

dren, the limits of age for employed children, Sunday-work, hours of labor,—these, and other like matters, ought to be controlled by the men themselves through their organizations. The laborers about whom we are talking are free men in a free state. If they want to be protected, they must protect themselves. They ought to protect their own women and children. Their own class opinion ought to secure the education of the children of their class. If an individual workman is not bold enough to protest against a wrong to laborers, the agent of a trades-union might with propriety do it on behalf of the body of workmen." Here is surely a clear recognition of the right of workmen to form such associations, and a broad basis for their operation. Whatever they can do, by consultation, by discussion, by united action, without resorting to force or fear, to increase the rate or prevent the reduction of wages, or to promote their own welfare in any such ways as Professor Sumner has indicated, they not only may do, but are bound to do. The same enlightened public sentiment which denounces the abuses of the trades-unions should emphasize their uses.

The late Congress of the Unions at Paris seems to have been temperate in its action. An international convention for shortening the hours of women's and children's work was proposed and agreed to, and the following minute was adopted :

"The identity of the interests of the working classes in different countries renders international legislation in labor questions necessary. This legislation will be the outcome of class organization, and, above all things, tend to abrogate laws against trade combinations. It should, in the first instance, apply to the weakest and oppressed, to those least capable of protecting themselves, as women and children. Further progress should result from the development of the working classes."

The debates at the Congress are largely the utterances of moderate and fair-minded men, who have no revolutionary propositions to make, and who are cherishing no unreasonable expectations. Undoubtedly the affairs of the local unions are often managed by men of a different temper; but the presence of a wiser element in their councils should be recognized and encouraged.

What has been said involves the rightfulness of strikes, when these are not accompanied by violence or intimidation. It is doubtful whether the rate of wages is ever materially improved by striking—whether the advance gained would not, in most cases, have come in due season without the strike, and without the serious loss which the strike occasions to workmen as well as masters. Nevertheless, this power of united action belongs to workmen, and should be frankly conceded to them; it is only to be desired that they should learn to use it intelligently and effectively, in such a manner as not to inflict undue injury upon themselves and their employers.

It should be added that this discussion all proceeds upon the basis of the wage-system. So long as this system is maintained in its strictness, the considerations here urged will be valid. But there is another system to which this reasoning would not apply—a system of federation between workmen and employers; a system in which private property would be fully recognized, and in which the captains

of industry would reap the full reward of their organizing power, but in which the workmen should have, in addition to their wages, a stipulated share in the profits of production, and thus be consciously and actually, as well as theoretically, identified with their employers in their interests. It is not likely that the labor question will ever be settled until some such method as this is in vogue. Its adoption would not render trades-unions superfluous; they would still have a legitimate work to do; but it would change their character, and correct their worst abuses.

Modern Catholicism.

THE recent celebrations of Luther's four-hundredth birthday have borne good fruit. They have given a distinct impulse to historical study; and the results of this study, as spread before the people in elaborate addresses and in the public prints, have contributed not a little to popular education. The people who read are largely slaves to the record of petty passing events and the novel; whatever delivers them, though it be but for a brief space, from this bondage, and leads them out into the wide realm of history, is a salutary influence. Moreover, the tendency of the present time to seek out the causes of the things that appear has led to a more careful exploration of the ages preceding the Reformation. It was the popular notion that the Reformation had its birth in the brain of Luther: the more profound and philosophical of the recent discussions have made it plain to multitudes that many political and intellectual causes had been long conspiring to bring on the crisis of which he was the hero. This fact is familiar enough, of course, to students; but the great majority of the people, even of those who have been educated in the common schools, have but dim notions of the operation of those secular causes whose results are harvested in the great epochs of history: in their hero-worship they are apt to ascribe the uprisings and overturnings of nations to the men whose names are connected with them. Thus they get the impression that great reformations can be produced at any time to order; and they are impatient of the delays which always attend the working out of important problems in church and state. Wherever the work of Luther has been adequately treated, much light must have been thrown upon this whole subject; and we may hope that a few of the more rational of the modern reformers will learn from it an important practical lesson.

But the most significant feature of these celebrations is the reasonably good temper with which, in the main, they have been conducted,—the comparative mildness of the *odium theologicum* which they must needs arouse. The old battle between Papist and Protestant has been fought over again by some of the more strenuous partisans on either side; and there have been those who have sought to make this anniversary an occasion for widening the breach between the two wings of the Western Church. But these have not been the only voices; many of the discussions have been characterized on each side by justice and moderation. It is known by most of the eulogists of Luther that the Roman Catholic Church of this day and of this country is a very different Church

from that out of which Luther went; that Leo XIII. is a far more exemplary and devout person than Leo X. and the popes who immediately preceded him; that, in short, a constant reformation in discipline, if not in doctrine, has been going on within the Church against whose errors and abuses Luther recorded his protest. Doubtless, there is still much that needs to be reformed; to this every intelligent Roman Catholic will consent; but the moral condition of both the clergy and the laity of the Roman obedience is far better now than it was four hundred years ago. To what extent this improvement has been due to the counter-irritant of Protestant criticism and example, to what extent it has resulted from the increase of general intelligence, and how much of it must be traced to the vital and remedial forces that are inherent in the organism itself, it would not be possible to determine. It is enough to recognize, with gratitude, the truth that the religious reformation of the last four centuries has not been confined to the churches of the Reformers.

Some of the orators, while fully justifying the Reformation, and giving to Luther and those who wrought with him the honor due to them, have been sanguine enough to express the hope of a reunion in the future between the Roman Catholic and the Protestant bodies. Such a hope might have seemed altogether visionary twenty-five years ago; but it cannot now be deemed irrational to entertain it. As the conflict with Materialism and Agnosticism has been waxing hotter and hotter, it must have become evident to intelligent Protestants that they have in the Roman Catholic theologians a strong body of allies with whom they ought to maintain friendly relations. It is not Protestantism, nor the Papacy, nor Calvinism, nor Trinitarianism, nor any other secondary Christian dogma that is now on trial; it is the main question whether there is any such thing as religion — whether there is a conscious God, and a life beyond the grave, and a free will, and a moral law. Upon these issues Protestants and Roman Catholics stand together; and their agreement, so far as it goes, ought to be recognized and emphasized.

In certain matters of discipline, vitally affecting the life of the family and of society, Protestant teachers gratefully acknowledge that the Roman Catholic Church takes high ground. The Roman Catholic doctrine and practice respecting divorce are much closer to the law of the New Testament than those of the Protestant churches have been; and there is an earnest effort at the present time to bring the practice of the Protestant churches a little nearer to the Roman Catholic standard. In contending against the foes that destroy the family, Protestants and Catholics can stand together.

It is thus evident that there is much common ground for the two great divisions of the Western Church; and it is to be hoped that the anniversary which has just been celebrated will have the effect of bringing the more moderate men of both sides into closer sympathy. Signs of this ironical temper are not wanting in recent literature. Two of the most successful books of the past season, "But Yet a Woman" and "The Story of Ida," exhibit a hearty recognition on the part of Protestants of the strength and loveliness of the Christian character as developed under the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. Mr. Hardy has

not been accused of exaggeration in his pictures of the old priest and the two noble women of his story: he has painted what he has seen; but his work gives evidence that a born Puritan is able to treat sympathetically the religious life of those in whom, not many generations since, no Puritan could have found a trace of good without incurring the suspicion of apostasy. As for "The Story of Ida," its transparent realism is irresistible. The grimmest Protestant will gladly acknowledge this young girl's saintliness, and will be grateful to Heaven for the faith that inspired and glorified her life.

In spite of all these practical and sentimental agreements, there are still vast differences between the Roman Church and the Reformers, — differences that reasoning cannot extenuate, and that good nature cannot set aside. There never can be unity between these separated churches until great changes take place in the beliefs of those who compose them. Is there any prospect of such changes? So far as the Protestant bodies are concerned, there is nothing in their principles to hinder them from making any changes which increasing light may require; and it is certain that the tendency among most of them is to minimize mere philosophical and ritual distinctions, and to put the emphasis upon those elements of character about which there can be no controversy. But what can be said of the Roman Catholic Church? Is not that, by its very constitution and all its traditions, irreformable on the intellectual side? Such may be the opinion of bigoted Papists and of bigoted Protestants; but it is safe to predict that the Roman Catholic Church will not successfully resist the light of science and the genial influences of this new day. It has felt these influences already; it is sure to feel them more and more. To realize how sensitive is Catholicity to its surroundings, one has only to compare the atmosphere of the churches in the United States with that of the churches on the Continent of Europe, or even with those of the French part of Canada. Many of the Roman Catholics in this country have the Bible in their hands; it is not denied them, and there is light by which to read it. That mighty angel, the *Zeitgeist*, is abroad, and the rustle of his pinions is heard, now and then, under the arches of cathedrals and in the palaces of bishops. The growing intelligence of the people will make loud demands for reforms within the church. When the time is fully ripe for such reforms, the dogma of infallibility, as Dr. Dörner has suggested, may prove the engine with which to set them in motion. It was monarchy in the middle ages that brought in liberty on the Continent of Europe. The power of the king was strengthened, and he made common cause with the people against their feudal lords. The same thing may happen in the Roman Catholic Church. Some future pontiff, of a liberal spirit and a courageous temper, hearing the cry of the people for some lightening of their load of dogmas and ceremonies, and knowing that the time is at hand, may rise up and wield that supreme and unquestionable power which the Vatican Council has conferred upon him, in the reformation of many abuses, and in the great enlargement of the liberties of the Roman Catholic people. Such a movement, when it is once begun, is not likely to be arrested; it may be long delayed, but its hour will come.