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We visit with our disapprobation the man or woman who collects pets—cats, dogs, parrots and so on—only to neglect them and let them die of starvation. We not only do not approve of such a person, but we call himself seems to be hopelessly precluded from choosing his parents. He has to take them as he finds them. He must not the careful choosing of the world when they are bothersome, or endow with health, strength, education and a reasonable opportunity to pursue happiness, we act quite differently. The law and the Pharisees refuse to demobilize their prejudice, ignorance and false sentimentality. They say sententiously, “increase and multiply,” forgetting that there were only eight people in the world when this advice was given. Natural causes, famine, disease and other ungentle and wasteful agents of destruction will look after the surplus.

Almost everywhere today, men and women insist on the right of self determination in the choice of mate. Why is not the careful choosing of the child the logical step in our halting progress toward rationalizing life? The child himself seems to be hopelessly precluded from choosing his parents. He has to take them as he finds them. He must certainly be quite often aghast at the situation in which he finds himself upon his arrival. Hurried hither without being consulted and, all too frequently without being wanted, it is small wonder that he so often behaves as inconsequentially as he does when he discovers the fix he is in.

THE FIRST RIGHT a child should have, and since he can’t protest, we should insist upon it for him, is that of being wanted. The second right is that his parents should be educated up to wanting him unless they are fairly sure they can provide for him decently, until he can look after himself. The only way that this can be done, is by educating the parents, fully, honestly, decently in a knowledge of themselves and their responsibilities, and by allowing them to be taught the means of regulating their families in accordance with their own health and economic resources. This latter information the law of the land refuses to let them have. The unthinking, who should not be the ones to carry on the race, produce children more rapidly than their health, strength and resources will permit. This is hard on them, worse for the children and harmful to the community. Their suffering, since they don’t think, can, if one likes, be discarded, the child and the community remain to be considered. The readers of this Review are intelligent enough to tackle this problem by themselves. The parents who think, but don’t know what to do, are next in order, and their suffering is enough to break one’s heart.

A nurse in the lower East Side told of an Italian woman who came to the clinic with her little boy whose collar bone was broken. The woman had six children and another one coming. When asked how Johnnie come to be in this shattered condition, her grief was distracting. She said that she had some sewing to finish, for the rent had to be paid—the husband’s wage was not enough for so many to live upon—she was thinking of the newcomer, and wondering how she could take care of him and whether they would all of them starve, or be dependent on charity. Johnnie was moody and irritating. She pushed him roughly aside and he fell and broke his collar bone. “Oh,” she cried, overwhelmed by remorse, “not to have any more children, till we can care for those we have. One baby—lovely, two babies good, three babies, all right, four, can manage. Five—hate ‘em all!”

DON’T JUDGE HER harshly, those of you who have nurses to look after your children when they are bothersome, and money enough to be comfortable and easy yourself. Consider her plight and resent the unjust laws which forbid a good wife and an excellent mother to so regulate her family even as you very probably do yours, that it will be a blessing to her and a benefit to the community. Someone may here remark “let the husband and wife be self controlled.” But it is not a race of celibates that makes the world go round. It is human beings, with desires and passions. It is the outcome of these natural instincts that must be dealt with—pending the entire transformation of mankind. And for the sake of the child, to say nothing of the race, it would seem only fair that he shouldn’t have to come where he isn’t, and under the conditions, cannot be wanted.

When eugenics first began to be discussed, objections were heard to the effect that they would reduce humanity to the level of a barn yard. Reduce is certainly not the word. No modern barn yard is run on any such blind plan as is pursued by the human race. No barn yard run so foolishly could even, for a few years, survive scientific competition. Let us elevate humanity to the same level. Holland, whose barn yards have (Continued on page 15)
Birth Control and Child Labor

By Owen R. Lovejoy,
General Secretary, National Child Labor Committee

The right of children to be well born, the right of children to be born only when they are desired and when conditions are such as to guarantee them a fair chance for growth and education, touches the child labor problem very closely. Considered in its broader sense the child labor problem is now the problem of the whole child and his needs. It can no longer be considered apart from the questions of education, recreation, dependency, delinquency and health. In investigations in various large cities within recent years indicate that about 30 per cent of working children (the total is roughly estimated at about 2,500,000) leave school from economic necessity. From 30 to 60 per cent more leave because they are dissatisfied with school—it fails to interest them, they want active, real wage earning work to do. Thus the questions of education and recreation are perhaps of greatest importance to the people who are trying to drive child labor out of existence. We must learn the means for enlisting the co-operation of the child himself, through satisfaction of his needs in school, with our fight against its exploitation.

Consequently it would be too much to claim that freedom for birth control would at once do away with child labor. There are other influences as potent as poverty, the greed of employers and parents and overcrowding in the homes, but we can fairly say that with a knowledge on the part of parents in the poorer classes of the means by which their children may be limited to the number that could be reared and supported in decency, perhaps one third of all the working children in this country could be saved from a life of exploitation and from an existence made well nigh unbearable through lack of early opportunity and training. One third—probably from eight to nine hundred thousand children—might be given a chance to escape an unsought existence, and the necessity of giving birth in turn to a new generation of child laborers. For this evil is self reproductive, and even the best of laws must fail to break the vicious circle of child labor, poverty, and back to child labor.

In the last few years the occupations open to children have radically changed in the proportion of boys and girls engaged. Attention used to be centered upon factories, mills, canneries and mines, because in these the most unhealhful and strikingly evil conditions obtained. Since the passage of the federal child labor law establishing a 14 year minimum age for these industries and a 16 year standard for mines, our attention has been directed to the three main fields of agriculture, street trades, and tenement home work.

Agriculture, according to the 1910 census, occupies about three fourths of all working children. These are working in the beet fields of Colorado and Wisconsin, in New England tobacco fields, in the cotton fields of the South, and on thousands of home farms all through the country. In Hardin County, Kentucky, a man lives with his wife, one son and four daughters on a small farm. He bought the property, paying 15 per cent bonus, which draws interest as well as the mortgage. Last summer they had six acres in tobacco, twelve in corn, and a small plot in vegetables. No help was hired, but instead, the 8, 12, and 17 year old girls and the 10 year old boy all worked in the tobacco field. Their father said by way of explanation, “That’s the advantage of the tobacco crop—every child is a hand.” In the same state a certain “cropper” lived on a few acres of land with his wife, four sons and three daughters. They were so poor the county was furnishing clothing and school books free to the children. The land was sublet from a tenant, who supplied him with team and implements, and guaranteed the payment of his bill at the local store. The oldest child, a girl of 14 years, was absent from school 34 days out of the 74 days in the first four months of the term, the 12, 11, and 8 year old boys were absent 43, 41 and 33 days respectively. All of these absences were due to farm work, most of it tobacco culture, but about one third of the absences of the youngest boy were caused by work done at home. It is in this way that the cycle of poverty, ignorance and child labor continues unbroken from generation to generation. Large families, poverty, and lack of schooling go hand in hand in these rural counties.

Kephart in “Our Southern Highlanders,” says “Mountain women marry young, many of them at 14, 15 and nearly all before they are 20. Large families are the rule, 7 to 10 children being considered normal and 15 is not an uncommon number, but the infant mortality is high.”

The Children’s Bureau, in a recent report, points out the immediate causes of this terrible waste of human effort: “One mother had done a washing the day before her second baby was born, she is a regular field hand and chopped cotton all day, five days a week, up to the day before confinement. Another, a mother of five children, continued her housework, field work, and chores up to the date of confinement, and the morning of the day the baby was born picked 45 pounds of cotton and cooked a big dinner for her family of seven.” It is literally impossible for these women to do anything else. As a negro mother of six children said: “I went because I had to do, but I wasn’t able.” She had continued field work until three days before confinement. And the children are the victims, as much as the women.

In street trading, it would seem, the connection between necessity and child labor is less close. But even here, in the children who help tend street markets, or who gather up bits of coal and wood to eke out the family supply, and thereby lose their chance for proper schooling, we find the result of overcrowded homes. Then there are the “little mothers” who are hired out to care for the neighbor’s baby before and after school.
Little Anna lives in the "back yard of Wall Street" and tends a neighbor's baby while that "lady" is at work. "It's easier than my last job, because then I had to take care of three babies and did not get so much money. I get up at 5:30 and go right to the lady, the babies are asleep when I get there, but they wake up at 7 and I dress them and mend them until the lady comes from cleaning. In the afternoon I take them out and bring them home before the man gets there."

Then there is Veronica who lives opposite the docks. Her father is a truckman, working fairly steadily and bringing his money home to the family. As there are six children, however, his wages do not meet all their needs and so the mother goes out and cleans office buildings for five hours a day. One of the children takes care of her little sister and brother while the mother is away, the older girl takes care of "Aunt Helen's babies" and earns $1 a week, and little Veronica who is only 8 years old takes care of two children every morning and night for $1.25 a week. She has been doing this for a year and a half and before that, "I minded my own baby."

Tenement homework is again the logical product of too large families and the resulting necessity to make "every child a hand." The eight children of the Sullivan family range in ages from 13 years to 10 months. For several years their work has been carding buttons, and at this work they average 18½ hours a day including Sunday, earning but a miserable weekly income at that. One child of 12 years, who worked on buttons, has been desperately ill. Those who have worked this year are Elizabeth, aged 13, Jim aged 10, Peter aged 8 and Alec aged 7. It is hardly necessary to enlarge on the evils of such work. The ill ventilated rooms, the insanitary conditions, the danger to the consumer, and the meager help given to the children engaged in it. Teacher's records show either long lines of absentee marks for these, or else a record of backwardness, due to fatigue and ill health. No amount of regulation can remedy matters. So long as women are allowed to take work from the factory, just so long will children continue to do sweat shop work in the homes. And just as long as there is overcrowding, undesired children, and consequent poverty, the demand of mothers already overworked will continue for even this lowest paid grade of labor.

In accordance with the broader view of child labor prevention as one in a number of related fields of child welfare, the National Child Labor Committee has made three state surveys in the two years, and is now engaged on a fourth. These surveys covered all the conditions relating to children-schools, agriculture, delinquency and probation, institutions, recreation, and so on. The striking fact shown in the reports was the need for correlated work in bringing all these fields to a common standard of effectiveness, both with regard to legislation and to enforcement of laws. In the study of North Carolina institutions, for instance, it was found that the "homes" were crowded with women of every grade of mental and physical defect, that there is slight segregation of young girls from older women in the so-called reformatories, that feeble-minded children are housed with normal children in the orphanages, and normal children with feeble-minded and epileptic adults. The conservative estimate of one supernumerary child placed the number of feeble-minded in the state who are uncared for and in immediate need of treatment, at between 5,000 and 6,000. Further the law forbidding marriage between mental defectives placed no penalty upon the clergyman or official performing such a ceremony. At one of the county homes there were found two little girls, 13 and 11 years of age, wild as young animals, the offspring of Peter and Polly Swink. Peter is 75 years old, blind, and a permanent inmate of the home. Polly is younger, a strong mountain woman, who drifts in and out with her two little girls as the fancy strikes her. She is always gone during cotton picking time but the superintendent has learned to expect her back when the first snow flies. While she is not obviously feeble-minded, she is entirely irresponsible.

The case of Alice Brown is an example of the ineffective manner in which such cases are dealt. She was known throughout the county as a "very bad woman," and was in the habit of spending her winters at the county home with her constantly increasing family of young children. Her conduct becoming so flagrant that the judge feared he would have to take the children from her, he decided that rather than do this he would give her a week to leave the state. In the matter of the care and segregation of abnormal in individuals, however, public opinion is awakening. It is the care of normal, or potentially normal children, that demands greatest attention. The country is agreed that child labor in factories, mills, and mines is destructive to human and even to industrial efficiency. It is recognized as a liability. What we need to realize now is that labor which keeps children from the education and developing play that is their birth right is harmful in almost equal degree. Further—that the state which keeps from women the knowledge which would enable them to give opportunity to a few children instead of the heritage of want and ignorance to a large family, is as guilty toward its citizens as the state that implicitly allows exploitation of its children in industry.

We stand—or like to think that we stand—as a nation for equal opportunity. Can we honestly say that we have fulfilled this ambitious boast when our schools are failing in the ultimate test of meeting children's needs—when our teachers form the lowest paid profession, so that in New York City in the last four years the number of children on part time has increased from 85,000 to nearly a quarter million, due to the teacher shortage—when nearly three million children are working while other children are being fitted for high salaries and an easy life—when, finally, the law takes from the poor women the opportunity to limit her family in accordance with her power to provide for them and equally from children, the chance for strong bodies, adequate care and nourishment and education? This fact lies back of the "economic pressure" to which one-third of the body of child laborers are attributed. If we are to get down to fundamental forces, birth control must be viewed frankly and sanely in its relation to child labor.
The Tragedy of the Accidental Child

By Margaret Sanger

The FIRST RIGHT of the child is to be wanted—to be desired with an intensity of love that gives it its title to being and joyful impulse to life. It should be wanted by both parents, but especially by the mother, who is to carry it, nourish it, and perhaps influence its life by her thoughts, her passions, her loves, her hates, her yearnings.

We have observed how strongly children inherit their mother’s traits. Freud has told us of children so greatly influenced by their mothers as to be incapable of a mate love for anyone who does not resemble them. We are all familiar with the old wives’ tales of children “marked” because of a mother’s fright or other strong emotion, though we know little concerning the truth or falsity of this theory. Just as little do we know of the effect of fear, hate, yearning or disgust in the mother at the time of conception.

Until scientists give years of careful study to the problem there will be no accurate information concerning it. At most we can only speculate upon it now. But since the life of the mother in its other phases, seems to affect the child so vitally, is it not probable that strong emotion at the time of conception, emotion which lingers and preys upon the mind of the mother in the months following, leaves its impress deeply if not medlebly upon the life of the child? And is it not time that the scientists were making a direct and exhaustive study of a problem which may be fraught with so much of weal or woe for the race?

My personal opinion, founded upon observation as nurse and as a worker in the Birth Control movement, is that these emotions have a profound effect upon the child. I believe that the mother’s fear of pregnancy has a most unhappy influence upon the life of her offspring. I believe that this fear and the unsuccessful practice of coitus interruptus are responsible for the timidity, the fretfulness and feebleness of many infants.

Does it stand to reason that no child can be what it should be, physically, mentally or spiritually, if it is concieved and carried by a mother to whom the embraces of her husband are repugnant? Can a mother who begins the creation of the little life in disgust and in disgust brings it to birth, bequeath to her baby the strength, the mental vigor or the disposiion to happiness that is its inherent right? Can a mother whose very being is trembling in terrified submission or quivering with hate at the time of conception and who for months there after experiences a measure of these same emotions, bring her child forth as well equipped for the life struggle as it would otherwise have been? We know something of the effect of worry upon the mother’s milk. What may we not yet discover concerning the effect of worry or even stronger emotions upon her blood that for nine months flows through the very being of the child?

Why the great numbers of feeble-minded children? Why the hosts of infants born too feeble to withstand the difficulties of the first year of existence? Why the weakening manhood and womanhood, too timid to make effective protest against the great social wrongs and tyrannies which crush them?

Science has answered these questions in part, but only in part. I do not believe that they will be conclusively answered until account is taken of the condition of the mind of the mother from the moment of the creative embrace until the child is born.

The tragedy of the unwanted child—of the accidental child—only begins with whatever evil prenatal effect the emotional condition of the mother may have upon it. The right to be wanted is its first right but only the first of many that are ignored. Usually it suffers a further handicap by being carried by a mother who is physically ill or overworked. Fear of pregnancy is frequently inspired in the mind of the mother by the burden of too many children, or by want or by both. When it arrives, the accidental child usually finds itself in the ranks of the millions of hungry and neglected infants. Often it is merely a candidate for an item in the infant mortality statistics. We have before us always the horrible spectacle of hundreds of thousands of children dying miserably before they have lived twelve months, of other hundreds of thousands dying just as miserably before they reach the age of five. Worse still, is the lot of those other millions who after the age of five take their places among the toilers in mills and factories.

What have we to offer those who do not go to the places of toil? To the majority of them, dwelling places too cluttered and crowded to be called homes. Schools that are crowded, in which “half time” is the sop of the state to the needs of childhood. Streets, filthy and crowded, as their play grounds. And for some of them, finally, crowded jails and crowded institutions for the feeble-minded. Crowded always, never breathing a free atmosphere and seldom a healthy one, from the beginning to the end of their monotonous lives, the hordes of unwanted children seldom have a chance to forget their unwanted state.

We hear a good deal of sentimentality about unfailing mother love. We are told that even these unwanted children have that to protect them in their hard lots. But how few of the poorer women have the time and the strength to let mother love develop and express itself? We make a mistake in as summing that mothers are always kind. We forget that under the stress of caring for many children, under the strain of helping to earn bread for hungry mouths and clothing for bodies clothed in rags, the strongest mother love may turn bitter and cruel.

Is anything more horrible, more hopeless than the cruelty of a mother worried and tired to distraction? Oh, yes, there is much of it! If you doubt, go for a little while to live among the families whose mothers are over burdened.
with children whose, bodies and brains are worn threadbare with toil made and outside the home. Unfortunately it is not only the hardhearted father of the story book who is cruel to the children—there is an appalling amount of cruelty from the mothers too.

Which of us has not seen such cruelty, even in the streets? A case significant only because it is of frequent occurrence came to my attention a few months ago. A woman, evidently worn out by a day's work, was wheeling a child in a baby buggy in fourteenth street. Another child, about three years old, was trudging at her side, clinging heavily to her skirt. It had on badly shaped, cheap shoes, which probably hurt its feet. It cried monotonously as it walked. The mother, apparently in frantic haste to reach home and prepare supper, doubtless for the children—there with the group of older and rougher boys. Her face and then the other. The tiny thing, surprised by the sudden attack, fell face downward upon the sidewalk. The furious, nerve-wrecked mother, picked it up by the chin and struck it again and again on the back until a passer by interfered. To a threat of arrest she retorted, "Oh, you shut up. This is my kid and I'll lick it when I want to."

Do you hesitate to believe that this happens often? It is common—as common, almost, as unwanted children. Of course, the mother later on rocks the child to sleep, covers its bruised face with kisses and seeks to wipe out the memory of the blows in a flood of remorse. But the scars are there, in the mind of the child, if not upon its body. Our militarists and ecclesiastics who shout for more and more children, who speak of them as "blessings," shut their eyes tightly to this aspect of child life among the harrassed poor.

In France, where a knowledge of contraceptives is available to a large proportion of the working class mothers, another typical scene is often witnessed. The mother arranges with her employer to leave her work for a time in order to fetch her child from school through the dangerous crossings and see it safely past the groups of older and rougher boys. Her attitude is almost invariably one of tenderness. The difference lies in the number of children. This French mother is not so badly overburdened and her child is the more precious to her because she has only the one, or two.

The child's right to a different lot from that depicted here is no longer questioned by thinking people. Many men and women are now working to alleviate the burdens and sorrows of the army of unwanted infants. The material side of the child's life is bound to receive a certain amount of consideration now and in the future. Even the unwanted children are becoming fewer. And the medical profession, even the church, the imperialist, and the employer of "hands"—all those who are in need of cheap and ignorant humanity—will see to it that children have better shelter and get more of the food and clothing necessary to their existence. Thus they will do in the interest of their own institutions.

Material Rights of the child, however, are far more easy to enumerate and to obtain—when children are scarce—than are others of its rights, which, for want of a better name, we may call spiritual. The awakening of the parents to these rights of the child, some of which have been indicated in the present article, must follow quickly upon the heels of its material rights.

The eugenist very correctly contends that the parents should be in good health, mentally and physically, when the child is conceived. They do well to insist that it is the first material right of the child to be "well born." But have they taken into consideration all of the factors?

From what deep springs of moral and spiritual weakness arises this huge stream of the cringing, the supplicant, the submissive? Whence come the natures of these millions of human beings who are but timorous pawns moved hither and thither upon the chess board of existence by a few powerful hands?

Who can say that it is not because we come into life with the feeling, conscious or subconscious, that we are not wanted—that we are accidents? Who can say that it is not because we have graven upon our natures, the fear, the disgust, the loathing, the shrinking of our mothers? Men and women, who have lived through the past four years, in any country on the globe, know what it is to be pawns. Not all the power of the church, not all the teachings of Christianity, not all our education, our theories of right and wrong, availed the weak wills of the millions of "accidents," when a few tyrants plunged the civilized world into warfare.

When we people the earth with men and women who are not "accidents," these human holocausts cannot occur. When we have men and women whose wills, whose moral and spiritual natures have not been marred by fear and hate from the moment of conception, war will be impossible.

When we insist that conception be surrounded by its normal atmosphere of triumph and love and happiness, and thus infuse into the new life the spark of love, with its impulse to live, to love in its turn, to be strong, we shall have a new sort of humanity. There will be no more "dumb, driven cattle" in the guise of men. When we can visualize out of the surging love and happiness of the creative act the strong, healthy, happy, mentally and spiritually vigorous child, we shall produce individuals with intellectual and spiritual gifts beyond those of any race that has yet appeared upon earth.

Our imaginations are as yet too weak, too unformed, to portray to us the strength, the beauty and the wonder of a humanity yet to be brought into being—through children created in the flame of love.

Volunteer!

Volunteers are needed to sell the Birth Control Review in both New York and other cities. A few women interested in the movement are selling the magazine on the streets daily in New York City. Anyone willing to help in this work should communicate with Elizabeth Colt, in charge of the Birth Control Review, 104 Fifth Avenue, New York City.
“TALK”  
By Max Ehrmann

(Mr. Goodsey and Mr. Pesh sitting in the library of——Club, New York City)

Mr. Pesh—“All sins are biological” That’s a great sentence. It should be carved in stone, and stand in the heart of every city.

Mr. Goodsey—It is wonderful. What does it mean?

Mr. Pesh—It means that sin always tends to wreck man’s body. Man’s body is a biological machine. And the greatest sin is to bring into the world a sickly child, or a child that one cannot provide for. That’s the unpardonable sin.

Mr. Goodsey—How are you going to prevent people from doing it?

Mr. Pesh—It’s against the law to tell. A great civilization can not come from poorly born children any more than a statue can be modeled of cinders.

Mr. Goodsey—People who talk about as uninteresting a thing as “a great civilization” usually have some hidden motive. What’s yours?

Mr. Pesh—To help posterity.

Mr. Goodsey—You must be ill.

Mr. Pesh—Now listen to me. We are always trying to make our government more perfect. But no democracy can arise above its people. As well expect the Hudson River to rise above its water. Therefore, bringing a child into the world isn’t an individual matter at all. It’s the most social of all matters.

Mr. Goodsey—Why, then, all of this Rooseveltian condemnation of “willful sterility” of a few years ago?

Mr. Pesh—Rulers and political leaders are usually thinking of a big army. Capitalists, especially real estate owners, are thinking of the price of real estate. Not every woman should have a child any more than every man should have whiskers. Whiskers are merely amusing. For women to have five children usually means that they and their husbands have committed murder. It is better to have one child and that one under nourished than to have two and both under nourished.

Mr. Goodsey—I suppose many children are not born of desire.

Mr. Pesh—They are born with less care than mushrooms, and like mushrooms, are popularly regarded as fungi.

Mr. Goodsey—A child is a gift of God. I fear you have no religion.

Mr. Pesh—I have a good deal of religion. I even believe in baptism if it is done daily. As for a child being the gift of God—a healthy child that its parents can provide for is, indeed, a gift of God. Any other kind is a curse. It is an evil that goes down the ages, ever withering the stock of humanity.

Mr. Goodsey—Do you really think the race is growing weaker mentally and physically?

Mr. Pesh—We shall have to be very careful. Else the pugs will overtake us. Under artificial selection, pugs are bred up under no kind of selection whatever, we are carelessly and ignorantly bred down.

Mr. Goodsey—Have a cigar. But to interfere would limit inherent freedom.

Mr. Pesh—Give me a match. Thanks. There isn’t any such thing as inherent freedom. The question is, what is the result of an action? A man might as well say, “I am going to have the smallpox if I want it.”

Mr. Goodsey—What do you have to say about Robert Louis Stevenson? He never was well a day in his life and yet he accomplished a great deal.

Mr. Pesh—That argument from Stevenson is nearly dead from over work. I believe in the eight hour law for arguments. Stevenson was one in a million sick persons.

Mr. Goodsey—He had children, too—hadn’t he?

Mr. Pesh—Yes, and they were beautiful and healthy, but they were children of his fancy, not his flesh. The whole question is one that concerns the well being of posterity.

Mr. Goodsey—Oh hang posterity!

Mr. Pesh—I am not in favor of it. Our present method is severe enough. Suppose our ancestors who lived for an ideal had had your attitude, you and I would be sitting here on a stump, with rings in our noses, and a spear and a skin, trying to digest our neighbors.

Mr. Goodsey—You seem to regard this as a very great problem.

Mr. Pesh—It is. Therefore nobody is interested in it—nobody but the police.

Mr. Goodsey—The police are necessary to keep things stable.

Mr. Pesh—They do that—odor and all. Yet police are useful. They are healthy and have healthy children. They look well in parades, and they add picturesque ness to street crossings. Their aesthetic value is incalculable.

Mr. Goodsey—You are flippant. Their blue uniforms represent the majesty of the laws.

Mr. Pesh—The majesty of the blue uniforms, I presume you mean. Hand me a match. Thanks.

TO MY BABY OR YOURS

By Ralph Cheyne

My little baby, you are so old—Long centuries old, if truth were told! You are her ancestors and mine, Savage and ape in unbroken line You are the Past, the Future, too All life to come depends on you Then, what a holy charge is ours To give you happy, healthy hours!
**Hard Facts**

A nurse who works in the lower East Side has sent us reports of actual, typical cases with which she has had to deal in the course of her day's work. If, as Prof Zueblin says, democracy wants quality in the mass, what chance have children born of exhausted mothers by unfit fathers into the conditions of life described here? What chance has the state to profit by the puny, sickly creatures born under these circumstances? In the campaign that has been waged against wastefulness, why was the greatest initial waste of all overlooked?

What can life mean to these mothers, except unbearable misery? What can it mean to these children except misery even more cruel than that suffered by their parents?

The report follows

**Bella K.—27 years old, married when 15 years old, pregnant 11 times, 7 living children born, 3 died when a few days old, 1 child lived to be 1 month old, miscarriage 4 times, children living now, 3, 7 and 10 years, patient suffers constantly, due to chronic nephritis.**

Has never had a normal pregnancy. Toxemia setting in with pregnancy. Has suffered with headaches, eye trouble and eclampsia seizures. The last time patient was pregnant and miscarried, she suffered terribly with her eyes. Examined by an eye specialist who told her if she became pregnant again she might become permanently blind.

Patient told me during the 11 times she was pregnant, she had been attended by 12 or 14 doctors, as each time her doctor had to call in someone for consultation, due to complications, and it usually ended up by her being sent to a hospital.

The only advice ever given to this woman was "be careful and don't get pregnant again or else you will die." Never was given any instruction even of how to safeguard herself.

Patient has two daughters and one son. Her great sorrow and anxiety is that her daughters, if they marry, may have to suffer the years of torture and misery that she has gone through. Hopes and trusts before they grow up that there will be a law to enable nurses to teach women how to escape much suffering from too many pregnancies—when they are not equal physically to going through with the pregnant period. Says she has never had much happiness, been ill most of her life and in want. Husband averages $18 per week.

**Mary C.—40 years old, 14 pregnancies, 8 living children, 2 still births, 2 lived to be 6 and 7 weeks, 2 miscarriages.**

This mother told me she could not have any more children, as she was done out and so weak she could not work any more.

Husband average wage $18 per week. Before last child was born she worked to within 48 hours before child came. Wanted to know was it any wonder (she had to work so hard) that the baby was born dead. One girl old enough to work earns $10 to $12 per week. Mother says it takes most of that to keep her looking right to go to work and for car fare. In asking her what she would like us to do for her to enable her to have a little rest to gain strength, she replied "I want to be taught how to avoid having any more children."

"The man is a good, steady man but our family is larger than we can care for. We will not be able to give the children the schooling they ought to have. We will have to take them out of school as soon as we possibly can. We must make them breadwinners as soon as we can, as I do not feel I can help out from time to time—working as I used to do as an office cleaner."

(Then they call us the weaker sex.—Nurse's note)

**Catherine M.—27 years old, had four children, two died in infancy and expected to be confined very shortly again. Home visit was made. The husband had been ill in the hospital for two months with typhoid fever. Very reticent and when spoken to about being sent for convalescent care, replied he would go home first. When he did not return to hospital, the home visit was made.**

Man was a barber's helper, average rate of wages $12 to $15 per week. Nest, clean, thrifty family

The wife said she hoped that she would have a safe confinement, but she had trouble during the whole time she was pregnant and had been depressed mentally, offered to assist them, were two months behind in their rent, replied they had never taken charity. Told them this was really not charity—that I had had a donation given to me to commemorate the birth of a little grand-daughter from a woman who wished to make some other woman happy.

The family then gradually told me their story. The struggle they had. The funerals of the children had cost $80 and it took them two years each time to pay the debt.

If they only had a chance and no more babies would come, the knew they would be able to get along. It seemed that all there was in the world was trouble and sorrow and more babies. Could I please not tell them how they could have a chance for a few years. Oldest child in this family, 6½ years.

**Josephine L.—57 years, rent $13, 3 rooms, 9 living children ranging from 16 to 1 year.**

Grandmother also lives with family

Husband laborer—$2.50 to $3 per day (no work on rainy days). This family first referred to me by the children's clinic doctor, because Mary, 9 years years of age, was so terribly under nourished. Mother questioned as to condition of other children and requested to bring them all to the clinic for examination. Found that six were all in the same under fed condition. During the winter the children were sent for convalescent care (two at a time) and given proper warm clothing. They were given four to five weeks' convalescent
care and it was amazing to see the improvement. Upon their return Josephine said she could not bear to see the children get skinny again and would like to go to work two or three days in the week, that the grandmother could mind the children.

Work was secured for her (though I think as long as I live, I will feel I committed a crime in doing so) and the family funds were increased by $7.50 per week for two weeks.

Josephine complained of headaches and that her eyes hurt her. Sent to an eye specialist who reported her condition due to anaemia. Josephine was told she would have to give up going to work. Insisted upon going to work two days in the week. Said they “must have the extra money for food and you know I receive good food when I work.” One morning the phone message came to me from Mrs W to say Josephine had not come to work and that she was like all the rest, did not keep her word.

Home visit made, asked why she had disappointed Mrs W. Repiled, “I had a fight with my neighbor who is my friend.” Asked her what in the world that had with her going to work? “Well, you know she lends me her shawl and skirt. I have no clothes to go to work in.” We have to buy everything on the installment plan and are in debt and cannot get any thing more until we pay something.”

Again an appeal was made for clothing for Josephine. She said she was ashamed to live,—it was “beg, beg, and hungry children.” Her burden surely was a heavy one, and she was living in terror of having another baby.

“If ever I become pregnant again I am going to kill myself,” she said. “But you are a nurse and you must teach me how to take care. You must help me. It is not right to have children more and more when you cannot feed or clothe them.”

MARTHA M—27 years old, four children, 6, 4, 2, infant.

Husband earns $15. First child normal. Mother made good recovery.

Second child died in infancy. Mother suffered from puerperal mania and required sanitarium care for several weeks.

Third child normal infant, died when 7 months old. Mother very depressed but remained at home during convalescent period.

Fourth child normal, mother again suffering mental depression and again in sanitarium, but prognosis not as good as when the second and third children were born.

This woman’s husband has appealed to the doctors to tell him how to avoid having any more children. He says he cannot rest day or night, is distracted when he sees his wife’s condition. Children taken care of by strangers. He tells me the doctors give him evasive answers. He asks, “Has no one any heart? What is the use of all science and knowledge if we cannot save my wife from the terrible suffering she endures after the children are born? It is your duty to instruct both myself and my wife in birth control.”

EITHER R—29 years old, 7 children. When this family was first brought to my notice, Rose, 9 years of age, had been ill with pneumonia. Made a poor recovery, was placed under observation for tuberculosis. Home visit made found three crippled children in family all suffering osteomyelitis, one child, hip, two with leg infected. All children anaemic. Rose died in an institution, at 12 years of age, where she had been placed two years before for pulmonary tuberculosis—the three children with bone tuberculosis are under institutional care.

Man, tins maker, average rate at that time $10 per week.

One bed in the home, 3 chairs and one table, stool.

Children slept on straw mattress on the floor.

After the family came under our care the eighth child was born, a poor, puny, sickly little mortal, lived three weeks.

The mother looked at the baby with disgust. “No good,” she said, “me no want babies, me too poor—too much sick child.”

This patient was a foreigner—had a friend write a letter for her and brought it to the doctor to “please give her medicine to please have no more babies.”

FROM THE NEO MALTHUSIAN, in which it was published by permission of the doctor who received it.

“Sir: Could you kindly send me word or help so I do not have any more babies as I am now the mother of 18 children and I havent the strength for more I should have had 17 alive only the 3 oldest sons have been killed in this war and my baby five months old I would not be against it only it keep me very poor and I have had legs in the veins hoping you will do what you can for me.”

The doctor adds “All the children came one at a birth these 18 confinements in 26 years! Husband gives her 25/ per week (6 dollars) The poor woman still has 10 children not earning anything.”

“WEAVE IN! WEAVE IN!”

By Walt Whitman

“WEAVE IN, weave in, my hardy life!
Weave, weave a spirit strong and full for great campaigns to come,
Weave in red blood! weave strews in, like ropes! the senses, sight, weave in!
Weave lasting sure! weave day and night the weft, the warp’ incessant weave! tire not!
(We know not what the use o’ Life! nor know the aim, the end—nor really ought we know,
But know the work, the need goes on and shall go on—the death enveloped march of peace as well as war goes on.)
For great campaigns of peace the same, the wavy threads we weave,
We know not why or what, yet weave, forever weave!”
MR P——, the father of this family is in the hospital suffering from chronic illness. All the children are anemic and the mother is in a very poor state. The children are under fed and under sized. The skin and bone frame of the boy is an example of what malnutrition does to children in the families of the poor. The little girl in the back of the picture is several years older than the girl in the foreground, but is under developed because of the hardships and want she has endured. There was another child which succumbed at once to the Spanish influenza.
Mr and Mrs S——, are 31 and 29 years old respectively. During sixteen years of their marriage ten children have been born. Seven, the baby three weeks old, are living. One child is tubercular and three others anemic. The father is a longshoreman. For the past three weeks he has been battling beside his fellows for higher pay and better conditions. And as he fights he must be weakened by the knowledge that his family is in greater want than ever. The mother is a janitress and in return for caring for the house, the family receives free rent. Mrs S—— said that last winter she has shoveled one hundred and twenty tons of coal.
Race Recuperation

An abstract of a lecture by Charles Zueblzn

Through the kindness of one of our friends, we have secured Professor Zueblzn's permission to print this abstract of his recent lecture on Race Recuperation. Many of those who heard the lecture had their attention turned for the first time to the consideration of the subject to which The Birth Control Review is dedicated.

The Greeks developed the greatest culture ever known. They not only produced art, drama and philosophy unsurpassed in succeeding years, but they had a scientific knowledge of the world and the solar system which their successors did not know enough to value for fifteen hundred years.

Why did the modern world begin with the fourteenth century A.D. instead of the third century B.C.? The Greek democracy was a sham. It was a sham. It was founded upon slavery. The best people stood aloof from politics. The Greek states tried to maintain the balance of power which has been the destruction of Europe.

Arbitracy wastes the race. It wants quantity in the mob, quality in men, inequality in sex. The welfare of the masses has been sacrificed to the will of the few under militarism, ecclesiasticism, and industrialism. War takes toll of the most vigorous and adventurous. In its wake famine and fever destroy the feeblest. The Church sacrificed the fearless truth seekers and the conscientious objectors. Industrialism puts the premium on people who have the most children.

Democracy conserves the race. It wants quality in the mass, equality in sex. After millions of years of experiment nature has produced creatures of such value that we cannot afford to have them born only to die. "Be fruitful and multiply" was the admonition delivered to four couples in an empty world, three of whom had no children, and the youngest was one hundred years old. It is no advice for a world filling up.

The Birth Rate is not the national barometer. The infant death rate is the national barometer. A high birth rate is always accompanied by a high death rate. A low birth rate prevails in countries like France, Great Britain, Holland, Australia and the United States, a higher birth rate in Russia, Austria, Hungary, Spain, and the Balkans. The reduction of the death rate means that the fathers are producers, supporting those who will be producers, not wasting their energies on those who will never mature to be producers.

The scientific and moral protection of mothers is the greatest guarantee of racial superiority. Women's work must under no circumstances lead to physical debility. Health certificates should be required for marriage in order to protect the fathers as well as the mothers and the children. It is the mother who should choose the children. She must have the knowledge which will give to the race the greatest number of healthy and happy children. We shall go the way of the Greeks unless we entrust the choice of the coming children to mothers.

The Progress of Children's Rights

Take heed to your progress, its feet are shod with the souls it slew with its own pollution—John Boyle O'Reilly

A comparison of conditions in England in the early part of the Nineteenth Century with some of those which the Child Labor act in the United States sought to remedy, shows that within the past hundred years society has awakened somewhat to the rights of the child.

That the awakening is still sentimental rather than real is startlingly evidenced by the fact that there are, according to the estimate of the National Child Labor Committee, nearly 3,000,000 child laborers in the United States.

Even the Child Labor Law, noted in one of the quotations which follow, was declared unconstitutional by the supreme court. And that would have affected only 150,000, according to the Labor Year Book for 1917.

In place of the law declared unconstitutional, congress, with an irony incomprehensible to anyone but a lawmaker, imposed a tax of 10 per cent upon interstate commerce in products made by child labor. In other words, it is exactly as much of a crume in the United States to work the lives out of children as it is to manufacture sulphur matches or oleomargarine, and the same sort of penalty is attached.

Still, the comparison between the first of the following quotations and the second shows that there is at least a superficial sentiment in favor of looking out for the child, and under agitation, it may deepen. The evil will not end, until the mothers of these workers attain a knowledge of Birth Control and refuse to bring more child slaves into the world.

Gibbon's Industrial History of Great Britain shows the condition of child labor in certain factory districts in the early part of the Nineteenth Century.

"Sometimes regular traffickers would take the place of the manufacturer, and transfer a number of children to a factory district, and there keep them, generally in some dark cellar, till they could band them over to a mill owner in want of hands, who would come and examine their weight, strength, and bodily capacities, exactly as did the slave owners in the American markets. After that the children were simply at the mercy of their owners, nominally as apprentices, but in reality as mere slaves, who got no wages, and whom it was not worth while even to feed and clothe properly, because
they were so cheap and their places could be so easily supplied."

It was often arranged by the parish authorities, in order to get rid of imbeciles, that one idiot should be taken by the mill owner with every twenty same children. The fate of these unhappy idiots was even worse than that of the others. The secret of their final end has never been disclosed, but we can form some idea of their awful sufferings from the hardships of the other victims of capitalist greed and cruelty. The hours of their labor were only limited by exhaustion, after many modes of torture had been unavailing applied to force continued work. Children were often worked sixteen hours a day, by day and by night."


"The Federal Child Labor Law which took effect September 1, 1917 bars from interstate commerce (though not from sale within the State), the products of mines and quarries where children under 16 are employed, and the products of mills, factories, canneries and workshops where children under 14 are employed or children between 14 and 16 are employed for more than 8 hours a day or at night. As for the results of the law in round numbers about 150,000 children will be affected. In factories, mills and workshops there are over 27,000 children 10 to 14 years old who will be thrown out of work and may, if their state laws are strong enough to keep them from other occupations, now go to school with their more fortunate brothers. There are also some 17,000 children between 10 to 16 who will be taken out of our mines and quarries. Over 122,000 children between 10 and 16 work in factories in states where they may be employed 9, 10 or 11 hours a day, and over 29,000 work in states where they may be employed in factories at night. The most notable example of factory workers are, of course, the cotton mill children of the South, while the bay glass workers of West Virginia are probably our best known child night workers.

CONTINUING ON THE same theme the Year Book discusses the decline of the apprentices system which is traced to various causes and the results of the breaking up of that system are noted as follows:

"(1) The state no longer protects and supervises its youthful workers. Compulsory education stops in nearly all states at the age of fourteen. Save for the regulation of labor of 14-16 year old children by a few states, the states in general cease to exercise control or supervision over the working and home life of the youth.

"(2) Children leave school early and go to work at jobs that are positively injurious to them. Studies by Professors L L Thorndike, G D Strayer and Dr. L P Ayres clearly indicate (a) that over 50% of those who begin school before the age of 13 are eliminated between the ages of 13-16 inclusive, (b) that there are approximately 1,100,000 children between the ages of 13-15 inclusive who are not in school, (c) that only 40% of the children who enter school ever finish the grammar grades, while approximately only 8% ever finish the high school.

"The chief reason for this exodus is poverty. The federal investigation into the conditions of women and child wage-earners together with Miss Atherton's private study of Wilkes Barre, Pa., indicate that 45% of those who leave school between the ages of 14 and 16 come from families whose weekly income, exclusive of rent is less than $2 per capita. Allowing 20% for rent this would mean a yearly income of $650 for a family of five. When we remember that the studies of Straughoff, Kennedy and Chapin estimates that from $800 to $900 a year is necessary for an average city family, it seems safe to conclude that families below the $650 line can hardly get along without the child's wages. Thus poverty is the direct cause of nearly one-half of the withdrawals and must be a powerful contributing factor in an additional large percentage. Thus the poor are compelled to sacrifice the future possibilities of their children to satisfy the pressing demands of present need.

(Is this fair to the children? — Editor’s question)

"When the modern child does reach work, he finds poorer opportunities than did his predecessors. Few employers will accept a child of less than 16 for a skilled position, and the 14-16 year old child almost invariably works at a "blind alley job" that affords no opportunity for advancement, gives no training and from which he is ousted when he demands an adult's wages."

THE MASSACHUSETTS Commission on Vocational Training discovered that 90% of the children from 14-16 were employed at unskilled or low skilled jobs possessing no educational value, and addition kept their jobs for only a short time, two months, on an average. These evils are not compensated for by the wage which the children receive, which in 1905 was on about $3 40 a week.

Fags do not grow on thistles nor do such leaden thoughts as find room in the minds of those unfortunate children develop into golden opportunitites.

The report of W H Swift on Child Welfare in North Carolina shows that although the marriage of the feeble-minded is forbidden by the state laws no penalty is imposed on the clergyman or the official who performs the marriage ceremony, even if he knows the conditions. The law makers must have been in a hurry when that law was passed.

The state education law is also somewhat primitive. It requires school attendance for only four months a year for children between the ages of eight and fourteen with "exception," in cases of poverty. This state also allows children to go to work at twelve years of age, and it frequently happens that the child leaves school each year at the end of four months to return the following year to the same grade.

Evidently the child hasn’t much to expect from the law. Isn’t it about time to permit the mother a knowledge of Birth Control and let her solve this problem by refusing to bring into the world unwanted babies, whose infant lives must be wrecked by toil?"
Charity or Contraceptives?

By “F’ACCUSE”

The Report of the Baltimore Vice Commission published in the Survey of May, 1916, showed that two well-known institutions in Baltimore for the reception of newborn infants exhibited these conditions: (1) That “privacy,” in these institutions was granted according to the ability to pay. If you were poor and wished to seem respectable, ward privacy was all you could get. If you had more to spend on your eleventh hour respectability, you could get a private room and the superintendent promised that “no one in the world would know that you have been there.” If this situation were not so tragic it would be ridiculous.

If the child was to be left in the institution it was to be separated from its mother at once and placed in a “nursery.” The name, in view of later developments, seems a sarcasm. This would cost $125 or $200, if so much could be extracted, and it was to be paid in advance. The mother, in this case, was required to sign a document relinquishing the child entirely. The child “must never be asked for, heard from nor claimed under any circumstances.” If the mother should wish to claim it she must pay board for it at the rate of $20 a month.

A special study of the babies who were placed in one institution when less than a month old showed that in fifteen years, beginning in 1900, not a single one not removed from the institution after the sixth month lived. In the other institutions the mortality rate was reduced to 97.5. What became of the less than 3 per cent. of unfortunate survivors, the investigators either did not know, or hadn’t the heart to say.

Over thirty clergymen of various denominations, some of whom were social workers as well, were interviewed and only two of them seemed to think it at all reprehensible to aid in the separating of mother and child. Respectability is indeed a tyrant and greatly to be feared by the child who does not know me, who curses me perhaps. The others have mothers who write to them.

And I can hear her still softly sobbing, “He will die and I shall never see him.”

Such are the conditions which prevail in some cases in Baltimore and in France. Perhaps they are different in New York. We all know that when a New York City official tried to find out a few years ago, he started something that was very upsetting. We are not in a position to do anything more than recommend these matters to the attention of our readers.

“There Will Come A Day”

By Angela Morgan

I saw two children, once, their mother in prison. I think—God! Shall I put it in ink? My shuddering flesh faints when I think of those children, Think of their dirt, their red-eyed, horrible plight. Even now as I write, With the shield of the years between, I am sick at what I have seen. O men, O women, you shrink! You raise offended hands to your horrified eyes—Would you cure the sore by disguise? Would you hide the festering wound with tinsel and lace? Well, cover your face, Smite and smoother your soul as you may, There will come a day!

—from “Forward March”
THE EDITOR'S UNEASY CHAIR

IN REGARD TO THE DISCUSSION in these columns, as to whether or not procreation is the sole purpose of the sex instinct, opinion seems to be decidedly on the negative side.

For example Dr William J. Robinson in the February number of The Critic and Guide, after remarking that while he knows he would be in much better standing with a certain class of idealists if he could persuade himself to the opposite belief, proceeds to mention a few of the obstacles which make that belief contrary to reason and common sense.

First, it would limit men and women to twelve relations in a lifetime, at the most. To a student of actual facts this seems quite preposterous. The sex instinct begins, perhaps ten years before, in our civilization, marriage is permitted, The instinct works all the year around and does not cease when its aim is accomplished. It exists in men and women who are sterile. Dr Robinson concludes that the results of the instinct are secondary, medicinal, and often undesirable consequences of the union of the sexes. Its primary purpose is higher, nobler, more socializing and more contributing to the sum total of human happiness.

Havelock Ellis, in his pamphlet, "The Objects of Marriage," arrives at the same conclusion through somewhat different reasoning. He says that even if the primary end of the sex instinct is to rear children, the secondary function which has been developing through the ages has become the inspiring stimulus of all those psychic energies which are counted most precious in civilization. He compares the evolution of this secondary function to that of the functional products of the human race: The hand was developed from the animal fore limb to grasp material things, but it can now play the violin and paint. It has taken God—or nature,—millions of years to evolve man, and to raise the human species above that help less bondage to reproduction which marks the lower animals.

Some people have not yet realized this. He mentions the isolated position of the Anglican Bishop of Southwark, before the National Birth Rate Commission held in London three years ago. This bishop maintained that procreation was the sole legitimate end of marriage, and that the relation of men and women except for that end, is degrading. The Commission was formed of representative men and women of various beliefs, Protestants, Catholics and so on. Not one identified himself with the opinion of this "materially" minded Bishop, while several decisively opposed it as contrary to the best beliefs of ancient and modern times and as representing a low rather than a high moral standard.

SOME ONE HAS sent us this clipping from an evening paper, and asked us what we had to say about it.

Former Jersey School Teacher Sued by Husband

Chicago, — David A. Maladen, today asked annulment of his marriage to Ethel A. Maladen, former Jersey City school teacher, alleging she refused to be a mother. They were married Jan. 21.

Frankly, on the information contained in this paragraph, we don't know what to say about it. Perhaps the lady's reasons were excellent. Perhaps she thought she would not make a good mother, perhaps she thought Mrs. Maladen would not make a good father. Perhaps she thought nine days too short time in which to accomplish so important a matter, or perhaps it wasn't the real reason at all, but only what the man decided to say. One thing we do think without any "perhaps," and that is, if she knew enough to teach school and he, enough to be married at all, they should have talked the matter under contention, over before they got the license.

CAN ANYONE ANSWER satisfactorily Mr. Henry Adams' question as to "Why Woman Is Unknown in America"? (P. 384 of "The Education") "Once," he says, "woman had been supreme, in France she is still deemed potent, not merely as a sentiment, but as a force." Evidently he thinks "America was ashamed of her, and she was ashamed of herself, otherwise they would not have strewn fig leaves so profusely all over her. When she was a true force, she was ashamed of her beauty, otherwise they would not have erected temples to the poor who needed it. New Zealand declared, not made a feature that would have been recognized by Adam."

Mr. Adams thinks that all previous ages and even the Puritans knew that neither Diana of the Ephesians nor any of the Oriental goddesses was worshipped for her beauty. She was good because of her force. Who or what is responsible for our present bemitted condition?

EDITORIAL COMMENT

(Continued from page 2)

always done well, being scientifically managed, has devoted herself for the last thirty-five years to improving, along the same lines, her Hollanders. She furnished information on parenthood, established clinics giving contraceptive information to the poor who needed it. New Zealand did the same. A great movement is on foot in Great Britain to copy the methods of New Zealand. Other countries are in the van of progress.

How much longer are we going to allow dead laws, passed by dead men, who perhaps would know better now, to make expiatory sacrifices of future generations upon the altar of their ignorance?
APPLIED EUGENICS By Paul Popenoe and Roswell Hill Johnson Macmillan Co 450 pp Price $2.10

The subject of eugenics has been given too little attention by the mass of people who imagine eugenists wish to breed human beings for perfect physical characteristics alone. To such we recommend "Applied Eugenics," by Paul Popenoe and Roswell Hill Johnson, for an inter esting and readable account of the real aims and value of the science of eugenics.

About a third of the book is devoted to the proof that heredity rather than environment, is mainly responsible for character. The origin and growth of the eugenics movement is told, and the methods advocated by eugenists for improving the quality of the human race.

The chapter on the eugenic aspects of certain reforms outlines the relation of these reforms to eugenics, but unfortunately the trend of the argument in each case seems to be that, eugenically, reform is not advisable. A tax on land values, it is stated, is not likely to be eugenic, and will have no effect in altering the race than anything else. The author suggests or attempted to date would be to the present slant.

Readers of this Review will find the book interesting for its assert to the cause of Birth Control, though the authors themselves seem in clined to place more reliance on restrictive eugenics—sterilization of the feeble minded, and life long segregation of the unfit—than on Birth Control.

"There is no justification," the book states, "for hoping to influence the race for good through the actions of any kind of external influences, and there is not much danger of influencing it for all through these external influences. The situation must be faced squarely... if the race is to be improved, it must be by the use of the maternal already in existence, by endeavor to change the birth and death rates so as to alter the relative proportions of the goods and bad germ plasm in the race."

And again "It is at once evident that a decline rather than an in crease in the birth rate of some sections of the population, is wanted. There are some strata at the bottom that are a source of weakness rather than of strength to the race, and a source of unhappiness to themselves and those around them. These should be reduced in number."

Having written that the race can only be improved by a change in the birth and death rates, and that a decline is desirable in the birth rate of some sections of the population, it is difficult to understand why the authors are not stronger in their support of Birth Control, since it is by this means alone that the birth rate can be appreciably reduced in large sections of the population. It would obviously be impossible to segregate whole sections of the population as unfit.

WOMEN Anonymous Alfred A Knopf 150 pp $1.25

A mid Victorian conception of 20th Century conditions. The ane mous author, be he man or women or a little of neither cannot accept the changes that have come about in the status of women. He admits their growing social activities, and ascribes them all to feminine vanity. Woman, not content with her laurels as the mere sex creature which she is, has sought new trophies in man's own world. So far owing to man a great good nature she has been able to have things both ways. These Elysian days will soon be over. The men will come back from the war turbulent and full of their rights. They will no longer be chivalrous toward women dabbling in industry.

Confronted with real competition, the woman will fail. Without man a moral support she always collapses. She lacks physical stability. There won't be men enough under the monogamic system to go around so she won't be able to ply her usual trade of matrimony.

Thus ambushed in every direction, even the author admits that her position is not reassuring. She will be crabb'd, but only for a hundred years or more. Then she will readjust herself and the good old times will come once more. Taught by failure she will again be content to look at things through men's eyes and to exist solely for his comfort and entertainment. This is sure to be her end, for, and this is the final triumph of the author's analysis, she is only receptive, she can never create and therefore she can only attain through man to any thing but mysteries. Either the author has no sense of humor or any thing else, or he is making fun of us all. The question is—is it worth while wading through so many exploded fallacies to be, in the end, confronted by such a riddle?

Two Reviews by Harold Hersey

KNOWLEDGE A YOUNG WIFE SHOULD HAVE and KNOWL- EDGE A YOUNG HUSBAND SHOULD HAVE By Dr A Philip and H R Murray Sex Knowledge Series David McKay, Philadelphia Price, 75c

It is about time these old gentlemen of ve honored profession should stop writing tomes, dull, valueless treatises on sex, marriage and love. In these two books we meet the typical "old maid authors, with their panaceas for all ills. In one book they go into detail advising the pros pective bridegroom to confer with the sweetheart's parents—for mercy's sake, if children were raised properly, we would not have to fear any such discussion with our lady loves.

In the other book the writer speaks of the curse of the corset"—"Economy in rent—etc, In both volumes the authors doddle birth control, putting up a lot of fake ideas to cover their fears of coming straight out in defence of this urgent necessity in modern society.

We are all weary of casuallity by doctors—authors. About ninety per cent of the professors believe and practice what they dare not preach. Such tommyrot, We certainly cannot recommend these two books by a pair of doddering puritans to two silly volumes by two silly moralists.
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Mental Examination of the Immigrant By E H Mullan. Bul. 396 United States Public Health Service 16 pp
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"Not Fit to Print"

THE ABOVE IS THE MOTTO of the New York Times, and below is a letter sent to the Times in response to its yearly two page presentation of the stories of "The Hundred Neediest Cases,"—those of the suffering poor who need immediate financial help.

The letter explains itself. But the Times editors evidently considered anything on birth control unfit to print, judging by the fact that a short time previously the Times refused to take an advertisement of the Arbiterator magazine, which contained a debate on birth control presenting arguments both pro and con.

To the Editor of the Times, New York City

Sir— I hope the Hundred Neediest Cases will be aided. They certainly need it. I hope moreover that a good deal more will be subscribed this year than last year, when the average relief provided was $135 per family. That will not go far when the cost of living has increased 67 per cent. I will gladly contribute $25 toward the fund, if you will publish this letter of comment on the hundred cases.

In 41 of those cases, the suffering would have been greatly lessened and in some, avoided altogether if the parents had been intelligent enough to postpone the births of some of their children till they had more money and better health. In other words they were in dire need of the beneficent, scientific contraceptive knowledge which our present shortened laws declare criminal.

In 18 of these cases, one and sometimes both of the parents, had tuberculosis for a long time preceding the birth of the younger children. It is well known that tubercular people, by an odd cruelty of nature, are more prolific than normal people. It is also well known that a tubercular woman with a baby coming menaces her own life and that of her baby. In case after case it is recorded that one, sometimes all of the children are predisposed to tuberculosis.

There are many cases where children have been born after insanity became evident in the father, many others where poor little babies had drunkards for fathers.

In all of these the woman known how to protect herself from further motherhood, she might have stood a chance for health, a fair earning capacity, and opportunity for her existing children.

On behalf of thousands of parents who have definitely demanded that laws forbidding this knowledge be repealed, and whose names and addresses can be produced, and on behalf of the numberless thousands of inarticulate sufferers from lack of this information, I most earnestly ask the New York Times and its readers to supplement the appeal for the neediest hundred cases, by a vigorous demand that the New York law be changed forthwith, at this very next session of the Legislature which convenes the first week in January.

MARY WARE DENNETT,
The Malthusian Doctrine Today
By Charles Drysdale, Sc. B
(Continued from March Issue)

WHEE DOES THIS MEAN? It can only be explained in three ways: Either the birth rate must have been remarkably low during the bulk of the time, or there must have been a tremendous emigration, or there must have been a very high death rate. The first two explanations are obviously untenable. Although we have no records, a very small factor seriously affects the population. The slow increase was due to an exceedingly high death rate which could only be caused by serious dearths of food. It cannot be explained by saying that it was due to want of medical knowledge or of sanitation. Evidently the slow increase was due to the slow growth of the English population, except for very serious and prolonged wars, can only be explained on the ground of almost chronic insufficiency of food, and the same applies to every one of the older civilizations.

The foregoing is an example of the reductio ad absurdum method of proof so familiar to students of Euclid. Having stated our law that population is continually pressing against the means of subsistence, we have proceeded to find out how fast population would have increased if no such lack of subsistence existed. That rate of increase was manifestly so absurd, in comparison with the actual or even conceivable rate of continual increase, as to show that the hypothesis of adequate subsistence was absurd. — O. E. D.

THE LAW OF CORRESPONDENCE of Birth and Death rates, the next deduction from the principle of Malthus, is the most momentous of all from the humanitarian standpoint. If population constantly presses against the means of subsistence, the increase of population is kept back to the increase of subsistence, just as the speed of a train must be kept back to that of a train in front of it on the same track.

Now, in each country over a considerable period there is a fairly constant rate at which its food supply can be increased, either by improvements of its methods of agriculture, by the bringing of new land into cultivation, by improvements of means of transport, or by the development of its manufactures, which can be exchanged for the food of other countries.

In long settled countries, confined chiefly to the advance of agriculture, like France, India and China, this increase must be comparatively slow. In those having large tracts of new land, like Canada and Australasia, it may be very high, as it formerly was in the United States. The same is true of countries which, although long settled, have only recently escaped from severe feudal restrictions, as in Russia and the Balkan States. In the last category are countries which have already developed their agriculture fairly fully, but have natural or sources and aptitude for manufacturing, as, for example, Great Britain, Germany and the United States at the present day.

Of course, this proof does not necessarily apply to civilized countries at the present time of considerably restricted families, but it most certainly does to Eastern nations and to the world as a whole.
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and in these the increase will, as a rule, be at an intermediate rate. That is to say, that each country has a more or less definite speed of its food train (to use the analogy previously adopted) fixed by the energy and capability of its inhabitants and by its natural resources.

What conclusion do we draw from this? Simply that as the population train cannot pass the food train, it can only advance at the same rate, and therefore any attempt to advance more rapidly will only cause collisions and loss of life. Or, in terms of population, all excess of the birth rate over a certain minimum required to keep pace with the food supply will only cause an increase of the death rate, without accelerating the increase of population.

In other words, a high birth rate implies a high death rate, a low birth rate a low death rate, and a rise or fall of the former should produce an approximately equal rise or fall of the latter. This may be called the law of correspondence of birth and death rates.

(Continued in May Issue)
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**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 Ennue Dunlop, 48 Broadway, Westminster, London, SW1 Periodical, The Malthusian

**Holland** (1885)—De Nieuw Malthusiasanse Bond Secretary, Dr J. Buetger, 29 Verhulststraat, Den Haag. Periodical, Het Gelijkzwaar Huiseiag

**Germany** (1889)—Sozial Harmonische Verein Secretary, Herr M. Hausmeister Stuttgurt. Periodical, Die Soziale Harmonie

**France** (1885)—G. Hardy, 29 Rue Pirexcourt, Paris. Periodical, Generation Consciente

**Spain** (1904)—Liga Espanola de Regeneracion Humana Secretary, Senor Luis Bulli, Calle Provenza, 177, Prat Is, Barcelona. Periodical, Sala y Pasos

**Belgium** (1905)—Ligue Neo-Malthusienne Secretary, Dr Ferdinand Masseau, Echern, Courcelles

**Switzerland** (1906)—Groupe Malthusien Secretary, Valentin Grandjean, 106 Rue des Eaux Vives, Geneva. Periodical, La Vie Intime

**Bohemia Austria** (1901)—Secretary, Michael Kachic, 1164 Zizhov, Prague. Periodical, Zadruh

**Portugal**—E Silva, Junior, L da Memoria, 46 t/e, Lisbon. Periodical, Paz e Liberdade

**Brazil** (1905)—Seccion Brasilena de Propaganda Secretaries, Manuel Moncada, Rua de Bento Pires 29 San Pablo, Antonio Bongueiro, Rua Vazande de Morangues 25, Rua de Janeiro

**Cuba** (1907)—Seccion de Propaganda Secretary, Jose Guardiola, Emprended 14, Havana

**Sweden** (1911)—Sallskapet for Humanitar Barnafastning President, Mr Hinke Bergegren, Vanadisvagen 15, Stockholm, Va

**Italy** (1913)—Lega Neomalthussiana Italiana Secretary, Dr Luigi Bert, Via Lamarone 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 Rhoads, 1316 Forest Court

**Ann Arbor, 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 Avenue

**Chicago Ill.**—The Citizen's Committee on Family Limitation Secretary, Mrs B E Page, 521 Longwood Ave., Glencoe, Ill

**Cleveland, Ohio.**—Birth Control League of Ohio Mrs A W Newman, 10601 Ashbury Avenue, secretary

**Detroit Mich.**—Mrs Jesse A Rees, 919 Brooklyn Avenue

**Elizabeth City N C**—Mr and Mrs W O Saunders

**Harrisburg, Pa.**—George A Hurren, 2436 Reel Street

**Los Angeles Cal.**—Dr T Horwaldenson

**Minneapolis, Minn.**—The Minnesota Birth Control League Mrs Helen C Thomsen, 1208 Vincent Avenue, N, secretary

**New Orleans La.**—H G Shockley, 428 Delarode Street

**New York**

The Committee of One Thousand Dr Ira S Wolfe, 230 W 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 51st Street

**Pittsburgh, Pa.**—The Birth Control League of Western Pennsylvania Mrs Clarence Renshaw, 117 Linden Avenue, East Wood, secretary

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

**Reading, Pa.**—The Main Line Branch of the National Birth Control League—Mrs Walter M Newkirk, secretary

**Rochester, N Y.**—A I. Howey, 227 Farnsworth Avenue

**St Louis Mo.**—Mrs Grace Anderson, Clay 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, 229 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 Westley, 1926 New Hampshire Ave., president
The war is over. You, the women who were beginning to take an interest in Birth Control and its meaning in our social development, were thrown by the war into a multitude of new duties. You were unable, while the conflict lasted, to give thought, time or money to any movement, no matter how worthy, no matter how pregnant with good to women or to society as a whole.

But the war is over, you are back in your homes, with time to rest and reflect. You have given two years of energy and devotion to the cause of "the boys over there." Now will you not give the same measure of time, energy, money and devotion to "the women over here"?

Governments have acknowledged universally the tremendous part you have played in winning the war. There have been a multitude of official communications, proclamations, resolutions and memorials attesting that victory could not have come without you.

Yet, you who have aided in winning the war, have been but a very small percentage of the women of the world. Only those who were unmarried were able to help. Of these married women who were not over-burdened with too many children, no woman could help who was tied to the domestic machine.

You were able to give your services because you were free—free through a knowledge of Birth Control. Had you been mothers of eight, nine or ten children, you could not have gone from place to place, "doing your bit," no matter how much you desired to do so.

You owe your freedom directly or indirectly to the Birth Control movement and the knowledge which it spreads.

No amount of money could have freed you from the worries, trials and sickness, of children and of yourselves, which a knowledge of Birth Control has spared you. You were indeed fortunate, for you are free from these chains.

By nature, and according to the laws of the state and the nation, you should have borne at least one child for every two years of your married life. Count up and see how many children you would have had, had you not the idea and the knowledge of Birth Control been available to you.

Reflect upon the fact that there are millions of overburdened mothers in America to whom this knowledge is a sealed book—to whom freedom such as yours is, therefore denied.

In gratitude for this knowledge, will you not come to the aid of the women from whom it is withheld? Will you not, for every child that you would have had, had you not known how to limit your family, purchase one $10 share of stock in The Birth Control Review?

For every bond you purchase, I promise to free ten women from the bondage of ignorance.

You have purchased Liberty Bonds for the men "over there." Why not "Liberty Bonds" now for the women "over here?"