

### ARE THE PEOPLE FOR RADICALISM?

The Cincinnati *Times-Star*, a newspaper owned by a brother of President Taft, raises the question whether there would be any chance of a Radical candidate or a Radical party carrying the country in 1912. Its own conclusion is that there would be no chance at all. Recalling the fact that, three times since 1896, the Republican party, as the party of conservatism, has shown that it could win the electoral vote of every large State north of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi, it asks what would happen if "Republicans and Democrats should change positions in the next Presidential campaign." If the Republicans were to have a Radical candidate on a Radical platform, and were to be opposed by the Democrats on conservative lines, it is the belief of the *Times-Star* that the latter would have an easy victory.

Such advance political speculations are usually pretty barren. It is hard enough to have a philosophy of history as respects the past; the future eludes us because we cannot know what unexpected conditions may arise to vitiate our wisest forecasts. There is no likelihood, for example, that the issue will ever present itself in the clear-cut form imagined by the Cincinnati *Times-Star*. We shall not have a frank avowal of thorough-going Radicalism on either side. If a candidate is put up who is really a Radical at heart, he will make a campaign in order to persuade people that he is one of the finest and most trusted Tories that ever lived. And his rival, if a known Conservative, will be driven by stress of political weather into intimating that, if it comes to smashing corporations and ripping things up generally, he will be found to be quite a devil of a fellow himself. Thus, instead of having a Radical squarely pitted against a Conservative, the chances are that we shall have only a Conservative Radical in one party standing against a Radical Conservative in the other.

We have, however, in our recent political past something pretty solid to go upon, in this matter of the inclination of the American electorate towards Radicalism. In 1896 we had the issue presented in as sharp a form as we are apt ever to see it, and with all the advantages on the side of Radicalism that it

could ever hope to have. It was championed, that is to say, by a popular orator of tireless energy and a fanatic strain, whose inflammatory appeals fell upon the ears of workingmen out of employment and farmers deeply in debt and seeing no exit from their hard times. It should seem a perfectly safe prediction that, if a man like Bryan could not procure a majority for Radicalism at a time when his agitation was so highly favored by circumstances, no other man need hope for success under any conditions that are even remotely probable. In 1896, for example, the West and the South were poor; today, they are the sections of the country where wealth is perhaps most generally diffused, and where certainly the sense of being well-to-do is most frequent. Does any man suppose that he could advocate a policy which might fairly be construed into an assault upon property, and now expect the support of States where property has been most rapidly accumulating?

There are two mistakes which ambitious politicians make in playing with Radicalism because they think it is popular. They confuse dissatisfaction and a desire for political change with a readiness to upset established institutions. Now, grumblers usually have special grievances; the discontented have particular things in mind which they very much dislike. About them a great deal of clamor may be raised, without at all implying that the dissatisfied voters are ready to take up with any kind of destructive course commended to them by demagogues. An intense and widespread dissatisfaction with the high cost of living does not mean that a happy-go-lucky statesman who proposes to make the necessities of life cheaper by government regulation can count upon a great rush of the electorate to his side. Discontent is a passing phenomenon, while Radicalism is a permanent attitude; and it is a blunder to think that one necessarily grows out of the other. The dissatisfied may appear to be as numerous for the moment as "the myriad cricket of the heath," but it does not follow that the Radicals will be equally so. That is the second mistaken inference of the eager agitators who hope to ride into power on a wave of Radicalism. They ought to be more careful of their definitions. They say that the country believes in progress,

and that therefore its citizens must be "progressives"; but then they proceed to slip into the word progressive various doctrines which are instantly perceived to be violently Radical and upheaving. Yet there is no evidence that Americans are disposed to run after such novelties, whether they be labelled progressive or reactionary. They have not got over their historic fondness for the cautious, rule-of-thumb and inch-by-inch method of making progress; and if anybody believes that he can suddenly convert them to the plan of making everything new overnight, he is destined to a rude awakening.

### AVIATION.

The public statements made by Mr. John B. Moisant in England, as well as since his arrival in this country, have been of extraordinary interest. No one else talks with the assurance and apparent mastery of the subject displayed by this young American, whose flight from Paris to London, carrying a mechanic with him, recently startled the world. Not that Mr. Moisant is in the least boastful or visionary. He is simply in deadly earnest and seems sure of his ground. Though deceiving himself in no wise as to the progress thus far made, he is positive, for instance, that an aeroplane will cross the Atlantic in ten years. To a reporter he stated last week that aeroplanes may really be said to have been in service for only one year, and he complained that the American public expected too much. "They want us to run before we can walk, and walk before we can creep. That is the wrong spirit." Yet he is confident that each month will see a marked advance in the practical development of the art of flying.

For all their impatience, Mr. Moisant indicts Americans for failure as individuals and as a nation to lend the aid and stimulus to this new art which are so notable in France and Germany. In that respect there seems to be a close parallel to the development of the automobile, save that the Wright brothers were indubitably among the first to develop a usable biplane. But the Wrights are to all intents and purposes devoting themselves to the purely commercial side of the business, while Moisant, Harmon, Hoxsey, Ely, and all the rest of the many who have suddenly gone into the business of flying are in the van of

American progress, but apparently far behind the developments in France. True, we are seeing a large number of "aviation meets," and many prizes are offered for long-distance flights. But Mr. Moisant feels that the latter do not help at present, and that the refusal of capital to go into the business in a serious way is likely to keep America in second place in flying matters, as it has been in fourth or fifth place in the development of the automobile—behind France, Italy, and Germany.

What, we presume, Mr. Moisant wishes is that some man of great wealth or that some great business concerns would take up the aeroplane and deal with it in a broad-minded and scientific spirit. There is a rumor that Charles M. Schwab has decided to become interested. We hope it is true. Mr. Moisant points out the kind of things he has had to learn by experience—the replacing of wires by tubular metal, the use of metal instead of wooden planes, the strengthening of the frame without increasing its weight, etc. He has even ordered a 100-horsepower engine to weigh only 214 pounds. But all these things are difficult for one man of small means to accomplish, and his progress must be comparatively slow. Were some large concerns like the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, for example, to experiment with a view to manufacturing frames and engines, the story might be a totally different one. As for the army, we must admit that there is not much in what it has done with the aeroplane this year to call for enthusiasm. Here, too, it seems as if progress must come from private initiative.

Whether this is due in part to military reluctance to develop a weapon which may make armies impossible, it is too early to say. On this point Mr. Moisant is as emphatic as Mr. Harmon, and in these words:

When I talk about what can be done by the plane in war I am talking about an accomplished fact, not a dream. It is not that we must make the aeroplane practical; it is only that we must put it into practice. That is only a question of time and of capital. People talk of shooting at flying machines from the ground and warding off an attack in that way. We can travel seventy miles an hour, and more than that soon, and can go up 5,000 feet or more. Can they hit us under those conditions?

He can himself, he says, steer his aeroplane with one hand and drop missiles with the other; and a passenger could give his whole time to that occupation.

Now, if there is anything at all in this it is the duty of every government to investigate it at once at any cost. As scouts, the German and English aeroplanes do not seem to have been very successful. As attacking forces they have not been tried out anywhere. But here is a practical question of such great moment to all the world that, if no one else will assume the burden, the peace organizations should lend their aid to solving it. At any rate, Congress should promptly make liberal appropriations for experimenting with an invention which cannot fail to be of enormous benefit to humanity, even if it should not bring about peace.

As to the question of custom houses, it is far too early to say that the aeroplane will make tariffs impossible, as Mr. Moisant seems to think. It may be difficult at the present time to see how aerial smuggling could be prevented, but the ingenuity of protectionists, of which we have had so many sad examples, may be relied upon to invent devices or to make laws that will compel men coming in from over-sea flights to land at certain points or be subject to drastic penalties. Whatever the future holds in store in this respect, the appearance in the field of aviation of practical, far-sighted men like Messrs. Harmon and Moisant is the surest guarantee that the progress thus far made is only the beginning of the most fascinating enterprise and sport of modern times.

#### A LANDMARK OF MEDICAL PROGRESS.

With the opening of its hospital on Monday, the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research in New York entered upon a new phase of its great work. At the same time, the announcement was made of an additional endowment of \$2,800,000. The results already attained, and the ample promise of others equally important, have fully justified the hopes of those who have been instrumental in organizing and conducting the laboratories in which the labors of the Institute's investigators have thus far been carried on. But now, in addition to this research work, the Institute will conduct a hospital designed for the purpose of concentrating upon a certain number of patients suffering from the particular diseases to which it is thought most important to direct study all the resources available to

medical science for their relief, and of gaining for medical science all the instruction that can be furnished by the most accurate and unremitting observation. Nothing that spaciousness and careful planning in the buildings, or any of the appliances of comfort and of medical care, can do to promote the well-being of the patient and the opportunities of the physician, has been omitted.

It must often have struck any one who has thought of the slow advancement of medical science—slow, at least, compared with what the eager interest of mankind would demand—that it labors under a disadvantage, in comparison with other sciences, which is inherent in the conditions upon which medical practice must be carried on. The very obligation lying upon the medical practitioner to do whatever seems most likely to benefit his patient deprives him of the chief weapon of the scientific investigator in any other field of research. Everywhere else, the scientific worker's cardinal resource is freedom of experiment. Speaking generally, he does not care a button, when making a particular experiment, whether a given effect will be produced or not; he is intent not upon making something happen, but upon finding out what *will* happen. The medical practitioner, on the other hand, whether in private practice or in the hospital, is under the most sacred obligation to make, in a sense, no experiments at all; he makes *efforts*, and only such efforts as his previous knowledge tells him are likely to prove beneficial. Only by the comparison of results in countless cases—attended, too, with all sorts of complications—do these various efforts, some times successful, sometimes unsuccessful, more often still of doubtful effect, finally yield results comparable in point of certainty with those obtained by free experimentation in other fields. When we think of the complexity of the subject-matter, and of the tremendous difficulty of bringing to a focus the results of inquiries conducted in this way, the wonder is not that medicine has not advanced more rapidly, but that it has conquered as much ground as it has.

But this debarment from the resources of experimentation is not the only fundamental disadvantage under which medicine has labored, in comparison with other sciences. Upon the side of observation—the twin sister of