

were in sympathy with him for precisely the same reason. Russia was dismembered under the Kerensky rule, and the separatists of Ukraine and Finland were naturally grateful to the Government that let them have their way on such easy terms. Even the Bolsheviki, all the extremists, condemned KORNILOFF.

The best news that comes out of Russia contemporaneously with the announcement of KORNILOFF's defeat is KERENSKY's promise to curtail the power of the soldiers' committees, which at least may be a beginning of the rebuilding of military authority. It is still difficult to conjecture what he means by the statement that soldiers' committees will not be allowed to interfere with matters of military strategy, "but will control only in matters of internal affairs" behind the fighting lines. As this represents a novel theory of the duty of soldiers, who in all previous history have been supposed to be concerned only with what was in front of them and not with what was behind them, explanations will be awaited with interest. But KERENSKY will not go far, he will not succeed in restoring order and stability at home and the credit of the nation abroad, he will not give Russia the place in the ranks of the Allies which she cannot desert without indelible dishonor if he does not extend the firm hand over the motley forces of political disorganization in Petrograd and throughout Russia, if he does not successfully exert his influence to bring his colleagues in the Government back to reason and sanity. No great nation, and for that matter no small nation, can be successfully administered by such men and on such principles as have controlled in Russia since the Provisional Government allowed itself to be displaced by the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates as chief authority of the State.

#### RUSSIA'S UNCERTAIN FUTURE.

If KORNILOFF's "rebellion" has ended in failure and surrender it is still much too early to say whether the defeat of the cause and the purposes he represented is a deliverance or a disaster for Russia. KORNILOFF was not, as some of the Petrograd dispatches have falsely represented him to be, an enemy of the revolution, a plotter for the restoration of autocratic rule. He is a patriotic Russian, he has been sincerely devoted to the interests of Russia; he sought to give Russia a Government capable of enforcing the commands issued under its authority, an army organized for victory, not for taking to its heels in the face of the enemy. In the disagreement that arose between him and KERENSKY at the Moscow Conference, his was the sounder position. His purpose was to restore the spirit and sound organization of the army. If he had been permitted to achieve that purpose under the Kerensky Government, doubtless he would have chosen to serve rather than to revolt.

Petrograd dispatches announcing the collapse of his attempt to organize a strong Government and an effective fighting force in the field must still be received with some reserve, since the facilities for communication with the outside world are in the hands of those who oppose him. But at least he does not seem to have commanded that support in the army without which his success was impossible. That in itself casts a doubt upon his capacity as a leader. The rebel who does not make sure of a backing sufficient to enable him to hold out for a week evidently lacks foresight and organizing power. The dispatches from Petrograd, asserting that the army chiefs were mostly loyal to the Provisional Government, seem to be contradicted by the rather notable roll of Generals listed for punishment as traitors because of their association with KORNILOFF. The probability is that the ranks of the army were so far saturated with the poison of socialism, so hopelessly given over to the fantastic ideas of what the new freedom means, that they would instinctively turn to a Government which has encouraged and permitted them to make a debating society of the army rather than to a leader whose foundation principle was the restoration of rigid military discipline.

KORNILOFF had the support of GUCHKOFF, one of Russia's foremost statesmen; he had the sympathy, if not the support, of MILUKOFF, the leader of the Constitutional Democrats, whom the Socialist Government rejected because he was unwilling to throw overboard the teachings of all human experience in the government of nations, of the forces of conservatism, of order, of Russia's industries. The whole moderate middle class appeared to look hopefully upon his venture as a possible means of deliverance from those conditions of anarchy toward which Russia was rapidly drifting under a Government made up of men who put the class struggle of the proletariat against capital above the needs of the nation to combat the great enemy, Germany, who, if not overcome, will make short work of the Russian proletariat. From the point of view of sincere and observant outside friends of Russia, KERENSKY has been somewhat less fortunate in his support. The Socialists of the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates stood by him, of course, for that has been the fountain and breeding place of the evils that overthrew the first Provisional Government of moderate statesmen, destroyed the discipline and effectiveness of the army, gave the German propagandists of the separate peace their opportunity, and set the feet of Russia in the path to destruction. The Ukrainians supported KERENSKY, for with the assent of his Socialist colleagues in the Government they have declared themselves independent of Russia. The Finns