

The Independent

Vol. LIV

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 1902

No. 2779

Survey of the World

Tillman and McLaurin Censured

The action of the Senate in the case of the quarrel between the two Senators from South Carolina appears to satisfy no one—not even the members of the committee, whose recommendation was accepted. A majority of the committee reported a resolution censuring both Tillman and McLaurin with equal severity “for disorderly behavior and flagrant violation of the rules,” and at the same time declared in an accompanying statement that the offenses of the two men were not of equal gravity. The Democratic members of the committee accepted the resolution, but dissented from the majority’s opinion that the Senate has power to deprive a State of its vote by suspending a Senator. Two Republicans in a minority report asked that Tillman be suspended for twenty-five days, and McLaurin for five. By a vote of 54 to 12, on the 28th ult., the majority’s resolution of censure was adopted. While the vote was being taken, Tillman offended again by saying that “among gentlemen an apology for an offense committed in the heat of blood is usually considered sufficient.” This remark he withdrew when the Senate seemed about to make it the basis of a fresh charge against him. The report of the committee and the action of the Senate are considered elsewhere in this number. Tillman, as ranking minority member of the Naval Committee, had been invited by the President to attend the dinner given in honor of Prince Henry. At the President’s request, Senator Cockrell privately asked Tillman to withdraw his acceptance of this invitation. Because Tillman flatly refused, the invitation was withdrawn by the President, who there-

upon was attacked by Tillman in an abusive public statement. Two days later the angry Senator induced his nephew, Lieutenant-Governor James H. Tillman, of South Carolina, to ask the President for a withdrawal of his acceptance of an invitation to present, at the Charleston Exposition, a sword to Major Jenkins, one of the Rough Riders. The nephew professed to be acting at the request of persons who had contributed money for the sword. Then Major Jenkins informed young Tillman that he would not accept the sword. The Senator’s course and the act of his nephew are disapproved by many in the State, but the condition of public sentiment there was at last accounts so disagreeable that the President was inclined to give up his project of attending the Exposition.

✱

The Cuban Tariff Problem

At the beginning of this week the decision of the Republican majority in the House as to the proposed reduction of duties on imports from Cuba could not be foreseen. The majority in the Ways and Means Committee had yielded so far as to present for consideration in a conference of Republicans a project for a reduction of 20 per cent., but by some members of that majority this project was not approved. At the first conference, on the 25th ult., at which about 125 Republican members of the House were present, Chairman Payne submitted a bill authorizing the President to negotiate, “as soon as may be, after the establishment of an independent Government in Cuba, and the enactment by said Government of immigration and exclusion laws as fully restrictive as the

Some Changes I Have Seen in the American Pulpit

By Theodore L. Cuyler, D.D.

“WILL you please to tell the readers of THE INDEPENDENT what changes have taken place in the methods of the American pulpit within your memory?” I cheerfully respond to this request from the editor of a journal to which I was a constant contributor during the lifetime of its founder, my dear friend, the late Mr. Henry C. Bowen. As far as I am familiar with the methods of our ministers in these days, I think that I discover some very marked changes since the days of my youth.

(1) In the first place, the average preaching in those days was more doctrinal than at the present time. The masters in Israel evidently held, with Phillips Brooks, that “no exhortation to a good life that does not put behind it some great truth as deep as eternity can seize and hold the conscience.” Therefore, they pushed to the front such deep and mighty themes as the attributes of God, the divinity of Jesus Christ, the nature and desert of sin, the atonement, regeneration, faith, the resurrection, and judgment to come, with heaven and hell as tremendous realities. Especially they emphasized the heinousness and desert of sin as the great argument for repentance and acceptance of Jesus Christ. A lapse from that style of preaching is to be deplored, for, as Gladstone truly remarked, the decline or decay of a sense of sin against God is one of the most serious symptoms of these times. Charles G. Finney, who was at the zenith of his power sixty-five years ago, bombarded the consciences of sinners with a tremendous broadside of Bible-doctrine, and many acute lawyers and eminent merchants were converted under his logical discourses.

No two finer examples of the doctrinal preaching—once so prevalent—could be cited than Dr. Lyman Beecher and Dr. Horace Bushnell. The celebrated sermon by the former of these giants, on the “Moral Government of God,” was char-

acterized by Dr. Thomas H. Skinner as the mightiest discourse he ever heard. Henry Ward Beecher hardly exaggerated when he once said to me: “Put all of his children together and we don’t equal my father at his best.” Dr. Bushnell’s masterful discourses, with all their exquisite poetry and insight into the human heart, were largely bottomed and built on a theological basis. To these two great doctrinal preachers I might add the names of my beloved instructors, Dr. Archibald Alexander and Dr. Charles Hodge, of Princeton, and Albert Barnes, and Professor Park, and Dr. Thornwell, and Dr. John Todd, and Dr. G. T. Bedell, and Bishop Simpson, and President Stephen Olin. Has the American pulpit grown in spiritual power since those days? Have the churches thriven whose pastors have become more invertebrate in their theology?

(2) Another characteristic of the average preaching threescore years ago was that sermons were more generally aimed at awakening the impenitent and bringing them to Jesus Christ. The evil of sin was emphasized, the way of salvation was explained, the claims of Christ were presented, and people were urged to an immediate decision. Nowadays a large portion of the sermons are addressed to professed Christians; many others are addressed to nobody in particular; but there is much less of faithful, fervid, loving, pungent and persuasive preaching to the unconverted. This is one of the reasons for the lamentable decrease in the number of conversions. If ministers are set to be watchmen for souls, and winners of souls, how shall they escape if they neglect the salvation of souls?

(3) I think that I cannot be mistaken in saying that there has been a decline in impassioned and fervid pulpit eloquence. There is a change in the fashions of preaching; oratory is at a discount. Students are taught to be calm and cool and colloquial, and to aim at producing epi-

grammatic essays, to discuss sociological problems and to address the intellects of their auditors rather than to arouse their emotions. The great Dr. Chalmers "making the rafters roar" is as much a bygone tradition in many quarters as a faith in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. I have often wished that the young Edward N. Kirk, who melted to tears the professors and students of Yale College during a revival there, could come back to us and teach candidates for the ministry how to preach. There was no stentorian shouting or rhetorical exhortation. But there was an intense, solemn, white-heat earnestness that grasped both head and heart, both the reason and the affection—that made his auditors feel not only that life was worth living, but that the soul was worth saving and Jesus Christ was worth serving, and heaven was worth securing, and that for all these things God would bring us into judgment. If Lyman Beecher and Dr. Edward Dorr Griffin and Finney did not possess all of Kirk's graces of delivery, they possessed his fire, and they made Gospel doctrines glow with a living heart that burned into the hearts and consciences of their auditors. May God send into our churches not only a revival of pure and undefiled religion, but also a revival of old-fashioned soul-kindling pulpit eloquence!

(4) It is rather a delicate subject to touch upon, but I am happy to say that in my early ministry the preachers of God's Word were not hamstrung by any doubts of the divine inspiration and perfect infallibility of the Book that lay before them on their pulpits. The questions, "Have we got any Bible?" and "If any Bible, how much?" had not been hatched. When I was in the Princeton Theological Seminary our profoundly learned Hebrew Professor, Dr. J. Addison Alexander, no more disturbed us with the much vaunted conjectural Biblical criticism than he disturbed us about Joe Smith's "golden plates" at Nauvoo. For this fact I feel deeply thankful; and I comfort myself with the reflection that the greatest British preachers of the last dozen years, Dr. Alexander McLaren of Manchester, Charles H. Spurgeon, Dr. Newman Hall, Canon Liddon, Dr. Dale, and Dr. Joseph Parker, have suffered no more from the virulent attacks of the

"higher criticism" than I have done during my long and happy ministry.

(5) Ministers had some advantages, sixty or seventy years ago, over their successors in our day. They had a more uninterrupted opportunity for preparation of their sermon, and for thorough pastoral visitation of their flocks. They were not importuned to serve on committees and to be busybodies in all sorts of social schemes of charity. Every pastor ought to keep abreast of reformatory movements and cheerfully use tongue, pen and pulpit for their advocacy as long as they do not trench on the vital and imperative duties of his high calling. "This one thing I do," said single-hearted Paul; and if Paul were a pastor now in New York, Boston or Chicago, he would make short work with many an intrusive rap of a time-killer at his study door.

I have noted frankly a few of the changes that I have observed in the methods of our American pulpit during my long life; but not, I trust, in a pessimistic or censorious spirit. God forbid that I should disparage the noble, conscientious, self-denying and heaven-blessed labors of thousands of Christ's faithful ministers in our broad land! They have far greater difficulties to encounter than I had when I began my work. They are surrounded with an atmosphere of intense materialism; the ambition for the "seen things" increasingly blinds men to the "things that are unseen and eternal." Wealth and worldliness unspiritualize hosts of professed Christians. The present artificial arrangements of society antagonize devotional meetings and special efforts to promote revivals. On Sabbath mornings many a minister has to shovel out scores of his congregation from under the drifts (not very clean snow, either) of the mammoth Sunday newspapers. The zealous pastor of today has to contend with a lowered popular faith in the authority of God's Word, a lowered reverence for God's day, and a diminishing habit of attending upon God's worship.

Do these increasing difficulties demand a new Gospel? No; but rather a mightier faith in the one we have. Do they demand new doctrines? No; but more power in preaching the truths that have outlived nineteen centuries. Do we need

a new revelation of Jesus Christ? Yes, yes, in the fuller manifestation of him in the more loving, courageous and consecrated lives of his followers. A new baptism of the Holy Spirit? Verily, we do need it; and then our pulpits will be

clothed with power, and our preachers will have tongues of fire, and every change will be a change for the better advancement and enlargement of the kingdom of our adorable Lord.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

A Provincial German Chat

By the Countess Von Krockow

“NOW, Countess, will you explain one thing to me?”

We had strolled into the library of our host after the dinner, the library of Bulau Hall being attractive, the only one in the whole country on whose tables one finds a number of foreign newspapers laid out, the rest of us contenting ourselves with subscribing for the *Kreuzzeitung*, the local gazette and a hunting paper.

I looked up inquiringly; perhaps somewhat mockingly. Baron Hochkirch often attacks me on political subjects, and as he held in his hands a New York newspaper, I surmised what was coming. If anybody in America had defaulted with five hundred thousand dollars, or a fire had consumed a theater, or a band of robbers had waylaid an express train, it was I who should be held accountable for the man, the conflagration or the train robbers, for the plain reason that I had been born in the United States! “Well?” And I put on a courageous air.

“Your countrymen are so practical. They say time is money. Why, then, do they waste their time printing and reading pages of stuff over a petty incident? See what stands herein about Prince Henry’s visit. And the American journals are all so.” He held the sheet by the top margin with his left hand, while his right dashed along down three columns of the front side and two of the reverse page. “How comes it that you busy Yankees devote time to perusing all that? About a mere act of polite courtesy, a visit, such as which, when paid to royal courts in Europe, as occurs every week, we report in a single paragraph or two?”

He looked really expectant, and the

note of earnestness in his voice attracted the attention of our neighbors at the library table. I laughed.

“Oh! Baron Hochkirch, and do you indeed think that busy Americans read their newspapers?”

“But, Countess, not read what one subscribes and pays for!”

“Busy Americans read nothing but the headlines. I fancy so, at any rate, now that I am old. I myself have never been a busy American. I have only been a callow one. When, I must confess it, I did read the papers, I believed in them, you see. That was the secret. And it was so exciting being lifted like a boat on one high wave after another of news booms; one month a ferreted out murder case, the next a crusade against Tammany, then the ‘ropes of pearls’ of some lady, and so on. In those days I should have been caught away upon this Prince Henry high tidal wave, too, I dare say. But I would not have been a ‘busy American.’”

“I consider that the gratitude on the part of the Americans over the Emperor recognizing them as equals—for the mission signifies this—cannot be exaggerated,” remarked Princess A., sententiously. “Miss Roosevelt has been distinguished by receiving an invitation such as hitherto have gone to the Princess of Hesse, the Princess John George of Saxony and ladies of royal blood.”

“Read nothing save the headlines,” repeated Baron H., under his breath; the waste of money imputed by this extravagance appearing more reprehensible than the waste of time to him.

“You must think of it this way,” I