

BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW

Fifteen Cents

\$1 50 A Year

DECEMBER

Dedicated to Voluntary Motherhood

**THE SUPREME COURT DECISION
THE HOSPITAL INVESTIGATION**

By Mary Halton M. D.

BREAKING INTO THE SOUTH

By Margaret Sanger

Editorials—News Notes—Uneasy Chair

FOREWORD

This Magazine does not publish contraceptive information

It is illegal, in this country, to give such information

The object of this Review is to show why this law is obsolete, pernicious, and injurious to the individual, the community and the race

The law must be changed

Read the Birth Control Review and you will understand why

BEACON BOOK SHOP

[Mail Order Book Service]

Offers to assist discriminating book buyers, those who are remote from big book centers, as well as others

Specializing in the mail order service, we can assure our patrons of unusual promptness and care in delivery and of infinite individual attention to their wishes

We take pleasure in sending regularly, to anyone interested, our Monthly Bulletin of Books, covering various fields of literature. Special facilities for securing out-of-print and foreign books. Correspondence invited

BEACON BOOK SHOP

(Formerly The Beacon 134 Montague St Brooklyn, N Y)

64 West 40th Street

New York City

Books On Birth Control and Kindred Subjects:

- Man and Woman**—By Havelock Ellis The book which reveals to each other Women and Men as they are.....\$2.50
- Birth Control**—In Its Medical, Social, Economic and Moral Aspects, by Dr S Adolphus Knopf 25
- The Century of the Child**—By Ellen Key An Illumination of the Child's Place in Society 1.50
- Heredity**—By Thompson A Study in Hereditary Influence from the Eugenic Standpoint 3.50
- Population and Birth Control**. A Symposium by William J Robinson, Achille Loria, Charles V Drysdale, Ludwig Quessell, Eden Paul, Edward Bernstein, D Dunlop, R Manschke, S H Halford and F W Stella Browne, edited by Eden and Cedar Paul.... 3 00
- What Every Mother Should Know**—By Margaret Sanger A Book That Teaches the Mother How to Tell the Truth of Sex of the Child Paper, 25c, cloth..... .50
- Limitation of Offspring**—By William J Robinson Answers All Arguments Against Birth Control 1.50
- The Sex Side of Life**—By Mary Ware Dennett A plain talk to young people..... .25

- List of References on Birth Control**—By Theodore Schroeder Bibliography of 1,400 Books, Articles and Pamphlets..... .35
- The Small Family System**—By C V Drysdale An Argument for Birth Control from Moral, Ethical and Health Standpoints..... 1.50
- The Love Rights of Women**—By Havelock Ellis A Book That Every Man Should Read .25
- The Trial of William Sanger**—By James Waldo Fawcett A Historical Record of the First Case of Birth Control Tried in the State of New York 10
- Uncontrolled Breeding**—By Adelyne More A Startling Scientific Treatise on Overpopulation as the Cause of War..... 1 00
- Small or Large Families?**—By Dr C V Drysdale and Havelock Ellis Birth Control from the Individual, Racial and Moral Standpoints Birth Control and War..... 1 00
- What Every Girl Should Know**—By Margaret Sanger Sex Instruction for Adolescent Girls In Plain, Simple Language Paper 25c cloth50
- The Law of Population**. Its consequences and its bearing upon human conduct and morals By Annie Besant..... .25

BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW, 104 Fifth Avenue, New York City

THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW

MARY KNOBLAUCH
Acting Editor

DEDICATED TO VOLUNTARY
MOTHERHOOD

MARGARET SANGER
Editor

Vol III

NEW YORK, DECEMBER, 1919

No. 12

Editorial Comment

IT IS TO BE hoped that Owen R Lovejoy's report on the *Legislative Prohibition of Employment for Children*, and the necessity, in this connection, of a better school system, will be seen by every citizen of this country. A summary of his paper read before the Children's Bureau in Washington is given in this issue. Mr Lovejoy insists first of all upon a careful consideration of the individual—the individual child be it noted, as well as the individual of mature years. Proper attention, he also shows, cannot be given to the child so long as excessive industrial burdens are laid on the shoulders of half starved mothers.

The mothers, of course, will be half starved and overworked so long as they are doomed to breed ignorantly more children than can be decently fed and cared for on the wage earned by the fathers. How long this will be depends upon the spread of scientific knowledge. A step in the right direction has certainly been taken by the committee of the same bureau, which reports on the minimum standard of education and protection for adolescent children. This includes a knowledge of sex hygiene and reproduction. The next step, let us hope, will be a knowledge of eugenics and the proper limitation of families.

The report of the Ohio State Institutions, the introduction to which we have reprinted, will show the necessity for this further step. One of our States at least has awakened to a realization of the folly of ignorance, and the expense of it as well. Taken merely from the point of view of the tax payers, this report shows the terrific burden to the community of reckless breeding. The unfit reproduce themselves with an appalling rapidity.

Of course, birth control is not specifically mentioned in these official reports, nor was it in Miss Lathrop's paper on *Income and Infant Mortality*, which was summarized in the November number of this REVIEW. And yet, what fundamental change in the sad condition of things can be produced without it. A minimum wage standard will do no good if the family to be supported by it cannot be regulated.

That seems obvious enough. The State institutions will always be filled with the unfit, if breeding goes on to the point of physically exhausting the mother, and exceeds the financial ability of the father to provide for his offspring.

The circle is a vicious one, and a widespread scientific knowledge of birth control seems the only solution.

When ignorance is no longer a fetish, the people will take the responsibility of producing a better race into their own

hands. They know that the knowledge can be had, and that it concerns them, and they will get it because they are entitled to it.

An institution is the result of an ideal, not an ideal of an institution. If the ideal of the people is a better race, the laws of the State which prevent the attainment of that ideal must be altered to conform to the new conceptions of what the people who make the laws think best for themselves.

Many of the well to do women to whom we have spoken on the necessity of birth control information as a health measure say, "But any doctor will tell you what to do if child bearing is dangerous for you or if you cannot bear a healthy child. Why make such a disturbance about a matter that regulates itself?"

That is just our contention. The rich or well to do can and do get the information. The poor, who need it most and whose ill born children become a nuisance or a menace to the community, cannot get it. The certified report of a physician and a witness who made the rounds of the city hospitals with a view to having such information given to a badly diseased patient proves that. We especially commend this report to the attention of our readers. After reading it, let them ask themselves the question. What can be done, what can I do to remedy so cruel and stupid a state of affairs?

Making People Think

THE MARKED SUCCESS of Margaret Sanger's visit to Elizabeth City, N. C., is attributed by her largely to the efforts of W. O. Saunders, editor of the *Independent*. Mr Saunders, too, is a human being with a mission. His medium is a newspaper and the public platform. He, himself, speaks through his newspaper, he brings lecturers on vital subjects to his home town to do the speaking from the platform.

Because Mr Saunders has been instrumental in benefiting his community by assisting Margaret Sanger to introduce the birth control movement there, the readers of THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW will be interested in knowing what manner of man he is. The best indication is a recent editorial which Mr Saunders published in his newspaper. The following excerpts are reprinted here in the hope that they may inspire other editors to follow the example of this high minded crusader of North Carolina.

"We grow only as we learn. We can learn only through the assimilation of ideas. Isolated people are, generally,

ignorant people To know things we must learn through contact with teachers These teachers may be newspapers, books, movies, billboards, phonographs, or public speakers Public speakers are, I think, the greatest teachers Maybe moving pictures are greater teachers But this I know most people's ears are better than their brains

"I am an educator, a teacher I have the greatest audience ever accorded any man who has lived in your midst I talk to probably 20,000 men, women and children thru the columns of my newspaper every week A hundred thousand persons, first and last, get my viewpoint in the course of a year

"And yet I have discovered that a good talker on a platform may make a bigger dent in the craniums of the public in a sixty minute speech than a writer can make in many weeks of editorializing

"I love this town and the people in it, and I desire to help make this a town of interesting people If I had the money of some of our wealthy citizens, I would build in this town an auditorium that would seat 2,000 people I would put a mighty pipe organ in that auditorium and hire a talented organist to give concerts two or three times a week And I would make a present of that auditorium to the people I would bring to that auditorium the greatest public speakers, the greatest preachers, the greatest orators, the greatest teachers, and the greatest thinkers in America I would do that I would bring to this town every week some worth while man or woman with a message I would bring education, inspiration, and uplift to every human being in this town, and get my reward by seeing this town grow into a community of enlightened, free thinking, beautiful souls

"But I can't do just all I would like to do for you I have found, however, that I can do this I can bring interesting men and women to Elizabeth City from time to time and give you an opportunity to hear them. And this I hope to do"

Would Not Grudge Three Cents

AT THE MEETING at the Greenwich House, Mrs Simkovitch asked Dr Dublin what he would do to take care of women who were willing to have children He looked a little bothered, explained that we could not help them financially or anything like that, gazed at us a moment and then (in a sudden confidential little burst to the audience) Well, he had never really felt, you know, that the three cents spent in this war for the little distinguished service medal had been wasted He had not, indeed

Now, this shows how much better it is to send a man out on the job of urging women to have children

A mere woman, a mother herself maybe, would have just said something heavy about a healthy child with a chance to grow up into a good man or woman being the greatest reward possible Such a woman would very possibly have maundered on into the admission that a defective baby or one that is going to be starved to death in its first few years

is a heavy punishment It takes Dr Dublin to think up a three-cent medal

Social Hypocrisy

MONSIEUR FERNAND MOREL, writing to G Hardy, of *Le Neo Malthusien*, says in part

"I recognize the utility of your publication, and even its necessity, but I deplore it I deplore the fact that it should be necessary to proclaim truths of so absolutely primitive a nature, it is as if it were necessary to publish a magazine which would say to people Don't eat except when you are hungry, or, better, accustom yourself to eat at regular hours, don't over eat, don't sleep except when you are sleepy, or, even, don't fall from a fifth story window, it will hurt you

"I deplore, above all, the hypocrisy which regulates our society, and the duplicity which enables crowds of the evil minded to overwhelm with mud and stones those who have the courage to say or do the things which no one after sane reflection would dare sincerely to disapprove of in his own life"

M Morel then goes on to say that he believes in contraceptive methods and considers almost anything less cruel than abandoning one's child to public charity, and he concludes

"But I consider that the fact of having brought a child into the world, of having voluntarily made him take the first steps in life, confers upon the author of his being, not rights but obligations, an immense debt to the creature for whom such a responsibility has been accepted, and I would be merciless toward the parents who neglected their parental duties, the only sacred duty that there is in this matter of procreation"

The BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW

104 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK, N Y

Editors

MARGARET SANGER MARY KNOBLAUCH
MAUDE EDGREN LILY WINNER BLANCHE SCHRACK
*And in Recognition of a Vital Spirit that Still Animates
this Magazine, JESSIE ASHLEY*

Art Editors

CORNELIA BARNES LOU ROGERS

VOL. III DECEMBER No 12

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.

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 THE BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW

NOTICE —When requesting change of address, give both old and
new address.

The Investigation of the Hospitals

By Mary Halton, M D

A RECENT OPINION GIVEN by a judge in the New York State Court of Appeals states that a doctor may give a patient contraceptive information in order to prevent disease

This opinion, if it stands, is directly contrary to and should set aside the law as it is written on our statute books, which makes the giving of such information by a doctor a crime. In order to test the working of the present law in its relation to poor women unprotected by the secrecy of the doctor's private office, a survey was made of the hospitals of New York and to find out what could be done for a poor woman in such condition of health that pregnancy would mean death to her.

A committee, of which Dr Mary Halton was chairman, was organized by the New York Women's Publishing Company, and a survey made of the hospitals.

The following is the report of that committee

Statement

THE COMMITTEE VISITED every hospital in New York City, Manhattan Borough, in which women are treated as patients

Eye and ear hospitals, hospitals in which children only are treated and other such special hospitals were not included in the survey

In each instance the medical superintendent of the hospital was interviewed and asked to answer for the hospital. In a few instances in which the superintendent was either unwilling to answer or felt that he had not sufficient authority to answer, the president of the medical board was interviewed and gave the answer.

The following question was asked of each hospital

"We have come to you to ask for birth control information for some patients if you can give it to them

We know that these patients can be legally aborted if they become pregnant, as they are suffering from advanced disease which would mean death to them if they attempted to give birth to a child

But therapeutic abortion in our cases would be insufficient to save life. Our patients are so advanced in kidney disease or in tuberculosis, that merely the incidence of pregnancy would mean a fatal termination of their lives. Can you, therefore, in order to save these women, instruct them in methods of contraception in order that they may live if they continue a normal wife's relation to her husband?"

Each hospital in New York refused to allow the patients to come, and each hospital said that under the present law it could not give such information to any such patients.

Some superintendents went on to explain that if the hospital acceded to our request, its charter could be revoked

and the doctor who gave the information would be subject to arrest.

All hospitals declared this information could not be given by the hospital either in the clinics or in the hospital itself in any official way. Some kindly superintendents suggested that we might go privately to some of the doctors of the hospital staff, and that on account of the urgency of the cases, they might be willing to break the law in their private offices.

Many superintendents expressed themselves as willing to sign a petition for a change in the present law, since it can put such hardship on sick women.

Some kindly superintendents suggested that we might go privately to some of the doctors of the hospital staff, and that on account of the urgency of the cases, they might be willing to break the law in their private offices.

The following hospitals were interviewed

Bellevue and allied city hospitals, which includes Gouverneur Hospital and Harlem Hospital

Harlem Hospital

Neurological Hospital

French Hospital

German Hospital, now Hahneman Hospital

Flower Hospital

Italian Hospital

Jewish Maternity

Knickerbocker Hospital

Lying In Hospital

Manhattan Maternity Hospital

Misericordia Hospital

Mount Sinai Hospital

New York Hospital

New York Medical College and Hospital for Women, now called Community Hospital

New York Nursery and Child's Hospital

People's Hospital

Post Graduate Medical School and Hospital

Presbyterian Hospital

The Park Hospital (formerly Red Cross Hospital)

Roosevelt Hospital and Vanderbilt Clinic

St Ann's Maternity Hospital

St Elizabeth Hospital

St Luke's Hospital

St Mark's Hospital

St Vincent's Hospital

Sloane Hospital for Women

Sydenham Hospital

Women's Hospital

Is Birth Control A Constitutional Right?

THE QUESTION WHETHER Birth Control is woman's constitutional right is still unanswered. For the first time in the history of the United States that question was raised on October 12, when the case of Margaret Sanger came up in the Federal Supreme Court. The case was dismissed without an opinion because the court held that it had no jurisdiction.

So this question, the most momentous for women that ever arose in the Supreme Court of the United States, went undecided.

Regardless of this fact, the same principle which caused the case of Margaret Sanger to be appealed to the highest court of the land, although she had long since served the sentence imposed, still lives. Whether the constitution of the United States protects a woman's right to the control of her own body and the mother function or does not protect her, she has that right inherent in her own nature. The Birth Control movement, growing by leaps and bounds, will fight for that natural right with increasing vigor and courage.

THE QUESTION at issue was not whether Margaret Sanger should go to jail. She was arrested October 26, 1916 for her part in operating a clinic in Brownsville, a district in Brooklyn, to which clinic overburdened mothers flocked. She was sentenced to thirty days in jail and served her sentence. The case was appealed upon principle. Involved in it was the most sacred right of American womanhood,—the right of keeping within its control the function of reproduction. At great expense and with infinite pains the case was prepared for appeal and fought through the New York Court of Appeals and to the highest court in the United States. The legal controversy has attracted wide attention. Even those who are ordinarily indifferent to the rights of women have taken notice of the serious import of the case. A Boston newspaper, for instance, called the attention of its readers to the fact that it is the most important case since the Dred Scott decision which was largely responsible for the Civil War.

But bloody as was that struggle, important as it was to the millions of negroes who were freed, vital as it was in deciding the destiny of the United States, it was still less important than the Sanger case. The Dred Scott case meant the freedom from chattel slavery of a few million of oppressed human beings. If the supreme court had held that the Fourteenth amendment to the constitution was violated by the so-called "obscenity laws," it would have almost directly opened the door of freedom to many millions of American mothers, and in a single generation would have raised the physical, moral and mental standard of the American people.

The Fourteenth Amendment provides "nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law."

ATTORNEY GOLDSTEIN IN presenting his argument showed the court that the present "obscenity" laws prohibiting the communication of information concerning con-

traceptives make motherhood compulsory to married women. He further showed that certain diseases are rendered fatal by pregnancy, and that thus the statute operates to condemn to death, without due process of law, married women suffering from such diseases.

That the statute also has the effect of forbidding marriage to men and women not sufficiently well to do to support large families, while it violates the right of the child to be born of that "emphatically purposeful parentage" which is necessary if the child is to be "the perfect result of the creative impulse."

"The man and woman," asserted the attorney, "have as much natural right to say how many children they shall bring into the world and when as to say when and why they shall marry."

Reproduction cannot be enforced haphazard as if men and women were convicts and parenthood the penalty of a crime, without vitiating the entire race."

OTHER POINTS RAISED in this epoch making argument included these. Prevention of conception is not obscene, and the subject of its very nature has no place in the "obscenity laws."

The law is unconstitutional and void because the prohibition it involves is not in any way related to the public health, morals, or welfare, and because the statute fails to promote either of the three.

The law is unconstitutional because it lacks "regulation" provisions—it prohibits physicians from giving information upon contraceptives even when pregnancy would be dangerous or fatal to the health of the patient.

THE PROSECUTION RESORTED to technicalities, but raised two points which are a reproof to the spirit of American womanhood. It pointed out that these laws have been on the statute books in some form or another since 1868, and have now for the first time been challenged before the Supreme Court of the United States. It also cited the shameful fact that in states where women have the vote, these statutes still remain upon the books.

MARGARET SANGER HAS done her part. Regardless of the fact that she served her sentence, and that her personal sacrifice, so far as this case is concerned, had been completed, she forced the case into the Supreme Court of the United States—and that at the earliest possible moment. But what is to be said of those who have let these infamous, oppressive statutes, violating the legal as well as the natural rights of women, remain undisturbed all these years? What is to be said of those women, who, having claimed the ballot, have failed to use it to wipe from the books of their states the laws which most invade their basic rights?

American women will not be free until they themselves win their freedom. They will not attain the right to control their own bodies until they have forced a recognition of that

right

The case has been fought through in behalf of American womanhood. If a favorable opinion had been handed down, and the "obscenity laws" wiped out, birth control information would have been within the reach of American women without violation of these laws, which, infamous as they are, are still laws and a powerful menace.

THIS WORK HAS been done at great expense, such as all like cases entail. Those expenses are still to be met, and they must be met by contribution. Everyone who realizes the importance of this case, which to women is the most important one which the Supreme Court has ever considered, should send a contribution toward the expense to Margaret Sanger, 104 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Breaking Into the South—A Contrast

By Margaret Sanger

THE FIRST public lecture on birth control in the South developed into a series of addresses within twenty-four hours, and was in every way a gratifying surprise to me. I had the feeling that it would be hard to break the ice for the birth control movement in a city in which not even a suffragist had delivered a public lecture. To my delight, however, I found that people, both white and black, in Elizabeth City, N. C., were so eager to know about birth control that every possible moment of my time was given to speaking.

The first lecture, which was the only one I expected to deliver in Elizabeth City, was arranged by Mr. W. O. Saunders, editor of *The Independent*. It was delivered in a theatre Sunday afternoon, November 2nd. Women in the audience requested an address for women only, and this was given immediately following the general lecture. These meetings were attended by white women of all classes and conditions, some of them being farmer's wives—mothers of five, six or more children—some of whom drove fifteen or sixteen miles to hear about birth control.

After the lecture, a number of elderly women lingered to ask further questions and to express their appreciation of the movement. They were singularly unanimous in their expressions. "The message comes too late for me," was the tenor of their words, "but thank God it comes in time to save my daughters from what I have undergone."

A committee of negro women urged a public address for negroes in a negro church for the same evening. This was delivered and was followed the next day by a short talk on "Education" at the negro normal school, and in the afternoon a lecture for negro women only on methods of birth control.

Meanwhile, women who came from near and far were gathering at the hotel where I stopped. Among these were a number of social workers and public spirited citizens, who asked help in establishing a clinic for the mill workers. A temporary committee was formed, and is going ahead with the work of bringing fundamental, practical help to those women who work in the mills.

All this happened between noon on Sunday and three o'clock Monday afternoon.

Never have I met with more sympathy, more serious attention, more complete understanding than in my addresses to the white and black people of this Southern mill town. Each element in the audience seemed to look at the question from

its own standpoint. All in all, these audiences were a striking demonstration of birth control's universal message of freedom and betterment.

Among the white people, the argument which appealed most strongly was that of family betterment and increased happiness in the home, where the size of the family can be kept down to a point in which the father's earnings and the mother's attention are adequate for the care of children. That birth control results in longer life among women and decreases the mortality among infants and children of tender years appealed to representatives of insurance companies, who made it plain that they had got the point. Even a mill owner, who is perhaps the most powerful citizen of Elizabeth City, was open minded enough to recognize that birth control, in bettering the condition of the workers in his mills, would tend to increased efficiency.

That the wives of farmers and of other workers recognized the liberty, the mental, physical and spiritual advantages that come with birth control was made plain by their attention, by their questions, and by their expressions of appreciation. They need it most, and doubtless it was they who best understood.

If Elizabeth City is an index of the South, it is ready, waiting, crying for the message of birth control.

It is with somewhat similar pleasure I look back upon a lecture given October 28th before members of the League for Women Voters in New York City. It was an interesting audience. These were workers—active business women, some in clerical positions, some of them professional women, some of them housewives. They were mostly women who have grappled with practical problems and who have been tasting the first fruits of an expanding freedom. Their attitude was one of intelligent reasoning—they wanted the message, they wished to weigh it and decide for themselves whether to apply it. There was in this audience but one objector—a mother of four children, who said she wished she had four more. The rest of the audience joined in the hope that since she desired them, she might have them.

In unhappy contrast to these meetings was the Conference of Social Hygiene, a division of The League for Women Voters, at which I was one of the speakers. This was held at the Park Avenue Hotel, New York, October 20th. At once one could feel hostility in this audience, composed almost entirely of women physicians. One wondered whence such

antagonism could come, but when the lecture was over and questions and discussion began, one was not left long in the dark. The antagonism was among the women physicians themselves—the people whom one would least expect to have that attitude. Yet there it was.

One physician rejected birth control because she believed I claimed too much for it. She did not believe that it can accomplish as much for women as I believe it can—therefore she dismissed the whole subject!

Another objected to birth control, saying that when a woman's children are arriving so rapidly as to make her lot unendurable, she should leave her husband. Asked what a woman living in the slums, and having four or five children barely supported by her own earnings and those of her husband should do with the children, this physician blandly dismissed the whole matter by saying she *should take them with her*. This from a woman physician whose practice is, presumably, largely among the poor!

A third woman physician objected to any discussion of the subject, saying that it was "nasty." It is hardly to be supposed, however, that this physician refuses either to give her

services or accept fees in maternity cases. Dr. Mary Halton quickly settled this point by her positive assertion of the beauty and cleanliness of all that relates to the sex life. Her defense of birth control was clear, strong, and illuminating.

But let us not deceive ourselves as to the general attitude of either women or men who are attached strongly to institutions—whether these institutions be professional organizations or something else similar in spirit. Usually their egos have become attached to these institutions—they have built up the old organizations—upon those organizations they depend largely for their standing and personal success. Subconsciously these well meaning people know that their institutions are going to tumble into disuse before the vigorous, fundamental remedies which we propose to apply. The women physicians who follow the old manner of thinking subconsciously know and fear the effect of birth control, which will largely dispense with their services as they are now rendered. These will never take the initiative in freeing the world from its chains. They love their institutions, their prejudices, their own chains, better than they love humanity and the truth.

Standard for Adolescents

THE STANDARD FOR the minimum public protection of adolescent children was submitted by the committee appointed by the Washington Conference of the Children's Bureau.

The committee was composed of the following members:

Dr. Charles V. Chapin, Chairman, Superintendent of Health, Providence, Rhode Island

Dr. Ellen Stone, Superintendent of Child Hygiene, Health Department, Providence, Rhode Island

Dr. George P. Barth, Director, School Hygiene Bureau, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Dr. H. L. K. Shaw, Division of Child Hygiene, State Board of Health, New York

Dr. William R. P. Emerson, Boston, Massachusetts

Dr. Dorothy Reed Mendenhall, Children's Bureau

The many interesting features of this standard show an utterly new interest in the care of the child from the point of view of his social needs as a future citizen. The fact that a knowledge of sex hygiene and reproduction is included as a necessary part of his education is an encouraging sign of the growth of the belief that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

Minimum Standard for the Public Protection of the Health of Children and Mothers, proposed by The Children's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor

ADOLESCENT CHILDREN

- 1 Complete standardized basic physical examinations by physician, including weight and height, at least once a year, and recommendation for necessary treatment to be given at children's health center or school
- 2 Clinics for treatment of defect and disease
- 3 Supervision and instruction to insure
 - (a) Ample diet, with special attention to growth producing foods
 - (b) Sufficient sleep and rest and fresh air
 - (c) Adequate and suitable clothing
 - (d) Proper exercise for physical development
 - (e) Knowledge of sex hygiene and reproduction
- 4 Full time education compulsory to at least sixteen years of age, adapted to meet the needs and interests of the adolescent mind, with vocational guidance and training
- 5 Clean, ample recreational opportunities to meet social needs
- 6 Legal protection from exploitation, vice, drug habits, etc

Light Ahead

By Frances Maule Björkman

BEGINNING last June with the formal request on the part of a group of members of the Conference of Social Workers that birth control be placed on their official program for next year, we have had steadily accumulating evidence that the subject of family limitation has been recognized by the organized forces working for social betterment as an essential part of their scheme.

So far this recognition has found expression merely in papers and discussions. But there is every reason to believe that these will be followed in time by action gradually leading to the adoption of the subject as one of the planks in their platforms.

Within the last month, hearings on birth control have been held before three of the most powerful and widespread of the organizations working for Social Hygiene—that is, the American Social Hygiene Association, the Social Morality Association of the Young Women's Christian Association (through the International Conference of Women Physicians), and the Social Hygiene Committee of the League of Women Voters.

Although Dr Lewis Dublin, statistician of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., who was selected to lead the birth control discussion which took place during the sixth annual meeting of the American Hygiene Association in October, was quite evidently on the negative side, this fact did not seem in the least to prejudice the large audience that had gathered to hear him.

Dr Dublin stated that while he did not quarrel with the effort to secure the repeal of the existing prohibitory laws regarding birth control, he did deplore what he called "The Propaganda"—from which one inferred that he was under the impression that there existed some organized effort to keep down the population.

AT THE CONCLUSION of Dr Dublin's address, the birth control advocates were given their opportunity to challenge him, and the applause with which their remarks were greeted seemed clearly to indicate that the majority in the audience was on their side. One pointed out that the only organized propaganda was that directed towards the repeal of the prohibitory laws on birth control information, that the purpose back of this effort was not so much a limitation of the number of children to a family as a prudent "spacing" of the children in such a way as to give each child the maximum opportunity and to safeguard the mother against exhaustion. She called attention to the fact that from the point of view of evolution it was in the order of nature for a developed humanity to produce fewer but better children, and she showed by examples drawn from biology that as life ascends from lower to higher forms, fewer young are born but more survive.

Mrs Maxwell Hyde brought forth an enthusiastic round of applause by asking Dr Dublin how "the family of four"

which he repeatedly mentioned as ideal, and even necessary to racial survival, could be attained by the average married couple without the aid of birth control. Dr Dublin admitted that this was a difficult question, in fact, did not attempt to answer it, but dodged with the exhortation, "Let the people have their four children first." Another speaker asked Dr Dublin how he could reconcile his demand that the duty of each married couple was to make the best possible contribution to the race with the fact that the only contribution that many thousands could make was a syphilitic, an idiotic, insane or criminal child, or a child cursed with all sorts of anti social tendencies, as long as the law prohibited the giving of information on birth control. To this Dr Dublin replied only that he was entirely in sympathy with the effort to change the laws.

STILL ANOTHER SPEAKER pointed out that withholding information on the subject of birth control by means of restrictive laws was not meeting the population situation, so deeply deplored by Dr Dublin namely, that the most intelligent classes were not replacing themselves, while the ignorant and unfit were multiplying themselves many times. She called attention to the fact that, despite the laws, the intelligent classes did possess this information, whereas the ignorant and the unfit were really the only one who were entirely unable to get it. Would not this condition be ameliorated rather, she asked, by throwing open scientific and reliable birth control information to the poorer classes, notably through the establishment of clinics where the best possible advice would be given free of charge.

During the six weeks' session of the International Conference of Women Physicians the subject of birth control was constantly before the delegates in one connection or another—as would seem inevitable in a group of medical women gathered together to consider the purpose announced in the banner strung across the platform, "Health for the Womanhood of the World."

ON OCTOBER 13TH, the subject was officially on the program in a paper by Dr Ada Potter, of Holland. It was rather unfortunate, despite the fact that Dr Potter was the only delegate from that country, that she was the person selected to lead the discussion on birth control. Dr Potter, it appeared, is a neurologist and psychiatrist, and as such has devoted herself exclusively to her own line. She admitted frankly that she knew extremely little about the government approved birth control clinics of Holland, and while her paper took for granted the use of contraceptics as a fundamental necessity for the safeguarding of women's health, she devoted her remarks chiefly to a plea for a greater measure of medical supervision in their use, and a stricter regulation of their sale.

The attitude of all the foreign doctors to whom I talked was characterized by this same taking of contraception for

granted. All said quite openly that they gave the best information they had whenever they were asked for it, but all agreed that this information was inadequate and unsatisfactory and that a great deal of laboratory research and clinical experiment was desirable. Most of them were rather horrified to learn that the giving of this information on the part of physicians was illegal in free America.

Within the month the League of Women Voters has twice given an opportunity for its members to listen to the claims of Birth Control, once at an open meeting at the League headquarters in New York City and once at a conference of the Social Hygiene Committee of the League.

At the open meeting, which took place on October 28th, Mrs. Sanger was the speaker. About a hundred women were present, and the discussion that followed Mrs. Sanger's address indicated that practically all were heartily in favor of the opening up of the utmost facilities for promoting knowledge in the use of contraceptives. At the hearing before the Social Hygiene Committee, which took place on October 20th, Mrs. Sanger and Mrs. Minturn Pinchot were the speakers. Dr. Valeria H. Parker, of Hartford, chairman of the committee,

presided, and demonstrated clearly by her opening and closing remarks that she herself was heartily in sympathy with the aims of the Birth Control Movement.

The audience was made up chiefly of women doctors attending the International Conference of Women Physicians, and a number of them were also the state chairmen of the Social Hygiene Committee of the League of Women Voters in their respective states—which fact gave to the conference an importance greatly disproportionate to its size.

The discussion brought out no serious comment that was not entirely favorable. Among those contributing to it were Dr. Edith Hale Swift of Boston, Dr. Mabel Ulrich of Minneapolis, Dr. Rachel Yarros of Chicago, and Dr. Mary Hall of New York.

While the conference adjourned without deciding to recommend that birth control be placed officially among its aims, the general sentiment was that the subject was in harmony with the purposes of the committee, and that, as individuals, the members should work quietly until public feeling had been brought to a point where a definite stand could be openly taken.

Future of Motherhood

We would call the attention of Dr. Dublin to the views of a practical man who wrote for the "Lansbury Herald"

FRANKLY, THE FUTURE of motherhood should be causing us the greatest concern, for a nation's wealth lies in motherhood. Sentiment will not help us out of our difficulties, for it must be understood that economic conditions will have a powerful influence over motherhood.

A leading feminist takes a rosy view. Listen: "It seems clear that women will choose motherhood rather than any other occupation if the State makes the conditions of motherhood tolerable." Now, it seems only reasonable that the State should make the conditions of motherhood tolerable. But past experience does not show that the State is likely to do the reasonable thing. Indeed, I suggest that we may expect the State to do the reasonable thing only when the Government has created a Brain Department. Therefore, for the moment my hopes of State aid are faint ones. As to the average young woman in the city, say, "choosing motherhood rather than any other occupation," I have the gravest doubts.

Let us take into consideration for the moment the average workman, whose weekly earnings amount to two or three pounds a week. The modern young woman has grown quite used to earning as much as he has. She has been able to buy fairly decent clothes, she has been able to go to a theatre or concert when she wills. In fact, she has tasted the sweets of liberty, and has been to a great extent free from financial worries. Her ego has developed making her independent and self-reliant. I cannot imagine the average city girl throwing up her comparative independence to marry the man with a small income—and they are the majority.

Our modern girl may be as romantic as a Charles Garvice heroine, but she will hesitate a long time before she leaps into

the sea of matrimony with a three-pound-a-week man.

For keeping house and home on about three to five pounds a week is no picnic, and the modern girl knows it. Romance is very charming, but the constant care of pounds, shillings, and pence, the worry of making both ends meet soon knocks the romance out of marriage, which often, under these circumstances, degenerates into a dismal little tragedy.

I doubt if the average girl who has been bending over ledgers or over boxes of ribbons will be overanxious to bend over a smelly gas stove instead. The ledgers and the ribbons finish at five or six o'clock in the evening, but the smelly gas stove goes on forever.

Let us turn now to the modern young man. I have talked with him at home and over there. He has traveled, he, too, has known something of freedom. He has no great hopes that wages will remain at their present level. As one of them put it to me quite recently: "No, old man, I shan't worry about marriage. I can keep myself fairly comfortably on about three pounds a week, but I don't feel justified in asking a girl to share such a small sum. It would mean a slow death to love trying to live on the money."

A large number of our young men are thinking the same and acting upon it. They see no reason for changing their ordinary life for the responsibilities of marriage. They will tell you that "the money won't run to it."

To put it briefly, I have no reason for hoping that the State will make the condition of motherhood tolerable.

War work may not make women lose their taste for marriage, but low wages and increased prices will certainly make men lose theirs.

HARRY FOWLER.

The Child in the Hands of the Law

By Ellen A Kennan

LAW IS ALWAYS AN inelastic, clumsy instrument, difficult to adjust to individual human need, likely at all times, even under the best of circumstances, to bear lightly on one and heavily on another. But laws framed to ameliorate conditions that are due to a deep, underlying injustice are bound to work out in strange backhanded ways.

Imagine a cess pool in the vicinity of a great city, from which waste matter seeps into the source of the water supply, so that the city finds itself a hot bed for typhoid fever germs. Then suppose that the city authorities, ignoring the condition at the source of the water supply, direct their whole attention towards the most careful and scientific quarantine of all persons afflicted with the disease, the typhoid will still continue, and there will always be plenty of people who will have to be quarantined. Just so long as we maintain an economic system that condemns children to a life of slavery, and lays its malignant hand upon them even before they have issued from their mother's womb, and just so long as our laws make child bearing compulsory, we shall continue to have defective children to segregate, even though well intentioned ladies and benevolent gentlemen spend all their days trying to bring order out of chaos with an endless chain of compulsory attendance laws, factory laws, free milk laws, tenement house laws, and what not. With one hand we rob children of the elementary human rights, the right to be well born, the right to be wanted, the right to play, the right to choose a vocation and prepare for it, and with the other hand we write laws making child bearing compulsory. Workers we must have!

IT IS A GOOD LAW that provides that a child may not be taken out of school until he is fourteen years old or until he has finished the grammar school, providing he is able to finish by sixteen years. And it is a good law, too, that prevents the child from hiring himself out during summer vacations without having first secured working papers, but under a decent social and economic system, one that was not based on underlying injustices such laws would be entirely unnecessary, and, well meaning as they are, under our present insane system, they often work very grave injustices to the poor, defective child. Such a child has to stay on in school among far younger children, although it is perfectly clear that he is learning little except to loaf and acquire idle habits. Oftentimes he chafes under the enforced attendance and would be glad to get out and find work. Even during the long summer vacation he must be idle. In my visits this summer I found family after family in which there was a big boy who was in the class for defectives, who was able to work and eager to work, whose financial help was much needed by the family, but whose hands were tied by the law. Why did he not get working papers? This matter of getting working papers is not so simple as it seems. There are few of these hard working fathers and mothers who can take time off from their work to go in search of the much desired papers. To the man or woman of leisure or even to

the working man who has easy hours and decent conditions and at least a practical knowledge of the language, it may seem a very simple matter to meet the requirements of the law, but to the father who leaves home, at 7 or 7 30 a m, and does not get back till 5 30 or 6 p m, or to the mother who has five or six little children clinging to her skirts and who never gets out except to market, such a matter is not simple.

JOHN FERRARI IS ONE OF these victims of a perfectly good law. He is a big handsome Italian boy, overdeveloped physically, and so underdeveloped mentally that he has been placed in the class for defectives. John likes to work and he is so good natured and pleasant he can get jobs. As soon as school was out this summer he had secured a job as helper in a barber shop. His employer liked him and he was earning about \$12 a week, money which his family needed very much. John was beginning to feel that he wasn't "dopey" after all, but that he was of some importance in the world, he was taking genuine pride in his work, when along came the inspector—he had to do his duty. John was under age and had no working papers, he was forced to give up his job, and was thrown on the street to loaf the rest of the summer. As it happened he was the oldest of a family of nine children of whom eight are living. The ages of the children run 13, 12, 10, 9, 7, 5, 4, 2, 7 months. This family lives in three rooms. The father earns \$35 a week. John's twelve dollars would have been a tremendous help to the family and the psychological effect on John himself of holding a job would have been fine, but—there was the law. One might draw some consolation from the assurance that at least the labor market was being protected, that the general wage scale was not being reduced by cheap labor. But even this crumb of comfort we are denied. In order to eke out the family income of \$35, John's mother "finishes skirts" at home. She gets 8 cents a piece for them, and to earn anything worth while at these rates Stella, 12 years old, a year younger than John (the law allows twelve year old Stella to be exploited) spends her whole vacation sitting stooped over in a close, hot tenement room, finishing skirts. Stella looks pale and sickly and has already twice failed of promotion in school. And while mother and Stella sew, little Concettina, ten years old, must tend baby, wash the dishes and diapers, and do all the other odd jobs waiting to be done in a family of that size. This mother is only 34 years old, she is Catholic, her mother had 13 children, her husband's mother had 17. It does not require much imagination to look ahead a few years and picture the situation, which is bound to grow steadily worse. But over and above all of this is the fact that Mrs. Ferrari and Stella are welding not only chains for themselves, but are helping to fasten the chains of slavery upon the whole working class.

ANGELO IS NOT YET quite 15, he is the oldest of a family that at present numbers seven children, two are dead and there have been two miscarriages, making a total for the mother of eleven pregnancies in fourteen years. The baby is only four

months old Angelo is subnormal in intelligence and has been placed in the class for defectives. Anna, 13 years of age, has not been able to get beyond the fourth grade, though she should be in the seventh. The glands of her neck are swollen, and she has already undergone two operations. Giacomo, nine years old, is still in the second grade. The rest of the children are not yet of school age. The father of this family is a day laborer on the car tracks, earning \$19.00 a week. Though they live in three rooms, and the children sleep three in a bed, still \$19 a week will not feed them all, so the mother "finishes pants" at home at the rate of 20 cents a pair. She earns \$1.20 a day, as she can finish six a day, provided, of course, that 14-year old Anna who has the swollen glands takes care of the four months old baby, washes, cooks and cleans. This mother is 35, is also Catholic and can still bear five or six children, and each child that she bears will be snatching the food from the mouths of those already on the scene. And all the time the wage scale that has been built up by the class conscious worker at such tremendous sacrifice, this mother with her little wage slaves, is doing her utmost to tear down!

Mrs. Mary Kolinsky is more intelligent than many of the mothers I met on my rounds. She has five children, all living, the oldest is 11 years, the youngest 5 months. She is very ambitious for her children, and it distresses her greatly that John, 10 years old, is in the class for defectives. Her husband is a window cleaner, earning \$27 a week. At the time I talked with her he was out on strike. Of course she could not see her children starve, so she was making women's underwear at hose, night gowns, chemise, petticoats, for 80 cents a dozen! She could make two dozen a day if the children were well and did not interfere. Of course the burden of the little ones fell on 11 year old Mary, while mother was sewing. Mrs. K is 29 years old, Polish and Catholic. But she is too good a mother to want more children, notwithstanding her Catholic training. She is eager to know how women who have small families manage it—but no one may tell her, for there is the law! So while the father of the family strikes to bring about better conditions in one line of work, the mother, faced by the hungry mouths of children she did not want to bring into the world, is making all of his effort and sacrifice purposeless, by dragging down the wage scale in another line of work.

Not all of my work this summer was with the poor mothers of many children, and the mothers of defective children. I sometimes found a mother whose children had been pronounced above the average in intelligence and had been placed in rapid advance classes. These mothers had for the most part such a passion for fine children that they had managed in some way or other to limit the size of their families. Mrs. Smith was such a mother. Her husband had died two years ago leaving her with four children. She told me how narrowly she escaped having two more mouths to feed. Her husband was earning \$22 a month, they already had four children and the youngest was only 18 months old when she found herself pregnant. She felt hopeless, she felt desperate! She had tried to take precautions, but the only information she had been able to get

was faulty. She had done her best, the method was not a good one. Now what was she to do? She knew it was unfair to the four children she had, to bring others into the world to share the father's meagre wage. She set herself to her task with energy and after much effort was put on the track of a doctor who would perform an abortion for \$30. It was very hard to collect \$30, but she knew it would be still harder to pay the expenses of confinement, and support a fifth child. The abortion was performed and in her womb was found not one child but twins. Just a year later her husband died. "Think of it," she exclaimed, as she finished her story. "What in the world could I have done with two more mouths to feed when it is so very hard to get on with the four I have!"

Mrs. Smith receives \$52 a month from a charity organization for the support of her family of four children. Sadie, her oldest, 13½ years old, is now in her second year of high school, as she finished the grades at 12. The law provides that Sadie may be taken out of school at 14, if she has completed the grades before that age. So the organization that is allowing Mrs. Smith \$52 a month says Sadie must stop school in an other half year and go to work. Sadie wishes to continue school, her mother wishes her to continue, her teachers say she has unusual ability, there is every probability that if allowed to go on with her education she will be able to contribute much to society, but it is perfectly legal to take her out, and a board of directors that has never seen Sadie cannot be expected to see the situation from a reasonable, human point of view, so she will probably soon go to work to help support the rest of the family, unless some kindly disposed person intervenes.

Not only Sadie has been placed in the rapid advance classes and has distinguished herself in her work, but the other three children also have proved themselves of unusual ability and have all been allowed to skip grades. Mrs. Smith who is an intelligent, thinking mother said to me in telling her story. "If my children were slow, stupid and defective, and could not get on in their work, they would have the privilege of staying in school until they were sixteen years old. But since I have unusually quick and intelligent children who are two years beyond their grade they are to be penalized for their intelligence by being forced to leave school at 14." No wonder the world seems a bit topsy turvy to this devoted mother, a world in which bright little Sadie, eager to study, making the most of her advantages, must leave school to go to work at 14, while big, stupid, good natured John, unable to learn, is compelled by law to hang on in school till he is 16.

Bees seem to have gleams of intelligence that we human beings lack. They have a class system—a working class and a leisure class, the drones, but their workers are not also breeders. They seem to understand that those that do the drudgery of their world must not also have the burden of bearing the new generation. They face their rotten class system quite frankly, and realizing that the bee race must be replenished from the best nourished stock, they practice division of labor—one class for the drudgery—the queen bee for breeding. Brutal? Oh yes, but rather logical. Anyway they're not human.

Judge Neil's Law

WHEN JUDGE NEIL visited the American institutions where fatherless children were being brought up by the State, he used to ask a child, "Where is your mother?" An outburst of grief was always the reply. He went to a Children's Court to see how the separation of mother and child was effected. The first case was that of a mother with five children. Her husband had been dead three years, and she had tried to keep the home together by charring in the day time and looking after the children at night. Her health gave way. She could not pay the rent. She came to the court for assistance. The officials parceled out the children among five different institutions. She was overcome with despair. "Would it not be kinder," asked Judge Neil, "to take her behind the court house and shoot her?"

Then he asked who paid for the children's keep. The taxes paid ten dollars (about £2 10s. in those happy days) a month for each child. "Why," he asked, "should not the ten dollars be paid to the mother?" "Oh, that would be against the law." "Then," he exclaimed, "let's change the law!" And to an English mind the astonishing thing is that he did change it. Judge Neil's law, known as "The Mothers' Pensions Law," or, more properly, "The Widows' Pensions Law," was passed unanimously by the State Legislature of Illinois in 1911, and has been since adopted by thirty-five States out of the forty-eight. Thousands on thousands of children have been saved from Institutions, and are being brought up by their own mothers. An official report from New York City says: "There has been a steady improvement in the homes. The money invested is returning interest in the way of lives made stronger, in decided physical improvement in the health of both mothers and children." The surest evidence of success is that in no State has Judge Neil's Law been repealed.

The amount of the widow's pension varies in different States. It seems to be assumed in all that a widow is able to bring up one child without assistance, but where there are more children than one, she is allowed something between six dollars a month and ten. The money is usually raised partly from taxes and partly from rates. In New York City the cost of a child in an institution was about £60 a year, under the pension law it is about £24. The number of paid officials is enormously reduced, indeed, they almost vanish. The money is administered and watched either by the Children's Courts or the County Agent, appointed by the County Board, which corresponds to our County Council and Board of Guardians combined. The administration of the pensions costs only 5 per cent of the expenditure. The administration of the institutions cost 75 per cent, and it was calculated that one official was required for every five children. In most of the States the pension is continued till the child is fourteen. In many till sixteen, especially if the child is delicate. In Nebraska and Nevada till eighteen, the age up to which the American Free School system is also continued. Unhappily, it is only in Michigan that the unmarried mother receives a pension for

her child, and on it is as a "deserted mother." It is true that, as a rule, the unmarried mother has not more than one child to support.

Last April our Government promised to introduce a Mothers' Pension Bill as soon as possible, and Mr. Baldwin Raper, M.P., has framed the main clauses: (1) the pensions to be limited to necessitous mothers with more than one child, the father also being dead or incapacitated, (2) the amounts to be the same as that now given to war widows, and administered also by the Ministry of Pensions, and with the same supervision, (3) the money to be provided, three quarters from taxes and one-quarter from rates. Mr. Raper estimates the total cost at about £10,000,000 a year. The estimate appears excessive, on his own showing. In a pamphlet called "Making Britain Fit for Mothers," he states that in this country we have 130,000 children under the Poor Law, and so if £24 a year were allotted for each child, the total would be £3,120,000. No doubt he makes allowance for the many necessitous mothers who have such a violent objection to the Poor Law that even extreme poverty cannot bring them to entrust their children to its official mercy. But still we think his estimate high. However high, it is merely the cost of three or four days of our infamous war on Russia.

So far as the law goes, not much alteration is wanted in this country. We suppose that ever since the Poor Law of Elizabeth, a destitute widow may receive a pension in the form of "Outdoor Relief." Certainly by the "Prohibitory Order" of 1844 she is made an exception from the rule that all relief must be given wholly within the workhouse. The clause making her an exception runs

"Where such person shall be a widow, and have a legitimate child or legitimate children dependent upon her, and incapable of earning his, her, or their livelihood, and have no illegitimate child born after the commencement of her widowhood."

By law, therefore, a widow with children may receive a pension in the form of Out Relief according to the discretion of the Board of Guardians. And Boards of Guardians have sometimes displayed their discretion by granting weekly sums of money, usually to the amount per child of half a crown a week before the war, but now rising with prices. By a merciful provision recently inserted, the deserted mother was allowed to count as a widow within the terms of this clause, rigorous warnings, however, being added against possible collusion with the husband. But in issuing the list of exception, together with their Prohibitory Order in 1844, the Poor Law Commissioners added an Instructional Letter urging the Guardians "to exercise great circumspection in applying the exception of widows with children in practice." The Commissioners feared that weekly allowances would deter relations from contributing to support, might tend to increase improvidence, and even to reduce wages. Guardians have

laid these instructions only too carefully to heart. They have added the fear that the widow might drink the money given in relief, or might attract the "cupboard love" of some man, who would live at ease upon the children's bread. Accordingly, it is the custom to relieve the poverty stricken widow of her children by taking them from her and sending them to the Workhouse Schools, usually known as Barrack Schools.

The children are then said to be "institutionally" dealt with, and the expression is exact. Of all forms of upbringing, the institution, even at its very best, is probably the very worst. The complete separation of boys and girls, the herding together of children in large crowds, the absence of solitude, change, and holidays, the inevitable want of human affection, the warping regularity, the mechanical devices, the ignorance of common life—all combine into the very worst possible education for a child. After costing the country about £30 a year for many years, the child emerges at last in the condition thus described by one who for a long time examined the conditions in the best of the Workhouse Schools round London:

"It was as though he were passed through each of its scientific appliances in turn—the steam washing machine, the centrifugal steam wringer, the hot air drying horse, the patent mangle, the gas ovens, the heating pipes, the spray baths, the model bakery, and the central engine."

To have given that £30 a year to the boy's mother and let her bring him up—how sane and simple it sounds by comparison! In a letter upon this very subject (quoted in the *Daily News* of last Monday), Bernard Shaw, after saying he did not know why pensions should not be given to industrial widows and orphans as much as to war widows and orphans, or why, if a man may be compelled to kill, he should not also be compelled to work, or why the rich man who refuses to work is flattered and pampered, remarked in conclusion: "The longer I live, the more I am inclined to the belief that this sphere is used by other planets as a lunatic asylum."

We admit the difficulties. As the Poor Law Commissioners urged, the widow's pension might make her improvident or entice her to take less than standard wages. As the guardians often fear, it might tempt to drink or to "sexual irregularities." The same might be said of the pensions we grant to impoverished Cabinet Ministers. In all such cases we have to risk something. We cannot always be prying into the private conduct of widows or ministers, like emissaries of the Charity Organization Society. The question is whether we are to attempt our remedial measures on the assumption that most men and women are fairly decent people or on the assumption that they are criminally disposed and will sink into crime the moment they get the chance. Everything depends upon that decision. In the present state of the world there is much to be said for the second assumption, and the cynics are having a grand run for their money. But on the whole one may still believe it safe to build up our public life on the con-

fidence that most people are fairly decent, and that out of a hundred widows probably not more than five would drink the pension instead of spending it on their children. Or even if the percentage were ten, the result would be worth the risk if only the children of the remaining ninety could be saved from "Institutional Treatment" under the cruel mercies of the State.

One word more as to unmarried mothers. We have seen that Judge Neil's Law does not touch their case, chiefly because the mother as a rule has only one child to support. Under English law an illegitimate child is "filius nullius"—nobody's baby. It is doubtful whether legally it even belongs to the mother. But custom, by a graceful concession, has agreed that a child is the child of its mother, provided it is illegitimate. Otherwise, it has no parent but the father. The unmarried mother is therefore fortunate to the extent that she is supreme over her own child, and even legally (or at least by custom) it is her own. For support she has a claim on the "putative father," but, for one reason or another, that claim is very rarely enforced. It might justly be argued that, if she cannot maintain the child, she ought to receive the same assistance as a widow or deserted wife, so long at least as the illegitimate family does not increase. At all events, it is just that assistance should now be given to unmarried mothers who have served in our various women services during the war, and that it should be given on the same terms as to war widows. One remembers the hysterical excitement over "war babies" that swept through the country at the beginning of the war. All that gush is silent now. It died as hysterical excitement always dies. But girls who were induced to join our services during the war now sit as unmarried mothers in our workhouses, and theirs are "war babies," if any ever were.—From *The Nation* (English)

Stole for Child Wife

SAD TALE OF HUSBAND OF FIFTEEN

A MAN NAMED Harold Robinson was yesterday acquitted at the London Sessions on a charge of receiving four stolen bottles of whiskey.

Charles Edward Wright pleaded guilty to the theft.

Appearing for Wright, Mr. G. A. C. Keeves pleaded for leniency. The prisoner, he said, was only 15 years of age, and was married to a girl only a year older than himself. He had got her into trouble, and married her to save her honor. He stole the whiskey in order to obtain the necessaries of life for his child wife.

The prisoner was bound over under the Probation Act to be on good behavior for two years.

DESPERATE BECAUSE SHE was not able to bring up her eight children, and on the verge of giving birth to the ninth, Mme. Sadoux, cultivator, living at Alby sur Cheiau, drowned herself.—*Petit Parisien*, July 17th

Should We Have Birth Control?

From the Pittsburgh Dispatch

By MARY WARE DENNETT, *Director of Voluntary Parenthood League, 206 Broadway, New York*

REGULATION OF THE family birth rate is a basic necessity for the health and welfare of babies, mothers, the rest of the family and for the community. Having babies without regard to the earnings of the parents, their health environment or wishes, is as stupid, wasteful and disastrous as it would be for a farmer to sow his seed indiscriminately.

It would do mighty little good to preach to a farmer about fertilizing and cultivating a potato field after he had been un-intelligent enough to plant his potatoes so close together that the plants had no room to grow. Likewise, it is equally futile for charitable folks to give to tenement house mothers instructions in infant care, when they have been ignorant enough to have an annual baby for several years, and the family earnings are not enough to give even one baby a decent chance for life and health.

Of the adult males in Massachusetts 35 per cent were earning during "war prosperity" less than \$20 a week. The proportion in many other States is similar. Can these fathers afford unlimited families? Can the country afford to have laws which keep them in ignorance as to how to regulate the birth rate? No possible future rise in wages will ever give an unlimited family adequate care.

Isn't it plain common sense to support the bill backed by the Voluntary Parenthood League, asking Congress to remove the penalty for circulating contraceptive knowledge?

By DR HARVEY W WILEY, M D

Director Bureau of Food Sanitation and Health, Good House keeping, Washington, D C

IHAVE VERY DECIDED views on the question. They are of a distinctly negative character. The sole purpose that nature has for all living beings is perpetuation. There is no other function for which nature cares a farthing. Of necessity, any artificial birth control is to run counter to nature. For economic reasons, any campaign of this kind must, of necessity, prove a failure.

There is just one element of birth control which can ever prove of much advantage, namely, subsistence. If the food supply drops, or if the effort to obtain food, that is, to make a living, becomes more than human beings can accomplish, then there will be a natural restriction in the rate of birth. A Nation that stands still in population is simply preparing to go backward. The means of producing food, and that means all the necessities of life, are constantly increasing. Scientific agriculture is showing how, without increasing the area, to increase production.

Man has two hands and only one mouth. The capacity of the mouth is forever constant. It is the same now as it was 10,000 years ago, and it will be the same 10,000 years hence.

The hands are capable of almost indefinite education, and are thus able to constantly provide a larger amount of the necessities of life. Great men and great women do not always come from isolated and thinly settled communities. The struggle for existence which hard circumstances produce is what brings out the truly great and remarkable in human nature.

It may be hard on the millions to produce one genius, but it is nature's way. Moreover, in my opinion, the teaching of artificial birth control is highly immoral. It is certainly contrary to the status of the country, and I would not advise any propaganda which would tend to land the propagandist in jail. I am, as you may gather from the foregoing, decidedly opposed to any system of education respecting the prevention of children.

By MRS CLARENCE RENSHAW

BIRTH CONTROL MEANS not the limitation of offspring, but the regulation of offspring. It demands that the size of the family be adapted to the family income and the health of the parents. It places its emphasis on quality rather than quantity, at the same time guaranteeing that quality means eventually the greater quantity.

"Should not the size of the family be ordered by Divine Providence?" asks the dogmatic objector. Since God made man in His own image and constituted him His Vicegerent on earth, the duty of intelligent family regulation necessarily devolves upon man. Man does not hesitate to exercise his trusteeship in the regulation of stock and crops. Why should he hesitate to apply his intellect to the far more important problem?

The children of overcrowded families, the offspring of unfit parents, make necessary orphan asylums, homes for feeble minded reformatories and juvenile courts. These institutions require and receive tremendous State appropriations, suppose this money could be used constructively! Probably it would be sufficient to offer a college education to every young person in our Commonwealth.

When voluntary parenthood is universal, when every baby is a welcome baby, we shall have progressed a long way in the science of right living.

By JOHN S SUMNER

Secretary New York Society for the Suppression of Vice

SELF CONTROL IS THE only sort of control that should be taught and taught without ceasing. Every evil or misfortune arises either directly or indirectly from lack of self control. Birth control, as distinguished from birth prevention, will result from self-control. No one, exercising self-control will bring into the world undesired children. Lack of self control is the source of this inhuman evil.

Character is built by overcoming difficulties—not by resort to easy methods. Artificial methods, advocated by promoters

of so-called "birth-control" spell birth prevention which means destruction of the home, the basis of social life. They have been the forerunner and will always precede lack of character, immorality, and race deterioration and destruction. Self control signifies a world populated by happy peoples living in peace and comfort. Lack of it means chaos.

Children of today are crammed with superficial knowledge but have not the mental strength of their ancestors because "easy methods" have been introduced into the schools. What is true of intellectual training is true also of sexual training. There is no royal road to anything that is desirable. A few flutter through a worthless life without care and without character. The millions toil and by their toil serve the race and serve themselves. They toil for home and family—the ambition of every normal human being—what 2,000,000 of America's best manhood yearned for during recent months and years of privation abroad.

Convince women that it is their right to cheat in the matrimonial partnership. Convince men that it is their right to indulge without limit. Convince both that by artificial means all parental responsibility may be avoided—physical life in spiritual death.

By IRA S. WILE, M. D.

264 West Seventy third Street, New York

THE QUESTION IS improperly stated. Birth control exists. The real question is, "Shall the facts relating to birth control be made available to all types in the community?"

This question involves voluntary parenthood, and a knowledge of the means whereby this may be secured and controlled. I believe all agitation for the reduction in the birth rate on the part of those unable to care for children adequately or among those for various reasons unfit to assume the responsibilities of parenthood, should be accompanied by a stimulation of interest in parenthood on the part of those able to bring up families and thoroughly fitted for this function. Birth release is as essential for the welfare of the community as a further reduction in the birth rate on the part of another section of the population.

If birth control carries with it the idea of more children for those fit for parenthood and capable of advancing the welfare of the race, it merits highest approval. If the movement for birth control concerns itself, in a negative way, merely with the prevention of conception, I believe its benefits, because of their negative character, will not have the most marked effect on future generations.

The idea is not to decimate the race through non production, but to better the quality of the race through limited reproduction on the one hand, and increased reproduction on the other. Those who now have knowledge of birth control should not abuse their knowledge, while those who lack the necessary information should have an opportunity to secure it.

By GRACE R. PAGE

Secretary Illinois Birth Control League

YES, IT IS the necessary preliminary to any scheme of social betterment. We may multiply charitable agencies of all kinds and they may work all the time, but so long as the

families of the poor increase without limit it is like brushing back the sea with a broom. Families where the father's wages could support two children in comfort are utterly swamped by six or eight. The mother is overworked and cannot give the children the physical stamina they should have nor the care and attention which would tend to make them healthy and useful citizens. Thus the children, the parents and society suffer.

Our country leads the world in the number of mothers who are driven to fearful and desperate means of limiting their families. In Holland the Government has supported clinics for instructing people in contraceptive methods for the last 30 years. The birth rate has declined, but so has the death rate. Fewer children are born, but fewer die and the standards of health and comfort are very high. In England a society exists to give this information to married people. It is time the United States repealed the laws which make it a criminal offense to send such information through the mails and enlightened citizens realized their duty toward their less fortunate fellows.

News Notes

IN THE VILLAGE of Bois, Chataegnon, in the Commune of Cressat, a poor girl, Denise Berger, twenty one years old, strangled the child she had borne, and buried it in the garden. Her mother was accused of complicity. The infanticide was made known and denounced by the seducer — *Le Bon homme Limousin*, June 29th.

The father of eight children has been arrested at Thor (Buches du Rhone). He admitted having several times violated one of his daughters, aged fourteen — *Le Radical de Marseilles*, 28 7 1919.

And M. Rossignol continues to pretend that the more children one has, the more virtuous one is — *Neo Malthusien*.

Two young girls, pupils of the Public Aid, have been violated by their patrons, Marlot Joseph and Denis Jules, who used them scandalously — *Reveil de la Marne*, 24 8 19.

And the repopulators say: If you have too many children, send them to the Public Aid!

In a cable to the *New York Times*, October 12th, Dr. Voronoff of the College de France has just discovered an elixir for the restoration of youth and the prolongation of life—of he goats and men. So far his experiments have not succeeded with the female of the species. This discovery, coupled with Sir Rider Haggard's project for having all children, even those born out of wedlock, brought up either "directly or indirectly," whatever that may mean, by the state, leaves women quite free to bear children and to die at the usual age, with no recognition, not even a three-cent war medal, from anyone. Isn't it time for the mothers to organize?

Notes by An East Side Nurse

SEVERAL weeks ago I called to see a new obstetrical case

The woman had been in this country about eight years. She had worked in a factory and gone to night school until her marriage, and she was pretty nearly a nervous wreck. Her great ideal seemed to be to be a real American. When I commented on a broken, much abused toe of hers, she said, "I was trying to be a Yankee when I was green, and my shoes were too short."

"My husband is a salesman in a gents' furnishing. Twenty dollars a week he makes. Twenty dollars a week, and I gotta skimp and save to feed my two children milk and buy clothes and coal and pay rent. Now I gotta take it away from the two to feed a third. I want that my children should be well and strong and go to school. I don't want they should work in a factory. I want them to be educated. I want it so badly that I go almost crazy. When my second baby was born, I went to the doctor to ask what I should do. Every year a baby. He says "Give up the married life. Leave your husband. A woman like you should not have any more children." Every week I went to the clinic with my headaches—all the time I worry. So the doctor sent me to a sanitarium, and I stayed four months. My headaches were better and I was lonesome for my children. I love my husband, but for my children I am responsible, they gotta have a chance. I tried living apart from my husband, but three rooms we got and I could not do it. I tried hot sitz baths, many times I was caught, and all the time I worry and worry, and my headaches. Oh, God, how it ached! Then the doctor sent me away again, this time I stayed a year. I have been home ten months and I gotta nother baby to feed and clothe. But for eight months I was happy, for I did not worry. What's the use? It was coming.

BUT LAST NIGHT I was like a crazy woman, thinking that for a week I could not care for my children. I could not save for this new baby. And while my husband sat in that chair and rocked after the baby was born, he talked already about the next baby. He don't worry that I can't buy more milk or shoes. He don't earn more money for each baby. I was like a crazy woman when I heard him talk. I don't know what I said. What should I do, Nurse? I know it is wrong to have more children than I can feed. What should I do? My husband won't give me the children so I can live separate, and without my babies I can't live. And I gotta live. More babies I can't have. Please tell me what to do.

Later that same day I met the doctor who said, "I recommended you on a case this morning. Nurse, on Rivington Street. What did you think of her, Nurse? She is positively the awfulest woman I ever confined. Like a crazy woman she talks. I never seen anyone like her. I never wish anyone any bad luck but if she would have an abscess of the breast I would be glad. The way she talks is fierce. "I knew a woman what had an abscess on her breast," said the patient

who was overhearing all this talk, "and it cost her fifteen dollars."

"Don't you think, doctor, that that patient is in a terribly nervous state, and I was all wrought up during her long drawn out labor pains? Don't you think it is wrong for her to have babies while she is in this state?"

"I was on many confinements where they had worse pains but never such a woman I've seen. I feel sorry for her husband, he is a nice man."

Men like him cannot understand anyone but a man.

Just what does our legislation say about Birth Control for such cases?

A PATHETIC WOMAN STOPPED a nurse on the street the other day and said, "Nurse, I want someone should come and see me. I want to talk with a nurse. Such trouble as I got." The nurse went home with her, she, with her husband and family of five children, the oldest eight years old, was living in three dark rooms.

"We just moved here," she said, "fourteen dollars a month I gotta pay rent here. Twelve dollars it cost me to move. I had to borrow the money. Mine husband, I just wish you could see him, nurse. He is so tin, like noting. Skin and bones he is. He vorks on a wagon, to be outsides. Eighteen dollars a week he makes delivering bread. Ven he vas a tailor he made more moneys, but the doctor says he got to quit the business and be outsides."

"I don't know what I should do this confinement." Oh yes! It was quite evident there would be another mouth to feed very soon. "I ain't got no money to have a woman in the house, for the doctor I ain't got no money. Each confinement I got less, like I had before. Vat should I do, Nurse?"

"You say I should go to the hospital and you will send the children away for two weeks, so I can come home well and strong to care for mine baby! I would go crazy if I gotta lie in bed and see nobody tending to mine children."

"How much milk I buy for mine growing children? Eighteen dollar a week mine husband gets. One quart of milk I get every day. Coffee and bread I feed mine children. Skin and bones they are."

"How many more children I can feed on eighteen dollars a week? Vat should I do, Nurse? Long ago I know I got plenty. Unt ven I think this year another one, next year maybe again. Vat should I do? Vat should I do?"

THE PRICE OF SLUMS MILLION DEFECTIVE CHILDREN

SPEAKING AT BRIGHTON yesterday, Sir Kingsley Wood, of the Ministry of Health, said the nation today was paying for the country's evil slums and criminal overcrowding.

Let them think of the three million people living more than two in a room, of the million defective children in our schools, and of the Midland City possessing forty thousand back to back houses, where the death rate of children was half as much again as in ordinary dwelling houses.

Editor's Uneasy Chair

SENTENCED "WRAF" WOMEN APPEAL FOR RELEASE

THE WOMEN'S FREEDOM LEAGUE has written to the Home Secretary asking for the immediate release of the W R A F clerk, Elsie Kathleen Smith, who was sentenced a few days ago at the Old Bailey to four months' imprisonment in the second division for attempting to smother her baby.

The evidence showed clearly, and the judge admitted its accuracy, that the girl was ill and hysterical when the child was born, she had been deserted by a Canadian officer, had been left to find her way into a Salvation Army Home, and her own people had refused to allow her to take the child home.

"It is entirely beyond our understanding," said the secretary of the League, 'that the judge should be able to talk about the sacredness of infant life while at the same time be allowed the name of the Canadian officer to be suppressed. This Canadian officer should certainly have been in the dock with the girl'."

Query—What will probably become of this child?

"WAACS" AS MOTHERS PAUPERIZED BY WAR OFFICE

WHEN THE HAMPSTEAD Board of Guardians met yesterday, Mrs M W Nevinson moved that, owing to the number of girls (six since July) belonging to the Military Services—W A A C and W R A F—who have recently become chargeable to the parish of Hampstead for confinement, none of whom belong to the parish, the War Office be asked to provide lying in accommodation for these young women, and that the question ought to be a national and not a parochial one.

Mrs Nevinson said that the girls should not come under the Poor Law, and soldiers felt very strongly on the matter, and they considered such a procedure was a disgrace to the King's uniform. Apart from that, the charge should be on the army authorities. By nine votes to two the resolution was carried.

I see a race without disease of flesh or brain—shapely and fair, married harmony of form and function. And as I look, life lengthens, joy deepens, love canopies the earth, and over all in the great dome, shines the eternal star of human hope.

ROBERT INGERSOLL

AN OCCUPATION

Translated for the BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW from *L'oeuvre*
by G. De La Fouchardiere

THERE ARE PHILANTHROPISTS who concern themselves with the results of the demobilization. They say "What can the 'poilus' do when they get home again?" You understand they are afraid that the former soldiers will be bored, they seek occupations for them, and they discover some that are admirable.

One of these philanthropists makes no bones about it, he goes right to the point. He says and writes 'Oh, very well, let the returned "poilus" occupy themselves with repopulation. Let them produce children on every side (sic). Thus our natality by its progression will counterbalance that of Germany, and later'."

A charming prospect, and many thanks for those who shall come later! There is, however, something which must be said at once, although it is hazardous to say it. One runs a great risk of being accused of Malthusianism, and that leads to recrimination and accusations of defeatism.

Here is a story which contains a warning. I know a man high up in the industrial world who encourages repopulation among his employees: he distributes rewards to them progressively on the births in their family, and bases his calculation on the previous number of children.

One day wishing to taste the delights of the happiness he was creating, he conceived the idea of visiting one of the most interesting, that is to say, the most numerous family in its home, the father was the possessor of eleven premiums.

His hands laden with gifts, this philanthropist climbed the five flights and arrived at last in a dirty flat, which smelt of alcohol and tobacco. "But where are your children?" said he with amazement, as he looked about him.

It was very simple. The oldest was in an institution for the deaf and dumb. The second had disappeared, it was supposed that, having had one of his epileptic attacks on the street, he had been taken off somewhere or other. There were two girls who had Potts' disease and were in plaster casts and three boys, who were being treated at various hospitals for abscesses and scrofula, three others were in the cemetery. As for the last baby, his mother had made such a festival of his birth and the accompanying premium that she had dropped him on the sidewalk and fractured his skull.

The philanthropist, learning these things, was indignant. "You are a criminal," he said to his employee. "What! An alcoholic and a syphilitic like you to create these little unfortunates, who

"These people never know what they want," said the man to his wife when his employer had gone.

We must know what we want: whether it is an improvement in the quality, or an increase in the quantity, that is to say, industrial production by batches in order to line up a large force thirty years hence, when

I regret to say that the second point of view is that of the sociologists and the philanthropists, who seek, so they say, the happiness of humanity.

The Greatest Problem of the Race—Its Own Preservation

THIS IS THE title of a book of 174 pages, "compiled, edited, and mostly written" by J W Jones, Superintendent of the State School for the Deaf, Columbus, Ohio

It is dedicated to "higher ideals and purer living"

It may be obtained by sending your name and address to the Ohio Board of Administration, Columbus, Ohio, and enclosing fifteen cents to cover the cost of printing, binding, and postage

Instead of reviewing this book, we will quote the introduction as it stands. It would be impossible to give a clearer outline of its purpose. It is a book which should be read by everyone, especially by those who believe that things are going on very well as they are

To those who believe in conscious and voluntary parenthood versus instinctive and accidental breeding, every page will furnish additional argument, it is especially recommended to those who so far have not thought upon this subject at all

INTRODUCTION

The State of Ohio expends approximately four millions of dollars annually for the maintenance of her State institutions. She pays out for lands, new buildings, equipment, repairs, and betterment on an average of at least one million more per annum

If we could take into consideration, and reduce to figures the loss in time, private expense, trouble, and sorrow of the families immediately involved, this vast sum would be multiplied. If the private hospitals and sanatoriums, almshouses, county infirmaries, jails and workhouses, and private charitable institutions were all brought into accounting, many millions more would be added to this sum

If the State of Ohio may be taken as a fair average among the civilized people of the world in the care and treatment of its so called State, county township, and private wards, at least three dollars per capita is expended for everyone of the world's population, or, in other words, five billion dollars are expended annually for this purpose, a sum almost equal to the amount necessary for carrying on the great European war

This war, which has shocked the world and horrified mankind with its destruction of the human race, is doing no more toward that end than the unnecessary inherited and self-inflicted diseases are doing

In battle we have the slain, the wounded, the missing, and the captured. In the social struggle we have the same classification of injured people: the killed from unnecessary diseases, the wounded (deaf, blind, feeble minded, insane, criminal), the captured (incipient cases of tuberculosis, temporary insane prisoners, drunkards), the missing (escaped criminals, deserters, tramps, footpads, and all those who are at liberty and a dangerous burden to society)

Those in charge of State institutions have a rare opportunity for investigating and studying the causes of this great

human waste. The results of their investigations have been set forth in annual reports for many years. These annual reports have been printed in limited numbers, and filed in the archives of the State and given out to any who may be interested enough to call for them. But the general public has never been made acquainted with the true conditions of its social fabric, simply because these reports have not been placed in the hands of the people in a form that invites reading

The Ohio Board of Administration feels that its duty is only half done when it furnished custodial care and treatment to the State's wards. It owes a greater duty also, namely, the education of the people concerning the causes and prevention of deafness, blindness, feeble mindedness, criminality, insanity, tuberculosis, intemperance, and general immorality. It believes that by better sanitation, purer living, and more careful mating that much of this human waste may be prevented

The several stories set forth in this book are filled with information and instruction which the people ought to have. Ignorance is the bane of our national life. People do not wish to live on a low plane, or to bring weak and diseased children into the world. They do so only because they do not know what they do

No parents want their child to be blind, but because they have not known the dangers attending childbirth, this great misfortune has come to them

No one wants tuberculosis, but because of a want of understanding of the dangers of infection, this disease is unwittingly passed from mother to child, brother to sister, neighbor to neighbor, and stranger to stranger

No one would be willing to marry into a family where disease is lurking, with the possibility of transmitting it to a probable offspring, but for the lack of education on this subject such marriages are being solemnized daily all over the world

The various chapters in this book acquaint the people with these dangers

The effort has been made by the superintendent to speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, as the knowledge has come to them in their wide experience in studying the various classes of people, and their diseases

There is no commercial enterprise behind this publication. It is a mere matter of voluntary service to the people of Ohio on the part of those who have contributed to it. Prompted by the enormity of the unnecessary sin, immorality, self abuse, and the untold expense of maintaining and caring for the products of these undesirable things, and with the hope of eradicating much of them, and aiding people to take a step forward in higher and better living, the Ohio Board of Administration endeavors to place this book in the hands of all of Ohio's citizens

MARY KNOBLAUCH

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, 1919 State of New York County of New York, ss.

Before me a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared MARY KNOBLAUCH, who having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that she is the Managing 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 104 Fifth Avenue, New York, N Y

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

Managing Editor—MARY KNOBLAUCH, Wyo Apts, 55th Street & 7th Avenue, New York, N Y

Business Managers—NONE

2 That the owners are N Y Women's Publishing Co 104 Fifth Avenue, New York, N Y Jessie Ashley (Estate of), 102 E 52nd St, New York, N Y Juliet Rublee 1957 Biltmore Street, Washington, D C Mrs. Mary Knoblauch, 55th Street and 7th Avenue, New York, N Y Mrs Frances B Ackerman, Lawrence Park, Bronxville, N Y

3 That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds mortgages, or other securities are 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 case 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)

MARY KNOBLAUCH, Man. Ed

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 30th day of September, 1919

[SEAL]

J G KAP, Notary Public

My commission expires March 30, 1921

N Y County No 30, N Y Register No 187

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 Bunnie Dunlop, 48 Broadway, Westminster, London, S.W. Periodical, *The Malthusian*.

HOLLAND (1885)—De Nieuw Malthusiaansche Bond. Secretary, Dr J Dutgers, 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, *Generation 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 Mascoux, 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/e, Lisbon. Periodical, *Paz e Liberdade*.

BRAZIL (1905)—Seccion Brasileira de Propaganda. Secretaries, Manuel Moscova, Rua d Bento Pires 29 San Pablo, Antonio Dominguez, Rue Vizconde 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 Hnke Bergegren, Vanadisvagen 15, Stockholm, Va.

ITALY (1913)—Lega Neomalthusiana Italiana Via Lamarmora 22, Turin. Periodical, *L Educazione Sessuale*.

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

MEXICO (1918)—Mexican Birth Control League, Secretaries, Mr and Mrs Linn A E Gale, P O Box 518, Mexico, D F, Mexico. Periodicals, *Gale's* (English) and *El Comunista* (Spanish).

IN THE UNITED STATES

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

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

PHILADELPHIA, PA.—Dr L. A. Young, 5152 Haverford Avenue.

CHICAGO, ILL.—Illinois Birth Control League.

Secretary, Mrs. B. E. Page, 521 Longwood Ave., Glencoe, Ill.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.—Birth Control League of Ohio. Mrs. A W Newman, 10601 Ashbury Avenue, secretary.

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

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

HARRISBURG, PA.—George A. Herring, 1304 Penn 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 YORK

The Committee of One Thousand. Dr Ira S. Wile, 230 W 97th Street, chairman.

International Birth Control League. Dr Wm. J. Robinson,

President, 12 Mt. Morris Park West.

The National Birth Control League. 200 Fifth Avenue.

Mrs. Maxwell Hyde.

The Woman's Committee of One Hundred. Mrs. Amos Pin-

chot, chairman, 9 East 81st Street.

Voluntary Parenthood League, 206 Broadway. Mary Ware

Dennett, Director.

PITTSBURGH, PA.—The Birth Control League of Western Pennsylvania. Rita F. Stein, 924 Mellon St., Pittsburgh, Pa., secretary.

PORTLAND, ORE.—The Birth Control League of Portland. 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, Superintendent of Municipal Nurses, 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.

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.