

courage. The figures of the last national election were very significant on this point. In every previous Presidential election the Prohibition vote had fallen far below what it had been in the off-year elections immediately preceding. Thus, in the State elections of 1871 the aggregate Prohibition vote in the whole country was 16,000, but in the Presidential election of 1872 it dropped to 5,600. In 1875 it had increased to over 42,000, yet in the Presidential election of 1876 it had dropped to 9,700. It recovered its strength partially in 1879, aggregating nearly 20,000, yet in 1880 it dropped to 9,600. After 1880 it mounted steadily and rapidly, reaching nearly 59,000 in 1883. In the Presidential election of 1884, for the first time in its history, it exceeded the vote of the preceding off-year election, going to nearly 151,000, which was the highest point it had ever touched. This is what Mr. Blaine's candidacy had done for the Prohibition party—it had made it impossible for the Republican managers to scare Prohibition voters back into the Republican camp by holding before them the horrors of Democratic rule.

Since 1884 the total Prohibition vote has nearly doubled, being in 1886 about 295,000. The party has never held a national convention at all approaching in numbers and enthusiasm the one of this year, and has never entered upon a campaign with such a determined spirit. It has funds, it cannot be scared, it is satisfied that the overthrow of the Republican party is a high and laudable mission, and neither threats nor ridicule will have any effect to turn it from its purpose. The Republican managers may well look upon it with dismay, but they should not pour out upon it imprecation and abuse. If they had not abandoned all principle, and given themselves up entirely to Blaineism, the Prohibition party would be scarcely more formidable now than it was in 1872, 1876, and 1880.

#### DESCRIPTIVE NAMES.

WE have perceived with regret from time to time that our practice of giving to several public men the names by which they are best known to all their friends and acquaintances, and by which they are invariably spoken of in the circles which they adorn, is giving them more or less dissatisfaction. Our estimable friend "Tom" Platt, for instance, showed, in an interesting interview in the *Tribune* on Friday, that he is extremely dissatisfied because he is known and mentioned among Mugwumps by the name by which he is known and mentioned among Republicans, and intimates that this is one reason why he and other "genuine Republicans" always, when they find out what Mugwumps want, "decide to do the opposite." We cannot help thinking ourselves that this policy is hardly worthy of a statesman of "Tom" Platt's standing, for if followed persistently, it must certainly occasionally place him in positions of great perplexity. He is too much of a man to play pig to the Mugwump's Irishman—for he has doubtless heard of the Irishman who directed the course of an erratic pig by pulling it by the tail in the

direction opposite to that which he wished it to follow. We are, of course, interested to a greater or less extent in "Tom's" movements, but we should never think of controlling them by any species of caudal traction. We like to see him follow the promptings of his own nature, and now that we know he will not be true to himself if we let him know what we should like, we promise to keep our wishes about "genuine Republicans" as private as possible.

But there is one point on which we cannot accommodate him. We cannot relinquish our practice of calling him "Tom." He can never be to us the "Honorable Thomas C. Platt," or even "Thomas Platt," first, because nobody who knows and loves him ever calls him anything but "Tom Platt"; and secondly, because these familiar names which we use in the *Nation* in speaking of various public men, are not only their real names, but they are descriptive terms—that is, they not only designate particular individuals, but they connote certain traits of character. In fact, among the politicians of whom we are in the habit of speaking as Mikes, Jakes, Tims, and Barneys, Michael, Jacob, Timothy, and Bernard are, it is true, the names given them by their unfortunate godfathers and godmothers in baptism, and under which they are indicted or bailed; but to their friends and associates they are titles of courtesy, such as are in England given to the sons of dukes, earls, and marquises, rather than names in the ordinary sense of the term. If any friend of "Tom" Platt, or "Barney" Biglin, or "Bill" Chandler were suddenly to call him Mr. Platt, Mr. Biglin, or Mr. Chandler, it would be at once inferred by the bystanders that a coolness of some kind had grown up between them, or that their relations had in some way undergone a serious change, or that, in short, to the friend, Mr. Platt or Mr. Chandler was not the same person as Tom Platt or Bill Chandler.

Our second reason is, however, the more important. That the familiar name of a prominent man, or indeed any kind of man—that is, the one by which he is generally known—contains, as we have said, a description of character, is one of the most familiar facts of daily life. No cold, or proud, or haughty, or serious, or reserved, or punctilious, or studious man was ever known as Tom, Dick, or Harry, Mike, Jake, or Barney. The bearers of these appellations always, or almost always, are in the category popularly known as "Hail-fellows, well met." They are the men whom you slap on the back, punch in the ribs, and around whose neck you put your arm, with whom you share a bed, from whom you borrow or to whom you lend trousers, shirts, collars, or pocket-handkerchiefs, whom you can hardly look at without wishing to "take a drink," to whom you can at any time lay bare a scheme of doubtful propriety in love, politics, or business, with the full assurance of tender sympathy, and whom you always convince in argument by "laying two to one" on the soundness of your contention.

We do not mean to say by any means that

this is a description of all Toms, Dicks, and Harrys, Mikes, Jakes, and Barneys; but assuredly nobody who answers to it was ever known except as a Tom, Dick, or Harry, Mike, Jake, or Barney. Nor do we mean to say that all Toms or Dicks are really confiding, simple-minded, devil-may-care persons. On the contrary, they often conceal a considerable amount of guile under a very hearty, impetuous, and harebrained exterior, which has a very saddening effect on the social philosopher. Any one, for instance, who acted on the supposition that "Tom" Platt was a typical Tom, or "Bill" Chandler a typical Bill—that is, a rash, candid, impulsive, generous, nobody's-enemy-but-his-own sort of man—would be cruelly deceived. What we maintain is simply that there is a certain general external resemblance between all members of the class—an outward softness and good nature, and familiarity, an absence of airs, or "frills," or "dignity of tone," which puts the plain man at his ease, and makes him feel that he is in the presence of a real son of Adam, a creature familiar with all the minor weaknesses, at least, of our race, and far from too exacting in the matter of virtue or propriety.

This being our position, it may be imagined with what surprise, mingled with pain, we have from time to time observed expressions of irritation or disgust from the various members of the class over our habit of speaking of them in our columns by the names by which they are universally known—names which, if tested by the rule of Catholic orthodoxy—"quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus"—must be considered correctness itself. Under this rule, in fact, the use of such expressions as "Mr. Chandler," or "Honorable William E. Chandler," meaning thereby "Bill" Chandler of New Hampshire, would be a gross impropriety. To speak of our local Boys, Jake, Barney, Clint, Steve, Sol, and Johnny, by any other names would not be simply improper, but misleading. They are the only appellations by which they are known in the sphere in which they shine—politics. In their own homes they may possibly treat these appellations as what the French call "war names," and lay them aside in the recesses of their domesticity. But into these sacred precincts we do not follow them. To us they are simply statesmen actively engaged in making places for themselves in history. As husbands or fathers we know nothing of them. To us, as to the whole population of this great city, they are Boys, and must always be Boys, with all that the name implies.

#### COÖPERATION AND ITS PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES.

It is a common belief that there is a large amount of wealth appropriated by capitalists and employers of labor without corresponding service to society; that it is the fault of the machinery of distribution which enables them to do so, and that, by proper alterations in this machinery, the workmen can obtain a large share of this surplus wealth, and add greatly to their comfort and well-

being. This idea is not confined to Socialists or radical labor leaders. It is held, more or less vaguely, by a large part of the community; and this fact gives strength and countenance to a great many schemes of reform which fail to meet expectation when brought to the test of practice.

Of all such schemes, the most promising has been that which is known under the somewhat indefinite name of coöperation. It is a plan which has undeniable merits. It tends to reduce the antagonism of classes, to educate the workman in habits of forethought, and to give him self-respect and independence. Men like John Stuart Mill have looked forward to its application with the highest hopes. It is of great interest to compare these expectations with the actual result. This we are now able to do. The Johns Hopkins University, as our readers are aware, has recently published a series of studies on coöperation in different parts of the United States, by men like E. W. Bemis, Albert Shaw, and C. H. Shinn, which are now collected into a single volume. As a contribution to industrial history, this book is of the very highest value. It gives us a sufficiently broad basis of fact to judge of the conditions under which coöperation will succeed or fail.

What is coöperation? Holyoake has defined it as "an industrial scheme for delivering the public from the conspiracy of capitalists, traders, or manufacturers, who would make the laborer work for the least and the consumer pay the most for whatever he needs of money, machines, or merchandise." This definition, it will be observed, assumes that the capitalists have "conspired" to accumulate unjust profits, and is intended to cover almost any scheme for redistributing them. Practically, the name is applied to three distinct things:

(1.) An arrangement by which the consumers manage the business and divide the profits—distributive coöperation.

(2.) An arrangement by which the employees choose those who are to manage the business—productive coöperation.

(3.) An arrangement by which the employees participate in the profits of the business—profit-sharing.

The conditions which decide the success or failure of an experiment in distributive coöperation are comparatively simple. Such an enterprise has the advantage of being fairly sure of its custom; it can therefore dispense with wasteful advertising and still more wasteful credit. If managed with the same ability as an old-fashioned store, these things should give it an advantage. In England the conditions were such as to give that advantage. Old trade methods were so bad that coöperative stores were able to sell cheaper. In America such instances of success were exceptions. The 500 councils of the Sovereigns of Industry, established a dozen years ago, have left but few survivals. The Patrons of Husbandry have fared better; but even here the percentage of failure was very great. It is the same story everywhere: the men to whom the funds were intrusted were found wanting in the necessary ability or character.

The cases of productive coöperation and of profit-sharing are more complicated. It may readily happen that the feeling of independence in the one case, or of personal interest in the other, is an actual source of added efficiency. This is the testimony of some who have tried it. Anything which thus increases the efficiency of the work, especially if it tends to prevent strikes, is a powerful source of advantage to all parties concerned. Unfortunately, the experience of the Brewsters in 1872 showed that the system of profit-sharing did not prevent strikes. There are few instances of good results to offset this signal failure. Only one case—that of the Pillsbury Mills at Minneapolis—can be described as a distinct and continuous success. Most manufacturers have found that loyalty and efficiency on the part of their hands can better be secured by personal consideration, steadiness of employment, or promotion, than by a half-understood system of supplementary dividends. The more complicated an industry is, the more fully does the truth of this statement appear.

But what of productive coöperation on the part of the hands themselves, where they choose their own managers, with or without a system of profit-sharing? This has been more frequently tried, with some marked instances of success, particularly among the shoemakers of Massachusetts and the coopers of Minneapolis. It is subject to two dangers. It is a question whether the operatives will choose as good a manager as the stockholders of a corporation; and it is also a question whether he can enforce as good discipline among those on whom he depends for his place. The first point is the more serious of the two. It is often hard for workmen to realize the value of the services of a responsible and efficient manager. They are not willing to pay for them; and this false economy too often wastes many times the money which it saves. The industries which lend themselves to productive coöperation are those of comparatively simple character; where the connection between the efficiency of the labor and its results is most obvious, and where the necessities for organizing power and speculative foresight are reduced to a minimum. But the importance of such industries is growing every day relatively less.

We have thus far considered coöperation solely from the standpoint of efficiency and economy as a matter of business. There are certain other things to be taken into account, especially its work as an educator. As far as it teaches workmen about the responsibilities and use of property, it has a most powerful influence for good upon them and upon the community. As far as it leads them to become possessors of property, the result is still more noticeable. The success of the building associations and coöperative banks has been largely due to this fact. But this very success is fatal to the pretensions of those who advocate the coöperative principle for its own sake. It is not by altering the machinery of distribution that it succeeds, so much as by educating men to take advantage of the existing machinery.

There are three forms of coöperation in which the percentage of success has been large—building associations, creameries, and mutual-insurance companies. The first leads its members to become property-owners; the second and third are directed by men who already own property. The success in these cases, so far from proving that the direction of industry should be taken out of the hands of capital, proves that the owners of capital are competent to direct it. Success here, contrasted with the percentage of failure elsewhere, shows the large importance of having responsible men in control, and the relatively small importance of any particular form of machinery of distribution. It is not new methods of distribution that we want, but education in the best and most efficient use of our powers. It is not as a machine, but as an educational force, that coöperation seems to promise success—not because it will enable leaders of labor to become leaders of industry, but because, as soon as those leaders are tried in the latter capacity, they are subjected to a test which only the fittest can survive.

#### SCHOLARSHIPS OPEN TO WOMEN AND GIRLS IN ENGLAND.

THE growth of the modern English system of scholarships in aid of the higher education of girls dates from 1853, in which year Queen's College, London, was incorporated by royal charter, and the body of professors, out of their private means, founded eight "perpetual" scholarships. About the same date senior scholarships for girls were provided out of the Reid Trust, created by Mrs. Reid, founder of Bedford College, London. As years went on, further pecuniary assistance was given to the higher education of girls; but it is only during the last eighteen years, *i. e.*, since women have obtained a participation in the advantages of university education, that the great development of the system of scholarships has taken place. There are now not only a large number of scholarships designed for women, but also many for which women may compete on equal terms with men. With respect to each kind our readers will want to know something as to annual value, period of tenure, the colleges at which and the conditions under which they may be held; and, in the case of scholarships derived from endowments, what means have been adopted by the founders to secure the ends desired. Estimating a scholarship of £50 per annum tenable for three years as being worth £150 in the year in which it is awarded—and excluding from our consideration the numerous scholarships for the encouragement of music and the fine arts—we find that in different ways a total of £6,500 is given annually in England in scholarships and exhibitions for women and senior girls. Of this about a third is interest derived from endowments; actually a fourth of the whole is drawn from the surplus revenues of Girton and Newnham Colleges, in scholarships tenable at these colleges; a fifth is given annually by the London City Companies, and the rest is due to the liberality of individuals able to subscribe towards scholarships to run a certain number of years.

Girton College, Cambridge, though it has only three perpetual scholarships, is by far the richest college as regards the value of scholarships, as much as £2,000 being given annually