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Dr Rutgers is dead. Only those who have been in close contact with the Birth Control movement in Europe, and who have come into contact with the wonderful personality of the veteran leader, can realize the loss to the world, and especially to women, when Dr Rutgers passed from the scene. About twenty years ago, Dr Rutgers gave up his general medical work and devoted himself entirely to Birth Control—both to spreading the idea and to carrying out practical work. For fifteen years, he labored among the poor, and especially among the poorer mothers, bringing hope and relief into thousands of homes. At the same time he continued enthusiastically his scientific researches, the results of which he published in successive books. As age crept on him, he found himself unequal to the double work, and withdrew from active service, but continued to pour into his books the wealth of his knowledge and the light of his idealism. He was indeed a pioneer in the great and beneficent revolution in sexual ideals of which Havelock Ellis is one of the chief prophets. If women could realize what Dr Rutgers' work has meant for their liberation and happiness, every woman in the world would desire to lay a flower on his grave.

SOUND common-sense characterized many of the statements concerning popular-omadne by Professor Henry Pratt Fairchild in the paper he read on August 15, and in his contribution to the Round Table discussion, at the Institute of Politics at Williamstown. His attitude of facing the problem squarely, and suggesting remedies came as a ray of hope after the outspoken pessimism of Rear-Admiral W. L. Rodgers, who could see no future for the nations, but the cycle of ever-increasing population on followed by aggressive wars. In which the stronger nations would so far exterminate the weaker ones as to make room for their own swarming hordes. Professor Fairchild, like Admiral Rodgers, saw the danger of increasing population, but he faced the problem from its two aspects—that of immigration and that of natural increase—and urged the bringing of population increase under the control of the reason and the will. Unless this is done, and only a small beginning has as yet been made, he questioned whether man would be able to escape disaster in the near future. But, instead of aggressive war by the strong nations, Professor Fairchild urged "a moral doctrine for the world" by which all nations should undertake to solve their own problems of over-population and immigration by rational measures of control, instead of by aggression on the rights of other peoples. "One thing is unquestionably true," he added, "that the old idea of movement as an escape from the evils of over-population must be definitely eliminated from national ideas. It must be definitely understood among all the nations of the world, not only that forcible acquisition of external territory can no longer be tolerated, but that the trans-shipment of population into other territories, against the will of the recipient people, is a violation of international ethics."

In Professor Fairchild's opinion, immigration into the United States does not greatly increase population. What it does is chiefly to slow down natural increase among Americans who have reached a much higher standard of comfort and intelligence than the incoming immigrants. The competition of these aliens, with lower standards of living, he characterized as "cruel, bitter and unfair" to American labor. It had resulted, in the decades before the war, in the slow but sure decline of the general level of comfort among the unskilled workers, and it was inevitable that the American people, who checked their own increase in order to be compelled to sacrifice their stand-
ands, should resent a decrease in comfort for the sake of adding a certain number of foreigners to the population "A society which has an intelligent interest in the well-being of its people," he stated, "would concern itself not with the increase of numbers of those not yet conceived, but with the provision of guaranty for their well-being, as well as for that of the present generation." After a society has reached a certain point in its development, it added, "it has to consider whether the products of its industries are to be devoted to maintaining a larger population on the same or lower standard of living, or to providing a higher standard of living for a population of the same size. It cannot do both." That Birth Control was the remedy to which he looked for a check on the disastrous growth of population he made quite clear. "No one will question," he added, "the obligation which a society owes to people who have been born, but to those who have never been conceived, it owes no obligation that they should be born."

A clipping which was sent to us by a friend on the Pacific Coast suggests a method of helping the cause of Birth Control which we should be glad to see generally adopted. This clipping is from one of the great San Francisco daily newspapers. It bears the headline "Examiner Wins Praise for News Section" Then follows a short letter praising the improvement and display of one of the local News Sections of the paper. "Also," the letter winds up, "as an individual, long interested in the work of the American Birth Control League, permit me to express my appreciation for the ungarbled accounts you have printed from time to time, of the motives of this organization." The whole of the letter is "boxed," and is well displayed at the head of the column. People are always ready to find fault with the daily press, but it is rare for them to express their pleasure and gratitude when these are due. Editors and newspaper men are human, and that they appreciate recognition of their efforts to serve the public is shown by the treatment accorded this little letter. In general, the press has dealt not only fairly but generously with the Birth Control movement and has given it publicity which was essential to the spread of the movement. If our readers would watch for opportunities to express their recognition of fair and open-minded reporting of Birth Control meetings and activities, the result would be more and better publicity for the movement.

In almost all the attacks on Birth Control made by Roman Catholic speakers, abortion is confused with the prevent-once conception. The difference between the killing of human beings after they have come into existence and the guard-

ing against the very beginnings of life has been so clear and unmistakable that it looks like deliberate malice rather than abysmal ignorance that the two should be still identified. Yet when Dr. John C. Coyle, of New York City, spoke on the subject at a joint session of the Central Society and the Woman's National Catholic Union in Allentown, Penn., on August 26, he repeated this unpardonable insinuation. He urged that when once God permits "the formation and growth of a human being, his will must not meet with human opposition. The child unborn, as well as born must have its chance." He then went on to speak of the killing of unwanted children by savages and pagans, evidently with the Intention of leading his hearers to class the advocates of Birth Control with the slayers of children, and added that it was "as wrong to prevent an innocent life from coming into being as to destroy an innocent life being." This last sentence is surely a terrible condemnation of his own conduct and of all the priests, monks and nuns of the R.C. Church, for what are they doing but continually preventing thousands of innocent lives from coming into being? If it is true that it is wrong to prevent an innocent life from coming into being, it makes no difference whether this prevention is by celibacy, abstemiousness or any other means of prevention. "It is the fact that a life has been prevented that Dr. Coyle condemned as a sin. What then about himself?"

When Judge Crane rendered his decision in the Brownsville Clinic case, appealed by Margaret Sanger, he opened a door to much useful work for Birth Control. The case was decided in 1918, and in pronouncing the opinion Judge Crane gave a rendering of Section 1145 that brings both liberation and responsibility to the medical profession. The importance of the decision lies in the interpretation of Section 1145, exempting physicians from the prohibitions of Section 1142 when the prohibited articles or instruments were used "for the cure or prevent-once disease." The exception, said Judge Crane, is broad enough to protect the physician who in good faith gives such help or advice to a married woman to cure or prevent disease. He then gave a definition of disease from Webster's dictionary which covers pain, sickness, illness, disorder. It is under this opinion that a Bureau of Clinical Research, under a capable and fully qualified doctor, was opened January 1, 1923, in connection with our Headquarters at 104 Fifth Avenue, New York. This Bureau has now become the Mecca of sick and suffering mothers, who are examined and given scientific instruction in Birth Control. The many cases which do not come under Judge Crane's decision are still compelled to wait for an amendment to the law.
Daedalus or Icarus:

IS SCIENCE TO BE MAN'S SERVANT OR HIS MASTER?

By Marcolm H Bissell

Prophets are said to be without honor in their own country, but anyone who gives us a picture of the future can always be sure of attention at least. This in some measure accounts for the popularity of Mr Wells' recent books and for the numerous attempts on the part of other writers to tell us the kind of world our descendants will live in. One man's guess may be as good as another's when it comes to describing the civilization of a hundred or a thousand years hence, yet too often the wish is father to the thought, and the enthusiastic believer in this or that panacea rides his hobby to his heart's content, without much regard to actual probabilities or to the fundamental facts of human nature. It is therefore particularly significant to encounter a book in which a judicial point of view is maintained throughout, in spite of the startling and almost unbelievable suggestions which it contains.

Such a book is Daedalus, or Science and the Future, by J. B. S. Haldane of Cambridge University. It contains less than one hundred pages, but no book of recent times is more likely to arouse the reader to vigorous reaction. Whether one agrees or disagrees with the author's conclusions—and few are likely to agree with them in toto—he is sure to receive a thorough mental shaking-up before he has read many pages. The conservative and the adherent of tradition will be stirred to fury by the ruthlessness with which their cherished ideals are handled, even the radical will find himself almost gasping at the boldness of the picture Mr Haldane has drawn. One can imagine the scornful wrath with which Mr Chesterton would review the book. But whatever one's reactions, he will be stirred to thought if he is capable of it. And he will also be entertained, for the book sparkles with witty sahies at the complacency of the traditionalists and makes numerous agile side-thrusts at the stupidity of present-day civilization.

The author has assuredly achieved his purpose in his brief introduction he states that he expects to be criticized for his "undue and unpleasant emphasis on certain topics." But, he continues "this is necessary if people are to be induced to think about them, and it is the whole business of a university teacher to induce people to think." There, in a word, is the keynote of the book.

Taking up the Challenge

The effect of Mr Haldane's challenge was not long in making itself felt. Mr Bertrand Russell soon appeared with a companion volume entitled Icarus, or the Future of Science. This is quite a different kind of book, written from another point of view, but almost equally thought-provoking. These two little volumes—each of them can be read in half an hour or so—furnish about the most stimulating mental food in small compass that has appeared in recent years.

The books must be read to be appreciated. No review of them can give an adequate idea of their qualities. While at first reading there appears to be a marked contrast in the two points of view presented, this is more apparent than real. If Mr Haldane is more hopeful than Mr Russell that man will eventually become a rational being, he has no illusions that the change will be a deliberate and voluntary one. But a discussion of the views of the two authors would lead us too far afield. Mr Haldane's volume alone touches almost every phase of human interest, from mathematics, chemistry and economics to philosophy, art, spiritualism and religion. We shall therefore be obliged to confine ourselves to a brief summary of the conclusions presented, with special reference to those relating to birth control.

Mr Haldane holds that the biologist is the most romantic figure in modern life, and he goes far toward justifying the claim. While his predictions are startling, he is careful to state that they are in every case based on work that has already been accomplished. He feels that on the whole our descendants will be much better off than we are, although to many readers his picture may not be altogether alluring. He looks forward to the complete triumph of rationalism over superstition and tradition, and to the regulation of human affairs by a kind of vast scientific world-organization. The food problem will be solved by the chemical manufacture of a "completely satisfactory diet," the general nature of which is outlined, and shown to be amazingly near accomplishment already. As a result, agriculture will become a luxury and mankind will be completely urbanized. Cheap and universally available power will be obtained by using wind energy to generate electricity, part of which will decompose water into oxygen and hydrogen to be recombined and again supply power in times...
of calm. Industry will thus be decentralized, and smoke and ashes will be things of the past. Disease will be entirely eliminated and death will cease to be regarded with horror, but will be welcomed as we welcome sleep.

But it is in the application of biology to human life that the most startling changes are to occur. Reproduction will be completely separated from sexual love. Children will be born ectogenetically—that is, the entire process of fertilization of the ovum and development of the embryo will take place outside the body of the mother, thus permitting the carrying out of eugenic principles to a degree previously impossible. Passions and emotions will be controlled by stimulating or retarding the secretions of the ductless glands, whose influence on human character and behavior we already know to be very great. In this manner we shall be able to deal with perverted instincts by "physiology" rather than prison and to regulate passions by some more direct method than fasting and flagellation.

A few quotations will illustrate the stimulating nature of Mr. Haldane's book. Many others equally arresting might be given.

"Einstein showed that experience cannot be interpreted in terms of the time and space."

"Within the next century sugar and starch will be about as cheap as sawdust."

"There is no great invention, from fire to flying, which has not been hailed as an insult to some god."

"If reproduction is once completely separated from sexual love, mankind will be free in an altogether new sense."

"We must learn not to take traditional morals too seriously."

"We can foretell little of the future save that the thing that has not been is the thing that shall be, that no beliefs, no values, no institutions, are safe."

"In the late war the most rabid nationalists were to be found well behind the front line. In the next war no one will be behind the front line. It will be brought home to all whom it may concern that war is a very dirty business."

"The tendency of applied science is to magnify evils until they become too intolerable to be borne, and the average man whom all the prophets and poets could not move, turns at last and extinguishes the evil at its source."

Mr. Russell is far less confident that science will prove a boon to mankind. A long experience with statesmen and governments has made him skeptical. "I am compelled to fear," he says, "that science will be used to promote the power of dominant groups, rather than to make men happy."

He points out that the chief effect of science has been to increase organization. Individual freedom is constantly becoming less, and the majority of mankind is tending toward a condition of complete submission to the wishes and ideas of those who control industry. The individual is helpless in the face of organization. Organized groups, such as labor unions and political parties, keep him from exercising free choice, and by means of the press, the schools and even the movies, he is constantly subjected to organized propaganda.

International Cooperation Needed

All this in itself might not be a serious matter were it not for the extreme nationalistic character of these organized forces. "The harm that is being done by science and industrialism is almost wholly due to the fact that while they have proved strong enough to produce a national organization, they have not proved strong enough to produce an international organization."

This is unfortunate because it leads to international competition instead of cooperation. Rivalry, rather than love of gain, is the real driving force behind the competition of nations, as is proved by the fact that although rival trusts would benefit by combining, they prefer the zest of competition to increased wealth. International cooperation, therefore, can never be brought about "while big business is controlled by men who are so rich as to have grown indifferent to money."

Mr. Russell's cynicism is much in evidence, especially in all matters involving political or governmental activity. He has little faith in the intelligence or unselfishness of the average citizen, and still less in politicians and office-holders. "Administrators in the future will be presumably no less stupid and no less prejudiced than they are at present." It must be admitted that there is reason for his skepticism. In this connection he calls attention to a very common fallacy, namely the assumption that a reform measure advocated by men of science would, if adopted, be administered by men similar in outlook to those who advocated it. This, of course, is a delusion, for a reform, once achieved, is handed over to the average citizen. Here Mr. Russell seizes a fine opportunity for satire at the expense of "Prime Ministers, Bishops, and others whom the State considers desirable."

Even biology will, Mr. Russell fears, be used to oppress mankind. If we knew enough about heredity to produce the kind of people we desired, the knowledge would be used by those in power to breed a subservient population. Similarly, if we ever learn how to control emotions and dispositions by regulating the secretions of the ductless glands,
the ruling classes will see to it that their own children are given the disposition to command, while the masses are molded to obedience, so that “against the injections of the State physicians the most eloquent Socialist oratory would be powerless.” We suspect that Mr Russell is not in his most serious mood here, but the picture, even if overdrawn, is enough to give us pause.

The Value of Birth Control

Both Mr Haldane and Mr Russell see in some form of world organization the only prospect of saving civilization Mr Haldane thinks such organization inevitable as the result of the applications of science, Mr Russell is less confident, although he admits a tendency in that direction. But he is not quite sure that civilization is worth salvaging, anyway Mr Haldane’s argument seems more convincing, but all well-informed readers will agree that a society which through prejudice and bigotry refuses to look facts in the face, and brings about its own dissolution by a failure to recognize the need of birth control, richly deserves its fate.

It is scarcely necessary to state that Mr Haldane appreciates the value and desirability of birth control, the new liberation of humanity through the separation of sexual love and reproduction, which he so vigorously emphasizes is exactly what birth control seeks to establish. He does not even consider it requisite to argue the point, he goes so far beyond mere birth control in his prediction of “ecogenosis” that few of us, perhaps, will be willing to follow him. Yet if we are honest we cannot but admit that there is nothing illogical or immoral or impossible in such a farther step in man’s conquest of nature.

Mr Russell also frankly recognizes the importance of birth control. He pays his respects to its opponents in various terse and satiric phrases, of which the following is an example: “Government opposition to birth control propagandas gives a biological advantage to stupidity, since it is chiefly stupid people whom governments succeed in keeping in ignorance.” But in spite of his belief in the necessity of birth control to prevent overpopulation, he foresees certain dangers. He fears that population will not merely become stationary, but may diminish. The white races will practice voluntary restriction of their numbers while “uncivilized” races remain prolific, with the ultimate result of extermination of white civilization by a “rising tide of color.”

This is a familiar bogey, but we are surprised that as a scholar as Mr Russell should allow it to disturb him. He has evidently come under the spell of Lothrop Stoddard. But Stoddard’s arguments are unsound and his whole thesis is a delusion. It has been most effectively disposed of by Professor East in his “Mankind at the Crossroads,” where it is clearly shown that the only danger menacing the white race is its own stupidity in refusing to recognize the menace of overpopulation. Even if this brilliant and careful analysis were not available, a little reflection should have convinced Mr Russell that his fears were unfounded. In the first place, the universal adoption of birth control by the white nations would greatly reduce the incentives to war among them, and hence the need for employing colored mercenaries against each other. Secondly, if the white race as a whole were to attain a stationary population, its position would be enormously strengthened as a result of the increased efficiency of its civilization. The elimination of the great amount of waste of both human and other resources which is inevitable in any organic group with a high birth-rate, would make the white race impregnable to the attacks of less civilized races. Intelligence and control of resources are far more important in the modern world than mere numbers. Only the inconceivable eventuality of an alliance of all the other races of the world against the white race could seriously threaten white civilization, and by the time the colored races reach the stage where this would be possible, they will long since have been forced to adopt birth control themselves. If, on the other hand, another race, such as the yellow, should develop an intelligence and a civilization so superior to those of the whites, as to enable it to supersede the latter, who could regard this as a calamity?

War! No Check on Population

Mr Russell has fallen into another common error: he is assuming that war is a check on overpopulation. The utter fallacy of this idea has been demonstrated by Harold Wright in his book on “Population.” War actually accentuates overpopulation by exhausting resources and disturbing economic life to a much greater relative degree than it reduces human numbers.

On the whole, both Mr Haldane and Mr Russell have produced telling arguments in favor of birth control, although neither of them had this purpose primarily in view. Mr Haldane has, we think, minimized the difficulties in the way of producing artificial food on a commercial scale, but the mere suggestion of such a possibility makes the need for the establishment of birth control all the more imperative. We shudder to think of life in an age with an unbounded food supply and without birth control! Starvation would perhaps be preferable to an existence in a world without privacy, solitude or natural beauty.

(Continued on page 302)
Birth Control and Medical Practice

By Dr. Hermann Rohleder (Leipzig)

Birth Control is a branch of hygiene and health. It is a branch of medicine, therefore doctors should be the leading authorities on Birth Control. For us, as doctors, it has two aspects (1) the hygienic-therapeutic, and (2) the hygienic-prophylactic.

The Hygienic-Therapeutic Aspect

It is generally recognized that women with heart disease are seriously endangered by pregnancy, they may suffer serious aggravation of the malady thereby, and may even die. Nearly all text-books on obstetrics emphasize this, and there are many references to it in medical works. In some bad cases artificial miscarriage has to be resorted to, and the majority of doctors approve. Surely from a humanitarian point of view, prevention of conception is more justifiable than abortion.

That serious disease of the lungs, especially advanced tuberculosis, demands that doctors should recommend Birth Control, is, in my opinion, obvious. It is still a much discussed question whether or not tuberculous girls should become pregnant. When Kirchner declared that the marriage of consumptives should certainly be forbidden, he was speaking praiseworthy from his hygienic standpoint. But his recommendation is quite impracticable. In view of the great prevalence of tuberculosis, Birth Control is the only way out of the difficulty. Birth Control is more important here than in all the other diseases put together.

Consumption is not an indication for Birth Control—it is the indication for it. To allow consumptive women to waste away through pregnancy is inhuman and utterly unworthy of the medical profession. The recommendation by doctors of sexual abstinence to married couples is unward, for they must know that it will not long be kept up by any married couple. Happily our ideas are changing. Kammer in "Disease and Marriage" says: "We must regard it as one of the principal duties of the physician to prevent conception in tuberculous women, with all the preventive means known to science."

Diabetes mellitus in its more severe forms is also an indication for Birth Control, for pregnancy has always a most unfavorable influence in those forms of the disease in which the sugar excretion reaches a high percentage. If a married woman is found to be diabetic, even slightly so, the doctor ought to inform her of the danger of a pregnancy making her mild case a serious one. Diabetic girls may marry, but they should have no children.

A high degree of contracted pelvis is an indication for Birth Control unless the woman is willing to have a cesarian section. But in no case ought one to go so far as to allow, as has been done, a woman to undergo cesarian section repeatedly until she collapses at the sixth time. On this case, my deceased colleague and friend, Dr. Mensinga of Flensburg (Germany) the inventor of the Dutch pessary, remarked: "Has the doctor realized at all the helplessness and hopelessness of such an existence? Is it creditable to him—this wanton torture to the bitter end?"

Chronic kidney disease in women makes Birth Control advice a medical duty on much the same grounds as for heart disease.

Venereal disease, and especially syphilis, makes Birth Control by the use of the condom obligatory, in order to prevent infection of others, and in order to prevent the infected person from going from bad to worse, as most frequently happens with advice of sexual abstinence. Sexual abstinence is here the best thing, but the disease may be long lasting and such abstinence a practicable imposibility.

The Hygienic-Prophylactic Aspect

Birth Control has to be considered in the case of serious infections, such as tuberculosis and syphilis. The decided inheritability of the tendency to tuberculosis and the gravity of such inheritance are well known. If all doctors were to advise Birth Control to consumptives, a great part of this social problem would be solved.

Certain constitutional diseases call for Birth Control on prophylactic grounds. Diabetes is one. As Senator says: "The progeny is endangered in a double manner by diabetes mellitus, because children of diabetic mothers are born in a weaker condition, and because of the hereditary nature of the disease, which is estimated at 20 per cent." Haemophilia is another constitutional disease which has a strong inheritability, and Rupke rightly says: "Bleeders ought not to reproduce."

That serious nervous diseases, epilepsy, hysteria, and mental diseases should not be further handed on is admitted by all doctors. These, therefore, call for the consideration of Birth Control. Indeed many doctors have written in favor of sterilization in these cases.

(Continued on page 300)
The World Crisis of Population

By Edward Alsworth Ross

Without being aware of it, civilized mankind is in a most critical situation. Its most precious contemporary achievement—the diffusion of decency of life, and comfort throughout all classes in society—is in danger of being swept away by a new deluge—this time, not of water but of babies. For at present mankind is increasing in number as in no previous period for which we have record. The watchful lookouts who pace the walls of Zion, instead of taking their case in her courts and streets, see the approaching peril to humanity's future so near and visible that they should be pardoned if they cry the alarm with strident voices.

The number of members of the human family is supposed to be 1,700,000,000, which is twice what it was estimated to be ninety-two years ago. Last year one of my students died at the age of ninety-two. When she was born the world had but half as many inhabitants as it has today. Think what it means, that within a single lifetime humanity has gained as many members as in all the previous thousands of centuries.

The Divine command, "Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth," was uttered to eight people who were all that remained of mankind after the Flood. There are now 250,000,000 times as many people as there were then. How much longer is this emergency mandate to be considered as still in force?

In the five year period, 1906-1911—the growth of human numbers has been calculated to be one and one-sixth per cent per year, which must be many times greater than anything of the kind which has occurred hitherto in the history of our race. Had this rate of expansion prevailed steadily through previous centuries, all the human beings on the globe could have been produced from a single pair in seventeen hundred ninety-one years, i.e., Adam and Eve could have set up housekeeping as lately as the days of the Roman Emperor, Marcus Aurelius. If you take, not the contemporary rate of increase, but the rate which prevailed between 1804 and 1914, about 2,400 years would suffice to produce the present population of the globe from an Adam and Eve living at the time of the Battle of Marathon.

One thing is beyond all dispute, viz., that the contemporary expansion of humanity, which is due, in part to the amazing success of medical science and public hygiene in fighting off disease, and in part to the rapid agricultural exploitation of new and fertile lands in the temperate zone, cannot continue much longer. There are no more Mississippi Valleys, Australias, Canadas, and Argentinatas to bring under the plow, so if mankind insists on continuing the present rate of propagation, life, within the experience of individuals now living, will become so crowded, harrassed, and difficult that the death rate will quickly rise in spite of the best that doctors and health officers can do.

The Increase of Population

The human family has doubled in number in ninety-two years, but at its present rate of expansion it will have doubled again within sixty years, that is, by 1983. In a hundred years, the same rate would have expanded the population of the world to three and one-sixteenth times the present population, and this is all the human beings which, according to the calculations of food and agricultural experts, could possibly be fed if every acre on the globe were tilled and producing as much as it is capable of contributing. In two hundred years, there would be ten times the present population of the globe, and then, even if mankind were fed by a fall of heavenly manna, they would be so crowded and would poison one another so terribly that life would hardly be worth living.

The(population of England and Wales at the opening of the nineteenth century was about nine million, but by the opening of the twentieth century, it had increased to 32,500,000, i.e., multiplied three-and-one-half times in one hundred years. "Had our forefathers since the days of William the Conqueror," says Mr Bland, "been in a position to achieve a birth-rate and a death-rate similar to those of England and Wales in the nineteenth century, the present population of this tiny little island—without allowing for any contribution from Scotland—would be somewhere in the neighborhood of 150,000,000. In line with this, is the statement made by Dean Inge before the British Birthrate Commission ""In the Middle Ages the birth-rate was about 45, and the death-rate about the same. Within the last century the death rate has been reduced from the median rate of 14, and, if the birth rate were maintained at anything like its natural level, about 40, all over the world, the population of the globe, which is now 1,700,000,000, would in 120 years have reached 27,000,000,000, or about ten times as great a number as the earth could probably support."
Examples of Population Growth

Europe is supposed to have had 80,000,000 inhabitants in 1700. In one hundred years this was more than doubled and in the last fifty years Europe's rate of increase has been unprecedented in history. Austin has calculated that from 1772 to 1872 the increase was at the rate of 16% for each 20-year period. Since that time it has been much more rapid, practically 20% in the period 1872 to 1892, and 26% in the period 1892 to 1912.

Calculations made from the census statistics collected by the Registrar General of England show that in 1916, Europe had 465,000,000 of people. In addition, great streams of emigrants had flowed away from Europe since 1800, and it has been computed that the descendants of these in the Americas, Africa, and Australasia number 185,000,000. Thus it appears that Europe and its offspring outside have more than trebled in number since 1816. Again, there has been an enormous increase in the native population of the lands to which Europeans have gone. Although having reached the saturation point, the population of North America, Egypt and India was formerly at a standstill, the arrival of European civilization and European governments with their irrigation and public health measures have caused population to start forward at an amazing rate. The most outstanding example of the stimulating effect of European contact upon the increase of the native population is witnessed in the case of Java. In the words of Professor Willcox: "This island increased its population, the great mass of whom have no trace of European blood, from about 4,000,000 in 1800 to about 30,000,000 in 1905. It is less than one-third as large as California, contains not one great city, and yet has nearly thirteen times as many inhabitants as this state, or about one-third as many as the whole United States. This single case of increase in the aboriginal population of Java, under the influence of Europe, is enough to outweigh all known decreases in all other parts of the world several times over." What U.S. has Done to Help Porto Rico

Or mark what has happened in Porto Rico. In the twenty years following the American occupation of Porto Rico its population has increased a quarter of a million, or 36%, owing to the commercial expansion and industrial development following the American occupation. Governor Yeager of Porto Rico states that the greatly enlarged opportunities for employment, instead of raising the standard of living and increasing wages, resulted chiefly in increasing the numbers of the laborers.

Likewise there has been an extraordinary increase among independent peoples who have adopted the white man's civilization on its material side. The population of Japan, which had been nearly stationary for two hundred years, grew from 33,000,000 in 1871 to 54,000,000 in 1914. Japan is increasing at the rate of three-quarters of a million annually, and at her present rate, in another forty years she will be attempting to maintain a population equal to the continent of the United States.

On the other hand, where European civilization has not yet been deeply felt, as in China or Central Africa, or inner Arabia, or Persia, population has been stationary or has even decreased.

The Fall in the Birth Rate

The recent fall in the crude birth-rate of the more advanced peoples has inspired a vast deal of denunciation and jeremiad. Every thoughtful person has heard of it, but few outside statisticians and public health officers have noticed the extraordinary lowering of the death rate which has been brought about in the last forty years. Yet, in most countries, it quite neutralizes that shortage of the baby crop which has inspired so many gloomy prophecies.

Compare the fourteen European countries with worth-while vital statistics, in respect to them records for the half-decade 1881-1885, and for the last half-decade before the War. viz., 1906-10 period, you will find that in nine of them, the death rate fell further than the birth rate, so that in 1910 their natural increase was greater than it had been a quarter of a century earlier, before forethought had given much evidence of its presence among the masses. If only the public could be made to realize that in the last quarter-century for which we have complete statistics (1881-85 to 1906-10) the death rate of Finland, Norway, Sweden, and Scotland declined about a fifth, that of Austria, Belgium, Denmark, England and Wales, Hungary, Italy, Spain, and Switzerland, a fourth that of Australia, Bulgaria, and Holland, about a third. In 1900 the death rate in our "registration area" was 17.6 per thousand of the population. In 1921 the rate was 11.7, a reduction of a third in twenty-one years.

Save our ingenuity in devising contrivances for blotting out human life, nothing in our time is so sensational as our success in vanquishing certain diseases. For example, a few years ago the deaths per 100,000 population from the fevers, including typhoid, typhus, and malaria, were only one seventy-third as common as the deaths from these diseases in India. There is no climate or geographical reason for their prevalence in India and these same diseases played havoc in this country a century ago. They scourg...
cause public authority has applied the discoveries of preventive medicine.

It is this agency that has chased from us those grizzly scourers of Azrael, bubonic plague, cholera, yellow fever and small-pox. Moreover, another four of his reapers, viz., typhoid, diphtheria and croup, tuberculosis and pneumonia have had them sickles dulled.

Saving the Babies

The progress of child saving alone suffices to offset a large part of the fall of the birth-rate. Peeps into the infant mortality of the less advanced peoples suggest that, night down through history, from a third to two-thirds of those born have perished in the cradle. A decade ago, a quarter of the babies born in Hungary in Russia faded to live a year. In Chinde, in 1913, I found the loss to be a third in some cities 47 per cent. Before the War, Moscow parents were losing half the infants within a twelve-month. In 1910, in the innermost province of China, an American medical missionary, with twenty years of practice, gave me his opinion that from 75 to 85 per cent of the children born in the his district die before the end of the second year.

On the other hand, thanks to modern hygiene and medicine we are saving infants with a success that our forefathers would have attributed to magic. Already there are more than a dozen peoples that lose less than a tenth of their children in the first year of life. Our country is not high up in this class but, nevertheless, there are twenty-five American cities which save nineteen babies out of twenty. In New Zealand there are good-suited cities that lose in the first year only one infant in twenty-seven.

That human life should be preserved with such success is an utterly new thing in the experience of humanity. In all the life of our race, extending over a thousand centuries and more, the idea of this has never been known. It behoves us to adapt our behavior to it as we adapt our behavior to artificial light or power, machinery or the automobile. If people are to die only a third or a fourth as fast as they used to die, let it be a plan that will never do for them to be born as fast as ever, so we have before us an endless vista of restriction of the size of families. We must leave unused an increasing portion of that fertility which became established in our species long ago, in order to meet a rate of wasteage which no longer presents itself in civilized life. The more advanced peoples really do not dare use more than half their natural fertility and we shall soon see the time where they will not dare use more than a third of it.

Headed for Saturation

As it is, we are headed straight for a world saturation which will make toil, poverty, anxiety, and low expectation of life the portion of the masses in all countries. It was some job during the War for the allies to feed a portion of the Belgians. Well as things now are, food for two new Belgians must be found every year. In the words of Professor East, "The tillers of the sod must prepare, plant, cultivate and harvest each year nearly forty million acres more than they did the year before." The end of rapid expansion is in sight. Within a lifetime, we shall arrive at a nearly stationary state of population. Shall the equilibrium between births and deaths be struck by adjusting the birth-rate to the death rate of ten per thousand per annum, which we may look for before very long, or shall it be struck by allowing the growth of crowding, overwork, and underfeeding to raise the mortality to 24 per thousand per annum, which is birth-rate? The answer to this depends on whether we shall strike the stationary state about the time we have a populabon of 150,000,000 or about the time forty years later when we shall have 200,000,000.

I doubt very much if Americans generally will ever consent to endure the wretched life which the Chinese masses have brought upon themselves by overmulitplication. Before descending into such a vale of wretchedness, curtailment of the size of the family will certainly become a general practise, but shall such curtailment be postponed until the pressure of numbers shall have wiped out much of the ease and comfort which the exploitation of a virgin continent has spread among us, or shall it be adopted in time to prevent a decline in the American standard of life?

The arrival of family limitation and the unchecked dissemination of knowledge of the means of such limitation are as certain to come as anything in the world. If eventually, why not now?

AN APOLOGY

We wish pubhly to express—what have already been privately accepted—our sincere apologies for the lapse in the August Review when we omitted to give credit for our beautiful cover picture to the Metropolitan Museum of Art. We highly appreciate the privilege of using, on the cover of our Review, the reproductions of these beautiful pictures and statues, which are exhibited for the enjoyment and edification of the public in the great art galleries of the Museum, and we greatly regret the seeming discourtesy of using one of them without due acknowledgment.

For him to whom sex is impure, there are no flowers in nature—Thoreau.
Birth Control and Public Health

By C Killick Millard, M D H

Continued from the September issue

4 The Eugenic Point of View

We have also to look at this question from the point of view of Eugenics. This is clearly allied to the point of view of Public Health, indeed Eugenics may be regarded as one sense as the Public Health of future generations.

No one will deny that the present position, with its differential birth-rate between the upper and the lower strata of society, is most unsatisfactory. Birth Control is being largely practised by the more desirable stocks, whilst it is being neglected by the less desirable, and although this is compensated to some extent by the reduced infant mortality which usually accompanies a lower birth-rate, the fact remains that our population is being unduly recruited from those elements which, humanly speaking, are the least fitted to make good parents.

It must be frankly admitted, therefore, that Birth Control, as we see it today, is distinctly dysgenic in its operation. How can this be remedied? It would appear that there are only two alternatives:

1. Induce the more desirable stocks to abandon Birth Control and have larger families, or

2. Induce the less desirable stocks to adopt Birth Control and have smaller families.

Does anyone seriously think that the first alternative is in the least degree practicable? The educated and “thinking” classes have decided that restriction of the size of the family is desirable. The clergy, doctors, schoolmasters, in short the intelligentsia of the nation today all have small families. Who shall go forth and persuade them to act differently? Birth Control has been on its trial for at least two generations (in reality very much longer) and I suggest that no civilization which has once discovered it is at all likely to abandon it. We may as well recognize frankly that Birth Control has come to stay.

The Logical Course

We therefore have to fall back upon the other alternative, viz., to induce the less desirable stocks to follow the example of the more desirable stocks and to practise Birth Control also. This is surely the more natural, the more logical and the more progressive course. How far is it practicable? It may be objected that we shall never succeed in persuading the more reckless. thriftless and thoughtless elements in the population to exercise the considerable measure of forethought, circumspection and self-control which the successful practice of any method of Birth Control demands. I frankly admit the difficulty and it is quite possible that we shall never be entirely successful, but this is no reason why we should not set this alternative before us as an ideal to be aimed at. Much, I believe, could be done by sympathetic practical instruction, and by providing adequate facilities. Also we may reasonably hope for improvement in methods now that the subject is being seriously studied not only in this but in almost all civilized countries. What is needed is a method which is at once simple, safe, effective and inexpensive. The experience now being gained in the two Birth Control clinics which are being carried on in London should help us in deciding how far the lowest strata of the population can be taught Birth Control. The following is a description of a visit to Dr Marie Stopes’s Clinic which appeared in the Daily News for June 20, 1921, from the pen of Mr Herbert Ashley, Secretary of the London Council of Social Service.

A Visit to a Birth Control Clinic

“To social workers who are willing to sweep aside false “modesty” and to think with courage, one fact is apparent that the mother of the poorer classes who bears a child unwillingly, rebelliously, bitterly, and with anguish, is not she who best serves our race. Such children are a loss to the State, an anguish to their mothers, and a misery to themselves. With such thoughts in my mind, I called at Dr Marie Stopes’s Clinic in Holloway. In a drab neighborhood it is a beautiful place. The whole atmosphere of the place is one of confidence and purity. The founders of the Clinic, who are supported by many thinkers in many different walks of life, have taken upon themselves a work which will save untold expense to the whole community, as well as untellable misery to individuals.”

I see no reason why a similar description should not be applicable to all Birth Control Clinics. I would suggest that whatever our views may be on this question of Birth Control, it is up to all of us who are medical officers of health to watch the work of these clinics carefully and sympathetically.

The problem of the most degraded stocks, e.g., the feeble-minded, calls for special treatment. No
doubt when public opinion is ripe for it—and it is certainly moving in that direction—measures will be introduced for the permanent sterilization of those unfortunates as an alternative to segregation. Already legislation with this end in view has been passed in some countries.

5 The Physiological or Medical Aspect

Lastly we have to consider the physiological or purely medical point of view. What effects—physiological, pathological or psychological—have contraceptives on those who habitually use them? This is an aspect which, of course, specially concerns the medical profession. It is much to be regretted, but none the less true, that we are not as a profession, at present, able to answer this question with any degree of certainty or unanimity. In an anonymous letter which appeared in the July number of Public Health over the nom de plume of "X and Y," and headed "The Dangers of Birth Control," the opinions of certain practitioners and gynecologists were cited, expressing the belief that the use of contraceptives was injurious to health. Elsewhere I have collected a number of opinions on the other side, and I have also published (Report of Fifth International Birth Control Conference), the results of two special inquiries I instituted, by means of questionnaires, amongst medical practitioners, men and women, including gynecologists. Suffice it to say here that these inquiries satisfied me that the consensus of medical opinion today is still that the opponents of Birth Control to say that responsible parenthood has always been held as an ideal. It is common knowledge that until Birth Control came into vogue the orthodox teaching used to be that children were "sent" and that it was the duty of married couples to take all that came.

I regard the use of contraceptives as the only practicable or desirable method of effecting regulation of the size of the family in the case of normal individuals, and I regard their use for this purpose as perfectly legitimate and a necessary part of the hygiene of marriage where restriction of the size of the family is indicated. Properly selected and properly used, I do not believe that they have as a general rule, any seriously deleterious effect upon health, though I am quite prepared to believe that their ignorant or improper use may in certain cases have been productive of harm.

I regard the suggestion that the use of contraceptives may cause permanent sterility as a bogey, quite unsupported by adequate evidence, but I recognize that if young married couples begin using contraceptives before they have had a child, and if, later on, when they desire a child, they fail to get one, it is very probable that they will reproach themselves and regard it as a "judgment." I recognize also that nowadays many young people are apt to practise Birth Control where there is no real need for it, and that they do not sufficiently appreciate the immense and permanent value of children in marriage, or the fact that after a certain age in the woman the likelihood of conception diminishes.

For these reasons I think it better, as a general rule and under normal conditions as regards housing, that young couples should always make sure of at least one or two children before adopting Birth Control and I disagree with those who teach otherwise.

Conclusion

Let me conclude with an expression of my own personal opinion. I regard the ideal of responsible parenthood, accompanied as a necessary corollary by regulation of the size of the family, as a much higher and more worthy ideal than the principle of unrestricted breeding which prevailed prior to the days of Birth Control. It is all very well for the opponents of Birth Control to say that responsible parenthood has always been held as an ideal. It is common knowledge that until Birth Control...
THE SINS OF THE FATHERS

Mothers Beg to be Saved From Bearing Diseased Babies

No reasonable man or woman believes that any child should be born with a heritage of syphilis. If there is one thing on which all doctors are agreed, it is that syphilitic parents should not produce children. Clinics for the teaching of Birth Control ought to form part of every campaign against social disease. No mother wishes to bear a syphilitic child, and the sin of bringing such children into existence lies at the door of soceity that forbids the prevention of their conception. Who would dare to say that such pleas as these ought to be denied.

My Child Might be Born Blind

I am a young married girl of nineteen. Last year I gave birth to an eight-months baby, born dead. My husband was troubled with syphilis some years ago, and the same doctor that treated him then was our doctor when the baby was born. And he told my husband not to try anything like that again until he came in and took a blood test. He said that it may have been the reason of our baby being born dead. But he didn't tell us anything to keep from getting that way. And three months ago, I failed to get my monthly sickness. My husband went in and asked the doctor to give me some medicine, but it didn't do any good. He went back again and the doctor told him he could not do anything more. He told him to take me to a doctor in the city after I was two months going. Then I took sick and was unable to leave the house for six weeks. I don't know if I could have it done or not. Since I am more than two months going, I decided to get my monthly sickness. My husband went in and saw that it was very injurious to the health and that children ought not to be born to parents troubled with the diseases mentioned in this letter. If you know of any way that I don't have to give birth to another child, please write and tell me at once, as my child might be born blind, or suffer from some other disease. If you can help me this time and tell me of Birth Control, so keep me from having babies for a few years, until I am older and stronger and I think my husband will be out of danger of our children being injured.

It Nearly Tore my Heart Out

Since reading your book, "Woman and the New Race," I have regained hope. It has made me feel that the time is coming when all women will be able to stop having children, when they brought enough into the world. But until then we have to continue to bear children, because we know of no other way.

I have been married four years this June. When we were first married I became pregnant in the fourth month, and in the second month of pregnancy, my body broke out in purple spots. Not having the least idea what could cause it, I consulted a doctor immediately. He took a blood test of both my husband and me. When I went back for my answer, it was "syphilis" and of the worst form. It nearly tore my heart out, and my mother as well, for I had always had such a horror of the very sound of the world. Then my husband told me he had got it from his first wife. So I had to be operated upon—it was not quite the same as an abortion and yet a whole lot worse.

Then we started taking blood treatments, three times a week. I could scarcely stand the infections. I had to keep a pack of ice going, or it was too much for me. I had to have the injections all night in order to sleep. The pain was so dreadful. My husband had no trouble.

The doctor said we could not risk having children for they would be affected. For a year we took those treatments, and during that time I was operated on three times. I used every available preventive that other people used, but I had no results from them. The doctor said I could not stand another operation—that it would kill me. So I remained for my husband to protect me. After much persuasion I got him to sue precautions, but it was a constant nagging, for he hated to do it. Yet he claimed to love me dearly, and I told him there was one way of proving it.

We went to Colorado. The climate was better there and I felt better right away. We had blood tests there and both were negative. Soon I was pregnant again. I had the baby, and he was perfect so far as we could see. But the disease was in his blood. And I have had several symptoms since, and there is little doubt that it is dragging me down—I am a nervous wreck. The baby is 15 months old, and I am six months with another. Because we are poor, we cannot stand the operation so often, and it can only mean for me to go on having one after another. I cannot nurse my babies for my milk is poison.

And now my husband and I quarrel whenever I remind him that he could prevent it if he would. My affection for him is waning, and he looks elsewhere for pleasure. It is no wonder I cannot hold him. But if I did not have children, I could make myself as attractive as any girl, and then his attention would revert to me.

There must surely be some means of prevention, and
no one would be more thankful to hear of it than I. It is not because I do not love ch-l'dren I love my baby so much that it drives me crazy to think that his blood is diseased. We went to a clinic for awhile, and I saw other babies there taking treatments. It made my heart ache to see them jam those needles into the tender little bodies. Poor little helpless creatures, who are not to blame, yet they must suffer from others' follies.

A Disgrace to Humanity

I am not writing for myself. I am a married woman with two healthy, bright children, and an earnest advocate of Birth Control, the same as my husband. But I have a very dear friend who was married at the age of eighteen to a young man of very doubtful character. Against her parents' consent, this man, when married, was the victim of a bad case of tuberculosis and of the so-called social disease. They had three ch-l'dren, not more than 10 or 11 months apart. The first living, but is not right and very delicate—a disgrace to humanity. The other two died at a few days of age. The woman is a physical wreck, awaiting death as her easiest relief. Her family physician refuses to help her. I want to do something for my friend, as her plight is a great worry to me. With the facts narrated here you can see how I feel about writing to help her. Anything you can send me will be more than appreciated.

Praying for her Baby's Eyes

I am a weak, run-down, sickly woman, been married five years. This tells the story—a radiant bride at 20, at 25 what? If you could see me you would not have to guess.

My first child was still born. I had an awful time. My next was a miscarriage at six months. In two months I was pregnant again, and by staying in bed for seven long months, I went full time. But my baby was almost blind. I spent three months praying night and day for my baby's sight, and God heard and answered my prayers, for at 22 months he has pretty blue eyes. But I would rather die than have another one, for my husband is a sufferer from gonorrhea. I have begged him to leave me. I would rather be separated than have any more. Please help me. I think the law is hideous. It ought to be a law against diseased men to marry pure, clean girls, to bring sickly ch-l'dren into the world to suffer, and oh the suffering the poor women have to endure.

Groping in the Dark

I grope in the dark for the knowledge for which I am searching. I am a young woman, twenty-six this month, and a high school graduate. Before I married in 1922 I was employed as assistant post-master at a small mining town in Montana. Soon after my marriage, I noticed that my husband had terrible sores, which, even though he doctored them insistently, refused to heal. I suggested that he go to a doctor and have his blood tested, which he quite readily did. The test was sent to the State Board of Health, and a report came back, 4-plus—syphilis. My husband became enraged, and refused to take treatment, all the while denying the same.

At this time I was pregnant three months. What could I do but go through with it to the end? When the baby came, the doctor refused to speak to me about syphilis, and we have had to doctor the little fellow ever since. I determined not to have another child, but three months after my confinement, I was again pregnant. I can't stoop to abortion, and must I go on bringing these little deformed, defenceless creatures into the world?

Helpless from Birth

I am today the mother of six living ch-l'dren, and have had two miscarriages. My oldest son is now twelve years old, and he has been helpless from his birth. The rest of my ch-l'dren are very pale, and I have to take them to the doctor quite often. One of my daughters has her left eye blind.

I have tried to keep myself away from my husband since my last baby was born, but it causes quarrels and once he left me saying I wasn't doing my duty as a wife. Each time with my babies I am sick for a long time, and I have to take chloroform.

My husband, I have learned lately, had syphilis before we were married, and on account of that loathsome disease he is never in good health. I do work for other people, besides taking care of my family and the house. I am in no good condition to bring another baby into the world. Please help me if there is a way.

The Babies All Died

I have given birth to three children. They all died. I have also had several miscarriages. I asked the doctor why this was so, also if he could give me something to prevent child-birth. He would not answer other question.

My husband is sick and is not able to go to work half the time, so naturally the burden falls on me. At times it is very hard for me, so I am writing to you to ask for advice.

I would rather have the children, if they would live, but I can't seem to go full time, or to have them alive, and yet I get pregnant again and again. Surely it is not intended that a woman should go on like this. Some one told me that my babies die because my husband has a disease, but I do not know about that. The doctor will tell me nothing. Surely you can help me. I should be very glad to hear from you.
The Passi

By Margaret Sanger

From its stormy beginning, now something more than one hundred years ago, that struggle for human freedom and the battle to liberate woman from the cruel slavery of enforced motherhood which today is known as the Birth Control movement, has produced a long list of martyrs and heroes known and unknown—an honor-list of brave men and courageous women who, without thought of recognition or official medals, unflinchingly have carried on the thankless battle against blind prejudice. Some of them, like those dauntless pioneers, the Duyssdales, have won a place in the history of human freedom that can never be wrested from them. Others must remain anonymous, though their valor has been scarcely less heroic. Propagandists, publishers, booksellers, active agitators like those men who first circulated the "diabolical handbill" at the very outset of the Neo-Malthusian movement—all have carried on the torch and kept our ideal alive.

Others have worked directly in the heart of the poor, in the midst of conditions and in the face of obstacles that would have discouraged men less staunch in their convictions, less loyal to the ideal of a liberated and regenerated humanity. One of the noblest heroes in this latter field has been Doctor J. Rutgers of The Hague the news of whose recent death has just come to us from Holland. The severity of this blow to our cause is alleviated only by our realization of the profound influence exerted by this valiant worker in our movement. The work of a whole lifetime devoted with the highest idealism to a love of his fellow-men has not been in vain. The influence of Doctor Rutgers has been profound. For he was one of the first to realize that this whole problem of voluntary contraception is not one merely of controversy and discussion, of theory and polemic, the moral rightness of which may be decided solely by preachers or teachers. It is a problem of practical science, to be tested by intelligent men and women. And so, quietly, modestly, without any blaring of trumpets, actuated by the courage of his convictions and a profound love of humanity, Dr. Rutgers gale the Neo-Malthusian movement, as it was known during the latter half of the nineteenth century, a new direction and a new life. His Instrument was the Birth Control Clinic. To him we owe the establishment of Birth Control Clinics in Holland.

In 1915 I went to him to learn all the practical aspects of scientific contraception. I shall never forget the long hours I spent under his guidance in those Dutch Clinics learning from this quiet humanitarian much more than merely the practical education I had gone to acquire from him. First of all he taught me, not so much by word as by practical demonstration, the paramount importance of the Clinic as a means of educating women in the hygienic and eugenic aspects of Birth Control. He taught me that real Birth Control could never be merely a matter of printed and published information, but of practical and scientific hygiene. And so from Dr. Rutgers I came to see that the Clinic must be the true goal of all adequate and thorough education in Birth Control. As conceived in the mind of this valiant worker and humanitarian, the Clinic becomes the surest instrument toward individual liberty and the regeneration of the race—profoundly eugenic and an institution of real hygienic education.

While to Doctor Aletta Jacobs we owe the high honor of being the first physician in Holland to offer practical advice to poor mothers, it was Dr. Rutgers' great achievement to organize the Clinics, to educate nurses and midwives in this delicate work and to effect the establishment of Clinics in the lesser cities and towns of the Netherlands.

In the face of unforeseen and almost insurmountable obstacles Dr. Rutgers carried on this great work to the point when the benefits of the Clinics could be scientifically computed and practically demonstrated, to that point, in short, when the work, organized by the Pioneer in this field, was officially recognized by the Dutch government as a humanitarian effort of national importance. By his devotion and tireless efforts, Dr. Rutgers had carried to fine fruition a lifework that at the beginning was almost blighted by neglect, misunderstanding, indifference and the enmity of his opponents.

I am proud to realize that through my efforts educators and social workers of other countries have been taught the importance of the Clinic as a true instrument of eugenic education. My enthusiasm for Dr. Rutgers' Clinic has led others to visit The Hague and investigate his results for themselves. So that his example in the near future...
of a Hero

may have widespread influence, not only in the Occident but in the Far East as well

How much the contemporary Birth Control movement owes to the example of Holland, the pioneer nation in this field, we all realize. How much Holland owes to the fine and unfailing idealism of Dr Rutgers, it is too early to say. His is an influence the benefits of which cannot be determined in a single generation nor in two. When we point to Holland as an outstanding example of what can be accomplished and what has been attained in the quality of breeding as opposed to the blind and indiscriminate reproduction of mere numbers, we should not forget that this practical national demonstration of our conviction is the outcome of the tireless patience and indefatigable idealism of a single man—Dr J Rutgers.

Let us honor his memory as that of one of the true heroes fighting for the liberation of humanity through the Birth Control movement.

By Martina G. Kramers

Our cause has sustained a great loss by the death of Dr J Rutgers, the chief promoter of the movement for Birth Control in Holland.

He was not its initiator—that high merit belongs to Mr. S von Houten, ex-Prime Minister, to Dr Aletta Jacobs, our first M.D. and her husband—but Rutgers popularized the movement by bringing the Neo-Malthusian League into touch with the laboring class, and making contraceptive advice and contraceptive implements cheap. The diminishing of our birth-rate and infantile death-rate during the last decades attest the efficiency of this course. In his medical practice in Rotterdam 1879–1904 he came to see that, among all social reforms, Birth Control was the most needed for the uplift of womanhood and of the subject class equally. At first his doctrine was not always understood and it found no general sympathy, but that position changed gradually. Rutgers' preaching was not so much by words as by deeds, and his patients honored and loved him. He did not begin his career in the medical profession, his father sent him to the university to study theology, and in 1874, when he was 24 years old, he actually was appointed as minister in the village church, but he soon felt that this was not his vocation and he began a new university course, as a student of medicine. From his old theological pursuits he always retained a well-founded hostility to the doctrines of St. Augustine and St. Paul on asceticism and the dualism of body and soul.

When Dr Rutgers became secretary of the Neo-Malthusian League in 1900, there was still a strong current of public opinion against it. He warded off many attacks from official authorities, both on the platform and in the press, and had to refute many false accusations, e.g. the promoting of immorality and of abortion. Even among the leaders of the Socialists there was a great deal of misunderstanding as to Neo-Malthusianism and the activities of the League. But Dr Rutgers knew neither dejection nor slackening in the work; he stood up for the doctrine and helped the women untringly. Meanwhile he extended the foreign relations of our League, which had always existed with the Drysdale family and the British League, and was instrumental in establishing the International Neo-Malthusian League or Ligue de la Regeneration Humaine, of which Dr Alice Drysdale Vickery became the president.

After 1904, when Rutgers left his medical practice and went to live in The Hague, he had more time for attending congresses and writing biological works. His investigations in biology led him to show that throughout nature's plan, in all plant and animal life, sex-attraction and love have a prominent part in race progress, and that it is criminal to treat sex as an unclean or unmentionable subject. His last great work "Das Sexualleben in seiner biologischen Bedeutung," which was published as a Giesecck in 1922 in Dresden, is a compendium of his views in this respect. It is about to be brought out, in an English translation by Dr. Norman Haire, by the same publisher. Apart from many contributions to periodicals and reviews and pamphlets for the Neo-Malthusian League, Dr Rutgers also wrote a more detailed work on Male Sex-Life in Dutch and "Eugenics and Birth Control" (Giesecck, Dresden 1922).}

(Continued on page 302)
CONEY Island in full swing on a Sunday or holiday beggars description, at least my description, even after selling the Birth Control Review there during two seasons.

What crowds, what enormous endless motley crowds! And what a field for Birth Control education!

Many thousands of people, including mothers, living in the "backwoods" of New York City, who never leave the vicinity of their homes except to take their children to Coney, see the Review for the first time.

Many hail it with glad surprise, for they thought "it was all stopped." They are under the impression that when the Brownsville clinic closed nearly eight years ago, and Mrs. Sanger sent to jail, the Birth Control movement was ended. Of course, I enlighten them on the wonderful progress the movement has made all over the world since then, and tell them about our present clinics, where women can be instructed by a doctor, to prevent or cure disease. And I ask them to tell all their friends about it, and to join the American Birth Control League and help get the law amended, so that clinics can be open in all overcrowded, poverty-stricken districts, and poor mothers instructed how to prevent the conception of babies that they don't want, and who only become a useless burden to the community.

People from other states and other countries are glad to see and buy the Review. A man from Philadelphia was very bitter at having been born one of seven, and reared in a slum. His childhood had been miserable, but he was doing fairly well now. He had one son and was not going to have any more. Another man wished his father had known of this, he had had twenty children by two wives, and only two grew up. Still another man was one of nine and his wife one of ten children. They had one son and he was going to have all the educational and other advantages he and his wife had missed.

One man bought the Review saying, "I don't need it for myself. I'm an old widower, but I want to help humanity." Ever so many war veterans have bought it. One told me his wife had had three babies in three years and they dreaded any more coming.

An Alderman, flashing his badge, said he was very interested as he bought the paper. A woman from Texas said Birth Control was badly needed where she lived, and she would do all she could to spread it. A man from Russia wished Mrs. Sanger would go over and instruct the women there. Two people from different parts of Connecticut came up at the same time. I always discover out-of-town people when I ask them to join the League. They seem under the impression that, not being New Yorkers, they are disqualified. Of course, I disillusion them and tell them how necessary it is for every American to join the League and strengthen it, to bring pressure to bear upon the legislatures. One of a group of Greeks who could not read English yet, asked about literature in their native language, so I referred him to our headquarters.

English visitors who want to "know more about it," I refer to the New Generation League in London. A lady who had just received a letter from a charity organization asking for a contribution towards sending poor children to the country, and also asking her to suggest how best to alleviate poverty, was going to reply "Judicious Birth Control" and to forward a copy of the Review. We agreed that mothers who had to depend upon charity children should be taught to prevent conception, instead of bringing more victims of charity into the world. No one can grow a moral back-bone on charity.

A Catholic woman told me how glad she was that something was being done to save others from what she had suffered, having ten babies, two of which died. She looked poor so I offered her a dollar. She looked surprised and said, "No, no, we die because the priest would refuse her absolution." Poor soul, was there ever such mental and spiritual bondage?

However, even the Catholic Church can't fool all of its flock all of the time, judging the number of Catholic women who do buy and read the Review. If they don't tell me they are Catholics, the rosary in the pocketbook is sufficient evidence.

Quite recently a priest bought the Review. I would have been more surprised than I was, had there not been a noticeable increase in clerical buyers lately. I asked him to get in touch with our headquarters and join the League, etc., but he smilingly shook his head and said, "No, no, we Catholics are opposed to this." "That is because you do not know what it is," I replied. "Oh, yes we do," he said. "But it interferes with God's work." I ventured that nothing could interfere with God's work. My work was God's work, or I could not possibly do it, that surely God wanted perfection in
the human race, and that Birth Control would help to bring that about. But he could not see it in that light and said something about God's way and punishment. I pointed out that wealthy Catholics practiced Birth Control and God seemed to be pretty good to them. I told him he would change his mind when he read the paper and he said "we always read your paper, we read everything to keep up to date." In spite of being an opponent he was very charming and likeable.

Soon after he had gone, a pale, thin, little wreck of a woman with several small children—regular doorsteps—stopped near me. She had some difficulty in keeping them together and the two older ones broke away and ran after their father. I offered her a leaflet saying she might be interested in it. She took it and thanked me with a pathetic smile. I asked her if they were all her children. They were—seven. They wanted to go home but all the cars were crowded, and her husband had gone to find a taxi. "But there are taxis right here at the corner," I said. "Yes," she answered, "but he wouldn't take one of them, he's so stubborn, he makes so much trouble for"—"and for himself," she added after a slight pause. "Of course," I said, "whenever you make trouble for others you make it for yourself, but it is high time we women got together and stopped men making trouble for us," to which she gave a smile and a nod. While talking to her I looked the five children over and none struck me as normal, two had very large heads and dull faces. They all went in pursuit of father and later passed with him still looking for a taxi. He was better dressed, fed and cared for than his wife and children.

Oh, yes, we'll have no more babies.
We'll have no more babies, oh yes,
We've morons and paupers, and drunkards and dope fiends,
White slaves and procurers, too,
We've bandits and slayers and madmen,
and victims of all sorts of badmen,
And to stop the recruiting to their ranks,
We'll have no more babies, oh yes

After standing for several hours amid that human flood surging up and down, in that babel of tongues in which the English is conspicuous by its scarcity, with vendors of all sorts of "delicacies" crying their wares, myself chiming in with "The Birth Control Review, 20 cents a copy," the taximen and bus men yelling for fares, the rattle of the traffic, frequently pierced by the shrill police whistle, the too-near merry-go-round organ grinding out "music"(!), I feel that Dante's Inferno would be a nice quiet little haven of rest and peace. When I feel weary and think "What's the use" an in-

significant looking little man or woman will come up and in broken English express his or her appreciation of what we are doing. Their cry is always "too much baby, too much poverty, too much misery." Many say "God bless you, for your good work!"

Most of my buyers speak broken English, Japanese and Chinese among them. Many foreigners are well educated. They speak correct English with an accent. Many colored men and women buy the Revue.

It has struck me very forcibly at Coney Island that the physically and materially worst looking people with the most children take the least notice of the Revue. As a man, after buying it and watching the people pass for a while, said, "they'd all buy it, if they had the courage except those that need it most." This Labor Day a group of Italians to all appearance three mothers, tiny women, and their children, all small, were trying to cross Surf Avenue, without getting lost or run over. Such a to-do! I tried to count them but that was impossible, they were scurrying all over the place.

I managed to slip a "Can you afford to have a large family," leaflet to one of the mothers. Some of the onlookers, interested in their progress said, "they need that all right," pointing to the Revue. They looked like a troupe of rag dolls scurrying across.

Though some people give me scornful glances and remarks and "look daggers," many give encouraging smiles and nods and call out "that's the stuff," "that's the best on earth," "That's what we need," "Birth control, I should say so, look at 'em," "You've come to the right place," "Fine work, keep it up," and so forth. Some intimate that they have seen me before by crying "Hello Macy's," or "Hello World Building." A soldier called out, "I don't believe in it!" I called back, "I do." Coming closer he said, "I believe in getting institutions full of idiots," I replied, "Oh, neither do I!" he exclaimed quite soberly, then added with a loud laugh as he passed on, "but we got thousands of 'em in the army," much to the amusement of all who had heard our "crosstalk."

A man, well dressed and important looking, somewhat the worst for "hootch" refused his change, tore and threw the paper at me, saying "You're a disgrace to womanhood," after which he crossed to the sidewalk and stood ogling and leering at "womanhood" as it passed, until a friend happened along and took him away, for which I felt truly thankful. A ragged man offered me a nickel, saying "Is that to help some church or something?" I replied, "No, this is to open clinics.
Book Reviews

Is Birth Control a Problem of Child Welfare

By HorneH Hart

In the competition of ideas as well as animal species there is a survival of the fit. When a textbook passes into a revised edition, it is an indication that it has performed a recognized service in the intellectual world. For ten years Mangold's "Problems in Child Welfare* has been the standard work in its field. Departing from the traditional philosophical approach to the problems of childhood, Dr. Mangold has endeavored, as far as readily available materials permitted, to place his discussion upon a scientific foundation of statistical data. It is highly significant, in a text which has been and will be so widely used as this, to note the attitude of the author towards the problems of eugenics, differential fecundity, and birth control.

"The Child and Heredity" is the title of the first section of the book. On page two to four, the author says:

Thus defective heredity is responsible for a large proportion of the ch-ldren who are condemned to such life-long abnormalities as idiocy, imbecility, bichardness, deaf-mutism, criminality, and certain forms of constitutional disease. It is further an unfortunate fact that some of these defective groups are much more prolific than the normal classes. By segregating idiots, imbeciles, instinctive criminals, and other groups in institutions (prevention of reproduction) can be accomplished. But custodial care must be permanent to make this plan successful. So large a proportion of these classes are eventually released that one group of social workers favors sterilization as the best preventive measure. Without doubt the most serious cases of defect can be handled either through sterilization or custodial care. From the eugenic point of view, in fact, these offer fewer difficulties than do thousands who suffer from slighter defects. But these people will not refrain from intermarrying with others who are similarly defective, while sterilization cannot even be mentioned. No generally accepted program of action to solve this question as has yet been developed.

It will be noted that Dr. Mangold makes no mention of the applicability of birth control to this problem. The index indicates that he discusses the limitation of birth-rate on page 33. The following quotation from that and the succeeding page indicate his point of view:

The voluntary avoidance of large families is probably the principal cause for the decline in birth rates. Natural and artificial causes are both contributing to a decline in our birth rates, but so far as they do not deplete our population, they do not offer a serious problem. Opposition to a judicious limitation of size of family is reactionary and unsocial.

Further recognition of certain aspects of the point of view of birth control advocates appears on page 25.

Fecundity is less Important than intelligent motherhood, and the brutal birth rates of the past have not made society more efficient. The mother of many ch-ldren has only stood more often by the open grave. A reasonable birth rate has decided advantages, because the mother, concentrating her thought upon a few healthy children, is charged with power to promote their future welfare but if her energy is dissipated among a company of short-lived and unwanted ch-ldren, the social consequences cannot be hoped.

Objection may be raised to the next following sentence. "A reasonable increase in population is a goal of all thinkers on social subjects, and the small families that threaten the extinction of the race cannot be condoned."

Attention is called by Dr. Mangold to the very low birth rate among college graduates and the higher birth rates among foreign than native-born stocks. He ignores, however, the accumulations of data which show the higher birth rates among the poor than the well-to-do classes and among the unskilled than among the skilled and professional classes. He fails even to mention such studies as those of the Jukes and Kallikak families.

The dominant emphasis in the book. aside from the sections in the introduction and the first chapter from which quotations have been presented above, is upon eugenics rather than eugenics, upon improvements in the environments of ch-ldren rather than upon endeavors to improve the quality of the stock from which the children are begotten and by which they are reared. Apparently Dr. Mangold overlooks entirely the fact that the excessive birth rate among the poor and ignorant not...
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only mutatuties defective germ plasm, but also
greatly increases the proportion of children
brought up in undesirable environments. He seems
to feel that public sentiment is not ready for any
constructive action toward improvement of the
racial stock. As illustrating this attitude it might
be well to quote a paragraph from page 18.

Occasional writers say that the child has a right
to be well-born. The author does not believe that
such a right has been established. Public opinion
favors the reduction of infant mortality to the lowest
practicable point, it demands health improvement,
the elimination of child labor and other opportuni-
ties for children, but it does not positively demand even
such reasonable control of human inheritance as will
reduce the proportion of inferior human beings,
either from the standpoint of mental or physical deficiency.
The right to be well-born is a goal that society
must eventually achieve for its children, but public sentiment today does not accept this principle.
In fact a large element of the population still believes
that society has no right to interfere with the mating
instinct, even though the inevitable consequences in
many cases will be birth of inferior or defective children.
Evidence of this fact are the reluctance of states to pass sterilization laws, the tendency of the
courts to declare such laws unconstitutional, the
tardy enactment of laws prohibiting the marriage of
the socially diseased and the non-enforcement of such
laws in most of the thirteen states which have taken
this legislative step. At best the so-called right to be
well-born is merely a hope, but some day it may be
realized.

Recognizing as he does the fundamental importance of eugenic reforms and feeling the unsympa-
thetic attitude of the public toward such meas-
ures, it is to be wished that Dr. Mangold might
have undertaken a more thorough study of the
available data in this field and a more vigorous en-
deavor to help to correct the sentiment whose ab-
ence he deplors. It is to be hoped, however, that
the reference he has made will help to direct public
attention to the need for greater emphasis upon
voluntary motherhood and upon the readjustment
of our present disastrously disegetic differential
fecundity.

A Review by Malcolm H. Fussell

BEHIND AND BEFORE By W. E. Hetland The
Macmillan Co., New York

To quote from the publisher's announcement, "This
book contains two essays on the relation of history,
politics, and eugenic warnings. The first deals with
the importance of a knowledge of past history to politicians
and active citizens, the second with the population ques-
tion as propounded to statesmen by biologists." In addi-
tion to these two essays, there are twelve brief appen-
dices dealing for the most part with political subject5.
The last two, however, and the longest, are devoted to a
discussion of the race problem as viewed by Lothrop
Stoddard and Madison Grant.

The conclusion reached in the first essay seems to be
that the efficient government of states is an almost hope-
lessly complex problem in which racial and other non-
political factors enter to such an extent that only quali-
ified experts can deal with them, and that "popular sov-
rranty expressed in votes" is not adequate to meet the
situation. Thoughtful students will probably agree with
this conclusion, but the author's argument would be
greatly strengthened by a more direct and concise treat-
ment, as it is, the reader feels that much of the discussion
does not lead anywhere in particular.

The second essay also suffers from a lack of cohesion,
and at times wanders far from its announced subject, the
population problem. It contains a number of provoca-
tive suggestions, such as the question whether the explot-
atation of natural resources implies the exploitation of
human beings. The question is also raised as to whether
children in large families develop their qualities better
than those in small ones. In the case of well-to-do parents,
there are undoubtedly some advantages in large
families, and the only child is, of course, almost always
at a disadvantage. However, since large families are
usually found among poor people, the question in general
can be answered most decidedly in the negative. The
harrowing letters written to Mrs. Sanger by members of
large families are perhaps the most effective answer to
Mr. Hetland's query.

We do not believe that the necessity of birth restric-
tion applies only to "undesirables," as the author sug-
gests. Many humble families, not favored by fortune,
cannot be classed as "undesirables," yet they are the ones
who usually suffer the most from inability to restrict their
offspring to the number they can properly care for. Nor
does it seem necessary to adopt such a "hesitant position
as Mr. Hetland takes in his criticism of Hubbard's views
regarding the racial dangers of family restriction.

The appendices, which make up the last sixty pages,
are perhaps the best part of the book. The author is
here more direct and to the point. The discussion of
"Legality and Circumstance" in relation to the problem of
secession and the American Civil War, is particularly
lucid and instructive, while the criticism of Lothrop Stod-
ard's alarmist views is timely and on the whole sound,
though perhaps not severe enough. This statement applies
still more to the discussion of Madison Grant's
"Passing of the Great Race," a book which has enjoyed a
popularity out of all proportion to its merits as a serious
scientific study. Mr. Hetland apparently accepts the
Nordic dogma almost in entirety, but in his conclusions
he exhibits a much more open mind than Mr. Grant, and
his statement that "a race that will not labor with its
hands is on a road that does not lead to survival" is
worthy of serious thought.

A NEW Year Book has made its appearance, and while, as Mr Alden says in the preface, year books are as the sand on the sea-shore for multitude, this volume is one which deserves a wide welcome, for it fills a place hitherto vacant, and meets a need felt by workers in the wide field of child welfare all over the world. Mr Edna Fuller, the compiler of the book, describes it as "a record of State and voluntary effort for the welfare of the child, including education, the care of the delinquent and destitute child, and conditions of juvenile employment throughout the world". The volume carries out this promise of the title page. It gives, in brief, concise and yet comprehensive form, the facts concerning these aspects of child life throughout the world. One may turn to its pages to know what the government has done for children in the United States, in France, Russia or Siam. A few pages have to suffice for the largest and most civilized countries, and the smallest territory or group of islands is accorded at least a paragraph. The book is an epitome of what mankind is doing to and for its children.

Nor does the title page describe the full scope of the volume. Mr Fuller has recognized that Child Welfare begins before birth, and he includes in his pages information concerning the marriage and divorce laws of each country, the laws affecting illegitimacy, and also the laws concerning Birth Control and the voluntary efforts made to bring contraception within reach of the mothers.

In introducing Birth Control as a necessary factor of Child Welfare, Mr Fuller has taken a position far in advance of the Child Welfare organizations of this country. One wonders whether the compiler would have been as open-minded had he lived in America instead of in England, for it must be recalled that in England Birth Control is perfectly legal, while here it is hampered by both Federal and State laws.

According to Mr Fuller, the only countries, besides the United States, where there are laws against Birth Control, are France and Belgium, in both of which the laws are of post-war enactment and are due to a fear of depopulation as a consequence of the war, and Sweden, where the sale or distribution of contraceptives is prohibited. The custom of Birth Control is noted as firmly established in Hungary, and tribute is paid to the good effects of the movement in Holland. The recent establishment of a Birth Control clinic in Mexico is noted and credit for this is given to the American Birth Control League. The unbiased account given of the careful work that is being done for the unfortunate children of Russia, and it is noted at the Second Conference of Russian Maternity and Child Welfare Associations in 1923, it was "maintained that advice on Birth Control should be given in cases where the woman's health demanded that she should not have children".

Holland comes in for commendation for its low infant mortality rate—the lowest in all Europe, and especially for its low rate of maternal mortality — "2.4 per 1000 live births, probably the lowest rate of maternal mortality in the world". It is also noted that the illegitimate birth-rate in 1921 was only 0.5 per 1000 of the population.

Concerning Birth Control, Mr Fuller writes:

"Private initiative in the Netherlands was responsible for the first Birth Control clinic in the world (1885) and there are now similar clinics in all the large towns. The clinics are maintained by the Neo-Malthusian League (Nieuw-Malthusiaansche Bond) which has also engaged in the training of large numbers of nurses to teach women the art of contraception, both at the clinics and elsewhere. The clinics are free to the very poor, while others pay according to their means. The league was granted a Royal Charter of Public Utility in 1895. Parli passu with this activity for the control of the birth-rate, there has been not only a steady decline in the latter, but a much greater decline in the rate of infantile mortality. Moreover, there has been a corresponding reduction in the proportion of military conscripts of low physical grade, and a marked increase in those of high grade. Whereas, in 1884, the proportion of conscripts, (aged 18) over the height of 5 ft 7 inches was only 32.95 per cent, it had risen by regular stages to 51.59 per cent in 1918."

Self-styled "investigators" endeavoring to discredit Birth Control, have stated that they failed to find any Birth Control clinics or any evidence of the usefulness of their work in Holland. It is evident that no such difficulty was experienced in the work of compiling this Year Book.

One omission we hope to see remedied when the Year Book reaches its second edition. No mention is made of the clinical research work in actual Birth Control practice that has been done in New York under the direction of Margaret Sanger, nor of the efforts to establish Birth Control clinics in other cities. The omission is probably due to the fact that much time has evidently been occupied in the gathering together of the facts contained in this volume, and to the impossibility of bringing the information up to date in the first issue of a year book covering an entirely new field. While we regret this defect, we welcome most gratefully the full recognition that Mr Fuller has given to the Birth Control movement, and we hope that his book will form a new precedent for writers on Child Welfare problems.

A BOOK carrying the Nilah Obstatus of the Roman Catholic Church is not one to which the advocates of Birth Control would look with hopefulness. Yet this volume...
In the Social Action Series, is one to which we offer a welcome, for it holds out a possibility of advance by the Church, and of a revision of opinions that are found to be wrong. It contains a sincere confession of ignorance in regard to social work and an acknowledgement that the Roman Catholic Church has not always kept to the highest standards as set by more scientific Social workers outside its membership. "No beating," writes Mr Kerby, "was pronounced in favor of those who serve a noble cause in a faulty way." "The Church aims to take account of the results of thought and experience at all times. She is eager to appropriate to her practical wisdom all the results of human thought and experience." Science proposes surgical procedure with criminals and imbeciles to prevent the perpetuation of these anti-social types. The Church refuses her approval, until she can gain time to understand whether or not such a procedure is a violation of the natural right which the victims have not necessarily forfeited in their condition or by their behavior. "The law of universal change operates in our charities as it does in the rest of the world." Surely a book in which we can find such statements does not shut the door entirely on a possible revision of the edicts against Birth Control. We recommend the book to the careful study of the more bigoted of our opponents in the Roman Catholic Church.

PERIODICALS

In the Fortnightly Review (London,) W L George, the novelist and strong advocate of Birth Control, is publishing serially, "The Story of Woman." He traces sympathetically the slow process of liberation by which women emerged from their sub-human condition as the possession and chattels of men, and came to take their place as almost the equals of the long favored superior sex.

Professor H S Jennings of the Johns Hopkins University, gives an enlightening discussion of the present status of knowledge concerning Heredity and Environment in the Political Science Monthly (Lancaster, Pa.) for September. He shows that 1815 is by no means a simple matter to distinguish how far characteristics in an individual are due to environment and how far they are a matter of inheritance.

In an interesting article in the August number of the Contemporary Review (London,) J Lyng discusses "The Problem of the Australian Aborigines." He shows that when the English went to Australia in the eighteenth century, they found the country over-populated from the point of view of the natives, who had not reached the agricultural, nor even the pastoral stage. "Out of consideration for the food supply," the natives were in the habit of checking the growth of population by killing some of the new-born children. Yet the Continent of Australia was then maintaining only one inhabitant to every 20 square miles. Overpopulation evidently depended not on the density of the inhabitants, but on the scantiness of this means of subsistence—a relation which holds good in much more civilized countries.

Lothrop Stoddard, in the Saturday Evening Post for September, contributes another article on immigration and heredity, under the title of "The New Realism of Science." In these articles Mr. Stoddard emphasizes the necessity for the United States to close the door against the floods of alien races if the country is to remain united in political ideals and government.

Jesse Lynch Williams, the well-known author and writer of short stories, contributes an article to the Peoria (Ill.) Transcript, for July 30, on the present status of marriage and the difficulties attending it, especially with regard to the bringing up of children. "Only one child in four," he writes, "has a fair physical chance to grow up in this world."

Yet the September Pictorial Review (New York) contains another of the vigorous eugenics articles from the pen of A E Wiggam. It is called "Ancestral Hand-Me-Downs." In these articles Mr. Wiggam, in simple familiar language, is teaching the American people the principles of heredity, and the evils of uncontrolled breeding.

The New Generation (London) for August, contains an article by Mrs B J Drysdale describing a visit to France. In it Mrs. Drysdale pays a tribute to the thrift and good sense of the French in refusing to bring into the world children for whom they could not possibly properly provide. Instead of a "rabbit-like brood," the French couple is content with "one or two children, carefully educated at home and at school—ready to maintain themselves in turn as their parents have done."

Physical Culture, New York, is carrying an interesting series of articles on Birth Control. We especially call attention to those in the July and August issues.

Mr French Strothers publishes in the September issue of The World's Work a popular presentation of the principles of Heredity. An editorial in the same issue attempts to answer Professors East and Ross, but without scientific background. It sees no danger to our civilization in a yearly increase of two millions to the population.

BOOKS RECEIVED


From D Appleton & Co., New York, Race Hygiene and Heredity, by Hermann W Siemens, M.D., translated and edited by Lewellys F. Baker, M.D.
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Editor, Birth Control Review

A number of your readers (August, 1923) have accidentally come into my hands, and I have read with interest the article entitled "Progress of the Birth Control Movement." But you will not wonder at the fact that the last words have made a painful impression on me. They simply show that you only know France from hearsay, "France militaristic and desirous of world conquest.

I have lived among the French people for the last thirty years. I have a cousin in the French Senate, several friends in the Chamber of Deputies, and I follow French politics closely. Now I can assure you that this is a huge mistake, and that President Poincaré was quite right when he declared that "French imperialism is a bogey that has been locked up for many years next to Napoleon's tomb."

The French have no wish to stay in the Ruhr, and will leave it when Germany begins to pay what she owes. The reason for which France keeps up her army is that in 1914 she was very near being beaten by the Germans and does not feel safe.

The reason for which the Government does not encourage Birth Control is because we have too much of it already. The one or two children family is quite general among our peasantry, the backbone of the country. In thousands of cases the one child has been killed in the war and nobody remains to take the place of the father on the farm. The result will be that within less than twenty years, Germany will have a population double of that of France. If, as is to be feared, the racial and imperialistic tendency gets the upper hand and declares war, the consequences may be very serious to France if she does not take proper precautions.

The outstanding patriotic duty in France today is to repolee the country, and to encourage large families. I mean families of more than two children, especially among the farmers. If your population in the United States had decreased by several millions during the last ten years, and if you had the Japs, instead of peaceful Canadians, on your northern border, I believe that you would do the same.

H. Mrle d'Aubigne
Minister of the Reformed Church of France

We are glad to print M. d'Aubigne's protest, and we acknowledge that there is probably some truth in his contention. If the circumstances of the United States resembled those of France, there would be demands here that we should engage in a cradle competition. Nevertheless we believe that such a competition would be unwise and wrong, and we are utterly out of sympathy with any attempt, either in the United States or in France, to prevent people from having access to scientific information through Government action. French families may in some cases be too small, and it is within the right of the French nation to encourage a sentiment in favor of larger families. But we would remind M. d'Aubigne that the French birthrate is approximately equal to that of Great Britain, but that, whereas, with 758,386 births, there was a natural increase in England and Wales in 1923, of 313,517, in France with 761,861 births, the increase only 98,871. These figures seem to indicate that the birth rate was amply high enough—in England it seems to have been too high—but that the French death rate might reasonably be reduced.

Editor

In Favor of Sterilization

Editor, Birth Control Review

I am deeply interested in Birth Control, but in a different way from what you understand. I am a German, came to this country in 1865, am now 78 years old. Perhaps you think what does such an old fool want to do with Birth Control? It is this way: After I got a little start with the English, I subscribed to the Scientific American in order to get more proficient in English reading. That was in 1874, and at that time the Scientific American had an article about criminals and their treatment. At that time there were 66 inmates in the Massachusetts Penitentiary, serving terms from 15 years to life. Now the Scientific American traced these criminals to one low woman. It said that woman had been sterilized, there would have been no such criminals. We here in Missouri have now about 3,300 convicts in our penitentiary. Then we have four insane asylums in which altogether there are about 4,610 insane persons and about 733 employees to take care of them. Then we have two reform schools, one for boys and one for girls. Our penitentiary is now self-sustaining, but the insane asylums cost about $5,000 a month each. The Scientific American proposed to sterilize all criminals, and I, for my part, think all insane persons should be sterilized, also those afflicted with syphilis. If all the outlaws and insane persons were sterilized that would be sufficient Birth Control, and would not cost the taxpayer so much money. I tried sterilizing on tomcats. It makes them so much meek. I have one now. He is sure a fine cat. Not long ago, he brought home a rabbit and laid it down in front of my wife. She feeds him. Now if you would agitate the matter through your paper it might call the attention of the public. If the sterilized criminals would behave so much better in proportion to the tomcats, it would be a great improvement.

George Butler, Eugene, Mo.

Our correspondent is right about the saving that would accrue to the community if the flood of diseased and defective infants could be stopped at its source. The American Birth Control League stands for sterilization under proper safeguards.
News Notes

UNITED STATES

New York

A Birth Control booth was one of the features of the Women's Activities Exhibit at the Hotel Commodore, September 22 to 27. The work was under the chairmanship of Mrs. George H. Day, Sr., of Hartford, Conn. Mrs. Day was assisted by Mrs. J. Bishop Vandever, Mrs. H. J. Tiedeman, Mrs. J. S. Browning, Mrs. Polly Randall, Mrs. Fenley Hunter, Mrs. Frances B. Ackermann, Mrs. Beverley Robinson, Mrs. C. W. Carter, Mrs. A. G. Porritt and Miss P. Daniels.

A resolution which, harmless and well-intentioned on the surface, is fraught with danger for progressive movements and freedom of the press, was passed by the Knights of Columbus just before the adjournment of the annual convention in August. They then adopted a recommendation to "organize and finance a movement for fighting the dissemination of immoral and harmful her- iture." As the movement will be directed by the Roman Catholic hierarchy, it is a distinct threat to Birth Control.

California

Much interest in Birth Control was aroused by the visit of Mrs. Anne Kennedy, Executive Secretary to San Francisco and Los Angeles. Everywhere she went, she interviewed men and women of prominence in political, university and social life, and met with much encouragement and stimulus. Following are a few notes on her more important meetings:

August 15 At a meeting held at the St. Francis Hotel, San Francisco, a committee was formed as a branch of the American Birth Control League, with Raymond H. Arnold of Oakland as chairman. The committee is to work for an amendment of the California law affecting Birth Control. San Jose, Palo Alto and Vallejo were represented at the meeting, and it is expected that the organization will take a large area around San Francisco. It was through the efforts of Mrs. Kennedy that this committee came into existence.

August 16 Mrs. Kennedy addressed the La Vero Foundation at an evening meeting, at which Mr. Fred Rivers presided. A spirited debate followed.

August 18 The Soroptomist Club, the Business Women's organization of Oakland entertained Mrs. Kennedy at luncheon at the Hotel Oakland, and listened to an explanation of the aims of the American Birth Control League.

September 3 Mrs. Kennedy was the guest of the Gamut Club, a Los Angeles men's organization.

September 5 A branch of the American Birth Control League was formed at Los Angeles, with Miss Elizabeth McManus as temporary Secretary. The occasion was a luncheon at the Hotel Clark, with Mrs. Henry Boesche presiding. Mrs. Anne Kennedy made an address, and convinced those present of the need of Birth Control.

September 6 Mrs. Kennedy spoke at the Metaphysical Library of San Diego. She was exceedingly well received.

Texas

At Houston, on September 11, the Workmen's Council of the City was addressed by Mrs. Anne Kennedy, in their Hall. The Chairman was Mr. J. L. Keeper. The interest aroused was manifested in many intelligent questions.

Unanimous approval of the programme of the American Birth Control League, providing for the establishment of Birth Control clinics, was given on September 15, when Mrs. Anne Kennedy addressed the Woman's Forum at Dallas. The chairman was Mrs. W. S. Bramlet, and Mrs. Kennedy was introduced by Mrs. C. E. Zigenbein. The meeting was for women only, but the following day Mrs. Kennedy addressed an audience of both men and women.

Utah

At the meeting of the American Prison Association in Salt Lake City, in August, Judge Jacob Kanzler of Portland made an outspoken plea that society should stop the rabbit-like breeding of the feeble-minded and the criminal. Unless steps are taken to alter present conditions, he urged, the asylums and other state institutions will become an almost unbearable burden, and the whole tendency will be, not towards better conditions, but towards more and more delinquency and crime.

CANADA

The omission of Birth Control from the programme of the all-American Conference of Social Workers, which was held at Toronto in July, was severely commented upon by the Canadian Forum. After commenting on the multiplicity and the subdivisions of Social work agencies it continued —

Social servants will find, however, that their efforts will be severely handicapped so long as they allow the search for truth or the pursuit of social welfare to be hindered by taboos, whether these are connected with supposed political expediency or theological...
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ment must act before he would give consent to the introduction of Birth Control at the Health Centers.

A deputation of women of the Labor Party waited on Mr. Wheatley, on August 13th. It was headed by Dr. Marion Phillips, and this time the specific demand was for an expert inquiry into the whole subject. This Mr. Wheatley was not able to refuse, and it is felt that the result will be such an education of the Labor Cabinet as to make it inevitable that the Ministry of Health will change its policy of obstruction.

Birth Control had a prominent place in the programme of the Summer School of the Independent Labor Party which opened on August 18th, at Cloughton, Yorks. An article by Mrs. Bertrand Russell was included in the booklet prepared for the use of the students. In this, Mrs. Russell recounted the efforts that had been made to secure permission from Minister of Health Wheatley for the giving of Birth Control information at Health Centers, and gave facts and figures showing the need for such instruction. Her researches had led her to believe that the lack of Birth Control, rather than its practice, was the menace to motherhood and to a happy married life.

The Annual Convention of the British Labor Party will be held in London during the week of October 6th and it is announced that the Women's branches are preparing to press for resolutions favoring Birth Control. It will be difficult for the Cabinet to resist, if the party makes a strong stand against the repressive attitude of the Minister of Health. If Mr. Wheatley finds it impossible conscientiously to withdraw from his position, his resignation will probably be the next demand of the women.

AUSTRIA

A DETAILED account of Birth Control work in Austria was printed in the July Review. The article was by Johann Ferch who is the leader and the inspiration of the movement there. A letter from Mr. Ferch dated August 20th, gives further news of progress. In Austria, he writes, the idea of controlling birth is making great strides ahead. Vienna has four and the Austrian provinces eight clinics. Moving pictures and lantern slides are used as a help, and all the newspapers continuously print articles about Birth Control.

GERMANY

The Austrian Birth Control agitation is being extended by Mr. Ferch into Germany and the German parts of Czecho-Slovakia. Societies have been started which are working hard, holding meetings.
with lantern slide lectures. The work is not hampered by any prohibitive legislation, and the daily newspapers are showing themselves ready to take up the cause. Mr. Ferris looks forward to translating the pamphlets (mostly of his own writing) into all languages and pushing them in Italy, France, Scandinavia, Hungary, Poland, etc.

COMING EVENTS

The 1925 Birth Control Conference

THE date for the Sixth International Birth Control and Neo-Malthusian Conference has now been fixed. It will open at the Hotel McAlpin, New York, on Thursday, March 26th and will last until the 31st. There will be no sessions on Sunday, March 29th, but it is intended to hold a public meeting in the afternoon. Various features for the benefit of the delegates will enhance the proceedings. Delegates are already promised from England, Germany, Austria, Italy and Japan, as well as from all parts of the United States, especially including the Pacific Coast, and from Canada.

Legislative Work for 1925

New Jersey and Connecticut are both planning campaigns of legislative work for the coming winter. In Connecticut a bill legalizing Birth Control was introduced in 1923, but was defeated in the Lower House. It is intended to reintroduce the bill, with some modifications, to make it more acceptable to the medical profession.

Mr. Everett J. Meves, who has already done much for Birth Control both in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, is planning to conduct a campaign of publicity in favor of an amendment which shall put the medical profession on a safe basis in prescribing Birth Control to all women who desire the information. Mr. Meves is Secretary of the Birth Control League in Camden, N. J.

BIRTH CONTROL AND MEDICAL PRACTICE

(Continued from page 280)

Chronic alcoholism and morphism affect the offspring most seriously. The curse of dipsomania is not sufficiently realized by us. At least 20 per cent of all feeble-minded children are the offspring of drunkards.

Pauperism is another affliction which calls most insistently for the question of Birth Control. Every pauper and everyone who is unable to nourish his already existing family has certainly no justification to bring still more children into the world. The pauper should lose the right to reproduction. Through its doctors the State must see to the reduction of pauperism, the State for its self-preservation, must see to it that social poverty be not increased by these people.
CONGY ISLAND
(continued from page 291)
where poor mothers can be instructed how not to have the babies they can't afford to clothe and educate. "Here, take it," he said, thrusting the nickel into my hand, and hurried away.

A woman jeered "birth control, I should think the good Lord takes care of that." He does with people who use the intelligence he gave them," I replied. Flappers of both sexes buy the Review. Sometimes a group of them stand a little way off, looking over at the paper, and giggling. I appear perfectly unconscious of them and at last one of them squares his or her shoulders and takes the plunge, to the suppressed laughter of the others.

I always impress upon them that Birth Control is the most serious and Important question on earth, especially to the young people who have the power of making the world a better place to live in.

Some people are quite concerned as to "where would you have been if your mother had practiced that?" A foreign born man, evidently trying to convey that, very agitatedly called out "Very wouldn't be here?" Another said "if Roosevelt could see you he'd have a fit" and I pointed out to him that Roosevelt's wife didn't have a baby every year, nor abortion after abortion, that their children had been well spaced and taken care of, and that there was no need for people who could not take care of children to have larger families than Roosevelt. "That's true, too, lady," he admitted.

Many apparently fairly well-to-do young couples with one baby, sometimes two babies, say they can't afford to have any more, they find babies a great expense. Many over-burdened fathers are glad to "take it home to the wife," and judging from the accompanying "burdens" the wife will be glad to get it. One worried-looking man with four had brought them out to give mother and the new arrival some peace and quiet. Often a group of husbands and wives with a swarm of children will halt a little way off and after evidently debating the question come over, or a child will be sent to get one. Some will pass on, casting longing or scornful glances back.

A woman asked "Is that to do away with the babies?" I said "No, it's to prevent doing away with them." Sometimes a proud father will hold his baby up high and call out "Nothing doing, look at this" and I call back, "That's all right if you can feed and clothe and educate it properly," at which those who have heard usually express approval. Mostly judging from the baby's general appearance father's pride is justified, but occasionally he ought to be prevented from repeating the offence. One said, "I am going to have as many as I want."
"As many as you can decently look after" I replied, with approval from hearers. One couple with a baby about 18 months old, looking the picture of health and happiness, looked thin and sickly themselves, as if they starved to feed the baby, which is very laudable no doubt, but the woman was pregnant and did not look strong enough to survive the next ordeal.

The same evening I noticed a poor-looking couple with a baby, gazing very intently at the Review from a short distance. I moved a little towards them with the crowd and they came towards me as if merely to pass, but in passing the man looked anxiously at me saying "how much?" "Twenty cents," I said, at which he sadly shook his head and went on, but I gave his wife who was behind him a leaflet and told her to come to the clinic. There are so many such cases. In all the merry-making of Coney Island they seem like skeletons at the feast.

DAEDALUS AND ICARUS

(Continued from paps 219)

Science may or may not prove a boon to mankind. No doubt Mr. Russell is right in his contention that it is no substitute for virtue and that what we need most of all is more kindness. Yet we believe Mr. Haldane is essentially correct in his claim that science tends to force man into greater cooperation with his fellows. However, we cannot wait a few centuries for invention and research to solve our present problems, and there is little chance for an increase of kindness in a world where unwanted children bring bitterness and hopelessness to overburdened mothers and discouraged fathers, where the derelicts and misfits of humanity multiply apace, and the pressure of hungering millions starts the rattle of the war-drums.

Birth control, after all, is more than an economic need, it is an ethic demand.

THE PASSING OF A HERO

(Continued from page 289)

their faculties, their time, and no less their body. Quite in accordance with their ideas, Dr. and Mrs. Rutgers were opposed to the double moral standard, the traffic in women and state regulation of vice. When in 1911 the Government abohshed the houses of prostitution, they were both prominent among the reformers, although, in politics, they held opposite views to those of the Government.

Rutgers was always strong and great enough to try to understand his adversary's ideas and enter into his views. He never lost an opportunity of finding points of sympathy with every living creature. He was most kind and serviceable. He was an ideal social reformer, and the world is the poorer for his death.
Valuable Hint For Housewives

Do you know that you can make an excellent Polish Mop out of an ordinary mop and a little 3-in-One? It's easy to do and costs very little.

Just cut off the strands of any mop about eight inches from handle and moisten slightly with 3-in-One.
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Allow a short time for the oil to permeate the strands thoroughly before using.

With this homemade, economical Polish Mop, it is so easy to clean hard to reach corners, under beds, behind radiators. Out comes the dust and lint, clinging to the mop as if to a magnet.

Shake off the dirt out doors and your Mop is ready to go after another load. Floors and old cloth always shine after a visit of your 3-in-One Polish Mop.

Cleans and polishes simultaneously.

3-in-One Dustless Dust Cloths are just as easy to make as Polish Mops, and they pick up dust just as well. Use any soft cloth, permeated with 3-in-One.

This great oil compound has 79 uses in the home-alone—lubricating all light mechanisms—cleaning and polishing woodwork and metal—preventing rust and tarnish. All these uses, and many others, are explained in a Dictionary of Uses which is wrapped around every bottle and sent with every sample.


3-in-One is sold at all good stores in 1 oz., 3 oz. and 8 oz. bottles and in 3 oz. Handy Oil Cans. Ask for 3-in-One by name and look for the Big Red One on the label.
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