

Albert, accompanied by his brother Ernest, arrived at Windsor.

Albert arrived, and the whole structure of her existence crumbled into nothingness like a house of cards. He was beautiful—she gasped—she knew no more. Then, in a flash, a thousand mysteries were revealed to her; the past, the present, rushed upon her with a new significance; the delusions of years were abolished, and an extraordinary, an irresistible certitude leapt into being in the light of those blue eyes, the smile of that lovely mouth. The succeeding hours passed in a rapture. She was able to observe a few more details—the “exquisite nose,” the “delicate moustachios and slight but very slight whiskers,” the “beautiful figure, broad in the shoulders and a fine waist.” She rode with him, danced with him, talked with him, and it was all perfection. She had no shadow of a doubt. He had come on a Thursday evening, and on the following Sunday morning she told Lord Melbourne that she had a “good deal changed her opinion as to marrying.” Next morning, she told him that she had made up her mind to marry Albert. The morning after that, she sent for her cousin. She received him alone, and “after a few minutes I said to him that I thought he must be

aware *why* I wished them to come here—and that it would make me *too happy* if he would consent to what I wished (to marry me).” Then “we embraced each other, and he was *so kind, so affectionate*.” She said that she was quite unworthy of him, while he murmured that he would be very happy “*Das Leben mit dir zuzubringen*.” They parted, and she felt “the happiest of human beings,” when Lord M. came in. At first, she beat about the bush, and talked of the weather, and in different subjects. Somehow or other she felt a little nervous with her old friend. At last, summoning up her courage, she said “I have got well through this with Albert.” “Oh you have,” said Lord M.*

LYTTON STRACHEY.

(To be continued.)

*Greville's statement (Nov. 27, 1839) that “The Queen settled everything about her marriage herself, and without consulting Melbourne at all on the subject, not even communicating to him her intention,” has no foundation in fact. The Queen's Journal proves that she consulted Melbourne at every point.

McCarthy of Wisconsin

CHARLES McCARTHY is dead, but his varied and picturesque personality has made a deep mark in American life.

He was perhaps the most original and interesting figure of the early Progressive movement. His particular contribution to the progressive idea of government was, of course, the creation of the Legislative Reference Department of the State of Wisconsin. This invention was the result of his watching the inept German, Norwegian, backwoods legislators trying ineffectually to frame their ideas into the exacting forms of law. One day, back in 1900, McCarthy noticed an old farmer assemblyman, with his lambswool coat and red-wristed mittens, wander into the library in search of the information that would help him turn some definite but home-made scheme for farm improvement into a bill that would resist the destructive fire of lawyers. The librarian handed him three or four large volumes, somewhere within which was buried what he wanted to know. Clumsily he sat down before them at a table, looked at them long and hopelessly, then with a sigh carried them back again, unopened.

McCarthy's quick sympathy for this simple man's perplexity set fire to his imagination. He had seen many other legislators in the same predicament. Representative government was then the big issue in the state. Legislators sent to Madison by the people could not command highly priced lawyers to draw up their bills, and in this the corporations had them at a disadvantage. Farmers had long since learned to be suspicious of law sharps who haunted the corridors and made over-friendly offers of help. What these legislators needed was a trained servant to do their research and bill drafting for them. Encouraged by Governor La Follette, it did not take McCarthy long to establish, up under the eaves of the Capitol, where the pine boards of his improvised office seemed to the farmer legislator something hospitable and friendly in the midst of those marble halls, a system which translated crude ideas into finished measures, legally watertight. McCarthy knew his plan would stand or fall according to the confidence it inspired in the legislature. So he made impartiality a cardinal rule—indeed at one time, when under criticism by the water power

lobby, he volunteered to draft, for any legislator who wanted it, a bill to abolish his own department. This impartial service of technical skill to lay legislators was expanded; more and more experts were added to it, so that it became an essential instrument of government. And it continued to grow in McCarthy's mind until at last he had a plan for making the results of scientific research available to every branch of government in America. Here, too, was the laboratory where he himself always found new things to learn, and in which he taught his students—as a close friend, Mr. Louis Wehle, has said—the “endless task of trying to fit government justly to human life.”

This invention, in itself a life's work, represents only part of McCarthy's varied activity. His whole career is a record of intense experience. Born in Brockton, Massachusetts, in 1873, the son of an Irish immigrant, a worker in a shoe factory,—the bitter strikes, the scarcely civilized industrialism of those days made a lasting impression upon him. At fourteen he ran away from home, shipped before the mast, worked around docks, on farms, in factories, finally got a job shifting scenes in a theatre. This led to scene painting. It was while working as a stage manager that he became a student at Brown University. When not earning his living, or studying politics or economics, he was playing football. McCarthy was an all-American back for two years, and was the first Brown man ever to cross the line against Yale or Harvard. Then came the Spanish war. Though rejected for physical reasons, McCarthy went to Florida, and was actually aboard a transport when he was found out and put ashore. Next we find him studying law at the University of Georgia, and making a living there by coaching the football team.

His wanderings stopped at Wisconsin. By race and nature a fighter, here was a proper battlefield for him. In those days, under La Follette's governorship, Wisconsin was a political Mecca to which travelled many to see the difficult process of two and a half million people coming into control of their own fate. The years following 1900 were years in which, step by step, statute by statute, the “Wisconsin Idea” of intelligent regulation of the “interests,” of human stupidity or selfishness, worked itself out. From his position at the strategic centre of the Legislative Reference Library, McCarthy had a finger in every pie, a fist in every fight. In the passage of practically all Wisconsin's progressive legislation during those years—in the direct primary, pure food, workmen's compensation, public health, conservation, water-power, anti-lobby, state bank regulation, insurance,

inheritance and income tax laws—he played a large part.

But McCarthy's interests were much more than merely legal. All progress was his province. Most of the credit for the Wisconsin farm marketing bureau goes to him. Though long at work on it, his plans for a university department of training for public service were cut short by his death. Next to the Legislative Reference Library, his greatest single achievement was the extension of the University of Wisconsin to the people of the whole state. In those days a large element in the University was under the influence of the eastern ideal of culture—an aristocratic influence—“and,” McCarthy once said, “there are no greater aristocrats found anywhere than in education.” In the faculty, there was a battle on between one group that leaned toward the liberal idea of education and another that wished the requirements for a degree to include Greek and Latin. Naturally the latter were horrified at the idea of spreading the class rooms beyond the campus—not to mention the unheard of proposal to put a great university into the business of teaching by mail. Thanks to McCarthy, the university went out to the people. By 1912 some 5,000 students were taking correspondence courses, and its professors regularly visited some fifty-seven local classes all over the state. Yet its work of higher education did not suffer.

Along with these achievements, McCarthy managed to coach football at the University, and was inconspicuously active in the fight that succeeded in driving the professional element from the game throughout the Middle West. He went to Japan with an exhibition baseball team. Other trips took him to Germany, Denmark, Ireland,—though born in America he spoke Gaelic fluently—where he studied agricultural cooperation. Yet in Wisconsin he had found the life work from which nothing could tempt him. He refused to go to China to serve as agricultural advisor to the Republic at a high salary—only one of many lucrative offers. Money he did not care for; indeed his generosity kept him continually poor. Position was nothing to him: “I think,” he said, “there ought to be one man who will stand through the whole thing without running for office and without asking for honor or emoluments.” And only once, when more as a matter of patriotism than politics he ran for the United States Senate during the war, did he even appear to waver in this philosophy.

But if Charles McCarthy had to his credit definite and varied achievements, perhaps the greater part of his work was done in ways that

can never fully be recorded. It has been well said of him that he had a "genius for making men aware of their own ideals." His electric personality struck in most of the men who knew him a spark, a realization of how in some concrete instance progress could be advanced. How great a leader he was will never be known, so much did he choose to keep himself in the background. "Credit that's worth having," he said, "will find the owner out." All over the United States are men and women, working for progress, who do so the more clearly and surely for having known him.

The contradictions in his nature help to define him. Though the founder of an organ of government that could frame laws technically perfect, some bills drawn up by him were said to be models of what bills should never be. The organization of his Legislative Reference Library was the work of genius, yet as an administrator of an already existing piece of human machinery, the Walsh Industrial Commission, he was not a success. While more than anyone else of his time he helped place science at the service of government, his own mind was by no means scientific. Himself a man of marked originality, his contribution to political thought was not original; his "Wisconsin Idea," as he himself said of it, "advocated no new philosophy," it "urged simply logical consideration of one thing after another as necessity appears." His conception of the state, his over-emphasis of the state's importance, was inspired by a German ideal, on which—and he might easily have been the first to admit it—the war shed a new and disagreeable light.

If McCarthy shaped public affairs to a searching philosophy of his own, we have no proof of it. His mind was not much occupied with any general scheme of things. Rather was he an engineer, who saw the broken bridge down the line and instantly conceived the most serviceable manner of repair; who used, along with the tools of his own ready ingenuity, much poetry besides, and who, by the example of his own hope and strength, easily enlisted the strength and hopes of other men. The immediate breakdown and the remedy preoccupied him; the ultimate idea, the idea of Socialism, for instance, did so very little. "The only way to beat the Socialists," he once said, "is to beat them to it."

The true signs of McCarthy's greatness—or of something akin to greatness—must be looked for in his personality, in a mind at once restless, patient, courageous, shrewd, open-minded, idealistic, practical, tolerant, continually burning with a tireless zeal, which made all these other qualities irresistibly contagious. His advice was sought by presi-

dents and mayors, labor leaders and business men, farmers and foreign governments. He was a pioneer into the wilderness of things that can and must be done tomorrow. If others followed him, it was for reasons the most various: because of his obvious sincerity, his enthusiasm, his humor, his readiness to acknowledge mistakes. A dash of brogue added charm to his dramatic power of speech. His physical appearance was unforgettable, and the true worth of him was easily to be read between its lines: a slim, loose-jointed, alert figure, above which was the face of a dogged Irishman, almost a prizefighter's face, with lean, jagged mask, hooked nose warped to one side by football, dark hair, close-clipped moustache, a long, belligerent, protruding lower jaw and with all this a pair of the bluest, frankest dreamer's eyes there to tell the most important part of the story. For such an athlete his slight frame seemed absurd; he weighed little more than 130 pounds, but, as he insisted, "weighing 120 doesn't matter; if you've got the spirit you weigh 200." Add to this an emaciation, described by a friend of his later years as much that of a hunger striker's, and you have the picture of Charles McCarthy, a man who did not care sufficiently for himself to rest from the fight even when he knew that he was burning himself away.

For McCarthy's particular combination of practicality with idealism, of science with agitation, the best name has been found by a friend of his. McCarthy was a "social inventor." Because of his inventions American political progress was advanced by years; because of him democratic commonwealths now have devices that will continue to serve the voters in their struggles to write their will into the law of the land, long after McCarthy's personal influence has ceased to be more than a memory and an inspiration to those who worked with him. But if greatly the craftsman of progress, he was also one of its prophets. By another friend it has been well said of him that "better perhaps than any other progressive leader he expressed the deeper aspiration of that movement, which was to convert the American government into an instrument of social democracy by improving its methods, by educating its agents and by increasing its sense of responsibility to the popular will." It is fitting that the Assembly of the State of Wisconsin should have voted unanimously to let his body lie in state at the Capitol "in order that all who loved him may have an opportunity to do honor to the great public character who was their fellow worker—the faithful servant of the legislature and of the people."

ROBERT LITTELL.

CORRESPONDENCE

The Menace of Opium

SIR: May I point out through your columns that Dr. Pearce Bailey's article, *The Drug Habit in the United States*, in the *New Republic* of March 16th, written as it is from the point of view of army statistics, is liable to be quite misleading in several particulars.

Statistics printed in the government report of Hearings before the Senate committee, investigating the Opium Traffic, have a more direct bearing on the matter. Part I of this report (now declared to be "out of print") gives the number of addicts in this country, as 1,000,000 in 1912 and 2,000,000 in 1918—a hundred per cent increase in only six years. One may be a long way from being an alarmist and still be appalled by figures such as these, which would seem to "approach accuracy" nearer than do those which Dr. Bailey has culled from the limited field of army statistics. I will admit that even these figures are "too small to justify anyone in proclaiming that the nation is on the verge of ruin from drugs," but I submit that they are alarming enough to make one deplore the attitude with which he approaches a traffic full of terrible possibilities for us in America.

Dr. Bailey's reference to the underground distribution of narcotic drugs which is deliberately forming addicts among the youth of this country, and his observations apropos of "registration," which he says throws the doors even wider open than formerly, give us food for thought. He believes that drug addiction is less a medical than a legal problem, but as a matter of fact it is most of all an economic problem! He himself touches the heart of the matter when he says that "traffic in drugs is a very lucrative business"! If the distribution and sale is lucrative, what shall be said of its production? I have not space here to go into this matter. Suffice it to say that the source of opium is India, where its growth is fostered by England, whose profits from the industry amount to between \$50,000,000 and \$60,000,000 annually,—figures taken from Ellen LaMotte's little book, *The Opium Monopoly*, which was reviewed last year in the *New Republic*.

Smuggling of opium comes up for discussion in Dr. Bailey's article. To the conditions which he cites, and which make it easy,—New York from all Seas and Canada; California from the Orient, I would add the Southern States from Mexico. And to the list of states that he cites as being particularly given to drug addiction, I would add Alabama, where there are reported to be more addicts in proportion to the population than in New York. This from the testimony of Mr. L. C. Nutt of the bureau of Internal Revenue, who also is authority for the statement that there seem to be more addicts in proportion to the population in the South, than in the North.

Dr. Bailey states that according to neuro-psychiatric army statistics, 83.2 of the drug addicts were found between the ages of twenty and thirty. Statistics obtained by more comprehensive methods tell us that the greatest number are to be found between the ages of eighteen and twenty-three. As to his statement that while no figures exist in regard to women addicts, "*the number in all probability (is) far below the number of men, as women have little tendency to form gangs,*" (italics my own) I can only say that it is well that we have his warning against accepting "unverified facts" as "final evidence"; and I beg to quote, in addition, from the testimony of Dr. Schereschewsky—an expert who testified at the Senate hearing—that as far as he could judge, the percentage of addicts is about equally distributed between the sexes. I would also refer the reader to medical journals for further information on this point.

The international aspects of opium distribution as it concerns this country, must, before long, receive serious consideration. Mr. F. R. Eldridge of the Far Eastern Division of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, stated before the Senate Committee that the fact that narcotics are allowed to go from the United States to China, either directly or indirectly, has an unfortunate effect upon our relations with that country, where (to quote from another witness) "we are slowly carrying on the greatest poisoning in all history,"—poisoning and debasing (I would prefer to put it—helping to poison and debase) a friendly people and a potentially great ally. And China is not the only country to be noted. There are the in-transit shipments to Japan,—shipments for instance, from Great Britain through the United States to that country, in bond. And that is not all! These are westward-moving shipments. In addition there was shipped from the port of New York, during the year 1918, i. e.

up to the end of September, morphine to the amount of 12,000 ounces; in 1919—33,000 ounces; and in 1920—61,000 ounces, a total of 107,000 ounces—together with cocaine to the amount of 163,000 ounces. Shall we not say, that, in addition to the medical, legal, and economic problems, we have in this opium traffic, an ethical problem? A part of the 235 tons of opium that came into the United States in 1920 we are using to 'drug ourselves, and part of it we are exporting to drug human beings somewhere else, with absolutely no realization—generally speaking—of the terrible moral, physical and mental degeneration that follows in the train of drug indulgence.

The problem that we are facing is serious and immediate. The destructive forces inherent in the opium traffic and habit are increasing. The evil is a difficult one to cope with, for it has its so-called "legitimate" and its "illegitimate" aspects, the one often overlapping the other. Much of the "legitimate" export is finding its way back into the country and entering the illicit trade. By means of the "underground" traffic many young people in our large cities are being infected with the insidious disease of drug addiction. At the lowest estimate one person in every hundred in this country is afflicted. A baby born of an addict mother is an addict. From the justice on the bench and the preacher, up and down through all grades of social and economic life, people are subject to the disease. Opium is clutching us! Shall we,—can we force it to let go?

New York City.

BLANCHE WATSON.

American Prussianism

SIR: "Manifestly the highest purpose of the League of Nations was defeated in linking it with the Treaty of Peace and making it the enforcing agency of the victors of the war," says President Harding in his first message to Congress. Truer words were never spoken, but what of the Treaty itself? What has Mr. Harding in mind when he speaks of "reservations and modifications"?

David Lawrence, writing from Washington April 12th, says: "If the European governments will . . . change the character of the League so that a member of it will not be compelled to enforce the provisions of the Treaty itself, America will join."

Frank H. Simonds, writing from Washington April 7th, says: "Stripped of all the finesse of diplomacy, the Harding administration has been saying to the Germans: 'You must pay. The question of the reasonableness of the Allied claims against you is not now open to debate.'"

The Harding-Hughes policy, then, is this: Germany must pay, but England and France must do the collecting.

In the final result such a policy can satisfy no one. If Germany ought to be made to pay what the Allied nations demand, the United States ought to help in the squeezing process. If the Allied demands are not just, the United States ought to insist that they be made just, or at the very least it should wash its hands of the whole business.

The Harding-Hughes policy is calculated to cost us the friendship and respect of the Allies without gaining the good will of Germany. It is a typically "America first" policy, an Americanized version of the "Deutschland über alles" policy. It will escape condemnation only because America lacks a pro-Ally, anti-Treaty party, a party which was for the war but which is against the so-called peace.

The sad fact is that since November 11th, 1918, there has been no movement in America for a generous treatment of the defeated enemy. Wilson, who had declared that the war settlement would be generous, accepted a harsh peace. His followers, who had applauded his high ideals of international relationships, then stopped thinking for themselves and through blind and tortuous ways went up and down the land crying, "Join the League of Nations," when they knew that the League was clearly destined to enforce a Treaty which not even its warmest advocate ever dreamed of calling generous.

And now, with all the talk of the tremendous difficulties which the Harding-Hughes administration is encountering in liquidating the war, there is hardly a voice raised for reconciliation, for the ideals of the Wilson of the old days, for a humble, considerate attitude toward other nations. Instead, we hear of "American interests," of "American sovereignty," of "American rights," of "freedom of action."

The Harding-Hughes policy, like the latter-day Wilson policy, is based on the belief that mankind is "after all neither democratic nor Christian." It contains all the faults of the Wilson policy and none of its virtues.

Hartford, Connecticut.

MYRON M. JOHNSON.