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A Birth Strike To Avert World Famine

An Editorial by Margaret Sanger

EVERY READER of The Birth Control Review should study carefully the interview with Mr R C Martens, one of the world's foremost authorities on food supplies, which is published in this number then every reader should call that interview to the attention of one or more friends.

As long ago as last July, the editors of this publication drew public attention to the situation into which the world has got itself through industrial overpopulation. The text used at that time was an address made by Frank A Vanderlip the banker Mr Vanderlip pointed out the dangers entailed by the financial condition of Europe. Now comes Mr Martens, a man who conducts a world-wide business, one who has had, perhaps, through his connections, particularly those with Great Britain's food controller, the late Lord Rhondtt, a better opportunity of knowing the condition of the world's food supply than any other man in America. And he too sounds a note of warning. His warning is to be more grave and considered than that of Mr Vanderlip, for his knowledge is more comprehensive and exact than Mr Vanderlip's could have been. More over, he deals with the most vital subject of all—the food supply. Mr Martens' long considered and carefully weighed opinion is that many millions of Europe's population will starve before next year's crops arrive.

LET US CONSIDER for a moment the world's situation as reflected by facts known to all thoughtful persons. First, the world's greatest war and a score of lesser ones still being waged, resulted from the pressure of populations as reflected in commercial rivalries. As one of the fruits of the war, and therefore of this same industrial overpopulation, we have according to all reports, millions of people (mostly children) suffering from lack of food or actually starving in Europe today. As the result of families too large to subsist upon the earnings of a single wage-earner, we have more than 2,000,000 of child workers in the United States and other millions in Europe and Asia—all of them doomed, in a greater or less degree to broken lives.

On top of all this misery comes the breaking down of Europe's productive system of her means of transportation and a resulting shortage of fifty per cent of her cereal, potatoes and the like to say nothing of the shortage of other food, which will be discussed by Mr Martens in forthcoming issues of The Birth Control Review. Europe, according to this authority, has on the average enough food to last until late summer, after which the aged and the young will begin to die of starvation by the millions.

THE WORLD FACES ITS greatest crisis. It approaches the greatest disaster of all time. And even before the arrival of that disaster, children are being worked to death in American factories. They are being starved in countless numbers in Europe. Hunger has not yet gripped the United States as a nation, but if we are no longer a nation to ourselves, we must feed Europe and Europe's hunger is bound to reflect itself upon us. Already we have felt the first nip of deprivation high prices and the scarcity of a number of food products. And as Europe's condition gets worse so will our grow worse.

What shall we women, as citizens of the nations, of the world do in this crisis? Shall we continue to bring children into a world that does not, seemingly, cannot provide food for them? Shall we continue to build up populations to die in war, of plague and hunger?

We do not invite guests to our homes if the pantry and purse are empty. Shall we bring children into a world that is bankrupt and starving? All of our mother instincts, all of our humane feelings, all of our common sense must cry out against such a course. There are too many children in the world now. They are being broken in factories, and they're dying of hunger. More of them are to die—and millions more, say those who are best informed as to the red situation.

THE GOVERNMENTS have been short sighted in dealing with this problem, and their measures have been pitifully inadequate. They have failed. It is time for the women of the world—for each individual woman to accept her share of this problem. In this hour of crisis and peril women alone can save the world. They can save it by refusing for five years to bring a child into being. And there is no other too.

For the next five years no woman who understands the present situation should bear a child. Not only should she refuse to bring another human being into a starving and disordered world, but she should refuse to support the efforts of those who continue to feed their families and feed the children now in the world. Each woman who is awake to the true situation should make it her first task to encourage and to assist her sisters in avoiding childbirth until the world has had an opportunity to readjust itself.
Child Labor

CHILD LABOR IS A MOST GRIEVOUS blot upon civilization. Those who have looked carefully into the problem know that it is one of the cruelest of all modern social evils and that when the full accounting is made, one of the most far-reaching in its blighting effects.

For many years various agencies have fought hard to awaken the people of the United States to the evils and the perils of permitting children to work their lives away in mills, factories and the streets. Chief among these agencies today is the National Child Labor Committee, which with heroic persistence and unflagging faith has sought to abolish this curse. This powerful group, always on guard, unceasing in its aggressive efforts, commanding a great following, has been leading this battle for humanity since 1904.

Despite all efforts, however, there are in the United States today, according to its own authoritative estimate, between 2,000,000 and 2,500,000 child workers, whose lives are being spent unprofitably, wastefully, cruelly, upon industry. And these millions represent just so many children deprived of their right to grow and develop, just so much racial energy taken from future generations.

And many of them are to become the mentally, physically and spiritually incompetent parents of weaklings, who will carry on the impoverished family strains for many generations.

But there is a way to abolish child labor. Picture the results that would have been attained if, when the National Child Labor Committee began its activities fifteen years ago, it had included in its campaign the freeing of mothers from the bondage of unwelcome child bearing. Suppose there had been established in those sections where the blight of child labor was heaviest, clinics in which parents who desired to limit their families could receive scientific instruction concerning contraceptives? There would have been born in these fifteen years only such children as the parents could care for—such as could be supported by the earnings of the father? Mothers would have refused to bring child slaves into being. The problem of child labor would have been solved.

And this is the only way in which it ever will be solved.

In Memory of Jessie Ashley

For one year THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW has carried among the names of its editors that of Jessie Ashley. This was the publication’s testimonial in recognition of a vital spirit that still animates this magazine, and a symbol of the memory which readers and editors have of the unselsh work and fine comradeship of a great and valiant soul.

Must Have Birth Control

So long as unlimited multiplication goes on, no social organization which has ever been devised or is likely to be devised, no fiddle faddling with the distribution of wealth, will deliver society from the tendency to be destroyed by the reproduction within itself, in its intensest form of that struggle for existence the limitation of which is the object of society—Huxley.
The Coming Crash

The First of a Series of Interviews with R. C. Martens, an Authority Upon the World Food Situation

Within the next few months millions of human beings, mostly Europeans, will starve to death. Food to meet the needs of the Earth's population is lacking and cannot be produced in time to avoid the great crash—the crash which will, as its chief incident, cost untold millions of lives, and bring in the train of that disaster no one knows what governmental and social changes.

These are the predictions of one of the few men in America who can speak with unquestioned authority upon the world food situation. They are based upon figures carefully collected from all corners of the globe through official and commercial channels. Mr. R. C. Martens, who, after many years of practical study of food questions, puts forth these opinions, was until quite recently the head of R. C. Martens & Company. This organization conducts an international business upon a scale seldom attempted by one commercial or industrial firm. Its activities include banking, importing, exporting, engineering, and construction. It has fortyeight branches and subsidiaries, serving every civilized country in the Northern Hemisphere and the Far East. In addition to Africa, one of the prime movers in this globe circling enterprise was the late Lord Rhondda, food controller of Great Britain. It is doubtful if any one government in the world has had so thorough or well digested a volume of information concerning world food supplies as this commercial concern.

In considering what Mr. Martens has to say in this and forthcoming interviews, it is well for the reader to remember that he is not a radical in the ordinary sense of the term, nor is he an advocate of Birth Control, as under stood by the editors and readers of The Birth Control Review. He is a business man who, as a business necessity, has made a careful study of world conditions. This study has given him a forward looking viewpoint, based upon facts as he has learned them through this far flung organization, not upon preconceived convictions, nor upon sentiment.

The first interview covers briefly and simply a single phase of the food situation as it applies primarily to Europe. Others will go more into detail, explain the significance of the situation to other parts of the world, and, finally, to America in particular.

"Before the war," said Mr. Martens, "two or three per cent of the food of Europe came from North and South America, and from Australia. For twenty per cent or thirty per cent, according to the needs of various countries, Europe relied upon Russia.

"Russia broke down economically, but conditions were not then nearly so bad in Russia as they are throughout Europe today. There was a food shortage in Europe, even before the war, but the withdrawal of great percentages of the male population from productive work into destructive occupations has vastly increased that shortage."

"This was an industrial war. When the man power was mustered for war purposes, it was drawn mostly from the ranks of agricultural workers. The nations could not afford to draw too heavily from their industries. This was the first factor in increasing the food shortage.

"The second factor had to do with the soil itself. Outside of Russia, the soil of Europe had been worked extensively for many centuries. Hence, it required each year a greater feeding with artificial fertilizer. During the war, this fertilizer could not be imported. Therefore, the soil was rapidly exhausted and the crops have been accordingly smaller.

Then came the armistice, labor unrest, and the feeling of relaxation after five years of terrible strain. Less productive work was done than ever before.

"Next, Nature herself stepped in and gave us one of the worst growing and harvesting years that Europe could have. All these factors, piled one upon another, gave Europe aggra
tive crops that fell disastrously below the necessary supply, but the end is not yet.

"The situation was rendered still worse by broken down transport—on—condition quite general throughout Europe—which prevented the removing of crops from the made quate storage of rural communities into the warehouses of the cities and towns. The result was that the mild frosts, prevalent in Europe, did great damage.

"As a result of all this, Europe's supply of cereals, potatoes and the like is fifty per cent below normal. Milk, eggs, fats and meats we will consider at another time, but for the present let it be kept clearly in mind that Europe's supply of cereals and potatoes is only fifty per cent of what it usually is.

"In brief, the situation is just this. Europe is short five billion bushels of cereals and potatoes. There is available in the word only one billion bushels of these supplies for export—about one fifth of what Europe alone needs.

"Before the war, European countries imported 500,000,000 bushels of cereals, potatoes, etc. mainly from Russia. At that time a bushel of cereal cost, upon the average, $1.00, or four shillings of English money and five francs in the currency of France. Today, the cost of a bushel of the same foodstuffs is fifteen or sixteen shillings, accord ing to today's rate of exchange, and the rate of exchange is dropping daily, therefore proportionately still further in ceasing the price to the consumer and from thirty to thirty five francs. And they need ten times as much of this imported food as formerly.
"Even assuming that the food were available, which it is not, and that Europe has the money to pay for it, which it has not, it would be utterly impossible to ship and distribute this amount of food to those who need it. The transportation of Europe before the war was constructed to distribute commodities within each of the empires. About eighty per cent of the distribution was within the boundaries of a given country, only about twenty per cent passed to and from beyond the border. Today the situation is almost exactly reversed—eighty per cent of the distribution would have to flow across boundary lines, by transportation means originally capable of carrying but twenty per cent. And half of those means of transportation are now broken down.

With such a situation prevailing, Europeans must die by the millions of starvation and diseases due to hunger. The very old and the very young will be the first victims, and more of them will die than of the vigorous adults. The animal nature comes out when the stomach is empty, and the weak perish. It is bad enough for the old to die of hunger, but the world catastrophe comes when the young die. Upon the young we have put the burden of straightening out the mess we have made of things. Upon them rests the task of bringing order out of the unimaginable chaos which we have created. But the children of Europe will starve—by the millions. Those who do not die will be left with impaired vitality—they will be weak physically and mentally. And to such as these we will leave the Herculean task of remaking the world.

"To lessen this disaster will require all the organized social energies of humanity. It is not a task for merchants, shippers, bankers and industrialists. It is a work for governments and for society as a whole. The work should be so organized that help would go primarily to children. The children must be cared for or the world will be racially impoverished for many generations. And it must be done now—next year will be worse than the present one, and the next will be worse still, because lower vitality and eventual shortage of seeds accentuates the shortage year by year, therefore action must be taken at once, unless action is taken at once.

"As the situation becomes harder, it will intensify with unbelievable rapidity." About half of Europe's population, outside of Russia, is urban. The rural population has first call upon food, and will be well fed when the other half begins to starve. But the other half will rush to the country like a plague of locusts. History will repeat itself—the rush will come, and the hunger maddened hordes from the cities will destroy more than they seize and use.

"Europe's food supplies will last, upon the average, until February. After that, the crash may come upon any day, at any moment. And it will be the Great Crash—the greatest disaster that humanity has yet experienced."

The Campaign Against Child Labor

By Owen R. Lovejoy

General Secretary, National Child Labor Committee

A HEALTHY, HAPPY, NORMAL CHILDHOOD is the rightful heritage of every child. Faith in the justice of this principle, coupled with belief that the premature entrance of children into industry inevitably precludes normal childhood, has been the basis for the long, unceasing fight which has been waged against child labor in the United States.

The complete elimination of child labor as a factor in industry is a standard which has now come to be demanded in all programs, national and international, for industrial and social reconstruction. Nations and states, as well as industry itself, recognize the economic waste of child labor. But, more than that there is a growing consciousness that the child himself—not the needs of industry—must be the foremost consideration in fixing standards for the child's protection. This new consciousness is due in part to the flood of new ideals which have come in with the war's wage, and in part it is due to an awakened realization that through the nation's children, and only through the children, can democracy be made real. But there remains the task of bringing about the practical application of these ideals.

In 1904 the National Child Labor Committee was organized by a group of social workers, with Samuel McCune Lindsay as its general secretary. The objects for which it was organized were summarized by Dr. Lindsay. "It desires, wherever its co-operation is requested, to investigate the conditions under which children are engaged in gainful occupations in all parts of the country. We wish to know how far such occupation interferes with the obtaining of a modicum of education on the part of every child in the community. We want to know how far such occupations prevent the physical development of the child and how far they are likely to stunt the growth or impoverish the efficiency of the future workmen of the republic. We wish to help create a healthy public sentiment in favor of giving each child the best possible chance to make the most of its life."

These objects became crystallized into specific determination to secure better laws for the protection of children in industry. Investigation and study very quickly revealed shocking conditions surrounding childhood throughout the country. In southern cotton mills little children were working without protection of law for long hours, day and night. In the coal mines of Pennsylvania, in the glass factories of
West Virginia, in the Gulf and Atlantic Coast canneries, boys and girls were exchanging their youth and vigor, their playtime their opportunity for education and for health and normal development, for the daily, deadly monotony of factory, mill, cannery and mine. It was obvious that a public opinion, informed of these conditions, would not long tolerate them. The first problem, then, was to arouse public opinion and enlist it in support of legislation in the various states looking toward the elimination of this evil—legislation that would keep children out of gainful occupations and in school during the early years of their lives. It was recognized that to secure to all children a normal childhood the first step must be to release them from employment and provide them with proper schooling. From the first, it was apparent that merely prohibitory measures against child labor fell short of accomplishing their object unless they were accompanied by their corollary, compulsory school attendance laws.

Efforts in the various states resulted in the enactment of child labor and compulsory attendance laws, and improvement of these laws, from year to year, until, in 1919, every state in the union has upon its statute books some kind of child labor regulation. These range from a sixteen-year limit in Montana for employment in any gainful occupation, to a fourteen-year limit in New Mexico for employment in mines only, and no limitation whatever in other occupations. In the same way, each state now provides some form of compulsory school attendance, yet Mississippi leaves the matter of school attendance at the option of the various districts, and Virginia requires attendance only to the age of twelve, sixteen weeks each year for illiterate children, while, on the other hand, Oregon requires school attendance to the age of eighteen for unemployed children (fifteen years for children regularly employed).

Because of this great divergence of the standards accepted by the several states as adequate for the protection of children within the state, and because, too, of the difficulty of creating the necessary state machinery for proper enforcement of these laws, it became apparent to those who had undertaken this work that a federal law was needed to equalize and standardize child labor regulation throughout the country.

The passage of a federal child labor law in 1916 marked the first success in the fight to secure recognition of the child labor problem as a national problem. This law established a fourteen-year limit for work in mills, factories, canneries, and manufacturing establishments, and prohibited employment of children under sixteen years of age or for more than eight hours a day, or in night work. It was passed as an Interstate commerce provision, and prohibited the shipment in Interstate commerce of the product of child labor. The law went into effect in September, 1917, and six months later a decision of the Supreme Court declared it unconstitutional. Coming in the early months of our participation in the war, with the demand for labor vastly increased and state vigilance relaxed, the effect of this decision was incalculable. At the very time when the need for conservation of our potential human power was most pressing, the flood gates were down, school systems were demoralized through shortage of teachers and relaxation of school laws, and children were encouraged to leave school and sacrifice their future usefulness to the immediate needs of industrial production. In states whose child labor regulation was made quie, great numbers of children were drawn back into the mills and factories from which the federal law had released them six months earlier.

Despite the stress of war, however, the National Child Labor Committee strained every effort to "hold the lines." A new federal law was prepared and passed as a part of the Revenue Act of 1918. This law, while maintaining the same age and hour limitations as the law of 1916, discards the Interstate commerce basis, and is based, instead, upon the taxing power of Congress. It places a ten per cent tax upon the employment of children under the specified ages or in prohibited hours. Virtually, its effect is prohibitive—this law is frankly an effort to tax out of existence an evil which may not, under the constitution, directly abolish. This law is being enforced now in all sections of the country, with the exception of the western judicial district of North Carolina, where a federal judge has issued an injunction against its enforcement. An appeal is now pending before the Supreme Court.

With the coming of peace there has come a deepened realization of the significance of the war's lessons. The discovery, through the drafting of the nation's young manhood, that 29 per cent of the men between the ages of 21 and 31 in the first draft were physically unfit for service, was a shock to the nation. We had been systematically destroying nearly one third of our potential manhood. That there was a direct relation between premature labor and this physical disability was illustrated by the fact that in the great industrial state of Pennsylvania, where for years child labor laws had been inadequate and the percentage of child labor had been high, 55 per cent of the men examined in the first draft were rejected as physically unfit.

Again, the call to war service revealed a percentage of illiteracy which was appalling. Of approximately one and a half million men examined in the draft, over three hundred thousand were unable to read or write, a great number of these were native born men. So we found that we had been providing neither physical nor educational opportunity for a large portion of our people. It was an indictment against our democracy—but it was also the means of bringing about frank recognition of this failure, and a determination to build for the future.

In the year that has elapsed since the signing of the armistice, this revaluation has been crystallized in the passage of much forward looking child welfare legislation. In legislative sessions of 1919, twenty states strengthened their child labor regulation. Attention was focused by state legislatures, too, upon matters of education, and compulsory

(Continued on page 19)
The Child Slave and the Law

After all the years of agitation against the enslavement of children, after all the legislative battles waged to prohibit child labor, the Federal Government now deals with the problem not as a prohibitor, but as a partner in the crime.

The closest parallel to the government’s attitude toward child labor is found just outside the pale of civilized law it is the method by which many cities deal with prostitution. It is still the fashion in American municipalities to regard the sale of women’s bodies as a “necessary evil.” Except when reformers are busy in these cities, most of them permit this unlawful traffic, but levy periodic fines, which amount to a tax, with the understanding that the operators of houses of prostitution will not be molested, as long as the fine tax is paid. The business remains unlawful, however. In the case of child labor, however, the business of converting childish strength, health, and playtime, and the racial vigor of coming generations into private profits has the stamp of government approval. The government not only permits the traffic in children to remain lawful, but it participates in the crime to the extent of taking ten per cent of the net profits of the employer. Note the consideration for the employer. The government does not take ten per cent of the gross receipts, nor even ten per cent of the gross profits, but merely ten per cent of the net profits.

Since the Supreme Court of the United States dared the so-called “Child Labor” bill unconstitutional, the child workers have not attained to the dignity of a special act. The present law is part of a measure “to provide revenue and for other purposes.” Child lives are lumped together with taxable articles of commerce.

The meat of the present law is contained in this paragraph:

Sec. 1200. That every person (other than a bona fide boy’s or girls’ camping club recognized by the Agricultural Department of a State and of the United States) operating (a) any mine or quarry situated in the United States in which children under the age of sixteen years have been employed or permitted to work during any portion of the taxable year, (b) any mill, cannery, factory, or manufacturin establishment situated in the United States in which children under the age of fourteen years have been employed or permitted to work, or children between the ages of fourteen and sixteen have been employed of permitted to work more than eight hours in any day or more than six days in any week, or after the hour of seven o’clock post meridian, or before the hour of six o’clock ante meridian, during any portion of the taxable year, shall pay for each taxable year in addition to all other taxes imposed by law, an excess tax equivalent to ten per cent of the entire net profits received or accrued for such year from the sale or disposition of the product of such mine, quarry, mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment.

That paragraph is worth studying. The subject dealt with, mind you, is the lives of children—the welfare and the happiness of helpless human beings, driven into factories to give up their playtime, their health, them very lives upon the altar of a greedy commercialism. And the best protection that the government of the United States can offer them is a tax of ten per cent upon the net profits of the plant in which they are employed.

This, callous, unfeeling, blind, and barbarous as it is, might be worth while if the tax measure reached a considerable percentage of children employed. But it does not. Raymond G. Fuller, managing editor of the American Child, in an article in The Review of Reviews, June, 1919, summed up the situation thus:

The Federal law applies only to occupations in which are found but fifteen per cent of the child laborers of America. It affords no protection for the infant hawkers of news and chewing gum on our city streets, none for the truck garden connoisseurs of Pennsylvanian, New Jersey, Ohio, Colorado, and Maryland—none for the sweating cotton pickers of Mississippi, Oklahoma and Texas none for the pallid cash and bundle girls in our department stores, none for the 90000 domestic servants under eighteen years of age who do the menial drudgery in our American homes—none for any of these none for many others. One of the most unfortunate features of juvenile employment on farms and on the streets is its interference with school work.

One would think that those so consumed with greed as to be willing to coin children’s lives into dollars would be glad enough to let the matter stand as it now does. Far from it! A Southern judge has declared even this act unconstitutional, and before his article appeared in print, the supreme court of the United States will probably have passed upon the constitutionality of the law. The child slaves may be deprived of even this left-handed protection.

So far as the Federal Government is concerned, this action of a revenue law is the only fruit of long years of striving idealism upon the part of the National Child Labor Committee and similar organizations throughout the United States. It is society’s reply to these altruistic agencies and to the mothers who bring the child slaves into the world.

The situation, in spite of all that earnest men and women have done to eradicate it, still stands forth as a spectacle of callous governmental indifference and a cold-blooded social horror. It puts once more to mothers of workers the question: “Why bring children into a world that has nothing better to offer than this?”

Child Labor Day

The National Child Labor Committee has designated Sunday, January 25th, as “Child Labor Day” for churches, January 24th, for observance in synagogues, and January 26th for observance in schools and clubs. The Committee, whose offices are at 105 East Twenty-second Street, New York, is asking the cooperation of all religious, social and civic bodies in making the observance of the day widespread in the United States. Literature containing information concerning the movement to wipe out child labor and suggestions for Child Labor Day programs may be had upon application to the Committee.
**Why Bear Children for This?**

**The Folly of Bringing Children** into a world that offers them only killing toil in the days when they should be playing, learning and growing stronger for the normal duties of life, is brought home with irresistible power when one considers the physical and mental effects of child labor upon the first victim—the child itself.

Facts concerning the physical unfitness of American manhood, revealed by army and navy examinations under the Draft Act, show the bitter fruits of child labor. Incidentally they challenge the attention of a government that thus far has denied mothers Birth Control information but has permitted their unwanted offspring to be forced into slavery.

"The States in which more than thirty per cent of the drafted men were rejected for physical reasons are Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Vermont, Maine, New Hampshire, West Virginia, Massachusetts, Delaware, Rhode Island, Kentucky, New Jersey, Nevada, and Louisiana," says Edward N. Copen, Ph.D., secretary for the Northern States for the National Child Labor Committee, in an article in *The Child Labor Bulletin*, February 18. "It is a rather striking fact that the manufacturing State, of New England and the East are those which have made the worst physical showing in the examinations."

Why did they make such a showing?

Raymond G. Fuller, managing editor of *The American Child* puts his finger upon the answer in the following para...
In Pennsylvania the percentage of rejection was fifty-five.

Mr. John A. Lapp, a noted publicist, suggests that this high rate was due to Pennsylvania's not having had an adequate child labor law for some twenty-five years.

If these men were not fit for the crude business of killing other men how fit were they for the higher activities of life? What a ghastly tale of physical weakness ensuing and disease is wrapped up in that fifty-five per cent of rejections in Pennsylvania.

COMMON SENSE AND SCIENTIFIC authorities agree that to deprive a child of its playtime is, in itself a grave injury to its unfolding nature. Psychologically, the child who never plays fails to learn that much of the ch-ld's dream is likely to lack spontaneity, originality, and a healthy mental aggressiveness. The boy or girl who goes to work too early will be a machine—and a very poor machine at that. It is often repeated that a broken will is worse than a broken back, and one of the first fruits of child slavery is broken wills.

Broken wills reflect themselves in broken health and twisted, warped minds. But there are more immediate conditions which evidence themselves frightfully in the physical and mental beings of child workers. There is a class of ailments known as "occupat-onal diseases," and their number is too great for them to be set down here. Types of these diseases are metal and chemical poisonings and forms of tuberculosis induced by dust and fibre. Of the forms of poisoning from which workers suffer, those most familiar to the popular mind are lead and phosphorus. Two significant facts are now widely known about these, and similar forms of illness induced by materials used in manufactures.

First, these diseases take tremendous toll even of health adults, second, the system of the child is far less able to combat such attacks than is the system of the grown person. And poison of this nature are commonly encountered in thousands of industries in which ch-ldren are employed.

The dust of the mines and quarries, the lint of the cotton and silk mills, each take a terrible tribute through tuberculosis and other diseases of the pulmonary tracts.

FLORENCE I. TAYLOR, in her pamphlet "Physical Welfare of Employed Children," published by the National Child Labor Committee, has this to say about the conditions found in Maryland:

"The diseases incident to child labor," says one of the medical examiners formerly employed by the Board, "are due chiefly to the susceptibility of the undeveloped child whose physical stamina is weak and whose power of resistance much less than that of the mature adult. Out of about 1,500 factors of children over fourteen years of age examined in Baltimore nearly 100 diseases and defects due to occupation were isolated. These children were employed in twelve principal industries. Twenty-eight of the 100 children were found to have irritation or inflammation in the respiratory passages due to the inhalation of dust—cotton, hair and broom fibre being the chief offending factor. The most severe form of bronchial irritation was found among the boys employed in cotton mills and one case of cotton fibroid phthisis was discovered. Boys employed at working copper or tin or enamel works suffered from diseases due to chemical fumes and poisons, and one boy who worked next to men employed in soldering showed evidences of soder poison which is almost as acute as lead poison. Children who inhale fumes of oil, turpentine or benzine, aniline stannles, etc., were affected by the chemical toxins and suffered from headache, nausea, and gastric pains. Children employed in but two factories where they inhaled the fumes of hot horn tissue, and children making chocolate candy in candy factories showed signs of similar toxic poisoning.

A large number of children suffered from muscular strain, due to carrying heavy loads. These children were employed mostly in clothing factories, box factories, and canneries.

Two boys developed serious heart disease from being compelled to run or walk long distances delivering messages for a messenger service company. Yet the messenger service has long been defended as an occupation for ch-ldren because it is less confining than work in a factory or store.

"Another great class of occupat-onal effects of which the number is legion among these youthful workers," said the medical examiner, "is the various forms of fatigue or oc- pational neuroses, where the long hours, the heavy strain of labor upon young undeveloped bodies and nerves, especially before the completion of puberty, and the nerve energy spent in constant alertness incident to the working of machines, some of them intricate and dangerous, results in a disorganization of the nervous system."

IN "DISEASES OF OCCUPATION and Vocational Hygiene" (Kober and Hanson), is shown how tuberculosis takes hold on the child who goes to work in industry. On page 749 of the volume is a table showing that among deaths of all persons engaged in industry, of ages ranging from ten to fourteen, tuberculosis causes 4 per cent and pneu monia 8 per cent. Of those from fifteen to nineteen, many of whom must have been working before entering this age period, tuberculosis claims 23 per cent and pneumonia 7 per cent.

Still more tragically illuminating are the figures from the same table applying to women alone. Tuberculosis causes nearly 27 per cent of the deaths of girls who work in any industry between the ages of 10 and 14. It claims some of those who escape during this first period after they pass into the fifteen nineteen period, for then 33 per cent of all the (Continued on page 14)
Large Families and the Steel Strike

An Interview with Joseph D. Cannon, General Organizer for the International Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union

The wage among steel workers has not been sufficient for a man to support himself and a family, even though he works twelve, fourteen, or nineteen hours shifts, seven shifts a week, fifty-two weeks a year—Sundays, Christmas Fourth of July, and ever other day. This results in keeping a large percentage of the steel workers unmarried. Those who do marry manage, by practicing strict economy and foregoing amusement, to get along fairly well until the first child puts in its appearance, increasing the cost of providing for the family, and requiring attention, medical and otherwise, which pile up expenses. To meet this situation the wife takes in a boarder or two, adding to her own labors the work of cooking, washing and cleaning for other men.

In another year or so, there is another baby on the scene. This means another boarder—or two—to meet the climbing expense. So the problem reduces itself to this—no babies, no boarders, many babies, many boarders, still multiplying the problems of home life. And with the latter alternative many babies means neglected babies, overworked mother, and frequently a young widow with a number of babies on hand, who require attention that a man working twelve and often twenty hours a day cannot give. That means another earl) second marriage, and the procession of babies begins all over once more. Which again means more boarders, the second wife following in the footsteps of the first.

Nearly every working family in the steel towns runs a boarding house, thus enabling the United States Steel Corporation to keep down the manufacturing cost of steel without, however, keeping down or lessening the cost of the finished product to the consumer.

In this strike, the women are taking an active interest, working as best they can for its success. Their position being that they want a wage for their husbands sufficient to maintain their families without being compelled to keep boarders—a wage sufficient to enable the boarders to marry and keep families of their own.

What happens to children born into boarding house homes, where the mothers are compelled to cook aash and clean for many men is indicated by a survey of Johnston, Pa., a typical steel town, made by the United State, Department
of Labor. It was found that more than fifty per cent of such children died before they reached their first birthday.

When the strike is called and husbands, boarders and every body else is out of work, labor comes forward nobly to meet the problem of supplying food for these families. There are 2,000,000 people to be fed in the steel strike, and the response to the needs of the strikers is wonderful. The problem is huge, but it is being met—in a way.

From Woman's Standpoint

By Margaret Sanger

From the Woman's Standpoint the steel strike, like all strikes, is a struggle within a struggle. When the men quit work to force higher wages, shorter hours, and better working conditions the women must go through that battle with them. But they go through it in loyalty to their husbands rather than in any willed hope of materially bettering their own situations. Whether the men win or lose, the contest with the employer, woman's battle to obtain necessities and comforts for her children and herself must go on unceasingly.

It will always be so while she brings unlimited families into the world.

Labor's deepest problem today is not the result, primarily, of lack of organization nor of exploitation. It is true that labor must organize more closely. It is true that it suffers from exploitation. It is true that the modern industrial system is breaking labor upon a merciless wheel. But it is also true that the unwanted battalions of babies, springing from the wombs of workers' wives, make all these hard conditions possible without these children, who constitute the burdens and the real danger of the workers, the workers would be a compact body they could not be exploited, and the task of producing the world's necessities and comforts would not—could not—be the cruel ordeal that it is today.

If the workers applied the principle of limitation, exemplified in their labor organizations, to their families, they would have long ago solved labor's problems and solved them in a way that would have made the earth a much happier place in which to live. Labor has won all that it has attained through the principle of limitation, but because it has gone on bringing huge families into existence it has produced its own competitors, its own strike breakers, its own chains. While it continues to produce these, it will not be able to cope with organized capital—it will not be able to bring about any great permanent betterment of its situation.

So far as the woman is concerned, if another baby arrives every year or two, strike victories mean very little advantage to her or her children. Rising prices quickly eat up the increase of wages won by the husband, or if he has a small margin left, he spends it outside the home for his own pleasure or comfort. This is inevitable under the present conditions.
A Matter of Life and Death

By L. L. Pruette

ROOM IN A TENEMENT HOUSE in southwest Chicago. A broken chair and a stool are placed, one on each side of the rough table which occupies the center of the room. A woman is seated in the chair, her head resting on the table. Her dress is nondescript, her hair matted. From time to time she is shaken by a hard sob that seems to rack her body. In one corner three small children are quarreling among them selves. As the curtain rises the older girl slaps the baby, a boy, who dodges and whimpers to himself. The woman does not move. In another corner on a piece of mattress lies a man sleeping heavily. There occurs a commotion outside and two children scampers in, shrieking, "Mother, here's Miss Gordon, here's Miss Gordon, Mother." Young woman, a settlement worker, enters. She is well but quietly dressed in a dark suit and hat. She carries a handbag, which she lays on the table.

MISS GORDON Well, Mary, how are you and the children? (She notices the man in the corner.) Oh'

WOMAN (Does not rise but sits looking at the girl a little sheepishly.) I guess—I guess—we're all right, miss, thank ye, miss.

MISS GORDON You were doing so well when I was here last that I haven't felt it necessary to come back any more. However, as I was near here I thought I would stop a moment. I did not expect to see you crying. (Sits)

WOMAN 'Taint nothin' miss, only Jake—

MISS GORDON Your husband? (turns to look at sleeping man)

WOMAN Yes'm—that's him, over there. He come back right after you was here—

MISS GORDON But you promised me you would not take him back. Oh, Mary

WOMAN (hangs her head as if ashamed.) You wouldn't understand—you ain't never been married.

MISS GORDON And after we had gotten you that pension—I told you it would stop if you went living with your husband again.

WOMAN Yes'm, it's stopped.

MISS GORDON (considers, then seems to decide to make the best of it.) Well, I'm sorry, but perhaps things will be better in the end. If Jake could get a good job and—

WOMAN (eagerly.) He's a goin' to get a job, but seems like it's kinder hard now for him to place himself. But he is tryin', miss. An' he don't drink quite so much. An' I can work for a while longer, anyway—

MISS GORDON (she has been thoughtfully studying the man lying prone in the corner. His heavy breathing is quite noticeable in the stillness.) Then what is troubling you so? You can work for a while longer—Oh, Mary, do you mean—

WOMAN (catches her breath in a sob and nods simply.)

The young settlement worker is plainly perturbed. She pats the sleeve of the woman.

WOMAN I can't have another one. Miss, I just can't. Won't you help me so as it won't come? Miss Kaslosky has so—medicine she's goin' to give me—

MISS GORDON Not the "bitter apple." Mary

WOMAN Yes'm, the bitter apple.

MISS GORDON But this is terrible, Mary. I can't let you do such a thing. The bitter apple is killing the women around here. I have just sent the woman right above you to the hospital—she will probably never be well—

WOMAN I don't care. I'd sooner die than have another baby. It's likely won't hurt me none to take the medicine. Anyhow, I won't have another one. That's the way all the women around here is feeling.

MISS GORDON But you will be committing a crime—you have no right to stop that life that you have created. It's wrong. I tell you.

THE DOOR OPENS AND A GIRL nearly grown comes in. She is "made up" somewhat wildly, and her clothes seem to be trying to achieve a style which might be called "chic." She starts to speak, but her mother fiercely motions her to be silent. She puts the bottle on the table, and with a shrug, goes out. The woman snatches up the bottle.

MISS GORDON What is that? Give it to me! I cannot let you take it.

WOMAN (sullenly quiet, holding the bottle tightly.)

MISS GORDON Mary, don't you know that you will be committing a crime? It's wrong, I tell you, wrong!

WOMAN I don't care. I don't care. Spose it ain't wrong for me to have another baby, when I can't feed the ones I got—spose it ain't wrong to have another one when my boy's in jail now on account of the no count gang he got in with here in this tough neighborhood. Spose it ain't wrong to bring another life here when I got five children in the cemetery now. An' my girl's on the streets now, trying to get things every girl wants that she can't get no other way. Oh, Gawd, I ain't care.ing what's right. I ain't goin' to have another one.

MISS GORDON (snatches at the bottle.) Give it to me. It might kill you.

WOMAN I don't care, I don't care. (She holds the girl off in a vise.) You ain't very strong, miss, you know.

THE GIRL IS THOROUGHLY FRIGHTENED. She runs to the man in the corner and tries to rouse him. She shakes him frantically and pleads: "Jake, Jake, wake up. Jake, your wife—oh, why won't you ever wake up?" While this is going on, the woman deliberately uncorks the bottle, smells it, then turns it to her lips and drains it. The girl turns just in time to see her and cries out "Mary, don't!" When she has reached her the woman is defiantly replacing the bottle on the table.

WOMAN You needn't try to wake him, miss, he ain't slept off his drunk yet...
Miss Gordon  But I must wake him. I can’t leave you like this, and I must get a doctor. (She picks up the bottle. A look of horror comes into her eyes.) You took it all? Oh, I must hurry. (She rushes out, leaving her bag on the table.)

The woman has seated herself at the table, her face toward the audience. She holds her head in her hand, and stares steadily into space. Once she turns to look at the three children quarreling in the corner, then she turns slowly for a long look at the man on the floor. Her head sinks slowly until at last it falls on her arm, her hands clenched in front of her, her body sagged across the table. The man in the corner moves with a grunt and an oath. Once he raises a red, bloated face to stare around the room, then drops back heavily again. The baby comes across and pulls at the woman’s dress. After pulling a few times he goes back to the corner. The doctor flies open and Miss Gordon and the doctor enter.

Miss Gordon  Oh, I’m so glad I ran into you. (She runs to the inert figure on the table, then shrinks back.) The doctor bends over in a brief examination. He shakes his head. You mean—she’s dead? (The doctor nods.)

The three children have drawn near in curiosity, and several others are peeping in the door. The older girl slaps the baby, who has gotten in her way. He dodges and lurches to himself. Miss Gordon draws him into her arms. The doctor places a handkerchief over the dead woman’s face. The man in the corner turns with a grunt. He lifts his head and stares, looking dazedly at the group, then sinks into stupor again.

Curtain

Why Bear Children for This?

(Continued from page 10)

In the period from twenty to twenty-four, many of those who have gotten through the first two periods pay the penalty for their enforced servitude during tenderer years, for then the death rate from tuberculosis is 39.8 per cent of the total number of deaths. Nearly 40 per cent—two of every five deaths.

This table tells all too well what becomes of factory children. The Federal government, in an investigation some years since, discovered that in the cotton mills of the South the death rate among employed boys was twice as high as that of boys who were not employed in cotton mills. Moreover, the death rate among girls under sixteen in cotton mills was relatively higher than that of the boys.

Nor is this all. Death brings a merciful release. Its vic-tim does not have to go through life with diminished vitality, stunted brain, suppressed instincts, wrecked nerves, or a crooked spine. There are no statistics to tell the dead weight of living human misery wrought by child labor. There is no computation of the social loss in ruined lives, perpetuating themselves and their miseries for many generations.

Let there be no mistake about it. The result of child labor is national and race wreckage—noting more nor less.

And since, in spite of long years of agitation, lobbying, legislation, and supreme court decisions, child labor still exists, what shall be done? I suggest the segregation of the pitiful product of these child-breaking plants. The race of tomorrow has its rights. We at least make a pretense of segregating the misane, the feeble-minded and the prostitute. Is it true that prostitution, like child labor, is considered an evil—by some a necessary evil—and we lack the national courage to strike deep at its roots? But we do segregate pros-titution as much as possible. Why not segregate this other pitiful wreckage, the human product of child labor?

Brutal? Unjust? Yes—but more logical and neither as brutal nor as unjust as breaking these lives in the first place. At least we might keep the curse from multiplying itself into the third and fourth generations.

Better and saner still, however, is for the mothers of these child slaves to take the matter into their own hands. When all is said and done, the only cure for child labor is birth control. Child labor will end when mothers refuse to bring forth children doomed to the labor market before they are born.
The Need of Child Labor
The Greater Crime

By Miriam Allen de Ford

I SOMETIMES WONDER WHAT experiences of life, or what human decency and kindness, the people can have who hold up their hands in holy horror at the idea of Birth Control. Ever since I was a young girl, I have seen case after case of unwanted children, worn out mothers, tragedy, disease, affliction—all because an ignorant man and woman "didn’t know what to do."

My father was a physician, and I have had forced upon my consciousness one instance after another of this lamentable situation. Here is just one case—a man dead in a hospital for consumption, his wife, a little, frail, neurotic girl, now eight months pregnant, without means of support for herself or the baby. If that child lives—as humane feeling must hope it will not—what are its chances of health and happiness?

When I left college I went on a big city newspaper. Here—a "story" a day—were more and ever more examples of the need of Birth Control. A young couple are married, their first child shows the atherto unthought of syphilitic taint. The frenzied mother kills herself and the child, the man is left to a lifetime of agonized remorse. Of course, they should have not have been married, but still should they have had children?

Once I was secretary to a noted specialist. I shall never forget when one day he paced the floor of his outer office—he was a gentle, kindly soul—and finally cried out, "I just haven’t the courage to go in and tell that man what the real trouble is with his daughter. Oh, there never should have been a daughter in that family!"

FOR A WHILE I DID SOCIAL WORK with the girls on probation from a big reform school. Twenty per cent of those girls had babies!—every one of the mothers under twenty, some as young as fourteen or fifteen. To be sure, perhaps these poor children-products of slums and mill towns—should never have "sinned", but why must all these helpless babies suffer for them? I stood by the side of the coffin of one of these babies—it had died at three weeks of gonorrheal infection—and I thought perhaps it was the happiest of them all.

My present position entails interviews with a great many men and women of the working class. Once a girl whom I was questioning happened to mention that she was one of fourteen children.

"All living?" I asked.

"Oh, no, only four of us are living. My mother died when the youngest was horn. I am the oldest, and I was seventeen then."

Regarding all these cases as exceptions, if you will, or as calling for some other remedy than Birth Control. But is there one adult American who has never known a woman grown old before her time with constant child bearing, a man chained to a soul killing monotony of labor to support too many children, a child who exclaimed—as one acquaintance of mine did, many years ago "We are all accidents!" Here I stand, an accident!"

God forbids that any child of mine should ever be able to say that dreadful thing truthfully.

WHEN I WAS IN HIGH SCHOOL I had a friend who was the admiration of us all. Lottie could play, act, sing, paint, write, do everything better than we. She was effervescing with animal spirits, one of the most charming and vibrant personalities I have ever met. Where is she now? She has been married seven years, she has five children and another coming. Two died at a few months of age. In the weary, stupid, slattern woman whose nerves and temper are all awry, who alternately slaps and spoils her children, with achmg heart I defy anyone who knew her to discover the old Lottie.

I used to say that if I were ever tempted to marry, I should call on Lottie, and that would cure it! Fortunately for my happiness, she was three thousand miles away when that temptation did assail me, and so I yielded. But there is no danger of my falling into the slog of despond which is drowning her—I married a man of the twentieth, not the eighteenth century. Whether or not we shall ever have a child depends on circumstances beyond the control of either of us. But until then I am free to do my own work, made more worthwhile through the joys of love and companionship, without the haunting fear of unwanted maternity—of thrusting the burden of life on another human being, without being able to guarantee it at least a fair chance in a decent world.

AND WHY IS IT "AGAINST THE LAW" to convey to others the information which I am fortunate enough to possess? Primarily to keep this knowledge from the working class, so that church and state may keep their grip upon them, and capitalism be sure of plenty of factory slaves in the next generation. Legislation on love, arising from prudent and diseased minds, would be funny if it were not so maddening.

We shudder at the European "war babies." But when we practically force the helpless, overburdened women of the poor to have constant and undesired children, or else forego all the natural human longings and happiness what are we doing? But producing "war babies" for the struggle of industrial competition?

"Cellbacy in a normal being," I once heard a celebrated lecturer say, "short of a great precedent moral or physical catastrophe, is a crime." Granted, but the bearing of indisputable and handicapped children is in the sight of the future an even greater one!
The Malthusian Doctrine and its Modern Aspects
By C V Drysdale, DSc, MIEE

(Concluded)

BEFORE LEAVING THE VERIFICATIONS of the over population doctrine, there are two others which are of interest, and which help to dispose of some of the current fallacies.

A most striking confirmation of the Malthusian Darwinian theory and refutation of the idea that the food supply could be easily increased is given by the fact that the sea, which is the great reservoir of all the soluble waste products of the earth, is practically destitute of two out of the three most essential nutritive constituents, viz., nitrogen and phosphorus. For countless ages the rain has washed out the soluble constituents of the soil (at the Rothamstead experimental farm it was found that thirty-seven pounds of nitrogen per acre were washed away annually from an unmanured fallow), which have drained through the rivers into the sea, waste products of the inhabitants of our cities has contributed immense quantities of nutritious material to the sea. If there were no pressure of life upon subsistence, the ocean could be a vast store of soluble and available nutritive material as it is of salt. But if the Darwinian doctrine of the struggle for existence is true, it follows that the animal and vegetable life of the sea must always be pressing against the means of subsistence, and that they are hungrily waiting to absorb any nourishment as fast as it arrives.

One evening, a few years ago, I was speculating on Henry George's ingenious "disproofs" of the Malthusian doctrine, one of which is that as plants and the lower animals reproduce more rapidly than man, food tends to increase faster than population, and it was obvious that the neglected factor in the question was the amount of nutritive material available. The question of the productive capabilities of the land was obscured by questions of human tenures, differences of soil, methods of cultivation, holding land out of cultivation, etc. But the sea is not private property, it requires no cultivation, and it is nearly uniform in composition. There is nothing to prevent the fish increasing up to their utmost capacity, and they are so prolific that, if nourishment were available, the whole ocean would be a solid block of fish in the course of a few years. And yet it is common knowledge among fishermen that fish are getting more difficult rather than more easy to get, quite apart from any question as to market or distribution.

It was abundantly clear, therefore, that the explanation was almost certainly to be found in the entire absorption of all available nutriment in the sea by the fish, and that if this were true, one or more of the essential constituents of life should be missing from sea water.

Fortunately, a book giving the analysis of sea water was at hand, and I looked it up. Here is the analysis of sea water in the English Channel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>Grams per gallon of 70,000 grams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chloride of Sodium</td>
<td>1964 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride of Potassium</td>
<td>53 855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride of Magnesium</td>
<td>256 655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromide of Magnesium</td>
<td>204 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulphate of Magnesium</td>
<td>16 069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulphate of Lime</td>
<td>98 462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbonate of Lime</td>
<td>2 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lime and Ammonia</td>
<td>traces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expectation derived from the Malthusian Darwinian doctrine was instantly confirmed. Not even in the English Channel, which receives the drainage from the Thames and the Seine, are there more than "traces" of nitrogenous material, and there is not even a trace of phosphates.

To those who are able to grasp wide Issues, the significance of this simple fact is immense. It kills with one blow the attractive "plenty for all, if we were only properly distributed" theory. It shows that in the ocean, which covers three fourths of the earth's surface, or about 140,000,000 square miles, to an average depth of over two miles, that there is a complete bar to the increase of human food, and that Henry George's contention that the rapid reproduction of plants and animals did away with the necessity for the control of human reproduction was the most superficial nonsense. If fertilizing material is limited, it matters very little whether the whole of the land is cultivated or not. It may quite well be that a greater total produce can be raised with erately intensive culture, i.e., by employing the fertilizing material over a smaller area, which can be more conveniently worked. This does not mean the least conflict with my statement last month that intensive culture is frequently delusive and dangerous, as this generally means working on very small areas with concentrated fertilizers and specialized varieties.

The land which is "held out of cultivation" is not absorbing fertilizing material, and it is contributing something through the washing away of its slowly forming soluble biogen into the sea to increase the supply of fish.

Naturally, this reasoning is not intended to justify neglect of agriculture or unjust land tenure. But it does show that...
such questions are of secondary rather than primary importance, and that it is quite possible in these days that the scientific utilization of the total and limited supply of fertilizing material over half, or even a quarter, of the area of a country, may give a greater total produce than general cultivation of the whole land.

Finally, this example is an excellent one of the justification of the apparently bombastic claim in the last article that none of the great truths of sociology can be understood unless the Malthusian Darwinian doctrine is kept constantly in mind.

The absence of nutrient in sea water was a pure theoretical deduction from that doctrine, and its verification was almost a matter of course.

The war, which has now lasted for three years, has taught us a number of lessons in sociology which will require some time to be brought into perspective and to be properly understood. But one undoubtedly blessing which has proceeded from it is that it has brought the food question into prominence, and has shown that the old confidence in the possibilities of food production was unwarranted. Within a few months of the institution of our blockade of Germany, the committee presided over by Prof. Eltzbacher issued a report in which the needs of the people and the possibilities of supplying them were dealt with, and, although political considerations no doubt caused them to make their report as optimistic as possible and greatly to underestimate the requirements for healthy existence, the difficulty of making Germany self-supporting was made obvious. The importance of the question of available fertilizing material, so universally ignored in agricultural writings, was also appreciated.

Since that time Germany has been able to drain the resources of Belgium and Roumania, and yet her distress for food is certainly severe.

The German counter attack by the submarines forced Great Britain in its turn to study the food question, and our Royal Society report (published in July, 1916) gave for the first time an estimate of the amounts of the chief food constituents available for human consumption before the war. The conclusion was that in the five year period, 1909-13 inclusive, the average annual amount of home and imported food available, after deduction for feeding of animals, etc., was equivalent to 1,438,000 tonnes of protein, 1,651,000 tonnes of fat, and 7,262,003 tonnes of carbohydrates, giving an energy value of 51,024,000 calories. Taking the mean population of the United Kingdom during the period as 45,200,000, and 77% of this as equivalent in adults, the daily ration per man, if uniformly distributed, was given as 113 grammes of protein, 130 grammes of fat, and 571 grammes of carbohydrates, or an energy value of 4,009 calories. Compared with the required ration as given in the report, viz., 100 grammes of protein, 100 grammes fat, and 500 grammes of carbohydrate, equivalent to 3,400 calories, there was not only sufficient, but a margin for waste.

This report, however, like the German one, is open to criticism, and has been strongly criticized upon medical authority. In the British Medical Journal of 12th May, 1917, Dr. M. S. Pembrey, M.A., Lecturer in Physiology at Guy's Hospital, gave data as to the recognized requirements under various conditions. There seems to be no doubt that the proted ration ought to be larger than the above. Atwater's figures for a man in moderate work, which have been generally accepted, requiring 125 grammes of protein, Dr. Pembrey gave examples of actual rations the British army minimum in South Africa containing 138 grammes of protein, and the U.S.A. army rations 157 grammes, while the Scottish convicts on hard labor (which is taken as "moderate labor") receive 173 grammes, and the English convicts 177 grammes. It is hardly likely that these rations are very excessive, so that the Royal Society's new standard of 100 grammes appears to be decidedly below the mark, and to have been adopted, like the German one, to make a better showing.

Even on the moderate standard, 125 grammes of protein, Atwater's available ration of 113 grammes given by the Royal Society report is ten per cent short.

But the figures are open to criticism on another ground. The available ration has been obtained by deducting certain estimated allowances from the actual food supply, which is much the same as if a man were to estimate his bank balance from his income and his estimated expenditure. Everyone knows that this is almost certain to give far too high a result, and it is pretty certain that the Royal Society report has materially underestimated the available ration in this way. No allowance appears to have been made for unavoidable waste or for the feeding of domestic animals. Had the estimate been checked by considering the actual budgets of families of various incomes, it is highly probable that there would have been a considerable discrepancy. According to the well known figures of Prof. Bowley, there were before the war 320,000 adult men earning less than 15s per week, 640,000 from 15s to 20s, 1,600,000 from 20s to 25s, and 1,680,000 from 25s to 30s, or a total of four millions (representing, with their families, probably about half the population of the country) having a maximum wage of 30s per week. The investigations of Rowntree and of Mrs. Pembrey Reeves showed conclusively that, on the basis of the prewar prices, the majority of these people would have deficiencies of protein in their diet varying from 20 to 40 per cent, so that, unless we assume great excess amongst the remainder (an assumption certainly unwarranted in the bulk of the middle classes), there must have been a considerable deficiency in the average ration of the whole country.

Although, therefore, both the German and British reports claim that there was sufficient, and indeed a small surplus, of subsistence for all before the war, their own figures distinctly indicate a deficiency of nitrogenous and proted food, and this deficiency is almost certainly less than the actual one. In any case, a valuable start has been made in the compilation of these figures, and they will, no doubt, lead in future to a more scientific treatment of the food problem.

Experience since these reports were issued has shown that they were certainly too optimistic. Germany has not only made strenuous efforts to provide her own food on the lines of the Eltzbacher report, but she has drained Belgium and Roumania, and has made great efforts towards the electrical
production of nitrates. But with all this, the deficiency of food appears to be terrible. And, as regards the world as a whole, the reports of the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome and others show a considerable decrease in the production of cereals.

The New Statesman of August 25th contained an article, entitled "A World Famine," in which it says, "In spite of frantic efforts to maintain and to increase production, the aggregate wheat harvests of the world have been year by year falling behind the needs of the growing population."

And it goes on to claim that for several years after the war "there will not be enough to go round." The implication in the article is that this short-ge is due principally to the conversion of thirty millions of peasants into soldiers and fifteen million men and women into munition workers. But this can hardly be an adequate explanation. The population of the world is now nearly two thousand millions, of which about half, or one thousand millions, would be adult men and women. The removal of forty five millions for war work is therefore not a very large factor, and this has largely been counterbalanced by the employment of women and machinery in agriculture, and by the greater attention and effort given to it.

On the other hand, Sir William Crookes pointed out in 1858 that the question of the world's supply of nitrates was becoming a serious one, and his prognostications have been justified by the deficiency of potatoes revealed in the above report, and the anxiety which the German authorities have shown concerning the supply of nitrogenous fertilizers. And, as we pointed out in The Malthusian of June, 1916, this difficulty has been enormously increased by the destruction of nitrates in the war. The great bulk of the explosives employed are nitrogen compounds averaging about 14 or 15 per cent of nitrogen, so that a tone of average explosive means about 300 lbs of fixed nitrogen which is "dissociated" or rendered useless when exploded. According to Huxley, an average adult man requires 5.5 kilos (or about 12 lbs.) of fixed nitrogen annually, so that each ton of explosive takes away the whole nitrogenous substance of twenty five adult persons. How much explosive has been used in the war, we cannot say (probably something like half the weight of the projectiles fired), but it must be many millions of tons, and this would amply explain the reduced harvests, without any mention of labor.

If this be the explanation, as appears likely, it shows (as we have contended for many years) that the available nitrogen is the true crux of the problem, and that there is a very definite limit to population, those who talk of the possibilities of agriculture have entirely missed. The available nitrogen will increase by solar action, agriculture, and economic action, but only at a slow rate, and the world population will only be able to increase slowly with it.

If our contention is correct that the world's population is normally limited by the food supply, it appears almost certain that the reduced harvests must have been attended by severe famine in the poorer countries like India and China.

The censorship probably prevents our hearing of this, but the fact that the question of Indian Home Rule is being considered during the war, and that the Secretary for India finds it advisable to take a journey there at present, is at least significant. When the curtain is lifted, we fear it may reveal a famine such as has not occurred for many years.

THE END

The Campaign Against Child Labor

(Continued from page 7)

attendance laws, continuation school laws, and provisions for improved school administration were passed in many states. Several states created children's code commissions for the purpose of studying and coordinating existing laws concerning children—child labor laws, school laws, health laws, provisions for recreation and the care of delinquent and dependent children, and provision for mothers' pensions. Alabama created a Child Welfare Department to administer the children's provisions in its laws.

Much remains to be done, however, before the children of America will have attained a full measure of protection. By far the greatest number of children listed as gainfully employed are found in occupations not affected by the federal law and of which most of the state statutes take no cognizance. In the 1910 census, 1,423,530 children are listed working on farms. An uncountable number of children are working on city streets. Yet only twenty two states

(Continued on next page)
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Birth Control Organizations

IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

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

COUNTRIES

ENGLAND (1877)—The Malthusian League, Secretary, Dr.
Bunnie Dunlop, 48 Broadway, Westminster, London, SW.

HOLLAND (1885)—Dr. Nieuw Malthusianische Bond Secretary,
Dr. J. Duijkers, 9 Verhulststraat, Den Haag. Periodical, Het
Gelijkom Huisgezin.

GERMANY (1889)—Sozial Harmonische Verein Secretary, Herr

FRANCE (1895)—G. Hardy, 29 Rue Pixerécourt, Pans. Pen
Generaletters, Le Malthusian.

SPAIN (1904)—Liga Española de Regeneración Humana. Secre-
tary, Don Luis Bullí, Calle Provenza, 177, Prat la Bar-

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

SWITZERLAND (1908)—Groupe Malthusienne Secretary, Valentin

BOHEMIA AND AUSTRIA (1901)—Secretary, Michael Kachka, 1164

PORTUGAL—E. Silva, Junior, L da Memoria, 46 t/c, Lisboa.
Periodical, Faç e Céberade.

BRAZIL (1905)—Secção Brasileira de Propaganda, Secretario,
Manuel Moscova, Rua D'Entro Præs 29, San Pablo, Antonio
Dominguez, Rua Veracruz de Morarazao 25, Rio de Janeiro.

CURA (1907)—Secção de Propaganda Secretary, Jose Guardi-
ola, Empredoado 14, Havana.

SWEDEN (1911)—Sällskapet for Humanitar Barnvårdsring, Pres-
ident Mr. Hinke Berggren, Vanadisvagen 15 Stockholm, Va.

ITALY (1913)—Lega Neo Malthusiana Italiana Via Lamarmora 22,

AFRICA—Ligue Neo Malthusienne, Maison du Peuple, 10 Rampe
Magenta, Alger.

MEXICO (1918)—Mexican Birth Control League, Secretaries
Mr. and Mrs. Lina A. E. Gale, P.O. Box 618, Mexico, D. F.
Periodicals Gale's (English) and El Comunista
(Spanish).

IN THE UNITED STATES

ANN ARBOR, MICH.—Mrs. L. A. Rhodes, 1318 Forest Court.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.—Dr. F. E. Lucas, 405 Central Street.

CHICAGO, ILL.—BIRTH CONTROL LEAGUE
Secretary, Mrs. B. E. Page, 512 Langwood Ave., Glencoe, Ill.

CLEVELAND, OHIO—Birth Control League of Ohio
Mrs. W. A. Newman, 1801 Asbury Avenue, Secretary.

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

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

HARRISBURG, PA.—George A. Herling, 1804 Penn Street.

LOS ANGELES, CAL.—Dr. T. Percival Gerson.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.—The Minneapolis Birth Control League
Mrs. Helen C. Thomas, 1208 Vincent Avenue, N., Secretary.

NEW YORK

The Committee of One Thousand Dr. Ira S. Wise, 220 W.
97th Street, chairman.

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

The National Birth Control League 200 Avenue.

Mrs. Maxwell Hyde.

The Women’s Committee of One Hundred Mrs. Anos Pin
john, chairman, 9 East 61st Street.

Voluntary Parenthood League, 206 Broadway.

MARY WARE

Dennett, Director.

PITTSBURGH, PA.—The Birth Control League of Western Penn.
sylvania Rita F. Steen, 924 Mellon St., Pittsburgh, Pa.,
Secretary.

PORTLAND, ORE.—The Birth Control League of Portland M.H.
J. Oatman, 549 Fifth Street, secretary.

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

ROCHESTER, N. Y.—A. L. Howser, 227 Harlem Avenue.

St. Louis, Mo.—Grace Anderson, Superintendent of Municipal
Nurses, City Dispensary, 11th and Chestnut Streets.

ST. PAUL, M. INN.—The Minnesota State Birth Control League
Secretary Mr. Grace M. Keller, 250 Vernon Ave. St. Paul.

ST. PAUL, M. INN.—The Minneapolis State Birth Control League
Secretary, Miss Grace M. Keller, 250 Vernon Ave. St. Paul.

SEATTLE, WASH.—The Seattle With 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 West, 1926 New Hampshire Ave.,
President.