

THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW

Dedicated to the Cause of Voluntary Motherhood

ARE BIRTH CONTROL MEASURES INJURIOUS?

By *Margaret Sanger*

THE STUPIDITY OF US HUMANS

By *Mary Ware Dennett*

"FOR THE CHILDREN'S SAKE"

By *Mothers*

SELLING "THE REVIEW" ON BROADWAY

By *Genevieve Grandcourt*

THE BIRTH CONTROL MOVEMENT IN VERSE. EDITORIAL AND CARTOON

THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW

104 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY

LITERARY EDITORS

MARGARET SANGER MAUDE EDGREN
WALTER ROBERTS LILY WINNER
JESSIE ASHLEY

ART EDITORS

CORNELIA BARNES LOU ROGERS

VOL. III No 1

Published monthly Subscription price \$150 a year, foreign countries and Canada \$175, postpaid.

Bundle rates ten copies for a dollar, \$9 50 per hundred

Owned and Published by
THE NEW YORK WOMEN'S PUBLISHING CO. Inc.
104 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter March 11, 1918, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3 1879

Issued on the first of each month.

Address correspondence and make checks and money orders payable to MARGARET SANGER.

NOTICE When requesting change of address, always give the old address as well.

Editorial Comment

By Jessie Ashley

A FEW OF OUR READERS have expressed disapproval of some things that have appeared on this page. Of course we are pleased, disapproval shows that we are read and we write to be read. Besides, we assure ourselves that when we arouse irate comment we are real enough to live on a bit longer. Praise is usually dangerous, it implies the innocuous. Then again, irate comment often suggests what next to write about, and that surely is something to be grateful for.

This time it is methods of propaganda. There are many roads leading to belief in Birth Control, there are many reasons for advocating it. To some, there is a desire to increase the number of people in the world, and to accomplish this they want fewer, but healthier children, in order that more of them may grow to mellowness. Others want health for mothers, so want to give them more time between births. Others want economic relief for fathers. All these are worthy motives and can be convincingly explained. It is certainly easy to make people agree with you when you ask, "Now, wouldn't you really rather see a family of four healthy children, than one of eight sickly ones?" Of course the answer is "Yes." Then you exclaim "Well, then, save the mother's health and the father's pocketbook and let them limit their family to the number they can care for." But is the healthy mother of ten to have no protection? Must she spend her life over milk bottles and mutton chops, wornout shoes and clean pinafores? Must father be compelled to an everlasting interest in schools, colleges and careers for innumerable sons and daughters, just because he has a pot of money? All this kind of propaganda

is based on the assumption that people would want large families, if only they could be healthy and well fed. But the facts contradict this theory. It is, speaking generally, only the poor who have large families. As soon as men and women are so placed that they can avoid having many children they do so. In the majority of cases neither men nor women want large families. Birth Control is as precious to the strong and rich as to the poor and sickly.

Recognizing this, some people advocate birth control by means of continence or of abstaining from sex relations. It is a fine idea too, and has the virtue of being open to all who care to try it. Only when it is openly advocated, the great medical men jump into the arena with their theories or facts regarding nerves and other little things of that sort. We meet Freud with his dreams. Clergymen with the Bible as a weapon of woe. Money makers who remind us of Mexican mines to be developed and devastated France to be rebuilt. We meet the Rooseveltians who see vast wars before us and want millions of human popguns. So every one gets quite scared and confused and all go right on with their sex habits.

Then we hear from Malthus that it is our duty to have as few children as possible, because the world simply can't feed so many, that population always keeps ahead of food production. This is a very imposing argument, but somehow it makes people think about food, not children and besides no one knows anything about the earth's capacity for food production anyway.

ANOTHER KIND OF PROPAGANDA for Birth Control is that which appeals to all alike, rich and poor, sick or well. The kind that everyone wants, we mean power, power to control ourselves. This reason for Birth Control is fundamentally sound. No device can take its place, no plan can be found in it. It rests on the solid base of universal human desire for happiness. We ask why should women be denied knowledge that will help them to live happier lives, will permit them to better control themselves and their destinies? We ask what right has anyone to prohibit anyone else from giving knowledge to those who want it? Knowledge, mind you, not fairy tales. Knowledge that would soon be more thorough, more useful, more intelligently applied if only it could be freely studied and discussed and experimented with. As it is doctors try Birth Control on rabbits and guinea pigs, while suffering human beings are pleading vainly to know what these methods are.

WHAT THEN IS the best course to pursue under the circumstances? Shall we suggest half truths to lure our wily legislators and label Birth Control "Better Babies?" Shall we soar to the idealism of continence and be quite overlooked in the scramble of realities? Shall we give our mothers and law makers pause with the Malthusian cry of Famine? Or shall we make ourselves objectionable creatures by preaching freedom and self control for all? It really is a puzzle, isn't it? So we of THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW have come to the conclusion that we will go right on our way, telling the story as we see it and let every one else do the same.

Are Birth Control Methods Injurious?

By Margaret Sanger

ADVOCATES OF SCIENTIFIC Birth Control are some times met with the absurd statement that such methods are injurious to the health of the woman. It is even asserted that they cause cancer and other disease and that they bring about sterility.

As applied to scientific Birth Control, these statements are both false and silly. In the light of the best authoritative information of the day, it can be unequivocally set down that modern Birth Control methods, properly employed, are not only not injurious but are often positively beneficial to the woman's health. The contrary is maintained for the most part by those who are mentally honest but uninformed or by such as are altogether prejudiced.

The clergy, bound to its theological dogmas is usually opposed to Birth Control methods and is only too ready to accept any bald statement levelled against them. A few physicians who are uninformed as to modern means of Birth Control, still incline to the opinion that they are injurious, but these physicians have in mind the earlier, cruder means of preventing conception.

Some of the persons who maintain that preventive measures are injurious are so ignorant of the whole subject that they in opposing abortion call it Birth Control. Still others believe that harmful drugs are given internally as contraceptives. They, of course, confuse abortives with the means of preventing conception. Anyone who knows anything about either Birth Control or abortion knows that scientific Birth Control methods would do away with abortions which occur in appalling numbers in America every year.

ONE COMMONLY PRACTICED method of preventing conception is not only uncertain but beyond all doubt injurious to the woman's health. This is the one which, because of the withholding of scientific information upon the subject is most commonly used. It was perhaps the earliest method known and was condemned by the wise men among the ancient Jews, being anathematized in the Bible in a very specific fashion. Modern science sometimes calls it Onanism from the name of the Biblical character who, we are told, was signally punished for practising it.

Until recent years it was supposed that this method was injurious to the man alone, but it has been discovered that the man in many cases seems to suffer no ill effects, while the woman's health may actually be wrecked.

Mantegazza believes that organic disease of the spinal cord may follow this practice. Hut says that it may lead to neurosthenic disorders. Eulenberg is of much the same opinion. Valenta declares that it is one of the chief causes of chronic neuritis. Kleinwachter says that its harm to the system of the woman is by no means trivial. Still other great authorities who have pointed out the dangerous effects of the practice are

Forel, Von Krafft Ebing, Mensiga, Freud, Lowenfeld, Elischer and Ellis.

"The lack of sexual satisfaction" says Kisch, as a sort of final word upon the subject, "aggravates nervous and hysterical troubles in women, while suitably regulated intercourse with mutual satisfaction has an actively beneficial effect."

This method, then, in the opinion of the best informed of modern Birth Control advocates is unscientific, and dangerous. In the same class so far as being unscientific and injurious to the health is continence, much advocated but little practiced. This subject will be considered in a later article as will the question whether scientific Birth Control methods are certain. For the present it is enough to point out that scientific Birth Control methods exclude those which are either uncertain or injurious and that the advocates of Birth Control stand for the dissemination of knowledge which will permit mothers to limit their families in a sane, scientific, healthful way.

THE FIRST ESSENTIAL in Birth Control is cleanliness and a sane observance of the principles of sex hygiene. These factors alone, taught to a woman, ignorant of the proper care of her physical functions until she sought knowledge of Birth Control, have restored many to health and have even disposed of many cases of sterility. It is the consensus of modern medical opinion not only that scientific Birth Control methods are not harmful but in thousands of cases very beneficial to women suffering from leucorrhoea, inflamed cervix and other local disturbances.

Among the objects of attacks by opponents of Birth Control are cleansing, antiseptic solutions, and the like. It is to be remembered that these are not preventives and are not to be depended upon as much. As the term indicates, an antiseptic is designed for and serves certain medical purposes. Its function when applied to the reproductive organs of a woman is medicinal or hygienic, not the prevention of conception. Injuries to women from the use of antiseptics result from ignorance or lack of proper directions, as would be the result if such solutions were improperly applied to a wound or a surgical incision.

Mechanical means have also been attacked, it being alleged that they cause cancer. Mechanical devices worn too constantly might produce irritation and cause trouble. A number of new devices have not yet been sufficiently tested to make an opinion as to their harmlessness possible at this time. And dangerous devices will be employed or devices misused as long as law and custom deny to woman knowledge of scientific means of determining the number of her children and the time of their birth.

A glance at statistics disposes of the contention that Birth Control is responsible for the development of cancer. The implication which the opponents of Birth Control seek to leave is that as the birth rate falls because of the use of con-

contraceptives, the cancer rate rises. The contention is sheer nonsense. As far back as 1876 before the birth rate began to fall, the cancer rate began to rise. Moreover, it is only among women who have reached the age of 65 that the increase is noted. It seems probable that women above 65 have not used contraceptives, as they were not so widely known during the child bearing days of women even now at that age. And if they had been known, it would seem very unlikely that a contraceptive used during their child bearing period would cause cancer twenty years afterwards. Nor is this all—further light on this particular absurdity is that no increase in the rate of cancers affecting women's reproductive organs has been noted.

STATISTICS OF SEVERAL countries throw still more light upon the preposterousness of the contention. Ireland has had an increasing cancer rate for twenty years with a constant birth rate. Birth Control certainly is not responsible there. For five years of diminishing birth rate due to the application of scientific Birth Control, Holland has shown also a decrease in the cancer rate. France, where Birth Control methods are in wide use, has a cancer mortality of only 76 per thousand as against 95 in England and Wales, where the birth rate was 28 per thousand at that time.

The assertion that Birth Control methods induce sterility is equally ridiculous. Many a woman, through the use of scientific contraceptives has so toned up and strengthened her reproductive organs as to become capable of child bearing when she would otherwise have continued barren. Where sterility has been laid to contraceptives, physicians have discovered in nearly every case conclusive proof of some condition in the woman or her husband which would have prevented children under any circumstances. In thousands of cases where women have practised scientific Birth Control for five, ten and even twenty years, they have later borne strong, healthy children. Usually the child is stronger in such cases because the mother has waited until her health is at its best and the family means are such as to give the baby the proper care, before and after its birth.

Dr William J. Robmson's challenge, issued several years ago, still remains unanswered. "I challenge," said he, "any physician and gynecologist to bring forth a single authenticated case in which disease or injury resulted from modern methods of prevention."

The gist of the matter then is this: scientific Birth Control is not only harmless but often a direct benefit to the health. Unscientific contraceptives are as likely to harm their users as any other unscientific thing applied to or used in connection with any part of the body. The plain conclusion is that with the health of the womanhood of America at stake, the mediæval laws and customs which prevent full and free dissemination of information concerning scientific Birth Control should be sent to the scrap heap along with rack, the thumb screws and other outworn instruments of torture.

BESIDES BEING HARMLESS and of positive benefit locally, scientific Birth Control methods have a much more important function for the improvement of the health of women. Anyone who knows anything at all about the subject knows

that the health of a woman who is the mother of two or three children born several years apart is better than that of the mother of many children who follow each other at periods of a year or two.

Nor is this all. The dread of undesired pregnancy is the nightmare of the lives of millions of women. To this cause and this cause alone is directly traceable the wrecking of the physical systems of many of them. Wille, a prominent authority quoted by Kisch, asserts that "the continued fear of pregnancy will in most cases do more injury to the feminine system than all the preventive measures in the world."

No woman can be healthy or strong who lives continuously in fear. Moreover, it is a fact universally recognized by physicians that to a nervously weak woman, preventive measures are necessary and a number of them are even helpful in regaining her health.

The sooner these facts are understood, the sooner the laws against the spread of scientific Birth Control are abrogated and information concerning reliable and safe or beneficial contraceptives comes within the reach of all women, the quicker the question of the general health of women will be settled.

Shaking the Gates of Privilege

ONE BY ONE, those men and institutions, which from the vantage point of wealth and privilege have frowned upon the worker's demand for Birth Control, are bowing to the inevitable. In England, following the fearless address of Dr C. Killick Millard, published in a recent issue of THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW, the ultra conservative Royal Institute of Public Health was moved to invite Dr Millard to address it.

"The discussion which followed was taken part in by Major Darwm, FRS, Dr Inge, the Dean of St Paul's, Mr Bernard Shaw and Dr Saleeby," says the recent annual report of The Malthusian League. "It was very sympathetic to the lecturer's views."

"Sir Robert Mordant, Chairman of the National Insurance Commission, in moving the vote of thanks, said that this important question of Birth Control should be kept prominently before the public and that he would be interested to hear more about the Birth Control clinics in Holland."

One can imagine the astonishment of Sir Robert at discovering that this maligned working class demand for Birth Control is neither immoral nor degrading. Being an insurance man, Sir Robert doubtless is attracted by the very evident fact that Birth Control means better insurance risks because it means better babies.

Not Obscene

Judge M. T. Dooley, of the United States District Court, sitting in San Francisco, held in the case of A. Belinski, that Birth Control literature does not come within the provisions of the federal statute penalizing the mailing of obscene matter.

Belinski was charged with having posted some of Margaret Sanger's literature.

The Stupidity of Us Humans

By Mary Ware Dennett

WE HAVE FOUR BASIC human functions
to feed ourselves
to clothe ourselves
to shelter ourselves
to mate and reproduce ourselves

In the exercise of these **functions**, how much does **unaided** nature do for us?

Nature provides **food,—only** for a few weeks or a few months, **sometimes** not at all

Nature **provides** shelter,—nothing beyond trees and an **occasional** cave

Nature provides a strong **sex impulse**, but no **guidance** for the use of it.

We want more than these **primitive provisions**, so we have to use our **minds** to secure them for ourselves

In the exercise of these functions, what have we learned to do, in **addition** to what bare nature does for us?

As to food,—we do something **besides satisfy** our hunger. We feed ourselves **scientifically** and **artistically,—that is**, we dine. We **avoid** gluttony and intemperance

As to clothes,—we do something **besides** merely covering ourselves. We try to dress healthfully and to **give delight** to the onlooker, **if** we can. We **avoid** excess and **ostentation**

As to shelter,—we do something **besides** merely crawl **in** out of the weather. We make homes, **with beautiful furnish ings** and an atmosphere of charm. We **entertain**

In other words,—we have added **science** and art to natural **instinct** and need, in order to make these three functions **socially productive** beyond **their primary** intent. We produce **emotional**, mental, moral and **spiritual** values from our expanded exercise of these **basic** functions. Each one thus becomes a double function. It serves **its** primary purpose and variously **enriches** our lives **besides**. We take **pride in this** development. It **is, in** a large way, the measure of our **civil ization**

BUT AS TO THE fourth great natural **function**, sex **relations**—what do we do, what have we learned **besides** what bare nature teaches **us**? **Mighty** little. We don't know what to do. We flounder.

As to the primary use of sex relations,—the production of **children**, we are neither **willing** to follow **primitive** nature's way **which is** to have an annual baby, nor **do** we **insist** that the race shall understand how to **improve scientifically** upon nature's way, by spacing **births with** reference to health, income, **environment** and **choice**. The law declares it a **crime** to learn **this science, and tradition**, outwardly at least, upholds the law

As to the secondary use of sex **relations,—we** are even more at sea. Some people **insist** that there ought not to be secondary uses of **this function** at all.

They **claim** that **sex relations** for the sole purpose of repro-

duction are **beautiful**, sacred, perfect, and the **like**, but that **otherwise** they are **degrading self indulgence**. These people are **relatively** few. Yet they have a **persistent influence** on the majority who do not hold such **views**. They do not succeed in **altering the practice** of the **majority**, but they do make the **majority** feel somewhat **apologetic** and shame faced,—for the **simple** reason that the **majority** are ignorant and feel somehow that **it is** improper to be **intelligent on this** subject.

The mass of people hardly dare to **believe** that there are **precious** and **vitalizing** results from sex **relations which** are an **enrichment of life** and a source of happiness just as **children** are. They are **afraid** to assume that there are **similar** emotional, mental, moral and **spiritual** values to be derived from the exercise of **this** function, just as **legitimately** as from the acts of **providing** ourselves with food, clothes and shelter. **Feeling** that perhaps the whole thing may be wrong, they find **it** hard to **determine** what temperance and good taste in sex **life** may be. There are no standards. There **is little** open **discussion**. The **splendid** books by **Ellis, Meisel Hess, Galli chan** and **Dr Stopes** reach **relatively** few people. The **mass** blunder on in darkness and embarrassment.

THE "PURISTS" BEG the whole question. They accept sex **relations** as necessary for parenthood and demand **complete suppression otherwise,—and arbitrarily** call that moral **triumph**. But curiously enough, they do not apply a **similar** theory to the other basic functions.

They do not say that we should use **eating** for **nourishment** only, or that **it is** wrong to **utilize meal time** as a means of **social enrichment**.

They do not **claim** that we should merely protect our **bodies** from the elements, or that **a is wrong** to **utilize** clothes as a means of pleasure and the **expression** of beauty.

They do not **in insist** that we should have only a bare **shel ter** to **live in**, or that **it is** wrong to make lovely homes, fine hotels, **beautiful libraries**, school houses, and the **like**.

How **stupid, limited, lazy** and **unimaginative it all is!**

Here **is** a great field of human development neglected and weedgrown. When shall we wake up and **begin seriously** to work upon **it**?

Getting the Birth Control question straightened out is the **first** imperative step. It **will** open the way for all the rest. And presently **it will** be natural to apply **science** and art to sex **relations** as fully as we now do to the matter of food, clothes and shelter.

We find laws upon our statute books **which** are **enslaving** a great part of the **population**, laws **which** have **inflicted** upon our womanhood a state of poverty, degradation, **illness** and death unequalled in the whole **history** of our **times**.

"For the Children's Sake"

Excerpts from Letters from Mothers

"FOR THE CHILDREN'S SAKE," a the plea that rings agam and agam through the letters of suffering and sorrowing mothers, letters that come daily to the office of THE REVIEW, letters asking for information concerning contraceptives

"For the children's sake" plead the mothers, "tell us how we may prevent more children than we can care for"

Upon the necks of these mothers, upon the necks of their children rests the barbarous yoke of the laws and customs which would deny to them the knowledge by which they may be free It is not only for themselves that they ask freedom, it is for their helpless infants, doomed to neglect, hunger, ignorance and disease

Nothing that a writer may pen, nothing that an editor may conceive, can be so bitter and so unanswerable an arraignment of the laws and customs of yesterday—persisting viciously to by—as are these simple letters from mothers

Can you masculine minded moralists, you conventional minded puritans, carrying over dark age laws and customs from a past which even you are only too happy to forget, read these letters unmoved?

Can you persist in your mistaken, abstract convictions, in the face of this concrete evidence of your error? Can you look undisturbed upon the fruits of your determination to force your own ideas upon a suffering womanhood and a starved and diseased and broken childhood?

Is there one among you, who reading these letters, can still say that woman shall be denied the knowledge of her own womanly function for which she pleads for her own sake, and "for the children's sake?"

Children Haven't Got a Chance.

DEAR MRS SANGER

I have just been reading some letters from women in your BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW, and it certainly makes my heart yearn for them, I am a mother of six children now, have had one miscarriage, my health isn't any good, I am simply a nervous wreck My baby is now near 6 months old, and after suffering agony in child birth it seems there is no end to the misery that a mother has with her children. My husband's health isn't any good and hasn't been for sometime My children has not and chance for school O, and the many dark and dreary hours that I have pondered and worried over this, and I am one among the women sex who has just awoken out of sleep, just awoke to the fact that woman's right is full control of her own body My husband has been a man that has worked hard and pleaded with me to try to control and not have so many unwanted children to have to go through this world and yet the future looks darker yet for them than for us But I thought it a sin and other women would talk to me and say it was to But thank the Lord the way will seem much

brighter to me if you will help me I am pleading with you now for help and believe I can use something in the way of Birth Control with a clear conscience

May the Lord help you in your undertaking for I certainly think it will be such a blessing for the poor class of women if they can only get something to help them out in Birth Control

Please answer at once for I am uneasy all the time—we are very poor and can hardly make support for our children Sure will appreciate your help"

"Starving to Death."

DEAR MRS SANGER

"Knowing that you are giving advise, how poor women can prevent birth of babies which she cannot feed and clothe

"I am one which has had seven children inside of ten years I am only 32 years of age Also I am very sorry but regret and misery compels me to ask for advise My husband is only a common laborer and makes only 83 50 a day You know how we get along by paying rent and living for nine on \$3 50 a day—we are starving to death now"

"Who Will Look After My Babies?"

DEAR MADAME

"I certainly believe there ought to be a way in this world to save mothers for their children's sake I have had four children and not over 16 months between each birth—my baby is four years old and ever since her birth my health has been a total wreck. I am so nervous and over worked I can't be the mother I want to be and do justice to my family My husband thinks I don't try to be pleasant, but how can I be when I am unfit for anything but a hospital, my health is like this tired, nervous and were it not necessary I could never move. I bore children, and now I get pregnant every two or three months, and in few weeks miscarry I realize it is killing me—soon I'll be gone and then who will see to my little children. I don't know how to prevent miscarriage, the doctors say to go to bed, etc, but how can I as I have my babies to see after and no help and no money to hire your work done. One doctor said an operation might relieve me, but we have no money for that still another said guard against conception, I can't for I do not know how It is one thing certain my husband won't give up his right as a husband for I've plead for it, as my very life seemed to hang on it. There is nothing I can expect of my husband or doctors I long to feel well one more time, just so my children might know their mother as she would be if she was only well and had strength to be a mother, as things are I can't last long unless things are changed and their remembrance of me will be a worn, tired out nervous woman who never had time for anything, not even strength to do their washing and sewing as it should be done"

(Continued on page 13)

Selling "The Review" on Broadway

By Genevieve Grandcourt

IT WAS "WRITTEN" that I should sell THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW in Broadway. I stood holding copies for someone else one evening when a man advanced and bought one, another immediately followed and bought two. I was not in the least sorry that the ice was broken, for, truth to tell, I was ashamed of my faint heartedness in a cause with which I thoroughly sympathized.

My first experience was a triumph. "Good for you!" people cried out, greatly to my embarrassment. It was as if fate had ordained that I get an abundance of stimulus. But no sooner was I fully launched as a Review seller than I saw the other side for I was next greeted by a chorus of disapproval, beginning with "unlady like," and ascending to "infamous," and then descending the scale to "unlady like" again. I ought to be ashamed, I ought to be arrested or shot, I ought to be thrown into the street, I ought to know better, and then, like a ray of sunshine, "I ought to thank God for my courage!"

This last was the fervent verdict of a nurse, back from an all night vigil at the death bed of a widow of 34, with nine children and nothing to eat! She grasped me by the hand not holding THE REVIEW.

"I have seen enough to know this is the only possible way to go about it," she explained. "It is frivolous to advocate the continence of men, it simply doesn't work. And I think the priests ought to wake up to it, and help us."

I asked her if the case, as regarded them, was hopeless, and she seemed to think, for the present, it was. They may be trying to make some of their men over, but all they talk is the sin of Blah Control as we see it, never admitting the sin of allowing children to be born of mothers who, not being fit to bear them so soon, render themselves thereby unfit to bear healthy children a few years later. She was heartsick at the looseness of reasoning among us Americans. Were things to go on like this, until we grow weary of trying to mend them, and lapse into the apathy which is responsible for much of Europe's failure?

HER REFERENCE TO the looseness of our reasoning remained with me after she had gone. A voice jerked me out of my reverie. "So you're advocating British control, is it? Well, I'll let you know the Irish in this country won't stand for it, I don't care who you are." Now, as British control is the very last thing I should advocate. I laughed aloud and asked him to "Read again," which he did in an excess of astonishment.

"Blah-control, was it?" he didn't know but that might be "worse yet." Think of the Irish that wouldn't be here to put a bit of ginger into the world. Ah, well, "he was a merry old soul, and a merry old soul was he," in spite of the fact that

he totally disapproved, and threatened me with eternal damnation.

"I'll take my damnation, and let you have yours," I shot after him, at which he took off his hat, and waved it in challenge, grinning as he went.

On another occasion a husky young woman stopped before me. "I'll have as many children as I want, I'd like to see any law limit me." As she snapped this new point of view, dissolving me into sudden laughter, a long faced, clerical looking man advanced to reproach me for making light of serious things. He had looked into Mrs Sanger's work, and had come to approve of it, yet I, a woman, could stand here selling a skit on it—a comic weekly! I assured him that I was selling Mrs Sanger's very "work," but that it was quite impossible, all the time, to ignore the funny side of things. His face cleared and he bought a paper, saying he would ask his congregation next Sunday to pray for me.

A DEAR OLD LADY came up with a sprig of holly in her hand, saying the Christmas season was near to remind her in contrast more and more, of the evil and suspicion of the world. She thought no more children ought to be born until we had cleansed society. She loved children and had had many, but they had their own families, and were not interested very much in her. She wished sons, in particular were less exclusive of their mothers.

"But I blame myself," she added, "I never gave them any reason to think the sacrifices I made for them cost me anything and they don't know they did. And if their wives spoil them in the same way, how can we women expect that they won't continue to throw away love and that is what they do all the time, throw away the love that might help them to control themselves and make the world over."

When I asked her if women didn't throw away love, as well, she admitted it but said the love we offer them is worth more than we get in return.

A much bedizened lady paused in front of her automobile, and said, "Between you and I, I would like to give you a lesson." I couldn't forebear retorting that I hoped, in all conscience, it wouldn't be in grammar.

One very significant aspect of the situation is the objection offered, by an occasional flaneur or fatuous old roue, that the Birth Control movement would injure young girls! I cannot imagine that any young girl disposed to evil ways would need this kind of information for long, or, requiring it, would find it hard to obtain while we have such men in our midst.

While selling THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW on the street, I often seem like an impersonal Being standing apart.



The New Year



SCIENTIFIC BIRTH CONTROL

LOW ROGER

for All Women

watching events It is good for my soul to know how very few indecent gibes are flung, how correctly, on the whole, the scales are balanced between good and evil among my countrymen and women as represented by the passing throngs in Broadway, how eager, for the most part, young and old, men and women are to get the truth and arrive at a just estimate When freedom of speech and freedom of the press come to us Americans, we may appreciate it all the more for its present withholding

Thinking thus one evening, I looked up to greet a keen-eyed Frenchman He came, it seemed, bearing gifts the gifts of reassurance and condolence One of our number had been jailed! He was very sorry It was such a comment on the hypocrisy of men I agreed with him, but assured him at the same time, that Miss Marion regarded her martyrdom as an opportunity to spread the Birth Control movement among those unhappy prisoners whom (according to one of his well known countrymen), we have a right to protect ourselves against, but have no right to punish

He agreed, saying that it had its uses—even the shortsightedness of the law

"Nevertheless, those judges don't know what to make of you," he added

As he went on his way, I reflected that if the judges who jailed Miss Marion didn't know what to make of our enthused

movement for the Birth Control movement, there's wasn't a circumstance to the ignorance of those who uphold the so-called Anti Vice Society and the stool pigeon system, in their fight against knowledge of the fundamental laws of life.

Wanted: Volunteers

We want twenty women to volunteer to sell THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW on Broadway We want many times twenty women to sell it on the streets of every other big city in the country

There is little unpleasantness to be faced. No undue attention is paid to the vendors and—the best of the people who pass are the buyers. Even the weather is not often unfavorable long enough at a time to interfere seriously with the work.

An hour or two a week at all the time that is required and the experience is interesting

"We want help," we ask you to do this for THE REVIEW You can put it on its feet financially and make it known to thousands of new readers, who when they understand the Birth Control movement will come forward to help the cause.

Send your name to Mrs William I Colt or to Kitty Marion, in care of THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW, 104 Fifth Avenue They will give you all necessary instructions and will form small groups to work together Volunteer today

To A Prisoner of the Social War

(For Kitty Marwn)

By James Waldo Fawcett

WHAT IS A PRISON? After all,
Nothing but one encircling wall,
A net of bars, an earthly chill,
A pulsing silence, sadly still,
A careful warder's prying eye,
And now and then a wild strange cry
Where some soul writhes in mortal pain,
And dares to scream and scream again,
The restless footsteps overhead
Where all but agony is dead,
And above all the sad dark night
To show God weeps at such a sight

Full many weary mortals go
To share the prison's human woe,
So many that the very stones
Shudder to hear their piteous moans
And are ashamed that they should hold
About a place so deathly cold

But there are many who go free
To taste the dregs of liberty,
To watch the dreary shadows creep
Across a mockery of sleep,

To comfort seek in pride and name,
In mere escape of prison shame,
And these are sadder far than those
The horrid dungeon must enclose.

Still others go in this world's ways
Who seem to know hut careless days.
Who bend the Law to their desire
And forge it in an evil fire
To chase Man's dream and Woman's right,
To keep from Love the wondrous light
By which it flourishes and flowers,
But only by some few brief hours
May these restrain the coming Dawn,
They know our Victory marches on

We are the free souls, in the night,
We are the bearers of the light
They may not prison us away,
They may not hold us in their sway,
They are the prisoners in jail,
There is the fight foredoomed to fail,
Ours is the Victory to be,
We are of those forever free!

"Birth Control---A Parents' Problem or Woman's?"

THAT LETTER FROM 'M B H' in the November issue of THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW stirred up a lively discussion, as was expected. She urged that Birth Control is the problem of both parents

The same new was taken by Mary Ware Dennett in a letter published in the December issue Lily Winner in an article maintained the view that it is, after all, a woman's problem.

Two of the letters published herewith set forth much the same position. Two other writers contend that Birth Control is the problem of both parents. Margaret Sanger will close the discussion in an article in an early number

Problem of Both.

ALL PROBLEMS ARE human problems. No problem can be solved without the joint efforts of men and women. Unfortunately, however, from the mere mechanics of the matter, the infinitely heavier part of the burden of both bearing and preventing the bearing of children must fall on the woman—which is all the greater reason for men giving women what sympathy and aid they can, and for having the need for this co-operation driven home to the consciousness and the conscience of men.

There is, moreover, no lack of good compelling, selfish reasons for men's backing the Birth Control Movement, just a few of them being the ability to marry as soon as one desires, having one's wife stay a wife and not become merely the mother of one's children, the absence of incentive to frequent prostitutes, the resulting health advantages, the tremendously important lightening of the economic burden, the actualization of marriage as a sacrament complete in itself and as a proud father, need I add the greater amount of attention and comforts one can give the children one can afford?

For these reasons I agree with M B H, and yet perhaps the most vital lesson Birth Control has to teach is that a woman's body does not belong to the church, or the state, or to man, but to woman herself, now so often "the slave of a slave"—and all effective gospels of emancipation must be preached to and by the oppressed, not the oppressor

Philadelphia

E R C

Fathers' Problem Too

UNDER THE TITLE, "Birth Control, A Parents' Problem or Woman's?" you invite in your November issue, opinions from readers. I think it possible that my experience may help a little to solve this problem.

The trend of mind of many a father of a poor family favors the birth of many children because, as they have told me, "When the children are older they will go to work and provide for us so that we do not need to work any more." Therefore, the more children there are, the better is the chance that the fathers can soon stop working. They do not figure the extra expenses caused by more children, they are proportionally inexpensive and will soon be productive. Neither do they consider the burden of the mothers childbearing as a wife's

duty anyhow, and the children grow up by themselves. Housework is done in an hour or two and the rest of the time mother sleeps or goes to the movies—if she does not also go to work! So those fathers think, even those working hard and feeling a sense of duty towards their children.

The fathers, therefore, often deliberately create those big families in which their children are underfed and are not brought up to be healthy and ambitious, but to be sent as soon as possible to earn money for the upkeep of the family.

It appears to me that those fathers ought to be taught what wrong they do to their children, how uneconomical it is to set ten children into the world, who feeble and abused before they grow up, cannot earn what five healthy strong ones would, what physical and mental strain the care for a large family is for most women and how much better they themselves could be cared for by their wives if they had fewer children. In short, what a benefit to themselves and their children it would be to limit their number of children.

The wives have, in such cases, mostly, nothing to say as they usually present their objections from a too personal point of view which does not count in the eyes of man. Therefore, men should also be instructed in the methods and benefits of Birth Control, but also, and in equal measure at least, should women know them, if it is only to protect themselves when they are not protected.

A MERE MAN BORN FROM A GERMAN MOTHER.

New York.

"The Woman's."

I read in the November issue of THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW, the interesting question of M. B. H. as to whether Birth Control was a woman's problem or both parents'. I started to write you then, but on account of the Flu did not do so. Now have before me the December issue with the several letters answering the same. May I suggest the following to that interesting question.

Is Birth Control the Problem for the Man, or the Woman, or Both?

At the present time there is but one answer, it is a woman's problem.

Under different conditions, different training and education it will eventually and ought to be the problem for both, but in the thousands of years of known recorded history and perhaps before that, woman has been the burden bearer, the slave in fact, of the human race. She is just now coming to the time when she has the opportunity to stand side by side with the man in the ordinary affairs of life, in many if not most cases, she would yet rather have "her man" even if he beats her, rather than to be free to live an independent life. For the last hundred years marriage has been for the majority only a means of gratifying the sexual cravings, and to bear children, whether or not, the woman's part.

Now at the dawning of a new day, the woman must still

satisfy her man's sexual **desires**—if she keeps **him**—and the burden of **prevention** of **conception**, falls upon the woman, if **conception** is prevented, for the man is blind or still be **unmindful** of the effects on the other **fellow**

In the hundreds of **divorce actions** that have come to my knowledge in the last twenty years, more than 90 per cent of them are traceable to the sex problem, and **believe** that at least 40 per cent of all **divorce** cases are caused by reason of the woman **refusing** to **indulge** in the sexual act, by reason of **sickness** or fear—that she **will conceive**—**accepting** the burden of **divorce**, rather than that of **child bearing**. While it ought not to be so, still, the woman **will** have to prevent if there is **prevention**

Yours truly,
M C LASELL.

Woman Must Solve It Alone.

I DO NOT AGREE with the **opinion** of M B H that, considering woman has the **pam** and danger of **child bearing**, therefore **Birth Control** becomes, in **justice**, the man's problem and **without his co operation** it cannot be solved

While **co operation** is desirable and to a **certain** extent **essential**, while **justice** demands that each should bear the **responsibility** of **his own** acts, especially when the burden is great and the **victim disadvantaged**, yet it is after all, woman's problem and **practically** alone must she solve it

With so much at stake, personally, she is more interested than man—colossally selfish and **unthinking**—can ever be. Death, insanity, **desertion** or **divorce** is about the only thing that will open **his** eyes and even in any one or all of these

extremities he does not always seem to understand the real cause of the **disaster**. **Radically**, development of **child life** is woman's job. Man frankly and most **liberally** reproduces and as frankly and **liberally** kills off the progeny. **This seems** to **comprise** his **chief**, self **determined functions** and duties in which she is supposed to have no concern whatever. **Incidentally**, he has brought the warfare **idea** into **industry** and while legally and **sentimentally** he may be required to "make the **living**," the **unlimited reproduction** forced upon her in turn forces her out into a **martial** world to fight for her own bread and for that of her **swarming** brood

He isn't interested in **eugenics**. He doesn't fight child labor. He doesn't concern himself with the **Better Baby Campaign** or **Primary** Education. The **disastrous** results of **his** "double standard" on the home or the race doesn't **disturb** him one **iota**. He **legislates** for her **without** her consent and over her protest. He has **made—and retains—laws** which compel her to **remain in ignorance** of the control of her own body. What **immediate** change can we expect in **him**? Men are not developed nor **organized** in regard to the justice or progressive phase of any one of these subjects. Women are. All they need is to **realize** their own power—sexually everywhere, **politically** in a few states, their majority in the churches, their unchallenged place in "society," so called, **their growing** power in **industry**. Revalue these **things**, stand by each other, and take decisive **action**. It is a **woman's** work because it more sharply affects her and her **life** work. She must solve it for the cool, common sense reason that if she doesn't, nobody else **will!**

St Louis, Mo

LULU MACCLURE CLARKE

ON CONTINENCE

A CERTAIN LADY who may be called **Miss X** was asked last month to attend the **dinner given** to **Kitty Marion** at the Civic Club. She declined because she **believed** **Birth Control** to be the only means of **salvation** for the race. Sounds odd doesn't it? But the method of **birth** control approved by **Miss X** is not **contraception**, but **abstinence** from all sex relations. Fact. But of course the lady **believed in marriage** and the **perpetuation** of the race.

A Reply to Miss X.

By Mary Knoblauch

WE ARE DEALING with facts which call for **immediate** attention, not with moral **ideals**

If the world is to be **inhabited** by people who shall be capable of **attaining** the **heights** you (Miss X) suggest, we must **begin** by **recognizing** the **weight** of physical forces

No one would now be able to fly had the law of gravity not been taken into account. It is more natural to **sink** than to **swim**, would you therefore agree that it is **debasing** to use a **life preserver** or to go down to the **sea in ships**?

There is nothing to prevent those who think as you do from **abstaining** from all sex relations or from all such relations

except those with **procreation in view**, but for the others, and they are certainly, at present, in the large **majority**, it is for their offspring that care must be taken. It is the **children** who pay the penalty, who become **public charges**, menaces and **nuisances**. I can't agree that some thought for the morrow, **especially when it** concerns the future of our **citizens**, is **debasement**, either to men or women, or to their relations. **Quite** the contrary.

The world has proceeded upon your **view** of things for many a long century, and the result has been—wives and **prostitutes!** **Neither** of them has benefited by the arrangement.

MORALITY

It is just as absurd for a State to make laws to **impose** or **enforce** a **morality** as it is to **impose** a **religion**. For **neither** the law nor the **penalty** imposed by the law **convince**. We know that **knowledge** is the only thing which **convince**, and **knowledge** is advanced through the **expression** of new **opinions** and the truth is discovered by the **free discussion** of such **opinions**. We ask the State to make terms with **progress**, with **human needs**, with **human welfare**, in fact with **civilization**.

When Laws Prohibit

DEEP ARE THE difficulties of the Destroyers of the Demon Booze, booze in quantities, is finding its way be aeroplane into the sternly sovereign State of Florida—booze by the way of New Orleans, booze from Cuba, booze from the four winds of heaven. The Florida prohibition bill, which its author describes as "the most drastic anti liquor law ever framed in the history of the world," is being defeated of its purpose. Hundreds of aviators fly regularly from half a dozen places in Florida to various points where illicit stills are in operation. Flights even as far as Philadelphia have been known.

As a result this law of unparalleled drasticity has had to be amended so as to include in its sweeping confiscation of all vehicles or means by which booze is brought into the state "all machines travelling through the air." Already it has made contraband of automobiles rigged with "jag tanks." It seems that another way of introducing the demon into Florida (and apparently other dry states) was by motor cars as well, so rigged that the tanks shall carry gasoline one side and alcoholic atrocities in the other. Then rooms are rented by the hotels at so much per night (sometimes as high as \$10), which includes booze to be found in the bureau drawers.

All this is a new and unexpected version of the devil. With a thousand miles of border to the south of us, three thousand to the north of us and aeroplanes flying in every direction the outlook for an absolutely air tight, water sealed America is not so bright as it was. The aeroplane is evidently more of a complication than anybody had ever dreamed. And the sudden ending of the war finds the United States with ten thousand aeroplanes on its hands, part of which it may have to sell off at bargain prices. We hope for the sake of

the cause that these may not fall into the hands of the unrighteous to be used for nefarious purposes—New York Tribune

NO DOUBT THESE aeroplane booze carriers will be fined or sent promptly to jail, and no doubt the Society for the Suppression of Vice will at once do all in its power to secure a little of the booze so as to testify against the trade.

But the point is this. When laws are passed that men (or some men) don't like, they have so many wonderful ways of evading them. Just think of it. Aeroplanes at their service and airplane experts to fly them. Hotel proprietors with bureau drawers at their disposal. Automobile makers who will manufacture trucks to hold both gasoline and booze. And a lot of booze sellers who are quite ready to sell gallons of the fire water. Just think of the money! Think of the skill, think of the people, of the ingenuity! All at the service of rebellious law breaking men who want to get comfortably drunk.

And when women want medical information, safe, sane, decent contraceptive information to protect their health and their homes and their children—they are hounded, villified, jailed, fined, trapped. Yet their efforts at rebellious law breaking consist in pitiful attempts to distribute a pamphlet or give quiet oral information to decent human beings seeking needed human help. They have very little money, no aeroplanes, automobiles, trucks, hotels or anything but their own personal pluck and determination to help others.

There you are. A nice clear cut contrast in law breaking

"For the Children's Sake"

(Continued from page 6)

"All in Fifteen Years."

"My dear Mrs Sanger —

I have been much interested in the little I have found to read upon birth control. I am the mother of five living children and one dead at age of 6 months and have lost three prematurely—all inside of fifteen years. I am 42—have not been well in months. Doctors now tell me I have dropsy, my limbs so badly swollen I cannot be on my feet but little. My husband is not strong and not able to work all of the time. We find it a struggle to keep our little family going.

"If you can and will give me any information on this line, oh, how glad I will be, for there is the thought all the time possibly there may come another little mouth to feed and body to clothe. We poor mortals must bear our burdens, for there is no money to pay doctors to make us wise"

"Life Not Worth Living"

"Dear Mrs Sanger —

"Life is not worth living to a woman that does not know how to take care of herself, and it would be a God's blessing to those poor women if only they could get your help, if they would know of you. I will tell you just these few things of myself. I am a woman at the age of 26 years and in seven years had five children which just took all my youth, strength and my health and I am not well to this day. I am going to ask you if you will please be kind enough to let me know of contraception methods which I would thank you very much and God's blessing to you for your kind deed to the poor suffering women.

"My husband is a farmer, and at times does not earn enough to buy food. So please if not too much trouble for you write me just a few lines and let me know"

The Sixty-five Cities of Disgrace

Do You Live in One of Them?

SIXTY FIVE OF THE LARGER cities of the **United States** are washing **babies** at a rate that is a black **discredit** to a country with any **pretensions to civilization**. The baby death rate in these **cities** is from **100 to 182** under one year of age for every thousand **babies born alive**. It does not include the **still births, which** are likewise a shocking figure.

"It is three **times** as safe to be a **soldier in the trenches** as to be an **American baby in a cradle**" This is what Dr **Josephine Baker** was quoted as **saying** during the war. She is a head of the Department of **Child Hygiene in New York City**. She proved **it** by the figures **showing** that the **casualties in the Allied armies** were four in a hundred, **while** the baby deaths in this country were over twelve in a hundred.

What is the matter with this country? Are other countries as bad? **Certainly not**. There are **Holland and New Zealand** for instance, with rates of only 7% and 5%. And of all the large European countries, none have a rate so bad as that of the **United States, except Germany and Russia**.

EVERY READER OF THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW knows that the answer to this question is that in **Holland and New Zealand** Birth Control knowledge is free and **wide spread, while here it is called a crime and is suppressed.**

In most of these **sixty five cities mentioned** the **birth rate is high**. The estimate rate for this country is **124** per thousand, which is **higher** than those of any European countries except **Austria, Bulgaria and Russia**. These two **universally go together, a high birth rate and a high baby death rate,—the most tragic and inexcusable waste of which the human race is guilty**.

These **sixty five cities** are the **milling and mining towns, the congested industrial centers, the big factory communities**. These are the places where **swarming tenements** abound, where mothers as well as fathers are employed at wages which can not keep up with the cost of **living, where ignorance and lack of opportunity** make people the **victims** instead of the masters of **life**.

SOME DAY POVERTY, and the privilege which causes it, and the ignorance which follows from it, will all be wiped out,—but not in this generation,—probably not in the next. Meanwhile, the very least that a decently **responsible government** can do for these **struggling victims** is to free the **domination** by which they may have only those **babies** to whom they can **give health and a chance**.

Suppose a **Birth Control clinic** were opened in every one of these **sixty five cities within a year**? Does any **intelligent person** doubt that the mothers would flock to them for help? Does any one doubt that the benefit which **Holland has gotten from its fifty two clinics** would **fail to be duplicated** here?

According to present laws, **clinics** are now legally **possible in thirty two of these cities**. In **thirty three** they are not. In **eighteen states** there is no law **prohibiting the giving of contraceptive knowledge** verbally. The federal law **making it unenforceable** of course, covers all **states**. **But in these thirty-three cities at least, clinics** should be opened **at once**.

IN THESE CITIES UNDER PRESENT LAWS CLINICS ARE LEGAL

ALABAMA. Birmingham, Mobile
ARKANSAS. Fort Smith
DELAWARE. Wilmington
FLORIDA. Jacksonville
GEORGIA. Savannah
ILLINOIS. Chicago, Peoria, Rockford, Quincy, Aurora
KENTUCKY. Lexington, Louisville, Covington
LOUISIANA. New Orleans
MARYLAND. Baltimore
MICHIGAN. Detroit, Grand Rapids, Saginaw
MISSOURI. Springfield
NORTH CAROLINA. Raleigh
SOUTH CAROLINA. Columbia.
TENNESSEE. Memphis, Nashville
VERMONT. Burlington, Rutland
VIRGINIA. Richmond, Roanoke, Lynchburg
WEST VIRGINIA. Wheeling
WISCONSIN. Superior, Green Bay, Racine

CLINICS ARE ILLEGAL

CONNECTICUT. Hartford
MASSACHUSETTS. Fall River, New Bedford, Holyoke, Lowell, Lawrence
MINNESOTA. Duluth
NEW HAMPSHIRE. Manchester, Nashua
NEW JERSEY. Jersey City, Trenton, Camden, Elizabeth, Passaic, Perth Amboy
NEW YORK. Poughkeepsie, Niagara Falls, Buffalo, Syracuse, Albany, Troy, Watertown, Utica, Binghamton
OHIO. Cleveland, Youngstown, Hamilton
PENNSYLVANIA. Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Reading, Norristown, Johnstown

Are you ready to help start the demand for a **birth control clinic in your city**?

If so, write to the **National Birth Control League, 200 Fifth Avenue, New York City**

This page is contributed by

THE NATIONAL BIRTH CONTROL LEAGUE
 200 Fifth Ave., New York City

The Malthusian Doctrine Today

By C V Drysdale, D Sc
(Continued from December issue)

A NOTHER ANALOGY WHICH I have found useful in attempting to make the kinetic theory of over population clear is that of two railway trams, one, representing population, running behind the other, representing food. In the last article we saw that the natural unchecked rate of increase of population was about 40 per 1,000 per annum (birth rate 50, death rate 10). Let us think of this as an express tram, running at a steady rate of forty miles per hour. If the line is clear, there is no danger in its running at this or any other speed until it gets close to the end of the line, when, of course, the brakes must be sharply applied, or it will be stopped by colliding with the buffer stops. This is the picture which the opponents of the over population doctrine ask us to accept. "Let the population run smoothly forward at an unchecked rate until the limit is reached," they say. But what if the line is not clear? Suppose that our express passenger tram, running at forty miles an hour, has a slow goods tram in front of it which moves forward from station to station, as the food supply increases from harvest to harvest. Would any passenger in the express tram care two straws about the distance to the end of the line? If the goods tram is only going to move forward five or ten miles in each hour, and the passenger tram is running only just behind it, there is going to be a collision, which will be worse the faster the passenger tram and the slower the goods tram. The shock of the collision and the loss of life thus depends entirely upon the speeds of the two trams, and not in the very least upon whether they are near the end of the line or not.

This is a very close analogy to the true doctrine of over-population. Our population, if running freely, would advance steadily at a rate of about 40 per 1,000 per annum. But the line is not clear. The present food supply of the world, whatever it ought to be, is only just sufficient to feed the surviving population (this will be shown later), and it advances from year to year, but probably by not much more than five parts per thousand, as is indicated by the actual increase of the world's population. This is as if our goods tram moved forward five miles in each hour. It is perfectly evident that if the brake is not put on the population tram, there will be a terrible collision and loss of life each year by means of famine, disease or war, even if it has only just started, and is thousands of years from the final limit.

THIS WAY OF LOOKING at the question shows the utter absurdity of the everlasting contention that the over population doctrine is wrong because we are now better off with a larger population than we were formerly with a smaller one. It depends simply upon the speeds of the two trams, i. e., on the rate at which the food tram can be pushed forward, and the extent to which the brakes can be put on the population tram. Even if the goods tram is only a few miles

from the terminus, it may be possible to speed it up, and if at the same time a sufficiently powerful brake is put on the population tram, a collision may be avoided, even though they may have had constant collisions in the earlier part of the journey, when far from their limit.

Now, so far as this country (England) is concerned, at any rate, both these things have happened. The improvement in the means of transport during the last few decades has speeded up our own food tram (even if it has slowed down those of other countries), and the information spread by the Knowlton trial and the Malthusian League has provided a new and vastly more efficient brake to the population tram. With our present birth rate of 24 per 1,000 and taking the death rate from old age as, say, 10 per 1,000, this means that our population is only attempting to increase 14 per 1,000 per annum, or our population tram has had its speed checked to fourteen miles per hour. As our food tram seems to be now travelling about ten miles per hour, the collisions are now very much less serious, and we are obviously much better off, even though we may be nearer some possible limit than we were forty years ago, when our population tram was trying to run at twenty-six miles an hour (birth rate 36, assumed old age death rate of 10)** and the modern brake of family limitation within marriage had not come into use.

But this does not in the least prove that it is not still running too fast, and that the brake does not need to be applied still further. On the contrary, while we still have a death rate of 14 instead of 10, and infantile mortality of over 100 per 1,000

*In fact, however paradoxical it may seem, we are getting less and less over populated as we get nearer the limit, just as the passengers in a modern tram provided with good brakes are safer now, when running into the terminus, than were formerly in a tram with weak brakes on the open track.

Books to be had at The Review Office

Population and Birth Control	
A Symposium	\$3 00
What Every Mother Should Know	
By Margaret Sanger	paper 25c, cloth 60
Limitation of Offspring, by Dr Wm J Robinson	1 50
List of References on Birth Control	
By Theodore Schroeder	.35
The Small Family System, by Dr C V Drysdale	1 50
The Love Rights of Women, by Havelock Ellis.	.25
The Objects of Marriage, by Havelock Ellis	.25
Birth Control in its Medical, Social, Economic and Moral Aspects, by Dr S Adolphus Knopf	10
Jailed for Birth Control, by James Waldo Fawcett	10
Uncontrolled Breeding, by Adelyne More	1 00
Small or Large Families	
By Drysdale and Havelock Ellis	1 00
What Every Girl Should Know	
By Margaret Sanger	paper 25c, cloth .50

birth instead of zero, as at Villers le Due, and a large number of people whose dietaries, according to Rowntree, are deficient in protein up to forty per cent of a proper physiological ration, we have every reason for contending that the brakes need still stronger application. And, especially, we have to replace the old barbarous brakes of celibacy, late marriage, prostitution, and venereal disease, which are still only too prevalent, by the modern humanitarian, hygienic brake of contraception.

All this explanation and analogy a very wearisome, but it is absolutely necessary for neo Malthusians to expose to ordinary persons the absurd fallacies which demagogues and economic experts alike attempt to pass off as genuine.

U S A needs a high quality population more than a greater quantity. She needs more of her children already born—to be reared into decent citizenship—not more to be born into destitution and poverty.

Civilize the Reproductive Instinct.

Adolphe Pmard, member of the Academy of Medicine of Paris, says

Researches relating to physiological heredity and pathological heredity ought to be pursued without interruption, but it is necessary to make known as soon as possible to the masses of the people the individual conditions, fully understood, which alone permit a favorable and healthy procreation. In a word, it is necessary as soon as possible to organize a great movement in order to show to the greatest number of human beings the absolute necessity for a conscientious, i e, an enlightened procreation. We must bravely approach the civilizing of the reproductive instinct, which alone has remained in a barbarous state amongst all the so-called civilized nations from the earliest times.

We are slaves to think that any former generation had a right to bind us, just as we are tyrants if we think we can bind the generations that are to follow.

Birth Control Organizations

IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The Federation of Neo-Malthusian Leagues
Dr Alice Drysdale Vickery, President

CONSTITUENT BODIES

- ENGLAND (1877)—The Malthusian League. Secretary, Dr Binnie Dunlop, 48 Broadway, Westminster, London. SW
Periodical, *The Malthusian*
- HOLLAND (1885)—De Nieuw-Malthusiaansche Bond. Secretary, Dr J Rutgers, 9 Verhulststraat, Den Haag
Periodical, *Het Gellukkig Huisgezin*
- GERMANY (1889)—Sozial Harmonische Verein. Secretary, Herr M Hausmeister, Stuttgart
Periodical, *Du Soziale Harmonie*
- FRANCE (1895)—G Hardy, 29 Rue Pixérécourt, Paris.
Periodical, *Génération Consciente*
- SPAIN (1904)—Liga Espanola de Regeneracion humana. Secretary, Senor Luis Bulffi, Calle Provenza 177, Pn I la, Barcelona
Periodical, *Solu y Fuerza*
- BELGIUM (1906)—Ligue Néo-Malthusienne. Secretary, Dr Fernand Mascaux, Echevin, Courcelles
- SWITZERLAND (1908)—Groupe Malthusien. Secretary, Valentin Grandjean, 106 Rue des Eaux-Vives, Geneva.
Periodical, *La Vie Intime*
- BOHEMIA-AUSTRIA (1901)—Secretary, Michael Kacha, 1164 Zizhov, Prague
Periodical, *Zadruby*
- PORTUGAL—E. Silva, Junior, L da Memoria, 46 r/e, Lisbon
Periodical, *Pox e Liberdade*
- BRAZIL (1905)—Seccion brasilena de propaganda. Secretaries, Manuel Moscosa, Rua d Bento Pires 29, San Pablo. Antonio Dominguez, Rua Vizcande de Moranguapez 25, Rio de Janeiro
- CUBA (1907)—Seccion de propaganda. Secretary, José Guardiola, Empedrado 14, Havana
- SWEDEN (1911)—Sällskapet for Humanitar Barnalstrang. President, Mr Hinke Bergegren, Vanadisvagen 15, Stockholm Va
- ITALY (1913)—Lega Neomalthusiana Italiana. Secretary, Dr Luigi Berta, Via Lamarmora 22, Turin
Periodical, *L'Educazione Sessuale*
- AFRICA—Ligue Neo-Malthusienne, Maison du Peuple, 10 Rampe Magenta, Alger

IN THE UNITED STATES

- ANN ARBOR MICH—Mrs L A Rhoades, 1318 Forest Court
BANGOR, ME.—Dr P E Luce, 40 Central Street

BOSTON MASS—The Birth Control League of Massachusetts
P O Box 1358 Mrs Oakes Ames, president.

PHILADELPHIA, PA—Dr L A Young, 5152 Haverford Ave

CHICAGO, ILL.—The Citizens' Committee on Family Limitation. Secretary, Mrs B E. Page, 521 Longwood Ave.
Glencoe, IU

DETROIT, MICH—Mrs Jessie A Rene, 919 Brooklyn Avenue.

ELIZABETH CITY, N C—Mr and Mrs W O Saunders

HARRISBURG, PA—George A Herring, 2436 Reel Street

LOS ANGELES, CAL—Dr T Percival Gerson.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.—The Minneapolis Birth Control League. Mrs Helen C Thomsen, 1208 Vincent Avenue.
N, -secretary

NEW ORLEANS, LA—H. G Shockley, 428 Delaronde Street

NEW YORK

The Committee of One Thousand. Dr I n S Wile, 230 West 97th Street, chairman.

The National Birth Control League. 200 Fifth Avenue
Mrs Maxwell Hyde

The Woman's Committee of One Hundred. Mrs Amos Pinchot, chairman, 9 East 81st Street

PATERSON, N J—William D Walker, 1139 Madison Avenue

PITTSBURGH, PA—The Birth Control League of Western Pennsylvania. Mrs Clarence Renshaw, 117 Linden Ave., Edgewood, secretary.

PORTLAND, ORE.—The Birth Control League of Portland. H C Dekker, 652 Elliott Avenue, president. Mrs J R Oatman, 549 Fifth Street, secretary.

RADNOR, PA.—The Main Line Branch of the National Birth Control League—Mrs Walter M. Newkirk, secretary.

ROCHESTER, N Y—A I Howser, 227 Parsells Avenue

ST LOUIS, MO—Grace Anderson, City Dispensary, 11th and Chestnut Streets.

ST PAUL, MINN.—The Minnesota State Birth Control League. Secretary, Mrs Grace M Keller, 230 Vernon Ave. St Paul

SAN FRANCISCO CAL.—The Birth Control League of San Francisco, 239 Geary Street. Margaret McGovern, president.

SEATTLE, WASH.—The Seattle Birth Control League. Minnie Parkhurst, 516 Third Ave., West Seattle, Wash., secretary.

SUMMIT N J—Rev Franklin C Doan

WASHINGTON, D C.—The Birth Control League of the District of Columbia. Mrs Anna Wexler, 1926 New Hampshire Ave., president.