

tion on this subject to doubt that it confers this power on the President and the Senate acting together. In defense of its dignity the Senate has denied its own authority. It has set aside the fundamental principle that where the Constitution makes no limit there is none, so clearly stated by our correspondent Mr. Wheeler in another column, and by Chief Justice Marshall, as quoted by him.

That the action of the Senate in denying its own Constitutional power to make a general treaty of arbitration, and to authorize the President to determine whether specific cases come within that general treaty, is as inconsistent with historical precedents as it is with any broad interpretation of the Constitution, we shall show in a future article.



## The Needed Revival

The great revival now spreading through Wales is reported as in a marked degree ethical, evinced as such by the reform of dissolute lives, the discharge of defaulted debts, the forgiveness of offenses, the reconciliation of estranged neighbors and relatives. But while these are fruits, they are not the full fruits of a religious revival that is thoroughly ethical. It would be a mistake to suppose either that such reforms fully meet the ethical demand upon loose lives, or that the demand has already been satisfied by the virtuous lives which need no such reforms. Yet such a mistake is widely current. The religious revivals now in progress here and there among us, and others for which there is present hope and preparation, need a higher ethical note, if the full demand, whether of ethics or of religion, is to be satisfied.

In the Sermon on the Mount, which is justly regarded as Christ's interpretation of the fundamental principles which he had come to inculcate, he draws sharply the distinction between a morality which consists in attempted conformity to an external standard, and one which consists in the spontaneous manifestation of an inward life. "Except," he said, "your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and

Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." The scribes and Pharisees were scrupulous in their obedience to certain rules and regulations of conduct. The righteousness which Christ commended was that of men who were blessed because in the secret springs of their character they were poor in spirit, meek, hungry for righteousness, merciful, poor in heart, peace-possessing and peace-making. The one righteousness is a servile if not reluctant obedience to rules; the other, a free, joyous, spontaneous life; the one rests in the attainment already made, the other is an eager pursuit after an unattainable ideal; the disciple of the one thanks God, "I am not as other men are;" the disciple of the other recognizes the truth that he who ceases to become better ceases to be good. As the Rev. R. J. Campbell, the well-known minister of the City Temple in London, has said in a recent sermon, "The supreme spiritual need of the hour is a strenuous morality." True; it needs proclaiming from the housetops; only let there be no mistake as to what strenuous morality is. The first duty of a true morality is not obedience to a recognized standard; it is the duty of hastening the evolution—to borrow Herbert Spencer's phrase; the duty of ever pursuing after that ideal set forth by Jesus—"Be ye perfect even as your Father in heaven is perfect."

The revival of religion that is thoroughly rather than superficially ethical must draw the line, as it has not yet been drawn for popular apprehension, between the really and the conventionally moral life. Professor Ladd, speaking as a Christian man, plainly told the churches not long ago that their moral condition was "relatively low and nerveless"—a statement on which *The Outlook* commented at the time. Not, of course, that they were not living up to current standards of morality, but that they were not striving toward advanced standards, not "forgetting the things which are behind, and stretching forward to the things which are before," but supinely tolerating existing evils. Well is it that there have always been a few disturbers of the vain dreams of those who are not

as thoroughly moral as they think themselves to be. "The now prevailing standard of respectability," said Thomas Hill Green, "would never have been reached, if the temper which now acquiesces in it had been universal."

The distinctive note of the barbarian temper is its disinclination to the effort that achieves advance toward civilization. "It costs too much to be a white man," said one such, in his content with his wigwam. Closely paralleling this indifference to the material ideals of civilized life is the temper of many who are reputedly, but not really, "good people." It is justly to be characterized as moral barbarism. It is seen alike in the so-called moral man outside the church, deeming himself moral because free from vice, and in the church member who thinks himself in sufficiently good standing while lacking aspiration and effort to become as his Master. The religious revival which would make Christian morality luminous must at the same time split asunder the cave of this moral barbarism, in whose darkness, mistaking respectability for morality, enormous evils flourish within hearing of church anthems.

It is in this darkness that there flourishes also the sharp and false distinction that many fancy as existing between morality and religion or spirituality, damaging both by putting asunder what God joined together. To quote Mr. Campbell again: "What has spirituality to do with morality? Everything." "The moral ideal," says Wundt, "belongs to the realm of the infinite." The spirit of devotion to it is essentially religious. Real morality, or, in Biblical phrase, righteousness, is the divinely prescribed liturgy of religion. The phrase "mere morality," widely current in religious circles, is utterly fallacious. There is no such thing. What the phrase mistakenly describes is the conventional morality that masquerades as what in reality it is not.

The nineteenth century was a century of moral as well as of material progress. Great evils were banned, great reforms achieved, great philanthropies introduced. The extensive advance thus made needs now to be matched by an advance that is intensive, in regenerating the popular idea of morality, dis-

tinguishing the conventional counterfeit from the sterling reality, quickening the social conscience to the work of casting out devils, and warming moral custom into moral passion. Those who would promote this now imperative advance must adopt the watchword given by the author of "Ecce Homo:" "No heart is pure that is not passionate, no virtue safe that is not enthusiastic." Amid abounding signs of moral torpor and decay, what fitter word for the time?

And what so fit instrument for arousing this passionate enthusiasm as retelling and reinterpreting the story of Christ's life, and reawakening a passion like that of Paul to "win Christ and be found in him"? Such a passion must be awakened to take the place of that conventional if not reluctant consent to abstain from the deeds which society condemns and to fulfill more or less laggardly the obligations which society recognizes and enforces, which often passes current for morality. To be moral in this twentieth century after the birth of Christ is to follow him, to obey his new commandment "that ye love one another as I have loved you," to come as he came, not to be ministered unto but to minister, to possess his spirit of gentleness and of forcefulness, of patience and of heroism, of service and of sacrifice, and to carry it into all our complex modern life, political, industrial, social. This spirit so applied is morality whoever possesses it, and, whatever his ecclesiastical connections or lack of them, it is also religion. Anything less than this, at least as a standard by which to judge our life and a goal to which to direct our life, is immorality, and no garments of respectability, social or ecclesiastical, can make it other than immorality. Nothing is moral which is less than a passionate and purposeful pursuit of the highest ideal which the soul is capable of entertaining. The only power adequate to generate and sustain such a spirit is a strong and deep religious conviction of the reality and practicability of this ideal, a conviction that it has been and can be a realized ideal. This, let us hope, is to come in a revival of religion more profoundly ethical than any that has blessed the world since Pentecost.

# Some Possibilities in the Russian Situation

By Wanda Ian-Ruban

Readers will remember the article called "What Defeat Would Mean to Russia," by the author of the following paper. As was stated when the former article appeared in The Outlook, "Wanda Ian-Ruban" is by marriage a member of a family of the old Russian nobility, and more than one of this family have been driven from Russia merely for trying to prevent disregard of existing law by those in authority, and for protesting against the unjust treatment of others. The writer has traveled through Russia and has had unusual opportunities of knowing actual conditions.—THE EDITORS.

THERE are not a few intelligent Americans who will confess that, at the time of its publication, they considered Mr. Kennan's narrative of his observations in Siberia exaggerated, even hysterical. They know well now that Mr. Kennan understated rather than exaggerated the conditions which he found, so great was his restraint. Ten years ago the specious misstatements of Grand Duke Sergius Alexandrovitch, to name but one of those to whose interest it is to converse politely with the interviewer whom they would best like forcibly to eject, would have met with credulity on the part of the casual reader. To the latter all Russian exiles were terrorists, every political assassin a madman or a degraded criminal. Even the spoken and printed words of Stepniak, himself a political assassin, whom Mrs. Julia Ward Howe recently spoke of as "that splendid man, Stepniak," as also of Kropotkin, reached a comparatively limited circle of sympathizers. Nor is it so very long ago that the present Czar was generally considered to be weak, perhaps, but well-intentioned, prevented by unscrupulous relatives and ministers from carrying out plans for the well-being of his people. It was even supposed that on account of these plans, so hateful to his *entourage*, he was held almost as a prisoner in order that no word of the pressing needs of his faithful subjects might reach him. Now all that is changed. Not only upon the venality of the bureaucracy, the corruption of the court, has the light of American public opinion been turned; even the Czar himself, known at last as he really is, has been forever judged. No

one is any longer able to doubt that he is perfectly aware of the dire need of his "children," and that he is more than passively culpable of the crimes which make horrible his reign. It is now matter of common knowledge that the same amiable potentate who sends postage-stamps upon the request of an unknown American child allows Russian children by the scores and hundreds, together with their parents, to be butchered when they dare to appeal to him to save them from starvation. A weak Czar he is, and a false and a cruel; and now at last Americans, in spite of their disapproval of Anarchism, which they too frequently confuse with anarchy, no longer shrink at the thought of the only means by which Russia will ever gain her freedom. The passionate cry of "Down with autocracy! down with the Czar!" has been answered by a thrill of satisfaction in many a dispassionate breast. But all this is already of the past. The revolution has begun. The tiny spring unsealed eighty years ago by the blood of a handful of dream-lured aristocrats has continued to grow, augmented by the tears, the blood, of other aristocrats, of nobles, of peasants, spreading through secret and underground courses, until the very foundations of the autocracy are irreparably undermined.

As the desire of the people for freedom has spread, so has the idea been broadened as to what constitutes that freedom. The so-called constitution of Loris-Melikof would be approved by no constitutionalist of the present day; though, for that matter, neither Loris-Melikof nor his master ever called his