Cabinet, and the growing tendency of the President to make his plans without consultation either with the Senate or with the people—all these things have led thousands of intelligent Americans to ask, not as partisans but as free citizens, whether the President is not becoming, far more than is consistent with democratic welfare, an advocate of government by executive order.

THE OPPORTUNITY IN RUSSIA

The actual condition of affairs in Russia was described the other day in an address in New York by Prince Lvoff, who was the head of the Provisional Russian Government which came into power immediately after the abdication of the Czar. Prince Lvoff, as most of our readers know, is a sincere advocate of self-government and of sound democracy. He declared that his country has been "passing through terrible calamities"; that "there is complete anarchy in Russia;" and that this is the result of the "destructive activities of the Bolsheviki." This is a dark and true picture of the Russia of to-day. But hopeful opportunities for reconstruction and restoration are now open.

The defeat of Germany and the crushing of autocracy the world over that is involved will react on Russia. Already the effects are evident. To quote Prince Lvoff again, "the patient is showing signs of convalescence." One source of hope for Russia is the fact that in the armistice conditions, and doubtless more in the future peace conditions, insistence upon the freeing of Russia from German influence, financial, political, and commercial, is and will be prominent.

The rule of the Bolsheviki is a rule of a minority led by unscrupulous fanatics, maintained by the bayonets of disbanded soldiers in the large centers, and now, according to all accounts, disgraced by wholesale political assassination. It does not now, and never did, represent the Russian people.

There are signs in Russia itself of the rising tide of revolt against anarchy. In the Ukraine, for instance, the former Dictator, Skoropadski, who stood for German domination and represented those of the Ukrainians who were affiliated with the Bolsheviki, has been overthrown. His successor, General Denikine, has established a Provisional Government bitterly opposed to all that the Bolsheviki represent. Whether Ukraine will in the end prefer to remain independent or will join itself either directly or in a federated form to a restored and liberal Russia does not matter. The important thing now is that hereafter her influence will be thrown against the leaders who have released anarchy to the condition of Russia.

At Omsk a change in government also has taken place. When despatches announced that Admiral Kolchak had become "Dictator," the word had an ominous sound. But on examination of the facts it appears that what has taken place has not been an overthrow of the All-Russian Government at Omsk, nor even a defeat of the Directorate of that Government, but simply a change of leadership, with special emphasis placed on the military and naval aspects of the movement. Kolchak himself has long been known as a bitter opponent of Bolshevism, and his address to the people of Russia announced the continued purpose of the Omsk Government to be "the conquest of Bolshevism and the organization of right and order so that the people can select the form of government they desire." That General Seminoff in Eastern Siberia disapproves of Kolchak probably comes from the fact that Eastern Siberia, now rid of Bolshevism locally, cares less for the idea of All-Russia than for that of an independent Siberia. It remains true, as the New York Times says, that "in a recent editorial well puts it, that "a friendly, rational Government has arisen in Siberia out of the chaos of the past two years. If it is assisted, in time it may well prove one of the most powerful guarantors of the peace which will be made at Versailles."

In the restoration of Russia America should play a leading part. Most emphatically is the true world democracy is involved, for it is not only in Russia but throughout the world a struggle is going on, or threatened, between those who believe in self-government and those who plot class war. The contest is between rule by the people and rule by the proletariat. The issue is plain in Russia than elsewhere, but it may clearly be seen beneath the surface in the revolutionary movements now going on in Germany. It is impending also in this country in the industrial questions which will follow the war. The Bolsheviki and the L. W. W. stand for the same idea; they do not want anything but immediate and rapid victory of the proletariat. The red flag, originally designed by the early Socialists to stand for blood brotherhood and human progress, is now becoming the flag of revolution and anarchy. And when those who are preaching class war demand the victory of the proletariat they do not use that mouth-filling word to represent the common people, nor even the working people, but only that portion of the working people who adopt their war cry and their flag.

It is against this class war that lovers of democracy and all representative governments must array themselves the world over. Just now Russia is the battleground. It is of incalculable importance that we should aid in making, especially in Russia, a government of the people, by the people, for the people, in Lincoln's meaning of these words, and not in the false interpretation upheld by such wild theorists and terrorists as now misgovern in Moscow and Petrograd.

THE LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE

There now exists a League of twenty-three civilized nations who have just brought to a successful issue four years "fighting for peace." This League includes all the civilized Powers who could join it with safety to themselves. It is bound together by no constitution, no formal treaties. Any member could leave it at any time. Two members have left it during the war—Russia and Rumania; Russia voluntarily, Rumania under compulsion. Its only bond of union is a common spirit and a common purpose. It is fluid like a river; its peoples, like the drops of water in a river, make one organization because they are all flowing toward the same harbor—justice, law, and peace among the nations.

Twelve of these twenty-three Powers have been active contributors of money and men—Belgium, France, Great Britain, Italy, Russia, Rumania, Serbia, Montenegro, Greece, Portugal, Japan, and the United States. These twelve nations have co-operated in this war as one people. American grains have supplied England, France, and Belgium with food; British ships have furnished transportation to American soldiers; American destroyers and submarine-chasers have co-operated with the British navy in affording protection to the world's commerce; American, English, and French soldiers have been brigaded together; and all have fought as one army and under one commander-in-chief.

These twelve nations are now about to determine the conditions of a world peace. One of the questions before them is this: When those conditions are determined, shall the League be dissolved? Or shall it be continued, with such modifications as will tend to promote more than a European peace—a world peace?

The question whether we can make war impossible may be left to debating societies. The question of statesmen is, Can we make it easier to maintain peace and more difficult to provoke war?

Discredit has been thrown upon those who advocate a League of Nations by dreams of replacement of monarchs and the passions of democracy by the more practical and safe devices of Internationalism; who wish to restrain the world by creating a Republic of Nations. A Republic of Nations may grow, but it cannot be manufactured. It must be rooted in the supreme desires and intelligent purposes of the peoples of the various nations, or it will be powerless to resist the ambitions of monarchs and the passions of democracy. It is not a substitute for a League of Nations as is proposed due to the doubt whether the nations are so far civilized that they can trust in each other's promises.

There was a league of nations before the war. Germany was a member of that league. Its constitution provided some safeguards against war and some rules for making war more humane than it had been in the past. Germany disregarded this
constitution as waste paper, declared that "necessity knows no law," acknowledged that she was going to commit an act of injustice to her neighbor, and trusted to repair it afterward. It is clear, therefore, that any league to secure peace must be composed only of those nations who have a reasonable degree of confidence in each other's fidelity and integrity. We believe that those nations who have attained to a sense of civic duty, can wisely form a league, the object of which will be to make it easier to maintain peace and more difficult to provoke war. But only those nations should unite in forming such a league that have demonstrated their moral power to endure self-sacrifice for the promotion of other interests than their own. Such demonstration has been furnished by the twelve nations that have contributed money and men to the prosecution of this war—Belgium, France, Great Britain, Italy, Russia, Romania, Serbia, Montenegro, Greece, Portugal, Japan, and the United States. To such a league, once formed, other nations may be admitted, much as new States are admitted to the Union on evidence that they are likely to prove worthy members.

The object of such a League is not primarily to secure peace among the nations. It is primarily to secure justice. Charles Sumner, in his famous definition of war, says that its object is to determine a question of justice between the nations. The object of an International League is to find a better means than war to secure justice between the nations; it is to substitute the appeal to reason for the appeal to force. In this respect it would follow the method which individuals and organizations have long since adopted for the purpose of determining questions of justice which may arise within the nation.

A dream of such a League has been entertained by poets from very early ages. The first practical proposal for such an organization in recent times was made by Edward Everett Hale in an address delivered at the Lake Mohonk Conference in favor of International Arbitration in 1886—twenty-three years ago—who pointed out with characteristic clearness that the first step toward such a League must be the organization of a Permanent International Court of Justice. This suggestion was taken up and brought before the Hague Conference by America, and eventually adopted. Such a Permanent Court was organized, and now exists.

If Germany and Austria had chosen to accede to the urgent request of Italy, France, Great Britain, Russia, and Serbia, and had submitted to this court the question whether Serbia had followed the method which individuals and organizations have long since adopted for the purpose of determining questions of justice which may arise within the nation.

The scheme to make a League of Nations is subject to very serious objections; but there are two other methods of enforcing the decisions of an International League—public opinion and economic law. The force of international public opinion has been strikingly illustrated in this war. The public opinion of the twenty-three civilized nations has reinforced the guns of Foch and Pershing. It has gotten behind the barricage of the Central Powers, appealed to the reason and aroused the conscience of the common people in the autocratic empires, destroyed the morale of their armies, contributed largely to their military defeat, and has been one cause of the abolition of their autocracies and the dissolution of their empires.

This power of international public opinion, which, after the experience of Germany and Austria, is not likely to be treated with contempt by any Power, can be reinforced without act of war by non-intercourse. The London "Spectator," in its issue of October 26, 1918, contains an article on "The League of Nations," embodying suggestions for its constitution, and we can perhaps best indicate the nature of an edict of non-intercourse by quoting from this proposed constitution four articles:

Any Power against which a Decree of Non-Intercourse is passed by the Council of the League shall be styled and regarded as an Outlawed Power.

When a Power is outlawed all trade and other intercourse is forbidden between the Members of the League and the Outlawed Power.

No ship belonging to any Member of the League shall enter the ports of an Outlawed Power, and if, at the time of the Declaration of Outlawry, any ship is in an outlawed port she shall withdraw as soon as possible.

No ship belonging to an Outlawed Power is to be permitted to enter the ports of any Member of the League, and any ship in a port of Members of the League at the time of the issue of the Declaration shall be ordered to withdraw forthwith.

This would not be an act of war, though it might lead to war. For the outlawed nation might declare war against the League of Nations, though the League of Nations had not declared war against the outlawed nation.

This scheme will not satisfy those who hope to create at Versailles in January a League which will inaugurates the millennium, but it may satisfy those who are content with the humbler purpose of taking a first step toward making it easier to maintain peace and more difficult to provoke war. Other features have been variously proposed for this League of Nations. For example:

That the Council of Nations should be a permanent organization.

That there should be a representative Congress or Parliament to formulate rules of international law, a Parliament with perhaps at first only advisory powers.

That there should be an administrative organization for the conduct of affairs of common interest, the protection and care of backward nations, and other similar matters.

That there should be some provision for an International Tribunal before which individual citizens might bring complaints for any infringement of the fundamental rights of man in case of the violation of those rights by any one of the nations of the League.

That there should be an agreement according to which the nations would contribute naval and military forces for the protection of any member of the League against an unjust war.

That there should be an executive body able to speak in the name of the nations represented and to act in case the peace of the world were endangered.

These proposals we may take into consideration in future discussions. But in this article all we attempt to do is to indicate to skeptics that is possible to promote a League of Nations without abolishing nationalism, to create an international machinery for the expression and the peaceful enforcement of international opinion without organizing offhand a federation of the world.

It takes twenty-one years to develop a man sufficiently to make him worthy to vote in a municipal, State, or National election. It is not to be expected that a Republic of Nations, able to guarantee the peace of the world, can be perfected in a six weeks' session of a Peace Conference.

The scheme to make a League of Nations is subject to very serious objections; but there are still more serious objections to