

The "Thing" in Families

By ELLSWORTH HUNTINGTON and LEON F. WHITNEY

SMALL families are supposed to have a great advantage over large ones, especially if the income is small. The mother of only two children can devote to each far more time than if other babies were occupying her attention. They can be taken to the seashore or mountains, attend dancing classes, go to a private school, and have fine tools, good books, and many other desirable things. Later they can spend a summer abroad, go through college without earning their way, and perhaps inherit an appreciable sum instead of a pittance. All these things might be impossible if there were six children. Do they not constitute important advantages? Another widespread belief is that the more successful people are, the less likely they are to have children. Is it not common knowledge that the upper classes have very small families?

Both of these ideas are untrue.

Why, then, do good authorities repeat them and almost every one believe them? Simply because nobody has taken the trouble to investigate. Here are some of the facts:

SIXTEEN hundred students of native white American parentage graduated from Yale College in the classes of 1922 to 1926. About half were sons of college graduates and came from a fairly homogeneous social level. Is there any relation between the success of these students in college and the number of their brothers and sisters? Yes, most emphatically.

In five different lines of activity the students from the larger families systematically excel the others. In the classroom, for instance, the thirty boys from families of six or more children score far ahead of the one hundred who are the only children of their parents. Those from families of two to five children also surpass those from the one-child families.

In extracurricular activities other than athletics the degree of activity diminishes from the one-child to the four-child families, but increases notably in the families of five or more children. The explanation of this twofold tendency probably lies in a combination of the effects of home and school. Boys from small families are more likely than others to attend private preparatory schools, where they learn to take part in student activities before coming to col-

lege. In the large families, on the other hand, the children rub up against one another, get their corners knocked off, learn to take part in group activities, become skilled in adapting themselves to other people, and thereby are fitted for co-operative activity and leadership. This probably gives them an even greater advantage than that of the boys who go to private schools.

In athletics the advantage of the large families is remarkably clear; the bigger the family, the greater the average boy's success. The rough-and-tumble play of one small boy with another is the best preparation for college athletics, both physically and morally. Nowhere do children learn to "play up, play up, and win the game" so effectively as in a large family where the children do not vary too much in age. Moreover, as a rule, large families of any given social grade have better health and greater physical vigor than small families. Where there is only one child in a family the reason is often found in the parents' lack of physical vigor. Among college graduates who send their sons to Yale a large family is usually a sign of good health and constitutional vigor on the part of both parents.

At Yale the seniors still cast their votes for the men who are most successful, most brilliant, most industrious, and most likely to succeed in life. Although these votes are largely an indication of popularity, the men who get many do tend to be successful later in life. The Yale classes of 1922 to 1926 gave at least a third more votes, proportionally, to their classmates from families of four or more children than to those from the smaller families. This may indicate greater ability among the men from the larger families, but it almost certainly also indicates that the free-for-all of a large family makes children good mixers and leaders, and more competent and agreeable than the petted only sons in families of one or two children.

The earnings of the sons of Yale graduates while in college average six times as great among students who come from families of six or more as among those who are their parents' only children. Yet, in spite of earning so much money, the men from the big families have time, energy, and ability to surpass the men from one-child families in every other phase of college activity. The supposed advantages of small families are cer-

tainly not very apparent. In fact, a boy's handicap in college seems to be almost proportional to the smallness of the family from which he comes.

THE Yale students whose parents have not been to college fall decidedly below the sons of college graduates. Those from large families are superior to those from small in non-athletic extracurricular activities, in athletics, in senior votes, and in earnings. In classroom rank, however, exactly the opposite is the case; the smaller the family, the higher the rank. This seeming contradiction is due to the fact that Yale students whose parents are not college graduates belong to a wide range of social levels. As we go down in the social scale the general degree of ability declines, while the size of the families increases. Such being the case, the best minds naturally come from the smaller families. Nevertheless in everything except purely intellectual activity the men from the larger families have the advantage.

The strongest evidence of this advantage appears when we divide the Yale College classes of 1893, 1896, and 1898 into the following eight groups: (1) unmarried, (2) married but childless, (3) married, with one child, etc., up to (8) married, with six children or more. In the classroom the men who remain unmarried rank lowest of all; those who are later married but have no children come next; then those who will be married and have one child. All the groups which are to have two or more children succeed decidedly better than those who are unmarried or who are married but have no children, or only one.

Turning to extracurricular activities, the relation between success in college and the size of a man's family becomes clearer than ever. There is an almost steady increase in success from the unmarried men, whose average rating is two, according to the scale used in this study, to the men with six or more children, whose average is four and a half. This implies that a relatively large percentage of the college men who remain unmarried, or who have no children though married, are relatively deficient in the physical vigor which makes athletes and in the qualities which make men leaders in extracurricular activities and in life. On the other hand, the men who later have reasonably large families

comprise a high percentage whose college careers evince physical vigor, push, energy, originality, and at least a fair degree of intellectuality.

The age at which men marry is closely correlated with the number of their children. Among the married men of our three Yale classes this age varies systematically from not quite twenty-seven years among the men who have six or more children up to thirty-three among those who remain childless. This difference of six years is symptomatic of the fact that men who are physically, mentally, and morally sound are not only more eager to marry than are the opposite types, but are more attractive to women, and more likely to be well established in their life-work, and hence able to support children, at a reasonably early age.

The most significant and perfect of our comparisons is based on success in life as determined by the opinions of five or more classmates. On an average, the unmarried men are the least successful; those who are married but have no children succeed a little better, but not very well. The man with one child succeeds somewhat better, and so on until the most successful group comprises those with six or more children. The differences among the fathers having three or more children are slight though systematic, but below that the differences are pronounced. Of course, some of the best men in every class fall in each group from the unmarried to those who have six children, but *on an average* there are many more unsuccessful men among the unmarried and childless than among those who have a number of children. The idea that successful people have few children finds no support whatever among Yale graduates.

IN order to be sure of our ground, let us divide our Yale graduates into ten equal groups according to their degree of success in life. On the whole, the most successful tenth graduate younger than the others, but the difference between the two extremes averages only about half a year. The age at marriage shows the same kind of difference, the range being from thirty years among the most successful to thirty-two among the least successful. Even more marked is the relation between success, on the one hand, and marriage and children, on the other. Among the most successful tenth no less than ninety-five per cent are married, while the percentage gradually declines to only sixty-six among the least successful. The percentage who have children falls off in the same way, but even more rapidly, for eighty per cent of

the most successful group have children, and only forty per cent of the least successful. A similar, but even greater decline, relatively speaking, is apparent in the fact that among the most successful men about forty per cent have at least three children, but among the least successful only ten or fifteen per cent have.

Still another way of representing the same thing is by means of the average number of children per father, or per man. The most successful tenth have, or have had, an average of over three children per father, the least successful only 2.2. But when we take the children per graduate, and include, not only the fathers, but the unmarried men and those who are married but childless, the contrast is much greater. Among the most successful tenth of these Yale graduates of a generation or so ago the average number of children *per graduate* is 2.4; among the least successful tenth, only about 0.8. The intermediate groups are distributed between the two extremes at almost regular intervals.

YALE graduates are by no means unique in their correlation of large families and success in life.

At our suggestion, Dr. J. C. Phillips, of Harvard, conducted a similar inquiry in respect to nineteen hundred Harvard graduates, with results exactly like ours. His most successful group, comprising less than seven per cent of three classes, reports an average of 2.19 children per graduate, compared with 2.42 for the highest tenth of the Yale graduates. His lowest seven per cent has an average of .80 of a child per graduate, compared with .85 for the least successful tenth of the Yale graduates. At Harvard, as at Yale, the results for single classes and for separate occupations are the same as for the whole group of graduates.

No matter whether we study lawyers, business men, bankers, professors, ministers, writers, engineers, or any other group, the most successful are the most likely to marry, to have children, and to have a considerable number of children. The evidence is so overwhelming and so unanimous that it presumably applies, not only to all college graduates, but to every group which is socially homogeneous, especially in the upper classes.

WHEN we combine all this with our discoveries as to the advantages of the sons of large families, it seems clear that the popular notions as to the size of families among successful people, and as to the advantages of small families, are completely erroneous. The error probably arises from the obvious fact that the upper classes have small

families and the lower classes large families. We have overlooked the equally important, but less conspicuous fact that *within any given level of society* the reverse is true—the successful people tend not only to come from the large families, but to have relatively large families themselves.

Why should this be the case? Are not many of the finest people unmarried or childless? Certainly; but that has nothing to do with the matter.

The point of the problem lies in the *percentage* of the best men who fall in each of our groups. The unmarried men, for example, undoubtedly include plenty of very fine individuals, but they also include a large percentage who are unsuccessful or deficient physically, mentally, socially, or morally. Young women do not want to marry such men. Still others might have been much more successful if they had had wives and children to stir them up, encourage them, and hold them to harder work and finer ideals. The same sort of reasoning applies to those who are married but have no children. In this group childlessness is often due to physiological causes for which the individual is in no sense responsible. That is the misfortune of many very high-minded and successful people. But with these fine types must be put a large number who have no children because of their own self-indulgence, selfishness, or other defects in character.

The larger the number of children from the higher social levels, the more certain we can be that both husband and wife are physically strong and nervously sound. That in itself is a great help to success. Moreover, parents whose equable, dependable temperaments help them to succeed in the world are also able to get along well with one another and with their children. They are much more likely to avoid the divorce court and to desire four to six children than are people who are irritable and erratic. Altruism likewise helps people to succeed in life, and also favors large families. Thus many qualities which promote success in life also promote large families.

ONE intensely practical result of all this is that because of our present system of freedom as to whether we will marry, combined with birth control, the upper classes are being sorted, sifted and improved with extraordinary rapidity.

Another is that we must completely abandon the modern idea that it is "the thing" to have small families. Among the upper classes, provided we deal in averages, the people who have families

of three or more children almost immeasurably excel the others in practically every kind of real success. Moreover, the children born in the large families reap inestimable advantages.

Thus the available evidence seems strongly to indicate the desirability that

people with a fine inheritance physically, mentally, and morally should have an average of four to six children, not only for the sake of society, but for the sake of the children. Such tends to be actually the case, in spite of the common supposition to the contrary. But this

tendency needs to be strengthened in order that children of the right type may be so numerous that their kind will not only be preserved, but will increase in relative numbers, thus giving the world a larger and larger proportion of high-souled leaders.

Professionalism and the Olympic Games

By DAVID F. DAVIS

AT a recent meeting of the Executive Committee in Paris the International Olympic Committee voted to permit the members of the national teams taking part in the Olympic soccer or Association football tournament to receive compensation for the salary lost during the time they participate. That this money is to be paid to their employers instead of directly into the hands of the players themselves fails to remove the suspicion of professionalism which results from the decision. If soccer players are entitled to compensation, are not the runners, swimmers, cyclists, gymnasts, and other Olympic athletes entitled to similar consideration? In Europe it is felt that the amateur character of the Games is endangered. Sport circles are perturbed.

To understand completely the deep interest of the European countries in the Olympic Games one must first be aware of the feelings of close national rivalry which exist. Dual meets of an international character are frequent occurrences in Europe, and arouse all the enthusiasm of intercollegiate contests in the university communities of the United States. An analogy is to be found by imagining each of the forty-eight States in America to be separated by national borders rather than by State lines, and each having its own language and customs. Athletic rivalry under such circumstances becomes more intense because of the close geographical proximity yet distinctly separate nationality of the groups. In Europe the Olympic Games, bringing together many countries, is the sum of such national rivalries.

Since their inception the modern games have been restricted to amateur athletes. It was Baron Pierre de Coubertin, that noble sportsman of France, who first conceived of organizing an amateur meeting of many nations in athletic rivalry every four years. He was inspired by his personal admiration of the English public school system and the English ideals of sport, and he determined to impart those ideals to France and the rest of the world. The

first renewal of the Grecian Games took place in 1896—in Athens, appropriately, where young Hellenic manhood had been accustomed to gather in ancient times. At the fourth celebration of the Games, in London in 1908, the Baron was able to see the representatives of twenty different nations compete in twenty different forms of sport. At the most recent celebration—the eighth Olympic Games, in Paris in 1924—he saw forty-five nations contribute a total of competitors three times as large as that in 1908. Nearly two thousand amateur athletes took part in the track and field events alone.

In Europe it is felt that much depends upon whether the International Olympic Committee rescinds its decision in regard to the soccer players; if allowed to stand, it is feared that the Games may become merely a professional world championship. The Olympic Committee, so its defenders say, was forced to take such a decision in order to save the Dutch Olympic Committee, as the organizer of the contests that are to be held in Amsterdam next year, from suffering a financial loss.

Trouble had developed when the International Association Football Federation declared for non-participation at Amsterdam unless the International Olympic Committee recognized the right of the players to compensation for lost salary. Ordinarily it is left to the Federation of each sport to determine what constitutes an amateur athlete, but such a proposal as the soccer authorities made was hardly acceptable. More trouble developed between the International Olympic Committee and the International Lawn Tennis Federation, and the Dutch Olympic heads faced the prospect of organizing a programme that would have neither soccer nor tennis. The receipts from these two sports form no inconsiderable part of the total, and Holland began to lose much of its optimism. A deficit appeared to be a certainty unless something could be done; it was under these conditions that the International Olympic Committee capit-

ulated to the soccer authorities, and attempted to save its face by making the reservation which has been mentioned—that no money should pass directly into the hands of the players. However, Count Baillet-Latour, the President, and his fellow-members of the Executive Committee failed to observe the elements of consistency. At the same meeting in which the soccer players gained the privilege of recompense without having their amateur status endangered it was voted to notify the tennis authorities that former professionals who had been requalified as amateurs by their national association could not be admitted to the Olympic tennis tournament.

Few people have a quarrel with the professional in sport as such, but many harbor an understandable dislike for those who assume the guise of the amateur but who accept the rewards of the professional. Therein lies the so-called problem of amateurism, and it has kept pace with the growing complexity of our system of sports and games, national and international.

When the British team of professional golfers journeys to Worcester to dispute the Ryder Cup matches, it is received with much of the enthusiasm that is paid Bobby Jones, the great American amateur, when he reaches England on the way to St. Andrews. When Suzanne Lenglen appears in the United States on a professional tennis tour, she is accorded all the courtesy and admiration that is offered to Tilden when he walks onto the courts at St. Cloud or at Wimbledon. The professional—unlike the prophet—is not without honor in his own land or in the lands he may chance to visit as long as his identity is clear. The amateur is recognized as one who participates for the sake of the pleasure afforded rather than for pecuniary gain. For the amateur, sport is a recreation and not a business; and he devotes to it a portion of his leisure time, and not his working hours. Probably as long as athletic competitions and games continue to be regarded as pleasurable forms of recreation there will exist this distinction