

sentiment in the interior of the continent. His utterances have seemed familiar to those long accustomed to the point of view in matters of foreign policy of such men as Bryan and La Follette. In the recent attempts in the Senate to limit the size of the naval appropriations it is not without significance that the speeches and votes of the opponents of the bill, Democrats and Republicans alike, came from the Middle West, and of these the Republicans were the more numerous.

Twenty years ago there were those who saw in the union of the South and West in support of Bryan a new nationalism opposed to eastern sec-

tionalism. The new Democracy of that campaign failed of success because the Middle West did not desert the Republican party. In the present campaign it seems at least possible, if not probable, that the insurgent Middle West will unite with the South in support of Woodrow Wilson. Should a majority mandate come to him and his party because of this added support, it may be said not only that this is the first complete Democratic majority victory since 1858, but also that out of the Middle West has at last come to dominance another significant movement in American politics.

EDGAR E. ROBINSON.

## Amateur Diplomacy Abroad

THE time of the wise, according to an English essayist of the middle nineteenth century, is chiefly occupied in repairing the mischief done by the good. The wise are always scarce and have never been so scarce in Europe as at present, but the good seem to be more numerous than ever, and among them are many Americans. For good Americans no longer wait until they die to come to Paris. All the Americans over here are ardently pro-Ally, or at least, pro-French, and that is as it should be. Those who have lived in France could hardly be anything else; if I had not been a devoted admirer of France and the French all my life, ten years' residence in France would have made me one. As it is, my English friends accuse me of thinking only of France in regard to the present war and of unpatriotically ignoring the interests of my own country. So I cannot criticize Americans for doing likewise; I would merely venture to suggest that they should temper their zeal with discretion.

Nearly all the Americans I meet here cannot find words to express their contempt for President Wilson. They declare that the whole American people is inspired by a passionate longing to fling itself into the war and is restrained only by the President's white-livered obstinacy. The French find it rather difficult to believe this; after nearly two years' experience of this war, it passes their understanding that anybody that has kept out of it hitherto should want to be in it. Still, they think that Americans ought to know best the state of mind of their own countrymen and they can but accept their description of it as a true one. The result is that, while Mr. Wilson is accused by the pan-German press of favoring the Allies under cover of a sham neutrality, some of his own fellow-countrymen are leading the French to believe that he is their enemy. I cannot think that the propagation of this view of American

opinion and of Mr. Wilson's policy, which seems to me, so far as I can judge, to be an entirely false one, is likely to better the already excellent relations between France and the United States. After all, it seems at least possible that Mr. Wilson may continue to govern the United States for another four years; and, that being so, it might be wiser on the part of Americans in Europe not to do all in their power to discredit him.

The views of Americans living in Europe might be discounted; many of them have been so long out of their own country that they might be expected to be out of touch with American opinion. Unfortunately, the same view of American opinion and of Mr. Wilson's policy is offered to us by Americans fresh from the United States, who have crossed the Atlantic to tell us what the American people are thinking. You in America have an enormous advantage over us in Europe in the fact that you have no professional diplomatists. Your ambassadors are not diplomatists, they do not profess to be diplomatists and they never attempt to play the diplomatic game. Therein lies the secret of their success and the guaranty of your security. Had you had professional diplomatists as ambassadors, you would probably by now be at war with one or other of the belligerent groups, perhaps with both. But, mischievous as is the professional diplomatist, the amateur diplomatist is, if possible, even more mischievous; he does not even know the game that he is trying to play, he is under no control and he can not be recalled. And he is so thoroughly and dangerously good.

At the present moment a distinguished American architect, Mr. Whitney Warren, is almost universally regarded in France as the chief and best authorized representative of American opinion. My wicked American friends in Paris—I mean, of

course, my colleagues of the press—tell me that this would cause great astonishment in the United States, where Mr. Whitney Warren's political influence is neither great nor extensive. Yet the whole French press, the members of the Institute, the leading politicians, the most eminent representatives in France of literature, science and art, will tell you with one voice that through the mouth of Mr. Whitney Warren speaks the great American people. I do not know why they think so; the only reason that they have for their belief, so far as I can discover, is that Mr. Warren himself has said it. In normal times we should hesitate to take a man at his own valuation; but we are not normal in Europe at present. Human beings, as Mr. Bertrand Russell has recently told us, are normally guided by impulse, not by reason, and use their reason only to attempt to justify their impulses and to prove that they are good and the impulses of other people bad. The few exceptions to this rule are the prophets whom we stone in their time and whose sepulchres we build after their death. Why is Bernard Shaw suspected and distrusted by the majority of Englishmen? Merely because he is guided by reason and makes us shiver by cold douches of that "most uncommon commodity, commonsense." What is abnormal in Europe is that we have ceased to use our reason even as an afterthought and that intellect has descended to a level that should satisfy even M. Bergson. Besides, the impulses by which we are guided are more and more those of primitive man. The almost universal acceptance in England early in the war of the great Archangelic myth—that a large Russian army had arrived in England—was only the most conspicuous example of the mentality that the war has created or rather resuscitated. Thousands of sane persons swore that they had seen the Russians and firmly believed it. To doubt the existence of the mythical Russians or the truth of any other legend, however preposterous, was to stamp oneself as a pro-German.

One of the characteristics of primitive man—or at any rate of the contemporary savage who is at present the nearest approach to him—is to take people at their own valuation. If you tell savages that you have divine powers, it is almost certain that they will believe you and the performance of a single conjuring trick will make it quite certain; they will then either worship you or eat you, according to the custom of their tribe—folk-lorists tell us that the two ceremonies have often much the same significance. The habit of eating our gods has not yet been revived in Europe; instead, we entertain them at a banquet. Mr. Whitney Warren has been entertained at many banquets; he has lectured to the Institute of France; interviews with him fill columns of the newspapers and even the serious *Temps* de-

votes leading articles to his utterances. All this must give a great deal of innocent pleasure to Mr. Whitney Warren, and there could be no serious objection to it had not Mr. Warren, with the best possible intentions and in the most complete good faith, led French opinion very much astray. He seemed to have come over this time in order to enlighten us about the forthcoming presidential election, and he and other Americans succeeded in convincing the whole French press that Mr. Roosevelt would certainly be chosen as the Republican candidate and as certainly be elected President of the United States. The result was that the whole French press, from the *Temps* downwards, adopted Mr. Roosevelt as the candidate of the Allies and insinuated that Mr. Hughes was a pro-German. To my knowledge, one at least of the more serious papers hesitated to express an opinion about a matter which, after all, is one for America, and was induced to do so only by Mr. Warren's positive assertions that Mr. Roosevelt's selection by the Republican convention could not be doubted.

I should have supposed that, in any case, an American would have been better advised than to push the French press into interfering in a matter of American internal politics. So far as I can judge, European opinion has little or no influence in America, but, if the opinion of foreign newspapers could have any influence on the decision of an American party convention, I should expect it to have an unfavorable influence on the chances of the candidate supported by the foreign press. As it is, the result of amateur diplomacy is that the Republican party is believed in France to be pro-German, and the choice of the American electors is supposed to lie between a friend of Germany and a man whom nearly all the Americans in France denounce as a weak-kneed shuffler. It seems that this fiasco is not enough and that an attempt has been made—again by Americans—to get the American correspondents in Paris to put themselves in touch with a sort of committee of eminent Frenchmen who would advise them as to what they are to say about the presidential election. Could the unwisdom of the good go further? Of course, the American correspondents, who, as I have said, are wicked and wise, have not the least intention of lending themselves to a scheme so silly and so obviously injurious to the interests alike of France and of the United States.

This is no great matter and no permanent harm will be done to the relations of the two great republics, whose traditional friendship is based on too solid a foundation to be shaken by the blundering diplomacy of a few well meaning persons. Those Frenchmen who know the United States know well enough that, whether Mr. Wilson or Mr. Hughes is elected President, American policy will continue to

be as friendly to France as it has always been. But it would be a pity, nevertheless, that America should be even temporarily misunderstood by any part of the French public, and a still greater pity that the misunderstanding should be caused by Americans. American sympathy is keenly appreciated in France and it has been practically and lavishly manifested; Americans have shown the generosity that is an American characteristic and have poured money into ambulance work and relief funds; the American hospital for French wounded at Neuilly is a model of its kind. All this will never be forgotten by the French people, but that is no reason why the French people should be misinformed. If I might venture to offer a word of advice to the well intentioned persons who have taken upon themselves the superfluous task of improving Franco-American relations, it would be: Let well enough alone.

ROBERT DELL.

## Metchnikoff

**M**EDICINE has long been a fertile mother of the natural sciences. Need for relief from pain and from grievous loss early drove men to seek aid in the earth and in growing things. Gradually the seekers became more interested in the objects they sought than in ailing mankind. Chemistry and botany and zoölogy were at last pursued for the satisfaction of the devotees of pure knowledge. Not infrequently, however, new facts failed to remain in isolation—ether was used as an anæsthetic, the aniline dyes helped in the struggle against tuberculosis—and thereby the daughter sciences returned to the primary motive of relieving man's estate. Sometimes, also, the investigator in a "pure" science found that his special interests led him back to medicine itself. So Pasteur, the chemist, revolutionized our intelligence regarding infectious diseases, and Metchnikoff, the zoölogist, first revealed important features of biological immunity.

It was in 1882 that Metchnikoff began reporting his studies of the action of the white corpuscles or leucocytes of the blood in protecting the body from disease, studies which at his hands, and at the hands of other investigators who followed him, have continued to be highly important and fruitful to this day. Earlier observers had noted that these corpuscles might contain bacteria, but it was supposed that the mobilization of the corpuscles at a point of bacterial inflammation was a means of spreading rather than of checking the infection. Metchnikoff suggested, however, that the leucocytes actively surround or incorporate the bacteria, destroy them by digesting them, and thus protect the rest of the or-

ganism from invasion. It is significant of the interrelations of the sciences that the fundamental observations on which this conclusion was based were made on a minute, transparent water-flea, *Daphnia*. In this little creature, whose life processes are apparently far removed from those of man and his relatives, the struggle between hostile invaders and the body's protectors was first made evident. Metchnikoff was able to prove that the outcome of infection depends wholly on the completeness with which the parasitic organisms are surrounded by the white corpuscles. Soon afterwards he discovered that by this process of "phagocytosis" frogs and mammals also are capable of combating experimental bacterial infection. Although the phagocytic theory of immunity at first met vigorous opposition, its opponents have gradually yielded, until now it is generally admitted that many forms of natural resistance to disease are best explained by the protective agency of the leucocytes. Even the immunity dependent on the fluid portion of the blood, due to the development in it of antitoxin, has not escaped the strong suspicion that it too results from a substance liberated from injured or stimulated leucocytes. The researches instigated by Metchnikoff's studies in the field of immunity alone have led directly or indirectly to revelations of new facts highly valuable to medical science; and investigations now in progress, thirty-four years since Metchnikoff's first reports, are proving still further the fecundity of the idea that the white cells of the blood are the body's protective militant forces.

Another important service to medicine with which Metchnikoff's name, as well as that of his colleague, Roux, will long be associated, was that of first reproducing syphilis in a lower animal, the chimpanzee. It was in 1903 that this success was published from the Pasteur Institute. The procedure was promptly confirmed by other experimenters. Suddenly this ancient pestilence of mankind was made subject to experimental attack. Active researches were started immediately in all directions by eager investigators, and in a few years animal experimentation, which had proved of measureless value in other fields, began to yield knowledge the importance of which for human welfare cannot be exaggerated. In 1905 the organism causing the disease was described by Schaudinn and Hoffmann, and Metchnikoff was able to demonstrate its presence in his animals; shortly thereafter a blood test for the disease was elaborated by Wassermann; and then Ehrlich discovered a drug of first-rate importance for successful treatment. Never in the history of medicine was a scourge to human kind, an affliction resting heavily upon the innocent and the guilty alike, more dramatically alleviated. It was a proper testimonial to the chief agents of our knowl-