

VERS
S.
RAND.
COMPANY,
WARE,
ery, etc.
Y Co.

The Independent

Entered at the Post office at New York, as Second-class Mail Matter.

"BUT AS WE WERE ALLOWED OF GOD TO BE PUT IN TRUST WITH THE GOSPEL, EVEN SO WE SPEAK, NOT AS PLEASING MEN, BUT GOD, WHICH TRIETH OUR HEARTS."

VOLUME XXXIV.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 19, 1882.

NUMBER 1729.

The Independent.

THE RIDE FOR LIFE.

BY HARRIET PRESCOTT SPOFFORD.

Saffron and rose the sunrise gild the air,
Over the city all the skies were fair,
Slowly the morning-star was melting back
Into the glory of the pearly rack.
Ah! who had dreamed that cloud of dewy bloom

Was but the dark and loathly lair of doom,
The dark and procreant lair whence all the day
The blistering poison crept about its prey!

Out from the people's palace to the light,
Out from the cruel spell of bale and blight,
Who, like some warrior from the deadly field,
Came on men's shoulders as upon his shield,
And passed in silence down the voiceless throngs

That held not by his greatness nor his wrongs,
But, with one sob, for his sake half would give
The remnant of the little lives they live!

Far off the great sea whispered on the shore
And into music lulled his thunderous roar,
And called his coolest airs from salted deeps
To fan the brow of him who sweetly sleeps
Hushed, as he rides for life now, into rest,
And cradled soft as on a mother's breast,
While the dark elements bend mystic powers
To snatch his safety from the fleeting hours.

As late that awful spirit o'er the skies
Swept with its trail of flame, till all men's eyes

Fired with the splendor, so did all hearts beat
With the quick throbs, the space destroying heat

Where like a fiery arrow o'er the land
Slid the swift wheels, and he, who with firm hand

Once guided states, then lay beside the helm
Less than the rudest man in all the realm!

O not those proud men who within the gate
Of law and justice upon freedom wait,
Not art, nor beauty, nor imperial sway,
Bent monstrous might those hours to gentlest play,

But science to the hands of rude men given,
Soft as the cloud before the south wind driven,
O whether into night or into day—
So Death and Sleep Sarpedon bore away!

CONCERNING COLLECTIONS.

BY THE REV. NEWMAN HALL.

"THE very thing I am concerned about. It is the fly in the apothecary's ointment; the twinge of pain in the pleasant dream; the world intruding on the Sabbath rest. I've had enough of money during the week; but when ledger and cash-box have been put aside again comes the jingle of coin and the rustle of notes. I have been listening to the blessed offer of salvation 'without money,' and am at once asked for money. I have been feasting on the privileges of adoption and the assurance of God's elect, till my 'willing soul would sit and sing herself away to everlasting bliss,' or have been mounting upward as on angel wings, when ruthlessly I am dragged back by an appeal for the collection!"

There was once a very great preacher, a bishop of bishops, who addressed a memorable charge to convocation at a city renowned for its culture, in the course of which he broke forth into an impassioned strain of electric logic, demolishing the superficial rationalism of the day, and, after raising the minds and hearts of his audience far above the low level of temporal things, thus closed an unrivaled peroration: "O death, where is thy sting? O grave,

where is thy victory? Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory! Now concerning the collection!"

This collection was for poor saints at Jerusalem. The dense population, the fact that the Christian converts were chiefly from the poorer class, the financial results of the community of goods, which had not been enjoined and was now discontinued, together with persecution, had impoverished the Jerusalem Church. Paul, when sent forth to the Gentiles, had promised the other Apostles that he would "remember the poor." He was now fulfilling his pledge. The benevolent society yonder was in urgent need, and because the poor could not put off being hungry and sick, nor put off dying unless relieved, Paul, though he had been defying the grave and anticipating glory, could not put off saying: "Now concerning the collection."

Perhaps some said: "What have we Greeks at Corinth to do with Jews at Jerusalem? We live far apart and are of a different race and language. Let them look after themselves." Yet the collection was urged and cheerfully made. It was a new thing in the world. Alien nations had been in alliance for predatory war or profitable commerce, but never before for philanthropy. Christianity had infused a new life into humanity. Men of all lands were drawn to the one Father, and so to each other in the one Brotherhood. There was now no longer "Jew nor Greek," etc., but all were "one in Christ Jesus."

St. Paul lays down many useful principles "concerning collections." (See I Cor. xvi. 1, 2.) These were to be: 1. *Individual*: "Let every one of you." A member of a church sometimes says: "We do so much for charity! We spend so much on missions," etc. We do it. Yet the individual so boasting does nothing. There is no obtaining pardon in common. "Every one" must repent, believe, and be saved. So "every one" must aid in doing good. 2. *Proportional*: "As God has prospered him." The giving should be in a suitable ratio to the getting. If more can be spent on ourselves, more laid by, so more should be given to God; not as some, the ratio of whose giving diminishes as their income increases. It is a fearful thing to be spending or hoarding beyond the proportion of giving. The poorest have an equal privilege with the richest. That church is not truly a "poor man's church" where the poor have only to be receivers, without the greater privilege of being givers. In God's esteem, the cent may be placed higher on the subscription-list than the dollar, just as the widow who put in two mites put in more than the rich who gave gold. The treasurer above reckons the value of what is given by the amount of what is kept.

3. *Grateful*: "As God hath prospered him." The rewards of industry and skill are his gifts, entrusted to us as his stewards, and, therefore, should be used by us as his faithful servants and grateful children.

4. *Periodically*: "On the first day of the week." If not weekly, at some stated period. We should not leave our giving to "hap-hazard," resolving to give "if we should have a surplus." Without waiting for a surplus, every week we spend money on ourselves for luxuries not essential. Should we not do this equally in works of beneficence? Every quarter or every year we pay our rates or rent. Should we not with equal regularity and system arrange for what is due to God? 5. *Devoutly and con-*

scientiously: "Let every one lay by him in store." Privately, prayerfully, not from the impulse of external circumstances, or the opinion of men, not contingent on exciting meetings, eloquent appeals, or fine weather on occasion of the annual collection.

In harmony with these principles, "systematic beneficence" is recommended. Some proportion of our income should be prayerfully consecrated to Him. This should be employed not for payment of service rendered to ourselves (as for a pastor's stipend), or for comfort enjoyed (as for church expenses), any more than paying for our doctor, or lawyer, or the furnishing of our own homes, or in literature, or art, or music; but simply for the temporal and spiritual good of others. Then all we have to do is to appropriate, according to the claims presented, the sum which has already been given. We should thus give more readily and cheerfully to each case and much more would be given. Christians generally succeed in industry and commerce, and they save what others squander in frivolous amusements. Some Christians leave frightful amounts of money behind them. Are there not members of churches whose gains, whose expenditure, whose savings are such that the amount they willingly contribute for the good of others, if set down in a *per contra* account, would shame and ought to alarm them. Are there not those who have suffered heavy losses, out of all proportion to the voluntary gifts they have placed on God's altar, suggesting the thought that he may permit such losses as a reproof of the littleness of those gifts, so to save his children from the perils of repletion? If we generate too much steam and will not turn it off into the works of benevolence, may not God take the weights off our safety-valve, and so save us from an explosion? "There is that scattereth and yet increaseth. There is that withholdeth more than is meet, and it tendeth to poverty."

There can be no question that God has already entrusted so much wealth to the responsible care of individual members of the Christian Church that, if all would thus systematically devote a proportion of their income, there would be such a superabundance for all the purposes for which help is generally sought in religious services that there would be very seldom any necessity to close a sermon with: "Now concerning the collection."

LONDON, ENGLAND.

VATICANISM AND M. LOYSON.

BY BISHOP A. CLEVELAND COXE, D. D.

It is more logical than is ordinarily supposed to separate the idea of "Romanism" from the Latin Churches, allowing that there are many good things, as well as good men, in these Churches, considered as so many National Churches. Thus we come to "Romanism" pure and simple, and can treat it *pathologically*, as a terrible disease from which these Churches suffer. In a family, every member may be chronically affected with a virulent form of distemper, which comes to be so associated with them as to be their character. We say of Gehazi's household: "They are lepers." Yes; but they are men, and leprosy is separable from their persons, and by God's love they may be cured. Now, Romanism is a leprosy, pure and simple. There is nothing good in it, though what is Christian survives in spite of it, and

more or less it taints the Latin Churches and all who belong to them. I say more or less, for there are millions of Latin Christians who are very nearly healthy Christians. They minimize their Romanism, and, in fact, keep it down as by powerful medicines, grieving over and deploring their own malady, when they see it in all the malignancy of "Ultramontanism," as the Gallicans have done for two hundred years and more. These elementary statements and illustrations will clear up the subject, I trust, for many who wish to love and honor pious and hereditary "Roman Catholics," in spite of a just abhorrence of Romanism. For myself, I am often accused of hatred to Roman Catholics. Nothing of the kind. The very reverse is the case. I have always had friends among them. In Europe, where there were no other churches, I have frequented their churches and appropriated all that is good in their services. I have often knelt, with my own prayer-book in hand, in the Latin churches of France and Germany, fervently praying for my Romanized brethren, that they may be soon purged from their malady and restored to a pure and primitive catholicity. This is the worst I wish for any of them. But Romanism I profess to hate, even as one hates *malaria*, and yet may love a household that shakes or burns habitually with its poisonous infection. One may hate Judaism, as St. Paul did, and yet love the Jews, as he did, to a degree which only hyperbole could express. And, if I hate Romanism, it is because I venture to say I understand it; that is, as well as a "mystery of iniquity" can be understood. And of Romanists, *par excellence*, I wish to say, in all charity, they seldom understand their own system. I never conversed with one of them that understood the history of the Papacy or had any conception of the ancient constitutions of the Catholic Church. Most of them have been educated in systematized ignorance of the New Testament, of ecclesiastical history, and of the history of the Reformation. The best authors even of their own communion—such as Fleury, De Marca, or Clemangis—are unknown to them. They are "prohibited" reading, and, if not actually in the "Index," as they generally are, they are practically kept out of the hands of learners and even of theologians, except those who are employed to refute, that is, to misrepresent them. With so much for a preface, let me add that, when I speak confidently of matters which for forty years have been my professional study, I do not feel called upon to answer the mere revilings of ignorance and impertinence. In all such cases my rule is to take no notice whatever of the adversary; but to write again and give more facts, returning to the conflict with fresh material. I venture, then, to think you will not be unwilling to hear again about Vaticanism or, at least, about Gallicanism, in its conflict with the Vatican. The observations to which I invite your readers are very encouraging, and ought to be reflected upon just at this moment, when Bismarck chews the leek and goes meekly to "Canossa" and the Vatican is emboldened to stir up another war in Italy. I speak of the encouragement of the outlook; for, as compared with the settlement of 1815, which riveted the chains of Italy and manacled free thought in Europe, the worst that is to be dreaded now still marks a triumphant progress for the freedom of churches and nations and (I am not

Joseph. His influence, whether for good or for evil, is potent to-day and the end is not yet.

I have endeavored to give the details of my visit to the Mormon prophet with absolute accuracy. If the reader does not know just what to make of Joseph Smith, I cannot help him out of the difficulty. I myself stand helpless before the puzzle.

WOLLASTON, MASS.

THE GIFT OF THE SPIRIT.

BY THEODORE L. CUTLER, D.D.

THE opening week of this year witnessed a concert of prayer every day throughout Christendom. This "week of prayer," which is now so widely observed, owes its origin to the suggestion of Dr. Morrison and Rev. Mr. Newton, of the "Lodians Presbytery," in Northern India. The original purpose of the service, as set forth by those missionaries (from America), was to pray that "the Holy Spirit may be poured out upon all flesh." It contemplated no more than this; but in this it aimed to secure the most vital and precious gift that could be bestowed from Heaven. There was no presumption in this, for our Lord had promised this glorious gift to those that seek aright, and declared that "your Heavenly Father will give the Holy Spirit to them that ask it."

When we pray for the Holy Spirit understandingly, we do not ask for a mere influence. We ask for the presence and power of a Person, the third person of the Divine Trinity, who possesses the attributes of personality as completely as Jesus Christ did when he assumed a human form. The Holy Spirit is the executive of the God-head. Through him the efficiency of the God-head upon human souls is exercised. He is the revealer of all vital and needful truth. He is the Author of that wonderful Word whose penmen he inspired. Is my Bible a light unto my feet and a lamp unto my path? He kindled the lamp. The Holy Spirit gives me discernment to apprehend aright the great truths of that Word of Life. He convicts every sinner of his guilt and danger who is genuinely convicted and brought to true repentance. The most powerful sermon of a Whitfield or a Spurgeon would not move one solitary sinner one inch toward Heaven without the agency of the Holy Spirit. When the apostle addressed his fellow-Christians, he said to them: "You hath He quickened"—i. e., to you hath he given life from the dead. If I am a Christian, with any power for good in this world and any hope of glory in the next, it is because the Divine Spirit regenerated me. To him I owe my new birth, just as veritably (though not in the same way) that I owe my natural birth to my parents. In my hours of conflict and sore trial he is my Comforter. If he dwells within me, then I possess peace, and submission to God, and fervent love to my fellow-men, and patience, and every other needful and beautiful grace. Without him I am nothing; with him I have power. All this being true, can there be any object of prayer that is even comparable to this gift of the Spirit of God? Not only for the opening week of the year, but through its every week the foremost request for all of us should be: "Grant unto us Thy Holy Spirit!"

The New Testament teaches us that the only two agents that are to bring this sin-smitten world back to God are the Holy Spirit and the Christian Church; but the Church without the Spirit is as utterly powerless to move itself or move others as a locomotive is to propel a train until a flame is kindled under its boiler. Here lies the secret of the inefficiency that so painfully affects and cripples our pulpits and our churches. Here lies the real cause of the lamentable lack of conversions which is now so much commented on in every quarter. We do not read that one of Christ's apostles ever converted a single soul until the gift of the Spirit had been granted; but when Peter (who had been reconverted himself) received the power from on high, he brought three thousand to Christ by one discourse! That master workman in the salvation of souls, Charles G. Finney, acknowledged that sometimes his preaching was as useless as sounding brass; and the reason was that

he relied on himself, and not on the Almighty Spirit. Then came what he called a "breaking down before God," when he renounced sin and self-reliance, and cried out for a fresh baptism of power from on high. When he became filled with the Spirit, the weight of his spear was a weaver's-beam and his words were clothed with thunder.

This was in the direct line of Scripture injunction and experience. The command to the apostolic Christians was: "Be ye filled with the Spirit." Two bodies cannot occupy the same space at the same time, and, if our hearts are filled with the Spirit of God, there is no room there for the greedy and godless world. Unbelief flees away, like the darkness at the coming of the dawn. Every grace thrives and grows. We are inspired with tender sympathy for others and become intensely solicitous for those who are living without God and dying without hope. We get some share of the feeling that Cranfield had when he prayed all night, before Dr. Edward N. Kirk came to preach to his poor waifs and street-Arabs in London. Of course, such praying, followed by such preaching, melted hearts of flint. When we are filled with the Spirit, we do not need to be drummed or scolded to a prayer-service, or to be baited to God's house by some prodigy in the pulpit or some novelty that piques curiosity. When filled with the Spirit, the purse opens easy at the touch of charity, the tongue is unloosed to speak for Christ, and what we say and what we do is attended with a supernatural power. To be filled with the Spirit is a revival.

At this moment this wonder-working Spirit of God, on whom our very lives depend, is absolutely "grieved" away and "quenched" in too many of our churches. "Ye do resist the Holy Ghost" is the tremendous indictment that lies against every pastor and church that are now cursed with barrenness. Such churches hamstring all their own capacities, and, by quenching the heavenly fire, become like an ice-field of Siberia. The one hope and the only possible hope of all such Christians is in a fresh outpouring of the Holy Spirit. This must be sought. A few persons in every church may inaugurate a new state of things, by putting themselves in the right posture before God. There may be a genuine and soul-renewing revival in any church, if only a few persons honestly, humbly, and earnestly prepare the way. There must be a clearing-out before there is a filling up; a breaking-down before God, before there is a building-up into new dimensions and beauty. When even three or four penitent Christians thirst for the Holy Spirit, and cry out for him, and make room for him, he will bear the prayer of faith and come. When the sun comes, then comes the morning. The gift of the Holy Spirit is (since Calvary) the mightiest, richest, holiest, and most unspeakably precious gift that the God-head can bestow. It is within our reach to-day. Shall we have it? And, having it, keep it?

BROOKLYN, L. I.

"THE CIVIL SERVICE ISSUE."

THE EVIL AND THE REMEDY.

II.

BY DORMAN B. EATON, ESQ.

THIS power and opportunity for parties, alike in the sphere of legislation and of executive action, the *Merit System*, declares to be all that a people can safely entrust to a party or to its great officials, and all that is needed for the honest, useful, or efficient action of either. It declares that these inferior officers should be selected for merit and removed for cause, regardless of partisan politics. It is preposterous and disastrous to apply a party test to a postmaster, a weigher, a lighthouse-keeper, or collector. The Spoils System, on the other hand, says that all of these 82,000 subordinate places, all the appointive offices in the legislative and judicial departments, all those in states and municipalities, as well, down to the washwomen, the hall-boys, and the porters, must be made prizes of party victory, justifying proscriptive removal everywhere, to gain places for the camp-followers, patronage for the chieftains, and political assessment pillage for war expenses. Which system has the right of this great issue? Mr. Madison, speaking

for the early statesmen, held the power of appointment to be a trust for the public good, and not the perquisite of a party, and that any officer who should knowingly remove without cause or appoint a person known to be unfit would be guilty of a breach of trust and would justly subject himself to impeachment and removal from office. Such was the accepted theory of the early statesmen, and the rule of action of all the Presidents until Jackson, and of the heads of departments as well.

For members of Congress, the judges, the President and Vice-President the Constitution fixed a term or tenure, but not for any of these 82,000 subordinate places. This, however, did not mean that they were to be treated as spoils or as prizes for corruption and oppression; but that they were to be filled and vacated by using the power of appointment and removal in the public interest. Such were the accepted moral code and constitutional duty of official life, and they were carried into practice under the first six Presidents. During the forty years from 1789 to 1829 only seventy-three of these "inferior officers" were removed, and these for cause. It was justly regarded as being as indispensable to send a public servant away for mere party objects as it would be to send away the public money for the same purpose. But let us look to the functions of these inferior officers, and see what suggestions they make as to the true theory of the Constitution and the usage of its authors.

They are in no sense representative or legislative, nor have they any guidance of the policy or discretion as to enforcing the principles which the people have approved at the quadrennial elections; and, therefore, neither the reason which applies to the President nor those which apply to members of Congress warranted giving these inferior officers a fixed term, whether for four years or longer. Hence, the Constitution did not give nor did any action of its authors favor a fixed term for any inferior officer; but such term (one of four years) was first given to some of these officers in 1830, by a law which records the first victory of the Spoils System gained on the floor of Congress or in Federal affairs. The duties of these inferior officers have nothing to do with parties, majorities, or political opinions. These officers should do the public work—the common business of the people—under the instruction of their superiors, alike each day and year after year, for all citizens, irrespective of politics, as that vast volume of work and business arises and, like a river, must go steadily on forever. They should be retained in office so long as they faithfully and efficiently discharge their duties and the public needs them, but always liable to removal for cause. There is no question of a life tenure, nor should there be any life tenures. While their time, thoughts, and actions, so far as not needed about the work for which they are paid, should be as free as those of any citizen, it is mere prostitution and tyranny for them to use their official authority or interference to control votes or politics; and their official functions—whether they be postmasters, collectors, lighthouse-keepers, inspectors, book-keepers, appraisers, or what not—have no honest or legislative relation with party politics, but are the same whoever is president or whichever party is in power, and almost of necessity, in the degree that they give themselves party politics beyond the limits here stated, they are for that reason bad officers and bad citizens.

It is such a body of public servants whom the Spoils System would select and remove for mere partisan reasons; whom it would tax to fill political treasuries and degrade into the servile agents of party chieftains and despotic officers.

I have no space for tracing the growth of this system. That it originated in New York and was devised by Aaron Burr; that it was matured by his apt disciple, Van Buren, and had made great progress in that state earlier than in any other state and before 1820; that it made Tammany Hall what it has been and caused the despotic New York City primaries of the Republican Party to be what they now are, a peril to that party—these are facts as indisputable as it is that Van Buren took the system to Washington and set it up under Jackson; that Marcy, a New York senator, was

its first shameless defender in Congress; that it has made New York politics more corrupt and servile than those of any other state; and that the system had its culmination and crisis when the late New York senators, in its behalf, left their places of duty and (like the champions of slavery, whom they imitated) fell ignominiously in a lost cause.

Such a system craves and needs short terms. The shorter, even to a year or a month, the greater the patronage, the spoils, and the more profitable the trade of the manipulator and the officeholder. It would be as interesting as instructive, if there was space, to show in detail how, in 1820, when Crawford was a presidential candidate at the head of the Treasury, with Van Buren as his lieutenant at the North, a bill was introduced at the end of the session, and carried rapidly through, *without the least debate* and for no adequate or apparent reason avowed, which gave a four years' term to collectors, naval officers, and other officials in the Treasury Department—the first instance of such a term and a real revolution in our official life. This was the first triumph of the Spoils System in Congress. The bill was made retroactive, in order to make many vacant places for the next President to fill. It was in vain that Clay, Benton, Calhoun, Webster, Ewing, Southard, White—in short, every leading senator and statesman, except Buchanan and Wright, from the two states where the Spoils System was first developed and has continually been most corrupt and despotic—made a resolute effort in 1835 to repeal that disastrous act. The attempt failed. Jackson's administration and this second triumph of rotation and partisan proscription gave increased strength to the short-term spoilsmen and made it possible, in 1836, to extend a four-years' term to all postmasters whose compensation was \$1,000 a year and upward (of which class of postmasters there were then about 450 and are now nearly 2,000) and to bring them for the first time into the Senate for confirmation. They had before been (as all postmasters still are) appointed and removed by the Postmaster-General. The political power of the Senate was thereby greatly and disastrously increased, and it hardly need be pointed out that all those changes greatly increased the potency of partisan influence and favoritism in those two great departments. It can require no words to make it plain that a four-years' term for such officers involved them more than ever before in every presidential contest, and forced them, in self-defense to become active and belligerent politicians, who must fight every four years for their places; nor is argument any more needed to make it clear that such terms tend to prevent adequate experience and to defeat promotions as the reward of trained capacity, which are essential to good administration.

This change was an invasion of executive functions by Congress, effecting a removal without cause of every good officer to which it extended every four years. This legislation facilitated the unparalleled abuses of Jackson's enforcement of the Spoils System. In such reasons and in the fact that the introduction of a four-years' term was the first fruit of the Spoils System, and in the further facts that at every stage the extension of that term to other offices (it now applying to only about 8,500 out of over 82,000 executive subordinates) has been a favorite measure of the most partisan class and of all the scoffers of reform, we may well find grounds for urging the repeal of the four-years' term provisions of the Acts of 1820 and 1836, as important measures of Civil Service Reform. It is quite certain that those most unfriendly to a non-partisan Civil Service, based on merit, will not only oppose such repeal in the present Congress, but that they will urge the extension of the four-years' term, in the pretended interest of reform. Think of the effect of making that term general, which would vacate every year *twenty thousand five hundred official places in the Executive Department* alone; which would annually take more than 700 of the most experienced clerks from the Treasury at Washington; which would require more changes at the New York custom-house than a removal and appointment every day would bring about;