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The Birth Control Review
Editorial Comment

By Mary Knoblauch

Standing by the bedside of a woman dying in child birth, Martin Luther is supposed to have said — "If a woman grows weary and at last dies from child bearing, it matters not. Let her then die from child bearing. She is here to do it."

These brave words may have been a consolation to the sorrowing father and husband, called upon to contemplate the result of his casual act—but were they wise or aptly spoken from any other standpoint?

Would anyone, for example, engage a chauffeur who said of his machine, "It's no matter if it breaks down, burns out, loses its parts, goes into the junk heap, that is what it is for." No! Certainly not. Machines cost money. The people who pay for them know that to give satisfaction they must be well treated. They must be oiled, greased and watered. They must have gasoline. They must be kept clean and in repair. Other wise neither pleasure nor profit can be had from them. The merest Ford contrivances to concentrate upon itself more care and attention than often falls to the lot of the reproductive machine called woman.

They — machines require rest. They can't be run all the time to the limit of their capacity and give either good service or long service. They also require individual attention. No one expects a Buick to run like a Rolls Royce, nor a truck to keep pace with a racer. It is considered sheer supidity when a man does not know what his engine can do, and tries to make twenty horse power do the work of eighty. There are expert machinists to give instruction in the physical make up and capacity of different cars. The law, please note, does not frown upon the giving of this necessary knowledge. The citizen has a right to be as happy, as safe, as satisfied as expert advice can make him when it is merely an automobile that is concerned. It is only women's bodies that must be used to death for want of information and the whole race that must suffer from this lack of foresight.

The State has found it wise to license chauffeurs. No one is allowed to drive on the highways who has not proved to the satisfaction of competent judges that he knows at least how to start and stop his engine. The more modern method of learning to drive by experience was found incompatible with the safety of the public. It is a crime to overload ferryboats and elevators or to operate them when you don't know how. Machinery won't stand for much nonsense. It refuses to be strained beyond its limit. Hence it is treated with respect. Yet it is a far greater menace to the safety of the public to overstrain a woman with child bearing, even if it be true that she has, as Martin Luther suggested, no other function than the reproduction of the race. To do that properly, she must at least be accorded the same measure of consideration that is shown to other machines.

Holland and New Zealand have seen the wisdom of giving her at least that much attention. Their physicians give expert advice on the limitations of the family, as they give it on club feet or squint eyes. The result has been fewer but sounder children, a great lowering of mortality, and a net increase in the population. Parents there, like chauffeurs here, have been taught how to go about their business.

Moreover, and in this respect woman differs from other machines, the smallest part of her work is done with the delivery of her child to the world. It is just as important for the welfare of the race that the mother should have the strength, the time, and the knowledge to bring up her children properly after they are here, as it is for her to bear them and die doing it.

If it is too much to expect that women should be regarded as human beings with the right of self determination in the matter of child bearing, let public opinion at least realize that she can't perform her duty as the race producing machine, if she is forced to continue childbearing when she is mentally, physically, or economically unfitted for the task. Let the laws be so altered that the doctors in the climes may give advice, when it is needful to women of the poorer classes, if our doctors don't know what advice to give, let them go to the Dutch and find out.

Queen Victoria, in a letter to King Albert of Belgium, written in 1841, says — "I think, dearest Uncle, that you cannot really wish me to be the 'mamma d'une nombreuse famille,' for I think you will see the great inconvenience a large family would be to us all, and particularly to the country, independent of the hardship and inconvenience to myself. Men never think, at least seldom think, what a hard task it is for us women to go through this very often." These were the words of a queen and a domesticated, conservative queen at that. She is not supposed to have had radical ideas to upset her equilibrium. She did not have to wash and bake and brew for her chldren she could count with certainty on having all possible care and attention for herself, and yet she considered the task
of having children a hard one, and realized that men seldom thought about that side of it, or thought about it as Luther did, with a sense of secure detachment.

The day has come, however, when they must think about it. The legislators must see that the day for blind dog meaning is done. Fear and ignorance never were the obedient weapons slave drivers hoped they would be. Slave labor was neither intelligent nor economical. The slavery our laws impose on mothers will, in the future of voluntary motherhood, seem just as absurd. The day will come here, as it has come and is coming in other lands, when physicians will give contraceptive information for the benefit of the race, as they now prescribe glasses to preserve the eyesight. Woman, the breeding machine, will get at least as much care as the automobile.

Judge Advocate on Birth Control

Minor J. C. Rupenthal, a judge advocate of the United States Army, formerly judge of one of the most important judicial districts in Kansas, gives his views on birth control in a recent letter to the Blab Control Review: "I have some firm convictions on the subject of Blab control. I am unable to agree with the extent or extremes of sentiment often found in the columns of the Birth Control Review. But I do think that people should consider the subject in calmness and not reject the whole matter out of prejudice or superstition, etc. Everyone ought to start in with positive convictions that the insane, the imbecile, the idiotic, the syphilitic, and perhaps other forms of physical defects that are incurable and transmissible, should not be reproduced. Nor should any woman bear children to a point that is dangerous to the well being, largely regarded, of either mother or child, but how far to go must be a controverted matter permanently.

"I hope some time to be able to follow your suggestion of summarizing all cases decided by courts, touching these laws whose summary has been made by me. My experience as judge in hundreds of divorce cases sustains your mew that the matters touched by Blab Control lead much to marital unhappiness and to divorce."

N. B. C. L. Begins Fifth Year

In view of the world events that occupied the public mind so engrossingly during the whole of its life-time, the National Birth Control League feels that it may well be justified in its conviction that "the first four years are the hardest". Organized in the spring of 1915, it has carried on all its difficult initial organization and promotion work against the heavy odds presented by the war, and therefore at the beginning of its fifth year, with the war over and with a substantial membership and a sound foundation of public opinion to stand on, it looks forward to a future of comparative easy going.

At the annual meeting held April 14th at the home of Mrs. Minturn Pmcnhot, a new Executive Committee was elected as follows.
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The Origin and Working of the Comstock Laws

By James F Morton Jr

THE FULL HISTORY of the censorship in sex matters remains to be written. Much material has been collected for the purpose, but the task will be one of great magnitude. It is certain that among the ancients there is little trace of the thought or feeling that the vital things of life require a special reticence in language or a veiled form of expression. What they had to utter on these themes was plainly expressed, with no strange fancy that a special virtue known as modesty required the use of muenudo, metaphor or euphemism to call up to the mind an idea naturally expressible in plain words. In view of the special activity of the churchly minded in seeking a religious sanction for the extreme prudery which has become a conventional virtue, it is interesting to note that the Jewish and Christian Scriptures are second to none of the writings of antiquity in the use of plain and explicit language with reference to sex organs, functions and acts. The advocates of verbal inspiration are therefore placed in a peculiar position of being required by the most elementary rules of logic to abandon their premise unconditionally, or to admit a divine example for the use of expressions which are today held to be under the ban.

It is not in the splendid classical civilizations and their literatures, any more than in the sacred books of the Christian and other Oriental religions, that a warrant is to be found for reading "obscenity" into the straightforward discussion of natural things. In fact, so persuaded are our censors they themselves acknowledge that the use of a foreign, especially a classical tongue purges references to sex matters of their assumed uncleanness. That it is possible under even our present exaggerated censorship to print and circulate almost anything in the Lahn language, so that not only medical, but books of all sorts for general circulation pass freely, although containing casual reference and quotations of the most baldly pornographic character, provided that the otherwise offending words or sentences are printed in Latin only.

The psychology which admits of such a subtle fugitive need hardly be characterized, being so far beneath contempt as to admit of no adequate term of reproach. Like the shameless hypocrisy of the censorship in other respects, such as the suppression of sober sex discussion and the impurity of the publications revelling in erotic double entendre, the prosecution of sellers of cheap editions of Boccaccio and like writers and the free course permitted to the publishers of editions de luxe, the "unwritten law" license even to medical periodicals above those of the latter, the liberty granted to certain classes of purchasing books which must not be sold to the public at large, this insane superstition that a word or idea is indecent in English and proper in Latin cannot be reconciled with the supposition of common intelligence or common honesty on the part of those who have usurped the right to dictate the speech and writing of the citizens of this country. Even a Comstock or a Sawyer would hardly maintain with a grave face that the wealthy, the members of certain professions or those able to read Latin are so much more pureminded than any of their fellow-citizens that contamination of their sweet souls is impossible, and no other hypothesis is tenable save that of cowardly or corrupt favoritism in the enforcement of the law. As speedily becomes the case with all censorships, the honest and just administration of the Comstock laws has never been even attempted by their author or by his successor.

UNTIL LONG PAST the Elizabethan period, the Anglo Saxon world had not become afflicted with the scourge of prudery. The plainspokenness of Shakespeare and still more that of Beaumont and Fletcher are familiar to all. The robust munks of that brilliant age saw no cause for blushing when a spade was called a spade. Throughout the Seventeenth and Eighteenth centuries, although certain traces of affected reticence had begun to appear, creating a prurient mental nastiness which renders the dramas of Wycherly and Etheridge consciously perverse, the process had not gone much farther than in other lands. In the Nineteenth century, how ever, apparently without rhyme or reason (although the historic causes may be determined when occasion permits a closer analysis), both England and America began to verge with great rapidity from the rest of the world, until today the curious prudery notable in the typical Anglo-Saxon mind is the cause of amused and contemptuous surprise to the natives of other civilized lands, who have not yet developed so wholesome an aversion to the normal view of sex. It has been our misfortune that British insularity and American vanity have concurred to develop in the English speaking world a preposterous Phraseology of the "holier than thou" order, which has made it impossible for us "to see ourselves as others see us." The hint that our thin-skinned prudery could be anything but a token of superiority is taken as a kind of treason or at least a proof of unpardonable coarseness. Until a certain day in August, 1914, it was permissible to point to the French as an awful example of a people that had become decadent and rotten through failure to adopt Anglo-Saxon notions of modesty. That sort of statement has not been much in evidence for some time past, and is not likely to be renewed in the near future. History has a way of giving the lie to our little national racial conceits.

WHAT IS CALLED OBSCenity, was not a crime under the common law of England. Space forbids the detailed proof of this statement, but any who doubt will find all questions removed by consulting Theodore Schroeder’s admirable work, “Obscene Literature and Constitutional Law,” pages 33 to 41. It is not until 1868 that we find in England an unmistakable denial of the right to discuss sex matters with the freedom applied to other subjects. In the well known case of Regina v. Hicklin, the court held a pamphlet attack on the Roman Catholic Confessional to be obscene in reveal
ing some of the objectionable questions put by priests to their female penitents. This is what is called a “leading case,” since the words of this court, although the product of loose and absurd reasoning, have ever since been blindly followed in both England and America, in spite of the fact that the United States had at that time been a separate nation for over ninety years, and our judges were in no way bound to adopt the vaga ries of the British courts.

The test of obscenity gravely put forward was “whether the tendency of the matter charged as obscene is to deprave and corrupt those whose minds are open to such immoral influences, and into whose hands a publication of this sort may fall.” In other words, sane and well balanced human beings are not to be permitted to read anything that might have an injurious effect on the minds of the feeble minded and degenerate. The monstrosity of the proposition is self-evident, and it is hard to return any respect for English and American courts which have for fifty years parrot mouthing it as if it were inspired gospel.

The sight of jewelry in a window may deprave the sense of honesty of a poor weakling, and the sight of the American flag may incite an abnormally minded alien enemy or social revolutionist to the impulse to murder. Therefore the jeweler and the patriot should be imprisoned for the crime of a possible tendency to “deprave or corrupt” some hypothetical person of a weak or already depraved nature.

The absurdity and futility of the dictum become no less when applied in the single realm of sex, instead of being extended to all parallel cases. It should be borne in mind that this British judicial atrocity was perpetrated just five years before the so-called Cornstock laws were enacted, and that our statutory legislation has since been systematically interpreted in the light of this more than dubious case settled under the vague idea of a general duty to protect the fragile “public morals.”

In this country, the open display and sale of porno graphic literature has been under the ban from an early period, under the general idea of preserving the public eye from gross scandal, but obscenity hunting as a fine art and favorite pastime began among us with the rise from obscurity of the somewhat unsavory character known as Anthony Comstock.

The early life of the notorious American censor contains nothing of special note. It has been charged that during one period he was addicted to somewhat abnormal and reprehensible sex practices, but the evidence is not clear. In any case, when approaching the age of thirty, about the year 1872, he suddenly acquired publicity by his vehement and extreme denunciations of the alleged corruption of the youth of America by a flood of obscene literature. His impetuous propaganda won him a large following, and in 1873, he besieged Congress with the demand that laws be immediately passed to curb the monstrous and growing evil. In the course of his energetic lobbying, he exhibited to the horrified gaze of the congressmen a number of samples of pornographic matter, claiming that the schools and colleges were being deluged with them. No hint was given at this time of any ulterior purpose, and the later wildest extravagances of the censor in his systematic attacks on literature, art, science and serious reform propaganda were kept carefully secreted from the attention of the law makers. The whole plea was based on the sale of porno graphic literature to the young, and the use of the mails to spread this “moral filth” among the school children. Naturally, nobody wished to appear as a defender of pornography, and no legislator even dreamed that anything further was involved in the rush of the closing days of the congressional session, the exact text of the apparently laudable measure received no careful scrutiny. As a matter of fact, the bill was passed in the last hours of the session with practically no discussion, being hurriedly jammed through together with some two hundred and sixty other acts. As later changes have been made, the text of the original act may be of interest.

Sec 3893. No obscene lewd or lascivious book, pamphlet, picture, or other publication of an indecent character or any article or thing designed or intended for the prevention of conception or procuring of abortion, nor any article or thing intended or adopted for any indecent or immoral use or nature, nor any written or printed card, circular, book, pamphlet, advertisement or notice of any kind giving information directly or indirectly, where or how, or of whom or by what means either of the things before mentioned may be obtained or made: nor any letter upon the envelope of which, or postal card upon which indecent or scurrilous epithets may be written or printed shall be carried in the mail and any person who shall knowingly deposit or cause to be deposited for mailing or delivery, any of the hereinafter mentioned articles or things, or any notice or paper containing any advertisement relating to the aforesaid articles or things, and any person who shall purvey any such plan or scheme for disposing of any of the hereinafter mentioned articles or things shall take or cause to be taken from the mail any such letter or package, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall for every offense be fined not less than one hundred dollars nor more than five thousand dollars or imprisoned at hard labor for not less than one year, nor more than ten years, or both.

This was merely the entering wedge. It is bad enough, with its vague epithets, depriving any person accused of mailing “obscene literature” of anything like due process of law, since the whim of a peculiarly narrow minded judge or ignorant jury might condemn any man or woman to ten years’ imprisonment at hard labor and a fine of five thousand dollars for a harmless reference to sex, which no normal human being would dream of finding obscene. Nor is this mere fancy, as many actual cases of vindictive and unscrupulous persecution can bear witness. Moses Harman, for example, one of the most sincere and high minded social reformers in our history, suffered a long term of imprisonment for publishing in his paper, Lucifer, an indignant protest against the brutal assault by a bestial ruffian upon his sick wife. Nevertheless, even this blanket provision did not suffice to enable the censor to vent his spleen upon those whom he desired to injure, and, subsquent amendments, bringing the law into its present form, were successively procured by him. The addition of the word “filthy” to the adjectives in the original act was made to cover matter which dealt with sex in such a way that even the Comstock type of mind could not bring it under the definition of obscenity in the cases Reg v. Hicklin. Another amendment subjected private correspondence, hitherto always held sacred, to the insulent invasion of an unprincipled censorship. Numerous verbal changes were made, with the general mention of stopping up every loophole, and of giving to a pre judge court or jury so many possible catchwords on which...
to convict that it should be rendered unsafe for any person so much as to mention the subject of sex for fear of falling into one of the traps set for honest reformers rather than for specialists in pornography.

In fact, the wording of the law is so vague and comprehen-
sive that its literal enforcement would be utterly impossible.

As stated above, the censors have never ventured to carry it out to the letter, without fear or favor. Physicians, lawyers, Latin scholars and to some extent scholars of other foreign

tongues, and above all the wealthy, have been systematically

granted immunity from the strict construction applied in the case of American citizens in general, as equality before the law is no part of the program of the censorship. In reality, the rules applied in the case of those not protected by favoritism would bar the Bible and Shakespeare from the mails under heavy penalties, would wipe out many of our popular magazine articles and would cause the suspension of most medical periodicals. The provisions regarding prevention of conception (even directly understood by the legislators who passed it, as by the ignorant today, as merely synonymous with abortion) would make it a crime to preach chastity or delayed marriage, or to advocate the sterilization of the criminal or unfit. Nay, there is in the files of the National Birth Control League a letter sent to me by Anthony Comstock himself, in which he specifically violate his own law, by giving me definite information of a certain "article" or thing designed or intended for the prevention of conception," and which has been very frequently used for that purpose. Men have gone to jail for no more than the great censor himself wrote to me.

THE ACTUAL ENFORCEMENT of the law has been marked by a long trail of persecution, falling largely on the high
est type of men and women. While the claim of Comstock and of his successor, Mr. Sumner, that vast quantities of pornographic literature has been suppressed, need not be disputed, any possible good in this direction has been offset beyond all comparison by the mischief of creating a reign of terror with reference to all wholesome and candid discussion of sex, out of which light and guidance might come. The emasculation of our literature has been fraught with pernicious consequences in the lowering of our national virility of mind. Art has suffered, and the mischief done to public health and normal living by enforced ignorance is beyond all comparison. If the censorship really wished what it originally pretended, to protect the immature minds of the young from the unworthy suggestions of pornography as thrust upon them for commer-
cial purposes, the end could be achieved without an autocratic

dictation to mature men and women without the persecution of smarce educators and reformers. I have myself offered a reasonable compromise law (in Case and Comment, June, 1916), to the following effect: Repel the present law altogether, since the vagueness of its provisions furnishes no criterion of guilt or innocence. Confine the prohibitory clause to the display in public places, or the mailing, exhibiting, giving, loaning or selling to children below a certain age of any pornographic product, and let pornography be specifically defined as any art or other product exhibiting persons or animals performing an act of sexual conjugation or of sexual satisfaction in any other form, or suggesting such an act or inviting to or preparing for it or in a state of sexual excitement, or calling attention by pointing, gesture, pose, attitude, or otherwise of the spectator or of other persons or animals represented, to the sexual organs, whether exposed or indicated under clothing, more than to any other part of the body or to the body as a whole, also any writing or print, pamphlet, book, etc., describing the pleasures of sexual excitement or of its gratification by any means whatever, normal or abnormal, or describing any specific instances of any form of sexual gratification or inviting to the performance of such acts or recommending them. Proper exceptions can be framed to remove all danger of the inclusion of medical writings or physiological textbooks or magazine articles in the scope of the prohibition, and the advertising and sale of means of abortion, except for the preservation of life or health, may be included. The foregoing is not offered as verbally perfect, but as indicating the direction and the limits of legitimate restrictive legislation.

The federal government is, of course, concerned only with

the malleability of the articles mentioned, as the question of display, sale, gift or loan belong to state provisions. I have not referred above to state laws. Suffice it to say that they have followed the line of the federal statutes, containing the same vagueness and offering scope to the same abuses. The New York and several of the other states were framed by Comstock himself, and enacted shortly after the passage of the federal law in 1873, and these have been copied by other states. It may also be added that additional federal laws, later secured by Comstock's influence, forbid the use of express companies or of any other common carriers to transport such articles as are barred from the mails. This was done in the face of a decision of the United States Supreme Court (U. S. v. Jackson, 96 U. S. 727), which expressly declared that Congress could not lawfully commit so gross an invasion of personal liberty.

THE REPEAL OF THE clauses prohibiting the giving of

Birth Control information is the special immediate issue. This legislation is anomalous in every way. With the excep-
tion of a freak law in Connecticut, no statute book in this coun-
try (and probably none in the world) contains anything so preposterous as a prohibition of Birth Control. Yet the federal and state laws make it a crime to furnish the means of doing an absolutely lawful act, or to give information concerning the same. It is a piece of legislative insanity probably with-
out a parallel. In getting rid of it, we shall be rendering a vast service, not merely to the host of unwilling mothers, not merely to our country and to the human race, but to the decency and dignity of our lawbooks themselves. While con-
centrating on this great work, however, let none of us forget that the entire body of the Comstock law is an infamous trave-
esty on law and justice. Its unconditional repeal would be in immeasurable improvement on the present state of things, but if we are afflicted with the timid fear that a little salacious reading will ruin our youth, in spite of all the counter in-
fluences of the home and the school, I have shown above an

(Continued on page 18)
And Now?

By Virginia C. Young

As we sit down to count the cost of the World War, surely the grimmest fact of all the grimness, the out- standing horror of all horrors, is the wholesale destruction of large numbers of the young and the fit. For each nation has given its best—those boys who were to have been the fathers of that newer and better race which each generation always hopes is to arise for the building of the better and fairer next.

Nor has the signing of the armistice brought, nor does the signing of the final peace treaty seem to promise a sucession from the pain and loss. The Horses of the Apocalypse still ride on! And in our morning papers we read of eminent scientists dying of starvation in Petrograd, and scores of students and highly trained army officers executed in Moscow. While at last, in all concealed terror we plan to close the gates of our own nation to the "Red Peril," which is the peril of the badly born.

There are those who would speak of Birth Control to a world so sorely in need of men and women to "carry on." And we can understand the protest of these bewildered questioners. But the war has taught us many things. It has taught us to think for ourselves, as never before, and one of the things that we are beginning to see, gospelly, at first and then more and more clearly, is that what the world needs is "not more of us, but a better brand of us."

Mr. Galsworthy has recently made an eloquent, if unconscious plea for birth control in an article in the Atlantic Monthly. He argues that war is only possible in a world where there is a preponderance of human beings who love ugly things more than beautiful things. To whom a green hillside in early spring is only a convenient place for gun emplacements and barbed wire entanglements. And we might add, to whom a cathedral is only a bulky mass of material which interferes with the range of cannon, and not the product of human love and worship and sacrifice and the spirit of beauty which is the spirit of God.

But whence are to come these "lovers of beauty," the parents of the yet unborn, who shall wisely, intelligently, and prayerfully, enter upon this vital busness of producing offspring of the highest and finest type? Where but from the ranks of the boys and girls of today?

Yes, all of us must realize, men as well as women (for women have always striven, even if unarticulately, for the privilege of voluntary motherhood)—I say, all of us must realize that we cannot and dare not go on in the stupid, blundering old way. The tune is here when we must see and confess to the rank hypocrisy of carefully limiting our own refined and exclusive family stock while refusing to hold out the hand of intelligent sympathy to those others whose power to people the earth fills us with dismay. What some of us know, all of us must know, in order that the day may come when no child shall be born into a society unready or unfit to welcome, to feed, to train and to properly provide for it. There is a task for Reconstructionists!!!

In this stirring appeal for a better race Miss Young refers to the "badly born" against whom we are thinking of closing our portals. It is interesting, in this connection, to note the efforts made by the present Russian Government towards righting past errors in regard to children. In the Dream of the Russian Government, published in a recent number of the The Nation, we read "children born out of wedlock are on equality with those born in wedlock with regard to the rights and duties of parents towards children and likewise of children toward parents." And further, "In case the father of a child born out of wedlock does not make such a declaration, the mother of the child, or the guardian or the child itself has the right to prove fatherhood by legal means."

Would it not be well if the more generally recognized governments would take some such step in regard to the "badly born" within their own portals? Also may we not hope that the wholesale slaughter of the intellectuals in Petrograd mentioned by Miss Young, may turn out to be as greatly exaggerated as the oft repeated story of the murder of the Grandmother of the Revolution?—Editor's Note.

Women to Discuss Birth Control

The women's international league of New York State is arousing women to their opportunities and responsibilities at home. The League is announcing a series of Women's Freedom Conferences for Tuesday evenings in May, where informal discussion at supper will be followed by more formal, but general discussions, on problems which affect women. The subject of Birth Control will form a prominent part of these discussions, as it did in the recent Women's Freedom Congress, held under the auspices of the League.

Over population—unrestrained breeding—is one of the facets working for war, and this subject must form a part of any program which aims to make wars impossible.

The Woman's International League is grasping the real and fundamental issues working for permanent peace and the freedom of women. It is a branch of the Woman's Peace Party which is, in turn, a section of the International Committee of Women for Permanent Peace. Twelve delegates from the United States are now on their way to Bern to attend the first convention of the International Committee since 1915. Jane Addams is chairman of the Committee.
...
**Why Not Birth Control Clinics in America?**

*Margaret Sanger*

"Why not Birth Control Clinics in America?" is the question asked of the medical profession by Margaret Sanger through the columns of the March number of American Medicine, New York, issued April 1. Mrs. Sanger's article with the editorial comment upon it, are reprinted by the courtesy of the editors of the medical publication, who believe that in publishing it they were fulfilling an obligation to their readers.

The absurd cruelty of permitting thousands of women each year to go thru abortions to prevent the aggravation of diseases, for which they are under treatment, assuredly cannot be much longer ignored by the medical profession responsibility for the menses of damage done by the practice of permitting patients suffering from certain ailments to become pregnant, because of their ignorance of contraceptives, when the physician knows that if pregnancy goes to its full term it will hasten the disease and lead to the patient's death, must in all fairness be laid at his door.

What these diseases are and what dangers are involved in pregnancy are known to every practitioner of standing. Specialists have not been negligent in pointing out the situation. Eager to enhance or protect their reputations in the profession, they continually call out to each other. "Don't let the patient bear a child—don't let pregnancy continue!"

The warning has been sounded most often, perhaps, in the cases of tubercular women. "In view of the fact that the tubercular process becomes exacerbated either during pregnancy or after childbirth, most authorities recommend that abortion be induced as a matter of routine in all tubercular women." says Dr. J. Whitridge Williams, obstetrician in chief to the Johns Hopkins Hospital, in his treatise on "Obstetrics." Dr. Thomas Watts Eden, obstetrician and gynecologist to Charity Hospital, in his Practica Obstetrics "Certain of the conditions enumerated form absolute indications for the induction to abortions," he says. "These are nephritis, uncompensated valvular lesions of the heart, advanced tuberculosis, insanity, irredeemable malignant tumors, hydramnios, moles, uncontrollable uterine hemorrhage, and acute hydramnios."

We know that abortion, when performed by skilled hands, under right conditions, brings almost no danger to the life of the patient, and we also know that particular diseases can be more easily combated after such an abortion than during a pregnancy allowed to come to full term. But why not adopt the easier, safer, less repulsive course and prevent conceptron altogether? Why put these thousands of women who each year undergo such abortions to the pain they entail and in whatever danger attends them?

Why continue to send home women to whom pregnancy is a grave danger with the futile advice "Now don't get this way again!" They are sent back to husbands who have generated of passion and passion's claim to outlet. They are sent back without being given information as to how to prevent the dangerous pregnancy and are expected, presumably, to depend for their safety upon the husband's continence. Back comes the patient again in a few months to be aborted and told not to do it again.

Do any physician believe that the picture is overdrawn? I have known of many such cases. A recent one that came under my observation was that of a woman who suffered from a disease of the kidneys. Five times she was taken to a maternity hospital in an ambulance after failing in offices or in the street. One of the foremost gynecologists of America sent her out three times without giving her information as to the contraceptive means which would have prevented a repetition of this experience.

Why does this situation exist? One does not question the intent or the high purposes of these physicians, or that they are working for the improvement of the race. But here is a situation that is absurd—hideously absurd. What is the matter?

Several factors contribute to this state of affairs. First, the subject of contraception has been kept in the dark, even in medical colleges and hospitals. Abortion has been openly discussed as a necessity under certain conditions, but the subject of contraception, as any physician will admit, has only recently been brought to the front.

It has been permitted to lie latent. It has escaped specialized attention in the laboratories and the research departments. Thus there has been no professional stamp of approval by great bodies of experimenters.

The result is that the average physician has felt that contraceptive methods are not yet established as certainties and has, for that reason, refused to direct their use.

Specialists are so busy with their own particular subjects and general practitioners are so taken up with their daily routine that they cannot give to the problem of contraception the attention it must have. Consultation rooms in charge of reputable physicians who have specialized in contraception, assisted by registered nurses—a word, clinics designed for this specialty—would meet this crying need. Such clinics should deal with each woman individually, taking into account her parturial dis ease, her temperament, her mentality and her condition, both physical and economic. Its sole function should be to prevent pregnancy. In the accomplishment of this, a higher standard of hygiene is attained. The result would be not only the removal of a burden from the physician who sends her to the clinic, but an improvement in the woman's general condition that would reflect itself in a number of ways to the benefit of her family.
The Birth Control Review

ALL THIS FOR the diseased woman. But every argument that can be made for preventive medicine can be made for Birth Control clinics for the use of woman who has not yet lost her health. Sound and vigorous at the time of her marriage, she could remain so if given advice as to what means she could space her children and limit their number. When she is not given such information, she is plunged blindly into married life and a few years is likely to find her with a large family, herself diseased, damaged, an unfit breeder of the unfit, and still ignorant. What are the fruits of this woeful Ignorance in which women have been kept? First, a tremendous infant mortality — hundreds of thousands of them dying annually from diseases which flourish in poverty and neglect. Next, the rapid increase of the feebleminded, of criminal types, and of the pathetic victims of toil in the labor factories. Another result is the familiar overcrowding of tenements, the forcing of the children into the street, the ensuing prostitution, alcoholism and almost universal physical and moral unfitness.

These abhorrent conditions point to a blunder upon the part of those to whom we entrust the care of the health of the individual, the family and the race. The medical profession, neglecting the principle involved in preventive medicine, has permitted these conditions to come about. If they were unavoidable, we would have to bear with them, but they are not unavoidable, as shown by facts and figures from other countries where contraceptive information is available.

In Holland, for instance, where the information concerning contraceptives has been accessible to the people, thru clinics and pamphlets since 1881, the general death rate and the infant mortality rate have fallen until they are the lowest in Europe. Amsterdam and The Hague have the lowest infant mortality rates of any cities in the world.

IT IS GOOD to know that the first of the Birth Control clinics of Holland followed shortly after a thorough and enthusiastic discussion of the subject at a medical congress in Amsterdam in 1878. The first Birth Control clinic in the world was opened in 1881 by Dr. Aletta Jacobs in Amsterdam. So great were the results obtained that there has been a gradual increase in the number of clinics, until to-day there are fifty-two in operation in that country of some 6,000,000 people. Physicians have found that nurses trained for this work by specialists are highly competent to take care of it and it is the almost invariable rule that Birth Control clinics are conducted by such nurses. Dr. J. Rutgers of The Hague, secretary of the Neo-Malthusian League, is the specialist who trains and instructs the nurses. The general results of the work are best judged by tables, appended to this article, taken from The Annual Summary of Marriages, Births and Deaths in England, Wales etc., for 1912.

In conclusion, I am going to make a statement which may at first seem exaggerated, but which is nevertheless carefully considered. The effort toward racial progress that is being made to-day by the medical profession, by social workers, by the various charitable and philanthropic organizations and by state institutions for the physically and mentally unfit is practically wasted. All these forces are in a very emphatic sense marking time. They will continue to mark time until the medical profession recognizes the fact that the ever increasing tide of the unfit is overwhelming all these agencies doing for society. They will continue to mark time until they get at the source of these destructive conditions and apply a fundamental remedy. That remedy is Birth Control.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth Rate</th>
<th>Deaths Rate</th>
<th>Infantile Mortality</th>
<th>Deaths in first year</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1906</th>
<th>1912</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37 1</td>
<td>24 7</td>
<td>23 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 1</td>
<td>13 1</td>
<td>11 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hague</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38 7</td>
<td>27 5</td>
<td>23 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 3</td>
<td>13 2</td>
<td>10 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37 4</td>
<td>32 0</td>
<td>29 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 2</td>
<td>13 4</td>
<td>11 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 9</td>
<td>10 5</td>
<td>7 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth Rate</th>
<th>Deaths Rate</th>
<th>Infantile Mortality</th>
<th>Deaths in first year</th>
<th>1880</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>306 4</td>
<td>2% 5</td>
<td>16 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>346 5</td>
<td>303 9</td>
<td>255 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 4</td>
<td>13 6</td>
<td>7 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>331 4</td>
<td>312 0</td>
<td>299 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 4</td>
<td>16 5</td>
<td>13 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Amsterdam (Malthusian Birth Control League) started 1881. Dr. Aletta Jacobs gave ad
vice to poor women, 1885.*
Intelligent or Unintelligent Birth Control?

An Editorial from American Medicine

Whether we shall have intelligent or unintelligent Birth Control u the question raised by American Medicine on us March issue. Under the title "Birth Control and Birth Prevention," the editors commented at length upon Margaret Sanger's article in the same issue, which we have reprinted elsewhere. In their comment, they emphasized the question which Margaret Sanger has often put to physicians, legislators, judges and social reformers. It is very significant of progress when a conservative, authoritative medical journal of the rank of American Medicine calls attention to the fact that family limitation of one kind or another is very generally practiced, and the sole question now to be solved is whether this family limitation shall be scientific and safe or unscientific and unsafe, as well as inadequate. It is also interesting to note the retort of the editor to Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, who declares himself opposed to Birth Control.

Dr. HILDA NOYES, an authority on eugenics and the care of babies, is an advocate of Birth Control. Needless to say, she is thoroughly well informed about the methods of contraception. In view of this, the critic of Birth Control (even the friendly critic perhaps) would be freely disposed to judge that Dr. Noyes, informed as she is, and aware of the grave responsibility of motherhood, might be the mother of one child, possibly of two children at most. The fact is that she is the mother of six splendid children. This interesting instance of the philosophy of Birth Control and its effect on the family is here mentioned not in approval of the doctrines of Birth Control, but in approval of a misunderstanding of the movement which is almost universal. It has always been the policy of American Medicine (as it is the policy of every lust critic) to examine both sides of the shield before committing itself to a final judgment, and we have adhered to this policy in the faith that the majority of the profession are of our own mind, which is, we think, not unduly prejudiced one. In printing Mrs. Sanger's article in this issue, American Medicine feels that it is fulfilling its obligation to its readers, and in recording its own impressions here it is fulfilling its obligations to itself.

In two important respects the Birth Control movement is very much misunderstood. In the popular mind it has come to signify but one thing, birth prevention—an incomplete and erroneous impression. It is also charged with advocating the small family, distinctly an undiscerning judgment. The emphasis of the philosophy of Birth Control is clearly indicated in its name, it is toward control. Prevention is but one of the methods of control found expedient in some cases, but it is by no means the only solution recommended. There are two ways of avoiding a train wreck when there is a dangerous obstacle on the track, one is to stop the train, the other to clear the track, and of the two the latter is distinctly the method to be preferred. The advocates of Birth Control lean toward this method, and their efforts to clear the family track of economic, social and health obstacles are too often not sufficiently recognized. Hence the popular misapprehension that they encourage small families. The truth is that they encourage small families where large ones would seem detrimental to society, but they advocate with just as great insistence large families where small ones are an injustice to society. They frown upon the ignorant poor whose numerous children, brought into the world often under the most unfavorable circumstances, are a burden to them, a menace to the health of the not infrequently unwilling mother, and an obstacle to social progress. But they frown with equal disapproval on the well to do, cultured parents who can offer their children all the advantages of the best care and education and who nevertheless selfishly withhold these benefits from society. More children from the fit, less from the unfit—that is the chief issue in Birth Control. The emphasis is on "control" rather than on "prevention." Seen from this point of view, the movement certainly assumes a different aspect, its intention is not hostile to the family but rather favorable to it, so that, if there is anything to criticize in the issue, it is not the motive but the program alone which is open to attack.

In ONE RESPECT certain the advocates of Birth Control have a clear advantage over its opponents—the advantage that President Wilson and the friends of the League of Nations have over its opponents. Despite the voluble and heated protests, Senators Lodge, Borah, and others have been very slow to suggest a substitute for the League which will be acceptable to a war weary world. The opponents of Birth Control, tho they have been emphatic enough in their criticism (some of it may be admitted, quite just and w'n v'ning) have nevertheless failed to come forward with a program of their own. That a program is necessary, that some form of decision or legislation is advisable, it would be rash to deny. Take, at random, a case reported by a nurse in the poorer districts of New York City. "One of my mothers has been the victim of fifteen pregnancies. She now has five living children, one of them is permanently deaf from an old case of otitis. Another has had a foul discharge from the ear for nearly two years. Only an operation can cure this, the parents refuse to have it done. Two of the other children have rachitic deformities. Of the fifteen pregnancies, one resulted in a miscarriage, nine children died during infancy, death being due to ignorance and neglect. All who lived through the first year were more or less enfeebled by being kept at the breast long after the milk had lost its value as nourishment. Ths one thing ts, I believe, the greatest wrong
done to babies among the poorer classes. The women hope in this way to escape pregnancy — erroneous method of Buth Control. This explains the reason for the great num-
er of children who are afflicted with bow legs, knock knees, and the various deformities resulting from the lack of proper bone making materials.

This Odyssey of motherhood among the ignorant poor is as typical and disheartening a picture as one can imagine. Pathetic is the extreme of the dumb, Ignorant effort at prevention which was perhaps the direct cause of the death in infancy of nine of the children and the deformity of the sur-
viving ones. And this case is by no means exceptional. Any frank practitioner familiar with family history in the poorer quarters will readily admit that it is rather the rule, and will be able to cite instances that are even more distressing. Who can deny that such a situation is dangerous to the extreme to both society and the family? Society and the family are the concern of both sides of the dispute. In her article, Mrs. Sanger frankly owns that she does not “question the intent nor the high purposes of these physicians (who oppose Buth Control), or that they are working for the improvement of the race.” Knowing Mrs. Sanger’s sincerity, one may unhes-
tatingly return the compliment and credit her with the highest motives. In this respect, both sides are beyond unpeach-
ment in the genuineness of their interests in the good of the race. However, the strength of Mrs. Sanger’s case lies in the fact that she has a definite program, while the weakness of her opponents lies in the fact that they have none. They still approach the problem as tho they were a question whether or not we should have Buth Control. The fact is that, in nine families out of ten at least, we have Buth Control—ignorant, unenlightened, dangerous Buth Control. The case quoted and the innumerable instances that come immediately to the mind of every practitioner are evidence of this. The question then, is whether we are to have intelligent Buth Con-
trol, directed toward the improvement of the family and the uplift of society, or un-intelligent, dangerous Buth Control at present practiced, endangering, often breaking, the health of the mother, imposing a burden on the family and on society of which both should be relieved, and cluttering the highway of progress with cripples, imbeciles and mendicants who are the by product of a stupid attitude of laissez faire or let well enough alone.

TO BRAND BIRTH Control, as so many of its opponents do, as the philosophy of the licentious, is to ignore its value as a scientific contribution to the study of race improve-
ment. It must be frankly admitted that the knowledge of Buth Control, placed in the hands of the public, is a dan-
gerous weapon, but all the tools of civilization are edged tools. Many excellent men, of high standing in their profession are bitterly opposed to Buth Control, but it is regrettable that they have preferred, up to the present, to state them objec-
tions in emotional rather than in scientific terms. They have submitted no program. Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, an opponent of Buth Control, asserted recently that every educated well-
to-do family should be obliged by law to contribute a minimum

of four children. That is the nearest approach to a definite program he saw fit to venture upon, but there is little in it that the most ardent advocate of control would object to. Are the opponents of Buth Control content to have it said of them that their strength lies merely in the fact that they have the approval of precedent and age-old sentiment on their side?

There is an amazing appeal to Dr. Wiley’s suggestion which tempts comment. Opposed to control tho he is, he reveals himself inadvertently and innocently an advocate of that philosophy. A well-to-do and educated couple, left to the natural course of nature, would contribute a dozen or more children to the well being of society. To limit themselves, to four offspring implies the employment of the very Buth Control methods to which Dr. Wiley is so warmly opposed.

It has been observed in Holland, for instance, that a general knowledge of scientific methods of Buth Control has resulted in somewhat larger families for the well to do, and smaller families for those with smaller incomes. There has also been a very rapid decrease in the amount of due pov-
erty. Nevertheless, Margaret Sanger has not advocated larger families for the rich. Rather, she has emphasized the necessity of leaving the decision as to the number of children and the time of their arrival to the mother, whether she be rich or poor.

Mrs. Sanger made her position plain in an article entitled “Buth Control and Racial Betterment” in the February issue of The Buth Control Review. In that article she said: “We hold that the world is already over populated and we urge the enactment of every law so that at least a few Eugenists will not or must not interfere with the well being of society.” It is well to do so, and we are convinced that the best judge of the time and conditions under which her child should be brought into the world. We maintain that it is her right, regardless of all other considerations, to determine whether she shall bear children or not, and how many children she shall bear if she chooses to become a mother.” — Editors of The Buth Control Review.

SUNDAY WHITE.

By Helen Hoyt.

When we see the little girls going by of a Sunday
In their daintiness of starched clean dresses,
We forget—and they too have forgotten—
The best backs of the mothers
Washing them white.

THE THING YOU ARE!

Charlotte Perkins Gilman Stetson.

And still the wailing babies come and go,
And homes are waste, and husbands’ hearts fly far,
There is no hope until you dare to know

The thing you are!
Endowment of Motherhood

By Dr Alze Drysdale Viickery

While this article by Dr Viickery, one of the foremost English authorities upon the social and medical problems of women, employs English conditions as a basis of discussion, it applies with equal force to conditions in America. Mother endowments have been discussed in Congress and exist or are being urged in many states. —The Editor

The position of the mother in the family is admittedly unsatisfactory from many points of view. In what way can we bring about a change for the better? This is one of the questions which is pressing for some solution, and as this is an era of conferences, it is proposed to bold a conference on the question of endowment of motherhood and of the family.

From one point of view the endowment of the mother and of the family as a state measure would not be a step in the right direction, except, indeed, it be adapted as a temporary measure for a strictly limited period, or for the alleviation of special cases of distress during this period of reconstruction, to which many of us are hopefully looking forward.

The chief source of our present difficulty is the attitude that past governments have adopted with regard to the so-called woman's sphere.

On the assumption of women's so-called natural disabilities, our legislators have thought fit to pile up and super add other disabilities legal and social—which are purely artificial, and the education and training of women and girls has been framed and conducted with a view to the maintenance of these quite unnecessary inventions.

Instead of steadily pursuing the idea of training boys and girls alike toward self dependence, and self government in order to prepare them for their future responsibilities and duties as to marriage, parenthood and citizenship on terms of equal opportunity and equal efficiency as comrades, parents, and citizens, they have started from a theory of masculine pre-eminence and mastery on the one hand, and dependence, obedience and self sacrifice on the other. The world was to be open to man, in his choice of career, in the creation of ideals and ambitions, but not so for the women.

There was a semblance of excuse for some interference with the liberty and freedom of the girl while methods of Birth Control with regard to the use of the family and the frequency of births were unknown, and while almost nothing but submission to natural decrees was possible, con jugal union having been entered upon, but, even so, if men had also accepted for themselves, limitation in freedom in marriage similar to those which they imposed upon women, many of our present evils would never have reached that scale of magnitude which make our problems so complex today.

This lack of limitation and restraint on the masculine side made him a danger to all unguarded women, it also made him the progenitor of unlimited and unwanted offspring who were left to grow up either as pariahs in his own country, or to become the creators of half caste races elsewhere.

It should be recognized, today, that maternity need no longer be regarded as a disability, or as an inevitable consequence of marital life, and this is of great importance when we consider the question of early marriages and also the case of the unfit. Birth Control has become not only a possiblity, but is now regarded as an essential part of a really practicable scheme of life. A new freedom has come to woman, a freedom that many had hardly dared to hope for. Birth Control as regards number of children, selection of time and place, of environment generally, places motherhood on a much higher plane. The power of choice to have many, to have few, if circumstances dictate to have none at all—these things are possible, so that the function of maternity ceases to be an abiding danger and disability, but, on the contrary, becomes a power, an asset, a privilege to be enjoyed when it means an added happiness in the home. Whether the power of maternity comes to be regarded as a privilege, a blessing, and ceases to be regarded chiefly as a misfortune will depend upon the character and attainments of the woman, and the position she will claim as a citizen.

But even if these so-called disabilities of women should continue to be regarded in the light of a handicap—surely there is all the more need for the removal of all obstacles, legal, social, or otherwise which have been super added to these so-called natural disabilities. It would seem to be reasonable that these obstacles should first be removed and the effects of freedom be realized before any hurried or ill-conceived legislation of the character of the endowment of motherhood, or of the family, should be introduced.

First, let us clear the road of all artificial limitations and obstacles which prejudice and tradition have twined about the path of women, before we proceed to enmesh ourselves and our successors in the coils and intricacies of new and untamed schemes, which may prove the source of innumerable evils in the future.

Second, let us change the outlook which impress upon the youthful mind. We must train our boys and girls to regard each other as equal citizens and coparterners in the future state.

Education must be directed toward the development of all their powers, the fostering of any special talent, while not for getting the wisdom of an all round intelligent outlook on life, and the cultivation of the capacity for readaptation, whenever social or natural cataclysms become the cause of unheavals and necessitate social or political readjustments. Therefore the road to learning, to the attainment of skill in professional or industrial activity must be as freely open to girls and women as to men. Rewards and emoluments, position and
career must be as freely within the scope of vision of the girl as of the boy. Equal pay for equal efficiency.

No more must be heard the excuse for inequality of reward that the girl can live upon less. Rather let us ask if there exists any reasonable or just ground for suggesting that she should, and the honest reply must be that there is no such ground.

It is true that the boy after meeting the expense of feeding, clothing and shelter should save for marriage and parentage, so also the girl after paying for food, clothing and shelter should save for marriage and maternity.

Motherhood makes great demands upon the feminine physique, and the racial physique will deteriorate if that claim be evaded. This is an undisputable fact which our military experts have been obliged to admit from the experiences both of the Boer War and of the recent War.

There is still another reason why the girl's wage should be in every way as adequate as the boys. The girl must save not only for marriage and maternity but also that she may be free to choose, to discriminate in the selection of a partner for life, as the father of her children, and as a participant in position of illness or old age. She should be in a position to make terms.

English parents would do well to copy the French custom in aiding their children of marriageable age in the choice of a partner, and of assisting both sons and daughters in the establishment of a new household upon equal and self-respecting terms. Equal division of the property among all the children of either parent should be the rule with us as with them. Thus would primogeniture and entail be swept away, and wealth would become more equally distributed among the people.

Also English parents would do well to save for their children in moderation. Life is full of uncertainties. The married daughter needs some security for herself and her infant children and the married son needs some starting point for energy and enterprise.

The adult daughter should consult with her prospective partner, as to their mutual claims. The wife who agrees to retire from industrial or professional employment in marriage, will only do so on the recognition by her husband of her claim to be considered an equal participant in all his acquisitions and emoluments. This is essential to her self-respect and personal dignity. Otherwise she becomes a dependent and subsides into a position of subjection. The principle of community of property prevails chiefly among the working classes and poorer population in France. It would place the wives of similar classes in England in a much better relative position if a similar custom were adapted here. No doubt most of the thrift and prudence of the French people may justly be traced to the more favorable position of the wife in the house, which is largely due to the recognition of financial equality.

The Endowment of Motherhood and of the Family would scarcely tend to check that recklessness in reproduction which a great fault and misfortune of our poorer classes. The poor working mother, besides being a slave to her husband, becomes a second slave enslaved by her family. She may be free to choose, to enter upon a position of equal terms. But do we as a nation, while theoretically desiring an equal population, practically favor the production of a C 3 population?

ON ACCOUNT OF ALMOST criminal deprivation of the knowledge of the methods of Birth Control, the working mother probably commences—maternity too early, and often in a state of unfitness from previous poverty and underfeeding. She enjoys no period of rest and recuperation between the birth of one child and the next. Therefore with each successive pregnancy her physique becomes lower, and later children suffer proportionately.

Thus do we as a nation, while theoretically desiring an equal population, practically favor the production of a C 3 population.

It is the province of women to safeguard the interests of the coming generation. In order to do this the wife and mother must have her rightful position in the conjugal firm clearly recognized. She must be able to act as her conscience dictates in these vital matters of social health. It has been the source of disaster in many homes that when the more or less erratic masculine has forgotten the necessity for self control and self-restraint that the wife has not been able, on account of her dependent position, to stand on the defensive and recall a recalcitrant husband to a sense of his duty to her and to the children for whose future they are jointly responsible. Many a man might have been restrained at the outset of an irrational crisis, many a home might have been saved by the timely assertion of the wife of her right to preserve her personal independence and safeguard the welfare of her children at a critical moment.

It may be urged that such considerations would justify the Endowment of Motherhood, and as a temporary measure for special cases something in its favor might be urged, but the wider effects and the more permanent aspects of a position of independence such as I have attempted to describe, would be immeasurably more effective and valuable than the fictitious independence gained by the substitution of one kind of mastery over another kind.

Women are likely to develop many interests outside the home. The affairs of the municipality, the nation, the entire globe will come within their purview, and the independence they seek must be something far wider than the escape from the subjection of the family and the home.
THE EDITOR'S UNEASY CHAIR

We call the attention of our readers to the symposium on Birth Control, in the March issue of the Medical Review of Reviews.

The symposium was conducted by Mary Ware Dennett and Frederic H. Robinson. A set of four questions was sent to a representative list of physicians whose opinions on the subject of Blah Control were not already known. Forty-seven were received.

These were the questions:

Do you believe or do you unequivocally not believe in Birth Control?

Do you believe the present law just or do you think it ought to be repealed?

Is Birth Control an economic issue or an ethical one exclusively?

Would the giving of contraceptive information lead to an increase in immorality by permitting sexual intercourse without fear of conception, or would it tend to decrease immorality by enabling young men to marry?

The editors of the symposium expressed astonishment that twelve out of the forty-seven physicians replied that they had not given the subject sufficient thought to warrant the expression of an opinion. We, on the contrary, are surprised and agreeably impressed by the fact that they considered an absence of thought and study of the matter sufficient warrant for not giving an unfavorable opinion.

Two of the most unequivocally unfavorable replies were from Dr. Howard Kelly of Johns Hopkins University and Dr. Harvey W. Wiley. Dr. Kelly has decided that Blah Control would lead to great nausia, a filled with disgust and horror at the thought of it. His is a state of mind, if not of reason.

Dr. Wiley writes in a perfect ecstasy. He says, "The way to be childless is to be virtuous." Does he mean that all children are lapses from virtue? Evidently not, for he goes on to say that every educated and well-to-do family should be required by law to have at least four children, and that all young men and women who refuse to marry, unless no one asks them or there be medical or surgical reasons, should be penalized. He seems here to leave loopholes for certain forms of Birth Control whether he knows it or not, and he ends up muddled with the Mormon cry, "Children, still children, and more children. Every one of them is a fortune, even to the father on day wages, and the mother who does her own washing." Evidently he regards men and women as kitchen utensils in the State service, and he has nothing to say about the welfare of the children thus brusquely compounded by law. He would pay more attention to the ingredients and ultimate disposition of a sausage.

Dr. Bass of New Orleans, on the other hand, is just as unequivocally in favor. He does not believe in any law which tends to ignorance of facts or the suppression of information leads to an unnecessary large percentage of undesirable births, and a comparative reduction in the desirable. He believes further that a widespread knowledge of Birth Control would tend to decrease immorality.

Dr. Leo Loeb is also favorable. Dr. Cleverly of Chicago believes in quality children and not the present bestial, reckless propagation without regard to fitness and preparedness. What ever tends to promote multiple births favors a reversion to lower forms of evolution—approximating the fish stage.

Dr. Goldwater takes a firm stand. He says the questions are an insult to the intelligence of every humanitarian, educator and physician. He deals mercilessly with the hypocrisy of some physicians in the matter. He believes in Birth Control and is not afraid to say so.

Everyone interested in the subject of Birth Control owes a debt of gratitude to the editors of this symposium, and to the Medical Review of Reviews for publishing it.

Dear Editor—Your magazine asks the question, "Is procreation the sole purpose of the sex impulse?" I do not think that it is.

Idealism, emotion, puts life and energy into our science and art, our inventions and law. Remove this and we have but a skeleton of life, soon to decay. The sex impulse is the means, the mechanism, by which we come in contact with and are related to, not only each other, physically, mentally, spiritu ally, but to the animate and inanimate world. We advance only in proportion as our power within us is developed and rightly used. It is the center, the motive power of all idealism, all emotion.

Creative desire is strong—desire to create a picture, a statue, a book, a business, an engine, a bridge, a child. We have considerably muddled matters by utterly alienating ignorance or prudery all thought of the relationship of sex to these creative efforts, with the exception of physical reproduction alone—a fact in nature evident even to the casual observation of a barbarian or a child.

Sex power is universal, deep rooted and with one purpose only—that we might have life and that we might have it more abundantly. It is not indicative of great intellect on our part to gauge "abundance" merely by our animal fecundity. When this prolific breeding leads to idocy, want and crime we are worse than stupid.

Sex manifests itself through all nature, plants, animals and man, not only crudely but in color, song, grace, motion, light and action. Each advance along these lines is hailed with delight. It becomes the treasure, the heritage of the ages. We can spare not one iota. We strive for further advancement and as we strive we develop our own creative and appreciative powers.

But on the animal plane alone, Nature calls a halt. Unmer cifully, yet with a wide mercy, she relentlessly slays her... (Continued on page 19)
Cheer Voluntary Motherhood

C H E E R S A N D P R O L O N G E D applause greeted a demand for sex knowledge and voluntary motherhood when Agnes Smedley deivered six fifteen minute addresses before the curtain of the Mt. Morris Theatre, New York, March 25th and 30th. The Scarlet Trail, a photo drama which deals m a frank, high mannered manner with the problem of social diseases and its attendant evil of quack medicines, was being shown. Between 10,000 and 12,000 people heard the addresses.

An even more enthusiastic reception was given Miss Smedley’s plea for sex education and Birth Control when she addressed large audiences in the Alhambra Theatre, Brooklyn, April 17th and 18th.

Miss Smedley told how the United States Government and various State Governments had broken the bonds of a morbid prudery in them campaigns against venereal disease during the war. Millions of pamphlets which discussed sex matters in plain language were used in these campaigns. She also voiced the demand of modern women for education in matters of sex and the privilege of determining how many children they shall have and when they shall have them. Excerpts from the addresses follow:

“False modesty, prudery, and hypocrisy, are being thrust aside today and we are learning to know what sex problems must be met frankly and sanely. We must tear away the curtain of morbid sex mystery behind which has developed diseases which threaten us and our children. When we refuse to tell our children the truth about sex they gain them information in the alleys and on the streets. This false and dangerous method can bring no good to society or to civilization.”

“We women in particular should respond to the new ideas at large in the world. This is not merely my own idea. It is the belief of such authorities as Dr. Herman Buxig, our State Commissioner of Health, who recently said:

“Is it not time that women should look at the sex problem squarely in the face, devoid of mystery and so-called ‘moral issues,’ from a practical and common sense point of view? Is it not time that girls and young women, the future mothers of the race, should know the truth about the reproductive organs and the diseases which may affect them, so as to preserve their health and that of their offspring?”

“If we, as women, are to meet the problems of society, we must demand every bit of knowledge which is available to the human mind. We are entitled to, and must demand, the information which will enable us to bring into the world only healthy children, only children free from physical and mental handicaps, and, furthermore, only the number of children which we can bear, rear and educate decently. The ideas often expressed that knowledge of these matters will lead to immorality are insults to womankind everywhere and are so untrue that we need not consider them. It is only half truths, only untrue ‘information,’ which is dangerous.”

Book Reviews


There is a profound significance in Zona Gale’s story of small town life, “Birth,” in the light of her assertion that neighborhood is a role requiring pangs, that to take one place as a member of a town is delicate business.

In this story of two generations you perceive how Barbara’s mays the penalty of her casual marriage, and of her ignorance and abhorrence of motherhood. It will always be so long as motherhood, which, by being voluntary might be fine and beautiful, belongs to ‘the lambs of things whispered about, commiserated upon, avoided, and stigmatized with the raucous.”


A highly interesting book. It goes far to prove that “men and women alike will achieve greater happiness, not by minimizing sex differences, but by frankly recognizing and using them.”

During this transitional period the energies of men and women must be set free, to work out a new society where the complimentary values of both sexes will be used to their utmost.

Earl Barlow is to be congratulated not only for being one of the few intelligent publishers of his time, but for doing something to carry on the splendid effort of Anne Besant and Ellen Key. This is a book that the thinking man cannot ignore. It is not great nor brilliant, but it is a bound, well written and a storehouse of ideas.


This little volume, although published some time ago, discusses a subject which is ever new—that of racial betterment. There are, $578 the author, three means at hand by which racial betterment may be accomplished:

(1) Eugenics, the science of race culture. (2) Social adjustment, the science of molding institutions, and (3) Education, the science of individual development.

These topics are discussed at length. Dr. Nearing calls attention to the fact that the Greeks eliminated the unfit by natural selection, but that such methods should be unnecessary today. The first step toward the ideal goal he considers the preventing of the propagation of defectives. While eugenics, or selective mating is necessary to the attainment of this ideal, he in doubt admits that the ideal couple would consider quality more essential than quantity, and would regulate the number of offspring accordingly.

BOOKS RECEIVED


PAMPHLETS RECEIVED


Who Are the Conscientious Objectors. By Committee of 100 Friends of Conscientious Objectors. 302 Grand St., Brooklyn. 36 pp. Price 10 cents.

India’s Freedom in American Courts. By Friends of Freedom for India. 7 East 15th Street. 12 pp. Price 10 cents.
The Voluntary Parenthood League

SHAL PARENTHOOD BE voluntary instead of accidental? was the subject of the first public meeting of the newly organized Voluntary Parenthood League, held at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City on April 10th.

Mrs Robert Bruere presided and the speakers were Professor Charles Zueblin, Dr George M Parker and Mrs Mary Ware Dennett.

Mrs Bruere's introduction included the story of the experience of herself and her husband in caring for some of the children of the Lawrence strikers in the strike preceding the present one. Inquiry as to he family of a twelve year old lad who lived with them several weeks revealed these facts.

He was the oldest of seven, was fairly bright, but small for his age. The next child was stupid. The next one frail from birth, the next an obvious defective, and so on down the line.

It was a family which would have over taxed the ill conditioned parents even if it had numbered only two children.

Dr Parker, a specialist in nervous diseases, did a very real service to the Birth Control movement by his scholarly psychological analysis of the taboo which has so long inhibited people from frankly standing for their belief in Birth Control, by acknowledging the dual function of the sex relation.

Professor Zueblin gave the major part of his address on Race Recuperation, which is one of the most significant of his several lectures on sociological questions. Excerpts from it were given in the April issue of the Birth Control Review. He proved conclusively that the human race must be more intelligently reproduced if it is to hope for social efficiency, the betterment of types, or the safeguarding of child life.

His picture of the whole ocean filled to overflowing with squirming eels in two years, if their profligate, wasteful breeding were not antidoted by an almost equally prodigious death rate, was unforgettable as a hint to humans what not to do.

MRS DENNETT ANNOUNCED the objects and plans of the new organization, which have been formulated as follows:

**OBJECTS**

1. To render available for the people's need, the best scientific knowledge as to how parenthood may be voluntary instead of accidental, and as a first step toward that end, the removal of the words prohibition of conception from the Federal obscenity laws which now besmear and degrade the question of intelligent parenthood by including it with penalized indecencies.

2. The education of parents, so that the birth of children may occur with due regard to health, heredity, income, choice, environment and the well being of the community.

**PROGRAM**

a. A careful thorough canvass of Congress during the special session, probably to be called in May for the purpose of making it clear to Congressmen that the proposed bill is a necessary public health measure, by which process the best sponsor for the bill will be discovered.

b. The introduction of the bill in the December session followed by a free hearing before the Judiciary Committee, with the best possible speakers and proper publicity.

c. The rapid publication of effective literature on all phases of the subject including leaflets, pamphlets and books, which will present not only the direct question, but the allied questions of eugenics, health, and sex education.

d. Judicious newspaper publicity and advertising.

e. The securing of endorsements from physicians and all the various welfare organizations.

f. A promotion trip over the country particularly in the 65 cities which have a death rate of over 100 per 1000.

**ORGANIZATION**

The simplest form of a secretary and director with a large National Council of the League to be supported by voluntary contributions.

The National Council is now being formed, and already includes such significant names as Professor Charles Zueblin, Dr Edward Sanderson, Mrs Emnet L Holt, Mrs Eugene Stone, Mrs Charles Knoblauch, Reverend John Haynes Holmes, Professor Warner Fite, Mrs Stanley McCormick, Dr and Mrs William J Robinson, Dr Lydia Allen De Vilbiss, Dr Hilda H Noyes, Dr Antoinette F Konikow, Mrs Robert Bruere, Hon W O Saunders, Mrs Harry Montague, Dr A L Goldwater, Mrs Caroline O'Day, Mrs Henry G Leach, Mrs B W Huebsch, Mr and Mrs J Leslie Tompkins, Mr James F Morton, Mrs W H Greene, Mrs Marion Nicholl Rawson.

**Origin of the Comstock Laws**

(Continued from page 8)

The easy way to furnish the p"ofession thought to be necessary, without continuing the disastrous rule of a demoralizing and autocratic censorship.

WOMAN: HER SEX AND LOVE LIFE

FOR MEN and WOMEN

By WILLIAM J ROBINSON, M D

THIS is one of Dr Robinson's most important and most useful books. It is not devoted to abstruse discussions or doubtful theories but is full of practical information of vital importance to every woman and through her to every man, to every wife and through her to every husband.

The simple practical points contained in its pages would render millions of homes happier abodes than they are now, they would prevent the disruption of many a family, they show how to hold the love of a man, how to preserve sexual attraction, how to remain young beyond the usually allotted age.

This book destroys many injurious errors and superstitions and teaches truths that have never been presented in any other book before.

In short, this book not only imparts interesting facts, it gives practical points which will make thousands of women and thousands of men happier, healthier, and more satisfied with life. Certain chapters or even paragraphs are alone worth the price of the book.

Illustrated 412 Pages Cloth Bound Price $3
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The Malthusian Doctrine Today

By Charles Drysdale, Sc B

(Continued from April number)

BEFORE GOING INTO the national aspect of this question, let us simply consider the homely example of a laborer's family. If we have a young couple setting out on married life in London on a pound a week, as so many thousands of couples do, this means, on the prices existing just before the war, that they could adequately nourish themselves and one child by very good management. If the husband is a good, average man, he may expect his wages to rise by five shillings a week every four or five years, and for each such sum they could support one more child. But if the children arrive more rapidly than this, as they almost invariably do, they simply cannot be properly nourished, and, unless other help is forthcoming, they or the mother become ill from undernutrition, and deaths occur, nominally due to certain diseases, but which have their origin in underfeeding. Unless the birth rate in the laboring classes as a whole, therefore, is exceedingly low, there will be deaths from pressure of surplus children on the family food supply, and the greater the number of births, the greater will be the deaths, as is perfectly well recognized by all who know anything of such families.

Of course, the relation between the birth and death rates is not the same for all families. In some cases the man is very competent, and rapidly rises to a better position, or the woman is a very good manager, or, again, they may receive outside help, and in such cases we find large families of healthy surviving children, just as we find some nations of rapid increase. But this does not affect the fact that, as an average for parents of average capability, a high birth rate most certainly causes a high death rate, and that the coming of each fresh child into the family tends to cause either its own death or that of some other member of the family.

Now, in the case of nations, the great bulk of their populations are always made up of the poor or wage earning families we have been considering, and it is therefore obvious that, as a whole, the same rule should prevail, i.e., that all births over a certain minimum should cause a similar number of premature deaths. The minimum will certainly be different in different countries with different opportunities, as it is in different families, but the broad principle should remain, that countries of high birth rates should, as a whole, have high death rates, that those of low birth rates should have low death rates, and that changes in their birth rates should produce similar changes in their death rates, except so far as any rapid and fundamental change takes place in their productive powers, owing to the introduction of a new industrial regime, an escape from tyrannical restrictions, etc.

In any case, however, the correspondence between the birth and death rates is sufficient to show that pressure of population is a very important one among the many factors which control their increase. The correlation coefficient between the birth and death rates, concerning which more will be said later, works out at the high value of 0.8 for those twenty-eight countries.

(To be continued in the June number)

---

The Editor's Uneasy Chair

(Continued from page 16)

plus Man, using no spiritual or scientific propagative control, would, long ago, through overpopulation, have made the world a horror, had his numbers not been decimated by overwhelming, oft recurring pestilence and war. He exhausts himself and his resources and curtails his larger creative power in behalf of an unwanted, disastrous physical increase.

Those who believe in procreative uses only are confronted by two measures. They must accept it checked or unchecked. Hitherto, it has been unchecked, with its long tramp of disillusionment, misery, death, degeneracy and crime. In the new order of a checked fecundity we find what? A high minded chastity, continence, temperance, or safe Birth Control methods, abortions or celibacy. All of these methods have been used from the standpoint of effectiveness, health, happiness, morality and our present degree of enlightenment and self control, I believe that sane, scientific methods of Birth Control are the only real solution.

Lulu MacClure Clarke

---
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IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

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

CONSTITUENT BODIES

ENGLAND (1877)—The Malthusian League. Secretary, Dr. Ronald Doudle, 48 Broadway, Westminster, London, S.W.

HOLLAND (1885)—Dr. Nieuw Malthusiaansche Bond. Secretary, Dr. P. Duising, 9 Verbieststraat, Den Haag. Periodicals, Het Gentlijk Huisje.

GERMANY (1889)—Soziale Harmonien Verein, Secretary, H. von Mauermüller, Stuttgart. Periodicals, Der Soziale Harmonie.


SPAIN (1904)—La Especie de Regeneración Humana. Secretary, Senor Luis Buñol. Calle Provenza, 177, Pal. 1A, Barcelonada. Periodicals, Salud y Puericultura.

BELGIUM (1906)—Ligue Neo-Malthusienne. Secretary, Dr. Fernand Courcelles.

SWITZERLAND (1908)—Groupe Malthusien. Secretary, Valentin Grandjean, 166 Rue den Eleu Xives. General Periodicals, La Vie Intime.

BOHEMIA AUSTRIA (1901)—Secretary, Michael Kacha, 1164 Zabov, Prague. Periodicals, Zadru.


CUBA (1907)—Secção da Propaganda Secretaria, Jose Guardiola, Emparedada 14, Havana.

SWEDEN (1911)—Saluhapetet for Humanitar Barlastning. President, Mg Hans Borgare, Vasavagen 15, Stockholm, Va.

ITALY (1912)—Lega Neo-Malthusiana Italiana Via Lamarmora 22, Turin. Periodicals, L ’edizione Sessuale.

AFRICA—Ligue Neo-Malthusienne, Maison du Peuple, 10 Rampie Magenta, Algiers.

IN THE UNITED STATES.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.—IDA. Rhoads, 1318 Forest Court.

BANGOR, ME.—Dr. F. E. Luce, 40 Central Street.

BOSTON, MASS.—The Birth Control League of Massachusetts, 3126 Boylston St. Rev. O. O. Austin President.

PHILADELPHIA, Pa.—Dr. L. A. Young, 5612 Haverford Avenue.

CHICAGO, ILL.—The Citizen’s Committee on Family Limitation. Secretary, M. B. R. Page, 521 Longwood Ave., Glencoe, III.

CLEVELAND, Ohio.—Birth Control League of Ohio. Mrs. A. W. Newman, 1604 Ashbury Avenue, secretary.

DETROIT, Mich.—Mrs. Jennie A. Rine, 919 Brooklyn Avenue, Elizabeth City, N. C.—Mrs. and Mrs. W. G. Saunders.

HARRISBURG, Pa.—Mrs. A. Herring, 2466 Reed Street.

LOS ANGELES, Calif.—Dr. T. Persier Ushern.

MINNEAPOLIS, Minn.—The Minneapolis Birth Control League. Mrs. Helen C. Thomas, 423 Vincent Avenue, N. secretary.

NEW ORLEANS, La.—H. G. Stockley, 425 Delarime Street.

New York.

The Committee of One Thousand. Dr. R. S. Wile, 230 W. 97th St., chairman.

International Birth Control League. Dr. Wm. J. Robinson, President, 12 Mt. Morris Park West.

The National Birth Control League. 200 Fifth Avenue.

Pittsburgh, Pa.—The Birth Control League of Western Penn. Mrs. Margaret Henning, 117 Linden Ave., Edgewood, secretary.

PORTLAND, Ore.—The Birth Control League of Portland. H. C. Decker, 652 Elliott Avenue, president. M. J. O. Atkin, 549 Fifth Street, secretary.

RADIO, N. Y.—Mrs. C. H. Knoebel, 117 Linden Ave.

St. Louis, Mo.—Grace Anderson, City Dupsness, 11th and Chestnut Streets.


SAN FRANCISCO, Calif.—The Birth Control League of San Francisco. 229 Cowper Street, Margaret McGonigle, secretary.


SUMMIT, N. J.—Rev. Franklin C. Dunn.
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