

dore Roosevelt's intimate and vigorous interest in the wild animal life of three continents will be suitably commemorated, in collections, in paintings and in sculptured mementoes of the chief events of his astonishingly varied life.

While Theodore Roosevelt never pretended to be a professionally qualified zoologist, his knowledge of the animal life he met in his travels in Africa and both the Americas ran substantially ahead of that usually encountered in even the more thoughtful and observant of big-game hunters. And the trophies of his expeditions today enrich several leading museums with scientifically valuable and popularly instructive material. His leadership, along with Gifford Pinchot, in the fight for the conservation of American forests and forest

wildlife is so well known that even passing mention is almost superfluous.

That Theodore Roosevelt was only giving expression to a deep-rooted family tendency when he wrought all these works was well testified at the dedication ceremonies last Sunday. His relative now in the Presidency, Franklin D. Roosevelt, made the principal address, as representative and leader of the newer developments in American conservation. And on the same platform was the second Theodore Roosevelt, who has followed to a large extent in his father's footsteps.

Politics may amount to a veritable family row among the Roosevelts, but in matters concerning conservation of wildlife resources, they are a united clan.

Science News Letter, January 25, 1936

the one main value of the modern motor cars—their rapid mobility.

Motor cars, he pointed out, are no more comfortable than a well-protected stage coach, and modern trucks cannot carry more load than an old-fashioned horse drawn dray. Their usefulness lies in the fact that they extend a day's journey from 30 to 300 miles and speeds from 4 to 40 miles an hour and more.

Railroad Experience

The current demand for speed curbs, the Harvard traffic expert said, was experienced in the early days of railroading, when the railroads were considered "instrumentalities of the devil himself." The feeling was in part logical because of the repeated and ghastly train wrecks. Better rolling stock, better roadways, improved personnel and safety devices solved the problem for the railroads.

All but the last point—safety devices if a human mistake is made—are also helping the automotive problem.

Fundamental in the traffic accident problem, said Dr. McClintock, is congestion. Congestion is the factor which limits the motor car to only a fraction of its potentialities in serving society.

Accidents are caused by four types of conflicts on the highways regardless of speed (which only affects the severity of the accident), said Dr. McClintock.

They are:

1. Overlaps in the paths of approaching vehicles—head-on collisions, etc.
2. Overlap between the moving vehicle and objects at side of road—impact with parked cars, bridge abutments, etc.
3. Intersection accidents.
4. "Internal stream conflict" due to the difference in speeds of vehicles moving in same direction.

Ideal Highway

The proper highway would overcome all four of these basic difficulties, says Dr. McClintock. Its requirements would be:

1. Physical separation of the two streams of traffic moving in opposite directions. The new roads with parkways down the middle meet this requirement.
2. Traffic lanes reserved for moving vehicles only. There would be no parking.
3. No grade crossings for any type of intersectional traffic.
4. Sufficient number of lanes for the segregation of fast and slow vehicles and provision for acceleration and deceleration lanes.

Science News Letter, January 25, 1936

SAFETY ENGINEERING

Curb on Motor Car Speeds Will Not Prevent Accidents

THE growing demand for restraints of motor car speed as a cure for traffic accidents and deaths is about "as illogical and irrational as the dulling of the cutting edges of all knives for the benefit of the few people who are incapable of using these indispensable tools," the meeting of the Society of Automotive Engineers heard from Dr. Miller McClintock, director of Harvard University's bureau for street traffic research.

"It is quite right and proper that public officials, in the performance of their duties, should place restraints upon the use of speed under conditions which experience has proved to be productive of hazards. It should be pointed out, however," Mr. McClintock said, "that these restraints are distinctly negative in character and that they do not approach a constructive solution of the accident problem. The great majority of current fatal, non-fatal and property damage accidents result from speeds which are below any speed limits which would appear reasonable or tolerable. Statistical evidence, though inadequate, indicates that not more than six or seven per cent. of fatal accidents can be attributed to speeds of more than fifty miles per hour. A rigid physical limitation of speed to fifty miles per hour would affect only a small proportion of even these accidents. Most of them would have proved

equally fatal at lesser speeds.

"The difficulty of dealing with the accident problem purely through a control of speed is illustrated by a situation of daily occurrence. Two vehicles on a rural highway are approaching each other, each travelling at thirty miles per hour. This is certainly a nominal speed and one far lower than that imposed by any state today. They meet head-on. The effect is very much as though each of them had struck a stone wall at sixty miles per hour. It is rather an academic question to ask how much more serious the consequence would have been if the speed had been higher.

Then added Dr. McClintock:

"Please do not interpret anything that is here said as an appeal for higher or unlimited maximum speeds, either in vehicle capacities or in the law. . . . Speed restrictions alone dodge the issue, can never touch more than a small fraction of the accident problem and fail to take any constructive action against the conditions that cause speed to be dangerous."

The demand for speed restraints is a healthy sign of growing public opinion on the important matter of doing something about traffic deaths, Dr. McClintock indicated, but it must be directed into the really constructive channels of thinking and not be allowed to strike at