

Children by Choice?

Wertewandel im 20. Jahrhundert

Band 3

Herausgegeben von Andreas Rödter

*Ann-Katrin Gembries, Theresia Theuke,
Isabel Heinemann (Eds.)*

Children by Choice?

Changing Values, Reproduction, and Family
Planning in the 20th Century

DE GRUYTER
OLDENBOURG

ISBN 978-3-11-052202-0
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-052449-9
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-052206-8
ISSN 2366-9446

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018934561

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

© 2018 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

Satz: le-tex publishing services GmbH, Leipzig

www.degruyter.com

Contents

Theresia Theuke

Introduction: Children by Choice? Changing Values, Reproduction, and Family Planning in the 20th Century	7
--	---

Ann-Katrin Gembries

Birth Control as a National Threat? Pronatalist Discourses on Abortion in France and Germany (1920s–1970s)	21
--	----

Claudia Roesch

“Children by Choice” – Family Decisions and Value Change in the Campaigns of the American Planned Parenthood Federation (1942–1973)	57
---	----

Eszter Varsa

“Respect girls as future mothers”: Sex Education as Family Life Education in State Socialist Hungary (1950s–1980s)	77
--	----

Yuliya Hilevykh, Chizu Sato

Popular Medical Discourses on Birth Control in the Soviet Union during the Cold War: Shifting Responsibilities and Relational Values	99
--	----

Agata Ignaciuk

Paradox of the Pill: Oral Contraceptives in Spain and Poland (1960s–1970s)	123
--	-----

Fiammetta Balestracci

The Influence of American Sexual Studies on the ‘Sexual Revolution’ of Italian Women	145
--	-----

Radka Dudová

Discourses on Abortion and their Impact on Institutions in Czechoslovakia and the Czech Republic in the Second Half of the 20th Century (1950–2003)	163
---	-----

Rona Torenz

Narratives about Contraception and Abortion in the GDR (1972–1990) Caught between a Liberal Law, Normative Ways of Living and the Individualization of Family Planning	189
--	-----

Isabel Heinemann

From “Children by Choice” to “Families by Choice”? 20 th -Century Reproductive Decision-Making between Social Change and Normative Transitions	215
---	-----

Authors	237
-------------------	-----

Theresia Theuke

Introduction: Children by Choice? Changing Values, Reproduction, and Family Planning in the 20th Century

How have attitudes, thought, speech and action changed in the last century with regard to family planning and reproduction? Can these changes be represented as a “change in values”, i.e., a long-term change in standards, values and practices around reproduction – and if so, how? These questions were at the center of an international conference entitled “Making Children? 20th Century Value Changes in Human Reproduction and Family Planning”, held in April 2016 at the Johannes Gutenberg University in Mainz, which emerged from the research project “Values and value change in modernity and postmodernity”.

The conference participants from Austria, Germany, France, the Netherlands, the Czech Republic, Poland and Italy examined various negotiation processes in the 20th century regarding techniques and practices of sexuality, reproduction and family planning in the context of value shifts and changing attitudes. It turned out that the process of negotiation and change was very different in the context of the varieties of forms of government, societies and cultures studied, and that narrative and justification patterns for the introduction of contraceptives or the legalization of abortion were not only different, but sometimes even contradictory.

Phenomenology of Family Planning and Reproduction

In today's societies, it is self-evident that children can not only be begotten and planned but also “made”. The medical and technical achievements of the twentieth century, such as the introduction of the latex condom in the 1930s, the admission of the pill as a hormonal contraceptive in the 1960s, or the establishment of in vitro fertilization since the end of the 1970s, not only enabled the prevention but also the exact planning of the next generation. The separation of sexuality and reproduction and the associated decoupling of parents and partnerships, which was made possible by the pill no later than the 1960s, as well as the associated increase in liberties in family planning and life-style, were not without an effect on the actors and social structures involved. In addition, the introduction and spread of chemical and mechanical contraceptives affected and influenced the social forms of the family, population development and gen-

der relations, which were anchored in different cultures¹. The discussions on the legalization of abortion as a subsequent means of birth control and family planning also changed attitudes regarding the value of life, women's rights, and provoked discussions about the limitations and possibilities of family planning.

The changes described here, which took place at different times in cultures and nations with different aims and characteristics, necessitated a change in values and norms which can also be regarded as the result of such a process. The discussions about the introduction of contraceptives and the legalization of abortion reflect the values and value changes of the respective actors. For example, in the debate about the legalization of abortion, there were two mutually exclusive values: on the one hand the position of the absolute right to life for the embryo and, on the other, the focus on the individual right to self-determination of the woman. In the past century, the disputes over the legalization of abortion not only had an unprecedented political and social explosiveness, but also led to a change in values, not just with respect to the enforcement of women's rights over their bodies and their reproduction, but at the same time over determining the status of the embryo and its rights.

Overall, in the development and change processes of family planning and reproduction in the 20th century, reproductive decisions in modern societies were both preventively influenced by the use of contraceptive measures and permissively by the termination of an existing pregnancy. Family planning by means of mechanical, chemical or natural aids was evaluated quite differently, morally, legally and ethically in the private and public spaces of various societies and from the point of view of the couples and women affected by them. It also concerned the assessment of abortion, its legal admissibility, and its social acceptance.

The multi-layered controversies surrounding family planning and reproduction, which have sprung up since the second half of the 20th century at the latest, show a strong tendency towards state intervention in a highly private sphere of life. The parliamentary conflicts and the attempt to influence, control and regulate the sexuality, reproduction and family planning of couples and women by means of legal regulations provoked debates, which were carried out depending on the nation under consideration by different social and political actors and groupings. Thus, the state assessments of the legal admissibility of contraceptives and access to abortions were closely linked to the commitment of women's movements, which claimed their reproductive autonomy in the various states, which included access to preventive means, sterilization and legal

¹ More recent studies show that the impact of the pill on population development and its importance for the so-called "sexual revolution" are less striking than generally assumed. For further information, see Lutz Niethammer, Silke Satjukow (eds.), „Wenn die Chemie stimmt“. Geschlechterbeziehungen und Geburtenkontrolle im Zeitalter der "Pille", Göttingen 2016, p. 9–34.

abortion according to medical standards and the promotion of sex education and awareness training. The Catholic Church, however, continued to oppose this attitude and demanded a ban on abortions and a more conservative sexual morality. These two weighty counterparts, the Catholic Church and Women's Movements, reveal the tremendous explosive force of the disputes about changes in family planning and reproduction, which must be considered a central part of the historical development of the negotiation processes for reproduction and family planning from the beginning of the 20th century until the 1970s. Moreover, change processes cannot be viewed as isolated phenomena, but as always taking place in the context of political, social, economic and cultural transformations.

Approaches to Research Literature

In the scientific literature of various disciplines, based on a large number of publications, there is a great interest in dealing with the controversies surrounding family planning, sexuality and reproduction. The negotiation processes have been dealt with especially in sociological research and increasingly also in the literature of historical science. In the majority of the scientific approaches to a study of the negotiation processes, these are partial studies which analyze individual aspects on a short-term basis². In addition, the largest number of

² On the history of abortion, see Ulrike Busch, Daphne Hahn (eds.), *Abtreibung. Diskurse und Tendenzen*, Bielefeld 2014; Gisela Staupe (ed.), *Unter anderen Umständen. Zur Geschichte der Abtreibung. Katalog zur gleichnamigen Ausstellung des Deutschen Hygiene-Museums* Dresden, Berlin 1993; Donna Harsch, *Society, the State, and Abortion in East Germany, 1950–1972*, in: *American Historical Review* 102/1 (1997), p. 53–85; Michael Gante, § 218 in Diskussion. Meinungs- und Willensbildung 1945–1976 (Forschungen und Quellen zur Zeitgeschichte, 21), Düsseldorf 1991; Daphne Hahn, *Modernisierung und Biopolitik. Sterilisation und Schwangerschaftsabbruch in Deutschland nach 1945* (Campus Forschung, 804), Frankfurt a. M. 2000. Studies on sexual history include Dagmar Herzog, *Sexuality in Europe. A Twentieth Century History*, Cambridge, 2011; Peter-Paul Bänziger, Magdalena Beljan, Franz X. Eder et al. (eds.), *Sexuelle Revolution? Zur Geschichte der Sexualität im deutschsprachigen Raum seit den 1960er Jahren*, Bielefeld 2015. Developments in family planning, reproduction, and birth control were discussed among others by Cornelia Usborne, *Frauenkörper – Volkskörper. Geburtenkontrolle und Bevölkerungspolitik in der Weimarer Republik*, Münster 1994; Merith Niehuss, *Familie, Frau und Gesellschaft. Studien zur Strukturgeschichte der Familie in Westdeutschland*, Göttingen 2001; Matthew Connelly, *Fatal Misconception. The Struggle to Control World Population*, Cambridge 2008. On the history of reproductive medicine and gene technology see, among others, Elisabeth Beck-Gernsheim, *Technik, Markt und Moral. Über Reproduktionsmedizin und Gentechnologie*, Frankfurt a. M. 1991; Andreas Bernard, *Kinder machen. Neue Reproduktionstechnologien und die Ordnung der Familie. Samenspende, Leihmütter und Künstliche Befruchtung*,

studies chooses a narrow temporal and geographical perspective, although there are isolated studies that take a contrasting comparison of situations in different countries as their starting point³.

Analyses that take into account longer periods of time and thus allow for the presentation of a change remain the exception, such as the collection of essays "Inventing the Modern American Family" edited by Isabel Heinemann, which examines the changes and value shifts of the concept of the family in the US in the 20th century⁴. The analysis of the history of abortion, presented by Silvia De Zordo, Joanna Mishtal and Lorena Anton in "A Fragmented Landscape. Abortion Governance and Protest Logics in Europe" also presents an international perspective, although the majority of the authors approach the issues from a sociological and ethnographical perspective rather than a historical one⁵. The collection "Reproductive States" edited by Rickie Solinger and Mie Nakachi examines the strategies and mechanisms of the population control of selected states and shows how population control became a global issue⁶. In the anthology "Wenn die Chemie stimmt" ("If the Chemistry is Right"), Lutz Niethammer and Silke Satjukow offer a review of the political and cultural significance of the pill for reconciling family and career, for sexuality and gender relations, as well as the historical and social-structural preconditions provided for the establishment of a chemical contraceptive⁷.

Bonn 2014; Michi Knecht, Maren Klotz, Stefan Beck (eds.), *Reproductive Technologies as Global Form. Ethnographies of Knowledge, Practices, and Transnational Encounters* (Eigene und fremde Welt, 19), New York 2012; Chikako Takeshita, *The Global Biopolitics of the IUD. How Science Constructs Contraceptive Users and Womens' Bodies*, Cambridge Mass. 2012. On the history of the pill in the Federal Republic of Germany see the monograph by Eva-Maria Silies, *Liebe, Lust und Last. Die Pille als weibliche Generationserfahrung der Bundesrepublik 1960–1980*, Göttingen 2010; For the US perspective see Elaine Tyler May, *America and the Pill. A History of Promise, Peril, and Liberation*, New York 2010; Bernhard Asbell, *The Pill. A Biography of the Drug That Changed the World*, New York 1995; Elizabeth Siegel Watkins, *On the Pill. A Social History of Oral Contraceptives, 1950–1970*, Baltimore, London 1998.

³ For example, see Ann-Katrin Gembries, *Von der Fortpflanzungspflicht zum Recht auf Abtreibung. Werte und Wertewandel im Spiegel französischer Parlamentsdebatten über Geburtenkontrolle 1920–1974*, in: Bernhard Dietz, Christopher Neumaier, Andreas Rödder (eds.), *Gab es den Wertewandel? Neue Forschungen zum gesellschaftlich-kulturellen Wandel seit den 1960er Jahren*, München 2014, p. 307–333; Agata Ignaciuk, Teresa Ortiz-Gómez, *Anticoncepción, mujeres y género. La "píldora" en España y Polonia (1960–1980)*, Madrid 2016; Silvia de Zordo, Joanna Mishtal, Lorena Anton (eds.), *A Fragmented Landscape. Abortion Governance and Protest Logics in Europe*, New York 2016.

⁴ See Isabel Heinemann (ed.), *Inventing the Modern American Family. Family Values and Social Change in 20th Century United States*, Frankfurt a. M. 2012.

⁵ See de Zordo, Mishtal, Anton (eds.), *A Fragmented Landscape* (as in n. 3).

⁶ See Rickie Solinger, Mie Nakachi, *Reproductive States. Global Perspectives on the Invention and Implementation of Population Policy*, New York 2017.

⁷ See Niethammer, Satjukow (eds.), *"Wenn die Chemie stimmt"* (as in n. 1).

As a result, the existing studies show changes in attitudes and assessments with regard to changes in the practical use of the medical and technical possibilities of family planning and reproduction, without explicitly considering the aspect of changes in value settings.

Social Sciences and Historical Value Change Research in Modernity and Postmodernity

The interest of the authors of this anthology is concerned with the classification and presentation of value-change processes over the past century. Thus, the contributions not only reflect the historical developments in family planning and reproduction in the course of the 20th century, but also reflect on the changes in values and value decisions in the controversies about the use of medical and technical possibilities for family planning and reproduction by keeping the background of cultural history and social change processes at the center of their respective analyses. They systematically investigate the underlying trends of and basis for changes of values in the field of reproduction and close a gap in the existing field of research. In this way, the anthology contributes to the study of value-change processes in the twentieth century and links both thematically and methodically to the research project entitled “Values and value change in modernity and postmodernity”.

Typically, the description of sociocultural change processes is the subject of socio-scientific research which, based on surveys, provides possible justifications for the change of values. The American sociologist Ronald Inglehart gave a first significant explanation in 1977 with his work “The Silent Revolution”, in which he stated: “The values of Western publics have been shifting from an overwhelming emphasis on material well-being and physical security toward greater emphasis on the quality of life.”⁸ His thesis concerning the shift from material to post-material values first dominated the socio-scientific controversy about the description of value change in postmodern societies, due both to its restriction to the categories of “materialism” and “postmaterialism”, as well as the methodological narrowing in place since the mid-1980s, which have been

⁸ Ronald Inglehart, *The Silent Revolution. Changing Values and Political Styles Among Western Publics*, Princeton NJ 1977, p. 3.

critically reviewed by the German sociologist Helmut Klages⁹. In his paper “Changes in Value Orientation” he described changes in values as a transition from “compulsory and accepted values” to “self-development values”¹⁰. He portrayed the change not as linear, as Inglehart had done, or as a “depreciation” as described by Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann, director of the Allensbach Institute, but rather as a pluralization of values¹¹.

The limitation of socio-scientific value-change research to the period after 1960 and the concentration on the evaluation of selectively collected demoscopic data did not make it possible to analyze and describe value changes over longer periods of time. In addition, on the basis of the sociological methodology, no conclusions could be drawn about the causes, mechanisms, patterns of progress underlying changes and long-term developmental tendencies¹². In addition to the question of the suitability of social-scientific methodology for the description of value-change processes, the history of science has recently dealt with the study of changes in values that go beyond the depiction of trends and accent shifts in tightly defined time frames and subject areas¹³.

⁹ Another well-known critic of Inglehart’s explanatory approach was the German sociologist Helmut Thome, *Wertewandel in der Politik? Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Ingleharts Thesen zum Postmaterialismus*, Berlin 1985; Id., *Wertewandel aus Sicht der empirischen Sozialforschung*, in: Hans Joas, Klaus Wiegandt (eds.), *Die kulturellen Werte Europas*, Frankfurt a. M. 2006, p. 386–443.

¹⁰ Cited by: Helmut Klages, *Wertorientierungen im Wandel. Rückblick, Gegenwartsanalyse, Prognosen*, Frankfurt a. M. 1984, p. 17–18.

¹¹ Cf. Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann, *Werden wir alle Proletarier? Wertewandel in unserer Gesellschaft*, Zürich 1979; Renate Köcher, *Die verletzte Nation. Über den Versuch der Deutschen, ihren Charakter zu ändern*, Stuttgart 1988. A critical reflection of the methodology and explanatory approaches of Inglehart and Klages is provided by: Wilhelm Bürkelin, Markus Klein, Achim Ruß, *Dimensionen des Wertewandels. Eine empirische Längsschnittanalyse zur Dimensionalität und der Wandlungsdynamik gesellschaftlicher Wertorientierungen*, in: *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* 35 (1994), p. 579–606.

¹² Karl-Heinz Hillmann provides an overview of sociological value-change research in: *Zur Wertewandelsforschung. Einführung, Überblick und Ausblick*, in: Georg W. Oesterdiekhoff, Norbert Jegelka (eds.), *Werte und Wertewandel in westlichen Gesellschaften. Resultate und Perspektiven der Sozialwissenschaften*, Opladen 2001, p. 15–39; Helmut Thome, *Wertewandel in Europa aus der Sicht der empirischen Sozialforschung*, in: Hans Joas, Klaus Wiegandt (eds.), *Die kulturellen Werte Europas*, Frankfurt a. M. (2005), p. 386–443.

¹³ Cf. Helmut Thome, *Wandel gesellschaftlicher Wertvorstellungen aus der Sicht der empirischen Sozialforschung*, in: Dietz, Neumaier, Rödder (eds.), *Gab es den Wertewandel? (as in n. 3)*, p. 41–69; Bernhard Dietz, Christopher Neumaier, *Vom Nutzen der Sozialwissenschaften für die Zeitgeschichte. Werte und Wertewandel als Gegenstand historischer Forschung*, in: *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 60 (2012), p. 293–304; Bernhard Dietz, Jörg Neuheiser (eds.), *Wertewandel in der Wirtschaft und Arbeitswelt. Arbeit, Leistung und Führung in den 1970er und 1980er Jahren in der Bundesrepublik*, Berlin, Boston 2017; Rüdiger Graf, Kim Christian Priemel, *Zeitgeschichte in der Welt der Sozialwissenschaften. Legitimität und Originalität einer Disziplin*, in: *Vierteljahrsheft für Zeitgeschichte* 59 (2011), p. 479–508.

In a historical-diachronic perspective, historical value-change research takes its own methodological approach into the process of value-change and examines it as a cultural-historical and social phenomenon¹⁴. Historical value-change research in this way goes beyond the focus of social science research of the 1960s and 1970s by instead considering phenomena and facets of value change throughout the 20th century. The extension of the temporal reference framework and the consistent historicalization allows the contextualization and embedding of the value change into cultural and social change processes and the analysis of the interactions of different influencing factors. In addition, historical value-change research can make statements about the origin and development of regulatory standards and collective values being considered¹⁵. “Values” are defined in this context in accordance with the definition offered by the American sociologist Clyde Kluckhohn as “[...] general and fundamental normative prescriptions that define ideas, speech and actions at the individual and collective level which can be explicitly articulated or implicitly assumed.”¹⁶

Andreas Rödder, Bernhard Dietz and Christoph Neumaier have developed the “value-change triangle” in order to confirm the change in values. This is an analytical starting point for the investigation of value-change processes in a comprehensive overall context, since it focuses on the interrelated social practice, institutional framework and discursively negotiated values¹⁷. The three poles point to the possible discourse levels that must be investigated if value-change processes are to be comprehensively captured from a historical perspective. In addition to expert, policy and broad-based discourse, the individual level is

¹⁴ See the article by Andreas Rödder, *Wertewandel in historischer Perspektive. Ein Forschungskonzept*, in: Dietz, Neumaier, Id. (eds.), *Gab es den Wertewandel?*, p. 17–39.

¹⁵ In this way, historical value-change research is not only a step further than the socio-scientific explanatory approaches, but also in the history of mentality, which in particular examines the world images, forms of thought and attitudes of the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Age. See also the keynote contributions of Volker Sellin, *Mentalitäten in der Sozialgeschichte*, in: Wolfgang Schieder, Volker Sellin (eds.), *Sozialgeschichte in Deutschland. Entwicklungen und Perspektiven im internationalen Zusammenhang*, Bd. 3, Göttingen 1987, p. 101–121; František Graus (ed.) *Mentalitäten im Mittelalter. Methodische und inhaltliche Probleme* (Vorträge und Forschungen / Konstanzer Arbeitskreis für Mittelalterliche Geschichte, 35), Sigmaringen 1987; Ulrich Raulff, André Burguière (eds.), *Mentalitäten-Geschichte. Zur historischen Rekonstruktion geistiger Prozesse*, Berlin 1987 sowie die Überblicksdarstellung von Ute Daniel, *Kompendium Kulturgeschichte. Theorie, Praxis, Schlüsselwörter*, Frankfurt a. M. ⁵2006, p. 221–230.

¹⁶ Andreas Rödder, *Wertewandel in historischer Perspektive. Ein Forschungskonzept*, in: Dietz, Neumaier, Id. (eds.), *Gab es den Wertewandel?*, p. 29. For Clyde Kluckhohn's definition see Clyde Kluckhohn, *Values and Value-Orientations in the Theory of Action. An Exploration in Definition and Classification*, in: Talcott Parsons, Edward Albert Shils, *Toward a General Theory of Action*, Cambridge, Massachusetts 1967, p. 388–433.

¹⁷ See, for example, Dietz, Neumaier, *Vom Nutzen der Sozialwissenschaften für die Zeitgeschichte* (as in n. 13), p. 293–304.

subjected to a more detailed analysis. Thus, historical value-change research places social values, social practices and institutional frameworks in relation to one another, and links them to general social, political, cultural and economic transformation processes¹⁸.

Such a way of assessing values makes it possible, aside from known explanatory models, to analyze and present changes in values in post-industrial societies. The first works to research the centralized values of Western industrialization as a whole appear or are being undertaken in historical science sub-studies of the fields of employment¹⁹, education²⁰, family²¹ and the value of life²².

About these Proceedings

The research assembled here shows that a focus on the changing processes of norms, values and practices as well as the comparative view on values, value changes and socio-cultural transformation processes can gain a lot from an international perspective.

This collection addresses this research aim. The studies gathered here discuss how the thought, speech and action with regard to children and family planning

¹⁸ See Andreas Rödder, *Wertewandel und Postmoderne. Gesellschaft und Kultur der Bundesrepublik*, Stuttgart 2004; Bernhard Dietz, *Zur Theorie des „Wertewandels“*. Ein Schlüssel für sozialen und mentalen Wandel in der Geschichte?, in: Peter Dinzelbacher, Friedrich Harrer (eds.), *Wandlungsprozesse der Mentalitätsgeschichte*, Baden-Baden 2015, p. 25–47; Isabel Heinemann, *Wertewandel*, Version: 1.0, in: Docupedia-Zeitgeschichte, 22.10.2012, URL: <http://docupedia.de/zg/Wertewandel?oldid=125455>.

¹⁹ See the articles in: Dietz, Neuheiser (eds.), *Wertewandel in der Wirtschaft und Arbeitswelt* (as in n. 13); Bernhard Dietz, *Wertewandel in der Wirtschaft? Die leitenden Angestellten und die Konflikte um Mitbestimmung und Führungsstil in den siebziger Jahren*, in: Id., Neumaier, Rödder (eds.), *Gab es den Wertewandel?*, p. 169–197; Jörg Neuheiser, *Vom bürgerlichen Arbeitsethos zum postmaterialistischen Arbeiten? Werteforschung, neue Arbeitsmarktsemantik und betriebliche Praxis in den 1970er Jahren*, in: Jörn Leonhard, Willibald Steinmetz (eds.), *Semantiken von Arbeit. Diachrone und vergleichende Perspektiven* (Industrielle Welt, 91), Köln 2016, p. 319–346.

²⁰ Cf. Anna Kranzdorf, *Vom Leitbild zum Feindbild? Zum Bedeutungswandel des altsprachlichen Unterrichts in den 1950er/1960er Jahren der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*, in: Dietz, Neumaier, Rödder (eds.), *Gab es den Wertewandel?*, p. 337–362.

²¹ See Heinemann (ed.), *Inventing the Modern American Family* (as in n. 4); Claudia Roesch, *Macho Men and Modern Women. Mexican Immigration, Social Experts and Changing Family Values in the 20th Century United States*, Berlin, Boston 2015; Christopher Neumaier, *Von der bürgerlichen Kernfamilie zur Pluralität familialer Lebensformen? Zum Wandel der Familienwerte in Westdeutschland in den 1960er und 1970er Jahren*, in: Frank Bösch, Martin Sabrow (eds.), *ZeitRäume. Potsdamer Almanach des Zentrums für Zeithistorische Forschung 2012/2013*, Göttingen 2013, p. 133–144.

²² See the research projects of Ann-Katrin Gembries and Theresia Theuke.

changed in the face of new medical-technical possibilities of human reproduction, and whether these changes in Western Europe and the USA, but also in Eastern and Southern Europe, may be described as a change in values in the 20th century²³.

The geographically wide-ranging studies lead to a broadened perspective on the value-driven handling of reproduction and family planning and make it possible to identify and express the specifics of national solutions and the interactions between states. In addition, the extended temporal frame of reference of these studies allows for the analysis and representation of breaks, continuities and shifts of value propositions, and at the same time serves to critically review central social science theses such as the assumption of a “change in value”²⁴ between 1965 and 1975 or the description of the value change in the “individualization thesis”²⁵.

Looking at the historical depictions of the treatment processes of family planning and reproduction, the disputes about the legalization of abortion are particularly striking because they were characterized not only by the vehemence with which they were carried out but also by the enormous speed of the process of change caused by them. The practice of abortions worldwide was, until a few decades ago, socially and legally penalized by majorities, and not accepted as a means of subsequent birth-control systems. The tendency to allow women access to abortions not only legally but also financially in the second half of the twentieth century in many European countries and the USA resulted in majority-backed legislation which legalized abortion in general or under defined conditions. The compromise solutions between life protection on the one hand and personal rights claims on the other hand, which have been achieved in violent social and parliamentary disputes, have been and remain controversial. Already just the controversies surrounding the issue of abortion reveal a change in ethical, moral and legal assessments and provoke questions about the contents of a possible value change. For example, it is important to ask which opinions and evaluations in the respective societies were dominant in relation to issues of sexuality, reproduction, pregnancy, embryos and birth, and how they changed.

²³ Exceptions are the collections of de Zordo, Mishtal, Anton (eds.), *A Fragmented Landscape*; Niethammer, Satjukow (eds.), “Wenn die Chemie stimmt”.

²⁴ In this way Helmut Klages characterized the consolidation of value-change processes from the mid-1960s to the end of the 1970s. See Helmut Klages, *Traditionsbruch als Herausforderung. Perspektiven der Wertewandelsgesellschaft*, Frankfurt a. M. 1994, p. 45.

²⁵ The “individualization thesis” was formulated the first time in 1986 in: Ulrich Beck, *Risikogesellschaft. Auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne*, Frankfurt a. M. 1986. It was thus linked to the observation by Helmut Klages, *Wertorientierungen im Wandel* (as in n. 10), p. 17f. of a shift from “compulsory and acceptance values to self-development values”, thus describing the tendency to dissolve social classes, structures, and institutions such as the family or marriage.

The assessment of family, parenthood and private life as well as the role of religion, law and medicine must be examined as well as the relationship between the individual and the collective. Furthermore, one can ask whether there was a change in values regarding reproduction and family planning, and, if one is identified, what its pattern was. Was it a linear, continuous development or a back and forth process characterized by shifts and counter-movements? What was the role of social actors such as women's movements, churches or private educational initiatives within these transformation processes? What interests did they pursue? However, the question must also be asked about the impact of the medical and technical achievements on social practice, the values within society and the institutional framework.

In this sense, some contributions examine the influence of scientific and medical expert groups on reproduction decisions (Fiametta Balestracci, Yuliya Hilevych, Chizu Sato). Furthermore, they analyze the state-legal framework of family planning (Agata Ignaciuk, Radka Dudová) and focus on the analysis of public discourses, as expressed in articles and surveys (Fiametta Balestracci, Agata Ignaciuk) and political debates (Radka Dudová, Ann-Katrin Gembries). Other papers focus on the investigation of education and family counselling by private or state-sponsored institutions, such as women's and patients' networks, pro-life organizations or medical associations (Eszter Varsa, Claudia Roesch, Agata Ignaciuk). In addition, in some articles the public and political discussions of prevention methods such as the pill, sterilization or condoms are examined in different political systems (Agata Ignaciuk, Ann-Katrin Gembries) or private birth control and family planning (Rona Torenz). Finally, the contribution by Isabel Heinemann undertakes a mapping of the differences and similarities between standard and attitudinal changes as well as reproductive practices in modern societies.

The essays contained in this collection cover the complexity of the decision-making processes in the area of reproduction and family planning. Against the background of the respective political and social systems and developments in Germany and abroad, the actors' choices as well as the institutional decision-making are analyzed. The relevance of the individual actors for the further development of negotiating processes proves to be quite different depending on the state concerned. The comparison of Catholic countries, as in the essay by Agata Ignaciuk, which compares the introduction of the pill in Poland and Spain, shows that there were sometimes huge differences between countries which displayed some moral or structural analogies. At the same time, national, ideological and political boundaries reveal clear similarities and differences in the way they deal with family planning, population policy, access to abortion, the moral and economic evaluation of the role of women, the dominant family concepts or the existence of eugenic aspirations.

In addition to the comparative possibilities resulting from the geographic and ideological differences of the countries under investigation, the long investigation period of just under 100 years makes it possible to present continuities, breaks and shifts in a temporal dimension. The temporal arc of the studies gathered here stretches from the eugenics and world population congresses of the 1920s and 1930s to the legalization of abortion in Eastern bloc states in the 1950s and in societies in the West in the 1970s. It also takes into account discussions on sex education, family planning, contraception, and abortion during the 1980s and 1990s. This long period of time makes it possible to examine the change in value settings in reproduction and family planning well beyond the period of the 1960s and 1970s, which has been identified as a watershed in reproductive decision-making so far.

Composition of the Volume

The collected contributions unite behind the research interest in tracing changes in thought, speech and act concerning family planning and reproduction – precisely against the background of different chronological, substantive and national focal points. It is not a question of developing general explanatory models for the transformation of values in the modern age, but rather to show facets of value change.

Therefore, it seemed appropriate to present the articles in chronological order. Thus, an essay by **Ann-Katrin Gembries** opens the anthology. In her contribution she analyzes contrasting changes in standards of argumentation within French and German debates on birth control and abortion from the 1920s until the 1970s. She notes the great importance of pronatalistic arguments at the beginning of the investigation period, which, however, almost completely disappeared over the course of time, despite the fact that the birth rate was declining. To account for this at first surprising result, she provides an explanatory approach based on the assumption of a shift from collective to individual values.

Claudia Roesch's contribution takes a closer look at the negotiation process for introducing and spreading contraceptives in the US. In her analysis she examines the central narrative and argumentative strategies of the US organization Planned Parenthood between 1942 and 1973. She elucidates how the rhetoric of the organization, which oscillated between immaterial and material as well as individual and collective values, mirrored a general value change in the USA.

In the next study, **Eszter Varsa** analyzes the most important contributions of the sexual councils published in socialist Hungary from the mid-1950s to the 1980s. She shows how the rhetoric and argumentation strategies of the literature focused on in the study changed during the investigation period, and which

goals were pursued by the publishers of these works. She demonstrates that in the sexual councils of the investigation period, pronounced pronatal efforts can be found, for example, reflected in advertising relating to sexuality in marriage, children and the nuclear family.

The contribution of **Yuliya Hilevych** and **Chizu Sato** analyze expert medical discourse on birth control in the Soviet Union from the 1950s-1980s on both sides of the Iron Curtain, concerning the conflict between “abortion or the pill”. In their analysis of the expenditure on the health magazine “Zdorovie” from 1955 to 1975, the authors work out the motivations and values based on the admissibility or rejection of abortion and contraceptives.

Agata Ignaciuk offers a broad comparative study of the factors, actors and conditions that fostered the development, introduction of the pill and the obstacles to its use by describing the differences in the distribution and frequency of use of the pill in the 1960s to 1980s in Spain and Poland. Despite the structural similarity of the two nations analyzed, Iganciuk illustrates by using the case studies that the pill in Poland, contrary to Spain, was accepted and applied at a far slower rate than mechanical contraceptives, for example condoms. Based on the results of the investigation, the author succeeds in analyzing the introduction and use of the pill as a mirror of changes in values and attitudes to sexuality, reproduction and family planning.

Fiammetta Balestracci examines the important factors influencing the “sexual revolution” of the Italian women’s movement in the 1970s. In addition to the diminishing influence of the Catholic Church, she emphasizes the relevance of the studies by the American biologist Alfred Kinsey, which was a clear breach of traditional ideas of female pleasure and sexuality. Balestracci shows how the “Sexual Revolution” was characterized on the one hand by medical and technical aspects and on the other by a new feminism that was heavily influenced by sexual research in the US.

For her contribution to abortion discourses of the second half of the 20th century in former Czechoslovakia / Czech Republic, **Radka Dudová** examines political, public and scientific discussions and elaborates the motivations behind the legalization of abortion in 1957 and the negotiation processes that led to it. This analysis shows that, unlike the Western European countries, feminist or bourgeois initiatives were not the driving force behind the relaxation of abortion law. This observation leads Dudová to the assumption that these developments were based not on a change of values but on political and medical discourses, as well as the development of medical techniques.

Unlike the previous articles, **Rona Torenz** uses oral history to analyze the importance and sometimes difficult negotiating processes of individual reproductive decisions by women in the former GDR. The evaluation of their conversations with the interviewees of different generations shows that women in the GDR knew about and took advantage of different forms of contraceptive and preven-

tive measures and the possibility of abortion, which had existed since the easing of the criminal law in 1972.

Isabel Heinemann closes the anthology with a comparative analysis of the individual results which she discusses in a broader historical perspective on social change and value transformations during the 20th century. She argues that discourses and practices of reproductive decision-making in both Western and Eastern European societies do not account for a general transition from materialist to post-materialist values in the realm of reproduction during the 1960s and 1970s. In contrast, the diverging negotiations of family planning and reproductive decision-making reveal multiple (and sometimes contingent) processes of normative and social change and their respective counter-movements, all of which require further historical study.

Finally, we would like to offer our heartfelt thanks to all who have contributed to the publication of this volume. Due to the commitment of the participants, the conference papers could be published in English. We thank Ian Copestake for translating and proofing the manuscript and we cordially thank Ronja Kieffer for her valuable cooperation in editing the manuscript. We would also like to thank the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft for its financial support of the conference.

Ann-Katrin Gembries

Birth Control as a National Threat? Pronatalist Discourses on Abortion in France and Germany (1920s–1970s)

When in the first decades of the 20th century birth control started to be publicly discussed and became the object of legislative works in many industrialized countries, pronatalist arguments soon appeared to dominate the discourse. At first glance, this could be explained by the birth rate decline that took place in nearly all Western societies during that time. But only a few decades later, in the 1960s and 1970s, when birth control was more than ever publicly discussed, pronatalist arguments had nearly disappeared from the discourse, while the birth rates were at their lowest. A long term perspective shows us that another explanation of this phenomenon is needed. In my paper, I suggest that underlying value changes in the fields of sexuality, reproduction, gender relations and family conceptions, which can be described as a shifting from collectivistic to individualistic value orientations, are a key to understanding this evolution.

Drawing on epistemic devices like discourse analysis and historical comparison, I examine the public discourses on contraception and abortion in France and in Germany between from the 1920s to the 1970s with regards to the ‘destiny’ of pronatalist arguments and underlying value changes. A comparison of these two countries is particularly interesting, because in France, pronatalist arguments were hegemonic until after the Second World War and never completely disappeared, whereas in Germany they had to compete from the beginning with other dominant arguments (eugenics in particular) and they nearly vanished from the public discourse on birth control in the second half of the century. Thus it appears that the different national contexts have to be taken into consideration when we try to reconstitute an accurate articulation of (1) the ‘hard facts’, i.e. the general birth rate decline, the introduction of modern birth control devices like the pill, the legal situation of birth control; (2) the influence of the historical background, i.e. the two World Wars, women’s emancipation; and (3) value changes in the public discourse on birth control.

Introduction

When in the first decades of the 20th century birth control started to be publicly discussed and became the object of legislative works in many industrialized coun-

tries, pronatalist arguments soon appeared to dominate the discourse. At first glance, this could be explained by the birth rate decline that took place in nearly all western societies during that time¹. But a closer look at the particular cases of France and Germany shows that this explanation is not entirely satisfying: While scholars generally agree on the fact that the spectacular birth rate decline in both countries was indeed caused by increasing birth control practices², this neither helps us to understand why the birth rate decline (and thus birth control) was actually seen as a threat, nor why the pronatalist discourse was more hegemonic in France than in Germany, while the French birth rates were similar or higher. Most importantly, it does not help our understanding of why pronatalist concerns nearly disappeared from the public debates on birth control in the 1960s and 1970s, while in both countries birth rates were sinking even lower than during the interwar period³. Indeed, from a long term perspective it becomes clear that another kind of explanation is needed, which may be found by considering this evolution with regards to deeper social transformation processes, and more specifically to value changes as an essential part of the transition from modern to postmodern societies.

So far, the existing historiography of pronatalism and birth control in France and Germany has concentrated on the period before 1945⁴. Here, scholars

¹ See for example: John R. Gillis (ed.), *The European Experience of Declining Fertility. 1850–1970*, Cambridge 1992; Herwig Birg, *Die demographische Zeitenwende*, Munich 2005; Jean-Pierre Bardet, *Histoire des populations de l'Europe*, Paris 1997.

² See for example: Christiane Dienel, *Kinderzahl und Staatsräson. Empfängnisverhütung und Bevölkerungspolitik in Deutschland und Frankreich bis 1918*, Münster 1995, p. 29.

³ Lowest birth rate in the interwar period for Germany: 14.7/1000 inhabitants in 1933. Source: Statistisches Bundesamt (ed.), *Bevölkerung und Wirtschaft*, Wiesbaden 1972, p. 103. Lowest birth rate in the interwar period for France: 14.6/1000 inhabitants in 1938. Source: André Armengaud, *La population française au XXe siècle*, Paris 1977, p. 87. Birth rates in 1975 for Western Germany: 9.7/1000 inhabitants; for Eastern Germany: 10.8/1000 inhabitants; for France: 14.1/1000 inhabitants. Source: Human Fertility Database, <http://www.humanfertility.org> (access on Nov. 10, 2017).

⁴ See for example: Cornelia Usborne, *Frauenkörper – Volkskörper. Geburtenkontrolle und Bevölkerungspolitik in der Weimarer Republik*, Münster 1994; Gisela Bock, "Zum Wohle des Volkskörpers...", *Abtreibung und Sterilisation im Nationalsozialismus*, in: *Journal für Geschichte* 2, 1980, Heft 6, p. 58–65; Elisa Camiscioli, *Reproducing the French Race. Immigration, Intimacy, and Embodiment in the Early Twentieth Century*, Durham NC 2009; Cyril Olivier, *Du "crime contre la race". L'avortement dans la France de la Révolution Nationale*, in: Christine Bard, Frédéric Chauvaud, Michelle Perrot et al. (ed.), *Femmes et justice pénale. XIXe–XXe siècles*, Rennes 2002, p. 253–264. Still, for the second half of the 20th century, a few exceptions should be mentioned: Annette Leo, *Christian König, "Die Wunschkindpille". Weibliche Erfahrung und staatliche Geburtenpolitik in der DDR*, Göttingen 2015; Donna Harsch, *Society, the State, and Abortion in East Germany, 1950–1972*, in: *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 102, No. 1 (Feb., 1997, p. 53–84); Janine Mossuz-Lavau, *Les lois de l'amour. Les politiques de la sexualité en France (1950–2002)*, Paris, Payot 2002.

have mostly focused on pronatalist pressure groups and birth policies⁵, rather than on discourses and values⁶, and their studies are generally limited to one country⁷. In this chapter, I suggest broadening the horizon both geographically and chronologically in order to try to understand the success and decline of pronatalist discourse, that is to say a very specific branch within the public debates on abortion and contraception in France and Germany, from the perspective of value changes.

In the following, I define values as general and fundamental orientation standards and order conceptions which are accepted as binding for thinking, talking and acting individually and collectively⁸. By taking into consideration the “social” and “discursive nature of values”⁹, it appears that some elements of discourse theory can help us achieve an analytical grasp of the collective value orientations carried by pronatalist discourses on birth control in French and German mid-century societies. Discourses can be considered as institutionally established

⁵ See for example: Vera Neumann, *Geburten- und Sexualpolitik in der Weimarer Republik am Beispiel des § 218*, in: Jürgen Reulecke et al. (ed.), *Stadt und Gesundheit: zum Wandel von “Volksundheit” und kommunaler Gesundheitspolitik im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart 1991, p. 307–324; Gabriele Czarnowski, *Hereditary and Racial Welfare (Erb- und Rassenpflege): The Politics of Sexuality and Reproduction in Nazi Germany*, in: *Social Politics* 4, 1997, p. 114–135; Andrés H. Reggiani, *Procreating France: The Politics of Demography, 1919–1945*, in: *French Historical Studies*, XIX/3, spring 1996, p. 729; Fabrice Cahen, *De l’efficacité des politiques publiques: la lutte contre l’avortement “criminel” en France, 1890–1950*, in: *Revue d’histoire moderne et contemporaine* 2011/3 (n° 58-3), p. 90–117; Marie-Monique Huss, *Pronatalism in the Inter-war Period in France*, in: *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 25, 1990, p. 39–68; Françoise Thébaud, *Le mouvement nataliste dans la France de l’entre-deux-guerres: L’Alliance nationale pour l’accroissement de la population française*, *Revue d’histoire moderne et contemporaine*, vol. 32-2, no. 2, 1985, p. 276–346.

⁶ The few existing discourse analyses do not primarily focus on pronatalism and birth control: Thorsten Eitz, *“Nieder mit dem Abtreibungsparagrafen!” Die Kontroverse um den § 218*, in: Thorsten Eitz, Isabelle Engelhardt, *Diskursgeschichte der Weimarer Republik*, vol. 2, Hildesheim, Zurich, New York 2015, p. 115–164; Verena Steinecke, *Menschenökonomie. Der medizinische Diskurs über den Geburtenrückgang von 1911 bis 1931*, Pfaffenweiler 1996; Ann-Katrin Gembries, *Von der Fortpflanzungspflicht zum Recht auf Abtreibung. Werte und Wertewandel im Spiegel französischer Parlamentsdebatten über Geburtenkontrolle 1920–1974*, in: Bernhard Dietz, Christopher Neumaier, Andreas Rödder, (ed.), *Gab es den Wertewandel? Neue Forschungen zum gesellschaftlich-kulturellen Wandel seit den 1960er Jahren*, Munich 2014, p. 304–334.

⁷ There is one notable exception, although it does not focus on birth control: Elisabeth Bokelmann, *Die demographische Frage nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg, Diskurse und legislative Maßnahmen*, in: Ilja Mieß, Pierre Guillen (ed.): *Nachkriegsgesellschaften in Deutschland und Frankreich im 20. Jahrhundert*, Munich 1998, p. 97–108.

⁸ This definition is inspired by Clyde Kluckhohn, *Values and Value-Orientations in the Theory of Action. An Exploration in Definition and Classification*, in: Talcott Parsons/Edward A. Shils (ed.), *Toward a General Theory of Action*, Cambridge 1962, p. 388–433.

⁹ Jan W. van Deth, Elinor Scarbrough, *The Concept of Values*, in: Jan W. van Deth, Elinor Scarbrough (ed.), *The Impact of Values*, New York 1995, p. 21–47, 34.

ways of speaking about a given subject¹⁰ – in this case about birth control. The rules, categories, order concepts, and value hierarchies underlying and structuring a discourse form the collectively accepted cognitive and normative frame for the thinking, speaking and acting of individuals in society¹¹. Discourses function as narratives that explain and legitimize social realities and power relations¹². At the same time, the configuration of a society and the individual (but collectively shared) historical experiences determine the social acceptability of a discourse and its success at a given time¹³. Starting from these theoretical considerations, I will try to answer the following set of questions: What were the characteristics of pronatalist discourse on birth control in France and Germany from 1920 to 1976? What narratives did it propose, and which collective values were embedded in it? What was its weight within the public debates on contraception and abortion? What other kinds of discourses did it have to compete with? Which social actors used a pronatalist discourse and for which purpose? Why did this particular discourse emerge in this particular historical configuration? Which collective experiences determined its acceptability at this given time?

In a second step, I focus on the dimension of long term value changes. The sociologist and philosopher Hans Joas has developed a triangular model of reciprocal causal interactions between discourses, social practices and institutions¹⁴. According to this conception, value changes can be explained by looking closely into the dynamics of how exactly discourses, social practices and institutions are interrelated in a longitudinal perspective. From these considerations, I will add a second set of research questions: What was the impact of pronatalist discourses on birth control legislation and on the social practices of abortion and contraception, and how were pronatalist discourses again influenced by changing institutions and practices?

These two sets of research questions will be answered with regards to France and Germany. A comparison of these two countries in particular seems to impose itself most naturally because, as we will see, a main component of the pronatalist discourse on both sides of the Rhine consisted of referring to the demographic situation in the respective neighboring country in the light of an old and permanent national antagonism. But the comparative approach is also useful as a heuristic device¹⁵ which helps distinguish how each particular national context influences

¹⁰ See Jürgen Link, Was ist und was bringt Diskurstaktik, in: *kultuRRévolution* 2 (1983), p. 60–66, 60.

¹¹ See Michel Foucault, *Les mots et les choses*, Paris 1966.

¹² See Peter Berger, Thomas Luckmann, *Die gesellschaftliche Konstruktion der Wirklichkeit. Eine Theorie der Wissenssoziologie*, Frankfurt a. M. 1980, p. 69.

¹³ See Siegfried Jäger, *Kritische Diskursanalyse. Eine Einführung*, Duisburg 1993, p. 155.

¹⁴ See Hans Joas, *Die Entstehung der Werte*, Frankfurt a. M. 1999, p. 252–274.

¹⁵ According to the methodology of historical comparisons developed by Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, Jürgen Kocka (ed.), *Geschichte und Vergleich. Ansätze und Ergebnisse inter-*