

THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW

Dedicated to the Cause of Voluntary Motherhood

KITTY MARION JAILED

AN OPEN LETTER TO ALFRED E. SMITH

VOLUNTARY MOTHERHOOD

By Rabbi Rudolph I. Coffee, Ph. D.

WHEN SHOULD A WOMAN AVOID HAVING CHILDREN?

By Margaret Sanger

BIRTH CONTROL THE CURE FOR WAR

THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW

104 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY

LITERARY EDITORS

MARGARET SANGER MAUDE EDGREN
WALTER ROBERTS LILY WINNER
JESSIE ASHLEY

ART EDITORS

CORNELIA BARNES LOU ROGERS

Vol II No 10

Published monthly Subscription price \$1 50 a year, foreign countries and Canada \$1 75, postpaid

Bundle rates ten copies for a dollar, \$9 50 per hundred

Owned and Published by
THE NEW YORK WOMEN'S PUBLISHING CO Inc
104 Fifth Avenue New York, N Y

Entered as second class matter March 11, 1918, at the post office at New York, N Y, under the Act of March 3, 1879

Issued on the first of each month

Address correspondence and make checks and money orders payable to
MARGARET SANGER

NOTICE When requesting change of address always give the old address as well

EDITORIALS

By Jessie Ashley

IT IS A QUEER world we live in On the one hand, we have an appeal to buy Liberty Bonds, so that America may bring death and destruction to Berlin On the other hand, we have a newspaper report of a married couple in France who had received ten thousand francs from the French Government upon the birth of their twentysecond child First we are urged to deal death, then we are paid for giving life Inconsistent? No, for how can man make war without lives to sacrifice? It is, in fact, cynically consistent Consistent in the utter disregard for the happiness and welfare of women Twentytwo children Ten thousand francs (about \$100 a child, unless the worthy couple dealt in children, and received 10,000 francs for each) and then some other government squeezes money from its people to make machines to destroy these same poor little \$100 children

Well, that is all right from the man's point of view Men like to fight and for ages have occupied themselves in killing animals for food, as well as in warring upon each other either in actual battle or in commerce or industry The more men there are, the bigger the fight But the interesting thing about it, is the attitude of women Why do women consent to bring twentytwo children into the world only to see them swallowed up in warfare, both industrial and political? Do they, also, like killing? Do they gloat over the children, thinking how this one will kill and that one bear 22 children? Do women really think this sort of thing pays? Do they think they really live, these women who breed excessively? We call our men noble and self sacrificing, give them honors without stint (medals of course) for spending a year or two in the trenches, in an unnatural life, created by mankind itself But imagine

twentytwo years of more or less active discomfort and pain in one lifetime and then a worn out middle age, and all for the purpose of reproducing her kind for the same sort of woeful existence What under the bright sun can a woman find tolerable in such a fate? Yet, women go on enduring this sort of thing, generation after generation Endure it, and pay taxes to bring death to the children of their enemies To us, they seem incredibly stupid, incredibly brutalized, these prolific mothers of men To us, it seems immoral to hand out 10,000 francs in praise of such a life, which is no life It seems to us degrading to encourage the race in such excessive reproduction It cheapens life, it lowers responsibility, it encourages the will to kill, because lives are so easily replaced But let any one so much as peep about rebel woman! Let any one so much as whisper, that life might be free and gay, even for women Let any bold little, poor little woman of them all, learn a secret that might help and tell it Let her even ask for such knowledge as exists (there is little enough of it, at best), in order to understand her own body and control it—then, well, she is a bad woman, bad and immoral, probably a criminal, and certainly an unnatural creature That is the plain, unpainted truth, no camouflage about it And men tell us that women like it!

IN THE MEANTIME, however, word comes from "Over there" that all standards have gone by the board and that no one any longer thinks of marriage This is but individual, personal observation, to be sure, but the observer is a perfectly good married American, working in France, with the Red Cross She has unusual opportunity to look and listen, if not to stop, nor does she explain whether it is the willful male, in the role of soldier hero, who is upsetting our precious standards, or the eternal feminine person busy on the job of keeping up the morale of the aforesaid heroes, who is to blame in the matter Perhaps it is the government itself All governments seem to be feeling a trifle worried about the size of the birth rate in their respective countries Possibly they are experimenting with informality along the hitherto rigid rules of matrimony If ten thousand francs for twentytwo children does not bring the desired results, perhaps a little freedom from legality along the line of one or two children, may be helpful We can at all events rest assured that State and Church and Society will co operate and will sanction that standard, old or new, high or low, legal or illegal, that promises to bring the best results in human material, and to State, Church and Society quantity is deemed better than quality That is the point that progressive women must keep in mind They must educate women to protect themselves from excessive child bearing When enough women insist on having scientific contraceptive information, that information will be forthcoming When women refuse to lead a life that is even less desirable than that of the cow, there will be ways found to meet the demand Many individual women today, know what a life of broad human activity may mean to them and are leading such lives They are not the women who have twentytwo children On with our fight in this tough little world for more intelligence, more health, more of the spirit, and less of the material sex ridden lives that women have to lead

AN OPEN LETTER TO ALFRED E. SMITH

HON ALFRED E. SMITH,
President of the Board of Alderman,
City Hall, New York

MY DEAR MR SMITH —

On September 26th, I addressed to you the following letter

"The subject of birth control is of vital importance to the women voters who are casting their first vote in the coming election of this state

For the benefit of the thousands who are interested in this subject will you not state your position regarding it, inasmuch as Governor Whitman has already gone on record for a Commission to investigate the necessity of changing the anti birth control laws

I will greatly appreciate hearing from you at your earliest possible convenience"

Very truly yours,
[Signed] MARGARET SANGER

At the same time I addressed a letter in identical language to Charles W Ervin, Socialist nominee for governor Mr Ervin has replied as follows

NEW YORK CITY
October 2, 1918

MY DEAR MRS SANGER —

Replying to your letter of September 26th, it is almost needless to state that I think that woman should be mistress of her own life, both economically and physically, and further, I think it is a crime for children to be brought into the world unless there is positive assurance that they can be given the best physical, moral and mental surroundings from birth until they blossom into manhood and womanhood

Believing this, I therefore am certainly in favor of a commission to investigate the necessity of changing the anti birth control laws I would, however, be most emphatically opposed to having this commission composed of a majority of men, but, on the contrary, I should just as emphatically favor the appointment of a majority of women on such a commission

Very Very Truly,
[Signed] CHARLES W ERVIN

Thus far I have received from you no reply to my query in behalf of the women who have written to me asking where the various candidates for governor stand upon the question of Birth Control

I have noted, however, your interview in the New York American of October 13th In that interview, you declare your self in favor of these policies and measures, among others

LAWS REGULATING HOURS of employment for men, women and children

Extension of Workingmen's Compensation law to include "occupational diseases"

Extension of labor laws "to take care of women and children forced into new lines of endeavor because of the war"

Minimum wage for women and children
Widow's pensions
Maternity insurance

Under present conditions, these are excellent palliatives, but are you aware, Mr Smith, that they are only palliatives?

And are you aware that they touch only superficially "the solution of the problems affecting men, women and children?"

If we are to judge a candidate upon a few pleasant sounding superficialities, uttered with the unction born of the necessities of a political campaign, many of the women of New York would doubtless be moved to vote for you But in these days an awakened womanhood is beginning to pay attention to the fundamentals We are more interested in the removal of causes than in the application of palliatives We care less for the multiplication of hospitals than we do for the prevention of sickness and wounds

Laws regulating the hours of employment for men, women and children are all very well, Mr Smith, but do you know that most of the women and children now forced into toil in the state of New York would not be there, war or no war, if it were not for the fact that the family of the average working man is too large for the husband to support?

ARE YOU AWARE that the high infant death rate is due principally to the family too large to afford proper living quarters, proper food and proper physical attention? Do you know that each year 300,000 children in the United States die of diseases due to poverty and neglect? Are you aware that there are upon the statute books certain "dark age" laws which make it a crime to convey to the overburdened mothers the knowledge by which she can limit her family to the size which makes it possible to give it proper care, proper food, proper clothing and proper medical attention?

Are you aware that the well to do and more highly educated almost universally practice family limitation, more popularly and accurately known as Birth Control, while the wives of workingmen are denied this knowledge?

And are you aware that the cost of the care of the insane alone in New York state last year was \$8,320,000, while the economic loss, due to insanity, according to the annual report of the State Hospital Commission, was \$35,000,000?

Do you know that most of the 37,069 persons in the state institutions for the mentally defective, came from large families reared in poverty? And do you know that unchecked breeding of these defectives has already overcrowded the state institutions to the extent of 10,000 persons?

Are you aware that the repeal of the statutes prohibiting the dissemination of the knowledge of Birth Control would in a few years rid the state of this burden, to say nothing of freeing women of the most abject of all forms of slavery, that of unwilling motherhood?

And do you know that there are hundreds of thousands of women in New York crying for the knowledge which shall enable them to have smaller but healthier, better-cared for families?

We are not asking you at this time to go on record in favor of Birth Control. But we are asking you to go on record in favor of a commission to ascertain, scientifically, accurately and without prejudice, whether under present economic conditions the unchecked birth rates in certain elements of society is responsible largely for the need of prisons and institutions for the mentally defective. We are asking you to pledge your self to an impartial commission to ascertain the relation between too large families and the health and death rates. We are asking you to name a commission which shall discover whether the repeal of the anti Birth Control statutes will in a few years remedy these conditions.

MATERNAL INSURANCE is, after all, but small relief to women whose lives have been wrecked by too frequent childbearing. Workingmen's compensation does not go far toward the support of a family of five or six or seven. You may find that Birth Control, which prevents the multiplication of children who can not have proper food, proper clothing nor proper shelter will do more to solve the problem than even strict child labor laws and regulation, which we all favor.

I am well aware, as are all women who have devoted their attention to this cause, that it is not the custom of candidates

for office to go deep into the fundamental causes of intolerable conditions. But, whatever you may think of it, Mr. Smith, the women of New York know where the trouble lies. They know that legislative palliatives mean little to women, until they are freed from this most degrading servitude. They know whence come the inmates of prisons and reformatories, the inmates of institutions for defectives. And they know whence comes the child labor evil.

Governor Whitman, prior to America's entry into the war, promised a state commission to investigate the need of the repeal of the anti Birth Control statutes. Charles W. Ervin, Socialist nominee for governor, has gone one step further. He has pledged himself to a commission of which a majority shall be women.

In behalf of the women who have written to me, in behalf of the thousands of New York women who believe in making the knowledge of Birth Control accessible to the wives and mothers of toilers, I ask you again, Mr. Smith, where do you stand upon this matter so vital to the well being of hundreds of thousands of New York women, and therefore so vital to the well being of society?

Very truly yours,

[Signed] MARGARET SANGER

Kitty Marion Gives Up Freedom --- What Will You Give?

WHEN KITTY MARION was sentenced to thirty days in jail or the payment of a five hundred dollar fine, she unhesitatingly chose the jail, although she knew that in the wave of emotion and indignation that swept over the supporters of the Birth Control movement, at the excessive amount of the fine, five hundred dollars, could then and there have been raised.

But Kitty Marion put the cause before herself and bravely sacrificed her liberty rather than use money that she thought should go to the cause of Birth Control. She is now doing hard labor for the sake of humanity.

We must do this. One hundred dollars has already been pledged. Come on, the rest of you, rich and poor alike, give

dimes and give dollars, hundreds of them. Send literally all you can to the Kitty Marion Fund to be used in the propaganda she is in jail for. It is time woman's voice was heard loud enough to be heeded.

Come now, noblesse oblige!

Send your contribution to Mrs. Frances B. Ackerman, Treasurer, 104 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Board of Directors

THE NEW YORK WOMEN'S PUBLISHING CO. INC.
By the Board of Directors

Jessie Ashley	Cerise Carman Jack
Mary Chamberlain	Juliet B. Rublee
Elizabeth M. F. Chambers	Margaret Sanger
Elizabeth W. Colt	Helen Todd
Mary Ware Dennett	Mrs. Calvin Tomkins
Virginia Heidelberg	Gertrude Williams

Children to Come

By E. Ralph Cheney

OH, HUSH, for a moment's space and, listening, stand aside

From the frenzied battle for bread and the crushing burden of fears!

Take heart in the breathless race from the wolf with jaws gaped wide,

For, hark, there's a lilt ahead in the litany of the years

"Oh, healthy, happy, hearty, singing, bringing strength and courage new,

The perfect fruit of perfect love, we, wanted, needed, come to you!

Now, Nature's lavish nuptial hand, by science stayed, to man gives heed,

And strong your bodies, brave young spirits answer wholly to your need."

Judges With Small Families Jail Kitty Marion

IF YOU BUY this number of THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW from a woman whom you are unaccustomed to see selling magazines on the street, it is because Kitty Marion, of THE REVIEW staff is in jail for her convictions

In a recent issue we told the authorities that for every woman jailed for her activities in the movement for Birth Control, ten women would rise up to do her work. We underestimated the vitality of our own cause. Instead of ten, fifteen women have volunteered to sell THE REVIEW on the street.

That was only the beginning. Wherever the news of Miss Marion's arrest and imprisonment has spread it has brought wider, deeper interest in the cause for which she is suffering. Words of encouragement come from every side. Proffers of co-operation multiply. Women who have not before taken an active interest in the Birth Control movement are awakening to the necessity of carrying forward this light.

It is peculiarly fitting that this English woman, a veteran of many fights for the rights of women, should through her dauntless courage and cheerful martyrdom, be the means of bringing home once more to the women of America the vital fact that they and they alone can win and establish their liberties.

FORTY YEARS AGO, in the dock of an English prison stood Kitty Marion's countrywoman, Annie Besant, and uttered words which awoke the women of the British Empire to the brutality of the laws which prevented them from attaining a knowledge of their own beings. That first martyr to the cause of Birth Control was sentenced to prison for six months and fined £200, though the sentence was never imposed. But the fire kindled by her example swept away the vicious laws against contraceptives and today it is not unlawful in the British Empire to impart information concerning Birth Control.

Woman's martyrdom bears abundant fruit for woman's freedom. Miss Marion is a member of the staff of THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW. No member of that staff pauses at anything which will further this battle for the freedom of woman. Hence it came that every afternoon and every night, Miss Marion went among the Broadway crowds to sell and thereby advertise THE REVIEW and the Birth Control movement. Other women, inspired by her example, have come forward to do this work. Still others have volunteered to do her work in the office.

We beg to revise our previous statement. For every woman jailed for the sake of Birth Control, twenty will rise up to do her work. Miss Marion was given her choice by the court of Special Sessions. She could pay a \$500 fine, or go to jail for thirty days. Instantly she chose the latter.

Whatever improvement you may note in THE REVIEW in the next few issues is due in great part to that decision upon Miss Marion's part. Money is not plentiful in the Birth Control movement, but had Miss Marion so chosen, her fine would have been paid instantly by contributors to this cause. She chose, rather, to give another proof of her great devotion.

"Put the money into THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW," said she, "I'll stay in jail."

THE TRIAL OF Kitty Marion, October 14th, was very brief.

She did not deny that she had imparted the specified information to Agent Bamberger of the so called Society for the Prevention of Vice. She was not given an opportunity to tell in court the pitiful story of an ailing and desperate wife and a discouraged man by which Bamberger induced her to procure and give him that humane knowledge which it is still unlawful to communicate in New York.

She did not apologize. She did not promise "never to do it again." She admitted the facts and received her sentence. Judge Freschi favored a fine of \$250 instead of \$500. Judges Kernochan and Murphy overruled him. Judge Kernochan was particularly insistent upon punishment of women who dare "to break the law."

One of the ironical features of the case is that while all three of the judges are married, one is childless, and two have but small families.

One wonders why, Your Honors of the court of Special Sessions, if you think it your duty to send a woman to jail who has given information concerning contraceptives to a man who says that his wife's health and life are in danger, you, yourselves, have not large families? One wonders, Your Honors, why Kitty Marion is in jail and your families to all appearances, have been the subject of a wise and judicious limitation?

Even this, however, is not the most ironical feature of the case. Bamberger, who played the agent provocateur and who receives a salary for inducing people to break the law, is still at liberty. He was not even reproved by the court. He is free to continue to draw his salary for inducing still other violations of other laws.

Kitty Marion has no apology to make for her violation of a dark age statute. Neither have we one to make for her. We approve of her generous courage and we are proud of the unselfishness and fortitude with which she undergoes the penalty imposed by law for her work for women. Bamberger cannot be left to his conscience for a trapper of women as surely has none. His case and the cases of those who like him have chosen to lead the existence of human vultures can be committed to the awakening social sense of a long outraged public.

Possibly because Miss Marion has several times undergone imprisonment in England for her work as a suffragette and because she there instituted a hunger strike, she has not been committed to the workhouse on Blackwell's Island. Instead, she has been held in The Tombs which is, in some slight degree, better than the Island prison.

Kitty Marion, refusing to pay a fine because she feels that the money is needed for the Birth Control movement, is a magnificent example of fearless womanhood ready to pay a man imposed price for the freedom of her sex. In the light of that example we can but pledge ourselves anew to a constant, more unflinching devotion to the cause for which she suffers.

When Should A Woman Avoid Having Children?

By Margaret Sanger

IF ONE JUDGES by the letters and personal inquiries that come to an advocate of Birth Control the one thing that women wish to know more than any other, is how to escape the burden of too frequent child bearing. Next to that they are interested in the question of when a woman should avoid having children.

One who has examined the books bearing upon the latter subject is quickly brought to the conclusion that there has been a great amount of disagreement among so called authorities in regard to this matter. Once it seemed that every one who discussed it, whether it was from the standpoint of medicine, morals, social welfare or individual rights disagreed with everybody else who had attempted to give an answer.

Within the past few years, however, medical and social science have made such strides in this direction that it is now comparatively easy to separate the worthwhile conclusions from those which are of doubtful value or plainly worthless. Those who have made a careful, scientific study of Birth Control are pretty well united upon the points which I shall set forth in this article. I do not give them as my own opinions so much as the result of investigation by others, which I have proved correct by my own studies.

THERE ARE MANY circumstances to be considered before one attempts to advise a woman who asks when she should avoid having children. When all is said and done, the answer is never the same in any two cases. There are certain things which the mother or prospective mother should know. Then she must decide for herself.

(1) *Generally speaking, no woman should bear a child before she is twenty two years old. It is better that she should wait until she is at least twenty five.* Not only is it desirable from the mother's viewpoint to postpone child bearing until she has attained a ripe physical and mental development, but it is all important to the child. The best authorities agree that a child born when a woman is twenty five or older has the best chance of a good physical and mental equipment, provided, of course, that the health of the mother is good.

(2) *Child bearing should be avoided within two or three years after the birth of the last child.* Common sense and science unite in pointing out that the mother requires at least this much time to regain her normal strength in order to give a new baby proper nourishment both before and after its birth. For the mother's sake it is sufficient to point out, as does Findley in "Diseases of Women" that "frequent child bearing almost certainly results in some sort of pelvic ailment."

(3) *By all means there should be no children when mother (or father) suffers from such diseases as tuberculosis, gonorrhea, syphilis, cancer, epilepsy, insanity, drunkenness or mental disorders. In the case of the mother, heart disease, kidney trouble and pelvic deformities are also a serious bar to pregnancy.*

Thousands of volumes have been written by physicians upon

the danger to mothers and offspring of having children when one or both parents are suffering from the diseases mentioned above. As authorities have pointed out in all these books, the jails, hospitals for the insane, poorhouses and houses of prostitution are filled with the children born of such parents, while an astounding number of their children are either still born or die in infancy.

These facts are now so well known that they would need little discussion here, even if space permitted. Miscarriages, which are particular frequent in cases of syphilis and pelvic deformities, are a great source of danger to the health and even to the life of the mother. Where either parent suffers from gonorrhea, the child is likely to be born blind. Tuberculosis in the parent leaves the child's system in such condition that it is likely to suffer from the disease. Childbearing is also a grave danger to the tubercular mother. A tendency to insanity, if not insanity itself, may be transmitted to the child, or it may be feeble minded if one of the parents is insane or suffers from any mental disorder. Drunkenness in the parent or parents has been found to be the cause of feeble mindedness in the offspring and to leave the child with a constitution too weak to resist disease as it should.

(4) *No more children should be born when the parents, though healthy themselves, find that their children are physically or mentally defective.* No matter how much they desire children, no man and woman have a right to bring into the world those who are sure to suffer from mental or physical affliction. It condemns the child to a life of misery and places upon the community the burden of caring for them, probably of their defective descendants for many generations.

(5) *There should be no more children whenever the conditions of life and the uncertainty of livelihood make it improbable that the children can be given proper care, both as to their physical and mental needs.*

AT LEAST ONE CHILD in every seven that dies in the United States perishes from malnutrition or some disease due to poverty. It is neither just to the baby, to the mother nor to the father, to bring into the world a child that is likely to lack for proper food, medical attention and healthful home surroundings. The want of these things inevitably bring disease and disaster to the child and a crushing burden to the parents, to say nothing of the burden to society at large. If there is not accorded to the infant the mercy of an early death, the jail, the poorhouse, and the house of prostitution have a great chance of claiming it. This is another point upon which medical and social authorities are now well agreed.

This, then, is the answer of science for all women generally. But I want to impress upon the mind of the reader who belongs to the toiling masses that women who labor, who do useful things in the world, have a special and exceedingly deep interest in Birth Control Society, for ages past has been and still is in different to the needs of the worker's children. Every now

Birth Control A Parents' Problem or Woman's?

New York, October 4, 1918

"MY DEAR MRS SANGER —

I have for some time been interested in the Birth Control movement I have been a reader of THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW, and a contributor to the funds for the support of Birth Control I mention these things that you may know that I am fully in sympathy with what you are trying to do

For some time past I have been going to write to you about a question that has arisen frequently in my mind as I have read THE REVIEW Don't you think you over emphasize the woman's side of the problem to the exclusion of the man's?

Women have all the pain and the danger of childbearing Doesn't it seem little enough that the man should take upon himself the problem of protecting her when protection is needed? Shouldn't the instruction in methods of Birth Control be given to men and more stress laid upon appealing to them to take this responsibility?

The more I think of it, the more I feel that this is a man's

problem and that without his co operation we can never solve it

Yours for a better race,

M B H"

WE PUBLISH THIS letter from "M B H" because it raises a question bearing immediately upon the direction which the Birth Control movement is to take

We are well aware that there is a wide difference of opinion upon this matter My own convictions are very decided I would like before expressing them, however, to give an opportunity to others who may have something to say on the subject

We will, therefore, devote a page of the next issue of THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW to this discussion Please make your letters as short as possible, so that everyone may have a hearing In the issue following the publication of the letters, I hope to state my own views

M H S

and then some new law is passed which attempts or pretends to give the child of the worker some protection Usually the protection amounts to so little that we might as well have been spared the mockery of it

So I have no hesitancy in putting down the following answers to the question

WHEN SHOULD A woman avoid having children?

If she is a working woman she should have no more children while society remains indifferent to the needs of her offspring and forces them to toil in mills and factories

"Industrial diseases" due to accident, overwork, lack of fresh air and lack of play, stunt both the mental and physical development of the child, which through the pressure of poverty at home, has been driven to coin its childhood into dollars

The working woman should have no more children while the profit system exists, for it dictates where you shall live, and what you and your children shall eat and wear

In the case of the majority of workers it dictates too little food, adulterated food, food of inferior quality, shocking living quarters, exposure to disease and inadequate medical attention

While there is a struggle between the forces of Poverty and Plenty the working woman should have no more children Every child is likely to have to go into the mill or the factory and compete with its father and mother for its daily bread

THE WORKERS WILL win their fight for better conditions, only when they cease to produce cheap labor for the labor market, and use birth control as the most immediate weapon for their emancipation

The mothers of workers have made human life cheap with battalions of unwanted babies As long as life is held thus cheap, society will continue to waste life prodigally in under

paid toil It will not place a higher value upon the life and the health of the worker until the women of the working class make babies scarce

Do not be deceived Your children are commodities—they are bought and sold in industry And the price of infants like the price of everything else, goes up when the commodity grows scarce

The war has brought women into industry as never before Poverty has driven them into the factory and the mill beside their fathers and brothers It has taken their children with them

All of the creative energy of womanhood, the maternal energy that is looked to for the renewal of the world, goes into a sordid, dead, unfeeling machine That is society's decision in the matter, and from it there is no appeal But until Society permits woman to give to the bearing and rearing of children the maternal energy given her by Nature for that purpose, and so long as she must give it to a factory machine, she must for her own sake, for the sake of other workers, for the sake of the child, avoid bearing children

REMEMBER KITTY MARION is doing thirty days in prison because she is a brave honest woman who sees a big fight before her and follows it Who will be the first to buy a share of stock in THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW as a protest against such laws, and such excessive penalties, for a kind and sensible, if illegal act? Send ten dollars to keep our flag aloft On with our education!

The post office regulations require that you pay for your magazine in advance if you are to receive it Those whose subscriptions to the Birth Control Review have expired should renew AT ONCE so as not to miss an issue.

SELF-APPOINTED
GUARDIAN
OF THE
PUBLIC
MORALS



BIRTH CONTROL
MEANS
HEALTH, HAPPINESS
PERFECT CHILDREN,



Verboten! Verboten! Verboten!

THE OFFICE OF THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW is flooded with heartrending letters begging for knowledge of contraceptives. Each letter is a plea hot from an overburdened heart, to whom life has ceased to be sweet. Each letter is in a peculiar sense an appeal to society to abate the burden of involuntary motherhood.

And what answer is made to these mothers whom custom and law have made unwilling brood animals?

Three judges, all married, one childless and two with but small families have sent Kittv Marion to jail for thirty days for imparting information concerning contraceptives. The answer of the reactionary and lawgivers is simply "Thou shalt not—*verboten!*"

Women may die of too frequent child bearing, men may break themselves at the wheel of toil to support in pitiful poverty large families, but when the mother asks for the knowledge of how to prevent more children the answer is always the same—"It is forbidden—*Verboten!*"

Clear thinking women with the realization of the brood slavery of their sex burned into their minds appeal to the legislatures and to Congress to change the dark age laws in order that the humane message of contraception may go forth to their suffering sisters. But the nearest official, with the gesture of a Prussian policeman, makes the same answer "*Verboten!*"

ON THIS PAGE are reproduced the cries of anguish of mothers who have appealed to THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW. Shall society continue to wave aside these living, hopeless tragedies?

What excuse can the lawmakers, the courts, the Puritans, the comstock societies offer, in the light of these letters?

If today their answer is "*Verboten!*" what will it be to-morrow?

Can they go on thrusting aside these pleas from the depths of misery and despair with the abominable retort of a dying junkerdom—"Verboten?"

Husband Constantly Drunk.

"Dear Madam —

Owing to the fact that I am compelled to go to work and would think it a great favor if you could kindly send me your advice on birth control. My reasons are that *I have a husband who is continually drunk and in order to give my children enough to eat I must go to work*. I am 28 years old, have four children, youngest 2 years. Kindly oblige as I am ready to do anything in the world for my children and feel it would be a sin to bring more children into the world. I think you are doing the finest work in the city and wish you luck."

Ten Dollars a Week for Five

"Dear Madam —

I ask as a great favor of you to send me one of your pamphlets as I am married six years last July and have had five children three living, 2 dead, the youngest 1½ years. My hus-

band does not earn more than ten dollars a week and find I have all to do to get along. If it were not for my folks I would go hungry many a time."

Can't Care for Children Properly

"Dear Madam —

Having read of your lectures on birth control I thought it possible you would be kind enough to help a mother of five.

We have five little ones from two to eleven and expect another one soon. *Although we love them dearly we would like very much to wait at least four years before another one comes along for the babies do not get a fair chance to make good strong men and women and I am failing very fast. We are poor folks and unable to take proper care of the little ones or ourselves.* I am twenty seven and my husband is ten years older. So if you can help us please do and God Bless you and your work."

"Three Times in Four Years"

"My dear Mrs Sanger —

I am a mother of the working class and am in need of some knowledge of birth control. I have tried my best to gain knowledge from friends and from doctors but have never found anything that would be effective. *I have been a mother three times in four years and had a miscarriage besides. The strain of such frequent motherhood combined with the economic stress is getting to be almost more than I can bear.* I am expecting to be a mother again soon and feel that if I can possibly do anything to avoid so frequent child bearing I must.

I certainly honor you for the great work you are doing to help the overburdened mothers to whom the great gift of motherhood is more a calamity than a joy.

If possible I would like to send you names of several others like myself who are in great need of contraceptive knowledge."

In Two Years!

"Dear friend —

"I am twenty years old. Have been married two years last February. I married a man just my own age and one not able to support me. Since I have been married I worked nearly all the time and of course have become pregnant nearly every month. *I have taken several different medicines recommended to me by my friends to keep from having children and I have had six abortions performed. These operations have broken my health and broken me all down.* I do not want any children, as I could not support even one child. I almost went crazy when I found out that I am pregnant now. Dear Mrs Sanger I thought of you this morning, and I would appreciate it so very much if you would help me and explain your birth control to me so that I can take care of myself and regain my health. I am only twenty years old.

"I intend to start to work again tomorrow in a laundry for six a week so I will have some money."

Voluntary Motherhood

Rabbi Rudolph I. Coffee, Ph. D.

OUR TRAIN WAS crossing the Nevada desert, and four passengers were conversing in a corner of the observation coach. Our group consisted of a successful physician from the Middle West, taking a brief vacation on the Pacific Coast, an earnest middle aged clergyman, giving up a New York pastorate to accept a larger one in California, a well known San Francisco lawyer returning home from Washington, where he had argued a case before the Supreme Court, and myself. Our conversation had touched various angles of the great world war, and we were then discussing the child of tomorrow, as he would be affected by these war changes.

"He must be given more practical schooling," said the lawyer.

"More attention must be paid to his physical needs," added the doctor.

The minister, fearing that his radicalism might shock us, earnestly said, "I speak for the unborn child. He must be well born." To which I quickly added, "His birth should be a voluntary act and the deliberate wish of his parents."

At once, the three professions were arrayed against me. "Do you stand for birth control?" they spoke as with one voice, and I smiled in assent.

My clerical acquaintance questioned me first. "If you are a true minister of God, how dare you interfere with the laws of Nature?" I replied that a law of Nature which controlled the actions of dogs, pigs and cats might not arbitrarily be binding on man as well. Surely there must be some degree of difference.

"But, Rabbi," he continued as though clinching his argument, "does not the Bible say 'be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth'?" I replied that God's word never commanded us to fill the earth with idiots, imbeciles and blind babies, the inevitable outcome of accepting this verse of Genesis without question. A command which was given, if we literally accept Genesis as divine, when the world was in its infancy and needed population, requires some modification in these days of overcrowded tenements and filthy slums.

Strange indeed and very sad, how the Bible can be used to uphold dangerous doctrines. The Kaiser quotes the Bible to show that he is divinely appointed. People, utterly unacquainted with Bible criticism, cite verses from Daniel to prove the approaching end of the world. Had Columbus listened to the so called wisemen, and their Bible interpretations, he would never have discovered America. The Bible is a holy book, but its interpreters have not always acted wisely. No friend of the Bible will quote its pages to prevent such action as will stop, at the source, this terrible increase of insanity and sex diseases.

THE MEDICAL OPPOSITION to my position was along different lines. "If you think I shall perform abortions for the sake of your theory, you are much mistaken," the doctor said. Of course, I quickly assured him that voluntary mother-

hood also objects to abortive operations. We further believe that it would minimize the number of these illegal acts because we stand for education along sex lines by competent teachers.

The doctor rather hotly protested and said that medical men—not laymen and faddists—should lead a reform movement which will so radically change methods of living. I reminded him that house cleaning does not always come from within. Not the insurance men, but Charles E. Hughes, a lawyer, had led the way to insurance reforms, not the lawyers, but an outraged public opinion, was overcoming the antiquated legal procedure of a century ago, it is not the doctors of America, but the Army and the Navy that is wiping out the segregated districts. Ten years ago, five years ago, we were still told by medical men that prostitution was a "necessary evil." Now, if the doctors will not lead in this movement for voluntary motherhood, forward looking men and women will be compelled to take the lead in this struggle for higher living ideals.

The lawyer belonged to the old school. "Whatever is, is right." He had made a very comfortable living, let others do likewise. Because he had been born with a healthy constitution, he expected the same of others. I asked how many children he had and slowly he answered "one." His wife did not wish the burden of caring for a second. The doctor likewise was the father of but one child. His wife was physically unable to bear another without grave risk and danger. The minister added corroborative evidence of a very startling nature. His family, also, was limited to but one child. Both he and his wife loved children, but his salary did not allow him to support a larger family.

So these three opponents of voluntary motherhood were proving my argument through their own lives. But with this very important difference. The poor who should limit the size of their families, lack the necessary information. These three strong and cultured men, well able to care for their personal interests, would deny the knowledge of birth control to the very people who need it most.

Having thus disarmed the three men, I explained the true meaning of voluntary motherhood to them. Let us frown on those women, physically, economically and mentally fit to be mothers who refuse this highest function of womanhood. They are the real upholders of race suicide, not those poor ignorant souls who seek guidance and light. From the homes of the healthy and the independent citizens, not from the weak, struggling and pauper families should the majority of our future babies come. Voluntary motherhood does not lay emphasis on fewer normal babies, but it does insist on fewer babies who are unfit to fight life's battles properly. Voluntary motherhood hopes for more babies, more of the fit, more of the healthy and strong, so that this world may be properly rebuilt for the residence of man.

Chicago, Ill., September 1918

Birth Control—The Cure For War

THE DEEPER THAT thinking minds look into the causes of the Great War, the more evident it is becoming that the chief cause of the cataclysmic struggle is high birth rates, particularly the high birth rate of Germany. High birth rates mean expansion of national boundaries, conquests, annexations, exploitation, and all the manifold oppressions of a militaristic and imperialistic policy.

The soundness of the general policy laid down by Dr C Killick Millard, the eminent British scientist and health official, whose notable address was quoted in the last issue of THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW, is strikingly exemplified in detail by conditions cited in the Fortieth Annual Report of The (British) Malthusian League just issued. Dr Millard laid down the principle that only worldwide birth control can preclude the possibility of another such race wrecking conflict as we are now undergoing. The report brings to light certain facts which leaves no doubt as to the necessity of limiting population by those normal methods for which advocates of Birth Control contend.

That these facts are beginning to take hold upon the public understanding is startlingly evidenced by the doubling of the demand for the literature of the Malthusian League during the twelve months covered by the report. The horrors of war are bringing home to the English people the necessity of reducing the birth rate.

THE WAR HAS certainly stimulated interest in the population question and birth control" says the report. "First the public was impressed by the statements of the Kaiser, Von Bernhardi, Von Bulow and others as to Germany's necessity for conquests in order to provide for its high birth rate, and next by the food difficulties and by the questionableness altogether, of bringing more children into the world at such a time. So the demands for our literature and for our free Practical Leaflet began to increase rapidly. People were interested to learn how, since 1901, Germany's high birth rate had been falling with amazing speed, and how we had hoped that peace between us might continue a few years longer and thus become permanent.

"In 1908 its birth rate had fallen below thirty per thousand per annum, and we hoped that Germany would soon enter into a peaceful alliance with France, Britain and America. Now we know that the preparations for war which Germany had made in its high birth rate years, had gone too far for this. But the fall of its birth rate since 1914 has been tremendous, and has aroused great indignation and alarm among its militarists.

"The January issue of Maternity and Child Welfare, in an editorial article in favor of birth control, quote as follows from Dr Marcuse who had discussed the subject with hundreds of sick German soldiers. The large proportion of them do not wish ever to have children again. They said in effect that factory food and cannon food, all that kind of thing, has got to go, and only after our women have proclaimed a general birth strike will things be better.

"It seems certain that Germany, though its birth rate like ours will probably rise for a year or two after the war, will soon become a very low birth rate country. Unfortunately, Russia and the Balkan States will continue for some years to have high birth rates causing a high pressure of population which will still endanger the peace of Europe."

Still other "war problems" bring home the necessity of birth control. "Many doctors and social workers" says the report just quoted from, "expect a serious increase in prostitution and venereal disease after the war."

"Our remedy for prostitution is to encourage early marriage by spreading the knowledge that couples can avoid having any more children than they are able to do justice to."

"There may be a period of terrible poverty and suffering after the war, and the fewer children born for a year or so, the shorter will that period be. The population of America, Canada, Australia and New Zealand continues, and will continue, to increase very rapidly, so Britain and France need not be in any hurry to raise their birth rates above the present level. In any case, the only way we can do something towards compensating for our losses in the war is to bring about a better distribution of children by upholding the Malthusian principle that people should not have more children than they can provide for."

THERE YET REMAINS the threat of an increase in the birth rate after the war and the intensification of the evils of poverty. Says the report:

"In the year or so after the war the birth rate will probably rise, alas, to about its 1914 figure of 23.6 per thousand. As there was still a large amount of poverty with this birth rate before the war, it would seem certain that there will be a greater amount with such a birth rate after the war."

"Moreover, if there is much emigration of young workers to the Colonies it will increase the amount of poverty. So the birth rate will soon begin to fall again, and it will go on falling until poverty (i.e., insufficiency of the necessities for good health) has disappeared. Those who look upon the falling birth rate as an evil and oppose it, only succeed in retarding the movement slightly, but they hinder its spreading where it is most needed, namely, amongst the poor and the unfit."

"We consider the falling birth rate to be a good thing, so to us the only question is—should the inevitable further decline of the birth rate be among the richer or among the poorer classes? We say that it should be among the poor and that advice on contraception, which they are generally so eager to get, should be freely given them. Birth control clinics, like those in Holland, should be established in every town, and doctors and nurses should also be called upon to give the information when needed. The Dutch Neo Malthusian League, which is officially recognized as a Society of Public Utility, enables poor people to get the information easily, and the improvement in the condition and physique of the nation has been extraordinary."

Looking After Legislation

AMERICAN WOMEN

THE JOLLY LITTLE candidate for Congress, somewhere in New York was being heckled. It was at a small campaign meeting and her dark eyes sparkled and twinkled as she flashed back answers to rapid questions. She was pretty, the lady candidate. Under the brim of her red hat waived dark hair and her cheeks were flushed with color.

Silly questions were flung at her, wise ones, searching ones, dull ones, stupid ones. For the most part the voters wanted to know what she would do about the cost of living, high rents, no sugar, bad bread, about long working hours, about daylight saving and so on and so forth. She answered straight from the shoulder, promising only what was possible if elected, not the usual impossible.

At last someone asked "Would you introduce a bill to make it legal to give people contraceptive information?"

On this instant the sparkle of excitement and combat died from the candidate's face, she turned gravely to the questioner, "yes," she said quietly, "I would." Then was a sudden lull in the fire of questions and the candidate continued "There is no one thing I deem more important for women or for the country, there is no one thing that is wrecking more lives than the lack of contraceptive information. Our laws are dangerous, cruel and antiquated. I can promise you I will introduce a bill that will remedy this evil."

That was all, but the whole spirit of the meeting was changed. A note of reality had been introduced, a vital intimate issue had been raised, one that touched every life, one that was at the foundation of many of the questions asked before.

For the heart of our country knows that contraceptive information is needed and desired. But how few candidates will honestly and fearlessly say "yes, if elected, I will introduce a bill to make contraceptive information available to all who need it."

In New York State women may vote. In many other states they have that right. If your State is one of these, watch your candidates for election and ask them if they will vote for Birth Control. If it is too late before election, watch what they do while in office and put them on record on this question by asking them to introduce such a bill and tell them

women want action in this issue. Where women vote this will be easier than in the non suffrage states, but even there it will be worth while to try the legislators out. See that at least they know what the law is and what it ought to be.

Then send in to the *League* or to the *REVIEW*, the results of your political activities. It will be a real help in other states, to know how things go in yours, and through the *REVIEW* your experience can so easily be shared with others.

As a last word, if you live in New York look out for the jolly little candidate with the red hat, for she is a winner.

HUN WOMEN

AND HERE IS something else to keep your eye on "Women for Self Determination"

"The Dresdner Volkszeitung reports that, at a meeting held in Hamburg on August 19th, some 3,000 women present adopted strong resolutions against the proposed laws for increasing the population of Germany being considered by German legislators, and declared that the proposal to prohibit the dissemination of information concerning birth control was "an unpermissible invasion of the right of self determination of mankind, especially that of women."

Actually something good coming of Hun Land (were there any women Huns, real ones, in those old days of wild horses, and shouting men with hunks of raw meat for saddles? If not, they have at last arrived, women Huns in protest!) It is rather wonderful this vision of German women rising in their wrath at an attack upon their humanity, for that is what the legislators were trying to do, defraud the women of the advantage of being human, instead of pure animal.

While nations are battling for the right of self determination, applauded and upheld by all patriots, even to the point of death, it is surely significant that the women of militarist, autocratic Germany should recognize and insist on retaining self determination for themselves as women.

It is shameful to think that women in the land of the Hun have the right of self determination now while in the United States the law sends women to jail for taking even a wee bit of that self same privilege that German women have in full measure, shameful and incredible that we, who are fighting for liberty, should be jailed for using a freedom that already belongs to German women—J. A.

This page is contributed by

THE NATIONAL BIRTH CONTROL LEAGUE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

CHAIRMAN
MRS. MAXWELL HYDE
TREASURER
MISS JESSIE ASHLEY
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
MRS. MARY WARE DENNETT
MRS. AUGUSTA CARY
MRS. WALTER CHAMBERS

MRS. WILLIAM H. GREENE
DR. A. L. GOLDWATER
MAXWELL HYDE
MRS. LOUISE KNEELAND
MRS. WOODRUFF LEEMING
MRS. AMOS PINCHOT
MRS. MARION N. RAWSON
MRS. LILLIAN R. SIRE
MRS. JOHN H. WILLIAMS

OBJECTS

1 To secure the repeal or amendment of all laws prohibiting the giving out of information concerning methods of birth control through the prevention of conception.

2 To collect and distribute facts in regard to the legal status of birth control education in the United States and other countries.

200 Fifth Avenue New York City Telephone Gramercy 3139

How About This, Mr. Burleson?

IT WOULD SEEM that so far as minor officials of the post office department are concerned, it make less difference what is said than who says it. Upon these minor officials rests the decision, in the first instance, as to what is mailable under the federal statutes and what is nonmailable. The August number of THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW was excluded from the mails because it contained a review of "Married Love," a book by Dr. Marie Stopes of London, which has received a most enthusiastic welcome in England. That book is mailable in any part of the British Empire and is hailed as the beginning of a new epoch in freedom of woman.

In the United States, just across an invisible line from Canada, where Anglo-Saxon civilization welcomes Dr. Stopes' fearless utterance, the book is not only unmailable, but any critique of it is banned—providing it appears in some publication like THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW. This ruling, however, does not seem to apply to *The Survey*, which in its October issue published an excellent review of "Married Love." We are glad to know that the minor officials of the postoffice

department have not attempted to interfere with *The Survey*. One wonders if Mr. Postmaster General Burleson can explain this apparent unfavorable discrimination against THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW upon the part of his subordinates.

A curious feature of the case is that Dr. Stopes cannot receive a copy of her own book through the international mails because of the ban upon it by the United States authorities. In order to mail "Married Love" to its English author, one must board a train, ride to the Canadian border and drop the parcel into the first Canadian mailbox one comes to. Unless someone does just that, Dr. Stopes, who has written for a copy of the American edition of her book, must go without it.

Isn't it about time that Mr. Burleson and his aides get together on these matters? And isn't it about time that the two great sections of Anglo-Saxon civilization, the United States and the British Empire agree also? We have no hesitancy in stating our own position. Between the postal practices of the two, we much prefer those of the Empire.

HAVELOCK ELLIS

I WALKED IN darkness on an unknown way,
Bearing a burden like a funeral pall,
Afraid lest by some hapless step I fall,
And, burden sore, by roadside hedge, decay
Moreover, not a word dared I to say
About the thing I bore, yet I saw all
Who passed me bearing burdens great and small,
Such as the leech like load that on me lay
Then in the troubled, burden bearing night,
One crossed my path, a torch was in his hand,
And from its light I came to understand
The burden that I bore was naught of shame,
But happy gift of God. For this clear light,
With me forever fair shall be his fame.

MAX EHLMANN,

Bibliography of Birth Control

THE fact that the Birth Control movement is becoming widely and permanently fastened upon the public consciousness is strikingly emphasized by Theodore Schroeder's "List of References On Birth Control" just issued from the press of the H. W. Wilson Company, New York. More than 1,400 books, pamphlets and magazine articles dealing with this subject are cited and the compiler does not, of course, contend that the list is complete. It is, however, the most exhaustive possible under present conditions.

More than 200 of the books and pamphlets are in the English language, as are some 600 of the magazine articles. The other 600 items represent books, pamphlets and articles in other tongues, including French, Spanish, Italian and German. Thus it is apparent that the philosophy of birth control is becoming a matter of familiar interest throughout the civilized world. By far the greater proportion of the books, pamphlets and articles are of comparatively late date, and this fact indicates a progress that is as rapid as it is wide spread. Judged by its bibliography, the Birth Control movement is winning its way at a rate seldom approached by any movement with which it can be aptly compared.

Mr. Schroeder's list of references is issued by the publisher as one of a series of "Practical Bibliographies" as a commercial venture and not for sentimental or propaganda reasons. This fact, too, indicates a gratifying rate of progress. A few years ago there were neither the writings to make up such a list nor the general interest in Birth Control which would have made the publication of such a list of profitable. That it is practical from the standpoints of public interest and publisher's profits tells in emphatic fashion how great and how permanent have been the results of this fight for the freedom of woman.

BOOKS TO BE HAD AT THIS OFFICE

Population and Birth Control	
A Symposium	\$3 00
What Every Mother Should Know	
By Margaret Sanger	paper 25c, cloth 50
Limitation of Offspring, by Dr. Wm. J. Robinson	1 50
List of References on Birth Control	
By Theodore Schroeder	.35
The Small Family System, by Dr. C. V. Drysdale	1 50
The Love Rights of Women, By Havelock Ellis	.25
The Objects of Marriage, by Havelock Ellis	.25
Birth Control in its Medical, Social, Economic and Moral Aspects, by Dr. S. Adolphus Knopf	10
Jailed for Birth Control, by James Waldo Fawcett	10
Uncontrolled Breeding, by Adelyne More	1 00
Small or Large Families	
By Drysdale and Havelock Ellis	1 00
What Every Girl Should Know	
By Margaret Sanger	paper 25c, cloth .50

BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW

104 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK CITY

The Malthusian Doctrine Today

By C V Drysdale, D Sc

(Continued from September issue)

THE REAL OVER POPULATION DOCTRINE

WHY DID MALTHUS claim that the world was over populated, and his followers that it is so now? Why do we go on reiterating that this country and all other important countries, except New Zealand and Australia, are and always have been over populated? It is perfectly evident to any intelligent person that the population of the globe has not nearly reached its limit. There are still large areas of habitable, uncultivated, potentially fertile land available in Canada and elsewhere, a considerable portion of land in this country appears to be capable of much greater agricultural development, and the steady increase of the world's population indicates that we may yet expect a rise of population for many years to come.

How, then, can we speak of over population? As an opponent once said "Until the last blade of grass is grown on the last acre, it is folly to talk of over population. It is the discouragement of agriculture by land monopoly, high rents, and bad distribution, which is the cause of any shortage of food which may now exist." This represents the point of view of Henry George and the land reformers, and it appears perfectly plausible to those who have not grasped the real meaning of over population.

* * * * *

The Two Kinds of Over population—The real difficulty which lies at the root of all the confusion and controversy over the population question is that there are two kinds of over population, and that practically everyone who talks or writes about the subject has a totally false idea of what really constitutes over population. They picture the world as capable of holding or supporting a certain number of inhabitants, just as a vessel is capable of holding a certain amount of water. Therefore, they say, there is no need to worry about over population until the world is full, just as there is no need to fear water overflowing from a tank until it is full up. Not only can they then easily claim that there is plenty of opportunity for better agricultural development at home, and especially in the hitherto uncultivated regions of the earth, of which there are still large areas, but they triumphantly point to the fact that during the last few decades of unprecedentedly rapid increase of population people have been getting better off as a whole. "Is it not absurd," say they, "to pretend that the world is or is getting over populated, when we are better off with a larger population than we were formerly with a small one? Surely, if the world is getting full up, the larger the population, the worse off we should be."

This is the constant objection made to the claim of over population at all discussions, and I do not know of a single modern writer who is free from the misconception it implies. And yet, it is such an absurd misconception of the true Malthusian doctrine, and so ridiculous even from the point of view of ordinary daily life, that one wonders how any intelligent person can write in such a strain.

CONSIDER THE case of an ordinary working class couple starting life on 25s a week, with a prospect of obtaining two pounds a week eventually. If we allow 1 pound a week for rent and for the support of the man and wife, and 5s a week as sufficient for the support of each child, this means an eventual possibility of supporting four children*. What the opponents of Malthusianism say in effect is this: Your limit of income is 2 pounds a week, on which you can support four children. Hence, if you have at present three children and your wage is 30s a week, it is absurd to say you are suffering from too many children. You are going to get 2 pounds a week, so that until you have more than four children you cannot be said to be over populated."

Suppose next that the young couple had had their first two children as quickly as possible after marriage, before their wages increased beyond 25s. This would mean a very severe struggle for them in London at the present time. Now comes along one of our distributors and hands them a tract, which causes them to write to us and get a leaflet showing them how they can restrict their families. They therefore cease having any more children for the time, and devote themselves to those they have for a few years, during which time the husband's wages increase from 25s to 30s and 35s, which gives them a decent margin. They then decide they would like to have another child, and soon after it arrives the husband gets his 2 pounds a week. Round comes a health visitor, finds the family happy and prosperous, and goes away to a public meeting to declaim against the absurdity of the over population doctrine, because she has just found a family which is more comfortable now when there are three children than it was formerly with two.

THIS SEEMS absurdly elementary, but it is absolutely on a par with the reasoning of practically all modern writers on the population doctrine. Because the world may some day be able to support a very much larger population, they talk as if it could do so, immediately, and that there can be no over population if the population is less now than its ultimate possible value. Because a large number of people in this and other civilized countries have learned how to limit their families, and have therefore caused a decline of the birth rate, which has made them better off (in the sense of being less badly off), while the food supply, like the workman's wages has been gradually rising, we are told that the Malthusian doctrine is absurd, because people are better off now with a greater population. They cannot get into their heads the simple notion that instead of there being a definite limit to the food supply, there is a limited rate at which it increases, and that the real question of over population is as to whether the rate at which the children arrive is faster than that at which the food increases or not. What is needed is for people to realize nationally what they do individually, that the food income of the world increase in the same way as a workman's wages rise, and that if children arrive faster than this there is over population of the world, just as there is in the family. It does not in the least matter what the ultimate limit of the world's food capacity may be, or even whether there is a limit at all.

(To be continued)

* I have purposely put these small sums, as the advocates of large families are continually claiming that so much can be done with small incomes. This does not in the least mean approval of them.

Birth Control Organizations

IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

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

CONSTITUENT BODIES

- ENGLAND (1877)—The Malthusian League Secretary Dr Binnie Dunlop, 48 Broadway, Westminster London, SW
Periodical, *The Malthusian*
HOLLAND (1885)—De Nieuw-Malthusiaansche Bond Secretary, Dr J Rutgers, 9 Verhulststraat, Den Haag
Periodical *Het Gellukkig Huisgezin*
GERMANY (1889)—Sozial Harmonische Verein Secretary, Herr M Hausmeister, Stuttgart Periodical, *Die Soziale Harmonie*
FRANCE (1895)—G Hardy 29 Rue Pixerecourt, Paris
Periodical, *Génération Consciente*
SPAIN (1904)—Liga Espanola de Regeneracion humana Secretary, Senor Luis Bulffi, Calle Provenza 177, Pral la, Barcelona Periodical, *Salu y Fuerza*
BELGIUM (1906)—Ligue Neo-Malthusienne Secretary, Dr Fernand Mascaux, Echevin Courcelles
SWITZERLAND (1908)—Groupe Malthusien Secretary, Valentin Grandjean 106 Rue des Eaux-Vives, Geneva
Periodical *La Vie Intime*
BOHEMIA-AUSTRIA (1901)—Secretary Michael Kacha, 1164 Zizhov Prague
Periodical *Zadruhy*
PORTUGAL—E Silva, Junior, L da Memoria, 46 r/c, Lisbon
Periodical *Paz e Liberdade*
BRAZIL (1905)—Seccion brasileña de propaganda Secretaries, Manuel Moscova, Rua d Bento Pires 29 San Pablo Antonio Dominguez, Rua Vizcande de Moranguapez 25, Rio de Janeiro
CUBA (1907)—Seccion de propaganda Secretary, Jose Guardiola Empedrado 14 Havana
SWEDEN (1911)—Sallskapet for Humanitar Barnalstring President Mr Hinke Bergegren, Vanadisvagen 15, Stockholm Va
ITALY (1913)—Lega Neomalthusiana Italiana Secretary, Dr Luigi Berta Via Lamarmora 22, Turin Periodical *L'Educazione Sexuale*
AFRICA—Ligue Neo-Malthusienne, Maison du Peuple, 10 Rampe Magenta, Alger

IN THE UNITED STATES

ANN ARBOR MICH—Mrs L A Rhoades 1318 Forest Court
BANGOR ME—Dr P E Luce, 40 Central Street

- BOSTON MASS—The Birth Control League of Massachusetts P O Box 1358 Mrs Oakes Ames, president.
CAMDEN, N J—Dr L A Young, 522 Spruce St.
CHICAGO ILL.—The Citizens Committee on Family Limitation Secretary, Mrs B E. Page, 521 Longwood Ave., Glencoe, Ill
COLUMBUS OHIO—The Birth Control League of Columbus Arthur Gluck, 2054 Tuller Street, president
DETROIT, MICH—Mrs Jessie A Rene, 919 Brooklyn Avenue
ELIZABETH CITY, N C—Mr and Mrs W O Saunders
HARRISBURG PA—George A Herring, 2436 Reel Street
LOS ANGELES, CAL—Dr T Percival Gerson
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN—The Minneapolis Birth Control League Mrs Helen C Thomsen, 1208 Vincent Avenue, N, secretary
NEW ORLEANS, LA—H G Shockley, 428 Delaronde Street
NEW YORK
The Committee of One Thousand Dr Ira S Wile 230 West 97th Street, chairman.
The National Birth Control League 200 Fifth Avenue Mrs Maxwell Hyde
The Woman's Committee of One Hundred Mrs Amos Pinchot, chairman, 9 East 81st Street
PATERSON, N J—William D Walker, 1139 Madison Avenue
PITTSBURGH PA—The Birth Control League of Western Pennsylvania Mrs Clarence Renshaw, 117 Linden Ave., Edgewood, secretary
PORTLAND ORE.—The Birth Control League of Portland H C Dekker, 652 Elliott Avenue, president Mrs J R Oatman, 549 Fifth Street, secretary
RADNOR, PA—The Main Line Branch of the National Birth Control League—Mrs Walter M Newkirk, secretary
ROCHESTER N Y—A I Howser, 227 Parsells Avenue
ST LOUIS, MO—Grace Anderson, City Dispensary, 11th and Chestnut Streets
ST PAUL, MINN—The Minnesota State Birth Control League Secretary Mrs Grace M Keller, 230 Vernon Ave., St Paul
SAN FRANCISCO CAL.—The Birth Control League of San Francisco 239 Geary Street Margaret McGovern, president
SEATTLE WASH.—The Seattle Birth Control League Minnie Parkhurst, 516 Third Ave., West Seattle, Wash secretary
SUMMIT N J—Rev Franklin C Doan
WASHINGTON D C—The Birth Control League of the District of Columbia Mrs Anna Wexler, 1926 New Hampshire Ave., president

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912

OF THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW, published monthly at New York, N Y for October 1 1918, State of New York County of New York, s s

Before me a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared MARGARET H SANGER who, having been duly sworn accordingly to law deposes and says that she is the Editor of THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW and that the following is, to the best of her knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption required by the Act of August 24, 1912 embodied in section 443, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit

1 That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are

Publisher—NEW YORK WOMEN'S PUBLISHING CO, INC, 104 Fifth Ave, New York, N Y

Editor—MARGARET H SANGER, 104 Fifth Ave New York, N Y

Managing Editor—MARGARET H SANGER, 104 Fifth Ave, New York, N Y

Business Managers—NONE

2 That the owners are (Give names and addresses of individual owners or, if a corporation, give its name and the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of the total amount of stock)

NEW YORK WOMEN'S PUBLISHING CO INC, 104 Fifth Ave, New York, N Y

MRS JULIET RUBLEE Cornish, N H
JESSIE ASHLEY 102 E 52nd St, New York City

MRS MARY KNOBLAUCH, The Wyoming 7th Ave & 55th St New York City

MRS FRANCES B ACKERMANN, Bronxville N Y

3 That the known bondholders mortgages and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are (If there are none so state)

NONE
4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholders or security holders appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting is given also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner, and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by her

5 That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise to paid subscribers during the six months preceding the date shown above is -----
(This information is required from daily publications only)

MARGARET H SANGER

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 24th day of September, 1918

[SEAL]
Form 3526—Ed 1916

JACK G KARPF,

(My commission expires March 1919)