

donor. The boggy of air-embolism, the allowing of small bubbles of air to gain entrance to the veins of the recipient, is no longer alarming, since it has been established that while it is not good practice to permit this to occur, if it should, no harm will result.

Most of the dangers which confronted the earlier workers in blood transfusion can be entirely obviated by proper atten-

tion to detail. Agglutination and hemolysis no longer occur since the study and establishment of the four blood types. It requires no more than a careful cross-matching of the bloods to be mixed to prevent the distressing or worse sequelæ that were at one time so common. And those reactions which are definitely known to be due to citrate may be avoided by using one of the direct methods.

City Planning

TURNING CITY BLOCKS INSIDE OUT

BY JACOB L. CRANE, JR.

A MATHEMATICIAN explains that the idea of the fourth dimension could be illustrated by turning the skin of an orange inside out without breaking it. The plan I here present contemplates turning the usual town plan inside out by facing home-sweet-home away from instead of toward the street. The time may be approaching for city planners to cry "Ready about!", as the sailing skipper does when he wants to head the other way. The contest for the use of the streets, waged between the conflicting purposes of traffic on the one hand, and play, promenade and outlook from the windows on the other, has been clearly won by traffic, and the losing side is now looking for accommodations elsewhere than along the streets. In response to this new situation there suggests itself an arrangement by which the street, passing between the rear ends of reversed houses, will be given over entirely to horseless four-wheelers hauling people and goods directly to the service entrances and people and refuse away from them. The sun-parlor, facing away from the street, will look out upon the garden, or upon the greensward of a private interior park full of playing children.

There was no conflict over the use of the streets until the excitement of riding fast by gas filled them with motor-cars. Formerly all of the customary street activities got along together. We could entrench ourselves behind half-drawn curtains or drape

ourselves on the stoop and keep the children in sight while they destroyed the lawn and darted safely among the infrequent carriages. Now, from the same vantage point, the scene has greatly changed. At five minute intervals we have to bawl to the youngsters to keep out of the roadway. An occasional child's funeral on some neighboring street adds to Mother's terror. Conversation must be edged in sideways between the racket of starters, sirens, klaxons, gabriels, and squeaking brakes. The ice man can't get in, and daughter has difficulty backing out because too many cars are parked along the curb. The quiet darkness of Summer evenings is destroyed by the glare of the street lamps necessary to keep the cars from wrecking one another.

We get out the old logarithmic slide rule to figure how we can pay the assessments for the pavement widening which will bring even more machines down the street and take out the parkway trees and the hedge so patiently developed for seven years. And over all there drifts a miasma of dust and carbon monoxide. Our streets have become traffic and service ways, and are no longer fit for playing, porching and promenading.

The most important consideration, it strikes me, is that of providing a place for the children. Shall their cavortings be limited to the back-yard? Maybe your back-yard is big enough; mine isn't. They require room enough to run, to throw and kick balls, and to emulate Tom Mix, Sitting Bull, Al Capone and Sergeant York.

The school yard is too far for going back and forth several times a day all Summer, especially for the smaller children. Also there are hazards in crossing main streets or railroad tracks. Mother can't keep an eye on them there. Even though it seems to be necessary in crowded playgrounds, the supervision of a janitor or a play director does not attract the gang with resources of its own. And so, the back-yard and the public playground failing alike to fill the bill satisfactorily, there is suggested (and in a few instances it has been tried out), the idea of a playground within each block.

The specifications call for a large enough area to provide for group play, say at least one hundred feet wide and as long as the block happens to be. There should be no access for automobiles. Woodmar in Indiana, the Country Club District at Kansas City, an outlying development near Dallas, and the Radburn project in New Jersey furnish examples. A two-thousand acre Illinois land operation now under development is laid out with interior playgrounds. Most of the little squares in Boston, New York and elsewhere do not qualify because of their limited size and the fact that they are generally surrounded by driveways. If we are to have sizable interior parks or playgrounds, we must turn our houses around and front them on open spaces. Sidewalks could be placed along the sides of the parks, inside the blocks. We could then push the houses back close to the service-way which the street has become.

Certain examples of existing interior playgrounds have been cited. Individual residences with their service entrances toward the street and their living quarters looking out on private gardens are even now not uncommon. From this experience we can understand the forces working against a general change. There is, first, the matter of custom, which is difficult for any of us to violate, even though we think we are as open-minded as the clerk

in an Atlantic City hotel. Many will cling to the traditional pleasure of viewing the road where the race of men goes by. Some will object to the noise of a playground, and these, no doubt, will confiscate the baseballs knocked outside its boundaries. Subdividers will not be able to crowd so many lots into a forty-acre tract. And there will be, as is the case with the interior parks already in use, the serious problem of financing the equipment and maintenance of the inside ground.

But these difficulties may all give way to the advantages of the arrangement suggested. If it is adopted there will be a place for the children to disport themselves safely and adequately and near enough to be called for dinner. The living-room and porch outlook will certainly be improved. The yard and garden will in effect be greatly enlarged by opening out into the larger space, and at the same time we will have far more privacy than the front-yard can ever again command. In-town walking, from one interior park to the next, will be more pleasant. All kinds of service to and from the house will be easier with the back door near the street. And we will be turning away from all the disagreeable features of the car-crowded roadway. The strength of these various factors, pro and con, is difficult to appraise, and their resultant is not easy to determine. But I can't disguise my prejudice in favor of the change, and I believe it may come about within the next generation or two, at least in new developments. The utilization of existing shallow blocks is possible also, but it will be slow.

This discussion, of course, assumes that the widespread, even if deplorable, custom of living in family units, one or more to a house, will continue. Probably it will. If not, then a still more fundamental change in our town planning will result when the children are left day and night at schools, the men live in dormitories and clubs, and the women are at last wholly free.

THE SPORTS SECTION

BY WILLIAM HENRY NUGENT

THE United States learned its first lessons in sports journalism and sports slang from the British Isles, where flowered the first public prints dedicated to horseracing, the hunt, the chase, cock-fighting, prize-fighting and other such pursuits and spectacles. The writers for these periodicals invented a special style and vocabulary that are still used by our modern sports-page literati.

Some of the terms thus transplanted in oral and printed speech have become so common that philologists, amateur and professional, often mistake them for Americanisms. *Chinaman's chance*, is an example. It has nothing to do with an Asiatic. It dates from the 1820's, when a writer in the *Weekly Dispatch* of London called the light-hitting Tom Spring, whom he thought likely to break in a long fight, a *china man*, that is, a porcelain man. *Palooka*, now signifying a fifth rate pugilist, derives from a pure Gaelic word. *Ham*, a poor performer in any line of endeavor, especially on the stage or in the ring, began as an abbreviation of *amateur* to *am*, which the cockney foot-racers and pugilists of the 70's pronounced *h'am*. Other locutions on the long list of transplanted English slang terms often mistaken for Americanisms are *to kid*, *faker*, *pink of condition*, *fan*, *cake-eater*, *to pony up*, *the fight is in the bag*, and *lucky break*. Despite a popular belief to the contrary, the English, the Scotch and the Irish have contributed much more slang to sports than the Americans.

That the British taught us sports journalism will not seem strange when it is recalled that they also taught us nearly all the games we now play or see. Out of

thirty-eight covered by the *New York Times* last year, ranging alphabetically from archery to yachting, only four were natives of this continent. The Indians bequeathed us *la crosse*, our native baseball players promulgated their first regulations in 1845, Dr. Naismith synthesized basketball on the gymnasium floor of Y. M. C. A. College in 1892, and the football Justinians of the 70's first codified the American football rules. The remaining thirty-four games listed in the *Times* came from the British Isles. All did not, of course, originate there, for to cite only two exceptions, the French idled at tennis and the Persians knocked a polo ball around centuries ago, but the British reshipped these exceptions to us along with their own inventions.

Before the Revolution, the pioneer Americans, as part of their heritage from overseas, raced horses, hunted, played cards according to Hoyle, fought game cocks, and mixed drinks. After 1830 many other imported games took root and flourished here. Turn to the colleges for examples. Yale and Harvard first rowed against each other in 1852, twenty-three years after Oxford and Cambridge had begun their rivalry on the river; American college athletes competed in the first intercollegiate Four A track and field meet in 1876, thirteen years after Oxford and Cambridge had inaugurated their dual meets; Rutgers and Princeton, in 1869, booted a football in the first intercollegiate match a decade or more after the English universities and club teams had given us the basis of the present game.

It will not seem strange that we inherited sports journalism from the British