**“The Papacy in Germany” American Sentinel 3, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

There was a Catholic Congress lately held in Freiburg, Germany, which showed the determination of the Papacy to push every claim to its utmost limit. The Congress demanded the return of all the orders of the church into Germany, with permission for all of them to labor there without hindrance. It demanded also that the State give up the sole control of the schools, and give to the church a share in their supervision and direction. It further formulated a demand for the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope. The *Germania*, the leading Catholic periodical of Germany, backs up the work of the Congress with the following:- {AMS December 1888, p. 89.1}

“That which the shameless monk of Wittenberg inaugurated three hundred and fifty years ago is no longer looked upon as a reformation. No; it was a rushing into a bottomless pit. It is the most flagrant, the most radical, the most wicked revolution which the world has ever seen. It was a revolution in the churchly, the religious, the moral, the political, the social, the economic, the learned, the historical worlds. The foundation of the so-called Evangelical Church has long since been understood by intelligent men. According to these, Protestantism is nothing but a mere rejection of all and everything that is supernatural; it explains everything on the basis of the law of nature, of natural development, and not even the smallest nook is left open for the God of revelation. Its foundations are the purest godlessness and religious nihilism; and on such a foundation only hate and empty words, only decay and destruction, in time and eternity, can be built.” {AMS December 1888, p. 89.2}

All this only goes to show the determination of the Papacy to re-establish her power everywhere by every means. And this evil leaven is working in the United States as well as in Europe. {AMS December 1888, p. 89.3}

**“One Pope or Many?” American Sentinel 3, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

A friendly critic, who is a diligent reader of the Sentinel, and who has often written both criticisingly and approvingly, writes us a letter in which he says:- {AMS December 1888, p. 90.1}

“Don’t be too sure that Protestant censorship of moral education in our schools will be ‘scarcely less bearable’ than Catholic censorship. Dr. Schaff includes the ‘laymen’ in his committee. I can stand a censor of my own choosing. I am willing to accept a censor chosen by the people. I can stand the tyranny of the people, but not the tyranny of the Pope or king. The tyranny of the latter is life-long; that of the people is soon corrected.” {AMS December 1888, p. 90.2}

“I agree with you on the main issue against Joseph Cook and his Reform Association. But we must waive some of our preferences in the education of our children, for the sake of unity and homogeneity, the same as we waive some of our natural liberty for the sake of good order and good government. {AMS December 1888, p. 90.3}

“‘The consent of the governed’-that is the jewel that must be preserved. Consent is the foundation of Protestant censorship. Dictation is the foundation of Catholic censorship. The judgment of every man has a voice in the former. The selfish judgment of one man controls the latter. These facts should ever be kept in view in the examination of Papal education and Protestant education. The supreme question is, Shall the people be sovereign over morals and religion? or shall the Pope? {AMS December 1888, p. 90.4}

“I am for putting the Bible into the schools if thereby we can strengthen the sovereignty of the people.” {AMS December 1888, p. 90.5}

This language is the more significant from the fact that our friend declares himself to be an infidel. That such sentiments should be held by an avowed infidel, who is an intelligent, thinking man, a lawyer, is exceedingly suggestive of the case with which National Reform, falsely so called, may some day count among its defenders those who claim to be the champions of liberty and “free thought.” From other letters that we have received, as well as from utterances through the press, we are confident that there are many professed infidels who are preparing, perhaps unconsciously to themselves, to fall in with National Reform ideas. {AMS December 1888, p. 90.6}

We are more than ever convinced that the only true liberty, and the only real freedom of thought and action, are found in the religion of Jesus Christ, as proclaimed by the great Teacher himself. There can be no free man except the one whom the truth makes free,-the truth as it is in Christ. We would have all men know that the true religion of Christ stands for the most perfect liberty; that it is the only real champion of human liberty. To be a Christian is to be free, and to be an earnest laborer for the fullest freedom of every individual. And no other man than the Christian can be in the fullest sense a champion of liberty. Hence it is that we do not rejoice so greatly as some others do at the opposition of infidels to National Reform. Knowing that they do not oppose it from the proper standpoint, we feel assured that those who do not become converted to Jesus Christ, will erelong be zealous champions of that which they now imagine that they despise. {AMS December 1888, p. 90.7}

Tyranny is tyranny, no matter who exercises it. For our part, if we must be slaves, we think it would be far preferable to be the slaves of one man than the slaves of a million men. But we protest against being enslaved at all. Freedom is more than life; without it life is nothing. Thousands of martyrs have testified to this with their blood. Slavery, whether of body or soul, is abhorrent to every principle of Christianity; and slavery of the soul and the conscience is so much worse than slavery of the body, that the latter is not to be named in connection with the former, except as a very feeble comparison. Thousands of slaves toiling in the fields or the galleys under the lash, and in chains, have been free men-infinitely freer than their brutal masters. The man who is “holden with the cords of his sins,” or whose conscience is in the keeping of another or of thousands of others, is an abject slave. The man to whom God has given intellect, who will allow any other, or others, to do his thinking for him, or to dictate to him in matters of faith and conscience, has no right to call himself a free man. {AMS December 1888, p. 91.1}

And the evil is not lessened, but rather augmented, when that slavery is voluntary. “The consent of the governed” is a fine phrase, but it may stand for the most degraded slavery as well as the most perfect liberty. Is a woman’s shame any the less because she consents to be the slave of lust? If she willingly sells or gives away her chastity, is not her slavery the more deplorable? The slave who groans in unwilling bondage is next door to liberty; but what hope is there for the one who forges the shackles for his own limbs, and willingly consents and even begs to have placed upon him the badge of servitude? {AMS December 1888, p. 91.2}

No man has a right to consent to waive his judgment in matters that pertain to conscience. God has delegated to no man on earth the right to demand that another shall give assent to a thing which he believes to be wrong. And what is not delegated to any man on earth, certainly cannot be held by a million. This is not anarchy, but, on the contrary, is in most perfect harmony with strict obedience to law; for our friend is mistaken in supposing that good order and good government require that we should waive a particle of our natural liberty. Perfect liberty is found in a state where each individual is careful not to injure his neighbor, and it is not consonant with any other state. When any man goes beyond and defrauds his neighbor, the imprisonment which he suffers upon conviction by the civil law, is only the outward manifestation of the bondage in which he placed himself by the commission of his crime, long before the law placed its hand upon him. Perfect liberty is perfect conformity to perfect law; and the law which demands that the humblest citizen should waive any of his God-given rights in order to conform to it, is an unjust law; and perfect conformity to an unjust law is slavery,-slavery on the part of the majority who conform to it because they have made it, and it suits their inclinations, even more than on the part of the one who is forced to it against his will. {AMS December 1888, p. 91.3}

We love unity and peace; but we hope that God may ever give us strength to fight against unity and peace that are secured by coercing a single individual to give up an inalienable right. {AMS December 1888, p. 91.4}

The supreme question is not, Shall the people be sovereign over morals and religion? or shall the Pope? That question means simply this: Shall the majority have power to dictate to the minority what they shall believe, and what shall constitute their religion? It means, Shall we have many popes or one Pope? The supreme question is, Shall God be recognized as sovereign over morals and religion? The American Sentinel’s answer to this question is, Yes; and it will never recognize any other sovereign. Its highest ambition is to be instrumental in bringing many others to make the same acknowledgement. {AMS December 1888, p. 91.5}

It is true that the proposed Protestant censor-ship includes laymen; but a pope is a pope even though he be uncrowned. We would as soon be dictated to in matters of conscience by priests and ministers as by laymen. We wish it distinctly understood that what we protest against is not the arrogation of power in matters of morals and religion by a particular class of men, but against the assumption of such power by anybody whatever. {AMS December 1888, p. 91.6}

Our fight is not against a certain individual’s wielding the lash, but against the wielding of the lash by anybody. {AMS December 1888, p. 91.7}

It may not be amiss to note that laymen have ever been used as tools by a bigoted and Pharisaic priesthood. When the laity depends upon the ministry to tell them what they should believe, what possible difference can there be between being dictated to by a layman and being dictated to by a priest? {AMS December 1888, p. 91.8}

Finally, in noting the last sentence of our friend’s letter, we declare that we are against the teaching of the Bible in the public schools, for the simple reason that thereby the sovereignty of faith and morals will be placed in the hands of the majority, and the few will be deprived of their God-given liberty; because such a proceeding will put man in the place of God, and thus the only object of studying the Bible will be defeated. In short, we are unalterably opposed to unchristian methods of spreading Christianity, because when the result has been accomplished by such methods, we have the equivalent of the Papacy, and not true Christianity. {AMS December 1888, p. 91.9}

E.J.W.

**“Prohibition Blasphemy” American Sentinel 3, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

The following article we clipped from the *Free Press*, Mankato, Minn., of October 12, 1888. The election is past, and the contest for the present is decided, but so far as we are concerned the matter here given is worth as much now as it was before election, as it is with principles that we have to do and not with parties as such. We heartily indorse every word of the *Free Press* in its rebuke of this piece of blasphemy. This exploit of the Wisconsin Prohibitionist is a sample of the kind of political contest that is, and will be, carried on by that party which Miss Willard declares is to be “the party of God.” Whoever has any respect for God or for himself had better separate himself as far as possible from the religious Prohibition party, its methods and its aims. The *Press* says:- {AMS December 1888, p. 92.1}

“There are no doubt many conscientious and estimable people in the Prohibition party, whose moral convictions prompt them to vote with that party as the best way to express their disapproval of intemperance. Such of these as still believe they are not misrepresented and disgraced by the methods of fanatical leaders and workers, we would ask to read the following stupid and blasphemous production, which belongs and should be credited to the Wisconsin Prohibitionist, in which it was published as a prominent editorial on September 27. It is alleged to be a quotation from the ‘Bishop’s Book of Common Prayer,’ and is given to ridicule the declaration of Bishop Newman, of the M. E. Church, that he considers that ‘the supreme duty is to place the Government in the hands of Harrison and Morton,’ and that ‘I vote as I pray and pray as I vote.’ This Wisconsin organ of a party which is always lauding itself as the friend of ‘God and home,’ and repeatedly exhorts its members to vote as they pray, blasphemes God and disgraces itself by ridiculing the sacredness of prayer, and publishes the following as uttered by Bishop Newman:- {AMS December 1888, p. 92.2}

“‘O Lord, thou knowest that I have had about as much attention from the Republican party as it is the good lot of any Methodist minister to receive; and thou knowest also that no man who has enjoyed these privileges can leave the party without being called a sorehead, a traitor, and a sniveling hypocrite; and yet it does look tough for a man of my standing to vote the same ticket with tens of thousands of saloon thugs and bloody brewers and distillers. It does look hard, as I before remarked, to see a Methodist bishop voting with such low-down and vicious pluguglies, thugs, and guttersnipes, to continue a traffic that pulls more men down to hell in one day than I ever converted in all my life. And yet, O Lord, thou knowest the fix I am in. Help me to make the people to truly see that both I, and Sheridan Shook, and Benjamin Harrison, and Peter Iler, and Capt. Pabst, and Buffalo Miller, and “Bloody Corner” Cox, and Schlitz, and Val Blatz, and Boss Quay, and tens of thousands of other whisky men, and several other good people, do heartily sympathize with all wise and well-directed efforts for the promotion of temperance and morality; and to Harrison and the Republican party be all the glory, forever. Amen!’ {AMS December 1888, p. 92.3}

“We submit that among the lowest ranks of journalism there is still enough respect for religion and the teachings of Christ to prevent them from becoming the subjects of unnecessary jest and ridicule. It was left for an organ of the great ‘morality’ party to descend to the lowest depths, and insult all decency and outward respect for the sacredness of religion by an abortive attempt to secure weapons to defend the party it disgraces. It is about time for self-respecting, thinking men who have connection with the Prohibition political party to sever their ties to an organization which develops such disgraceful, uncalled-for methods as this clipping discloses.” {AMS December 1888, p. 92.4}

Amen and Amen, say we. {AMS December 1888, p. 92.5}

**“The Woman’s Christian Temperance Union and Politics” American Sentinel 3, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Sentinel has sometimes been accused of antagonizing the good work of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, and of turning aside from its legitimate work to fight that body. This charge we most emphatically deny. With the good work of the W.C.T.U., we are most heartily in accord; but just to the extent that it allies itself with so-called National Reform, and belies its name by becoming a political union, to that extent we are opposed to it. That is, we are opposed to it only when it neglects its own work. But in order that criticism may be turned from us, we publish the following from one of the most talented leaders in the National W.C.T.U. No words of ours have ever equaled it in scathing criticism, although it is justly deserved. The article is from the pen of Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, in the *Independent*, of November 1:- {AMS December 1888, p. 93.1}

Permit a brief recital of the position of the W.C.T.U. on the much debated question of politics. The essential elements of religious truth upon which this organization is based are total abstinence, and Christian unity in advocating it. The leading characteristics of this movement have been the education of individuals as to personal duty, and the suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors by legal enactments. This second phase of the question (work for prohibition) is not an end but a means to an end. This means is, however, so closely related to the end as to be sometimes substituted for it. {AMS December 1888, p. 93.2}

Brought into prominence by reason of more manifest connection with the duties of citizenship, the political phases of the question have very largely absorbed the vital forces of the movement. During the last few years an effort has even been made to bend all these forces into the line of party action alone. The doctrine has been boldly announced that effort, unless made by a party, was valueless for good, and all agitation and discussion on these lines has had its bias set in a party mould. A frenzy seems to have possessed the souls of men, and nothing of good or beauty is seen in anything but the work of partisanship with all its attendant curses. Doctrines subversive of the duties of citizens have been freely taught, and lessons which logically result in anarchy and discord have been readily set. The most willing students of these lessons have been the women of the W.C.T.U. Their zeal has outrun that of their brothers; it has had less of knowledge and more of religious fervor, and consequently been far more dangerous. It has made direct assaults upon the Christian character and political integrity of its own protesting membership, and has weakened its own hold upon the Christian public. The W.C.T.U. of to-day differs widely from the inspirational movement of the crusade or the early years which immediately followed. {AMS December 1888, p. 93.3}

We do not claim that lines of Christian effort have been abandoned. The children are still gathered in the Bands of Hope, and taught the truth of total abstinence; prisons are still visited with words of blessing, anointed with flowers and tears; daughters are still taught the charm of social abstinence, and mothers are admonished of the obligations and the possibilities of the home. In all the forty departments work still goes on, but these all are overshadowed by the turbid smoke of party frenzy, and the malarial mists of party Jesuitism. {AMS December 1888, p. 93.4}

No woman enjoys the official patronage who publicly antagonizes the political policy of the Union; no evangelist is sent out who is not in sympathy with the party work; no one is indorsed as a national organizer who declares her opposition to this policy. The official organ is a pronounced partisan paper. Like other partisan papers, it reports news and facts so as to make for their side. The paper for the work among foreign-born citizens is a party campaign paper during this year. The edition of the *Union Signal* for State and county fair work was made to bristle with arguments in favor of Prohibition party work. {AMS December 1888, p. 93.5}

The blight of partisanship is upon everything, and women who expect to purify politics lend themselves to insinuations and half statements of truth for party effect as readily as the veriest demagogues in the old political parties which they condemn. {AMS December 1888, p. 93.6}

This course has driven the women to great inconsistencies and many illogical positions. They talk about opposing “sweet reasonableness to severe epithet;” they make “gentle and dignified denial of any wrong intent toward any of our number,” and then proceed to adopt with applause, charges (evidence of which is withheld) against the personal integrity of a sister whom they profess to love and honor. They formally declare the most slanderous-insinuations of their willing press to be characterized by “Christian courtesy.” Their president commended to her followers as “spicy reading,” an open letter containing a most brutal attack upon a Christian minister, and which also contained insinuations against the character of a “beloved sister.” Against such treatment there is no redress, since the code of Christian courtesy has swept away the ancient rule, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. {AMS December 1888, p. 93.7}

They indulge in tumultuous applause at the name and presence of third-party candidates, but their president declares that sooner than support Warner Miller in his present candidacy in New York, “Let the minions of that accursed business (saloon) elect their candidates and so fill up the measure of their wrath.” To-day those same minions know that the influence of this Christian organization in the vital issues to be settled on November 6 will strengthen the opposition to the man who has answered the challenge of the saloons by saying he preferred defeat to success due to saloon influence. {AMS December 1888, p. 93.8}

The question is often asked: “Is not the minority as intensely partisan as the majority? Is not Mrs. Foster, an active Republican, as earnest in her platform advocacy of Republican doctrines, and as trusted in the counsels of party managers, and as responsible for Republican methods in dealing with the temperance question, as is Miss Willard for the third party?” {AMS December 1888, p. 93.9}

To this we reply: “Mrs. Foster is earnest in her belief and advocacy of Republicanism; possibly as trusted in the temperance counsels of Republicans, and she willingly shares the responsibility of the general trend of Republicanism on the temperance question. The difference between her position and that of Miss Willard is, that her Republican party work is done as an individual; she does not attempt to coerce the opinion or the influence of the organization to these party ends.” Miss Willard does, in her official capacity, support the third party; she goes in person to local conventions, and pleads for this party alliance; she gives official approbation to representation of the W.C.T.U. in third party political conventions; she is herself, by vote of the National W.C.T.U. Convention, a “consulting member” of the National Prohibition Committee; she uses the platform of the W.C.T.U. Convention in personal advocacy of the third party and its candidates; she herself introduces these gentlemen as the candidates of “our party.” This Mrs. Foster has never done. In Iowa, where the Republican party has warranted the largest approbation of temperance women, and where, if anywhere, the society would be justified in promising allegiance, there the W.C.T.U. has never given it; and Mrs. Foster has time and again declared it never could be done with her approval. {AMS December 1888, p. 93.10}

To fail to see the difference between official action and individual action, reveals a lamentable condition of mental or moral obloquy. In the conflicts of modern civilization it argues pitiful imbecility not to possess political convictions, and it argues mental or moral cowardice not to advocate them. This is as true of women as of men, but the political immorality of the National Woman’s Christian Temperance Union consists in its appropriation of the political influence of the minority against their protest. That influence was given to the organization to keep and to use, but not to assign to any political party. {AMS December 1888, p. 93.11}

In civil courts to obtain money under false pretenses is “embezzlement,” and to divert funds from their assigned and constitutional uses is “fraud.” This is what the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union has done; the difference in honor being in favor of the embezzler; the grand larceny committed by this Christian organization being of heart and soul and home “influence,” while the embezzler merely steals material value. {AMS December 1888, p. 93.12}

In the time of the Woman’s Temperance Crusade, through the prayers and Christian fortitude of these brave, devout women, there were reported scores of genuine conversions to Christ. We should like very much to see a report of the number of conversions effected through the political workings of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union. {AMS December 1888, p. 93.13}

**“The Church and State, alias the Prohibition Party” American Sentinel 3, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

The election is over, but since the third party Prohibition managers say that the Prohibition campaign has but just begun, the following incident showing the character of the so-called Prohibition movement, is as timely now as ever. {AMS December 1888, p. 94.1}

The evening before election one of the editors of the Sentinel was with several others in a business office in Minneapolis, when a well-dressed and intelligent looking gentleman came in, and, after noting how many voters were present, laid upon the desk as many sealed envelopes, addressed, “To the voters.” As the gentleman turned to go out, someone handed him a printed notice of a lecture that was to be delivered that evening on “Church and State.” He took in the contents of the handbill at a glance, and, hastily assuming from the most prominent words upon it, that the lecture was to favor the union of Church and State, said: “Church and State; that means Prohibition; we’re with you on that.” {AMS December 1888, p. 94.2}

The Prohibition politician was gone before anybody could disabuse his mind as to the nature of the proposed lecture on Church and State; but those who remained received a better idea of the real object of the so-called Prohibition party, than could have been gained by a week’s talk. The remark that Church and State is synonymous with Prohibition was so spontaneous and so hearty that it could not fail to convince all who heard it. We wished that thousands of Sentinel readers could have heard it for themselves, but this is an exact statement of the matter. {AMS December 1888, p. 94.3}

Let everybody be assured that work done for party Prohibition is work done to promote the union of Church and State, and to bind the citizens of the United States in a worse slavery than was ever suffered by the negroes. We cannot any longer in good conscience call the third party the Prohibition party, for temperance is by no means its main issue. Chairman Dickie himself declared that all the saloons and intemperance in the land are not so great a curse as the disfranchisement of women. So we are justified in saying that no one who has the cause of temperance and real liberty at heart, can train with the third party. It is not a Prohibition party, but a Church and State party, and strong opposition to it is perfectly consistent with the greatest devotion to true temperance and prohibition. {AMS December 1888, p. 94.4}

There is a good suggestion in the following: “When a man sets about an undertaking, he should first have settled these four things-what he wants to do, why he wants to do it, whether he has the right to do it, and how it can best be done.” {AMS December 1888, p. 94.5}

**“Back Page” American Sentinel 3, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

Read the Sentinel this month from beginning to end, if you never did before. You cannot afford to lose any of it. {AMS December 1888, p. 96.1}

There are many things which we find on our table, which should be noticed this month, but lack of time and space forbid. Questions have been sent that should have immediate answer in the Sentinel, but which must be deferred until next month. The field is widening, and we could easily fill two Sentinels every month. {AMS December 1888, p. 96.2}

The next National Convention of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union is to be held in San Francisco, in October, 1889. It is expected that five hundred delegates will be present. We shall be much interested to see how far they have progressed during the year, in the line of party politics and National Reform. {AMS December 1888, p. 96.3}

For the benefit of several who have made inquiries, we will state that Senator Blair is from New Hampshire, and is a Republican. It is also true that he, like many other Republicans, and Democrats also, is a prohibitionist. That is, he believes in prohibiting the liquor traffic, but does not, as yet, believe in separate party action for that purpose. His introduction of the Sunday bill was an individual matter, and cannot be considered as committing his party to any such policy. {AMS December 1888, p. 96.4}

We have received several very appreciative letters lately, which are a source of great encouragement to us. Some of these have been from men professing to be infidels. We are sure that there are scores and hundreds of infidels to-day who were made so by false teaching concerning the Scriptures, and by being made to feel, by the actions of professed Christians, that the Bible sanctions injustice. The mission of the Sentinel is to uphold perfect liberty, and to show that true liberty can be found nowhere else excepting in the Bible and Christianity. In con-sequence of this, we expect to see many avowed infidels renounce their opposition to the Bible, and become free men indeed. That men might know the truth and be made free by it, is our most earnest desire. {AMS December 1888, p. 96.5}

In his report to the *Christian Statesman* of November 15, Secretary Weir says:- {AMS December 1888, p. 96.6}

“It was my privilege to speak, October 9, to the R.P. Presbytery of Pittsburg, on their invitation. The subject treated was the latest development of the National Reform movement, viz., in the line of practical politics, pressing its principles upon the various political parties for adoption.” {AMS December 1888, p. 96.7}

“October 11 the Pennsylvania W.C.T.U. gave opportunity to briefly speak on the same phase of the movement, and to ask their help. It was one of the experiences indeed to speak before a thousand Christian women. They unanimously adopted a resolution affirming National Reform principles as applicable to civil and political affairs, asking the women of their Unions to urge them on the various political parties. {AMS December 1888, p. 96.8}

“To give effect to this, and to forward our principles in general, they created a new department-that of National Reform. This of course means a State superintendent for it, and county and local officers, just as in other departments. What opportunities will this give for mutual co-operation, distributing our literature, arranging for lectures or sermons, conventions, etc., as well as carrying the discussion of our principles just where it is so grievously needed, before the political parties.” {AMS December 1888, p. 96.9}

Facts speak for themselves. It does not need a prophet to tell just what the W.C.T.U. of Pennsylvania, at least, is running into. {AMS December 1888, p. 96.10}

The National Woman’s Christian Temperance Union proposes to make Christ “this world’s king; yea, verily this world’s king in its realm of cause and effect; king of its courts, its camps, its commerce; king of its colleges and cloisters; king of its customs and its constitutions.” But Christ himself declared, “My kingdom is not of this world.” Therefore it follows that the kingdom which the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union proposes to establish in this world is not the kingdom of Christ at all, but if established will be but a counterfeit of it, and that will be only a likeness of the Papacy. Christ says, “My kingdom is not of this world;” the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union says, “Christ shall be this world’s king;” therefore the word of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union is flatly against the word of Christ, and therefore that part of the work of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, is antichristian. {AMS December 1888, p. 96.11}

The *Christian Statesman* doubtless rejoices to be able to print the following:- {AMS December 1888, p. 96.12}

“The Eighth District Woman’s Christian Temperance Union Convention, at Augusta, Wis., October 2, 3 and 4, passed this resolution:- {AMS December 1888, p. 96.13}

“Whereas, God would have all men honor the Son, even as they honor the Father; and, {AMS December 1888, p. 96.14}

*Whereas*, The civil law which Christ gave from Sinai is the only perfect law that will secure the rights of all classes; therefore, {AMS December 1888, p. 96.15}

“*Resolved*, That civil government should recognize Christ as the moral Governor, and his law as the standard of legislation.” {AMS December 1888, p. 96.16}

Comment seems almost unnecessary, and all we will say at this time is that the above is of the low view of the law of God that is held, and must of necessity be held, by National Reformers. The law given from Sinai was not a civil law. If it were a civil law, why would it require to be administered by a moral governor? If the law of God could be the standard in civil legislation, then it would cease to be the wonderful law that it is. But the thing which we wish to have remembered is the adoption of National Reform principles by the W.C.T.U. {AMS December 1888, p. 96.17}

About a year ago the School Board of Pittsburg, Pa., made a Catholic priest principal of one of the city schools; but as there was much stir made about it, the priest retired from the position. It appears now, however, that he only let go to get a better hold; for the Catholics have now established a parochial school in the same public-school building. The dispatches say that the Protestants protest; but they cannot consistently protest for two reasons: 1. They demand that religion shall be taught in the public schools, and that is what the Catholics are teaching in that school-it seems to be a fact also that the children in that ward are almost wholly Catholic. 2. Christianity is the established religion of the State of Pennsylvania, and as even Protestants admit that the Catholic Church is a part of Christianity, that church has a right to claim the help of the State in teaching the State religion. There is a real need that there should be some Protestants in Pennsylvania who should protest, but whenever it is done, the protest will have to be against Protestantism itself as well as against Catholicism. {AMS December 1888, p. 96.18}

The following, from the November number of Our Day, Joseph Cook editor-in-chief, should be noted by those who think that Church and State union is not possible in this country:- {AMS December 1888, p. 96.19}

“Five million signatures to a petition to Congress for laws promoting a better observance of Sunday have now been obtained. The National Woman’s Christian Temperance Union Convention have voted to make the advancement of this petition a special and urgent work. The most influential indorsement which the petition against Sunday work in the mail and military service and in interstate commerce has yet received was given unanimously and enthusiastically on October 18, at Richmond, Va., by the International Convention of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, after two hours’ thorough consideration of the subject, under the lead of the editor of our department of Church Work [Rev. W. F. Crafts]. Let all labor organizations, large and small, and all churches, do likewise speedily, and the desired law will not be long in coming. Churches and labor unions combined are politically irresistible.” {AMS December 1888, p. 96.20}

But let it be borne in mind that when churches become politically irresistible, they are spiritually powerless, for they never seek political strength until they become conscious of diminishing moral force. {AMS December 1888, p. 96.21}