otherwise it is an imbecility, for men build houses and gardens expressly to overcome the chilly immensity and indifference of the natural environment; and your skyscraper is as formidable as Nature itself. Genuine architecture consists in making the size and shape of the building suit the purpose for which it is used. The modern skyscraper glorifies the powers of business and increases groundrents; at the same time it exhibits proudly the manifold devices of modern engineering. This doubtless causes satisfaction to the business man and the engineer. In building a home, a theatre, a college, a church, a library or a garden, however, these purposes are not merely foreign: they are hideously contradictory. If men liked the environment of the office building they would not in such large numbers escape to the suburbs; and although business and industry are fast making prisoners of us all, there are murmurs of revolt among the more intelligent part of the population: the public that sees "The Adding Machine" and "R. U. R." and "Beggar on Horseback" have begun to laugh on the other sides of their faces. Take what pleasure you can in the service of business, but don't imagine that the skyscraper is the pattern of the heart's desire and the very mansion of the soul. You must learn to purchase your æsthetic effects a little more cheaply. I repeat: it would be well to try canvas.

ARCHITECT—Your tirade leaves me quite unconvinced. But it is time to be drifting home now; you know I must catch a train at 9.20 for Darien, where I spend about half my time.

CRITIC—Yes: I passed your little estate one Sunday afternoon last Spring and caught a glimpse of you pruning the pear trees in back of that charming little Colonial house. Your deeds are much more admirable than your dreams. For one thing, they are much nearer the earth.

ARCHITECT—And you—you criticise these towers, and imply that we all ought to live in garden-cities; and yet, I see, you continue to remain in the heart of the metropolis.

CRITIC—Quite so: that is why I realize its defects so much more keenly than you appear to. At any rate, night has fallen on the city, as well as on our argument; and it is a blessed relief. Without darkness and fog, how could the architect get along?

Sociology

THE DRUG ADDICT

By ROBERT A. SCHLESS

A DRUG addict looks and behaves no more like his stage impersonator than a theatrical Irishman or German or Jew is like his prototype. In fact, some thousands of cases have taught me the great difficulty of diagnosing narcotism, in the majority of instances, with anything like legal certainty. One pictures a wild-eyed trembling wretch, who jumps at a shadow. One sees instead a group of rather quiet and easy-going men and women who look no more like "dopers" than criminals resemble the so-called criminal type.

The menace of the drug addict to society exists, I believe, mainly in the minds of the uninformed, and it has been instilled therein by such enthusiasts as hoodwinked us in our grammar-school days with alarms about the effects of alcohol. A fair proportion of felons, true enough, are addicted to drugs, but few of them were users first and criminals thereafter. Our court records show quite the reverse. Sex crimes, which are commonly regarded as a natural result of drug taking, actually never occur among addicts, for their sexual desires, and even their sexual functions, are entirely dormant while they are "on the stuff." Murder and assault are rare among them, and

the taking of drugs impels to robbery only because they are very expensive. This last indirect criminal result of drug addiction has been caused by the unscientific and illogical methods taken to stamp out the habit. Drug users are notably loyal and affectionate husbands or wives, and it is extremely rare for the wife of an addict, herself not a user, to make an attempt to have her husband forcibly cured of his habit. She usually does so, indeed, only when his heavy expenditures, together with his lessened earning powers, have made difficulties that are purely financial. There is not nearly so much wife beating, desertion, or other evidence of family disruption among this group as there is among chronic alcoholics.

As to the physical effects of drug-taking, it is axiomatic among physicians of large first-hand experience that no permanent organic injury is caused by narcotics when they are used in the usual quantities. On this score, drugs are infinitely less harmful to the body than alcohol. In a constant tippler, changes occur in the liver, kidneys, heart and blood vessels that no abstinence can ever eradicate. But I have yet to see a drug addict who, on being entirely cut off from his narcotic for, say, from three to ten months, could be differentiated by most careful physical examination from non-users of the same age. Indeed, only the scarred arms and thighs caused by unclean hypodermic injections and the tell-tale slate blue tattoo caused by cocaine betray the erstwhile addict. I remember one man who was fifty-two years old and had used drugs uninterruptedly for twenty-some years, yet he was sufficiently fit in appearance to be accepted for service in the Army during the late war, when he gave his age as thirty.

I used to be much puzzled by the frequency with which Negro addicts are found. That so serene a race should have a penchant for the decadent thrill of narcotics seemed very strange. But talks with colored drug users have brought to light the startling fact that their "habits" have been brought from the Black Belt of the South in the recent heavy immigration northward. Some of the Southern plantation owners, seeking to stem the sweep across the Mason and Dixon line, have encouraged and abetted the use of heroin and cocaine among their field hands, and tried to chain them to their source of supply. Negroes seem to suffer very slight damage from drugs; probably the toxicity of such drugs is directly proportionate to the nervous complexity of the user. Certainly it is common to find colored men and women whose indulgence is mild and sporadic, and unaccompanied by any visible physical deterioration.

As a rule, habitués who use drugs in large amounts are characterized by pallor and varying degrees of emaciation, due in large measure to the obstinate constipation that is a concomitant of indulgence. On the cessation of drug taking the restraining effects of the narcotic are removed, and there is an abundant discharge of nervous energy, with overactivity of the depressed organs and an exuberance of sexual desire. It is in this stage that the few medicines used in treating addicts are administered. This period of breaking the habit lasts from one to four days, rarely longer. In my records I can find but one in every two or three hundred cases where even a single injection of morphine was required in treatment. I find little justification for the prolonged withdrawal method, and favor full withdrawal—the process known as "cold turkey." In the former, the period of craving is prolonged ten-fold, and the total time required to clear the system is increased by weeks, with no advantage in any way. Certain drug sanatoria advertising the "slow withdrawal" cure offer an emergency haven for well-to-do addicts whose source of supply has been temporarily suspended, due to police activity or family interference. The rich addict who has used, say, twenty grains of heroin a day is admitted for treatment, and, claiming a greater use, is put on a regimen that keeps him comfortable until another il-

licit, unlimited source of supply has been established.

How does a drug addict get started on his habit? Many believe it is commonly initiated by the therapeutic administration of opiates, causing a craving that persists long after the original malady has subsided. Nothing could be further from the truth. The drugs used by addicts are not employed in medicine in amounts that produce the characteristic effects, save in two legitimate instances—for severe pain, where even large doses expend their effect so completely that there is no excess to produce stimulation, and secondly, in the latter stages of torturing, incurable disease, where habit-producing is, of course, not to be thought of. How then, are we to account for the use of narcotics among so many young people? Almost invariably our offenders are boys and girls in their teens or early twenties, or, if they are older, they admit having used drugs since youth.

I believe that most drug addiction today is due directly to the Harrison Anti-Narcotic Act, which forbids the sale of narcotics without a physician's prescription. Prior to the passage of this act, there was a limited number of drug addicts who went to the corner druggist for their day's or week's supply. They paid a moderate price for the then legitimate article of sale, and the druggist, upheld by professional traditions that are only too often scoffed at, would no more dispense heroin or morphine to a curious adolescent than the old-time bartender would sell whiskey to a child, especially since the profit was small and the temptation, therefore, not inordinate. But with the passage of the Harrison Act the old addicts were immediately shut off from their old source of supply. The demand remained; the supply was almost nil. Following inevitable economic law, illicitly obtained drugs went sky-high, and the prototype of the bootlegger, the dope peddler, appeared upon the scene. In a few months, these men made fortunes that would be the envy of bootleggers. Sources were established abroad—even, it is whispered, with certain smug old pharmaceutical houses in this country. Bottles of cocaine, bearing the stamp of a Holland manufacturer, were soon circulating. Heroin was being sold on the street corners in "dollar decks" containing a grain or two of the drug adulterated with several grains of sugar of milk. Now the vest pockets of the dope peddler are equivalent to the warehouses of the bootlegger. The latter is at the mercy of his customer, for there is nothing confidential in liquor; the man who buys brags of it and makes small secret of his source of supply. But the drug addict is not only a criminal in legal theory, but a criminal in court-room fact, and the secrecy in which he uses his drug acts as a cloak of protection for the peddler.

Did the peddler but supply the old addicts and the former small annual number of recruits to narcotism, the worst of it would be the rise in prices that incites to crime. But having no professional ethics and with the law already against him, he has become the great disseminator of the habit. In the hang-outs of thieves, in the bawdy houses, even in the jails he offers "happy dust" or "snow" to the tyro in misdemeanor. Once a user, always a customer. In the same spirit in which a better class youth is urged to take a drink and be a man, the youth of the underworld is given a drug and valiantly strives to "take his as steady as the next one." Snow parties are the equivalent of flask parties. The foundation of all vice is curiosity. Every first time is an addition to life-experience.

Addicts who are broke act as *agents provocateurs* for the peddlers, being rewarded by gifts of heroin or credit for supplies. The Harrison Act made the drug peddler, and the drug peddler makes drug addicts. So intimate is this association, so intricate is the relationship of user and supplier, that the courts, valiantly attempting to differentiate between the criminal sellers and their entangled victims, are nonplussed. The professional peddler is often a user too. The user is often a peddler or peddler's agent.

The courts are now concentrating on the

professional peddler and no mercy is shown him when he is brought to justice. But even he is not the prime mover in the tragedy. He is but the economic result of the unsound theories of our legislators. Jail him, and a successor is always at hand to supplant him. Addicts, meanwhile, are committed to corrective and reformatory institutions to be built up physically by fresh air, out-door work and the total deprivation of narcotics. After months of vigorous training of the body, and restoration of the weakened morale that made the habit possible, these former "dopers" have commonly gained fifteen to fifty pounds in weight, are sound in wind and limb, and glow with new health. They step out of the reformatory gate vigorous and restored—and ready to be accosted by another peddler.

Philology

WALT WHITMAN'S NEOLOGISMS

By Louise Pound

Walt Whitman took many liberties with the English tongue when he wished to reach certain effects. Along with his polyglot borrowings, such as *allons* and *ma femme* from the French, *cantabile* and *romanza* from the Italian, *libertad* and *Americano* from the Spanish, *rhythmus* from the Latin and *eidolons* from the Greek, he liked vernacular coinages or manipulations, or archaic revivals. When taken from their contexts these locutions often seem forced or absurd. But they are always clear, and, in their connection, read by those who are used to Whitman's verbal divagations, they seem appropriate and effective. They sound as he wished them to sound and they convey the meanings that he wished.

He was especially fond of launching agent-nouns: he had people constantly in mind. His poetry is thronged with human figures, types and classes and personifications. He had a special partiality for feminine abstract conceptions in *-ess*, some of which had book currency, some not. These he introduced characteristically in apostrophe:

> *Dispensatress*, that by a word givest a thousand miles, a million farms, and missest nothing,
> Thou *all-acceptress*—thou hospitable, (thou only art hospitable as God is hospitable).
> —*The Return of the Heroes*

> Approach strong *deliveress*,
> When it is so, when thou hast taken them I joyously sing the dead.
> —*When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloomed*

> Then courage, European revolter, *revoltress!*
> For till all ceases neither must you cease.
> —*To a Foiled European Revolutionaire*

> *Protectress* absolute, thou! bulwark of all!
> —*Song of the Exposition*

> Lo, *Victress* on the Peaks,
> Where thou with mighty brow regarding the world . . .
> —*Victress on the Peaks*

Some examples of the agent-nouns in *-ess*, liked by Whitman, which are not used in direct address are:

> The *Originatress* comes,
> The nest of languages, the bequeather of poems, the race of eld,
> —*A Broadway Pageant*, 2

> Here spirituality the *translatress*, the openly avow'd
> The ever-tending, the finalé of visible forms,
> —*Starting from Paumanok*, 5

> To work as tailor, *tailoress*, nurse, hostler, porter,
> —*Song of the Exposition*, 7.

> They shall train themselves to go in public to become orators and *oratresses*
> —*Mediums*

These feminine formations (some, like *tailoress*, *protectress*, are by no means peculiar to Whitman) may not seem very striking when we think of our present-day ventures in *-ette* or *-ine*, such as *slackerette*, *conductorette*, *hoboette*, *actorine*, *batherine*, *doctorine*, or the now bygone *farmerette-soldierine* of the newspapers; but they were unusual for the language of poetry when he wrote. His coinages of masculine agent-nouns fluctuated between the suffixes *-ist*, *-ite*, *-ee*, and the staple *-er:*

> . . . are all, to the eye of the *ensembliste*, but necessary sides and unfoldings . . . in the endless process of Creative thought,
> —*Specimen Days*