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Editorial

THE INTEREST shown in birth control at the National Conference of Social Work, June 14-20, is an indication of the steady progress of the movement. Birth control is no longer an outcast, an eager-eyed supplicant, a timid newcomer. When the forces of social betterment take counsel together, it has its appointed place. It is recognized as an instrument of preventive medicine, of preventive social work, and of race betterment.

Meetings arranged by the American Birth Control League were filled to overflowing and well reported by the press. We print in this issue Robert W. Kelso's address Dependencies and Birth Control, and Dr. Elias P. Lyon's address Is Birth Control Eugenic? In addition to these, George Packard, Chicago attorney, spoke on Birth Control — Is It Legal? Reverend David Bryn-Jones, of the Minneapolis Trinity Baptist Church, on Birth Control, Is It Moral?, and Dr. E. E. Minnich, of the University of Minnesota, on Biology and Birth Control. Excerpts from these speeches, as well as details of the meeting on clinical service, will appear in the August and September issues of the Review Discussion on birth control, however, was by no means confined to special sessions. It permeated the conference, and rightly so, for it touches many sides of life. To cite one instance, Dr. John W. Elliott, director of Social Education for the American Baptist Publication Society, speaking before the Church Conference on Social Work, declared that "the dissemination of birth control knowledge is now general, and soon will be universal." He recommended that "social leaders, both in the churches and out should cooperate in providing education for the wise use of birth control knowledge."

Such espousal of birth control is heartening. It indicates a trend which cannot be denied, it offsets the disappointment felt by all interested in birth control, when the Presbyterian Commission on Marriage and Divorce eliminated the section on birth control from their report to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. Meeting in Pittsburgh on June 2nd, The deleted section read as follows:

"Earnest Christian people are asking for the church's guidance on the subject of birth control. This subject demands attention today as never before. Economic conditions and a worthy standard of living, clearly make it wrong to bring children into the world without adequate provision for their nurture and proper consideration for the health of the mother."

"The Christian conception of sex clothes the relationship between husband and wife with a spiritual significance, sanctifying marriage as a divine institution. Moral control is the basic essential to a worthy experience of a marriage relation."

"In expressing its judgment on this subject, the church in no sense modifies its condemnation of sex relations outside of marriage."

"Two methods are possible in securing birth control. The first is continence. The second is the use of contraceptives. When this method is adopted in seeking the worthy objectives stated above, it should only be in fidelity to the highest spiritual ideals of the Christian home."

This seems similar in intention to the Lambeth Conference resolution, adopted by the Episcopal Church, and sufficiently mild. Its withdrawal was largely a matter of policy, because it was felt, the time was not yet ripe for an open discussion and vote on the subject. Reports of the attitude of various denominations and localities toward the recent pronouncement of the Federal Council of Churches show interesting mingling with timidity, and a sense of the importance of a united front. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church voted to remain within the Council, and appropriated $18,000 to it, but it passed a motion offered by the Reverend Mark L. Matthews, pastor of the largest Presbyterian church in the country, in Seattle, that "the Council be instructed to hold its peace on questions of delicacy, morality and integrity, until we have an opportunity to talk them over."

Without doubt, this motion expresses the inner meaning of the Commission's action in
withdrawing the birth control section from its report — the churches are aware of the birth control problem, but they need time to talk and think about it. Any attempt to push through a formulated policy too soon will only stir up opposition, threaten the unity of the Protestant church, and defeat its own end. A clearer understanding of the issue a bound to result from discussion, pro and con.

In this connection we call attention to the articles on Do Women Want Children? in the June and the current issues of the Review. There has been a great deal of nonsense written about motherlove, and the feminists of the first decades of the Twentieth Century were stirred by a natural spirit of revolt against Victorian acquiescence and sentimentality. Like other — and less important jobs — child-bearing should be a matter of choice. But the pendulum is swinging back and the average young woman of today looks forward to marriage and children more than to causes and careers. There are, of course, some women who do not want children. We believe they have a right to plan their lives to suit themselves. This they can do, thanks to birth control, and fortunately so, for an unwilling mother will, in most cases, make a poor mother. But the desire and love for children, the delight in babies, the unquestioning response to helpless, young, growing things is, we believe, inherent in the physical and psychological make-up of the vast majority of women. We touch here upon deep and fundamental racial instincts. Given proper economic conditions, women — and men too — do not deny their most miraculous power, the creation of new life.

Hardly a month goes by without news of the formation of a new state league. Minnesota now joins the fast growing list, as described in the News Notes of this issue. We look forward to the time when every state will have a well-functioning birth control league, when every physician will be as well equipped to give advice on contraception as on any other physical problem, when every city and town will provide clinical service for those unable to consult private doctors, when a correct understanding of birth control will make it a potent force for race betterment.

The Medical Times and Long Island Medical Journal for June cites the medical objections to present contraceptive methods and comments editorially, "As medical scientists we must insist upon rational methods or none." It does not point out that research is retarded by the stigma that still clings to the subject of birth control, that the ambitious young physician does not command the same support and approval when he undertakes research in contraceptive methods as would be his due were he to engage in research in cancer, or tuberculosis, or a relatively unimportant matter, such as hay fever. The best medical authorities agree that present-day methods are harmless, reasonably sure, and fairly inexpensive. There is room for improvement, and the Improvement will come when the problem is taken up by the best research talent, when all restrictions and slurs are removed. But before that time comes, the medical profession must free itself from such muddled thinking and misinformation as that which concludes the above mentioned editorial "if a woman is not in condition to bear a child, is she fit for the exactions put upon her by sex relations?" Does the same question apply to men unfit for fatherhood? Has our honored colleague heard of the phrase "mutually beneficial" or read Havelock Ellis?

The children's bureau of the Department of Labor reports that one-fifth of 12,000 mothers studied in Philadelphia in 1928, were found to be working out, to help support their families. Twenty-eight per cent of these working mothers were the chief breadwinners, and fifty per cent had children under 11 years of age. We should recall these figures when we hear platitudes about women's duty to their children, and about "health only" reasons for contraception. Family life and economics are interlocked, as long as women are forced out of the home to support themselves and their children, they must have the right to decide how many children they leave behind, uncared for.
Dependency and Birth Control

By ROBERT W KELSO

IN MY JUDGMENT the subject of birth control and dependency is, at the present moment, the deep-est riddle of human conduct, a needle concerning which a few palming pungent observations need to be made and repeated, and reiterated until such time as the scientific knowledge of today can be harmonized with the folk customs of the past.

Dependency is that degree of poverty that calls upon others for support. It is increasing throughout the world in the face of high perfections of mechanical aids in the production of food and the manufacture of products suitable to human needs. It is increawng in spite of a standard of living appreciably higher than in more primitive times. It is increasing because of two truths, one of which is the inevitable principle of physical Me, and the other of which betrays our unreasoning attitude toward the future.

The first of these truths is the principle that man, in common with every other form of Me, tends to increase his numbers beyond his available food supply. This rule operates under all economic conditions, through all sorts of political weather, in spite of the influence of every creed or religion that man has ever invented, prevailing over all the influences of the past whatsoever.

The other truth is that man has consistently disregarded this principle in his philosophy of conduct. Through all the cons of tunc which represent our human day upon the earth, man has known little about the mystery of Me, and naturally has ascribed to superhuman power, the propagation of his own offspring as a new day of scientific understanding, seen dimly in the past no doubt, but now realized with accuracy, which places the individual and his mate in possession of concrete understanding of the processes through which thew young are propagated. At the same time it places upon them the obligation toward human society in general, and their prospective young in particular—to apply that scientific knowledge so that the best possible heritance may be bestowed, and the broadest opportunity in life offered to their young.

So it is only within this past half century—intensively only within the years of this present century—that the question comes pointedly to the front of man's mind, "Shall we apply our new scientific knowledge to the propagation of our young, no matter what that course may do to our existing beliefs and folk customs, so long only as it tends to unprove the physical, the mental, and the moral status of the individual?"

In the narrow houses of the poor, we may find abundant proof the degrading and devastating effect of improvident childbirth. We find by sampling studies, that laborers' wives bear nearly twice as many children as the wives of professional men, yet we do not find that the professional class is dying out. By other studies we find that infant mortality is much heavier among the poor than it is among those better conditioned in the economic world. Of course these two facts go together. The wives of laborers who by and large are the poor, bear more children and suffer the tragic misery of losing them in infancy more frequently than do their better favored sisters. We need hardly ask ourselves why this is so.

An examination of the records of relief societies reveals the typical working man's family as one in which the children have been born usually from eleven to thirteen months apart. After the birth of the sixth or the seventh child you see a mother worn out by the drain of childbirth, harassed by the heavy job of caring for a large flock, struggling along at washing and scrubbing, and keeping the household in shape for these children. If death has taken some of them the scars of that...
death are on the mother’s face—it is she who has paid the price. The truth is that she is all used up. Her lot has been hard, anyhow, without the strains of childbirth, but in addition she has never had a chance to recuperate after the birth of any one of her children, and the drain has been too great. The result is that she is not able to give the full measure of a mother’s care to the children she has left. Each child has added expense in the home, and those who have died have brought heavy debt, as the death of a member in the families of the poor customarily means expenditures out of all proportion to any expectation or even hope of financial ability to pay the bill. Among the poor insurance is almost invariably burial insurance. One of the haunting fears of the poor man’s family is that if any one of his loved ones should die it would have to be buried in a pauper’s grave.

**What about the children?**

But let us turn our attention now to the children who survive. The family relief records are eloquent in their monotonous biographies. The children are undennounished, they seem to run the gamut of children’s diseases with rare facility. The great advances in immunization have been a boon to them, but still they suffer. Sample studies by the U.S. Public Health Service have uncovered the fact that sickness among the poor is much more frequent than among other classes, and that the average duration of illnesses is over twice as long. Naturally this is what we should expect where the opportunity to procure medical treatment is less, where nourishment is less regular, and less adequate, and where the wear and tear upon mind and body is greater. We are in the habit of saying that these are the natural results of poverty, but we have the cart before the horse—they are family conditions arising largely out of the size of the family, which have produced the condition of too many mouths and not enough food. They have resulted in a poverty that knows no elevation.

Again the record reveals an ugly truth about these surviving children. Their schooling is but fragmentary. They are kept home for lack of shoes or clothes. They come to school with no breakfast, so much so that in all our metropolitan school systems, school lunches are provided and given to children who haven’t enough food at home. This fact is evidence of underprivilege in these children in their preparation for life. Again we say it is because of their poverty, but again I say we have mistaken the cause for the effect. The family from which they came has undertaken on too slight assurance, to carry a load of support too heavy to be borne. It is not a lack of loyalty to the job—it is not a failure of determination to work every day and earn workman’s pay—it is only that the workman has taken on too much of a load.

The American laboring man’s family, certainly in the lower paid occupations, follows a well recognized poverty cycle, which begins with the young fellow at the point of marriage. He begins housekeeping with his bride, and they live with fair competence above the level of want. Independent and courageous. Then come the children. The first makes some difference in the family budget but if it is a healthy child the young couple go forward with some feeling of prosperity. The second child is still not too much of a burden, but by the time there are five, the household is pretty well known to the social worker. Roughly speaking, the large laboring families that have not been at some time or another dependent upon charity are the exception. The saving circumstance is that the first and second child become old enough to earn, so that if the brood is not too large and the mother has not broken down and the children are not sickly, and all the other major ‘ifs’ are satisfied, the household itself again above the line of dependency and is self supporting. “But as soon as the children leave to establish homes of their own, the parents find themselves growing older and older, presently super-annuated for the getting of a job, and without savings. They face a dependent old age.

So much of a routine has this poverty cycle become, that it may be taken as axiomatic, that large families rapidly produced, mean poverty, misery and a low quality of physical and mental capacity in the young.

As we classify and argue and discuss the various causes of dependency, we ascribe heavy toll to drink, a good deal to vice, the heaviest mark for sickness, but the professional case worker knows full well, how much drunken debauchery follows from the utter discouragement of men and women in the battle of life. They know how much of the vices akin to drink, strife along the same path, and they can tell you that the families of frequent and numerous childbirths are the families of many sicknesses and of frequent deaths.

If we were to look up and away from the family dependency records, at the far horizon of depend-
ency as you see it in the mass, we should find eloquent proof of man's improvident propagation of his young. So ingrained is the fallacy that numbers means strength and that rapidity of growth means progress, that we shall have to be careful not to fall into a false philosophy in our thinking. Our loud-voiced political leaders have for decades insisted that the people of the United States are great because they have grown so rapidly, because they have so many populous cities. In all probability our greatest weakness is our rapidity of growth. Somehow national character and race culture are deep matters of slow development.

From the economic point of view population growth is unsound that is not in complete attune with the development of available and dependable food supply. China is thought by the ablest students, to have been overpopulated for 300 or 400 years. She appears never to have placed the slightest check upon her birth rate. She recognizes three great forces that serve to keep her population down — war, famine, and disease. And so we find her today, as she has stood through all this time, at the saturation point, breeding about 16,500,000 young each year, and losing approximately the same number of souls by death. If this holocaust were ordained by the Supreme Being, the problem facing us would be different. So far as man has any reason to believe, Fate plays no such part — the real reason for it is Ignorance, and ignorance no longer justified, since scientific knowledge has dispelled it.

If we turn to India, we find the same situation — an agricultural people, seeking to support whole households on half an acre of tillage, dying by the hundreds of thousands, where even a moderate shortage of rainfall reduces the food supply. This Indian situation is interrupted slightly by the incoming of the British government, with imports and some regularization of supplies, but so long as the East Indian places no check whatever upon the numbers of his young, just so long must all other forces, economic and political, be overborne by the great compelling law of overpopulation.

Look where we will through the history of mankind, across the nations of the earth, we shall find that the deadly law of over-population is working constantly, rolling up populations in excess of the reasonable expectancy of feeding them. The population of the world today lives upon a huge sf if the grain and the vegetables and the fruit are produced sf they are gathered sf nothing goes wrong with the elaborate, intricate system of transporting them from the point of production to the place of consumption and, finally, if the closely-herded population swarms at the terminals of these supply routes have the wherewith to pay for them, then man in his present state can live. But the chain of industry, like a conveyor, must move smoothly, and no link of it must get caught or break.

A NEW PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE

The human family is becoming more convinced today than ever before, that there is something inherently wrong in this industrial system that has taken the world captive. We speak of business depression as a banking or an accounting difficulty, yet we are discovering now that there are psychological factors governing credit behind these sick spells of industry. We are discovering degrees, that the artifice of mechanized industry rests like everything else, upon fundamental factors of human motives, and that at the end of our analysis we shall discover our greatest difficulty to be the pressure of population upon food supply.

Let us be careful at that point, not to assume that birth control as a remedy means mere restriction of numbers or that the thing we need is a positive decline in the numbers of our people. What we do need is the propagation of each child with a maximum of physical opportunity for his sound upbringing, the protection of the mothers so that they may give the maximum gift of strength to the child. We need in short a new philosophy of life, which will say that one child well bred, is worth a score of children who are scrawny, ill-conditioned and 111-favored of nature for the tasks of life.

Society's chief concern with the mating of the sexes is the propagation of children who shall be the best that their parents can produce. Society has no use for a miscellaneous collection of runts — it wants finest strong babies that are capable of becoming assets in the social balance sheet. So long as the human family neglects this vital service to its young, so long shall we have a dreary record of unnecessary dependency.

Nothing that is admitted and unmistakably horrible matters very much because it frightens people into seeking a remedy, the serious horrors are those which seem entirely respectable and normal to respectable and normal men.

—George Bernard Shaw
Is Birth Control Eugenic?

Dr Lyon, Dean of the Medical School of the University of Minnesota, delivered this address at the mass meeting on birth control at the National Conference of Social Work.

By ELIAS P. LYON

The answer is yes—neutral—no. Birth control is a method of modifying population. The same question regarding any method of modifying population must be answered "Yes—neutral—no." A more accurate answer demands the determination of the differential between desirable and undesirable types of population. If there is no differential, i.e., if all types of population are modified alike, the answer is "neutral."

But usually there is a differential. Let us begin with man in a state of wildness (I object to the phrase "state of nature." Anything and everything that conforms to Nature's laws is natural.) The automobile is as natural as the basket on an Indian woman's back, the radio is as natural as the waterfall.) Let us assume man in a state of wildness—"all his behavior instinctive and unmodified by reason. Population is unrestricted from the reproduction standpoint, but it is restricted by disease and food supply. The strong, the healthy, those with initiative survive and reproduce. The weak, the deformed and those lacking the ability to adjust, penish, usually without reproducing themselves. There is a eugenic differential. This method is called "Survival of the Fittest." Whatever else may have happened, all plants and animals including man have come to their present state under the operation of this law.

Even under so-called civilization population may outrun food supply. Conditions may become so poor that progress of certain kinds is impossible. It is true the fittest survive, but it is the fittest to meet the peculiar conditions that exist. That is the state of affairs existing under the American flag right now in Porto Rico. Disease and poor living conditions go together, the securing of bare necessities absorbs the labor of the population, and there is no surplus for education and material improvement. What that country needs is a ten-year moratorium on births. What it gets is a nice speech from the President and an encyclical from the Pope.

Or let us take war. The best and strongest are selected to fight and die. The feebleminded and their ilk, the cowards, the shiftless do not make good soldiers, they remain at home to procreate. War is undoubtedly dysgenic. So far as stature is concerned the records show decreased average height of Frenchmen as the result of the Napoleonic struggles. That the average intelligence of this people was also lowered is not now capable of statistical proof but it is probable that it occurred. Surely the last war had that effect. War is dysgenic, and that is the worst thing that can be said about it. War should be outlawed for this reason alone.

Let us take modern medical science. Thousands of children born today will grow up and reproduce, who under the conditions existing half a century ago would have died in childhood. Among these, of course, are many of excellent inheritance, for death in the old days did not wholly respect the families of the capable. But on the whole, medical science preserves a larger proportion of the unfit than would formerly have survived. To this extent medical science is dysgenic. And so also is an enormous amount of the social and philanthropic work of which this National Conference of Social Work and all informed people are so proud. Those of you who are interested in homes for the aged may compliment yourselves on the neutral aspect of your endeavors so far as race welfare is concerned. For the rest I can hardly think of a single group which is not striving to defeat the "Law of Survival of the Fittest." You are conniving at racial impairment and you are dysgenacists, whether you know it or not.

Cehbacy is a dysgenic factor. In so far as it withdraws from reproduction a group superior to the average in intelligence, imagination and moral control. Some statisticians claim they can prove the dysgenic effect of cehbacy in the religious sect in which it is extensively practiced.

Education is dysgenic to the extent that it favors late marriage or no marriage, few children or no children among the more progressive and intelligent of the population. The emancipation of women is dysgenic to the extent that superior
women give up home and family responsibilities in order to pursue a "career." The number of Misses among prominent women is appalling! Misses they are. Racially they are missing something very important.

But on the opposite side let us consider the feebleminded. This socially destructive condition is distinctly ineritable. If in any way these people can be prevented from reproducing, the average population is thereby improved. Sterilization is one way. Sterilization is therefore a eugenic measure. Many people are mildly interested but think the task impossible. They talk of "a drop in the ocean." because we know the number of feebleminded is very great.

But consider such a case as that recently reported in the Eugenics journal, entitled Four Generations of the Dysegeneic Family. From Alma, feebleminded progenitor, who came to America in 1850, many have been traced about forty members of the family. In other words some of these are two or three kinds of defective or delinquent in one person. The cost to the state of this group doubles every five years and will total $45,000 in the next five years. Now suppose Alma, the grandmother, had been sterilized before she had children. Several social workers would be out of a job and tax payers would be relieved. Sterilization of feebleminded pays compound interest to society. But you have to use imagination to see it.

It takes little imagination to see a crippled child, a sick mother, a feeble old man and do something about it. But as someone remarked, "Notions of cosmic tragedy do not often effectively influence the individual." It will take imagination and much education to put into operation the thousand year plan needed for the improvement of the race. Sterilization of the unfit is one method that will be employed.

And now what of birth control? Is it eugenic? The answer is yes—no! But the more important question is does it operate differentially? The judgment of those who have studied this question most carefully is that it does so operate. They say that the higher classes use it more than the lower classes. In other words birth control, as it is used, is dysgenic. Further, they say the higher classes so limit their families that they are not reproducing themselves. There is abundant evidence that this is true. The leadership of America does not reproduce itself. This is the most disturbing—appalling—fact that I know in the whole social, political, and economic category.

Dozens of studies have been made proving this fundamental fact. No college group that I know of reproduces itself. Harvard graduates do not keep up their number. Yale graduates do not do so. Women's college groups have less daughters than their own total. State university coeducational students fall behind.

I graduated from a small college. There were 37 in my class. With 37 real or potential spouses the number to be compared becomes 74. As class secretary I canvassed the group a few years ago and found 66 children. Just roughly I ran over the completed families of my acquaintance in the faculty of the University of Minnesota. They averaged about two children to the family. It takes over three to the family in order that any group may be maintained. This is because of deaths, failures to marry, failures to have children. This faculty is not reproducing itself. The men and women of Who's Who do not reproduce themselves.

CLASS SUICIDE

Why is this? Is it lack of money? Surely not entirely, for the bankers do not reproduce themselves. Is it sterility resulting perhaps from intellectual Me? I do not think so. I note that missionaries have large families, that poor clergymen do better than rich industrial leaders. Most of those who have studied this matter think it is birth control.

When you get right down to the naked truth many intelligent people do not want children because they cost so much—so much trouble sometimes, so much money more often. The average intelligent, foresighted citizen thinks he is performing his duty to the state and to his family better by having one or two children for whom he can provide as much as possible of the good things of life and especially an expensive education, than he would by having more children and providing less. Never did a more falacious argument influence the action of a great group of people. Nor is this argument new. Writing in the tune of Greek decadence Polybius complains, "The most [our citizens] consent to do is to have one or two children, whom they leave rich and seated in the lap of luxury."
And where now are Athens and the Isles of Greece? "Eternal summer gilds them yet, But all except their sun has set"

The danger is not race suicide but class suicide. Birth control, as someone says, is a "two edged sword." If applied among the least desirable types it would be eugenec. Applied among the more desirable types it is dysgenic. It is being applied in the latter not the former manner. The well-to-do, careful, farsighted, intelligent use it. The poor, shiftless, careless, weak-minded do not know about it or do not use it. This is the main reason why I am in favor of birth control clinics and the widest possible dissemination among the poorer types of the same information which the better types have and use. At the same time I think every effort should be made to impress on the leadership group the obligation of having larger families. Calculating at present rates of reproduction, in the fifth following generation, it is said, 100 brain workers will have 14 descendents, 100 unskilled workers will have 236 descendents. If this is not a danger signal, heredity is a delusion and the past experience of the race is no guide for the future. "The plain fact is," writes Albert Wiggam, "if civilization is to continue, the higher classes must have more children."

**STERILIZATION AND CONTRACEPTION**

By E E Gosney, President, The Human Betterment Foundation

Confusion results from carelessly coupling the terms eugenic sterilization and birth control together, in eugenic discussions. Both diminish fecundity, but imprisonment, capital punishment, prolonged illness, and many other conditions also have this result. For clear thinking it must be recognized that the differences between eugenic sterilization, as it is practiced under the laws of twenty-seven states and a number of foreign countries, and contraception as advocated by birth control students and propagandists, are greater than the resemblances. For instance:

1. Eugenic sterilization is applied by the state to persons who are, for the most part, irresponsible. Contraceptives can be used only voluntarily by people who are responsible.

2. Eugenic sterilization is irreversible, permanent. Contraceptives are reversible, never permanent.

3. Eugenic sterilization will prevent any possibility of future abortion in that marriage. It has never been found whether contraception, as now practiced, leads to less or to more abortions.

4. Eugenic sterilization is certain in its results; contraception is uncertain.

5. Eugenic sterilization is, under usual state laws, ordered or permitted by the state, for the benefit of the state. Contraception is practiced by the individual, on his own initiative, primarily for his own benefit rather than for the benefit of the state.

6. Therefore, Society accepts the responsibility in the application of eugenic sterilization. The individual alone accepts the responsibility in the application of contraceptive methods.

7. Eugenic sterilization starts where contraception stops. It is applied primarily to people or families without the intelligence, emotional stability or self control, to handle contraceptives successfully. It succeeds where contraceptives would fail.

The basic facts of all this are, of course, the facts of heredity. Heredity determines all the possibilities of a man. It is proved beyond all doubt that intelligence and the qualities of leadership are inherited. Education does not make brains, it merely develops their possibilities. Brains are bred, like short horn cattle or Percheron horses, from men of brains, as short horn from short horns or Percheron from Percherons.

If you think the world will be better in 100 years with less brains and more morons, continue to do social work and do not have children. One hundred and eighty babies are born every hour in these United States. Only eight have a high grade of intelligence, the great bulk will never attain a mental age of over 12 to 15 years. Considering the increasing complexities of life in an age of science and industry, it seems to me more brains are needed.

"You wish to serve the state, Niceratus?" asked the Woman of Andros.

"I do."

"And you admire courage?"

"I do. Crysis."

"Then go and bear children!"

To which I add: Provided you are above the average in intelligence, temperament and physical heritage.
Do Women Want Children?

By NAOMI MITCHISON

MAY I be forgiven for writing a rather personal article—a provisional and bothersome one? May I take the novelist's privilege of being unreasonable?

Because there are two or three rather worrying things about the writings and talk of those who favor birth control, both here in England and in the United States I want to make them clear to myself and perhaps to other feminists, who may find themselves in the odd position of abusing and belittling one of the most interesting and often pleasurable things that a woman can do, and one which no man, however intelligent, can do at all.

When I first became interested in the theory of contraception, some years ago, and in its practical application in clinics and welfare centers, I thought that it was essentially a feminist activity. I was less interested in the eugenic or Malthusian aspect, because I have an inborn distrust of statistics and have seen too many doctors and scientists contradicting one another. But it did—and does—seem to me good feminism that women should be this much set free, should say when they were going to have their babies, and organize their lives on a more certain basis. Things were, of course, simpler, in those days. We had the idea that certain contraceptive devices, properly used, were at least 99% safe, and that the extra 1% was a matter of scientific research, a few years work at the most. We thought little of the aesthetic inconveniences, supposing them to be equally temporary.

Since then we have realized two things: that the percentage of safety for an ordinarily fertile woman is lower, and that the ideal contraceptive, fool-proof, certain and at the same time without the emotional and aesthetic inconvenience of all present methods, is yet to seek and may well be, in spite of active research work, very many years in coming—if it comes at all. There has also been an increasing amount of birth control propaganda, designed for persons of all classes and carried on by all kinds of experts. And, as in all situations, should be reconsidered at frequent intervals, it seems about time that feminists should reconsider the birth control situation.

For, to my mind, there are two main dangers about which we must be wary. One is the constant danger of modern life, the danger of being regimented, of being bullied into doing a thing because everyone says that everyone else is doing it; and that it is a capital thing to do, if being told that one is uncivilized and unscientific if one ventures a feeble protest. This regimentation has been applied to men for some time but only lately to women in their own special function as parents and potential parents. We are told exactly how to feed, clothe and play with our babies, so that we dare not put them into a pretty frock for fear of the all-wool enthusiasts (or for that matter, a woolly vest for fear of the all-sun experts) or kiss them for fear of the psycho-analysts, or keep them a minute longer than clock-time at the breast for fear of the dieticians. The only mercy is that with a little hunting one can usually find one expert to contradict another, but it is all very heart-searching and effectively renews us of many of the joys which were experienced both by the Cave Woman and the Victorian Mother-of-Ten. We are also told that we must have such and such an interval between births, it is hard to get an expert who will allow one less than three years, even if one has adequate food, clothing, housing and help with the children. The difficulty is that this regimentation is growing, one doesn't know where one will be next. Isn't it time to think about it before someone has to come with a banner and the great rallying cry, "Women of the World, Anse, you have nothing to lose but your Experts!"

The other danger is this: there is a constant anti-feminist movement going on in high-brow circles, especially in England and America. There is a constant, mghghg anti-baby propaganda. We
are told of the horrors of motherhood, our flesh is made to creep The undoubted mueries of being a mother (as indeed of being a person) in a bad slum are given this particular emphasis, so that we are led to suppose that all the unhappiness comes, not from living six in a room anyhow, with the father out of work, but from having that extra baby The supposition creeps up the social scale, so that gradually the extra baby comes as a black mark in the family which can afford to have it comfortably and, if I may say so, without heresy, enjoyably It has come to the pitch that a woman may reasonably and respectfully ask her husband for, or apply her own income to, a car, a pearl necklace, a country cottage or a European tour, but that extra baby is a thing which she must feel it really rather dreadful and shaming to ask for! Well, at any rate there is that rather large margin of uncertainty about all contraceptives.

Of course this is not supposed to be so, all good birth controllers, from Mane Stopes onwards, carefully put in bits about how nice the family is, the well-spaced family of three, for choice. And it is not necessarily they who do the preaching. That is a matter of public opinion. And may I venture to wonder whether it is not perhaps at bottom male public opinion, added to the opinion of immature females and a certain number of mistaken female reformers, which is belittling our babies and taking away the pleasure and pride we had in them—or trying to—depriving us of what would be called, in any other profession, our pride of work? This is nonsense or anyhow exaggeration? Possibly. But all the same we ought to consider it. I have lately had three children, in unorthodoxly rapid succession, and really, from what some people think of me, they might have been burglars! Do for goodness sake let us stick to our night to be women, to have babies proudly and gayly, without any kind of social shame, to get all the tremendous kick out of the babies, when we have them, as we possibly can—for soon enough they will be people on their own, demanding their own lives, on whose bodily beauty and mental freshness we must take care not to trespass—and above all to space them and have them as we and their fathers like, and not be bullied into doing the hygienically fashionable thing by any expert or any propagandist.

**Dr. Scott is Right**

I AM VERY GLAD that Dr. Scott has had the courage to write "Do Women Want Children?" and that you have had the courage to publish it. You will receive many letters of protest, many of them hysterical in tone. We always resist violently any plain truth which has its roots deep in our emotional life.

The fact is that Dr. Scott is correct, or nearly so. There is a type of woman who wants children, I regret to add that from my observation she is usually not a type that is desirable for racial welfare. Her exaggerated prototype may be found in the nauseating heroine of Rex Stout's *Seed on the Wind*. A woman who has any intellectual or cultural interests may accept motherhood as a misfortune or a social duty, but she does not ardently desire it or suffer for lack of it. It is impossible in a letter to give the data on which this dogmatic statement is based, but I am nevertheless convinced of its truth. The so-called maternal instinct as we see it displayed today is a perversion of civilization, the primitive mother, like the animal mother, has her babies as she has smallpox or a broken leg, and forgets about them as soon as they are able to fend for themselves.

If the result of a recognition of this fact should be the extinction of the human race, there are those of us who could bear up under the prospect, but if this is considered a calamity, then, as Dr. Scott says, childbearing will have to be subsided, as is every other sacrifice laid upon citizens for the good of the nation or the race.

**Miriam Allen deFord**

**Women's Heritage**

BECAUSE I do not feel that I am any gnomous exception to the female sex, I think my personal feelings may be quite as valuable in this argument as the emotional prejudices (also devoid of statistics and proof) of one of the opposite sex—Dr. George Ryley Scott, author of the article "Do Women Want Children?"

If Dr. Scott is a medical man, he must surely be familiar enough with the whole physiological set-up of woman, and with its special attendant psychological reactions, to conclude that a creature so biologically designed for the special purpose of reproduction, would be rather more desirous of fulfilling this function than not, that she might also have some instinctive knowledge that the psy-
Marriage in Transition

By JAMES H. S BOSSARD

Judges, like doctors and lawyers, are in a position to gain considerable insight into a variety of human problems. Unfortunately, at least in one sense, the politics of them practice has led them as a rule to keep the knowledge thus gained to themselves. While it is extremely important for all persons who deal professionally with other people to respect always the confidence of their clients, it does seem legitimate to share the value of their experience with serious-minded students. In fact, it is a question whether the records of professional practice have been given sufficient recognition as sociological data.

It is all too seldom that one who is well qualified and has dealt for a long time with some intimate phase of human life will speak freely and frankly, in the formal pages of print, of his experiences and observations. When this does happen, the result generally is interesting and most often instructive. Certainly such a person, if at all intelligent and sincere, deserves an attentive hearing.

There are those, of course, who will dismiss the book because it hails from Reno, insisting that as such it reflects only the seamiest side of the picture of American domestic life. Upon second thought, however, it must be obvious that Reno is only a geographical and legal accident. It might as well have been some other state, whose abbreviated residence laws could have been utilized to meet the

Men. Women and Conflict. is a book of this kind. During his many years on the bench at Reno, Nevada, Judge Bartlett presided over some 20,000 cases of divorce. Obviously, there can be no question of the extent and range of his contacts and experience, nor, for that matter, of the importance of the problems involved. And his new book speaks frankly and intimately of a variety of aspects of the relations of men and women—marriage, divorce, birth control, child welfare, women in business, and the like.

Helen Millikan

demand for easy divorce. In fact, recent legislative enactments in several other states indicate that Nevada’s monopoly of this business is about over. At any rate, these legal developments, both in Nevada and elsewhere, however unpleasant to some, must be interpreted by the serious student as but the visible signs and symptoms of rather fundamental changes involving the family and marriage relationships.

For the sake of convenience and clarity, Judge Bartlett’s observations will be presented under four heads: (1) divorce, (2) marriage, (3) birth control, (4) spirit of approach.

(1) Judge Bartlett believes in divorce and its contribution to human happiness. He accepts it as a sort of clean and justifiable spiritual surgery. Practical egress from a man-made trap which lacks emotional justification, he insists, is no menace to the marriage institution, but rather enables and elevates it. Reverting again to the analogy with surgery, divorce, he says, may be painful and radical, but like an appendixectomy, it may be absolutely necessary for the well-being of the persons involved.

Divorce should be easy, because it is love, alone, that unifies. When love is gone, it is a union in name only, “a travesty upon the thing it ought to be.” Especially is society’s wide acceptance of divorce “the banner of woman’s triumph over marital slavery.”

Judge Bartlett’s emphasis upon the distinction between the complaints voiced by litigants and the more fundamental factors involved is a point well taken. Divorce is a human, not a legal, problem. The legal causes mentioned, as a rule, are but the symptoms of the “real causes” which do their festering beneath the surface.

Behind the legal complaints, he identifies “three very strong re-agents: money, affection and sex.” Of these, sex is identified as the most important. “Experience with thousands of cases of divorce has left me with the ineradicable conviction that of all factors that contribute to happy marriage the sex factor is by far the most important. Affection, as distinct from sex, can save a couple sexually mismated from divorce.” The economic problem is present in most marriages and determines nearly as much of the success or failure of them as sex does. Family finances do most of their festening beneath the surface. Modern standards of living put such a premium upon the husband’s earning power that few girls can hope to marry a husband near their own age without facing a previous sacrifice. This disparity of marriage age is one of the commonest bases of divorce.

Money involves the relations of a couple to outside society and often becomes the final fatal irritant.

(2) Judge Bartlett looks upon marriage objectively, as a social institution. And social institutions, like the Sabbath, are made for man and contrived for his happiness, and not vice versa. He sees marriage as in a state of change. Just as our ideas about physics, once considered as wholly fixed, have been revolutionized by recent scientific discoveries, so are our ideas about marriages undergoing transformation, “only we have yet to hear from a marital Einstein.”

These changes are leading us to something considerably different and better. As to the nature of the new, he has no set ideas. “What is happening is that civilization has brought us to a point of uneasy doubt on the one hand, and science fails us on the other. To assure progress, we must both curb our yearning for improvement and have faith with our research workers.”

(3) Readers of this Review will be interested particularly in his views on Birth Control. “A little daily experience in the divorce court would convince any but the blindest bigot that more marriages are wrecked by the complications that arise from unwanted pregnancy than by any other single cause.” Divorce as a national evil is likewise unimportant as compared with the forces of human pity and of national health. Which he so largely in the actuality of unwanted babies. The distress of the man and wife who cannot agree is unimportant as compared with the potential criminals they may send into posterity through neglected offspring. Every divorce judge or lawyer I know strongly favors the well-organized scientific promulgation of birth control information. “Surely the observations of a man of Judge Bartlett’s experience outweigh the sonorous generalizations of the lesser informed.

(4) The scientific objectivity and restraint with which Judge Bartlett deals with his material would do credit to the pretensions of many an academician. Throughout, he seeks, not to make out a case, but to report his experiences and observations. Moreover, even when he generalizes, it is with reservation. For as strongly as he insists upon anything it is this one fact that each case must be considered separately. “There are not, and never will be, two marriage situations exactly alike.”

(Continued on page 223)
Sex Education in the Y.M.C.A.

By HOWARD K HOLLISTER

No official opinion as to the necessity or advisability of birth control has been enunciated by the Young Men's Christian Association of the United States, but both the local organizations and their federating body—the National Council—seem to be fostering an extensive and intelligent policy of sex education wherever the local officers are qualified to organize group study or impart information in individual interview.

According to Mr J Edward Sproul, Program Section Secretary of the National Council of Y M C A's, there are four chief methods whereby the national organization helps the local units in building up a rational ethic on matters of sex among their member groups:

1. Helping to conduct demonstrations or experiments in sex education in local Y M C A's, and getting the best of these experiences reported to other Associations.

2. Helping to make available needed publications, recommending, reviewing and distributing books in which sex subjects are treated in straightforward fashion, publishing some where necessary.

3. Helping to train local staff members in sex education through study conferences and summer schools.

4. Carrying on research in co-operation with a World Y M C A and Y W C A Commission on Sex Education, the object here being to discover the information basic to a sound program.

"Today there are probably fewer direct lectures on sex in Y M C A's than one might have found some years ago," says Mr Sproul, "but more frequent dealing with this interest in its total life setting. Information is sought and given as it is pertinent or as questions arise in the midst of play, discussion groups, interviews, plans for activities, reading, etc.

The information offered is undoubtedly sounder than much that formerly passed for fact, and the highly emotionalized gatherings with resounding 'thou shalt nots' is almost completely gone."

Instruction within groups aims to help people to become articulate and to deal with the subject objectively. In forums and discussion groups all sorts of views are expressed. In most of them no attempt is made to dodge the most intimate phases of sex perplexities. No fiat, or official attitude is promulgated, but men and boys are helped to understand the known facts, to arrive at their own opinions, and then to bring their conduct under intelligent control. This does not mean that every Y M C A secretary everywhere conducts groups in the discussion of sex problems. There are still many—perhaps a majority—who do not feel competent either to discuss sex matters with authority themselves or to arrange for such discussion.

Evidence suggests that much of the existing program, however, is carried on with considerable skill.

In several Associations in and near New York City several kinds of groups offering adults and young people opportunities for discussion of sex problems may be found. First, groups of young men and young women who wish to know how to prepare for marriage, second, groups of married couples facing problems of family life, third, groups of parents interested in their own problems, and in the education of children. The subject of birth control is one that comes up naturally in many of these meetings, and while no definite recommendations are made, experiences are shared, books made available, and names of reliable medical authorities given. In scores of other groups among boys—like Hi-Y Clubs, Employed Boys' Brotherhoods—sex also finds its appropriate place.

Specific information is often sought and given, talks are arranged where orderly statement is desired by an entire group. Interviews are common.

As a result of summer schools, personal reading,
university study, and special conferences, the number of secretaries competent as personal counselors is rapidly increasing. Knowledge of contraceptive measures and of recent research in this field is commonplace among the better trained Y M C A officers, both professional and non-professional, but probably no more so among the rank and file than among citizens generally. An official expression on birth control and intelligent sex knowledge and discussion, if ever made by the National Council of Y M C A s, would undoubtedly take the same form as it did in the Federal Council of Churches — that is, in a majority and minority opinion. The close affiliation of the Y M C A s with the churches would probably result in wide circulation of the Federal Council document rather than formulation of a new one.

It is significant that the books of Wmfield Scott Hall, which used to strike fear into the hearts of boys, are now out of print, while the modern, rational books, So Youth May Know, by Roy E. Dickerson, and The Sex Life of Youth, by Harry Bone and Grace L. Elliott, bearing the Association Press imprint, have sold thousands of copies since publication a year and two years ago. Mary Ware Dennett's book, The Sex Side of Life has been distributed in Y M C A s by the thousand. At the time of Mrs. Dennett's trial, three National Y M C A officers took places on her defense committee. They were William E. Speers, Chairman of the Home Division Committee, Harisson S. Elliott, Chairman of the Boys' Work Committee, and Abel J. Gregg, of the Boys' Work Staff.

Among the Young Men's Christian Associations in the New York area which have been particularly active in the movement for intelligent sex education for the past several years are New York City, Brooklyn and Hackensack, Westfield, Montclair and Paterson, New Jersey. In several of these, courses in preparation for marriage are held, often in conjunction with the Y W C A. A course given in Brooklyn in the Spring of 1930, and repeated at Westfield in the Fall of 1930, conducted by William H. Dewar, covered, among others, the following topics: What fundamental qualifications should govern the choice of a mate? What about physical attractiveness, heredity, social status, education, religion, moral character, disposition, wealth, money habits, etc? Do you know what the physiological laws of marriage are? Are there reasons why some men should not marry some women and why some men and women should marry no one? What psychological adjustments does marriage require? Should married women work? How shall our income be spent? Do children make or break marriage relationships? Are they an asset or a liability? Should they be born the first, the second or the third year after marriage? Or should there be no children at all? What information about birth control is available and legitimate? What makes for happiness in the home?

"Where figures have been obtained," says Mr. Dewar, the leader of the Brooklyn group, "it would appear that not over five per cent of the young men and boys who participate in local Y M C A groups have had sex instruction from their parents. It is therefore plainly the duty of the Y M C A to provide this instruction for its members."

"Our experience has been that the young men and young women who attend the discussion groups on preparation for marriage have a serious, earnest purpose. The gatherings have been similarly free from curiosity seekers. It is not required that those who take the instruction be actually engaged, but they must recognize marriage as their goal. Perhaps half of the young people who attended the Brooklyn class last year were living in Y M C A or Y W C A dormitories. The joint activities provided by the two organizations, such as dances, sightseeing parties and picnics, gave them what I might call sex education in the broad sense. Their interest in the discussion group was a natural sequel.

"In regard to birth control we take the attitude that Ignorance is no longer comparable with innocence. The members of our groups are informed on the history of the movement and existing laws, cautioned against depending upon casual information. Where the need for information about methods is evident after thorough investigation of individual cases, married couples or couples about to be married are told where and under what circumstances it can be had."
The White House Conference

The Sin of Omission

By IRAS WILE, M.D.

The deliberations of the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection have been gathered together* for purposes of reference and for the guidance of those who are specifically interested in Child Welfare. The discussions of facts and figures, theorems and programs, ideas and comments, usually ending in a series of conclusions and recommendations.

It is significant that an entire volume devoted to child health and progress there should be no recommendations concerning birth control. Here and there is a hinted appreciation of the fact that rapid child bearing and too numerous progeny have some relation to the health and protection of children. Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, Chairman of the White House Conference, for example, refers to the facts that "The intelligent control of our human stock offers a fundamental solution of some of our present difficulties and gives promise of a greater future for us as a people." Whether this refers to eugenics and marriages in general or whether the "intelligent control" is to arise through the teaching of contraception is not stated.

Martha Van Rensselaer, in a splendid address, refers to the possibility "for children to be better born," but there is no carrying on of the idea to its logical conclusion save in a later paragraph in which she refers to a better understanding of the problems of parenthood and the development of individuals more qualified for marriage. Contraceptive guidance may have been part of her unspoken thought.

The most glaring sin of omission occurs in the discussion of pre-natal and maternal care by the Committee under the Chairmanship of Fred L. Adair, M.D. One searches in vain among the conclusions dealing with infant and maternal morbidity and mortality which are admittedly "unnecessarily high," for a single hint of the relationship between too rapid child bearing and large families to those wholly preventable casualties. The ostrich has been outdone.

Those who are interested in the frank and honest discussion of birth control will receive no enlightenment from a perusal of this book. Everyone will approve all of its recommendations, although many will regret the sad and stupid omission of all direct reference to birth control in its relation to child health and protection. Article IV of The Child's Charter, contains a pledge "For every child, full preparation for his birth, his mother receiving pre-natal, natal and post-natal care, and the establishment of such protective measures as will make child bearing safer." In its essence and broadest implications this is the doctrine which the advocates of birth control especially commend and support.

Not One Cent for Heredity

By ELIAS P. LYON

A BEAUTIFUL PIECE of English composition, "A Children's Charter," came out of the Conference. In nineteen articles in nineteen separate ways it held forth how the environment should be perfected. I hope they will all be accomplished, although some of them hold implications of such far-reaching social and economic change that one wonders whether the politically minded...
Comments on Ellis’s Article

FREEDOM AND KNOWLEDGE NEEDED

I FIND myself in complete agreement with Have-lock Ellis in his article on Marriage—An Enduring Institution. I believe that monogamy is the ideal to which society should approximate. There should be nothing compulsory about it. Marriage should be made harder and divorce easier. Plenty of sex education, and probably sane and decent sex experience should precede permanent marriage. The new sexology, far from destroying marriage and the family, is the only thing which can make possible a happy and enduring marriage for the majority of mankind. Most marital discord is due to absence of sex knowledge and to sexual maladjustment, both of which would be eliminated if we were civilized enough to disseminate scientific knowledge on sex matters and to permit pre-conjugal sex experience.

There is no doubt that a civilized society would permit voluntary sex relations outside of the recognized relationship in cases where marriage did not prove possible or desirable. Further, unmarried women should be allowed to have and rear children when intellectually and financially capable of meeting such a responsibility. In other words, we should not envisage a social order where sex expression would be limited exclusively to the legal family. But the family would be the normal unit in which to concentrate the recreational and procreative manifestations of human sexuality. Freedom and knowledge, such as Mr. Ellis has so vantingly supported, are probably the only procedure which can save the family in modern civilization. Obviously, the bonds of theological and legal intimidation are bursting. The new family order must rest upon intelligence, freedom, and adequate information.

Harry Elmer Barnes

THE FUTURE OF MARRIAGE

HAVELOCK ELLIS’ article, Marriage, An Enduring Institution, in the Birth Control Review, is both timely and interesting. There is a great deal of wishful believing. People believe that a certain thing will take place because they want it to take place. Whether the facts are with or against them does not seem to disturb them. If all those who write about the “bankruptcy of marriage” and tell us that within a decade or two...
marrage will cease to exist as an institution would examine the facts, they would see that their prophecy is merely a reflection of their wishes.

As a matter of fact, proven by incontestable official statistics, the number of marriages has not been diminished, but increased "In 1890, for instance, 55% of the adult population of the United States were married, thirty years later, in 1920 (the figures for the 1930 census are not out yet), the percentage was increased to 60! "Adult" applies to men and women over fifteen years old. In other words, in a population of 100 million there were in 1920 about 4½ million more married people than there were in 1890 (See The Critic and Guide, March, 1931.)

The causes of the increase in the percentage of marriages are many, but without doubt the spread of the knowledge of prevenction or birth control is one of the most potent factors. Anybody who is an earnest student of the subject will acknowledge that the fear of a large family was one of the most restraining influences, one of the most powerful brakes on marrage. Now that all intelligent men and women know about birth control, there is less hesitation in entering the institution known as marriage. And it is my well considered opinion that with the further spread of prevenction knowledge and with divorce becoming easier, the number of marriages will go on increasing. Instead of taking place at a later and later age, as was the case a generation or two ago, marriage will take place at a considerably earlier age. And this will do away, to a great extent, if not with promiscuity, certainly with commercialized prostitution.

I certainly believe that marriage, instead of being a crumbing, decaying, putrescent, bankrupt institution, or whatever other adjectives our ultra-radical, half-baked sexologists may apply to it, is and will remain an enduring institution.

Permit me to quote from my Sex Morality, Post, Present and Future, which I wrote exactly twenty years ago "The monogamic system of marriage will probably survive in the future as the dominant system. The family will in the future as in the present form the basic unit of society, for a happy, harmonious family is the best environment for the proper bringing up of children, for the proper development of character. Of course it is possible that the state institution for the care of children in the future will be of a much higher character than the institution of the present. But the institutions with which we are familiar do not inspire us with very great expectations in this respect. A good home is superior to the best institution or asylum or pension or dormitory, and no substitute has yet been found for mother love and father love.

Whether or not the people will still solemnize their marriages with religious or legal ceremonies is a matter of minor importance. One thing is certain: marriage in the future will not be such a practically indissoluble arrangement or contract as it is now. On the petition of both parties a divorce or dissolution of marriage will be granted without further ceremony, for the two persons who have to live together are the best judges as to whether they want to continue to live together or not. And when there are no children to be taken care of, a simple declaration by husband and wife, repeated perhaps after a lapse of three or six months, should be and will be quite sufficient for the termination of the marriage contract. Here the State should have nothing to say. When there are children the State will make sure that they will be properly cared for and provided for, before a divorce is granted.

Monogamy, while being the prevalent system, will not be surrounded with the rigid and iron-clad rules of the present day, will not be so absolute in its applications as it is theoretically supposed to be, and occasional departures from it will not be accompanied by the odium and legal punishments of the present day. The mass of the people being more familiar with the truths of physiology and psychology, occasional straying from the straight and narrow path of monogamy will not be frowned upon by the wife. Perhaps it will be encouraged by her.

It is possible that it will be considered best for people to marry at a very early age—in eighteen to twenty-two—even before the man can establish and support an independent home. In such cases the young man and woman would remain at their respective parents' homes, until such a time when they could live independently, and they would meet only occasionally. They would have to guard against having children, but the measures for the prevention of conception are easily taught and easily carried out.

Changes the marriage institution will undergo, but a change does not mean abolition. It very often means strengthening and improvement. Our entire moral code, not merely our sexual mores, is undergoing a change, is in a condition of flux,
but that does not mean that our entire moral code is going to the dogs. On the contrary, we believe that it is becoming higher, nobler, more humane, and what is of equal importance, more intelligent.

William J. Robinson, M.D.

NO CAUSE FOR ALARM

Havelock Ellis' assertion that the persistence of the family as an institution is to be expected and is highly desirable socially, comes with particular force from a radical thinker and a freeminded sociologist. His correlative assertion that marriage will vary in form and in rigidity of structure need not then alarm us. His emphasis upon its essentially human origin and character justifies us in thinking that the archaic theistic ceremony still in vogue will give place eventually to a type more humanistic, like the one already in use in the First Humanist Society of New York, based upon human ideals rather than upon divine sanctions.

Charles Francis Potter

A MATTER OF BELIEF

In commenting on Havelock Ellis' article Marriage—An Enduring Institution, my inclination is to say if Ellis says so, it is very likely so. He is no advocate or special pleader, his attitude is judicial and his judgment cool. I think I must follow my inclination. With these reservations, What is called "mamage" is an extremely complex institution, a folkway in which not alone amenable drives, interests and habits suffice one another, discordant and conflicting ones also enter in. As an institution, marriage is an unstable compensation of its components. Its equilibrium is dynamic, shifting now to this, now to that component for a base, according to the pulls and intensities of the centrifugal parts. Thus, marriage has a history, which is a succession of forms that vary with the time, the place, the people and the cultural situation, and marriage consists of an assemblage of present forms which are the resultants of similar and of novel influences presently operative.

Whether any one, or all, of these influences is strong enough to disintegrate the institution of marriage by reinforcing its centrifugal components, cannot be told from a study of its biological grounds, or of the sex life of savages, or of its history as an institution. The present state of marriage is present, not so far as it repeats the past, but in so far as it embodies unprecedented elements, and reacts to unprecedented conditions, which the past could not foresee and which could not be predicted from a study of the past. The impact of large scale industry and of science on civilization and its institutions has transformed the dynamics and patterns of social life, including the family, in the most unexpected ways. And these forces are still very far from the maximum of their intensity. The observations and Inferences of biologist, psychologist, anthropologist, and the rest, throw no light on how these forces affect marriage, or mamage them. The "social sciences" simply provide data, like so many articles on the menu of a cafeteria, from which intellectuals choose and publicists rationalize the satisfaction of their appetites. But they do not enable us to predict that marriage will endure, or in what form it will endure or how long. These are matters of belief and preference, not of scientific forecasting. And it is because I prefer that marriage shall endure and so believe that it will endure, that I align myself with Mr. Ellis.
France Needs Birth Control

By GEORGES VALOT

The French law against the spread of birth control information is the most drastic of any country. It the Federal Council of Churches had issued a statement in France similar to that issued in New York in March all the members would have been put in jail.

To be or not to be that is the question for France, where the population is decreasing. France strives for peace, but she believes in the old proverb, “Si vis pacem, para bellum.” As compared with our population of 40 million, Germany has 66 million and Italy has 41 million and is increasing at the rate of 450,000 per annum. This increase makes it absolutely necessary for Italy to extend its territory, consequently we see Italian leaders claiming Corsica and Nice as their own. This formidable Italian Increase in population is a permanent danger for peace in Europe, and in case of war France will be overpowered by superior numbers.

Public opinion, various leagues and the government all join to urge an increase in our population. To that end the French government has tried to increase our birth rate in two ways: first by encouraging an increase in the birth rate, second, by repressing all measures which tend to diminish the birth rate.

Encouragement bonuses, reduction in taxes, certificates of honor and good citizenship, and medals are meted out to those who produce large families of from 6 to 20 children.

Repression ban on criminal abortion. Article No. 317 of our penal code is particularly severe for pregnant women seeking abortions, and for anyone who performs them. A physician convicted of teaching or practicing abortion is condemned to hard labor. Those who disseminate contraceptive methods are punished by one to six months in jail and fined 100 to 5,000 francs. As a result, even in cases where a woman has had several Cesarian operations, or suffering from severe tuberculosis, it is absolutely a crime to prescribe contraceptives.

I challenge anyone to show me a single book on the population problem published in France which is not affected by the slogan “France is becoming depopulated because she has no children.” Although this point of view is based on the attitude of the French Government it is absolutely wrong. While from 1900 to 1929 the birth rate was diminishing by 45 per cent in England and by 49 per cent in Germany, the birth rate in France was diminishing by only 18 per cent. At the present time the French birth rate, 17.7 per thousand inhabitants, is higher than the English figure of 16.3 per thousand, and is very close to the German birth rate of 17.9 per thousand.

The French birth rate is satisfactory. If the population of France is decreasing it is because she is the only one of all the highly civilized countries to have a death rate of 18 per thousand. The following death rate figures are significant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Death Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These nations have approximately the same climatic conditions, and good hygienic institutions. The mystery is explained as soon as we compare the mortality and the consumption of alcohol in these various countries.

France stands at the head of the list, and after her comes Spain and Italy. Up to the advent of Mussolini, the Italian death rate was higher than the French. Now matters have been reversed, largely. I believe, because Mussolini has been successful in closing thousands of saloons. In the hope of reducing the French death rate, the Bureau for the Study of the Liquor Problem (Office National D’Etudes Sur L’Alcool) was founded last year, with the help of Professor E. Gley, former President of the Academy of Medicine in Paris. On behalf of this organization, I am traveling through many countries studying mortality in relation to hygienic conditions and alcoholic consumption.

I hope that I shall gather sufficient facts to prove that the trouble with France is the death rate not the birth rate, and that its death rate is due to its large consumption of alcohol. If I can succeed in reducing the death rate through lowering the consumption of alcohol, I shall indirectly help the birth control movement in France, for I shall point out that it is not the birth rate which is an evil, but the death rate.
**Book Reviews**

THE PHYSICAL BASIS OF PERSONALITY,
by Charles R Stockard, M D W W Norton and Company, New York $3.50

The insane, the idiotic, and possibly the criminal are familiar examples of personality gone wrong. In the animal world such individuals would be promptly and inexpensively taken care of by the impartial struggle for survival. With a civilized people, believing in the sacredness of human life even though it be solely the prolongation of the physical existence of but the dead clay, the problem assumes altogether different proportions. The constantly increasing drag on positive evolution of humanity by the maintenance and care of the abnormal personality reaches proportions, in dollars alone, little short of astounding. From this single side personality touches every one of us, yet this may be the darker side. In our every day contacts it is always the personality of one human being that of another which looms to the fore. It behoves us, therefore, as intelligent human beings, to make a direct effort to understand the ways and means of personality. Furthermore, if we are to have a successful program for the prevention of the waste attendant upon abnormal personality, it becomes necessary to have a thorough understanding of the things to be prevented.

Dr. Stockard has presented in the book under review a unique contribution to the analysis of what makes personality. No aspect of this many-sided problem is over-balanced. Environment, heredity and development all come in for their proportionate share. In the space allowed for review, but one of the numerous important contributions to this subject can be cited. The instance chosen is from Dr. Stockard's own work in the study of personality in dogs. The many types and breeds of dogs are differentiated one from another in striking ways. In attempting to analyze the physical basis of these differences in personality, he has made crosses of these pure types on another. In a cross between the short-bent-legged basset hound with the normal, wild-type, long-legged German shepherd, often in error called police dog, the hybrid offspring are all very closely alike in form, coat texture, color, and behavior, and this is true no matter which breed is used as sire or dam. The progeny are all short-legged like the basset parent and none have the long legs of the shepherd. The shortness, however, may vary somewhat and is rarely so pronounced as in the pure basset hound. The short-legged, first generation hybrids all have the long drooping ears of the hound and never the erect ears of the shepherd, and the voice or bark is also more hound-like than shepherd like. When these hybrid pups are reared by a shepherd mother and have never seen a basset hound, they will, when put on the field for the first time, scent with their noses down and bark as they run, behaving as their hound father would do, acting in a manner entirely unlike the reactions of their shepherd mothers with whom they have always associated. Thus their hunting instincts are as truly inherited as leg-lengths or hair color. Being probably associated with acuteness of smell, and are not, in this case at least, developed as a conditioned reflex by observing the behavior of the mother.

Dr. Stockard has performed a real service in gathering together the scattered and varied literature on the physical basis of personality and summarizing it in such a pleasing style. In the space of 320 pages is collected a subject matter having a significant bearing on us all.

JOHN W. GOWEN


Dr. Paul takes as his thesis, change in the forms of family life caused by modern economic conditions, which have brought about woman's freedom from male dominance, both economic and personal, and by the knowledge of birth control now widely practiced. Therefore men and women can and do indulge in sex relationships suitable to basic human needs, though what these needs may be is not defined, nor is any evidence to support the assumption of widespread change in sex relationships given.

Having airy disposed of monogamy (apparently parents in the past got no emotional or social satisfaction from permanent relationships with one another or with their children) Eden Paul grants that children may be born, forgetting the assumption that birth control should eliminate such a contingency, he provides for their care by placing them in "scattered homes," where children will...
be guided by adults who "have a talent for parenthood" and will become socialized through contact with one another.

What the ultimate effect upon adults and children thus aligned will be and hence upon society per se Dr Paul does not disclose.

That there are profound changes occurring in family life today no one would question. But whether the ultimate and universal adjustment will be along the lines indicated by Dr Paul may well be challenged.

Elsa Butler Grove

MARRY OR BURN, by George Ryley Scott Greenberg, New York $2 50

This most uneven book is remarkably hard to review fairly. With one hand Dr Scott gives what he takes away with the other. One can say of him that he is sincere, forthright, unafraid, that he is a thorough believer in birth control, and also in legalized abortion—in other words, over a woman's right to possession and use of her own body, that in general his views on marriage and on sexual abnormalities are entirely sane, and that he recognizes organized orthodox theology as the greatest enemy of progress in the sexual as in all other fields. On the other hand, he is an extremist, next door to a fanatic on some points, he injures his own cause by the wild and impossible claims he makes, he betrays a personal bias, especially in regard to feminism, which makes him at times ridiculous, and to cap the climax, a great part—as he is fond of saying, a "big" part—of his book is written in a language that never was on land or sea, with neologisms that display bad Latinity, and with a pedantic use of obscure and obsolete words that will weary out most readers' dictionary-directed patience.

Love to Dr Scott, is a fiction, it consists in the preservation of an illusion combined with sexual technique, and apart from that it is nothing but lust plus affection. But what has anyone ever claimed to be an expect lust plus affection, to reduce it to its lowest terms? When he expatiates on either religion or economics, he shows the same emotionalism and prejudice. I happen to be in entire agreement with him on religious questions, and yet I feel that misreadings of the Encyclopedia Biblica will never help our common cause. Likewise, I confess to a fellow-feeling with Dr Scott in his anamblings on children, in his statement—that unpopular but, I believe, true—that children break up more marriages than they bind, and that for those with important work to do they are an unmitigated liability, but I cannot follow him when he concludes that therefore child-bearing must be made "attractive"—by repeal of public education and child-labor laws? Surely (and this applies as well to his anti-feminist tirades), if there are not enough jobs for all the healthy adults in the world, the solution is to establish a social system whereby there shall be enough, and not to forbid women from being self-supporting, or demand that children shall be! Much of the book, indeed, is a wish-fulfillment dream. Certainly in this country there is no such universality of Rationalism as Dr Scott proclaims, and (as a member of the British Rationalist Press Association, and a constant reader of its literature) I doubt very strongly whether such a condition obtains in England either.

Dr Scott will have down on him all the war nurses and other aids, all the feminists, all the religiousists, however modernistic, all those who love and desire offspring, as well as all the "morals" and reformers who would naturally attack a book of this nature. As propaganda for birth control or for changes in marriage system, his work frustrates its own end. I know—and have not always avoided—the difficulty of remaining judicial and impartial while in the gap of strong emotional convictions, but the fact remains, as Mencken has pointed out, that indignation in literature defeats its object.

If some sympathetic friend had taken the manuscript of this book and deleted from it all that arose from merely personal emotional bias, we should have a valuable work. As it is, Rationalists, marriage reformers, and birth controllers alike must needs sigh, after reading it, "God save us from our friends!"

Maynard Shipley

A NEW THEORY OF HEREDITY, by George Arthur Gaskell. C W Daniel Co, London 2s 6d

Emphasizing the psychological rather than the physical aspects of life, the author of this little book sets out to expound a new theory of inheritance. His arguments savor of the séance room rather than the laboratory, and he uses biological terms with a looseness which would cause even the most charitably-minded biologist to shudder, yet he sets forth an interesting point of view. The theory, briefly, is that life and inheritance result...
not so much from the union of two mature sex cells as from some "subtle surrounding medium" concerned with the "super-physical nature of mind and emotion," a something which surrounds our planet like an atmosphere and which contains the "special life processes of every kind of plant and animal on the globe." Lacking any experimental data whatever for support, the theory as explained bears the virtue of being novel rather than convincing.

Of most interest to the readers of the Birth Control Review is a section in the appendix entitled "Heredity and Birth Control." Here the author includes some correspondence with Charles Darwin, dated 1878. In answer to a letter written by Gaskell explaining some of his generalizations in regard to social selection, or the birth of the fit, Darwin replied, in part, as follows:

I have lately been led to reflect a little (far now that I am growing old, my work has become merely special) on the artificial checks to increase, and I cannot but doubt greatly whether such would be advantageous to the world at large at present, however it may be in the distant future.

Suppose that such checks had been in action during the last two or three centuries, or even for a shorter time in Britain, what a difference it would have made in the world, when we consider America, Australasia, New Zealand and South Africa! No words can exaggerate the importance, in my opinion, of our colonization far, the future history of the world.

If it were universally known that the birth of children could be prevented, and this was not thought immoral by married persons, would there not be great danger of extreme profligacy amongst unmarried women, and might we not become like to "arreers" societies in the Pacific?

In the course of a century, Prance will tell us the result in many ways. We can already see that the French nation does not spread or increase much.

It is interesting to note, here, the conservative stand taken by Darwin on the question of birth control. There is little doubt that in the light of present conditions Darwin would have taken a more optimistic view, as the writings of his intellectual descendants, Julian Huxley, Leonard Darwin, and others, evidence.

ESTHER F. VREELAND

MRS GRUNDY A HISTORY OF FOUR CENTURIES OF MORALS INTENDED TO ILLUMINATE PRESENT PROBLEMS IN GREAT BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES, by Leo Markun D. Appleton and Co., New York $5.00

MEDDLERS UPLIFTING MORAL UPLIFTERS, by H. I. Brock. Ives Washburn, New York $3.00

CENSORED THE PRIVATE LIFE OF THE MOVIE, by Morris L. Ernst and Pare Lorentz. Jonathan Cape and Harrison Smith, New York. $2.75

WHENEVER society or society's Volsteads, Comstocks and Grundys, officially or unofficially, go too far in attempting to direct and regulate personal and public morality, there follows a violently liberal reaction. We are living now in such an era of reaction, in testimony of which we have these three volumes, a few of many such recently published.

Mrs Grundy, like the poor, has been and—although we deprecate it—will be always with us. But one thing is certain—and this is Mr. Markun's thesis—her good reputation is not what it once was, for the simple reason that she is preeminently fickle. She changes her position as to what is right and wrong as often as the minute hand of a watch. Mr. Markun's thesis is not new. The burden of Leck's History of European Morals is that the recognized virtues are practiced in varying degrees depending on the tune and the place. "There is not," writes Mr. Markun, "a single definite rule for moral conduct that has always and everywhere prevailed among men."

For instance, like Benjamin Franklin, Mrs Grundy is not the same person abroad as at home. She changes her attitude in the Solomon Islands, again in Panama, again in Moscow, and again in the Tibet. Nor is she the same woman today that she was yesterday. She has rewarded pirates, but has renounced children in Cromwell's time for having said that they had seen a squirrel run across a road, she has condoned gambling but has frowned at munsters who baptized infants born on Sunday. She applauded, when a president of Harvard in 1673 said that he looked upon toleration "as the first-born of all abominations," but she condones, when enroute through Germany, the activities of the nudists. A strange woman, this! A most unreliable authority! Exceedingly untrustworthy! For exposing her anew, Mr. Markun deserves high praise. He has shown how necessary it is for every-
body, singly and en masse, to get sensible about the regulation of moral behavior.

Meddlers is an excellent companion volume to Mrs Grundy, for in it Mr Brock catalogues and criticizes the forces which he believes are interfering with the natural evolution of American moral life and thought. He finds meddlers everywhere, and as thick as mosquitoes in a September swamp. He finds them in church, in the psychological laboratory, in peace conferences, in patriotic assemblies, in the Senate and in the House, in the school and college, in the club, in the publishing houses, on your doorstep and in your back yard.

But even their ubiquity might be tolerated were it not for their imiquity! They are pestilential. They carry a poisonous stigma with them everywhere, which may, indeed, put a commendable citizen in class with a criminal "If a man who takes a drink of synthetic gin, or a man who has in his possession a copy of a book by Giovanni Boccaccio is no less hable to arrest and punishment than a felon who breaks into your house, shoots you full of holes and tramples the baby to death in his eagerness to get away with the silver—then what pnce felony? What pnce law? What pnce decency? What pnce horse sense, and that of the damnest plannest sort?"

Here are symptoms that warrant such a book as Mr Brock's—a book unfortunately that the majority of the meddling brood will not dare not read—for Truth's sake, (their Truth, of course) and Mrs Grundy's Truth.

Censored—a book of the same salutary type as the two preceding, corroborates our suspicions that in various states our films are "cut" frequently and in a most assine and indiscriminate way. It is a book which might well be titled "Movie Meddlers," or "Mrs Grundy in Filmland."

For instance, in Virginia, "Unwelcome Children" was rejected in toto and thrown out of the state. But why? Here is the censor's comment: "This film is a photoplay with a clearly defined well-acted plot, but—terrible to relate in the name of all that is scientifically true and socially advisable—it involves such delicate questions as eugenics, birth control, and abortion, contraceptives and the like." "A Woman of Affairs" was shown to the august censors in Virginia, they barred it because it touched on the subject of syphilis.

No movie of any artistic importance was passed by the ladies and gentlemen of Ohio without some "unholy gesture" being snatched from it, with the exceptions of the story of Christ, "The King of Kings," and Charlie Chaplin's "The Circus."

Peculiarly enough, each state board according to these authors, has its own set aversions. Kansas suppresses nose-thumbing, Maryland neck-kissing, Virginia untoward remarks, New York political corruption, but Pennsylvania is "the most arbitrary and severe of them all," and works "with a fury and an inconsistency that offer no clues as to what it purports to serve."

When the movie industry decided to "get itself a bishop" it turned the fate of the movie "over to a politician and Presbyterian elder," and Messrs Ernst and Lorentz conclude that "we can expect no fight for freedom, taste or mature thought in the conduct of the movie barons so long as the Bishop of Hollywood chants his platitudes and swings his pot of purity."

Earl H. Detsch

BOOKS RECEIVED

Backgrounds for Sociology, by Hannibal Gerald Duncan, Ph D Marshall Jones Co., Boston, Mass $4 00

The Child in Primitive Society, by Nathan Miller, Ph D Brentano's New York $3 00


Fifty Years of Freethought, Vol II, by George E. MacDonald The Truth Seeker Co. New York $4 00 (with Vol I—$6 00)

Birth Control and the State, A Plea and a Forecast, by C P Blacker E P Dutton and Co. New Ywk $100

Biology in Human Affairs, Edited by Edward M East McGraw Hill Book Co. New Ywk $3 50


A New Argument Against Birth Control

Suppose I go to a river where salmon are spawning and I pour a fluid into the stream which nullifies the power of the female eggs to germinate. The game warden catches me and brings me into court. I tell the judge that I did not kill any fish and am therefore not guilty of destroying salmon.

What do you think would happen to me in one of our federal courts?

Rev. P G Klein

Seattle, Washington
News Notes

INTERNATIONAL

THE International Union for the Scientific Investigation of Population Problems held its second general assembly in London, June 15-19. The American committee included Dr. Louis I. Dublin, chairman, Dr. Raymond Pearl, Dr. Henry Pratt Fairchild, Dr. Frank H. Hankins, Dr. P. K. Whelpton.

UNITED STATES

BIRTH CONTROL as a public health measure was advocated at the annual meeting of the Medical Women's National Association in Philadelphia on June 8th. Dr. Ellen C. Potter, medical director of the New Jersey Welfare Department and chairman of the race betterment committee of the Association, said: "The medical profession should have the most comprehensive outlook in relation to race betterment, and this view should include birth control, selective sterilization, prenatal and post-natal care, sex education, mental hygiene, parental education and behavior problems." The organization has always favored birth control under medical supervision, according to Dr. Olga Stasny, retiring president.

The Eugenics Research Association held its annual meeting on June 6th at the American Museum of Natural History, New York. Dr. Clarence G. Campbell, president, pointed out that "we have small hope of making permanent improvement in social, economic or civic conditions, unless at the same time improvement is made in the hereditary nature of the human stock that is involved in these conditions." Among the speakers were Professor Harrison R. Hunt, Dr. Charles B. Davenport, Dr. Bessie B. Wessell, and Dr. A. F. Blakeslee.

The newly organized National Council on Freedom from Censorship has undertaken the defense of Mane Stopes' book "Contraception," which was imported several months ago by Dr. R. N. Taylor, a research specialist, and seized by the Collector of the Port of New York. The defense contends that any scientific book should be allowed free entry if needed for study.

CONNECTICUT: Dr. Herbert Thoms of Yale University School of Medicine, speaker at the fourth and last forum held on May 26th under the auspices of the Naugatuck Birth Control League, and said that physicians should be granted the right, by law, to impart contraceptive information to married persons.

Addressing the annual meeting of the General Association of Connecticut at Windsor on June 10th, the Reverend Fletcher D. Parker, of Hartford, called upon the Congregational clergymen to "speak out as Christians" against the law prohibiting the dissemination of birth control advice. He said: "By our absurd laws here in Connecticut, we cause thousands of hapless parents to bring into the world other thousands of poor, unwanted children. The repeal of this law is a primary charge upon our conscience as pioneers for a better Christian civilization."

NEW JERSEY: The State Federation of Women's Clubs, through their Social Welfare Department, will take up the study of birth control next winter. The Social Hygiene Committee of New Jersey League for Women Voters (95 New Street, Newark) has issued an outline for individual and group study of birth control, presenting both sides and giving references to available pamphlets and books. Dr. Eric Matzner, medical director of the American Birth Control League, spoke on the "Medical Aspects of Birth Control" at the weekly luncheon session of the Veritans Club of Paterson on June 3rd.

MINNESOTA: The Minnesota Birth Control League filed Articles of Incorporation with the Secretary of State of Minnesota on June 13th. The offices of the League, which is affiliated with the American Birth Control League, are President, Mrs. G. C. Shafer, first Vice-President, Mrs. R. F. Welch, second Vice-President, Mrs. R. J. Dorer, Secretary, Mrs. H. B. Wilcox, Treasurer, Mrs. Gilbert J. Holzer, Chairman of Finance Committee, Mrs. W. O. Winston, Jr., Chairman of Social Welfare Committee, Mr. Charles P. Wagner, Chairman of Extension Committee, Mrs. A. E. Selby, Chairman of Publicity Committee, Mrs. Bernard S. Harris.

Mrs. W. O. Winston, Jr., was nominated as representative on the Board of Directors of the American Birth Control League. Temporary summer headquarters will be kept at the home of Mrs.
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Progress in Connecticut

The Connecticut Birth Control League wound up its activities for 1930-1931, and fired its opening gun for the new year at a large luncheon given at the Lawn Club at New Haven. The gathering was representative and included many physicians and prominent women from all parts of the State. Proceedings were opened by a short speech from Mrs A G Pornitt the retiring Chairman of the League, who introduced Mrs E B Reed of New Haven, who presided Dr C E A Winslow, who had been largely influential in forming the New Haven Committee of the League, was Unfortunately called away at the beginning of the meeting, but the Yale Medical School as well as the medical profession of the State was well represented.

The work done during the Legislative session was reviewed by Judge Epaphroditus Peck, who introduced the Birth Control Bill in the Legislature, piloted it to a favorable report in the Judiciary Committee, and spoke for it when it came up for its final vote in the House. Judge Peck regretted its defeat, but pointed to the fact that the vote in its favor had increased from 17 in 1929 to 76 in 1931. He attributed this partly to a growing sentiment in favor of birth control, and partly to the fact that the bill had been much less drastic than that of 1929 by which a total repeal of the Connecticut law, prohibiting the use of all contraceptives, had been sought. The forces which the advocates of Birth Control now face, he told the League, are twofold. First there is the opposition of the Roman Catholic Church, and second there is the conservatism and Ignorance of a large section of the population, particularly in the over-represented rural towns of the State. The first opponent is, he believes unchangeable, but the second will give way with the advance of education. He reviewed at some length the recent steps in favor of birth control, taken by the Protestant churches, and advised the League to continue its efforts at education and gradual modification of the attitude of the average small town man and woman.

Dr David R Lyman, the highly-respected head of a large sanatorium, was the second speaker. He told of the desperate need of contraception for tubercular women and stated that it was infinitely preferable to prevent her pregnancy than to relieve her of it by therapeutic abortion, such as was permissible under the Connect--culaw.
The most important report given at the meeting was that of Dr Herbert Thoms, who read a statement signed by Dr Comfort, Secretary of the State Medical Society.

"As a medical organization the Connecticut State Medical Society is concerned solely with the medical and public health aspects of birth control, and not with social or economic considerations. The present Connecticut statutes provide for the legal performance of abortion in the presence of tuberculosis, heart disease, nephritis and other serious diseases. With this fact in mind it appears reasonable that our patients be further safeguarded by legalizing the dissemination of contraceptive advice for medical purposes by licensed practitioners, as was embodied in a proposed amendment to the State statute which was approved by more than 400 members of our society and by the Judicial Committee of the present Legislature.

"The House of Delegates voted unanimously that the sentiments expressed in the above statement be approved by the Society.

"The House of Delegates also voted unanimously that this expression be referred to the Committee on Public Policy and Legislation of the Connecticut State Medical Society for proper study, action and report at the 1932 session of the Society."

Fortified by this support from the Connecticut State Medical Society, Dr Thoms moved that the Connecticut Birth Control League concentrate its efforts on the fight to secure an amendment of the Connecticut law on the same lines as the amendment introduced in 1931. The motion was carried unanimously.

The election of officers followed. Dr A. N. Creachick of New Haven was chosen as President. The Vice Presidents are Judge Clarence S. Hall, of Bridgeport and Mrs George S. Hauck of West Hartford, Secretary, Mrs E. B. Reed, the Treasurer, Mrs Longshaw K. Porrutt. The Executive Committee are Mrs George H. Day, Hartford, Dr A. lhss Dayton, New Haven, Mrs Henry L. Galpin, New Haven, Dr James R. Miller, Hartford, Dr D. C. Peterson, Bridgeport, Dr Samuel Person, Stamford, Mrs A. G. Porrutt, Hartford, Dr Herbert Thoms, New Haven, Mrs James K. Whitemore, New Haven, Professor C. E. A. Winslow, New Haven, Mrs Karl Young, New Haven, Mrs Leonard D. Adkins is chairman of Fairfield County, and Mrs Alfred M. Pease of Hartford County.
In the Magazines

IN MEMORIJUM—JAMES FREYER COOPER
By S. Adolphus Knopf, M.D.

There are many discoveries in the field of curative medicine and surgery which have lessened disease and suffering, prolonged life and increased human happiness, but no monuments in bronze or stone exist to perpetuate the memory of the great physicians and surgeons who attained those marvelous results. It is the same with those who have devoted their labors to the prevention of disease.

James Freyer Cooper was one of the great souls who belong to this latter group, but advocates of such unpopular ideas in preventive medicine as contraception are usually little known to the laity, and in many instances are frowned upon and discarded, particularly by men and women who are taught by their spiritual advisers not to listen to or read about information concerning such matters. Even physicians belonging to these religious persuasions are warned not to follow the teachings and works of the advocates of birth control.

Dr. Cooper was, until his death, the medical director of the American Birth Control League, which position he had held for nearly seven years. It was my rare privilege to have known him personally and to have had many intimate talks with him concerning the problem which he had made his life's work. How far-reaching this work was, or how many lives of mothers of this generation have been saved by himself and the medical men and women who listened to his lectures and read his articles and books cannot possibly be estimated. If the letters which reach the advocates of birth control such as Mane Stopes and Norman Haire, of England, Margaret Sanger, the founder of the American Birth Control League, Mrs. F. Robertson Jones, the present head of the League, Mary Ware Dennett, the founder of the Voluntary Parenthood League, Dr. Robert L. Dickinson of the Committee of Maternal Health, Dr. William J. Robinson, the indefatigable writer of books on the subject of birth control, and the letters which came to Dr. Cooper himself from mothers in distress and women who have been helped by the advice of preventive measures, could be published, they would constitute the best possible argument in favor of scientific, judicious and ethical contraception, commonly called "birth control." Such letters and personal appeals are daily coming from all classes of society, high and low, from all creeds and races, even from many whose church canons forbid them to resort to contraceptive methods.

In his relatively short medical career he accomplished more along the lines of preventive medicine than can be even remotely estimated. He was a teacher of a little known subject to thousands of physicians and students, a subject still forbidden in many medical schools of the country. He was a defender of womanhood and parenthood and an advocate of medical freedom, combined with the highest medical ideal and ethics. Dr. Cooper will not soon be forgotten by his friends, coworkers, fellow physicians, and students. Some day when birth control will be recognized by the general public, the entire medical and legal professions, and particularly by our Legislators, as indispensable to the physical, spiritual and economic welfare of any civilized nations, and when modern medicine will include scientific, judicious and ethical contraception among the most important subjects of the curriculum of medical schools, James Freyer Cooper's name will be known as one of the strongest, noblest and most efficient workers and teachers in this most important branch of preventive medicine.

—Medical Journal and Record, May 20, 1931

FEWEB AND BETTEB

While the churches continue to debate the right and wrong of birth control, the American public has apparently adopted the practice. The census figures tell the story. In not one American city having over 50,000 population hitherto reported are enough children being born to maintain even a stationary population. In most of the cities there are only two thirds to three fourths of the number of children required to prevent a decline in the normal population increase.

Taking the country as a whole, the population is still increasing about 1 1/2 per cent a year. Statisticians estimate, however, that within forty years the population will be stationary at something less than 170,000,000. Then, if we have not changed our immigration laws or our habits, there may be a slight decrease.
The importance of this change can hardly be overestimated. It is directly attributable to birth control.

Although some of the churches strenuously oppose this practice and others incline to give it qualified approval, the people, of all creeds and of none, seem to be accepting it.

Fewer children are being born. For more attention is being paid to health. Consequently, death rates also fell. The expectation of life has been greatly extended. The emphasis of our generation has been laid on providing more health, more education and better opportunities for smaller families. This is a new chapter in history.

_In_ Collier's, June 20, 1931

A significant study

_President Hoover_ in his address before the White House Conference on Child Welfare said, "The birthright of every child should be a sound mind in a sound body, born under conditions which favor development."

In the ninety laborers' families receiving help from charitable agencies in Pittsburgh which were recently studied by the Birth Control League of Allegheny County the average number of children was six. According to the family budget of the Pittsburgh Federation of Social Agencies a minimum of $154.00 a month is needed to support such a family. And yet not one man among those studied was earning enough to meet this minimum standard of health and decency.

With this situation existing the following conditions are found to be prevalent. There is undernourishment, ill health and lack of medical care, improper clothing and housing, lack of supervision of the children by the parents, delinquency, child-labor and crime, early marriage and a repetition of the above conditions in the next generation, and dependence upon relatives, agencies, or the state for support.

In one family of eight children, every child is undernourished and in need of clothing. The eldest child, a girl of fourteen who underwent an operation was very slow in recovering because she was not given the proper care and treatment. Another child in the family broke his ankle, his crutches were homemade and awkward. The two-year-old baby needed medical treatment but there was no money. Not enough to pay the rent. Another baby is expected and the knowledge of this is accompanied with a feeling of dread, for the other children are in want.

It is necessary and very commendable that charity be given these people to relieve their immediate suffering. However, it must be evident to every intelligent person that our responsibility does not cease here. The community must enable these people to limit their families by scientific and medical means, if we are to have children born with sound minds and sound bodies and with a chance for development.

_—Editorial, Pittsburgh Press, June 6_

**Will Birth Control Solve China's Problems?**

By D. O. Lively

_National Director, China Famine Relief, U S A_

_When_ and if the National Government of China creates a National Economic Planning Council and gives such a Council the wherewithal to make the necessary studies, there are three outstanding absolutes which will get first attention. They are:

1. Reduction of armed forces
2. Increased food production
3. More and better roads

With our knowledge of the Central and South American countries, we should be able to realize
that revolution in China means an election in the offering. This does not signify the absence of patriotism, nor does it indicate a lack of progress. In the development of a national spirit, China has made and is making giant strides. The clan inheritance is slowly yielding to a national conception.

Considering how many centuries the tradition-bound civilization of China has been based upon and rooted in the family and the clan, those who measure what is now taking place in that country, and who do not make the common mistake of trying to apply a Western yardstick, note and evaluate vast changes.

There is reason for high hope in the material and cultural advancement of the Chinese, a people fundamentally great and admirable. First in importance is the unmistakable awakening of China, one evidence of which is the proposal to name a National Economic Planning Council.

One of the evidences of progress in China is the acceptance of and enthusiastic cooperation in the plans that China Famine Relief U.S.A. has developed for the solution of the famine problem. Because of their fitness and since the application of similar methods banished famine from India, thus enabling that country to consider its desire for a place in the sun without having to carry the burden of hunger, it is certain that the perfectly obvious program which our organization is fostering will be included in the plans of the proposed National Economic Planning Council.

This program, purely charitable in intent, takes on economic habiliments and falls under five general heads, as follows:

- Giving food to the starving.
- Exchanging food for labor on roads and irrigation projects.
- Developing home industries among farmers and villagers in the famine areas.
- Making available the demonstrated results of drought-resisting seed and better farming.
- Forming more cooperative rural credit associations.

Now, where does birth control come in and is there a place for it in the stabilization of China? The answer to this question is that a service of great magnitude can be rendered China in teaching birth control to its people. Leadership—disinterested leadership—is China's primal need, but until a greater start has been made in meeting her food and clothing and educational exigencies, birth control must be patient.

Keeping in mind that since history began the root and branch of Chinese civilization has been the family and the clan, remembering that the cost of the cheapest contraceptive device is equal to a month's food supply for the average Chinese adult, and realizing that the rank and file of the population of China cannot read nor write, it will be seen that the building up of a consciousness of the wisdom of birth control is an undertaking of no little magnitude.

Let none gather from what I have said that the task is hopeless. There is, first, the tremendous and constantly pressing economic need over all of China. But if, like India, China can solve her food and transportation problems, and work out a solution of her financial difficulties, the field for the propagation of birth control knowledge will be ready for cultivation. What has been done in the consideration of birth control in the treaty ports of China has not dimpled the surface of thought in China proper, and when the time comes for tackling the subject in a real way, the methods that other countries have tried and found workable should be studied and used.

---

MARRIAGE IN TRANSITION

(Continued from page 206)

This explains why the law, the church, the opinion of the public and the screeds of all writers on marriage can only roughly approximate an application to marital difficulties. This emphasis upon the individuality of the case, he carries to adultery. "Case after case of divorce convinces me, what is a sin in one instance is not a sin in others, no matter what the beliefs involved."

In summary, Judge Bartlett has written a provocative book. It would be easy to criticize it. The material might be organized to better advantage. There are numerous repetitions, as well as other earmarks of composition by a busy person. It is obvious, too, that the facts revealed in a divorce suit need to be supplemented by careful case investigation. Case studies such as Healy and Bronner have made of juvenile delinquents are even more necessary for domestic discord. But, and this is a matter of no mean importance, this is a fearless book, written out of a wealth of experience, and tempered both by a judicial spirit and by the mellowness of maturity. It is a refutation, and an advantage, always, to read a book written by a man who has definite ideas, based on facts, and expressed with conviction and with frankness.
This important book makes genetics exciting!

"Interesting and remarkable," says The Science News-Letter, "it explains to the ordinary man such puzzling things as genes and chromosomes, why he looks the way he does, and what his looks signify in terms of personality and character. The book is noteworthy because the author contrives an interesting and very readable account of a difficult subject without resorting to the usual style tricks of most popular science writers."
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