

"rests in a great measure on ethical motives." "Wherever co-operation has succeeded," says Ely for America, "it has produced excellent effects on character. It makes men diligent, frugal, intelligent and considerate of the rights of others." "Co-operation misses its highest mark," says Ernest Aves, "if the character of its adherents be not raised," and he goes on to speak of its fostering self-reliance and the spirit of fellowship, its aim being "to increase the economic usefulness of the individual life, and through that the national welfare." Mrs. Webb characterizes co-operation as belonging to an advanced stage of civilization, and refers to Herbert Spencer's generalization that "character will ultimately be more highly esteemed than intellect." The early English societies almost invariably prefaced their constitution with an address on the moral aspect of co-operation. A frequent motto was the following: "They helped everyone his brother and everyone said to his brother: Be of good cheer." I mention this aspect of the case in much the spirit that reference was made above to the huge proportions of the movement, that it may imbue us with a sense of the essential dignity of the step we are contemplating. Of course there is co-operation and co-operation. Not all co-operation is to be entitled to the high rank which Thomas Hughes confers upon it, namely, that it is a direct outcome of religious faith and that it is an attempt to realize the kingdom of heaven on earth. But I think we must look, nevertheless, in the present situation to far off results. Co-operation would represent the service trying in one way to accomplish from within what the government has already done from without in taking the service out of politics, the building up of its character. If co-operation represents a more efficient way of transacting our ordinary business, we may depend upon it that its adoption will gain us the respect and not the hostility of the country out-

side. As things are at present we seldom or never hear a reference to the civil service that is not by way of joke or epigram. Would not a successful co-operative undertaking, in addition to the organized activities we have already on foot, be an answer that would effectually silence all such? And is not the good of the country involved in anything that tends to increase the personal efficiency of civil servants both as workmen and as citizens?

All this may seem to smack of theory, and in our discussion of this subject let us not forget that co-operation is not a theory but a practice. This is overlooked by those who would dismiss co-operation as socialistic or semi-socialistic, socialism as someone says, being "a good working bugbear." Nothing, in fact, could be more misleading than such a comparison. Socialism is a political theory which advocates a fundamental change in the economic basis of society. Co-operation, on the other hand, starts with the accepted basis of private ownership of the bulk of the capital and the private direction of the greater part of the industries of the country. They are alike in employing the principle of association to work out their separate ends, but as has been said, "it would be as fair to identify those who blow up a houseful of people with those who blow up a rock which impedes traffic because both use gunpowder." That co-operation is a theory we are perhaps not liable, from the standpoint of this association, to forget, confronted as we are already by a successful though tentative application of its principle to the business of the service. In point of fact, it is the actual presence of co-operation in our midst that constitutes our immediate problem.

This may bring us to the second part of the inquiry, namely, the lines upon which co-operation in the civil service should go forward, provided it is decided to make the attempt.