# Sterilizing the Fittest

By Henry R. Carey

*Are the girls' colleges promoting race suicide among America's most intelligent women by influencing their graduates against marriage and maternity?*

At a great gathering of college women at Atlantic City, in 1926, a learned professor, a spinster of arts, declared positively and emphatically that women's colleges in America do *not* interfere with the normal processes of marriage and childbirth. Since her evidence, as reported in the press, seemed somewhat sketchy, I decided to investigate for myself. As a result of careful research, it appears to me that her widely quoted assertion was a trifle hasty.

As a matter of fact, eugenists and sociologists have long been aware that something is desperately wrong with the wifehood and motherhood of college women. (I am speaking more particularly of graduates of the leading women's colleges in the Northeastern United States, such as Radcliffe, Bryn Mawr, Wellesley, Mt. Holyoke, Vassar, Smith and Barnard.) It is time that this highly important phase of women's education should be brought frankly and fairly into the open. Are women's colleges breeding unintelligence by sterilizing intelligence? Is college feminism attacking the American home by boring from within? Is it leading a sexual rebellion among the selected best feminine brains?

It is interesting to note, at the outset, that of the Presidents or Deans of the colleges under discussion, two are men and married, and five are maiden ladies; and that Vassar and Smith, administered by the married men, are known as places where college life has a certain balance between the emotional and intellectual and where men visitors are made especially welcome. Now a larger percentage of all the alumnæ of Smith and Vassar are married than in other colleges of the group. Is this a mere coincidence?

The following table, indicating this fact, shows also that the graduates of women's colleges do not indulge in matrimony as freely as women of the nation at large.

| | *Per Cent Married* | *Date* |
|---|---|---|
| Women of nation over 15..... | 72.5 | 1920 |
| Men of nation over 15..... | 64.6 | 1920 |
| Vassar (all alumnæ)..... | 55.5 | 1928 |
| Smith " " ..... | 50.1 | 1926 |
| Bryn Mawr " " ..... | 48.1 | 1928 |
| Barnard " " ..... | 41.8 | 1925* |

* *Including Barnard graduates through 1924 only.*

| | *Per Cent Married* | *Date* |
|---|---|---|
| Group of exceptionally distinguished alumnæ (average age 53)..... ..... | 20 | 1928 |
| Group of exceptionally distinguished Yale graduates (average age about 54)..... | 95 | 1927 |

But is it fair, someone will ask, to compare the national with the women's college percentages, to the detriment of the latter, when the college figures do not include girls 15 to 22 years old, as the national figures do? Is not the difference in the percentages due in part to the fact that non-college girls "get the jump" on their college sisters, marrying to some extent between 15 and 22? Probably, in so far as they meet prosperous husbands. That is just my point. More important by far, however, the acquisition of a college degree may tend to defer matrimony for the college girl for years *after graduation* also. And if so, does this not likewise account for the low marriage percentages of the women's college graduates in the data just given?

Let us consider this possible post-graduate delay in marriage, comparing a man's college of the Northeast with the women's institutions of the same area. Here we are on safer ground than before, since we are contrasting persons, male and female, of similar age, social class, and habits:

| *Graduates of* | *Age* | *Per cent Married* | *Date* |
|---|---|---|---|
| Harvard..... | 30 to 42 | 73.77 | (1925 to 1928) |
| Smith..... | " " " | 63.6 | 1928 |
| Wellesley..... | 35 to 42 | 61.8 | " |
| Bryn Mawr... | 30 to 42 | 57.27 | " |
| Barnard..... | " " " | 50.73 | 1925 |
| Mt. Holyoke... | " " " | 49.25 | 1928 |

The Harvard marriage percentage would be considerably higher if the basic recordings had been virtually up to date when compiled, as is the case with all the women's college information. As it is, Harvard excels the nearest women's college competitor by over 10 per cent, while in the nation at large, as we have seen, women apparently marry more freely than men. These data must not, however, be taken as showing that women's college graduates are necessarily more given to spinsterhood than *non-college women of similar social status and mentality*. Nevertheless, the known fact that college women marry on the average 1.6 to 2.1 years later than their non-collegiate sisters, cousins and friends, is a strong indication that women's college celibacy is something special and apart. It is of unusual interest to notice, too, that only one-fifth of the American women Ph.D.'s were married and had families in 1926!

But perhaps all this is nothing new. Perhaps women's college graduates were always given to celibacy. Not so with Mt. Holyoke at least. A study mentioned by Dr. William S. Sadler, covering a period of fifty years, showed that "Whereas 85 per cent of the graduates married at the beginning, only 50 per cent married at the end, showing a gradual decrease from one decade to the other." Thus for every old maid old-style graduated from Mt. Holyoke at the outset, more than two old maids new-style received degrees at the end.

If now we compare *year by year* the incomplete marriage percentages of Harvard and the up-to-date figures of five of the women's colleges, it appears that the women's college mar-

riage lines strike a general low dead level between the ages of 30 and 34. The Harvard man's marriage curve, on the other hand, keeps steadily rising, high above all the women's college lines, certainly up to 42, and probably to 46 and beyond, for a man's marriageable age long outlasts a woman's. Probably, however, the most striking fact is that while the highest marriage percentage peak, of all ages of all alumnæ studied (67.4 per cent), fails to reach the general marriage percentage figure (72.5 per cent) *for the women over 15 in the nation at large*, yet the highest Harvard percentage peaks, and indeed the whole Harvard percentage line after about the age of 33, surpasses the general marriage percentage figure (64.6) *for the men over 15 of the nation*, by various amounts up to 20 per cent.

Thus it appears that the problem of the women's colleges is chiefly, though not entirely, the wholesale suppression of marriage among the selected best of the nation, resulting in the annihilation of the fittest of the race.

And what of the children of the married college women today? How many do they bear? And how does the record of the alumnæ compare with that of the wives of male college graduates, or the mothers of the nation at large? A careful study indicates that married women of the nation, who are old enough to have completed their families, average about three times as many children as married alumnæ of similar age. Moreover, in most cases studied, the married alumnæ average distinctly fewer children than the wives of Harvard graduates — men of the same age. (For example, at the age of 37, the averages are Harvard, 1.75; Barnard, 1.67; Smith, 1.66; Mt. Holyoke, 1.48; Wellesley, 1.04). Taking the more important comparison, between the graduates, *married and unmarried*, of the male and female institutions, we notice the pathetic effect of feminine celibacy, combined with cases of infertility in marriage. We observe that at the ages of 37 and 42 the Harvard graduates are begetting on the average nearly twice as many children per graduate as the majority of the alumnæ of the same age. (Averages, age 37; Harvard, 1.47; Smith, 1.08; Barnard, .86; Mt. Holyoke, .78; Wellesley, .64. Averages, age 42; Harvard 1.81; Bryn Mawr, 1.69; Smith, 1.37; Mt. Holyoke, 1.17; Wellesley, 1.05; Barnard, .90.)

We may suspect, therefore, as I shall show more clearly, that there are difficulties ahead for the woman who wishes to combine personal achievement and motherhood. Nature appears to have so arranged things that a good father can easily get on in the world — but that is not all; the more distinguished his accomplishment, the better he is apt to be as a family man. Professor Ellsworth Huntington of Yale defines the successful Yale graduate as "the one who is of the most value in making the community a better place in which to live." Such men, he finds, are, at about 54, 95 per cent married, whereas a less successful group of similar age has arrived at only 66 per cent. He shows clearly that the more socially useful the Yale graduate, the more likely he is to take a wife and the younger he tends to do so. Achievement, it seems, is not hostile

to marriage, at least in a college man. On the average the most successful men have three or more times as many children as the least successful. Among the most successful tenth, moreover, no less than 80 per cent have children, whereas among the least successful this falls to about 40 per cent. The most successful are maintaining themselves and are increasing a little from generation to generation.

Paul Popenoe, in *The Conservation of the Family*, offers figures differing in origin from mine but confirming the discrepancy between the average number of children of men's college graduates as compared with women's. For married graduates his figures are: Yale, average number of children 2.57; Harvard, 2.51; Syracuse (men), 2.06; Vassar, 1.82; Wellesley, 1.56; Syracuse (women), 1.46; Bryn Mawr, 0.84; Wellesley (honor scholars), 0.57.

LET us look now at another small number of graduates, this time, women's college alumnæ, selected for the writer by the Northeastern women's colleges themselves, as persons of extraordinary distinction, scholarly and otherwise. These women come fairly under Professor Huntington's definition of "successful." Since they average fifty-three years of age, their families are doubtless complete. Curiously enough, they are but 20 per cent married (23 per cent lower than the lowest record for *ordinary* alumnæ, though these are a decade younger). Moreover, these highly distinguished women average exactly two-fifths of a child apiece (one-half a child less than the most infertile of ordinary alumnæ a decade younger). Nature is here shown struggling, for the good of nation and race, to overcome through our ablest men the differential birth rate, the swamping of the country by the children of less successful stocks, while the women's college graduates, especially the most distinguished, are shown in opposition to the most beneficial processes of nature. The alumnæ are only about one-third as fertile as the plain women of the nation, and the leaders are less fertile than the plain alumnæ. Nature fights, however feebly, for eugenics, while the graduates of women's colleges are doing their very best for dysgenics and disaster.

PLAINLY, then, high achievement for college women works unfavorably against marriage and fertility, while for college men it accompanies distinct increases in both. In this connection it may be noted that an analysis of Wellesley alumnæ who have attained scholarships or memberships in the Phi Beta Kappa Society, shows that these girls have definitely fewer children than their less intellectual sister alumnæ. Of the 687 college women listed in *American Men of Science* (1927), a fourth came from the women's colleges we are examining, exactly 1.6 per cent chose to specialize in home economics, and, though their median age is 42, only a pitiful tithe is married. A study of Vassar graduates showed that those who taught and had children had smaller families than those who married but did not teach. Less than a third of the group taught and also married. Putting all this information together,

may we not safely assume that the more women's colleges raise the standard of scholarship, as they are now intent on doing, the lower will be the marriage and birth rates of all alumnæ, especially if they achieve distinction?

We are now in a position to talk with President Neilson of Smith College, who, in a widely circulated article, has recently asked what are the "intellectual and emotional differences between the sexes that need to be taken into account in education." I will mention but one of these. (There is also an economic factor.)

PERSONAL achievement for a college man is a *prerequisite* to marriage and parenthood. It is known that the abler the college man mentally, the sooner he marries on the average, the oftener he marries on the average, and the larger, on the average, is his family. On the other hand, personal success for women is very often psychologically a *deterrent* to marriage and parenthood. The abler the alumna mentally, the *less* often she marries on the average and the *smaller*, on the average, is her family. Man, however busy, keeps a part of his energy and desire for the period of courtship. Woman more often does not. Therefore, to encourage achievement in college men is to assist a eugenic factor and an efficient division of labor after marriage, as nature intended, while to encourage the same sort of personal success in college women is to abet a dysgenic factor and either an unnatural celibacy or married childlessness and an inefficient division of labor.

The women's colleges as leaders in the community will be held responsible for educational policies which have long tended to cause race deterioration, which have diminished the supply of leaders, which have caused women to thwart their deepest natures, which have reduced the supply of intelligent wives trained for their jobs, available for their equals among men, which have educated women who possess a cultural and biological heritage, only to cut off both in the next generation, and which have been a potent factor in the development of the American centrifugal home. Turn it about as you will, personal ambition is the friend of efficient fatherhood and the enemy of efficient motherhood. That is inescapable.

INTELLIGENT people everywhere are awake to these difficulties. To mention only one, Dr. William S. Sadler writes: "One thing is certain, something is radically wrong. . . . There can be no excuse urged or explanation offered to justify the fact that our exclusive women's colleges actually disqualify their graduates for motherhood. The American people should see to it, and that immediately, that the girls' schools of this country have their curriculum reformed. . . . The women in the separate colleges of the East have the worst record in this respect." He then adds significantly: "The eugenist suspects that women's colleges of this country are not conducted with a view to turning out wives and mothers, and *he fully recognizes that their influences, in addition to college training, have been operative in lessening the number of marriages among this class of women.*" (Italics mine.) Is it possible that the perspective,

the atmosphere and the teaching of these colleges are at fault?

If now we compare some of the achieving women of pre-college days with those of today, we find that Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, Mrs. Louis Agassiz, Mrs. Bronson Alcott Pratt and Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, (to take names at random) not only attained distinction in their own persons, but have *in all cases left lineal descendants who are leaders*, and people of whom America may well be proud. For the most part, it seems, these ladies worked at home. And in the midst of grinding work and anxiety, Mrs. Stowe could write, "My children I would not change for all the ease, leisure and pleasure that I could have without them." How out-of-date this sounds in 1929! What would have been the result had these noble women gone to a modern woman's college? It seems to me incontestably better for the nation that the family lines of such brilliant people should not only be preserved but strengthened. The cultural treasures received by the children of such mothers are probably even more valuable to them than the biological inheritance. Why should not the women's colleges do more to build up, instead of perpetually helping to tear down, a group of permanently and traditionally civilized families?

And by what magic do part-time mothers new-style — oscillating between house and office — become skilful within the home? Either they must give up personal motherhood or they must dispense in whole or in part with offspring. Yet all seven of the women's colleges have actually publicly proclaimed their satisfaction that an increasing number of their graduates are "carrying on part — or whole — time jobs outside their own homes."

THIS brings us to the central question. After all, is the present college woman's game worth the candle? Have American college women in more than fifty years contributed enough to the world of men to make up for what they have stolen, year after year, from the cultural and biological heritage, and from the whilom unity of the American home? Has there not been a net loss to the few children produced, to the men who might have had intelligent wives trained in home-making, and to the college women themselves? Have college women been accelerating the frightful centrifugal tendency of our households?

I am sure the great question which the educated people of the East must ask themselves, over and over again, is whether they want these college women, one-half of them maiden ladies, in business and in the professions, where they limit the earning power of married men, or whether they prefer them as mothers, with boys and girls who shall inherit their special abilities and special culture, with which to face and conquer the appalling vulgarities and complexities of our present and future civilization.

*IN a second article, Mr. Carey discusses some of the steps which the colleges are taking to remedy the conditions he outlines here.*

# When I Was Mayor

By Jay E. House

*A one time executive of Topeka tells how he tried in vain to enforce Prohibition in the capital of a State, the reputed dryness of which he denies*

These, briefly stated and much abridged, are the memoirs of an ex-Prohibition enforcement official. As Mayor of Topeka, Kansas, I was the titular head of the police department and the responsibility for curbing the demon rum within the corporate limits of the municipality was mine. I contribute them to the rising tide of Prohibition discussion for whatever light they may throw upon it. I shall also offer certain opinions befitting to the circumstances.

I remember the Topeka mayoralty campaign of 1915 — the term was two years and I was reëlected in 1917 — as the most bitter and abusive I have known. More mud was thrown than in any previous or subsequent election I now recall. Most of it splattered on me. My opponent was a dignified gentleman who was "right" on all the great moral issues. He was for everything that was nice, and a Prohibitionist from "who laid the chunk." Nothing could be said against him and, so far as my supporters were concerned, nothing was said.

I was the pariah — the outcast candidate. There really was nothing against me as a man and citizen, but, as a newspaper writer, I had, for a dozen years, poked fun at the town's dearest flubdub. That, however, was a minor count in the indictment. I was suspected of being unenthusiastic about Prohibition. I had even implied that the State law was not as well enforced as it might be. That, in itself, was enough to damn me. In Kansas, then and now, no individual may publicly express such opinion or make such intimation, save at his own peril.

It was all true enough. I was not enthusiastic about Prohibition, although I was not then the bitter opponent of it that I have since become. I knew the prohibitory laws were not enforced and had said so many times. And I made no denial of the charges. I merely said I would enforce the law to the best of my ability — that I thought I could enforce it a little better than was being done by the Dry administration then in power. Since in those

(*See Editorial Note on Page 529*)

days, and even yet, municipal elections in Kansas turned on the wet and dry issue, my tacit refusal to bootlick set all the Drys at my heels. My refusal to dignify the charges by denial made the Drys doubly furious.

THAT was the background against which I set up what was, perhaps, the most dogged and persistent local attempt to enforce Prohibition ever made in this country. For four long years I used every device provided by law — and many which were not sanctioned by it — to stop the bootleggers. I repeatedly broke other laws in an attempt to enforce one, and I literally lived on top of the police force. I don't know yet why I did it. All I know is that between the date of my election and the time of taking office I became a little rabid on the subject of law enforcement.

Probably my zeal for the enforcement of the prohibitory law was compounded from three or four human elements. My opinion of the law had not changed; I was still unenthusiastic about it. I doubted the possibility of its enforcement. My zest probably sprang from the factors of pride in performance, a certain regard for my word and oath, and a desire to confound my opponents. Be that as it may, I came to understand the fanatic. I do not approve of him, but I understand him. I know what makes him tick. For in some of my public acts in relation to Prohibition I was as fanatical as the most zealous Dry.

It was much easier to enforce a prohibitory liquor law in the years lying between 1915 and 1919 than it now is. The whole structure of the liquor business has changed. Then the illicit sale of liquor was shady dealing carried on mostly by those who barely rose above the bread line. Now it is a business. In the days of State Prohibition, I never knew more than half a dozen bootleggers who made any money. I recall only two who kept what they made. The great majority of those engaged in the trade were shiftless, inefficient, improvident, inconsequential gentlemen — white and black — who barely kept a fire in the kitchen stove. They were easy to catch and, with the consent of the jury, easy to convict. Most of them were without influence and without the funds necessary to provide a spirited defense. The trouble was that when one was sent away three came to take his place.

I DON'T know whether public sentiment has changed. I leave that to the controversialists; this, essentially, is a recital. But public sentiment against Prohibition — so much as there is of it — has become articulate. It speaks its mind and it has cohesion. It is backed, too, by tremendously strong newspaper and periodical support. In the days of State Prohibition, public sentiment against the law was dumb and it presented a broken and straggling front. Nobody dared to say anything publicly. Most people, no matter what their private opinions may have been, accepted the contention that liquor selling is a crime. That condition no longer obtains. There literally are millions of people who doubt that liquor selling is a criminal offense, and they do not hesitate to express such doubts. And this attitude in the public mind in-

creases enormously the odds against Prohibition enforcement.

More than that, as I have previously noted, liquor selling now is a business. It is well and efficiently organized, abundantly financed and, from a court standpoint, ably defended. The gentlemen in the liquor business no longer are improvident and inconsequential. They have brains, influence and money. With it all, the opposition to Prohibition has come out of its coma.

WITH my induction into office I became officially cognizant of what I had always known privately — that Topeka reeked of liquor. The Dry administration which I succeeded had given eloquent lip service to Prohibition, but it hadn't done much in the way of enforcing the law. That is a typical condition and much the easiest way. If a Prohibition enforcement officer will give Prohibition its due meed of lip service, and make an occasional grandiloquent gesture, he will get along with both Drys and Wets. The Drys will think he is enforcing the law and the Wets will be grateful for the fact that conditions are undisturbed. A Dry crusade never amounts to much, but it always disturbs a lot of people. The fear that a Dry crusader may finally achieve something is always upon them.

My first move was to reorganize the police force and to make it understand that the new attempt to enforce Prohibition would not be a mere gesture. The force got the idea after I had stripped the stars from three or four veteran officers. Then I hired a number of spotters and set the dogs after the bootleggers. I had a theory about Prohibition. It was as good as any, but it didn't work. My idea was to crash through from the top. I had noticed that Prohibition enforcement in Topeka had always centered on the small operators — the hip pocket and kitchen joint men. There was a reason for that. The hip pocket and kitchen joint operators were easier to catch and much easier to convict. The big shots were infrequently disturbed and, being ably defended, almost never convicted. My plan contemplated an incessant riding of the big shots. We took the small operators when they got in the way, but over the big shots we maintained an eternal vigil.

CONDITIONS looking to law enforcement were all any official might ask. I had the benefit of the most drastic laws a State Legislature could devise. These laws had the whole-hearted support of the press, the courts and the clergy, and the ostensible support of all other officials and the public. If there was opposition to anything I did by way of Prohibition enforcement it was inarticulate. I rode high and handsome.

I may best epitomize my experience in enforcing Prohibition in my prosecution of two women. One I shall here call Kitty Tolley. She was known locally as the Queen of the Jointists. She operated in her own home and had an exclusive and high class clientèle. And she was exceedingly prosperous. I believe she was the first lady operator in Topeka to drive her own motor car. She had been operating continuously over a period of more than twenty years. I had occasion to look up her court

record. I wanted to know about it. I found she had been arrested once or twice, but had never been convicted.

I set the spotters after Mrs. Tolley and we got the evidence necessary to convict. Then I sent a plain clothes man after her. I was sitting with the desk sergeant when he brought her in. She was a good looking woman and her diamonds aided materially in the illumination of the police station. She asked the desk sergeant's permission to use the telephone and added, "I want to telephone the Colonel about my bond." Thereupon I said to the sergeant, "Book her and lock her up. There'll be no bond tonight." It was my idea then that throwing liquor offenders in jail was a good disciplinary measure. I always saw to it that they spent at least one night in durance. It marked the peremptory and unlawful manner in which I tried to enforce Prohibition. I had no more legal right to refuse an acceptable bond from Mrs. Tolley than I have to rob a bank.

We convicted Mrs. Tolley on the charges then pending. We arrested her many times thereafter and convicted her almost as many times. For four years the police department rode herd on her. Once we actually got her into jail and kept her there three months. But I don't think she ever stopped selling liquor. Only two or three years ago I noticed in a Topeka newspaper that she had been arrested for the old offense. Evidently she escaped punishment, for I saw no further reference to her case. The prosecutions to which we subjected Mrs. Tolley cost her a great deal of money. She was less prosperous at the end of my second term. But I can't recall anything else that we accomplished.

The other woman whom I will here call Maggie Chester, was, like Mrs. Tolley, an old offender. She had been in business a long time. She had been arrested oftener than Mrs. Tolley, but had never gone to jail or paid a fine. Her business, too, was more complex than that conducted by Mrs. Tolley. In addition to selling liquor, she was an impresario of the "oldest profession in the world."

I put a woman spotter in Miss Chester's handsome apartment and got the goods on her. I learned where she cached her liquor and also that two women from Kansas City who were staying at her place were quarreling with her over what seemed to them to be an unfair division of the receipts. Kansas has a law which makes the business of such an impresario a penitentiary offense. That cinched the case against Miss Chester, provided we could make the evidence stand up. We segregated the two women from Kansas City and persuaded them to testify against their whilom landlady. Then we saw to it that they did so.

I sent a sergeant's detail after Miss Chester with instructions to bring her in. It was gone a long time; I think the sergeant was waiting for me to go home. It finally came back with half a barrel of beer which it had seized in a raid on the cellar of an honest but inconsequential Russian living in North Topeka. "Where's Maggie?" I asked. "Well," explained the sergeant after he had tried to dodge me by going out the back way,

"we didn't find any liquor and I didn't think it was any use to bring her in." "Her liquor is in the bookcase," I told him, and took his star then and there.

I sent another detail after Miss Chester and that one brought her. It was in the late summer. By October we had her in the penitentiary, where she served her time less her allowance for good behavior. What was it all about? I don't know. Liquor still flows in Topeka. The Seventh Commandment, so I have heard, still is violated in that vicinity.

I have referred at length to the prosecutions of Mrs. Tolley and Miss Chester because they were, from the purely human angle, the most interesting with which I dealt. But, in their general aspects, all cases were alike. From 1915 to 1919 the police department chased unremittingly bootleggers of all kinds and colors. It never stopped doing it; it never even let up in its pursuit. Every year we made hundreds of arrests and secured hundreds of convictions. We put bootleggers by the dozen in jail and kept them there until the county grew tired of feeding them. We put them to tremendous expense and an enormous amount of inconvenience.

But I don't think we diminished by one drop the amount of liquor peddled and consumed in the town.

I take time out here to explode the great Kansas myth. That is to say, so far as it lies within my power to do so. The myth is the one to the effect that the prohibitory laws are enforced in Kansas. It has been reiterated and retold so often that it has come to have a general acceptance, particularly in the urban sections of the country. Prohibition has never been enforced in Kansas. It isn't enforced now. Drinking is as widespread and general there as it is throughout the rest of the country.

There may be those who will cavil at these revelations — who will question the persistence and sincerity of my attempts to enforce Prohibition. I am willing to leave it to Topeka. I think I left office with the reputation of having done the most effective work in behalf of Prohibition the town had known. Everybody knows I tried; a great many still believe I succeeded. I know better. Nothing I did or tried to do amounted to shucks.

## *An Unsuppressed Article*

AFTER the foregoing article was in type, we received a telegram from Governor Clyde M. Reed of Kansas objecting to its prospective publication. We believe Governor Reed's telegram was sent under misapprehension as to the scope of this article, which Mr. House offers as a bit of history and not as a further contribution to the recent controversy — widely reported in the press — over alleged drinking in Topeka today. And we feel sure that the citizens of Topeka who twice elected Mr. House to the Mayoralty would not question his right to tell magazine readers in other cities something of his experiences and conclusions.

However, the Topeka controversy has again brought to more than local attention the question of enforcement in Kansas. Governor Reed states that conditions in Kansas have been deliberately and sensationally misrepresented in certain magazines and newspapers. We have invited the Governor to write for THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW an article presenting the actual facts of enforcement today in his State. —

*The Editors.*

# From Glider to Autogiro

By Juan de la Cierva

(With Donald F. Rose)

*The inventor of the famous "flying windmill", latest sensation in aviation, tells for the first time the story of his aeronautical achievements*

Mine is not a long story, as years go, but neither is the airplane a very venerable affair. I myself have lived long enough to remember the first successful flights of the Wright brothers. Only a year or two later I was busy in Madrid with aviation experiments of my own. At the age of an American high-school freshman, I had studied as thoroughly as I could the work of Langley, Maxim, Ader, Chanute and others, and particularly the theories and designs of Otto Lilienthal. The latter was a true pioneer of the age of flight, and when he was killed in 1896 after more than two thousand gliding flights he was definitely on his way to the triumph which was won at last at Kitty Hawk.

With the supreme confidence of my fourteen years, I was not deterred from aerial experiments by my knowledge of Lilienthal's fate. There were three of us boys in a little aviation "company" and one of my associates had access to his father's woodworking factory. This helped very considerably to reduce the overhead of our experiments. We did what we could with kites, and then dared further. We began to build gliders, achieving our first success with a monoplane whose motive power was provided by small boys of the neighborhood at the end of a rope. Fortunately for us young pilots there were no cliffs at hand for our take-offs. The best we could do was to slide off from a fifteen-foot bluff below which lay a gently sloping hill. At the end of a few hundred feet of rope we coasted along a few yards from the ground. We built controls into our craft, crude ailerons and rudder, with such aeronautical wisdom as was in us. And we flew, and somehow broke none of our necks.

The craft worked so well that I came under severe pressure from my younger brother, who saw no reason why he should not also fly. The three proprietors of the company yielded at last, and up he went. But either an unusual gust of wind came along at that moment or there was some serious error in our aeronautical calculations owing to the lighter weight of the pilot. Suddenly the glider shot fifty feet in the air,