

## VETERANI IN FILANTROPIJA PO VELIKI VOJNI: VLOGA IN STALIŠČA FUNDACIJE CARNEGIE ZA MEDNARODNI MIR

## VETERANS AND PHILANTHROPY AFTER THE GREAT WAR: ROLE AND REPRESENTATIONS FROM THE CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

**Povzetek** V letih 1918 in 1919 se je Fundacija Carnegie za mednarodni mir (CEIP) znašla v vodstvu akterjev, ki so izšli iz vojne in stopili na novo politično prizorišče. Kot nevladna organizacija se je na podlagi mednarodnega prava zavzemala za boljše razumevanje mednarodnih vprašanj. Namen tega prispevka, ki se opira na arhivsko gradivo Fundacije CEIP, je predstaviti, kako je velika vojna vplivala na pogled te fundacije na vojaka, ko se je ta vrnil v civilno življenje. V dokumentih se zastavlja veliko vprašanj, med drugimi: Kako je vojak opisan kot žrtev vojne? Kako bosta družba in vlada obravnavali vprašanje »invalidov«? Po vojni je fundacija začela uresničevati velikopotezen program, namenjen tako kratkoročnim kot dolgoročnim vprašanjem, ki so nastala zaradi vojne. V letih 1919 in 1920 je vodila dva velika projekta: v Beogradu je prevzela gradnjo velike knjižnice, ki naj bi stala v novem univerzitetnem naselju, v Rusiji pa je uvedla obsežen projekt pomoči beguncem. Vodenje obeh projektov je predala dvema veteranoma, častnikoma oboroženih sil ZDA. Članek je empirična študija, ki opisuje, kako sta ta nekdanja borca vodila projekta, ki sta bila v bistvu zasnovana kot programa za spodbujanje mednarodne sprave. Poleg tega poudarja tudi neposredni vlogi dveh ključnih voditeljev Fundacije CEIP, Nicholasa Butlerja, predsednika Univerze Columbia, in Elihuja Roota, prvega predsednika fundacije.

**Ključne besede** *Fundacija CEIP, mednarodne zadeve, prva svetovna vojna, veterani, ponovna vključitev.*

**Abstract** In 1918-1919, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (CEIP) positioned it self at the vanguard of the actors emerging from the war in the new political

landscape<sup>1</sup>. As a non-governmental organization the CEIP promoted a better understanding of international issues through international law. Drawing from the Carnegie archives, this paper seeks to present how the Great War shaped the CEIP's perception of the soldier once he was back in civilian life. The documents raise an array of questions: How was the soldier described as a victim of the war? How would society and the government deal with the issues of the "invalids"? Following the war, the Endowment launched an ambitious programme addressing both immediate and long-term issues born out of the war. In 1919-1920, the CEIP ran two major operations: in Belgrade, the CEIP undertook the building of a large library to be located in the new university campus, and in Russia, it set up a large relief operation to help refugees. In both cases, the CEIP handed the operations to two veteran US military officers. This paper, an empirical study, describes how these two ex-combatants ran what was primarily a programme promoting international conciliation. It also emphasizes the direct role of two key Carnegie leaders, Nicholas Butler, the president of Columbia University, and Elihu Root, the first CEIP president.

**Key words** *Carnegie Endowment, international affairs, World War I, veterans, reintegration.*

**Introduction** In 1918-1919, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (CEIP), a US-based philanthropic organization, was a newcomer on the international stage. Created a few years before the Great War on December 14, 1910, by Andrew Carnegie (1835-1919), the man known as the "King of Steel", the CEIP positioned itself at the vanguard of the actors emerging from the war in the new political international landscape (Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (CEIP), 1941). As a non-governmental organization, the Endowment played a substantial role in re-defining international affairs, institutionalizing the concept of peace through law elaborated by the pre-war Peace Movement at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>2</sup> Organized into the three divisions of International Affairs and Education, International Law, and Economics and History, the CEIP was structured as a transnational and transatlantic network, with offices located in New York and Paris. As one of the first "think-tanks" of modern times, the Endowment gathered together a group of cross-disciplinary international scholars and jurists; its members belonged to the academic elite and governmental circles on both sides of the Atlantic and thus formed a body of international experts.

The main feature of the CEIP was to study the causes of war, and especially to determine its impact on civilians both during warfare and after the conflict (Carnegie

<sup>1</sup> From its creation, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace was also called the Endowment. Today, as in this paper; historians and researchers continue to use both terminologies to describe Andrew Carnegie's international organization.

<sup>2</sup> The Peace Movement became institutionalized after the two peace conferences of 1899 and 1907, gathering 26 and 44 states respectively at The Hague. In 1907, the conference was called at the suggestion of President Theodore Roosevelt (1858-1919) addressing further the issues of the rules of war. James Brown Scott (1866-1943), the head of the CEIP International Law division, was part of the US delegation.

Endowment for International Peace (CEIP), 1941, p. V). How can one define the parameters and position of the Carnegie leadership in relation to the unexpected link between an organization advocating peace and its leaders' preoccupation with the study of war? The CEIP approach was to combine scientific philanthropy with strategic giving in order to advance the cause of peace (Peter Weber, 2015).<sup>3</sup> Two of its most prominent leaders, Nicholas Murray Butler (1862-1947), the high-powered president of Columbia University up to 1945, and Elihu Root (1845-1937), Andrew Carnegie's lawyer, former US Secretary of War and Secretary of State, decided before 1914 that the aim was to reveal the direct and indirect consequences of warfare and thus to address its validity in international affairs (The Berne Conference of Economists and Publicists, 1911). Consequently, the military – the soldier – was central to the study, viewed as a corollary to the civilian in warfare and perceived as a key element by the CEIP leadership. In the aftermath of the Great War, the ex-combatant acquired a particular dimension. For the CEIP leadership, the veteran embodied the consequences of the war in terms of his status, reintegration into civilian society and the practical aspects of the post-war reconstruction process, viewed, in the eyes of the CEIP leadership, as part of international conciliation.

Building on a previous work presented at the CSWG held in Athens in 2015 and following a similar approach, this paper is an empirical study based on the Carnegie archives.<sup>4</sup> The main purpose is to examine how the presence of ex-soldiers manifests itself within societies in the midst of the demobilization process. The paper presents how the veteran appears in the Carnegie Endowment archives from two angles: firstly, as a subject of thought and concern, and secondly in the way in which veterans participated in the reconstruction programme set up by the Endowment immediately after November 1918. On a broader scale, the Endowment leadership addressed the veteran as an individual, one of a kind, outside the army and the collective dimension that existed during the war. But, at the same time, the CEIP documents also sought to establish how the veteran was in need of a social structure in order to be able to define his status and defend his rights, considering his relationship to the state he belonged to.

## **1 THE VETERAN IN THE CEIP DOCUMENTS: PERCEPTION AND REPRESENTATION FROM THE CEIP LEADERSHIP**

### **1.1 The “returned soldier”**

As a preliminary remark, it is important to note that there were no military at the head of the Carnegie Endowment neither among the leadership nor among the trustees. Throughout the post World War I period, only Elihu Root, as ex-Secretary of War

<sup>3</sup> In this excellent article Peter Weber defines philanthropic internationalism and confronts the two giant figures of Andrew Carnegie and Edwin Ginn.

<sup>4</sup> CEIP Records, Rare Book and Manuscript Library (RBML), Columbia University, Series III, Topical volumes (1910-1940) and European Center, consisting of the letters exchanged between d'Estournelles de Constant and Nicholas Butler, as well as personal notes, press clips, official reports, recounts of meetings and visual material (photos and drawings).

(1899-1904), had a direct relationship with the military. However, since the CEIP's ultimate objective was to promote peaceful settlements of international disputes and to regulate war through international law, the soldier was a central figure, as a civilian who had been turned into a combatant/fighter and who, once the war was over, was returned to civilian life as an ex-combatant, one who has been enlisted in the army. The word "veteran" does not appear in the CEIP documents; instead, the term used for someone who had fought in a war is "the returned soldier".

The CEIP reports and exchanges between its leaders show how the soldier figured in the leadership's thoughts and concerns. In the post First World War context, the soldier back in civilian life is depicted from two specific angles: firstly, as a victim of the war and a mutilated person or maimed body. The head of the Carnegie office in Paris, d'Estournelles de Constant (1852-1924), in his correspondence addressed to Nicholas Butler in New York, described the physical trauma of the ex-combatants in poignant words, using a strong vocabulary and listing the visible and multiple details, the missing arms or legs, the crutches, the disfigured faces damaged forever (CEIP Records, 1921). He also underlined what he called the "mute despair" of the disabled soldiers, and how they were perceived by society as an "obstacle" (obstruction), "dead weight" or "object of horror".<sup>5</sup> The documents raise an array of questions, such as: What could be the conditions for their return into civilian society? How would civilian society deal with the issues of the "invalids"? How would the government take care of them, especially with regard to practical aspects, such as pensions and costs? The wording, as well as the issues described in the CEIP reports, are a reflection of the discriminatory attitudes that had prevailed before the war, when society associated disabilities with moral failure. One should also notice that d'Estournelles de Constant also addressed how the veterans, with their physical appearance resulting from the war, were aiming to build for themselves a new social identity. Consequently, they created organizations to influence state policies in order not only to be recognized as a collective social entity, but also to obtain enhanced benefits (Gerber, 2003). In 1918, d'Estournelles de Constant discussed at length the Congress of the Mutilated and Wounded held in Lyon on February 24-26 (Guieu, 2015).<sup>6</sup> This major meeting later gave birth to the Federal Union of French Associations.<sup>7</sup> He likened the congress to the *French Etats Généraux* of 1789, which led to the French Revolution (Sarthe Departementales Archives 1918). Besides this probably overstated but powerful image, d'Estournelles de Constant was genuinely concerned with how to implement practical measures to help the victims of the war. Further, he elevated ex-combatants to the status of a new, united and coherent social group with special needs to be addressed by the government. He also compared their claims for pensions to the demands made by the *Etats Généraux* in 1789, calling them by the same name "notebooks claims" or "*cahiers de revendications*". Finally,

<sup>5</sup> The terms used in French are: "poids morts", "objets d'horreurs", "ils sont encombrants".

<sup>6</sup> In 1918, associations of mutilated and discharged soldiers started to gather to form one single organization. Following the Congress of Lyon, the Federal Union (UF) was officially created.

<sup>7</sup> *Union fédérale des associations françaises d'anciens combattants et victimes de guerre.*

in an unexpected way, he conceived a new division of French society into three “orders” (again using pre-1789 terminology) that would include the bourgeoisie, the people, and the victims of the Great War. He attributed to the latter a power that will allow them to rise against all “war partisans past, present and future”. He saw this group as extending far beyond the French borders and rejoining other ex-combatants’ associations to form “Les États Généraux du Monde”, a transnational community. In that sense, one can see here an example of Patricia Clavin’s theory on the formation of transnationalism, when she writes that “transnationalism is about exploring connections” between elite groups and wider ones, including soldiers (Clavin 2005, p. 427).

The future of the ex-combatants is also addressed in terms of education. As d’Estournelles de Constant rightly underlined, “our youth” had been left without education for the past five years or more according to the age of the soldier (Sarthe Départementales Archives, 1919). How could these young men join or re-enter the workplace without training, instruction or even a basic school education? For Andrew Carnegie, education of the public was one of his main concerns. Following the war, giving free access to knowledge to everyone would be one of the CEIP’s objectives. As a scientific philanthropist, Carnegie established a unique and exceptional network of public libraries, a path continued by the Endowment leaders after 1919 (see after part II).

The second perspective in which the topic of the veteran is discussed in the CEIP archives is linked to the study of economic questions during and after the wartime period. Because of injuries and disabilities resulting from the war, the “returned soldier” was perceived as potentially being excluded from the workforce. Consequently, he was considered as a financial charge, a “burden” for the state, and included in the statistics dealing with the cost of the war. This approach goes back to 1911. On the initiative of Nicholas Butler, the CEIP launched a project to study the war using a scientific approach and focusing on the relationship between economics as part of the civilian domain and the war (CEIP Records, 1911). At a gathering in Berne, about 20 world economists specialists discussed the effects of the war and, opting for a quantitative approach, they included among the destruction of national productive forces both disability and the lost of human beings (CEIP Records, 1911).<sup>8</sup> The first application of this innovative thinking was incorporated in the Balkan Report of 1914, which examined the causes of the two Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913.<sup>9</sup> Chapter 6 of the report emphasized how the mutilated – the “invalids” – could “no longer be counted on for the prosperity of the land”. They were deprived and reduced greatly in strength. This concern for the “invalids” extended to the following unexpected comment: “This is an economic result of war to be noted: the creation of the artificial leg industry” (Report of the International Commission

<sup>8</sup> *The Conference was called by the Division of Political Economy and History.*

<sup>9</sup> *The Balkan Wars (October 1912-August 1913) set a precedent in the new century for massive atrocities on every single side. The military forces have been estimated at one million (700 000 against 300 000 Ottomans).*

to Inquire the Causes and Conducts of the Balkan Wars, 1914, p. 243). In a practical way, the author added that, “the period of regular financial settlement began” (Report of the International Commission to Inquire the Causes and Conducts of the Balkans Wars, 1914, pp. 235-236). In the Balkan Report’s appendix, one can find, in the statistics on the costs of the wars in the case of Bulgaria and Greece, a detailed account of how pensions should be granted to invalided soldiers and officers (Report of the International Commission to Inquire the Causes and Conducts of the Balkans Wars, 1914, p. 381 and p. 389). On a more positive note, Chapter 7 opens with descriptions of the returned soldiers and their participation in the victory celebrations with joyful processions, “triumphal arches, banners, flowers and music” (Report of the International Commission to Inquire the Causes and Conducts of the Balkans Wars, 1914, p. 266).

At the end of the conflict, the study of the war project resumed under the direction of James Shotwell (1874-1964), appointed as head of the CEIP division of Economy and History. About 150 volumes were published between 1921 and 1937, and several of them are dedicated to the specific topic of the ex-combatants and their reintegration as civilians into society. One can note the following examples, from the British series: Dr. E. Cunygham Brown, “Health of the Returned Soldiers” (1924), Edward T. Delvine, “Disabled Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Pensions and Training” (1919), and from the French series, Rene Cassin and de Ville-Chabrolle: “The Wounded Soldiers” (1924).

One could summarize the CEIP perception of the “returned soldier” as follows: based on the terrifying observation that the veteran was perceived primarily and foremost as “a mutilated body”, he was therefore incapable of rejoining the workforce and could no longer pursue a normal existence. Consequently, he became a financial charge for the state, which, however, was from then on responsible for his well-being and his new socioeconomic position in society.

## **2 THE VETERANS IN THE CEIP RECONSTRUCTION PROGRAMME POST WORLD WAR ONE**

The second part of this paper describes how the Endowment as a private organization, decided to call for military officers to run what was primarily a programme promoting international conciliation through reconstruction. In 1919-1920, the Carnegie leaders set up an ambitious programme addressing immediate and long-term issues born out of the conflict. The CEIP launched two major operations, one dealing with the refugee crisis in Russia in the midst of the Civil War, and the other addressing education of the public and free access to knowledge in the post war context. Why did the CEIP choose veterans to run these two post war operations? What was the process? How did these officers/ex-combatants work with civilians to face situations born of a war they had been involved in?

## 2.1 The Belgrade CEIP operation

In 1919, a reconstruction programme in urban areas was launched: the building of large libraries in Belgium, France and Yugoslavia (N. Akhund, 2011). The project, conceived as a triple European operation, was achieved in 1928 (CEIP Records, 1918).<sup>10</sup> In Belgrade, the building of a new university library began in 1920. It was a full Carnegie operation, involving a committee of seven members chaired by a former lieutenant in the US Navy, Leo Capser (1893-1975), who was hired as the CEIP representative. The construction process did not encounter any major obstacles; the Endowment was determined to achieve the building and the Serbian/Yugoslav authorities needed to rebuild the capital and to organize a complete new state altogether. In that sense, the University Library bore a symbolic meaning. The complexity of the task came from the articulation of the relationship between a private group that had taken the initiative to launch the project and two governments. Lieutenant Capser played a crucial role as coordinator. On June 23, 1921, a lavish ceremony for the laying of the cornerstone took place, and the University Rector, Slobodan Jovanović (1869-1958), praised the Carnegie Endowment as “one of the greatest and most humanitarian powers of our age...we are fortunate that our university is in this way connected to such a highly cultural country”.<sup>11</sup> He praised Capser personally for his work and his open sympathy for Serbia. Leo Capser answered in both English and Serbian, a gesture that the Serbian officials appreciated. He received the “Grand Cross of Saint Sava” from Prince Alexander. The building was officially completed in May 1926.

Who was Lieutenant Capser? What was his role in the running of the operation? Leo Capser was recommended by Cordenio Severance (1862-1925), one of the CEIP trustees, whom he had met in 1917 when Severance was travelling to Serbia as chairman of the US Red Cross Commission. Twenty-eight years old, Capser had studied engineering and business administration at the University of Minnesota.<sup>12</sup> In 1916, he was posted to Salonika as assistant manager to the local office of the Standard Oil Company of New York. Later, he joined the American Navy as a lieutenant and was stationed in France. Towards the end of the war, he was assigned to the American Relief Administration (Hoover Foundation) in Southern Serbia, and by 1919 he was back in the United States. Severance underlined Capser’s knowledge of Serbia as “by reason of his residence in Salonika at the time the Serbian government was located there, and through his subsequent service in relief administration, Mr. Capser has a very wide and intimate acquaintance with Serbian officials” (CEIP Records, 1920). Severance praised how Capser was willing to take full responsibility for carrying the work and how he seemed to be a very determined, engaging young

---

<sup>10</sup> Ladeuze, Rector of Leuven University, expressed his gratitude to the US national committee headed by Butler. The project of a library was justified because of the association of Mr. Carnegie, of his own personal work and of his benefactions with libraries..

<sup>11</sup> Speeches were made by the Mayor of Belgrade, the Rector, the Ministers of Education and the Interior, the American Charge d’Affaires, Capser himself, and the last one by a Serbian student.

<sup>12</sup> Capser was born in 1893. His grandfather had emigrated from Germany (Bavaria) in 1846 to the United States.

man (CEIP Records, 1920).<sup>13</sup> On December 11, 1920, Lieutenant Casper signed a contract to represent the Endowment in Belgrade for six months. In a personal letter, Butler spelled out his role and the task: Casper would be in charge of overseeing the entire building process and be responsible for all disbursements. He also had to have the entire project approved and signed by the Serbian authorities. On February 3, 1921, Leo Casper left New York for Belgrade.

The first meeting of the Committee took place on February 28, 1921, at the Ministry of Public Instruction. In attendance were the Minister of Education, Svetozar Prbićević (1875-1936), Slobodan Jovanović (1869-1958), Rector of the University in Belgrade and also a public figure as Professor of Law and History, the architects, Nikola Nestorović (1868-1957), Professor at Belgrade University, Professor Dragutin Georgević (1866-1933), Andra Stevanović (1859-1929) and the US ambassador, Percival Dodge. Leo Casper occupied the central position in this web of diverse people. One can only imagine the complexity of the task for someone coming from such a different environment as the United States (Minnesota). He maintained a thorough correspondence with the CEIP, showing a sense of duty, a professional consciousness and an awareness of what was at stake with this ambitious project. An overall friendly climate was established between the committee members, and Casper was at ease with everyone. All decisions were to be taken unanimously. Furthermore, payments and disbursements would bear the two signatures of Casper and Jovanović, showing the project as a full cooperation between the CEIP and Belgrade University. In the same spirit, Casper took the minutes of the meetings in English and Jovanović would translate them into Serbian.

Casper's reports are a valuable testimony. In his letters addressed to the CEIP leaders, Casper expressed personal opinions. He insisted on the remarkable cooperation from the officials and the architects, and repeatedly used the word "friendship". He spoke Serbian well enough to have a direct relationship with the people he was working with: "I am still glad to state that the officials with whom I have been working have given the most satisfactory cooperation and appear exceptionally competent, and have shown an initiative that makes me optimistic" (CEIP Records, 1921). The library can be seen as a symbol of Andrew Carnegie's life and achievement, even though he himself never saw the building or even the project, as he died on August 11, 1919. The entire project came to fruition because of the determination of Nicolas Butler and Cordonio Severance, and on the ground, thanks to Leo Casper. As a soldier, Casper asked an interesting question: Was it possible to attribute a political meaning to the library project? This point is an arguable, even a debatable question. However, I include it as Casper himself raised the issue linking the building of the library to the creation of the new Kingdom (CEIP Records, 1921). Casper made a strong political statement about the new constitution, "which at once gave confidence to the people and a noticeable change in the attitude of the officials and in the economic

<sup>13</sup> Severance wrote: *From the standpoint of view of education, experience and acquaintance, he is in my opinion an especially valuable man for this task. This is the original sentence from the archives. It can be corrected or modified. Thank you.*

perspective”. Furthermore, he saw this constitution as a unifying element for the new state. He perceived the new set of institutions, including the future University and its library, as a vital binding force. In an intriguing way, he began the last section of his report by describing the work’s progress, and then, without transition, he jumped to the topics of the constitution and the parliament. It almost seemed that the construction work of the library and one of the state institutions were completely merging. He ended his writing by advising the CEIP to pursue its aid in economic developments. Finally, he added a list of suggestions on how to help Yugoslavia, ranging from a call for funds to subsidising books written by members of the faculty or of the parliament. He also wished to attract the attention of US medical institutions, which could help the Medical Faculty in Belgrade. On several occasions, he presented the library not only as a gift from the Carnegie Endowment, but as a way to bring the USA and the Kingdom closer together. While at a press congress in Sarajevo, he insisted that the building would cement “the bonds of friendship between our countries” (CEIP Records, 1921).

The very active, personal and direct role of Leo Capser is to be acknowledged. From his reports and personal notes, it appears that his initiatives and his great understanding of the complex political situation were a decisive and essential contribution to the project. Leo Capser may be an unknown figure in history, but his role was influential and even essential.

## 2.2 The CEIP operation in Russia

The second operation run by the CEIP under the supervision of an ex-combatant took place in Russia, at the same time as the building of the Belgrade library was beginning. It was a relief operation and it bears what we call today a humanitarian feature. During the spring of 1920, the CEIP turned its attention to the dramatic distressed situation of White Russian refugees. Russia had initially been included in the plan, adopted by the CEIP Executive Committee in 1917, to assist European reconstruction along with France, Belgium and Serbia. However, by 1919 the Bolshevik Revolution had led the CEIP to limit aid to the refugees gathered in the various border areas of the former Russian Empire (J. Prudhommeaux, 1921, p. 46). If the February Russian Revolution had been welcomed and perceived as a peaceful end to the Tsarist regime, viewed as autocratic and despotic, the CEIP leaders became concerned by the Bolshevik government, the spread of violence and by the extreme brutality of the civil war. In this case, the CEIP did not appoint a local committee, as in Belgrade. The relief operation was organized by the American Central Committee (ACC) for Russian Relief, newly created in December 1919. However, Elihu Root, who was then the president of the Carnegie Endowment, had a strong interest in Russia, and was one of the four AAC vice-presidents.

As so often when it came to Eastern Europe, it was Nicholas Butler himself who took the initiative after discussing the matter with Root. By early April 1920, Root had drawn Butler’s attention to the following three points: first, the people who were fleeing Russia were precisely those the country was depending on to build the future

Russian Republic, i.e. professional and trained teachers, doctors, businessmen and other educated people. Second, they were badly in need of necessary relief and aid: “They must be fed and clothed and have medicine and medical care, or they will die” (CEIP Records, 1920). Third, he suggested organizing help through the American Central Committee for Russian Relief, as this committee was equipped and had the facilities for the application of such relief aid. Butler fully approved his friend’s proposal, as the situation in Russia “would make it perfectly justifiable to offer relief in the way you outline” (CEIP Records, 1920). In May, the board of trustees decided to use parts of the funds appropriated for reconstruction and relief in the regions devastated by the war to help the Russian refugees. James Scott Brown (1866-1943), head of the International Law division at the CEIP, was in touch with Montgomery Schuyler (1877-1955), a former US Army Captain who had served on the General Staff in Siberia in 1918-1919 and was the secretary of the AAC for Russian Relief. The two men met through Elihu Root. The allocated funds, a total sum of \$50,000, were then sent within a few weeks (CEIP Records, 1920).<sup>14</sup> Starting in the autumn-winter of 1920, the relief operation covered a very large geographical area that extended from Scandinavia, Finland, and the Baltic States to Istanbul, including Poland, Germany, France, Southern Russia (Crimea, Tifflis) and Greece, Bulgaria, and Serbia, as well as on to Jerusalem and at its farthest point, Japan (CEIP Records, 1920). Captain Montgomery Schuyler was responsible for the exact allocation and distribution of funds in each country. When he asked what kind of publicity the Endowment was wishing for, the Executive Committee instructed him to mention that the funds had been taken from a Carnegie grant and should be advertised as such (CEIP Records, 1920). In the same documents, relief aid for civilians in Armenia and Syria was planned, but there is no evidence in the archives that this operation actually took place. Discussions were held in May-June 1919 with representatives of the American Committee for Armenia and Syrian relief, of which Elihu Root was also one of the directors.

Captain Montgomery Schuyler presents a very different profile from that of Lieutenant Capser in Serbia. Born in 1877, he graduated from Columbia University and started a career in diplomacy. In 1902, he was sent to Saint Petersburg as second secretary at the US Embassy, and again in 1907. When the war started, he returned to Russia as special agent to the State Department to assist the US Ambassador. Then, in 1916, he was once again in Russia as Special Correspondent for *The New York Times*, and he wrote about 20 articles that year, at least four of which were about refugees, displaced people and food supply issues in Russian cities. In 1919, he was Chief of Staff of the American Expeditionary Forces (AEF) in Siberia.<sup>15</sup> His interests, gift for observation and detailed knowledge of Russian affairs and politics, in addition to his contact with Elihu Root, made him the perfect candidate to supervise the relief operation. According to the archives, it does not seem that Schuyler was hired specifically

<sup>14</sup> Overall, the files about Schuyler contain scarce information; there are no personal notes or letters.

<sup>15</sup> The American Expeditionary Force Siberia was a United States Army force sent during the Russian Civil War (1918-1920). However, due to Russia’s harsh weather conditions, the forces did not fight any battles. The AEF consisted of 7,950 officers and enlisted men.

by the CEIP to run the operation, nor did he sign a contract, but as AAC secretary he was fully in charge of it. He sent several statements to the Endowment leaders explaining how the funds had been divided between the various states located along Russia's borders (CEIP Records, 1920). Schuyler also mentioned that donations and distributions of warm clothing and food were made where relief seemed most necessary, according to the ACC's own reports.

In the post World War I context, the veterans represented here by Lieutenant Casper and Captain Schluyer created an unexpected link between the military and a well-known philanthropic organization, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. In both cases, the CEIP handed the running of the operations to two veterans –two US military officers who monitored the entire logistics of the operation. These two operations also emphasize the direct and personal role of two key CEIP leaders, Nicholas Butler, the president of Columbia University, and Elihu Root, the first CEIP president.

## Conclusion

As a non-governmental organization, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace stands at the crossroads between the state authorities and private groups represented by leaders in the financial and industrial sectors. Therefore, following the war, the CEIP was in a unique position to better grasp the extremely complex transition phase in which the “returned soldier” found himself, being demobilized but not yet returned to civilian life. Even if the Carnegie leaders were not directly in charge of veterans, it demonstrated how a private group participated in the process of reinsertion and rehabilitation by taking the initiative to designate ex-combatants to complete projects linked to the aftermath of the war. Hiring military people can be seen as part of the process to return an ex-combatant back to civilian life. From “war maker to peace maker”, the soldier who fought on the front line was then put in charge of building an organized peace. Therefore the veteran stood at the intersection of military and civilian life (J. Eicheberg, 2013).

## Bibliography

1. Akhund, N., 2011. “The work of the Carnegie Endowment in the Balkans after World War I: The University Library of Belgrade 1919-1926”, *Infotheca*, 2/vol. XII, pp. 3-21.
2. “The Berne Conference of Economists and Publicists” 1911. *American Society of International Law*, vol. 5/4, pp. 1037-1044.
3. *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace Records, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University, New York Series IIIB, Topical volumes (1910-1940), European Center, Series IIIC.*
4. *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, (1941). Summary of Organization and Work 1911-1941. Washington.*
5. *CEIP Records, vol. 142/box 480, d'Estournelles de Constant to Butler, January 31, 1921.*
6. *CEIP Records, vol. 148/box 483, Butler to Clark, May 9, 1911.*
7. *CEIP Records, vol.148/box 483, August 11, 1911.*
8. *CEIP Records vol. 52, Ladeuze to the National Committee, December 26, 1918.*
9. *CEIP Records, vol. 63, Politika (English translation), June 23, 1921.*

10. *CEIP Records*, vol. 53, November 17, 1920, Severance to Butler.
11. *CEIP Records*, vol. 59, Capser to the CEIP Committee, April 15, 1921.
12. *CEIP Records*, vol. 56, Capser final report to CEIP, September 28, 1921.
13. *CEIP Records*, vol. 56, Capser to CEIP, September 28, 1921.
14. *CEIP Records*, vol. 53, Root to Butler, April 5, 1920.
15. *CEIP Records*, vol. 53, Butler to Root, April 6, 1920.
16. *CEIP Records*, vol. 53, Scott Brown to Schuyler, May 15, 1920.
17. *CEIP Records*, vol. 53, Schuyler to Scott Brown, May 22, 1920.
18. *CEIP Records*, vol. 53, Schuyler to Scott Brown, June 9, 1920.
19. *CEIP Records*, vol. 53, Schuyler to Scott Brown, January 10 and 18, 1920.
20. Clavin, P., 2005. "Defining Transnationalism" *Contemporary European History* 14/4. pp. 421-439.
21. Eichenberg, J., John Paul Newman, John Paul (ed.), 2013. *The Great War and Veterans' Internationalism*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan
22. Gerber, D. A., 2003. "Disabled veterans, the state, and the experience of disability in Western societies, 1914-1950", *Journal of Social History* 36/4. pp. 899-916.
23. Guieu, J. M., 2015. *Gagner la Paix 1914-1929*, Paris: Seuil.
24. Mazower, M., 2012. *Governing the World*, New York: The Penguin Press
25. Prudhommeaux, J., 1921. *Le centre européen de la Dotation Carnegie pour la paix internationale 1911-1921*. CEIP: Rue Pierre Curie.
26. *Report of the International Commission to Inquire the Causes and Conducts of the Balkan Wars, 1914*. Washington DC: CEIP.
27. Sarthe Départementales Archives, Le Mans, France 12J385, d'Estournelles de Constant to Butler, March 4, 1918.
28. Sarthe Départementales Archives, Le Mans, 12J386, d'Estournelles de Constant to Butler, March 2, 1919.
29. Weber, P., 2015. "The Pacifism of Andrew Carnegie and Edwin Ginn: The Emergence of Philanthropic Internationalism", *Global Society* 29/4, pp. 530-550.