

Birth Control Review

Published by the American Birth Control League

Vol III No 5 (New Series)

JANUARY, 1936

Fifteenth Annual Meeting

American Birth Control League

Biltmore Hotel New York City

January 22nd and 23rd

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 22

- 10 00 a m ANNUAL MEETING NEW YORK STATE BIRTH CONTROL
FEDERATION
Presiding—MRS. GEORGE C BARCLAY, President
- 12 30 p m INFORMAL LUNCHEON
New York State and American Birth Control League delegates
and friends (\$1 per plate)
- 2 00 p m CLINIC ROUND TABLE
Presiding—RUTH BACKUS, Executive Secretary, Rochester Maternal Wel
fare Center
- 3 00 p m ROUND TABLE
"Publicity Problems, Meeting Opposition"
Presiding—MARGUERITE BENSON, Executive Director
Discussion—FRED O NEWMAN, *New York Herald Tribune*
MABEL TRAVIS WOOD, Publications Director

THURSDAY JANUARY 23

- 10 00 a m ANNUAL MEETING
Presiding—MRS LOUIS DEP MOORE, Chairman Executive Committee
Election of Directors—Changes in By-Laws
State League Reports—Staff Reports
- 12 30 p m ANNUAL LUNCHEON (\$1 25 per plate)
Presiding—MRS LOUIS DEB MOORE, Chairman Executive Committee
PROFESSOR STEPHEN DUGGAN, Director, Institute of International
Education — "Population and Peace"
HELEN M HARRIS, Head Worker, Union Settlement — "The Individual
and Social Change"
ERIC MATSNER, M D, Medical Director — "Modern Medicine Demands
Birth Control"
(The luncheon meeting will end promptly at 2 30)
- 3 00 p m BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
Election of Officers

1935—TWELVE MONTHS PACKED WITH EXCITING EVENTS AND TREMENDOUS PROGRESS FOR THE LEAGUE THE CEN
TERS UNDER MEDICAL DIRECTION HAVE INCREASED BY FIFTY PER CENT MEMBER LEAGUES HAVE GROWN IN
NUMBERS IN SIZE AND IN EFFICIENCY THE DECEMBER MASS MEETING HAS THROWN THE BIRTH CONTROL QUESTION
OPEN FOR PUBLIC DISCUSSION FROM COAST TO COAST COME TO THE ANNUAL MEETING AND KEEP IN TOUCH
WITH THIS HEARTENING PROGRESS COME AND HELP TO PLAN FOR WHAT PROMISES
TO BE AN EVEN BIGGER AND BETTER YEAR!

A Reply to Cardinal Hayes

This vigorous statement made public December 16 by thirteen New York clergymen marked a turning point in birth control history

THE sermon delivered by Cardinal Hayes in St Patrick's Cathedral Sunday morning, December 8th, on the subject of birth control was clearly meant to be more than a pronouncement of the Roman Catholic authorities to the members of the Church. The circumstances surrounding the delivery of the message, the fact that it was inspired by the Mass Meeting on birth control held in Carnegie Hall, December 2nd, and the statement of the Cardinal that he spoke as an *American citizen, as well as a shepherd of his flock*, make the sermon a challenge to every right thinking and morally minded man and woman in America.

No one questions that it is the duty of the Cardinal to remind the communicants of the Roman Catholic Church of its teachings on the subject of the limitation of the family and to urge Catholic men and women to live in accordance with the principles of their faith. We must, however, in the same measured, deliberate and emphatic terms employed by the Cardinal protest against any word or act of the dignitaries of the Church that would in effect impose upon other Americans the beliefs and practices of Roman Catholicism. The program advocated by the American Birth Control League and the National Committee on Federal Legislation for Birth Control is not mandatory, but permissive. It does not compel any man or woman to act contrary to his conscience or his Church. It leaves each one free to practice the principles that he believes to be wise and right. This is what is meant by democracy. For any one religious group to attempt to exercise authority over other groups, whether that authority be legal, social or ethical, is undemocratic and out of place in America.

The Cardinal, we regret to state, permits himself in this sermon to repeat arguments against birth control that have been disproved a number of times. Birth control, he insists, leads to race suicide. There is no evidence to support this assertion. A study of the vital statistics of the leading countries in the world prove that while the birth rate has dropped markedly during the last fifty years, the death rate has declined with equal rapidity. On the other hand, a high birth rate in backward countries is always accompanied by an equally high death rate. The population, in other words, is not composed of those who are born, but of those who survive. In the United States the difference between the birth rate and the death rate at present is so great as to add more than a million and a half to

the population every year. This fact does not seem to prove that America is "already a dying nation."

The Cardinal allows himself to reiterate the often answered argument that birth control is followed by decadence. The social studies that have been made of families in which birth control is an acknowledged procedure do not reveal a lower standard of morality than is found in families that do not limit the number of children. The very opposite is the case. In the large family there is a higher rate of neglect and desertion, of waywardness and delinquency than in the small family. The sanctity of the family does not depend upon conception or contraception but upon the spirit of consecration with which men and women come together in a spirit of comradeship. The same conclusions are true concerning nations. The ethical standards in Holland, England, France and the United States are certainly just as high as the standards of life in countries in which birth control is outlawed by both custom and statute. The security of the State does not depend upon laws that lead to unlimited procreation but upon the principles of social justice and the maintenance of civil rights and governmental integrity.

We agree wholeheartedly with the Cardinal that the present social system is unjust and that it is our duty to reorganize the social order in such a way as to achieve a more equitable distribution of opportunity and income. The Cardinal, however, seems unaware of the fact known to every social worker and social scientist, namely, that an excessive number of children not only undermines the health of the mother but makes it utterly impossible for the large families to lift themselves out of destitution and despair. The families and the groups that have advanced themselves in the economic scale are the very ones that have endeavored to limit the number of children.

The longest argument in the Cardinal's sermon and the one upon which he ultimately bases his case is found in the statement that birth control is contrary to the commandment of the Deity. This is true if by the Deity we mean the God that is found in ancient myth and legend. This is not true, however, if by the Deity we mean the God who is revealed in the endless sweep of evolution and whose majestic message is being slowly translated by science into the accents of the human tongue. The lower down we go in the scale of evolution the less limitation we find imposed upon the

spawning process. The higher we rise the more restriction and restraint is placed, we discover, upon the powers of reproduction. In other words, instead of violating the law of nature and nature's God through birth control we are merely giving sight and intelligence to what in nature is a blind and groping impulse. If the Cardinal chooses to accept the literal interpretation of Old Testament statements as infallible doctrine, we register no complaint, nor should he complain if we choose instead to base our faith upon the evidence, the knowledge and the experience available in our own time.

When we appeal to the Roman Catholic Church, as we do most solemnly, to withdraw its opposition to the establishment of birth control clinics and to the amendments to the law that would make possible a wider program of birth control service, we do not presume to offer to the members of the Roman Catholic communion any counsel that we believe should govern their conduct, nor do we ask the Roman Catholic Church to endorse or adopt our program. We only insist, as we believe we have a right to do in a democracy, upon the privilege of developing a system of social procedure that we believe to be socially wise and ethically correct, and that we are convinced will reduce the mortality of children, preserve mothers from invalidism and premature death, lighten the heavy burden of social distress and unemployment, and solve the urgent and acute problem of overpopulation that always leads to famine and plague, as in India and China, and that is often advanced as an excuse if not a cause for war, as in Germany, Japan and Italy today.

SIGNERS OF THIS STATEMENT

Dr Edmund B Chaffee, director, Labor Temple Presbyterian Church
 Dr Horace W B Donegan, St James Protestant Episcopal Church
 Prof Harrison S Elliott, Department of Religious Education, Union Theological Seminary
 Dr Harry Emerson Fosdick, The Riverside Church
 Dr Sidney E Goldstein, Chairman, Commission on Social Justice, Central Conference of American Rabbis
 Dr John Haynes Holmes, The Community Church, Brooklyn
 The Very Reverend Arthur B Kinsolving, II, Dean of the Cathedral of the Incarnation, Garden City, Long Island
 Dr John Howland Lathrop, Saviour-Unitarian Church, Brooklyn
 Bishop Francis J McConnell, Methodist Episcopal Church
 Dr John Howard Melish, Holy Trinity Protestant Episcopal Church
 Rev Canon H Adye Prichard, Cathedral of St John the Divine
 Dr Minot Simons, All Souls Unitarian Church
 Rabbi Milton Steinberg, Chairman, Committee on Social Justice, Rabbinical Assembly of America

EDITOR'S NOTE

More than a defense of the birth control movement, the clergymen's statement above champions the right to liberty of conscience in America. Newspapers throughout the country gave the statement as much prominence as they had accorded to Cardinal Hayes' sermon, wherein he assailed the supporters of the American Birth Control League's mass meeting as "prophets of decadence."

Cardinal Hayes' attitude was defensive when he replied to the clergymen's statement on December 19. However, he chided the clergymen for a non-moral approach and cited statistics on the decline of the birth rate in America.

Replying to the Cardinal's second statement, the clergymen repeated without reservation their stand on democracy. They concentrated upon his accusation that they had "abrogated the belief in a moral law" and, on the population question, they pointed to a statement by a group of sixteen social scientists, released on the same day. (See page 4.)

So far, more than 1,500 clippings have been received from every State and Canada on the mass meeting and the discussion growing out of it. Especially significant are the amount of space given the controversy by small town newspapers in conservative States, and the editorials and letters from the people. The majority of letters in non-Catholic publications have upheld birth control.

The second statement of the thirteen clergymen, released December 30, said in part:

"Statistics on infant mortality published by the Children's Bureau in Washington prove that the chance to survive steadily decreases for each child born after the third child in the family. The records of clinics and hospitals prove that too many and too frequent confinements not only undermine the health of the mother, but lead to invalidism and premature death.

"A policy or a program that condones or encourages these conditions is not only socially dangerous but a violation of the fundamental principle of religion and morality, namely, the sacredness of human life. On the other hand, a program or a policy such as birth control, which reduces the death rate of children, preserves and prolongs the life of mothers, which mitigates misery and distress, must be judged, if we are to remain within the realm of reason, as profoundly ethical both in essence and in social action. We contend that, when the human mind discovers a principle in the light of which man may live more nobly and in closer approximation to the great ethical ideals, this, too, is a revelation of God's will."

The Scientific Approach to Birth Control

By HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD, PH D

*President, American Sociological Society, Past President, Population Association of America
Excerpts from an address signed by fifteen outstanding sociologists and broadcasted December 29*

MUCH of the argument on the birth control question rests upon two basic assumptions. The first is that a great many people are having children whom they do not want. The second is that for some reason or other it is socially desirable that they continue to do so. About the first of these suppositions there can be little doubt. There are certainly many married couples who, because of ignorance of the achievements of modern science, are bringing children into the world not because they desire them, but as an unwelcome consequence of the relationships of normal married life, just as there are thousands of married couples who, also for the lack of modern scientific assistance, are prevented from having the children that they eagerly desire. Both of these classes need help. Concerning the second assumption there is room for a serious difference of opinion. Is it socially desirable that married couples should produce as large families as will result if no voluntary restraint is imposed? Let us see.

The human species is equipped with a reproductive capacity sufficient to provide for a very rapid geometrical increase. It is a perfectly safe estimate that mankind could double every twenty years if there were nothing to interfere with the realization of the biological equipment and the powerful instincts and urges associated with it. The most remarkable illustration of this truth is furnished by the United States. From the time when we took our first census in 1790 to the last census in 1930, the population of this country increased from four million to 123 million. That is, our population increased by about thirty one fold in 140 years. Imagine what would happen if we increased thirty one fold in the next 140 years, and similarly in the future! Opinions differ as to how much of the growth should be attributed to immigration, but even the most liberal allowance still leaves an amazing demonstration of the capacity of mankind for increase when conditions are favorable. Or, to bring the matter closer home, if the population of the United States were to continue to increase as it was actually increasing during the first part of the present century, by the end of the century we should be much more densely overcrowded than China is today. These are hard facts which cannot be removed by any sentimental considerations or appeals to some ill-defined moral law.

We are frequently told with great emphasis that in

this matter of reproduction we ought to follow natural processes, and that anything which is unnatural is sinful. Remember that the natural procedure is to allow innumerable offspring to be born, to throw them upon the mercy of a cruel, competitive world, which offers only limited means of subsistence, and to allow all the superfluous individuals to be killed off, mostly in infancy. Nature's method is control by death.

Within the last few generations intelligent and humane thinkers have raised the question whether there is not a better way, a human way, to control population. So the birth control movement was instituted, relying on the achievements of modern science, and seeking to impose the unavoidable control of population by distinctly human means, involving a minimum of suffering, loss, and social injury. But like every modern movement it incurred the opposition of institutions and interests which are heavily influenced by tradition, dogma, and formalism.

Organized religion took a prominent place in this opposition from the beginning. But as the necessity of a rational, humanitarian control of population increase came to be more clearly recognized, and the nature of the birth control movement was better understood, this religious opposition faded away in Western countries until today the only organized opposition to birth control on religious grounds, and indeed the only important organized opposition on any grounds, in the United States, emanates from the Roman Catholic Church. This makes it necessary, in discussing birth control objectively and dispassionately, to give special attention to the statements of the representatives of this body, such as those recently issued by Cardinal Hayes.

One familiar with Roman Catholic literature might easily get the impression that this Church is irrevocably opposed to birth control. This, however, would be a serious mistake. Quite the reverse is true. In a Catholic book* on the subject, which bears the official stamp of approval of Cardinal Hayes himself, appear these words: "The Catholic Church believes in birth control, but by self-control." This doctrine clearly means that married couples are not to avail themselves of the full intimacies of man and wife except on those occasions when a child is definitely desired. The other form of

*"The Case Against Birth Control," by Rev. Dr. Edward Roberts Moore.

birth control, vigorously promoted by the Catholic Church within the past few years, is the so called natural or rhythmic method, based upon a recurrent sterile period in women, which is supposed to be capable of practical determination. Arithmetical data to be used in applying this method are given in another book bearing the imprimatur of Cardinal Hayes **

In view of these facts many of the arguments used by Cardinal Hayes and other Catholic spokesmen take on a very peculiar aspect. With reference to these Catholic methods of birth control, one of two things must be true. Either they are effective, reliable and practicable, or else they are ineffective, unreliable, and impracticable. If they are effective and reliable, that is, if they have the result of enabling parents to determine the size of their families deliberately, then every argument used by Cardinal Hayes based upon the evils of a declining population, the selfish avoidance of parenthood, and the importance of large families applies to the Catholic method precisely as well as to other methods. In other words, Cardinal Hayes is arguing against himself. If these methods are not effective and practicable, then why do Catholic leaders so persistently encourage their followers to depend on them?

Although Cardinal Hayes seems strangely oblivious of the fact, the recent acts of leaders of his Church have brought the birth control movement to the situation where the only remaining ground for argument between it and those who are usually recognized as the champions of birth control is on the question of method. And it hardly need be said that there is no advocate of birth control who would not recognize the rhythmic method, and include it in his own recommendations, if it had been scientifically proved to be safe and reliable.

Many of the facts and figures which Cardinal Hayes sets forth are accurate. His interpretation, however, is frequently fallacious. To condemn birth control as unnecessary or undesirable because the birth rate is declining is like asserting that gasoline is unnecessary because your car is already running smoothly at fifty miles an hour. And to oppose a salutary decline in the rate of population growth because it may go too far is like warning a person that he should not start on a trip because he might not be able to stop when he got there. The whole purpose and spirit of the birth control movement is to bring the fundamentally important social interest of population increase under the same

control of intellect, reason, foresight, and will on which we pride ourselves in every other great department of life, and to make this human, scientific resource just as available to the less fortunate and less prosperous members of society as it has been, or may be, to those whose lot happens to be more comfortable. There is, of course, the possibility that the present decline in the rate of population growth may threaten actual underpopulation. But the surest way to forestall this result is to establish the social practice of regulating reproduction intelligently and purposefully. Society should then be able to set up new incentives and conventions to reverse the trend.

To condemn this undertaking as a violation of a great "moral law," as Cardinal Hayes does, seems to indicate a peculiar conception of the nature of morality. By the moral law, does Cardinal Hayes mean the moral code of a given society? In that case, he must be a good enough student of human affairs to know that such codes often contain many socially injurious precepts, that they are constantly changing, and that often they need to be changed as a result of intelligent analysis. Or does he mean some abstract God-given code? In that case, millions of his fellow countrymen will refuse to believe that the kind of birth control that he condemns is forbidden by any divine fiat, and will deny his right to dictate to them as to what the divine will is on this subject.

And what of the morality of an attitude that leads to such degrees of overpopulation as inevitably result in war with all its horrors and slaughter? That such is the result is attested by the very highest Catholic authority, the Pope himself, who is reported to have said last August, "In Italy there is a question of a just war a war made necessary by a population which increases day by day."

Population must be controlled, and there are only two ways of doing it, by death or by birth. Nature uses the former. Man has it in his power to use the latter, if he will. On his decision hangs the fate of national prosperity, of international peace, in fact, the whole destiny of the human race.

SIGNERS OF DR FAIRCHILD'S STATEMENT

Prof Ray E. Baber, professor of sociology at New York University

Dr Maurice A. Bigelow, director of the School of Practical Arts, Teachers College, Columbia University

Dr Guy Irving Burch, director of the Population Reference Bureau, Washington

Prof Edmund deS. Brunner, professor of sociology at Columbia University

Dr Louis I. Dublin, president of the Population Association of America

**"The Sterile Period in Family Life," by Canon Valere J. Coucke and James J. Walsh, M.D.

Prof Edward M East, professor of genetics at Harvard University
 Prof Frank Hamilton Hankins, professor of economics and sociology at Smith College
 Prof Norman E Himes, professor of sociology at Colgate University
 Prof Ellsworth Huntington, research associate in geography at Yale University and president of the American Eugenics Society
 Dr Clarence Cook Little, director of the Roscoe B Jackson Memorial Laboratory at Bar Harbor, Maine
 Dr Frank Lorimer, secretary of the Population Association of America
 Prof Harry F Perkins, former president of the American Eugenics Society
 Prof Edward Alsworth Ross, chairman of the department of sociology and anthropology, University of Wisconsin
 Prof Warren S Thompson, director of the Scripps Foundation for Research in Population Problems of Miami University, Oxford, Ohio
 Mr P K Whelpton, also of the Scripps Foundation

A Clinic for "Tobacco Road"

I WISH you ladies would tell me something to do," quietly asked a white faced mother of five as she reached the window where two young women were checking empty bottles at the Junior League Milk Station in Augusta, Georgia. She had been standing in line with her full milk bottle in one arm and her newest baby on the other.

"Do about what?" asked one of the "ladies," still counting bottles. The woman outside raised eyes like those of some animal, dumbly enduring pain. "The doctor says if I gits another young un 'fore five year hit'll kill me, an' I gits 'em ever year," she answered.

Later came a day when a milk station client with a perfect attendance record for her last three babies failed to arrive for her free quart. On visiting her home we found her in bed with one premature twin. The four older children were shut up in the next room with measles, and the other twin lay in state in the only screened spot in the house—a little coop loaned by the undertaker.

Then came the death of a thirty six year old mother, brought on by starvation and her ninth childbirth.

Thus in the old Junior League Milk Station for undernourished babies was conceived the idea of a clinic for undernourished mothers.

In February, 1934, a committee from the Augusta Junior League was appointed to investigate the possibility of interesting the doctors in adding a birth control clinic to clinics already established in the Outpatient Department of the University Hospital. Thirty eight out of forty leading physicians who were interviewed expressed approval. With the help of Dr Lom

bard Kelly, Dean of the Medical College, a resolution was drawn up which was adopted without a dissenting vote by the Richmond County Medical Society. Each of five leading welfare organizations in the city wrote a statement of the need for a birth control clinic.

Dr Melvis Corbett, who was serving as resident obstetrician at the University Hospital, volunteered her services as clinic physician. In the midst of those first days of planning came the timely visit to the Medical College of Dr Eric M Matsner, who approved our decision to send Dr Corbett to New York for special training in clinics there. The Augusta Junior League voted one hundred dollars to help defray the expenses of her stay in New York, and later voted three hundred dollars for equipping the new clinic.

Our clinic opened in July, 1934. Two sessions a week were set—Tuesdays for white women and Thursdays for colored. Each patient is charged a fee of one dollar to cover cost of contraceptive materials. This fee has been supplied for patients on the relief rolls of our Family Welfare by that organization itself. The local FERA has also paid the dollar for its clients when they were referred by its own case workers.

Missionary work among the patients attending older clinics was thought helpful in spreading the word about the new clinic. About ten young married women from the Augusta Junior League were selected to give talks to mothers visiting other clinics. Emphasis was placed on the gynecological and venereal disease clinics. The news about the birth control service, when simply told by one young mother to another, was received with pathetic gratitude.

With the colored women it was a different story. They swarmed into the gynecological clinic and into the venereal disease clinic by the hundreds, seeking treatment for "Body Trouble" and, as they described it, "Humor in de Blood." They sweated into the room where we held our talks. They nodded in approval as they fed their babies at their breasts. Then they went home and took turpentine to try to terminate a pregnancy. Or they sought the advice of a conjurer. Thursday came and went without a single patient. The talks to colored women were about to be branded as energy wasted.

Then one morning a big black sister punched another beside her and said, "Honey, if that ain't but a dollar, I b'heve I'll *jine!*" Her last word told the whole story. Realizing that this new "club" with dollar dues must compete with the "Badges" and "Hot Suppers" of lodge night, with the zest of protracted prayer meetings and open air "Baptisin's," we changed our tactics completely. Instead of telling about a clinic where a

physician prescribed the most scientific method of birth control, we told them there was a lady doctor who had just returned from *New York* with the latest style method for mothers—the same as that used by the rich ladies for years. We always stressed the fact that no operation was involved, as greater than her superstition is the average Negro woman's fear of the surgeon's knife.

The colored clientele grew to ten and twelve a Thursday. Since the visit of the field secretary of the American Birth Control League in the spring, it has also come to include mothers of six weeks' old babies. In response to her suggestion our talks were concentrated on mothers returning for a postnatal check up, the name of our clinic was changed to "Mothers' Health Clinic," and cards recommending patients to this clinic were distributed to the various hospital departments.

The "new baby" of the Richmond County Medical Society celebrated its first birthday with some four hundred patients prescribed for. With more than 4,000 families on our relief rolls, we feel that we have much need of building up the referral side of the clinic. A birth control clinic has now been established in Macon under the sponsorship of the Utility Club. We are looking forward more than ever to Georgia's membership in the American Birth Control League.

—NORA FORTSON NIXON

NOTICE OF ANNUAL MEETING

The Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the American Birth Control League will be held at 10 00 a m on Thursday, January 23rd, 1936, at the Hotel Biltmore, Madison Avenue and 43rd Street, New York City.

MARY ELLIS PELTZ, *Secretary*

The nominating committee presents the following for election to the Board of Directors

To SERVE UNTIL 1939

- Mrs George C Barclay, New York
- Mrs George D Dunning, Pennsylvania
- Prof Henry Pratt Fairchild
- Rabbi Sidney E Goldstein
- Mrs Caleb S Green, New Jersey
- Mrs Leshe D Hawkrige, Massachusetts
- Mrs John Mead Howells
- Mrs F Robertson Jones
- Mrs Edwin Levis, Missouri
- Mrs Casper Offutt, Nebraska
- Mrs A Morgan Pease, Connecticut
- Mrs Deane Small, Maine
- Eric Stone, M D, Rhode Island
- Mrs Carl Taylor
- Mrs Union Worthington, Delaware

To SERVE UNTIL 1938

- F O Plunkett, M D, Virginia
- Mrs Moritz Rosenthal
- Mrs Fred B Slee, Washington
- Mrs Henry Wilson, Indiana

To SERVE UNTIL 1937

- Mrs Benjamin Carpenter, Illinois
- Mrs Mansfield Ferry
- Niles O Monserud, South Dakota
- Mrs J Stillman Rockefeller

CHARLOTTE M MIXSELL, *Chairman*

Birth Control Review

Published Monthly by the

AMERICAN BIRTH CONTROL LEAGUE, Inc
515 MADISON AVENUE, NEW YORK, N Y

*Sent to all members of the League
and affiliated State Leagues*

VOL III No 5 (New Series)

JANUARY, 1936

AMERICAN BIRTH CONTROL LEAGUE

- MRS F ROBERTSON JONES *Honorary President*
- MRS FRANCIS N BANGS *President*
- MRS LEWIS L DELAFIELD *First Vice President*
- MRS FREDERICK G ATKINSON MRS RICHARD BILLINGS MRS DEXTER BLAGDEN MRS BENJAMIN CARPENTER CLARENCE GAMBLE M D *Vice Presidents*
- MRS FREDERIC CROMWELL *Treasurer*
- MRS JOHN DEWITT PELTZ *Secretary*
- MRS LOUIS DEB MOORE *Chairman Executive Committee*

DIRECTORS AT LARGE

- A N Creadick M D
- Henry Pratt Fairchild Ph D
- Mrs Mansfield Ferry
- Mrs Morris Hadley
- Frederick C Holden M D
- Mrs John Mead Howells
- Mrs Roger Howson
- Mrs John Humpstone
- Mrs Thomas S Lamont
- Mrs David Levy
- Clarence C Little Sc D
- Mrs Robert McC Marsh
- Mrs Harold Mixsell
- Stuart Mudd M D
- Richard N Pierson M D
- Mrs J Stillman Rockefeller
- Mrs René Seligmann
- Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver
- Benjamin T Tilton M D
- Mrs Leslie J Tompkins
- Ira S Wile M D
- Mrs Willis D Wood

MEDICAL BOARD

- Alexander M Campbell M D Michigan
- Franklin G Ebaugh M D Colorado
- J Shelton Horsley M D Virginia
- Foster Kennedy M D New York
- Rae T LaVake M D Minnesota
- William Palmer Lucas M D California
- James R McCord M D Georgia
- Eric M Matsner M D New York
- William Allen Pusey M D Illinois
- Irving F Stein M D Illinois
- Fred J Taussig M D Missouri
- Howard C Taylor Jr M D New York
- Tiffany J Williams M D Virginia
- Milton C Winternitz M D Connecticut
- Hans Zinsser M D Massachusetts

STAFF

- MARGUERITE BENSON *Executive Director*
- ERIC M MATSNER M D *Medical Director*
- DORIS C DAVIDSON R N *Field Secretary*
- JANET B WHITENACK *Headquarters Secretary*
- MABEL TRAVIS WOOD *Publications Director*

AFFILIATED STATE ORGANIZATIONS

- ARKANSAS EUGENICS ASSOCIATION
- CONNECTICUT BIRTH CONTROL LEAGUE
- DELAWARE BIRTH CONTROL LEAGUE
- ILLINOIS BIRTH CONTROL LEAGUE
- MATERNAL HEALTH LEAGUE OF INDIANA
- IOWA MATERNAL HEALTH LEAGUE
- KENTUCKY BIRTH CONTROL LEAGUE
- MAINE BIRTH CONTROL LEAGUE
- BIRTH CONTROL LEAGUE OF MASSACHUSETTS
- MATERNAL HEALTH LEAGUE OF MICHIGAN
- MINNESOTA BIRTH CONTROL LEAGUE
- MATERNAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION OF MISSOURI
- MATERNAL HEALTH LEAGUE OF NEBRASKA
- NEW JERSEY BIRTH CONTROL LEAGUE
- NEW YORK STATE BIRTH CONTROL FEDERATION
- NORTH CAROLINA MATERNAL HEALTH LEAGUE
- PENNSYLVANIA BIRTH CONTROL FEDERATION
- RHODE ISLAND BIRTH CONTROL LEAGUE
- SOUTH DAKOTA BIRTH CONTROL LEAGUE
- VIRGINIA BIRTH CONTROL LEAGUE
- WASHINGTON MOTHERS CLINIC ASSOCIATION

New England Regional Conference

Delegates from all New England States will gather in Boston on February 19 for the first New England Regional Conference on Birth Control, to be held under the auspices of the Birth Control League of Massachusetts and the American Birth Control League. Headquarters will be the Copley Plaza Hotel. Among the questions to be discussed are cooperation with social agencies, consultation on marital problems, how to organize a clinic, and service for rural communities. Further details may be secured from Mrs. Morton Prince at the Massachusetts League's headquarters, 3 Joy Street, Boston.

An Important Interpretation

A package of birth control devices, sent by Baroness Ishimoto of Japan to Dr. Hannah M. Stone, medical director of the Birth Control Clinical Research Bureau of New York City, for research purposes, was ordered admitted to the United States on January 6 by Judge Grover M. Moscowitz of the United States District Court. The package, sent two years ago, had been seized by customs authorities who acted in accordance with the provision of the customs law which prohibits the importation of birth control writings, drugs and devices. The case had been accepted as a test of the legality of the use of contraceptives under medical supervision.

Judge Moscowitz said "Taken literally, the language of the statute would seem to forbid the importation of any article for the prevention of conception, even

though the article might be capable of legitimate uses and the importer intended that it should be so used. Such a construction would prevent the importation by physicians of any article for the prevention of conception, even though the physician desired to use it for the purpose of saving a human life.

"The claimant (Dr. Stone) having imported the libeled articles for experimental purposes to determine their reliability and usefulness as contraceptives to cure or prevent disease, a lawful purpose, it must be held that the libeled articles do not come within the condemnation of the statute and a decree must be entered for the claimant dismissing the libel and directing the return of the articles."

Judge Moscowitz pointed out that recognized physicians and surgeons, including Dr. Frederick W. Bancroft, a government witness in the case, testified that "from a medical standpoint there are various types of cases in which it is necessary to prescribe a contraceptive to cure or prevent disease, and that the medical profession is in agreement as to the necessity of contraceptives for that purpose."

—From a report in the *New York Herald-Tribune* January 7

Milwaukee Center Expands Program

The Maternal Health Center of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, has been accepted as an affiliated unit of the American Birth Control League. The center is planning an aggressive program for members, for publicity and for enlisting further interest among physicians of the State. Mrs. James H. Niedecken is acting president.

DOUBLE THE REVIEW'S CIRCULATION—PASS THIS COPY ON TO A FRIEND

Birth Control Review

Published monthly by the
American Birth Control League, Inc.
515 Madison Avenue New York N. Y.

•

Sent to all members of the American Birth Control League and affiliated State Leagues

Sec 502 PL&R
U S POSTAGE
PAID
New York N Y
PERMIT No 8388