

# Story of Mr. Bryan's Efforts to Promote World Peace

By HARRY W. WALKER

The grandeur of Rome was in its military system and severe laws. Its conquests, which left a trail of blood from the Mediterranean to Britain and from Asia to the Atlantic, have been translated into every tongue and taught in every school.

Tolstoy, the great teacher of humanity, the philosopher and student of man, early realized that there was a greater cause for man than conquest by the sword; that there was a greater theme than the shedding of blood and establishment of empires; that there were more lasting words than those which described great victories by battle. He pays a high compliment to the great peasant writer, Bondaref, and his far-reaching influence. To emphasize his high estimate of the enduring service rendered by Bondaref in advancing the doctrine of bread labor he compares his influence with the growth of Christianity.

"How strange and odd it would have seemed," he says, "to the educated Romans of the middle of the first century had any one told them that the obscure, confused and often unintelligible letters addressed by a wandering Jew to his friends and pupils would have a hundred, a thousand, a hundred thousand times more readers, more circulation, and more influence over people, than all the poems, odes, elegies and elegant epistles of the authors of that age, and yet that is what happened."

Tolstoy's reference to the influence of the teaching of Christ shows that he believes that the most lasting and widespread word is that which appeals to the best in man, and that the most revered act is that which makes humanity better one to the other.

Tolstoy believed in progress, but not the progress which appealed to the Roman statesman—with them conquest means progress, with them war is just; to arouse the martial spirit in youth is an ambition that should be cultivated, for by war alone can all disputes between nations be settled. To them "God is on the side that has the heaviest cannon," and to appeal to peaceful methods is to show weakness and to lose advantage.

Even in the glorious age of Greece, which has indelibly engraved itself upon all civilized nations, war was the only method of settling disputes, and the poetry and drama of that unequalled time was cast aside that blood might be shed.

Today Europe is dominated by the same feeling. The so-called civilization of 2,000 years ago was set aside in a day that men might satisfy their lust for one another's blood, and today and for many days Europe has been a slaughter house to an extent never before known in the world's history.

Amid this terrible condition the United States stands revered by the world, for from the United States has come a new policy that is destined to set a wider and deeper example and become a greater influence over the passions and ambitions of men than all the great writings and poems and dramas that deal with war combined.

It was 10 years ago that William Jennings Bryan first gave voice to the doctrine of peace, which is now embodied in 30 treaties negotiated by him as secretary of state. The Commoner of February 17, 1905, contained the following from his pen:

"It is time for the leading nations to join together in proffering their good offices for the settlement of the war in the east. There must be mediation some time, why not now? Russia can not hope to retake Port Arthur in years, if at all, and Japan will find war more expensive and more hazardous the farther her army marches inland. There has been killing enough on both sides to satisfy that absurd sense of honor which requires bloodshed. There never was a time when the Christian nations were under a more imperative duty to throw their influence on the side of peace, and the United States can well afford to take the lead because our relations with both Russia and Japan are such as to relieve us of any suspicion of selfish interest. And when peace is restored our na-

tion should take the initiative in promoting a system of arbitration so comprehensive THAT ALL DIFFERENCES WILL BE SUBMITTED TO THE ARBITRATION COURT, RESERVING TO EACH NATION THE RIGHT TO REFUSE TO ACCEPT THE FINDING IF IT BELIEVES THAT IT AFFECTS ITS HONOR OR INTEGRITY. Such a system would make war a remote possibility."

## ADVOCATED ARBITRATION OF ALL DISPUTES

A second editorial appeared February 24, 1905, a week later, and presented the idea more at length:

"It is possible to provide for the impartial investigation of any international dispute, leaving the final submission to arbitration. The president might be authorized to enter into an agreement to submit ANY AND EVERY INTERNATIONAL DISPUTE TO THE HAGUE COURT FOR INVESTIGATION. When the court reports upon the facts and presents the real issue between the parties THEN THE PARTIES CAN DECIDE INTELLIGENTLY WHETHER IT INVOLVES A PROPER QUESTION FOR ARBITRATION OR AFFECTS THE INTEGRITY AND HONOR OF EITHER NATION. Such an investigation would, in most cases, remove the misunderstanding and bring about a reconciliation, and public opinion would exert a powerful influence in harmonizing any differences which might be found to exist. If such a plan had been in operation the Russian-Japanese war might have been prevented. It is quite certain that a preliminary investigation by an impartial board would have prevented most of the international wars of the last half century, and would be still more effective in the future."

So great was the proposition then advanced that many failed to comprehend its magnitude, and there were journalists who even attempted to turn it to merry jest. Many men of prominence, after declaring that Mr. Bryan's theory was impractical, insisted he was a "dreamer," but Mr. Bryan found encouragement in this, remembering that Joseph, who "had the corn," as well as our own Thomas Jefferson, had been called "dreamers."

Even these doubters and scoffers were compelled to think again when, a few months later, in the fall of 1905, at Tokio, Mr. Bryan, addressing a large and distinguished Japanese audience, spoke in favor of an international peace. The great impression that this speech made upon the Japanese was reflected on the people here, besides attracting wide attention in Europe.

The next presentation of the plan was at the Peace Congress in London, July, 1906. Twenty-six nations were represented at this congress. Mr. Bryan received an invitation to the Peace Congress while he was in Norway, before reaching Great Britain. When he arrived in London he laid his plan before Lord Weardale, from whom the invitation was received, and whom Mr. Bryan had met two years before when a peace congress was held in the United States.

Lord Weardale at once indorsed the plan and thereafter gave Mr. Bryan effective and valuable support.

Mr. Bryan next presented the plan to Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, the British premier at the time. Sir Henry not only approved it, but in making his speech at the opening of the peace congress purposely made use of language which might be used as a basis for the introduction of the resolution which was afterward offered by Mr. Bryan and unanimously adopted by the congress. The resolution was as follows:

"If a disagreement should arise which is not included in those to be submitted to arbitration, the contracting parties shall not resort to any act of hostility before they separately or jointly invite, as the case may necessitate, the formation of the international commission of inquiry or mediation of one or more friendly powers, this requisition to take place, if necessary, in accordance with article VIII, of The Hague con-

vention, providing for the peaceful settlement of international conflicts."

The speech of Mr. Bryan in support of his resolution attracted world-wide attention and thousands in his own country who, previous to this, had regarded Mr. Bryan only in the light of a political leader, now regarded him as a Christian statesman and many American newspapers called him the "Gladstone of America."

In the spring of 1907 at the peace congress held in New York Mr. Bryan's plan was again adopted.

When President Taft was preparing the treaties with Great Britain and France, Mr. Bryan called upon him and presented his peace plan and urged that it be embodied in each treaty. The president was pleased with the plan and called in the secretary of state, who likewise expressed approval. During the same visit to Washington, Mr. Bryan called upon James Bryce, the British ambassador, whom he had met in Great Britain, and laid the plan before him. The plan in part was embodied in these treaties. The senate did not object to this part of the treaties, but the objection which prevented confirmation was made to another provision. Shortly after this, when visiting Lincoln, Neb., President Taft, in his speech, gave great credit to Mr. Bryan for having suggested this feature in the treaties.

When President-elect Wilson invited Mr. Bryan to Trenton, after the election of 1912, and tendered him the position of secretary of state, Mr. Bryan mentioned his peace plan as something that could be worked out through the state department. This suggestion received the cordial approval of the president-elect. Soon after Mr. Wilson's inauguration, early in April, the matter was again brought to the attention of the president. He laid it before the cabinet, and then, with the president's approval, Mr. Bryan consulted the senate committee on foreign relations. After obtaining the indorsement of the principle by the committee, to make sure of the ratification of the treaties, he presented the plan in writing, with a verbal explanation, to the representatives of all the governments, the offer being made to enter into such treaty with each of the nations severally. After the indorsement of the principle a note was sent to each of the ambassadors and ministers, presenting the plan in detail.

The republic of Salvador was the first to agree to the terms of the treaty, the convention being signed on August 7, 1913.

I had occasion to call upon Mr. Bryan that day and I will never forget his look of intense happiness as he handed me a copy of the first peace treaty.

Thirty-three nations have indorsed the principles embodied in the plan, and 30 have entered into treaties in the order named:

1. Salvador	Aug. 7, 1913
2. Guatemala	Sept. 20, 1913
3. Panama	Sept. 20, 1913
4. Honduras	Nov. 3, 1913
5. Nicaragua	Dec. 17, 1913
6. Netherlands	Dec. 18, 1913
7. Bolivia	Jan. 22, 1914
8. Portugal	Feb. 4, 1914
9. Persia	Feb. 4, 1914
10. Denmark	Feb. 5, 1914
11. Switzerland	Feb. 13, 1914
12. Costa Rica	Feb. 13, 1914
13. Dominican Republic	Feb. 17, 1914
14. Venezuela	March 21, 1914
15. Italy	May 5, 1914
16. Norway	June 24, 1914
17. Peru	July 14, 1914
18. Uruguay	July 20, 1914
19. Brazil	July 24, 1914
20. Argentina	July 24, 1914
21. Chili	July 24, 1914
22. Paraguay	Aug. 29, 1914
23. France	Sept. 15, 1914
24. Great Britain	Sept. 15, 1914
25. Spain	Sept. 15, 1914
26. China	Sept. 15, 1914
27. Russia	Oct. 1, 1914
28. Ecuador	Oct. 13, 1914
29. Greece	Oct. 13, 1914
30. Sweden	Oct. 13, 1914

These governments exercise authority over nearly twelve hundred millions—with our population, fully three-fourths of the inhabitants of the globe. Germany, Austria, and Belgium have accepted the principle, but treaties with these countries have not yet been concluded. Mr. Bryan believes that Japan will be added to the list of treaty nations as soon as the California question is settled. A treaty with Colombia unquestionably will be made if the treaty with