

national regulation of labor conditions. Decisions were taken at the League's Labor Conference at Washington with regard to the application of an eight-hour day, night work for women and children in factories, unemployment, the protection of women at child-birth, and the labor of children under fourteen. The machinery for applying these decisions is now being worked out in detail. This particular undertaking has been, by general admission, an almost unqualified success, and no

one can mistake its importance. I will not dwell on it further except to point out three things: that representatives of both employers and employed, and also of government, were present; that both Entente representatives and representatives of Germany and Austria are now present; and that the force of mere publicity was found to be overwhelming in bringing doubtful or recalcitrant parties into line. The League could not have started with better omens.

[*Nya Dagligt Allehanda* (Lutheran Conservative Daily), *February*]

## WHAT INSPIRES A LEAGUE OF NATIONS

BY PROFESSOR RUDOLF KJELLEN

IF we ask why the great idea of a League of Nations should have taken concrete form just at the present time, we get three answers. We discover three groups of motives of different depth, three responsive chords of different sensitiveness. First and foremost is hatred of war. This is not hatred of civil war, which is still a favorite sport of the very classes that are loudest in condemning war in general, nor a war of starvation by blockade, for this is being legalized as a future weapon in the very Covenant of the League. It is international war — the frank, brutal war of machines which we have just experienced — that has been made an object of universal hatred and abhorrence by our recent suffering. This sentiment is associated with an impulsive conviction that the great crisis was precipitated by the evil design of certain individuals, and that it might have been

prevented had there been a super-government above national government — some higher authority, some supreme political organization.

We need not stop to consider how far these beliefs are justified. We shall not even attempt to plumb the depth of the sentiment against war. Perchance that sentiment is merely an expression of weariness and consequently a passing one, like similar waves of feeling following earlier crises in history. What we desire to fix in our reader's mind is merely that a condition of sentiment plays a large rôle in the present effort to create a League of Nations. Perhaps that condition is not a very stable support, but it nevertheless constitutes an extraordinarily favorable opportunity for those who believe themselves called to be the architects of the future.

This gateway of opportunity is widened by the strong and permanent

drift from Liberalism to Socialism. Quite apart from the war crisis, a profound transformation is now under way. For a century or more the ideals of Liberalism have fared onward under constantly favoring breezes. In the hundred years of struggle between the state and the individual, the individual has won the victory. The modern conception of the state is circumscribed by the limited horizon of the individual defending his 'inborn rights.' As is invariably the case, so one-sided a view has produced in practice dangerous results. Freedom has degenerated into license and the state has begun to dissolve in anarchy. Thereupon, society is resorting to Socialism as the antithesis of Liberalism. Society, the community, is reasserting its supremacy over the individual.

That is what has happened inside the state. The fact that Liberals and Socialists often form close alliances, merely proves that human selfishness and party interests are more powerful than abstract principles. But are not governments themselves subject in their turn to the same course of evolution in relation to the community of nations, that individuals are in relation to single governments?

Up to the present the absolute, unbounded sovereignty of the state has been our highest ideal. Above the state no organization was permitted which limited the former's individualism; for in their relations to each other, states themselves become individuals. Undeniably this excess of freedom has come to imperil the very existence of the state itself. As a concrete illustration, Montenegro may be cited. That little independent principality set fire to the train which blazed up in the Balkan War, and thus, indirectly, caused the World War — a conflagration for which another in-

dividual state, Serbia, set the tinder. Therefore, in the relation of governments to each other, as in the relation of individuals to each other within the state, practical experience shows that unlimited freedom may contain the germs of disastrous anarchy. So again we face a demand to limit freedom. The Socialist state and the League of Nations — although vastly dissimilar in degree — are parallel phenomena. They are children of the same epoch.

Right here this great ideal becomes a two-edged sword for the small nations. For the most part they greeted it with great rejoicing, regarding a League of Nations as a step toward justice, as guarding their own independence against the usurpations of the mighty. But we now discover that this same freedom may protect the powerful against the insolence or self-assertion of the smaller Powers. It is the great nations that draw the line between patriotism and chauvinism, and they draw that line very narrowly. This creates that danger of 'amalgamation,' which played so important a part in the Norwegian attitude toward union with Sweden. The weaker party risks being absorbed when it enters into partnership with a powerful neighbor.

The latter danger threatens every small state which sits down to table with the Great Powers in the hall of the League of Nations. That is the reverse of the medal. So when we debate joining the League, conflicting motives and fears struggle for the mastery, and we see clearly the error of assuming that membership will bring us only profit and no loss.

But we have not yet sounded to the very bottom of these inter-playing motives. Viewed from the perspective of world history, the League of Nations signifies a return to the greatest political tradition in the records

of mankind — namely, the Christian community as a universal system — as conceived in the Middle Ages and symbolized externally by the Holy Roman Empire and the Papacy. These two political concepts, never actually realized, but always vivid ideals, were greatly weakened in Europe when the national states acquired individual sovereignty and complete control of their own destinies. Now, the demands of a new era seem to bid us return to the old unity. But this unity will surely not be unity under an Emperor or a Pope, or predominantly under Christian dogma. The place of those earlier concepts has been taken by a more comprehensive ideal named 'modern culture.' Civilized men are developing little by little a consciousness of community, a community greater than that of nations, which is now seeking to incorporate itself in a political form. Here we seem at length to have struck firm ground, beyond the quivering morass represented by the transient and temporary emotions of the moment. We have concrete evidence that mankind as a whole is inspired by common concepts of justice and humanity, which are manifesting themselves slowly but with increasing power in internationalism. This tendency was regarded as subsidiary in the pre-war epoch—as negligible in contrast with the main current of nationalism. However, certain practical aspects of international unity, such as modern jurisprudence, social welfare, commerce, and science, had already begun to take on the outlines of a universal League of Peoples. We might cite the Hague Peace Congresses of 1899 and 1907. At the first of these, twenty European Powers, four Asiatic governments, and the two principal nations of North America were represented. At the second congress, forty-four govern-

ments participated, presenting an early adumbration of mankind as a political unit.

This was the slow, silent, but steady and irresistible movement of evolution toward its goal — a League of Nations at The Hague. The World War stands for a revolutionary interruption in this evolution, and the League of Nations of Versailles is a child of revolution. Let us emphasize clearly the contrast between the two; for in it lies the key to the whole situation. From the calm experience of centuries we had begun to lay the foundations of a system for the harmonious coöperation of all peoples. Even the physical site had been selected. The materials had begun to be assembled. The piles were being driven to support the foundation of the international edifice. Then suddenly the preparations were interrupted. The very ground beneath was shaken by the violence of a world-wide earthquake. Now mankind is trying to resume the work, accommodating the new structure to the broken surface of the still distorted landscape.

A revolution may hasten organic development or it may divert it in a wrong direction. Undoubtedly, it was the design of the responsible leaders at Versailles to seize a creative opportunity in order to give concrete form to the ideal of The Hague. But they forgot that the ideal of The Hague presumed a normal situation. Their league will not be the same structure if erected on a different site.

Consequently, the League of Nations as constituted in its new form will collapse. A violent crisis has interrupted the profounder currents of history. Selfish interests backed by conscious physical power, will never bless the League builders with that true vision needed to design the lasting temple of world justice.

[The Hibbert Journal (Religious Quarterly), January]  
RUSSIA'S RELIGIOUS RENAISSANCE

BY PRINCE EUGENE TROUBETZKOY

THE civil war which is now going on in Russia is accompanied by a spiritual conflict not less determined and portentous. For the Bolsheviks, it is well known, the only question at stake is that of realizing a certain political and social programme of human relationships. Their programme is merely a particular application of the materialist conception of life, erected into a dogma and proclaimed as the fundamental principle of all human society. It is not surprising, therefore, that Bolshevism has for its adversary a religious movement, which is now becoming a powerful effort of the whole nation to recover its soul.

The materialist conception of which I speak is in no sense original. The doctrine of Bolshevism is merely a transformation of Marxism adapted to the [business] of revolution and consequently [distorted] and falsified. The doctrine of Marx, I need hardly say, is an explanation in materialistic terms of the historical evolution of society. Socialism is there represented as the final result of a long historical process, a result due to arrive in a future more or less distant and uncertain. To transform this scientific Socialism into a programme of revolutionary action, it has been found necessary to give it a violent twist. This Bolshevism has done by substituting *immediate revolution* for the *evolution* preached by Marx. For him materialism is mainly one of the means for explaining history. For Lenin and his adepts it is primarily a law of action, the principle not

alone of what *is* but of what *ought to be*.

One of the most striking characteristics of Bolshevism is its pronounced hatred of religion, and of Christianity most of all. To the Bolshevik, Christianity is not merely the [theory] of a mode of life different from his own; it is an enemy to be persecuted and wiped out of existence.

To understand this is not difficult. The tendency of the Christian religion to hold before the believer an ideal of a life beyond death is diametrically opposed to the ideal of Bolshevism, which tempts the masses by promising *the immediate realization of the earthly paradise*. From that point of view Christianity is not only a false conception of life; it is an obstacle to the realization of the Communist ideal. It detaches souls from the objects of sense and diverts them from the struggle to get the good things of this life. According to the Bolshevik formula, 'religion is opium for the people,' and serves as a tool of capitalist domination.

In contrast with religion, Bolshevism is first and foremost the practical denial of the spiritual. The Bolsheviks flatly refuse to admit the existence of any spiritual bond between man and man. For them economic and material interests constitute the only social nexus: they recognize no other. This is the source of their whole conception of human society. [The love of country], for example, is a lying and hypocritical pretense which is used to 'mask' the interests of the dominant