing to carry out Lincoln's high resolve that government by the people shall not perish from the earth.

Freedom shall be redefined and will include freedom from want, for people will no longer believe that poverty is a necessity. The greatest freedom demanded will be freedom from war. Will

that be peace? Peace is more than that. Peace means justice for every human being.

As the first world war failed to end wars or bring peace, students today ask, "Were any genuine efforts made to that end?" This magazine answers that question. Edward Bok, a naturalized citizen, in 1923 offered \$100,000 to bring out a workable plan to be adopted by Congress.

In the Congressional Record for December 14, 1942, Hon. Martin F. Smith, member of Congress from the State of Washington, placed in the record an outline of the plan which, as a young lawyer, he submitted in that Bok contest.

Briefly, he proposed that all nations should organize themselves into the United States of the World on a threefold basis: First, the peoples of the world shall turn to the United States Constitution and form one government on that plan. Second, the citizens shall owe a dual allegiance, first to the state or nation within which they live, and second, to the United States of the World. Third, each state or nation retains its sovereignty and every power not delegated to the United States of the World.

Mr. Smith's plan then outlined the procedure by which the three departments of government would be organized: the legislative, executive and judicial. It required that the president of the United States should call the nations of the world into an international convention to be held in Washington in 1924 to write the constitution, which should be ratified by the nations and the president elected in 1925. Then the author adds, "Mankind shall have entered upon time's noblest era, securing peace, liberty and prosperity to all peoples everywhere."

Insurmountable objections to this plan will arise in the mind of every reader, as they seem to have arisen in the minds of the committee charged with the duty of selecting one plan.

In this connection it is worthy of note that on February 1, 1879, Victor Hugo said, "Europe in the twentieth century will form one great republic of which France will be the center and Paris the capital. No more wars will then be possible."

The \$50,000 prize-winning plan of Dr. Levermore required the United States to adhere to the Permanent Court of International Justice as well as to cooperate with the League of Nations.

But this cooperation was weakened by the necessary reserva-

tions that we would be at liberty to maintain the Monroe Doctrine and would assume no obligations under the Treaty of Versailles which had been rejected by our Senate on November 19, 1919. It was further specified that the Articles should be changed to eliminate any suggestion that our nation would use force, but that moral judgment and public opinion should be substituted therefor.

Now study the plan of Dr. Sheldon. He gives a statement of the growth of excessive nationalism which resulted in many shocking conditions in Europe with intense hatred of neighbor nations. This condition brought about the first World War with all of its horrors, iniquities and suffering.

In Dr. Sheldon's plan of 1923 he set out the fact that a peace plan, to succeed, must win the hearts of the peoples of the world, even if it be necessary to patiently begin with the young children in their schools. Then he set out the details. Prizes of honor and money should be given in these other lands for the production of pictures and posters, songs and poems, editorials, novels and heart-throbbing dramas for adults, while children should be provided with attractive playthings to inculcate peace instead of toys which inculcate the spirit of battle.

An initial outlay of one hundred million dollars by Congress was regarded as necessary. Then was first presented the plan of sending our adopted citizens of foreign stock back to their own countries as missionaries of peace and good will to foster the growth of a firm peace sentiment in every locality.

Maxim Gorky in a lecture to students once said: "Yes, we can fly like birds in the air, can swim in the water like fish, but how to live on earth—that's the question."

The League of Nations had the misfortune to be built on the model of our American Articles of Confederation. The plan would not work for the thirteen small colonies, much less would such a plan work for the whole world.

John Foster Dulles says the League is not a government—it has no power in itself. During the period from 1930 to 1939 the League was powerless to prevent the resumption of the World War.

The Kellogg-Briand Peace Pacts were finally signed by sixty-three nations, which nations thereby agreed, first, to condemn re-

course to war; and second, that the settlement of disputes should never be sought except by pacific means. Yet this global war came. The hearts of the people had not been touched by signatures of their statesmen to peace pacts. *The Nazis and Fascists inculcated their totalitarian doctrines by patient teaching of their youth. Why could not a love for peace be inculcated in the same manner?*

Nineteen years have passed since these peace plans were written, yet today many plans are being presented in books and magazines which show an unmistakable drift to the same principles outlined by Dr. Sheldon back in 1923.

Louis Adamic, the Yugoslavian, who came to America in 1913, because of his brilliant accomplishments has been awarded grants from the Rockefeller, Guggenheim and Carnegie Foundations. Since 1931 he has been publishing about a book a year, and just seven weeks before Pearl Harbor he published his dynamic "Two-Way Passage." In a magazine article in *This Week* under date of November 8, 1942, he tells us that while we are training expeditionary forces for war, we should be training experts in the job of re-creating Europe. He adds:

"People in our immigrant groups know the old-country languages and customs or can learn them more quickly than others. They would inspire confidence in our intentions. And my thought is that they should go over, not only with material help but also as purposeful missionaries of democracy."

Mr. Adamic also gives us this illustration of striking force: "Recently Pearl Buck, who knows the Orient as no other American, came out in favor of extending a passage-back proposal to Japan. She calls attention to the loyal Japanese-Americans in evacuation centers on the Pacific coast, urging that they be trained here, now, for future governors, administrators and democratic leaders for post-war Japan."

He also says: "It is important to the starving millions abroad who will need not only food and medicine, but also competent, specially trained leadership, and who will surely prefer that leadership to be American and non-military."

The education for peace will be of slow growth, for doubtless America, Britain and Russia at the close of the war must temporarily police the world in its danger spots. Thus we see that victory will impose burdens almost as great as war.

Education has brought war ; may it not likewise bring peace? Hitler in *Mein Kampf* said : "The question is not how can we manufacture arms? Rather is it, How can we create the spirit which renders a people capable of bearing arms? When this spirit dominates a people, will-power finds a thousand ways each of which leads to a weapon."

C. J. Hambro is president of the Norwegian Storting and president of the Assembly of the League of Nations, but for the duration is living in Princeton, New Jersey. In a recent address he said that Scandinavian countries had been at war for a thousand years before 1814. The histories used in their schools told contradictory stories, but a joint committee of scholars from the northern countries revamped those textbooks, taking out of all books used in one country any line that might hurt the feelings of a citizen of the other. He adds : "There have been no catastrophic results. The Swedes have been educated to be better Swedes than they were, and the Norwegians better Norwegians."

Wendell L. Willkie in his radio address on October 26, 1942, said that the people of Russia and China were not satisfied with the Atlantic Charter ; they ask, What about a Pacific Charter? "They expect us *now*, not after the war, to use the enormous power of our giving to promote liberty and justice, *** the chance to help create a new society in which men and women, the globe around, can live and grow invigorated by freedom."

In my opinion there can not be too much discussion of plans for peace. There must be a meeting of minds upon the various elements involved. Then money must be poured out to attain that aim as lavishly as it was expended for the winning of the war.

Other nations must believe in our plan because they see it exemplified by the citizens of our beloved land. If we truly show it in our dealings with nations everywhere, such nations will gladly accept our missionaries of peace who come to examine their problems and assist in reaching objectives by the road which leads to world-wide peace.

Peace after the war is won will be the world's greatest problem. I close with the words of George Washington : "My sincerest wish is to behold war, the shame of mankind, driven from the earth." And of Lord Bryce : "If we do not destroy war, war will destroy us."