

IPPF EUROPE

Regional Information Bulletin

Vol 6 No 1 January 1977

At its fifth meeting, held in June in Warnemünde, the Regional Council passed the following resolution:

"That the IPPF Europe Regional Council, considering the problems of Malthusianism to be a very important issue inside and outside the IPPF, welcomes a full all-round discussion for and against Malthusianism within the framework of the IPPF. Discussion on this topic in the committees and publications of the IPPF would certainly give much wanted information to the member associations and to the staff." Accordingly, this issue of the Bulletin includes two articles on Malthusianism aimed at stimulating discussion within the Region and the IPPF as a whole. Correspondence on this subject is welcome and should be addressed to the Editor of the Regional Information Bulletin, IPPF Europe Region, 64 Sloane Street, London SW1X 9SJ

Malthusianism and the IPPF

In discussing Malthusianism – as recommended by the IPPF Europe Regional Council in 1976 – it should first be ascertained as well as possible whether or not the following theses are correct:–

- I. that Malthusianism has always contributed to the economic and cultural exploitation of people, and presently, among others, many people of the so-called Third World.
- II. that although the current IPPF Constitution neither prescribes nor approves Malthusianism, and although this Constitution leaves open the possibility of opposing Malthusianism in fact, the IPPF as a whole still covertly or overtly adopts a Malthusian attitude, inter alia in respect of the Third World.

I believe both theses to be correct, and would add a third: that it is both possible and desirable for the IPPF as a whole to adopt an anti-Malthusian position (III).

Space does not, of course, permit an exhaustive analysis of all the points.

In this issue

- Malthusianism and the IPPF by Jules de Leeuwe
- updating Malthus' population theory is out of the question today by Nevenka Petrić
- A history of the Malthusian League is reviewed by Philip Kestelman
- a report on a working party on Family planning and sex education in Socialist Countries
- a report on a Regional Working Group on Ethical Aspects of Abortion
- the second Supplement on information and education material used by member associations
- a subject Index of the contents of the Bulletin 1972–76

Malthus and his offspring

"Malthusianism" is the term given to theory and related practice based on the proposition of Thomas R. Malthus (1766–1834) that since natural population growth will always proportionally exceed the increase in the means of subsistence (especially food) this growth should be curbed, in order to combat and prevent mass poverty, hunger and undernourishment. In his publications on this subject in 1798 and 1826¹ Malthus argued that this proportionally rapid population growth was the decisive cause of poverty and hunger (which in turn contributed to civil disturbances and wars) and also of mass unemployment. He explicitly opposed William Godwin (1756–1836) who argued in 1793² that poverty occurred in the world because goods are not always available to those most in need of them.

Present-day Malthusians (neo-Malthusians) have found, it is true, that Malthus' abovementioned principal argument need not be

generally valid, but they still adhere to Malthus' basic principle in this respect: that the increase in population numbers is the chief factor in phenomena such as hunger, unemployment, the decline in the standard of living of the masses, and backwardness in the Third World. The most recent neo-Malthusians – to whom I shall refer as neo-neo-Malthusians – in general arguments emphasise "factors other than population numbers" and deny that they are Malthusians, yet in fact confine themselves to making propaganda for, and applying, population control.

As example of a neo-neo-Malthusian is John D. Rockefeller III, as may appear from a statement he made in Bucharest to the Population Tribune on 26 August 1974 on the occasion of the World Population Conference. *Planet*,³ the daily published by IPPF during the Conference, reported on 27 August: "The millionaire philanthropist reaffirmed his belief – first made in a letter to his father 40 years ago – that the population problem was 'fundamental and underlying'. But he made a major shift of emphasis in conceding that he now saw as the 'only viable course' the need to 'place population policy solidly within the context of general economic and social development' . . . The immediate response to Mr. Rockefeller's speech came largely from his critics. Someone suggested that 'economic development is seen as a new kind of contraceptive', and another speaker asked if Mr. Rockefeller has specific proposals. Disarmingly he replied that No, he hadn't. He had merely called for a reappraisal. . .".

A few decades after publication of the sixth, much expanded, edition of Malthus' *Essay on the Principle of Population*¹, Karl Marx argued that Malthus' views – whatever the intentions of the author – serve objectively to explain the misery caused by capitalism, both at home and in the colonies, on account of too large a number of mouths instead of on account of a mode of production under which on the one hand the technically possible production of goods is time and again obstructed by the ruling capitalist and landowning classes, while

on the other hand the goods which are produced nevertheless are manipulated by the same minority, backed by the police, law courts, army, etc., to create profits for their own small upper stratum. In my view this perspective should be one of the principal points in our IPPF discussion. (For a clear exposition of the subject see *Marx and Engels on Malthus*, ed. R. L. Meek⁴).

A clever thief pretends to confess

If Thesis I is correct, it is understandable that capitalists and landowners have remained overt or covert Malthusians to this day, and support international organisations which promote Malthusianism to the best of their ability. These aspects have been discussed often within the IPPF Europe Region (see articles by P. Pradervand^{5,6} and N. Rea⁷, and the NVSH report⁸).

It is clear that by the same terms there are neo-neo-Malthusians. They "confess" that counting heads is not enough, since Malthus' basic principle is confounded in practice with clockwork regularity.

Anti-Malthusians do not dispute and have never disputed that population policy as such and also, sometimes, a policy to curb the rate of population growth, may be useful, or that family planning may ease the situation of individual families. But anti-Malthusians also point out a sober fact, which Malthusians are only able to gloss over and distort but cannot disprove – that neither population numbers nor a rapid rate of population growth determine poverty, starvation and unemployment in any country, but that the decisive factor is the mode of production, and the distribution and use of goods.

As long as in any country (whether "rich" or "poor", industrialised or not) the means of production are manipulated by and for the benefit of an upper stratum, the condition of the population remains poor and any prosperity and welfare acquired are endangered. On the other hand, if the working people in any country succeed in abolishing the power of the domestic and/or foreign upper strata which controls the means of production and production itself, it is demonstrated that after some years such a country has abolished starvation, cyclical economic crises, systematic mass unemployment

and (in countries with widespread illiteracy and lack of medical care) illiteracy and many endemic diseases.

The "New economic international order"

Discussions within the IPPF should consider also recent proposals for a "new economic international order". There is *no* reason to be happy with the economist Jan Tinbergen and Jan Pronk (Dutch Minister of Development Cooperation) who are among its chief spokesmen. There is a world of difference between a new international economic order as propounded in the interest of people in the Third World and elsewhere, on the one hand, and as presented in the name of multi-national capitalist enterprises in terms of the "Reshaping the International Order" (RIO) report⁹, on the other.

Why should IPPF intervene?

Referring to what Pradervand has made known about the financial background of the IPPF⁵ (by now about 45% of IPPF income is derived from capitalist countries in Europe), I will now discuss Theses II and III.

The first part of Thesis II (that the IPPF Constitution nowhere approves Malthusianism but leaves room to oppose it) does not seem to be any longer a point of discussion within the IPPF. (See sections 3, 4 and 5 of the NVSH report⁸).

But discussion continues – also in the IPPF Europe Region – on the question of whether the IPPF as a whole might adopt an anti-Malthusian attitude. Some members of the IPPF Europe Regional Council feel that there is no further need even to *talk* about Malthusianism within the IPPF¹⁰.

In my opinion IPPF should, in accordance with its Constitution, concern itself with family planning, no matter where in the world, if people can be helped in individual families to have the number of children they desire. This basic concern is capable of uniting organisations of rich and poor, of socialist, capitalist and feudally ruled countries, through exchanges of opinions and mutual learning and teaching. However, *this kind* of family planning (for the benefit of the individual) would be inadequate or even abortive if the IPPF were to leave it at

that. In that case the IPPF would in fact support in many countries power positions which cause the misery of which family planning is capable of combating *only certain symptoms*.

It is found, unfortunately, that "human rights" remain an empty phrase if people tolerate constant violation of these human rights without raising their voice against it. If people say they want to promote human rights through family planning but stubbornly refuse to analyse and denounce the ways in which hunger and poverty are perpetuated and aggravated in certain Third World countries, and elsewhere, from outside and within by ruling upper strata, such people are at best behaving like scared ostriches and at the worst like mean deceivers.

Within the IPPF an anti-Malthusian stance should, for the time being, have at least the same scope as the Malthusian stance has, notably in its central publications, central committees and central executive bodies. National member associations and Regions have the right to remain aloof from the Malthusian issue to the extent they do not thereby directly violate the central IPPF Constitution. Yet it must be pointed out that this Constitution explicitly visualises peoples interests (eg. "community wellbeing and international goodwill").

Jules de Leeuwe
The Hague

References

1. Malthus, T. R.: *An Essay on the Principle of Population* 1798 and 1826.
2. Godwin, W.: *The Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Political Justice* 1793.
3. *Planet* (27 August 1974) Bucharest.
4. Meek R.L.ed (1953): *Marx and Engels on Malthus*.
5. Pradervand, P. (1972): *Population and the Third World*. Mimeo.
6. Pradervand, P.: *Realistic Approaches to the Acceptance of Family Planning in Africa*. Mimeo.
7. Rea, R. (1974): *What is Population Education? and what is its relevance to planned parenthood?* Mimeo.
8. NVSH (1971): *The Aims of the IPPF*. A memorandum to the IPPF Europe and Near East Regional Council. Mimeo.
9. Tinbergen, J. (1976): *Reshaping the International Order (RIO Report)*.
10. IPPF Europe Region (1976): *Minutes of the 5th Regional Council Meeting*.

Updating Malthus' Population Theory is out of the Question Today

Few authors have been judged in such contradictory terms as T. R. Malthus, English parson and economist (1766–1834)¹. While some people (like Franz Oppenheimer) consider him to be the writer of pamphlets of the cheapest kind who has quite underservedly been ranked among the greatest world thinkers, others (like John Maynard Keynes) believe him to be one of the most significant figures of our civilisation. Though Malthus' social and economic thinking is frequently quite wrongly described as dealing exclusively with population, it is true to say that he devoted most of his energies to studying the problems of population, the standard of living and the introduction of such a policy as would translate into practice his principle of population, and that he is known throughout the world today by his *Essay on Population*.

In the introduction to Malthus' *Essay on Population* W. T. Layton² says that it is remarkable that some writers, Malthus among them, have been much discussed by persons who have never read their works. Of Malthus, it would be quite correct to say that this is true even today, when contemporary development has raised certain questions about population growth and food shortage, so that many people, without entering into the substance of the problem, refer to Malthus' population theory, failing to see its real place in the history of economic thought.

Even today there are attempts to update Malthus' population theory. Regardless of the forces behind such attempts, they cannot, under any circumstances, confirm Malthus' "principles" on population and make them relevant to contemporary socio-economic development.

In the preface to the Second Edition of his *Essay* Malthus himself says that he wrote it after the works of Hume, Wallace, Smith and Price had already been published³ and that from their writings he had deduced the principle which formed the main argument of his own work. He goes on to say that on the basis of research he had discovered that much more had been done in the past than he had been aware of when he first published the *Essay*. He noted that the increase of resources on the one hand and the poverty arising from a too rapid population growth on the other, had been distinctly seen long ago and that the most violent remedies had been

proposed as early as in the times of Plato and Aristotle, and that later the question had been treated by some French economists, Montesquieu in particular, and in England by Franklin, James Stewart, Arthur Young and Townsend, so that he was surprised that the subject had not attracted more public attention in the past.

The first edition of his work, entitled *An Essay on the Principle of Population as it Affects the Future Improvement of Society, with Remarks on the Speculations of Mr. Godwin, M. Condorcet and Other Writers*, published anonymously in London 1798, was no more than a pamphlet of the kind typical of the political polemics of the time. The publication of this pamphlet had a marked effect on the general train of thought that followed, while it brought the author himself much abuse and violent criticism. That is why five years later, Malthus published an almost completely new study, omitting the philosophical discussion on the troubles of people, and introducing, as the most important modification of his first edition, the notion of "moral restraint" as an effective preventive check to the growth of the poor population.

In an endeavour to investigate in the *Essay* means of promoting society, Malthus sets himself the task of investigating the causes which had hitherto impeded the progress of mankind towards happiness, and of examining the probability of the total or partial removal of those causes in future. Malthus believed that to enter fully into an analysis of all the causes that influenced human improvement would far exceed the capacity of one individual. "The principal object of this essay is to examine the effects of one great cause intimately united with the very nature of man, which, though it has been constantly and powerfully operating since the commencement of society, has been little noticed by the writers who have treated this subject" . . . "The cause to which I allude is the constant tendency in all animated life to increase beyond the nourishment provided for it"⁴. Summing up his reflections in the first part of the first book for his *Essay*, he underlines the substance of his theory by saying: "Taking the whole earth instead of this island, emigration would of course be excluded; and, supposing the present population equal to a thousand millions, the human species would increase as

the numbers 1,2,4,8,16,32,64,128,256, and subsistence as 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9. In two centuries the population would be to the means of subsistence as 256 to 9; in three centuries as 4096 to 13 and in two thousand years the difference would be almost incalculable".

"In this supposition no limits whatever are placed on the produce of the earth. It may increase for ever and be greater than any assignable quantity; yet still the power of the population being in every period so much superior, the increase of the human species can only be kept down to the level of the means of subsistence by the constant operation of the strong law of necessity acting as a check upon the greater power"⁵.

The appearance of the first (anonymous) edition of the *Essay* was first explained by Godwin on the pages of *Political Justice* and the *Enquirer*. Under the influence of French writers of the Revolutionary era, and strongly believing in the power of human reason to bring humanity to a state of perfection, Godwin, like his more famous successor Robert Owen, maintained that the evils of society were due to man and that all troubles resulted from the existence of private property. Malthus' population theory came as a reaction to the theoretical generalisations made under the influence of new social revolutionary changes and scientific discoveries which, abandoning old religious and philosophical beliefs, developed the idea of the need for human institutions to be subject to a natural order (Condorcet, Godwin), and that the "natural" order should be arranged so that all men, being good by nature, should live in a community the evolution of which depends on the progress of science.⁶ Instead of a society of equals in continual progress, Malthus envisaged the inevitability of a class society with the poor condemned to live at subsistence level. Contrary to authors who demanded a change of the social order and who looked upon population growth with greater optimism, Malthus regarded the social order of his days as being natural. Disagreeing with his opponents and particularly rejecting Godwin's views, Malthus wrote that he was certain his hypothesis was right, that is that the power of the population to multiply was greater than the power of the earth to produce means of man's subsistence. The publication of the second edition of the *Essay* in 1803 could be said to mark the

beginning of the history⁷ of one of the most widely read books in the development of economic thought. At the same time it signified the beginning of Malthusianism.

Malthus treated the principle of population as a natural law and not a social one, because it emanated from the aspiration of all living beings to multiply without limit. Applying this natural law to society, he found that the population throughout the history of mankind could not develop at the same rate with the necessary means of livelihood with the exception of the northern provinces of New England (in the present-day United States of America) where the population doubled in under 25 years for a whole two centuries so that "... the rapidity of increase was almost without parallel in history".⁸ Primarily on the basis of this example, Malthus developed a theory according to which the population, unless "checked", increases in a geometric ratio, that is by multiplication, and means of subsistence at a far slower pace, at best in an arithmetical ratio, that is by addition. Malthus' population theory resulted in the development of Malthusianism – a non-scientific concept of population development.

Malthus' population theory after 1825, when more data were available on contemporary population trends, was completely contradicted by empirical evidence of socio-economic development.⁹

Malthus' works stimulated interest in population questions¹⁰ and is considered to mark the beginning of modern population theory. Being controversial in content, it in some places still constitutes the backbone of the approach to population policy. As a result of the considerable controversy created among Malthus' contemporaries by his population theory, both his followers and opponents became conscious of the need for a better understanding of population trends and their relations with social and economic conditions.

Criticisms of Malthus' Population Theory – The differences that arose between Malthus' and his contemporaries as well as his later critics, were not primarily over his concept of the "population principle" but rather over his rigid views on society.

Classical Economic School – Malthus'

assertion that population increase exceeded the increase of means of subsistence was incorporated in the theory of values of the classical school of economic growth. For example, Adam Smith¹² demanded the regulation of the reproduction of man, and David Ricardo suggested some kind of voluntary population control.

Non-Socialist Writers – Malthus' arguments were not accepted by many writers, who also differed amongst themselves in many respects. The critics of Malthus' theory from the ranks of non-socialist writers can be divided into three groups:¹³ the first group advocated birth control (Hazlitt, Hamilton, Moreton); the second attempted to demonstrate that preventive checks were the result of social and economic progress (Rickards, Alison). An expert on the whole scientific debate over Malthus' population theory who can be included in this group, Kenneth Smith, noted that even in Malthus' lifetime his opponents had seriously criticised his population theory. In his comprehensive study "*The Malthusian Controversy*" he said among other things: "It is generally agreed that Malthus was not original in his views and our first book has shown the completeness with which his main points had been earlier brought forward by other writers. Wallace and Townsend, the latter a contemporary, left between them little to be added. But Malthus' *Essay* was the book of the hour. It caught the tide and as Godwin's star began to wane, that of Malthus rose to ascendancy. Across the channel property was threatened; and Malthus was the apostle of private property... Malthus preached that the old order was sound, its laws, if not natural laws, at least the most natural of positive laws and departure from them the sure road to disaster. The times made him a prophet"...

Finally, Kenneth Smith says of Malthus: "He uses his illustrations to show the existence of checks but since his classification of the checks is unscientific and defective, the method is neither useful nor instructive"... "He discovers his checks the world over but he is quite unable to evaluate their incidence, or even in many cases, to connect them with numbers at all."¹⁴

The third group of writers who rejected Malthus' teachings emphasised that the reduction of natural fecundity should be connected with economic

development and changes in the milieu.

The Socialist Writers – They focused their attention on social differentiation in the process of which the working class became poorer and poorer. They sought examples from the past e.g. Thomas More's *Utopia* which depicted a state with an ideal social organisation based on reason and moral considerations, or from the English and French socialists. All the socialist writers attributed human misery to defects in the capitalist social order and maintained that by social reform the productive forces could be further developed and employment increased which would at the same time prevent over population. Although the socialist writers were unanimous in rejecting Malthus' population theory, their ideas about population differed markedly.¹⁵ Prominent among these in England were Ricardo, who indicated certain forms of voluntary population control, and Robert Owen, the well-known social reformer who was particularly alert to the role of the working class. The French socialists had more definite views on population questions. Saint-Simon did not agree with Malthus' proposition of model restraint because he thought it was incompatible with the happiness of the working class. Fourier favoured voluntary birth control, and Proudhon a balance between population and production. In Germany, Rodbertus and Lasalle believed that population growth depended exclusively on the degree of intensity with which the workers were being exploited. In Italy, Achilla Loria considered population size with respect to capital rather than to the means of subsistence. He believed that population growth was the cause of economic evolution and of the historical succession of social systems. In Russia, the first to express their disagreement with Malthus were Malinovsky and a group of revolutionary democrats headed by Chernischevsky, while Milytin, Utopian socialist, rejected the Malthusian approach and suggested that science should endeavour instead to alleviate human suffering and promote the material wellbeing of people.¹⁶

K. Marx and F. Engels did not formulate a population theory as such, but they established a set of basic principles which they regarded as governing population and its economic and social correlates. Either in the form of theses, a presentation of view, a polemics or

through individual illustrations, as part of their comprehensive outlook on the world and life and their materialist-dialectical perception of society and nature and of the relationships between man and nature, Marx and Engels described the relationships between the reproduction of man and the reproduction of material goods, particularly underlining the interdependence between population growth and production. They elaborated population questions primarily from the economic point of view indicating the effect of the reproduction of goods on the reproduction of the population and vice versa.¹⁷ "The contradictions between the natural growth of labour which does not satisfy the need of capital accumulation while exceeding them at the same time is a contradiction of capital movement itself. Capital needs greater quantities of labourers of a young age and fewer of mature age".¹⁸ The so-called overpopulation conditioned by capital accumulation in the capitalist society was considered to be relative by Marx and Engels who believed that in absolute terms (natural resources, technical possibilities, etc.) our planet was underpopulated. They thought that the problem of absolute overpopulation would not arise for many years, and they stressed in that connection, that the socialist society alone, in view of the absence of the capitalist system and a higher level of consciousness and culture of the population, would be capable of organising conscious population restriction.

In view of the significance of production for the life of society and the discovery of the surplus value, that key category for exploitation of wage-labourers by the capitalists in a capitalist system of production relations, Marx and Engels, and later Lenin, unmasked Malthus' unscientific population theory. Marx believed that there could be no natural and universal laws of population which are determined by the economic and social conditions prevailing in different societies. Contrary to Malthus' "abstract" principles, Marx insisted "... in fact every special historic mode of production has its own special laws of population historically valid within its limits alone".¹⁹ Many Marxist and bourgeois writers²⁰ frequently quite wrongly connect Marx' views on population primarily with his criticism

of Malthus' population principle and on that basis they find grounds either to oppose it or to designate it as an outlook on the problems of human population.²¹

Among all the critics of Malthus' population principle, Marx is the most significant. Marx says that production always corresponds to a certain level of social development, and that the substance of the law peculiar to the capitalist mode of production is that the labouring population while producing capitalist accumulation increasingly produces the means which make it relatively superfluous. Marx speaks about the population as a theoretical category. "An abstract law of population exists for plants and animals only, and only in so far as man has not interfered with them".²² The science of population was constituted in more recent times, after Marx. Nevertheless, contemporary bourgeois demographers have bravely acknowledged the merits of Marx scientific interpretation of socio-economic effects on the population.²³

Engels made an additional contribution to Marx' approach to population theory. He first advanced his criticism against Malthus' principle of population and the theory of diminishing returns in agriculture advocated by Malthus together with Ricardo, disregarding technical progress, the basis of rent, etc. Engels indicated however that it was Malthus' theory which had helped to overcome economic pessimism and for mankind to rid itself forever of overpopulation. That theory is a source of important arguments in favour of social transformation, for even if Malthus were right with respect to the reproductive behaviour of workers, social reorganisation was necessary, for only this reorganisation and the enlightenment of the masses could make possible "that moral restraint upon the instinct for reproduction which Malthus himself puts forwards as the easiest and most effective countermeasure against overpopulation."²⁴

Both Marx and Engels were aware of the spontaneous reproduction of the labouring population which was the result of extreme exploitation under the capitalist order as there was always ever greater demand on the labour market for young workers. The way out of this situation, according to Engels, lay in the first place, in socio-economic reorganisation with upbringing and education being immediate influences on the reproduction of the population.

Engels' statement on population growth in his letter to Kautsky of February 1, 1881 is well-known. He admitted that there was an "abstract possibility of overpopulation" calling for limits to population growth. However, if at some stage communist society found itself obliged to regulate the production of human beings it would be able to do so without difficulty and in the manner in which the production of things would be regulated at the time. He believed that it would not be particularly difficult to achieve by plan what had already been achieved spontaneously in France and lower Austria. At all events, in a communist society, men would decide themselves what measures, if any, and in what way, need to be taken in that direction. He did not feel it was his business to make any suggestions or to give them any advice on the matter.²⁵

Fredrich Engels made an important contribution to the analysis of the position of the family within the context of the struggle for society's reorganisation. He said that with the means of production becoming collective property, the individual family ceases to be the economic unit of society. The private household is transformed into a social industry. Care for and rearing of children become public concerns; the society cares equally for all children legitimate and illegitimate. Thus concern over consequences which he said were in his time the most important social, moral and economic element is removed.²⁶

The Post-Marxist socialist writers belonging to the "revisionist" stream adopted the neo-Malthusian proposition that birth control tends to improve the living conditions of workers while the "revolutionary" stream adhere to Marx' and Engels' basic concepts on the need for social change. The principle of population of Malthus and his followers was also exposed to merciless criticism by numerous socialist-oriented theoreticians whose aim was to prove that Malthus' theories were scientifically unfounded and arbitrary and who thought that their main aim was to draw attention away from the uneven distribution of goods and income and its real causes, and to remove the responsibility for the miserable position of the underprivileged strata of the population from the capitalist socio-economic order and its contradictions. In his showdown with the Malthusians, Karl Kautsky and later his son Dr. Karl

Kautsky,²⁷ made an important contribution by their study of the birth rate in a socialist society. Otto Bauer also emphatically denounced Malthusianism. Bebel's²⁸ analysis of population questions was primarily related to the status of women under capitalist conditions and in a socialist society. He believed in the possibility of greatly augmenting the food supply, and in changes in reproductive behaviour occurring as a consequence of improved economic conditions.

With the further evolution of Marxist thought which most fully came to expression in the works of V.I. Lenin, who revaluated a number of Marx and Engels' positions, the next stage of capitalism was explained and the basis of the struggle for socialism elaborated. Deliberating on the economic substance of the "Narodnik" movement (populists) Lenin emphatically rejected abstract population theories which bore no relationship to "historically different forms of social orders."²⁹ He claimed that the overpopulation of agrarian Russia was not the consequence of disparity between human reproduction and means of subsistence but a result of the penetration of capitalism into agriculture. In his polemics with Bulgakov he sharply criticised the latter for endeavouring to resurrect Malthusianism.³⁰

According to Lenin, Malthusianism is a reactionary theory of an English bourgeois economist Malthus who claimed that social misery could be removed only by an artificial reduction of population growth, i.e. by restraints on marriage and childbearing.³¹ Lenin rejected neo-Malthusianism in 1913 as a petit-bourgeois, pessimist philosophy which, runs counter to the intentions of the revolutionary workers' movement, and supported the "unconditioned abolition of all laws prohibiting abortion or dissemination of medical means for preventive measures". He regarded such laws as hypocrisy on the part of the ruling class because they could not be enforced. Speaking about the "social theory" of neo-Malthusianism, Lenin said that the conscious workers would always wage tirelessly against efforts to infiltrate this reactionary and base theory into the most progressive class of the time, the one that is strongest and best prepared for major changes.³² Lenin's views on man's right to birth control exerted considerable influence

on socialist writers and on the health policy of USSR.³³

The Chinese socialist writers have rejected the population theory of Hung Liang Chi (1744–1809)³⁴, a Chinese predecessor of Malthus popularly known as the Chinese Malthus who published his theory simultaneously with Malthus' Principle of Population in 1798.

Some Conclusions

Contrary to Malthus' fabricated "law", in some economically advanced countries (socialist and capitalist), consumer goods have been growing at a faster rate than the population. "In some of these countries (or regions), there is even evidence of depopulation as opposed to so-called demographic explosions in the developing countries due to preventive measures to reduce the death rate of the population, particularly children,³⁵ under conditions of a very low level of development of productive forces due to century-long domination by the capitalist states."

None of the Marxist writers believed population growth to be the cause of poverty in the colonies. They pointed out that poverty was due to their colonial position which was also to blame for their under-development. "The main reason for the extreme poverty lay neither in any natural cause nor in a non-existent 'overpopulation', but in the social and economic conditions existing under imperialist rule".³⁶

Explaining the significance of the teachings of Adam Smith on population growth within the context of economic development, Joseph J. Spengler says of Malthus that his theories were not original.³⁷ Malthus admitted this himself.³ Though he did to some extent show concern for the poor and propose certain measures to improve their living conditions³⁸ this did not change the substance of his teaching. Even C. Stangeland who recognises that Malthus' work appeared at an opportune time and that it indicated more fully than his predecessors certain relevant factors for population growth, denies his originality.³⁹

Marx' evaluation of Malthus' principle of population (and he mentions it in all three volumes of the *Capital* 62 times) is certainly most relevant. In spite of his occasional polemical tone, he

particularly stressed the negative side of Malthus' theories. In addition to what has already been said, Marx drew attention to the fact that in explaining the most important economic categories, Malthus had in fact taken a step backwards in relation to the attained level of economic science of his time.⁴⁰

In more recent times, too,⁴¹ there have been attempts to infiltrate neo-Malthusian concepts in discussions on development problems of the under-developed countries, as there is a marked discrepancy in those countries between available means of subsistence and population size which still has a tendency of accelerated growth.

The world of our times and particularly of the last decade, is increasingly concerned over the question whether our planet is approaching the population limit and what measures the UN should take in that connection. In talking about population, some writers, theoreticians, economists and demographers refer even today to Malthus' principle of population. The fact is however, that Malthus' "solutions" were not even up to the standards of bourgeois economic thought of his own time. What is the explanation then?

Corresponding representatives of UN member-countries, spurred on by a rapid population growth which in some countries is acquiring alarming proportions, have met already three times at the level of UN World Conferences on Population. At the last, held in Bucarest in 1974, radically new views were presented to the effect that burning problems of mankind can no longer be resolved within outmoded economic and political frameworks. The "remedy" of enforcing an anti-childbearing policy in different parts of the world in international crisis situations was described as an effort to avoid the real solutions which are to be found, in the first place, by reducing the gap between the developed and underdeveloped parts of the world. "... The proposals of the non-aligned countries, formulated in Algiers and adopted at the Sixth Special Session of the UN General Assembly, given a radical revision of prevailing economic conditions in the world, are a prerequisite for the resolution of the global problems of the world, including the population problem,"⁴² as population is not (as we are frequently led to believe), the principal and sole

cause of poverty and the low level of development of individual countries, though this aspect of development must not be neglected as, in addition to other causes, it has a particularly restrictive effect on accelerated economic development.

The policy of the United Nations is aimed at a better quality of life for all, which can only be achieved by a revision of prevailing relations in the world. "Optimal family size and birth control can no longer resolve the problems of the contemporary world. They are far more complex than that. The gap dividing the developed world from the developing countries is becoming one of the main causes of conflict in the world. A new international economic order, based on sovereign equality, joint interests and cooperation between all states, regardless of their economic and social orders is the only possible framework for settling the population problems which can anyway only be tackled as an integral part of socio-economic development on both the national and international planes".⁴³ "Population policy can have some measure of success if it constitutes an integral part of socio-economic development; its contribution to the resolution of the world's development problems therefore is only partial, as is that of other sectoral strategies. Therefore, the *Plan of Action* must be considered an important component of the system of the international community for promoting economic development, the quality of life, human rights and fundamental freedoms".⁴⁴

Nevenka Petrić
Belgrade

References and Notes

1. *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (Fourteenth edition) Vol. 14, pages 744, 755.
2. Malthus, T. R. (1928): *On the Principle of Population*. Introduction by W. T. Layton, page viii. Everyman Library, London.
3. Malthus, T. R. (1803): *An Essay on Population* (Second edition) Author's Preface, page 1. London.
4. Malthus, T. R. (1928) op. cit. Vol. I, Book I, page 5.
5. Ibid, pages 10, 11.
6. Aleksandrova *et al* ed. (1949): *Istorija filozofije* (History of Philosophy) Vol. 2, pages 45, 50, 82-83, 93, 299, 411. Kultura, Belgrade.
7. The Third Edition was published in 1806, the Fourth in 1807, the Fifth in 1817, the Sixth in 1826, the Seventh in 1872. Some editions were reprinted several times in French and German.
8. Malthus, T. R. (1928) op. cit. Vol. I, Book II, page 305.
9. United Nations (1973): *The Determinants and Consequences of Population Trends*. Vol. 1, page 43. New York.
10. Ibid, page 33.
11. Chalmers, T. (1832): *On Political Economy in Connection with the Moral State and Moral Prospects of Society* (Second edition). London. Scottish theologian (1780-1847) and Malthusian whom Marx described as "one of the most fanatic Malthusians according to whom there is no other remedy to social evil than religious upbringing of the working class, which according to him really means brainwashing with Malthus' population theory but in a fancy Christian way with parson promising salvation".
12. Spengler, J. J. (1976): *Adam Smith on Population Growth and Economic Development*, in *Population and Development Review*. Vol. 2, No. 2, pages 167-180. Population Council, New York. Spengler says that Adam Smith was Malthus' principal mentor.
13. This division is given in the UN study cited (pages 42-43).
14. Smith K. (1951): *The Malthusian Controversy*. Pages 324-325, 331. Routledge & Keegan Paul, London.
15. United Nations op. cit. Page 45.
16. Ibid. Page 46.
17. Marx, K. (1957): *Capital*. Vol. 1, page 656. George Allen and Unwin, London.
18. Ibid. Page 536.
19. Ibid. Page 645.
20. Breznik, D. (1973): *Razvitak marksističkog pristupa teoriji o politici populacije* (The development of the Marxist approach to the theory of population policy) in *Stanovištvo* 1-2, pages 242-257. Belgrade.
21. Macura, M. and Sentić, M. (1974): *Marksov prilog nauci o stanovništvu: Prilozi teoriji i politici stanovništva* (Marx' contribution to the science of population: contributions to population theory and policy) page 34. Institute of Economics, Belgrade.
22. Marx, K. op. cit. page 645.
23. Macura, M. and Sentić, M. op. cit. page 43.
24. Engels, F. (1929): *Očerki kritiki političke ekonomiji* (Outlines of a critique of political economy) *Sočinenja* Vol. II, Partizdat CKVKP (b), page 15. Moscow.
25. Ibid.
26. Engels, F. (1946): *Porijeklo porodice, privatnog vlasništva i države* (Origins of the family, private property and the state) page 67. Zagreb.
27. Krašovec, S. (1975): *Razvitak marksističkog pristupa teoriji o politici populacije* (Development of a Marxist approach to population theory and policy). SK SSRNJ, Belgrade.
28. Bebel, A. (1956): *Žena i socijalizam* (Woman and socialism). Chapter on proletarian marriage exposed to poverty and capitalist exploitation. Pages 121-123, RAD, Belgrade.
29. Lenin, V.I. (1948): *Zabrana Dela* (Selected Works) Vol. I, Chapter IV, page 440. Kultura, Belgrade.
30. Lenin, V.I. (1960): *Zabrana Dela, Agrarno pitanje i "kritičari Marksa"* (The agrarian question and the critics of Marx). Chapter on the law of diminishing returns from the land (Selected Works Book 6), page 36. Kultura, Belgrade.
31. Ibid. Page 536.
32. Lenin, V.I. (1930): *Sočinenja* (Works) Vol. XVI, pages 497-499 of Russian edition. Article on the working class and neo-Malthusianism, Moscow-Leningrad. *Pravda* 137/341, 16 June 1913.
33. Among other social reforms the Soviet government legalised abortion in 1920. It was again prohibited in 1936 and legalised in 1955.
34. Silberman, L. (1960): Hung Liang-Chi: *Chinese Malthus in Population Studies*. Vol. XIII, No. 3, pages 257, 260-261. London.
35. Krašovec, S. (1970): *Stihijnost i kontrola kretanja stanovništva, problem savremene napredne populacione politike* (Spontaneity and control of population trends, problem of a modern and progressive population policy) in *Stanovištvo* No. 1-2, pages 12, 47-8.
36. United Nations op. cit. Vol. I, page 51
37. Spengler, J. J. op. cit. page 167.
38. Malthus, T. R. (1928) op. cit. Vol. II, Book 3, page 137.
39. Stangeland, C. E. (1904): *Pre-Malthusian Doctrines on Population in A Study in the History of Economic Theory*. Page 356. Columbia University Press, New York.
40. Pjanić, Z. (1955): *Tomas Robert Malthus, Iz istorije građanske misli* (Thomas Robert Malthus in The history of bourgeois thought). Page 93. Naučna knjiga, Belgrade.
41. *The Limits to Growth* (1972). A report for the Club of Rome, page 171, Universe Books, New York.
42. Tomšić, V. (1975): *The World Population Conference in Review of International Affairs*. Page 5. Belgrade.
43. Dobson, W. M. (1974): in *The Population Debate: Dimensions and Perspectives* Vol. II. Pages 625-640. And other articles.
44. United Nations (1974): *World Population Plan of Action, the Population Debate: Dimensions and Perspectives*, Vol. I, page 155.

Book Review

A History of the Malthusian League, 1877–1927

by Rosanna Ledbetter (Ohio State University Press, 1976: \$12.50)

In the Britain of 1798, a warm reception awaited the Reverend TR Malthus' *Essay on the Principle of Population*. According to classical economics, the wage-fund (the money available to pay wages) was predetermined, and workers could only harm themselves by seeking higher wages. Malthus inferred that increasing the number of workers could only decrease wages; conversely, decreasing the number of workers was necessary to increase wages. Moreover, population tended to increase beyond the means of subsistence.

Malthus concluded that overpopulation was the prime cause of poverty and starvation; and that the workers themselves, by having large families, were primarily to blame. His solution was fertility limitation by late marriage and coital abstinence. Malthusians accepted both his economic doctrine and his solution. NeoMalthusians argued that Malthus' prescribed sexual repression was both unrealistic and unhealthy, and advocated contraception instead. However, by the time the Malthusian League was founded (1877), economists had practically abandoned the notion of a wage-fund.

The 1820s saw published Carlile's *Every Woman's Book; or, What is Love?* and Place's *To the Married of Both Sexes of the Working People*: leaflets disseminating information on contraception. Owen's book, *Moral Physiology* (1832), and Knowlton's pamphlet, *The Fruits of Philosophy* (1834), both included frank details of the known methods of contraception.

In 1854, a book, *Physical, Sexual and Natural Religion*, was published anonymously; the second edition (1857) was retitled *The Elements of Social Science*. It advocated a scientific approach to the human body and sexuality, detailed the hazards of coital abstinence, expounded neoMalthusianism, and described the techniques of contraception. The Malthusian law of population was a law of nature; and the poor must realise "that they themselves are the cause of their own poverty, that the means of improving their condition are in their own hands". Their salvation lay in contraception, not socialism.

After his death in 1904, it emerged that

the anonymous author had been George Drysdale, who had expressed sympathy in 1857 with the idea of a society to advocate neoMalthusianism. In 1861, Bradlaugh proposed the formation of the Malthusian League, which finally arrived in the wake of the renowned Bradlaugh-Besant trial (1877).

Already in circulation for over 40 years, Knowlton's *Fruits of Philosophy* became the subject of a successful prosecution against its bookseller and publisher. Bradlaugh and Besant then decided to challenge the 1857 Obscene Publications Act by reprinting Knowlton's pamphlet. At their trial, they sought to demonstrate that the book advocated the only logical solution to the problem of poverty. The jury returned an ambiguous verdict, interpreted as guilty; however, an appeal (1878) was granted on a technicality.

The trial multiplied the sales of the Knowlton pamphlet manifold. Meanwhile, it was decided to replace it by Besant's *The Law of Population*, a thoroughly Malthusian book (including contraceptive techniques). Besant became the Malthusian League's first secretary (1877–80). George Drysdale's brother, C. R. Drysdale, was elected the League's first president (1877–1907); his wife became its second president (1907–21); and his son, C. V. Drysdale, was its final president (1921–61), although the group practically ceased activities in 1927.

C. R. Drysdale (1848) had visited Ireland just after the famine (1845–7), like Bradlaugh (1850–3) shortly afterwards. Fifty years later, Drysdale recalled vividly the abject misery which he had witnessed as causing him "never to lose sight of the evils caused by over-population, which so many people . . . ascribe to mere political or government errors". Equally characteristic was his brisk dismissal of trade unions, penned in the same year (1898): "they have no permanent effect on wages; . . . The only really useful strike is that against the appearance of a too numerous posterity".

The Malthusian League's primary objectives were: to abolish "all penalties on the public discussion of the Population Question"; and to disseminate "a knowledge of the law of population, of its consequences, and of its bearing upon human conduct and

morals". In 1913, the second objective became: to urge medical authorities to provide contraceptive instruction to married people "who desire to limit their families, or who are in any way unfit for parenthood". In 1917, C. V. Drysdale emphasised the importance which the league attached to spreading Malthusian economic doctrine rather than contraceptive information, and deliberately contrasted the bases and aims of socialism with those of Malthusianism.

For the first two-thirds of the league's active existence, its leaders feared prosecution for sponsoring practical information. Instead, they recommended Besant's *The Law of Population* (1877); Allbutt's *The Wife's Handbook* (1886); and Standring's *Malthusian Handbook* (1893). However in 1913, the league published its own practical leaflet, *Hygienic Methods of Family Limitation*. Recipients were obliged to declare in writing that they were over 21 years old, married or about to be married, and that they considered "the artificial limitation of the family justifiable on both individual and national grounds". No legal difficulties arose.

In a vain attempt to capture the leadership of the family planning movement, burgeoning elsewhere by the 1920s, the Malthusian League was briefly renamed the New Generation League (1922–5). The league's journal, *The Malthusian* (1879–1921 and 1949–52), became *The New Generation* (1922–49), edited by the Drysdales (1879–1923). However, Malthusian (conservative-liberal) economic doctrine remained the league's crumbling foundation to the end: both outmoded and inimical to the developing labour movement, it guaranteed socialist and trade union opposition. The league insisted that workers limit their fertility to solve the problem of poverty; while socialists countered that wealth redistribution was necessary to eliminate poverty and motivate workers to limit their fertility.

Most physicians, clergymen and politicians probably accepted Malthusian economics, while denouncing, or passing over in embarrassed silence, the league's contraceptive solution (After all, Malthus was an Anglican clergyman). In the 1920s, Stopes emphasised the individual benefits of contraception, and the need to improve

the quality of the race, echoing the Drysdales' – and the league's – growing preoccupation with negative eugenics (restricting procreation by the 'unfit'). However, she accused the league of impeding the acceptance of family planning by its antichristian bias. Indeed, the neoMalthusians were characteristically secular and utilitarian: "The greatest happiness of the greatest number", as C. V. Drysdale put it in 1901.

The Malthusian League's membership never exceeded 1250. By contrast, its most successful sister-organisation, the Nieuw-Malthusiaansche Bond, founded in the Netherlands in 1881, achieved 6000 members by 1917, about 40 times more popular (in proportion to population) than the Malthusian League. The Bond soon published its own bestselling *Methods of Preventing Large Families* (1884). In its early years, although always more practical in approach than the league, the Bond also stressed Malthusian economics, antagonising socialists. Then Dr J. Rutgers, a socialist, became its secretary (1899–1917); while his wife became its president (1899–1912).

The Rutgers firmly believed that the Bond "should above all endeavour to spread knowledge which would be useful of itself . . . all views as to the economic or other standpoints of the question were of little importance in comparison with the question of the individual": the words of C. R. Drysdale (1899). Though explicitly aimed against Malthusian doctrine, the Rutgers' criticism was evidently lost on C. V. Drysdale, who frequently attributed the Nieuw-Malthusiaansche Bond's success to the NeoMalthusian movement, rather than to the family planning movement. In 1909, he remained convinced that "Neo-Malthusianism will fail very largely in its ameliorative effects if it is taken up solely in its individual aspect".

The Malthusian League was the first organisation in the world to advocate contraception as the solution to overpopulation and poverty. Until the 1920s, the league remained the only British organisation favouring contraception. In 1921, Stopes founded the Society for Constructive Birth Control and Racial Progress. In 1923, the Society for the Provision of Birth Control Clinics was established, being absorbed in 1937 by the National Birth Control Council (founded, 1930), which

became the Family Planning Association in 1939.

At its last Annual General Meeting in 1927, C. V. Drysdale declared the Malthusian League's work complete. He noted that the birth rate (18 per 1000) had been halved since 1877 (36 per 1000), a trend for which the league assumed a major share of the credit. Drysdale concluded triumphantly: "the neo-Malthusian doctrine and the practice of birth control have been accepted throughout the civilised world to such an extent that their complete adoption is absolutely assured".

Ledbetter concludes her well-written *History of the Malthusian League*: "The league's first objective was achieved as voluntary family limitation became acceptable to almost all segments of English society. At least some credit for the change in attitude should go to the league". A highly debatable verdict, bearing in mind that the league's first objective was to abolish "all penalties on the public discussion of the Population Question".

Nor can the decreased birth rate be construed as evidence for any increased "knowledge of the law of population", the league's original second objective; let alone of the 1913 revision, to induce the government to provide contraceptive instruction. Only in 1930 did the Ministry of Health authorise MCH centres to dispense contraceptive advice – on medical indications only. (The National Health Service accepted full responsibility for contraceptive services in 1974).

The Bradlaugh-Besant trial (1877), and subsequent prosecutions, may well have publicised information on contraception. Decreased fertility was mainly achieved by an uncertain mixture of nonappliance contraception and illegal abortion, practised under material constraints (though hardly the Malthusian checks of disease, famine or war) newly perceived by individuals. Advocating contraception was perhaps bound to antagonise the established church and medical profession, without whose support politicians were reluctant to move.

Advocating Malthusian economics necessarily alienated organised labour, and hence the majority of thinking workers, who readily perceived the individual benefits of smaller families, practically in spite of the Malthusian League. Indeed, Ledbetter's highly

readable and recommendable book originated in a PhD dissertation (1972) with the considerably more arresting title: *The Organisation that Delayed Birth Control*. It would be interesting to know whether the author softened her attitude on reflection; and if so, why? (The joy of speculation is left to the reader!).

In this centenary year (1877–1977) of the Malthusian League's foundation, few will mourn its passing. However, the history of the ideological confusion – and distinction – between "the Population Question" and fertility regulation in practice, between Malthusianism and planned parenthood, is clearly a rich seam, apt for further exploration in Europe. (Ledbetter mentions developments around the turn of the century in: Belgium, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland).

In 1961, the Malthusian League's remaining assets were distributed, the main beneficiaries being the British Family Planning Association (£850), and the IPPF (£350). However, organised neoMalthusianism's main legacy was more ideological than financial. Ten years later (1971), the IPPF Governing Body agreed the following second aim, curiously reminiscent of the Malthusian League's original second objective of 100 years ago: "to increase the understanding by people and governments of the demographic problems of their own communities and of the world".

Argument continues between the advocates of an equitable distribution of resources as a precondition of low fertility, and of low fertility as a precondition of economic development. On the other hand are those advocating planned parenthood as an individual human right, irrespective of such economic arguments. For anyone seeking to understand this controversy, Ledbetter's *History of the Malthusian League* is essential reading.

[The Ohio State University Press Sales Representative in continental Europe is: Feffer & Simons (Nederland) NV, Rijnkade 170, Box 112, Weesp, Netherlands; in Britain: Feffer & Simons Inc, 7 Maiden Lane, London WC2E 7NA.]

Philip Kestelman

Family Planning and Sex Education in Socialist Countries

Physicians, educationalists and counsellors from Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Romania and USSR participated in a meeting organised by the Polish Family Planning Association (TPR) which was held 12–14 December in Warsaw. The meeting was convened by TPR Vice President, Mikołaj Kozakiewicz who introduced the meeting with a general survey on demography, family welfare, and social policy. Three other background papers were presented by TPR workers on: family planning services – means and policies; sex education – organisation and content; and pre-marital and other counselling services. Each paper was followed by discussion and country by country accounts of the situation in the different fields.

Discussion revealed considerable variations in approaches to the subjects discussed, but in certain fields also similarities. For example, the theory and practice of pre-marital and family counselling were found to be convergent in important respects in the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia and Poland. On the other hand only in Poland and the German Democratic Republic was sex education already taught in schools, although in Czechoslovakia and Hungary it is planned to introduce school sex education on a comprehensive basis.

The object of the working group was to afford socialist countries the opportunity of exchanging information and experience in these fields and to establish the basis for future cooperation. As stressed by the Convenor, there are limitations on the extent to which experiences can be used, and discussion in the working group showed clearly enough the diversity of cultures and subcultures in the countries represented and the need for each society to approach the areas in a way appropriate to the local conditions. It is hoped that a similar meeting of socialist countries will be held again in the future. The report of the meeting will be published by TPR in Polish and English.

Abortion ethics discussed

Beginning on Human Rights Day, 10 December 1973, a Regional Working Group on Abortion met in Brussels: its report was published as *Induced Abortion and Family Health: A European View* (1974). In December 1974, a Regional Working Group on Abortion Counselling met in Rotterdam: its report was published as *Abortion Counselling: A European View* (1976). In June 1975, the Regional Council agreed a Regional statement on Abortion (published in the July 1975 *Regional Information Bulletin*).

Induced Abortion and Family Health: A European View had already broached ethical questions; while *Abortion Counselling: A European View* concluded that philosophers and others should discuss the ethics of abortion more thoroughly. In June 1975, the Regional Medical Committee recommended a Regional Working Group meeting on ethical aspects of abortion, to consider the ethical dilemmas of health personnel and women seeking abortion, and to help people to make up their own minds on the rights and wrongs of abortion. The aim of the meeting was to clarify the issues and feelings involved, rather than to resolve the ethical problem of abortion.

Accordingly, the Regional Executive Committee appointed Dr Jan Karbaat (Regional Medical Committee Chairman) convenor of a Regional Working Group on Abortion Ethics, and agreed its title: *Ethical Aspects of Abortion: Some European Views*. On 8–10 December 1976, the Regional Working Group on Abortion Ethics met in the Regional Office, London. Participants attended from Belgium, Britain, Federal Republic of Germany, Finland, Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal and Sweden; with an observer from the World Health Organisation Regional Office for Europe.

Among the participants were philosophers, theologians, physicians, and others. It rapidly became clear that a three-day meeting was insufficient for any deep exploration of all the ethical aspects of abortion, let alone of the inextricable moral problems raised by all methods of fertility regulation, in relation to individual human rights and the exigencies of population policies. For example, opinion was evenly divided on whether any moral distinction could be drawn between contraception and abortion.

Nonetheless, it was substantially agreed that the pregnant woman should be allowed to decide whether to continue or terminate her pregnancy, although not only her own interests were involved. Society ultimately determined whether the human fetus should be

treated as a person, irrespective of its biological parents' wishes; and different societies decided in different ways. Indeed, the differential interpretation of abortion legislation within European countries (notably Britain, France, and the Federal Republic of Germany), and the heavy load of foreign abortion-seekers (currently shifting from Britain to the Netherlands), remains characteristic of Western Europe.

The Regional Working Group on Abortion Ethics concluded that the ethical arguments could not usefully be addressed to the immediate situation of abortion counsellors and women seeking their advice, notwithstanding the counselling ideal of enabling abortion-seekers to reach fully informed decisions. On the other hand, moral considerations affecting personal decisions on family size (including the range of available means) should be integrated into public education, including medical education and the mass-media, bearing in mind the dominant roles of male legislators, moralists, and physicians.

The Regional Working Group on Abortion Ethics resolved no controversy, although the temptation was often strong! The meeting may have partially succeeded in opening up for wider consideration hitherto unexplored features of abortion ethics, and in broadening the discussion into the relatively neglected arena of ethical aspects of fertility regulation and population policy more generally. The diversity of views is acknowledged in the title of the report (*Ethical Aspects of Abortion: Some European Views*), to be finalised by the Working Group, and presented to the Regional Council at the next annual meeting, to be held in June 1977.

Regional Publications

This issue of the *Bulletin* includes a list of Regional publications and a subject Index of the English edition of the *Bulletin* 1972–76. Back issues of the *Bulletin* are available free-of-charge from the Regional Office, but postage will be charged.

ISSN–0306–9303

International Planned Parenthood Federation
Europe Region
64 Sloane Street
London SW1X 9SJ

IPPF EUROPE

Regional Information Bulletin Supplement

Vol 6 No 1 January 1977

Information and Education Material Currently used by Member Associations in the Europe Region*

Denmark – Foreningen for Familienplanlægning, Aurehøjvej 4, 2900 Hellerup, Copenhagen

– *Leaflets* – the FF publishes a wide variety of leaflets – on contraception:

– *Praevention – Metoder* (Contraception – Methods) 150 000 copies in several editions since 1958; *I uterus praevention* (IUD contraception) 40 000 copies in several editions since 1968; *Hormon praevention* (Hormonal Contraception) 70 000 copies in several editions since 1968; *Pessar praevention* (Diaphragm) 30 000 copies since 1968; *Ikke planløst* (Not PLANless – also in English translation) and on condoms – 100 000 copies since 1974. These 4 page leaflets are distributed to schools for the intention of older students, and to the general public in places where people seek advice on contraception.

– on other subjects:

– *Kønslaere – Ordliste* (Sex education glossary) – 8 pages of terms in Danish and Latin, distributed to schools for the intention of students aged 15+ years. 30 000 copies since 1970.

– *Fristen er 12 uger – orientering om abort* (The limit is 12 weeks – information on abortion – also in English translation) – 4 pages describing the human and social situation presented by an unwanted pregnancy. The leaflet is distributed to schools for the intention of students aged 13–19 years, and accompanies the film of the same title (see below). 100 000 copies since 1974.

– *Du vokser* (You are growing – also in English translation) – 4 pages on physical and psychological growth in puberty, distributed to schools for the intention of boys and girls aged 10–12 years. 400 000 copies since 1960.

– *Du vokser endnu unge mand* (You

are still growing young man – also in English translation) – 8 pages of information on sexual problems in relationships, distributed to schools for the intention of boys aged 14–16 years. 200 000 copies since 1963.

All the above leaflets are available free-of-charge to the consumer.

– *Films – Praevention Metoder* (Contraceptive methods – script in English translation) – 10 minute black and white 16 mm film on a school class demonstration of contraceptive methods. Intended for school children from the age of 13 years, the film is distributed to schools by the Danish Government Film Office. Since 1972 the film has been lent out 645 times.

– *Det sker for enhver* (It happens to everybody – script in English translation) – 10 minute black and white 16 mm film which relates through interviews with boys and girls of pre-puberty age the sensation of changing from child to adult. Intended for schoolchildren aged 13–14 years, the film is distributed in the same way as the above film. It is greatly in demand and since 1972 has been lent out over 1000 times.

– *En – to – tre* (One – two – three – script in English translation) – 10 minute black and white 16 mm film in which two couples are interviewed about their relationships and their wish for a child. Intended for older schoolchildren, the film is distributed in the same way as the above films. Since 1972 it has been lent out nearly 700 times.

– *Fristen er 12 uger – orientering om abort* (The limit is 12 weeks – information on abortion) – 15 minutes colour 16 mm film with interviews with 5 young women aged

15–19 years who are involuntarily pregnant and applying for an abortion. Intended for older schoolchildren, the film is available from FF (not yet in the official distribution system).

German Democratic Republic – Ehe und Familie, Leninallee 70, 25 Rostock

Books: (title – author – publisher – date – price)

– *Sprechstunde des Vertrauens* (Confidential counselling) by L. Aresin. Pub. Greifenverlag zu Rudolstadt (1968). M 4.40.

– *Geschlechterziehung in der sozialistischen Oberschule* (Sex education in the socialist high school) by K. Bach. Pub. VEB Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, Berlin (1973). M 14.80.

– *Denkst Du schon an Liebe?* (Do you already think of love?) by H. Brückner. Pub. Der Kinderbuchverlag, Berlin (1976). M 10.80.

– *Wunsch Kinder?* (Wanted children) by K-H. Mehlan. Pub. Greifenverlag zu Rudolstadt (1969). M 9.40.

– *Methoden der Empfängnisverhütung* (Methods of contraception) by K. Rothe. Pub. VEB Fischer, Jena (1973). M 16.–.

– *Mann und Frau intim* (Man and woman intimately) by S. Schnabl. Pub. Greifenverlag zu Rudolstadt (1969). M 11.–.

– *Intimverhalten – Sexualstörungen – Persönlichkeit* (Intimacy – sexual problems – personality) by S. Schnabl. Pub. VEB Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, Berlin (1972). M 15.80.

Ireland – Irish Family Planning Association, 15 Mountjoy Square, Dublin 1

– *Family Planning* – 30 page illustrated booklet published by the IFPA giving general information on

*Unless otherwise stated the material is published by the national planned parenthood associations, to whom any enquiries should be addressed.

contraceptive methods and infertility for the general public. The booklet is sold at *IFPA* clinics, by mail order, in shops and at *IFPA* meetings, and is in great demand. 10 000 copies printed at a cost of £2300. Price 30p per copy.

A 12 page illustrated booklet with the same title, also published by the *IFPA*, provides similar information, but in simpler language for those who have difficulty in reading. This booklet is distributed in the same way as the other booklet. 5000 copies printed at a cost of £600. Price 15p per copy.

The *IFPA* plans to produce leaflets on different methods of contraception for students and youth groups and a leaflet for free distribution with condoms sold in colleges.

- *Leaflets* – the following leaflets on fertility/contraceptive methods published by pharmaceutical companies are used by the *IFPA*: *Understanding Conception Control* and *Understanding Conception* (Ortho); *Planning with Discretion* (Syntex); *Birth Control* (Wyeth); *Birth Control can be Simple* (Organon). The leaflets are distributed to the general public in the same way as *IFPA* booklets but are free-of-charge. They are considered useful for distributing at meetings, and are included with contraceptive supplies supplied by mail order.
- *Sex and Marriage* – 30 page booklet, published by the *British Medical Association*, on marriage relationships, sexual techniques and contraceptive methods, sold to the general public, price 30p.
- *What Every Woman Should Know* 20 page leaflet published by the *Irish Cancer Association* giving simple information on breast cancer prevention. The leaflet is distributed free-of-charge to the general public in the same way as the other publications.

Italy – Unione Italiana Centri Educazione Matrimoniale Prematrimoniale, Via Eugenio Chiesa 1, 20122 Milan

- *Leaflets and information sheets* – 3 fold printed leaflet on *UICEMP* aims/activities/services, distributed to the general public at advice centres

and at meetings; single page mimeograph sheets on services offered by *UICEMP* centres and on sex education courses, distributed to social workers and health personnel (in continuous production); 5 page mimeograph sheet on contraceptive methods, distributed to the general public and *UICEMP* clients; single page mimeograph sheet on premarital counselling, similarly distributed (in continuous production). The leaflet and information sheets are distributed free-of-charge.

- *Poster* – giving basic demographic data, information on the incidence of abortion in Italy, and referring people to *UICEMP* advice centres. Distributed free-of-charge to social workers and public/private organisations. 500 copies produced at a cost of Lit. 100 000.
- *Guida semplice dei metodi per la pianificazione familiare* (Simple guide to methods of family planning) – 8 page mimeograph information on contraceptive methods, intended for the general public, free-of-charge (in continuous production).
- *Troppo Rischioso!* (Too Great A Risk! – originally published by the British FPA) – folded comic strip leaflet, intended for the general public, free-of-charge. First edition of 1000 copies. The leaflet has been found too “English” by many readers.
- *Bucharest '74* – 50 page illustrated report on the World Population Conference, intended for social and health personnel, politicians, etc. Price Lit. 1000. 1000 copies produced at a cost of Lit. 1 500 000.
- *Notizario* (News) – 8 – 10 page quarterly giving news of *UICEMP* activities, information on legislation, articles on different aspects of planned parenthood (some translated from IPPF publications) It is envisaged that space will be given to clients' accounts of their experience at *UICEMP* centres, with suggestions. *Notizario* is subscribed to (annual sub. Lit. 2000) by *UICEMP* members, social and health personnel, journalists, political parties, and various institutions. It is circulated free-of-charge at *UICEMP* meetings. 8000 copies are produced quarterly at an annual cost of Lit. 4 000 000.
- *Pianificazione familiare e controllo dello nascito* (Family planning and

contraceptive methods) – 40 page illustrated booklet, published by *Ed. Aesopus*, giving detailed information on contraceptive methods. Available to the general public from *UICEMP*, price Lit. 500.

Luxembourg – Mouvement Luxembourgeois pour le Planning Familial et L'Education Sexuelle, 3 Avenue Pescatore

- *Zur rechten zeit dran denken* (Think of it in time) – 4 page 2-colour leaflet in German giving information on the *MLPFES* Centre services. Intended for the general public, the leaflet is distributed free-of-charge at *MLPFES* meetings, at medico-social centres and is available in local government offices. Printed in an edition of 3 000 copies at a cost of 12 600 B fr.
- *Sexualität hat mit Liebe zu tun* (Sexuality is part of love – also in French: *La Sexualité fait partie de l'amour*) – 30 page booklet (13 full page photographs) published by the *MLPFES*, giving information on different aspects of sexuality and relationships, contraception, hygiene, responsible parenthood, etc.; intended primarily for young people (although popular also with adults and parents). The booklet is sold by the *MLPFES* price 70 B fr.
- *Methoden der Empfängnisverhütung* (Methods of Contraception) – 27 page booklet in German published as a reprint of a series of articles from a Luxembourg newspaper. Distributed in the same way as the above leaflet, 40 000 copies of the booklet were made available free-of-charge by the newspaper.

Poland – Towarzystwo Planowania Rodziny, Ul. Karowa 31, Warsaw

- *Problemy Rodziny* (Problems of the family) – 80 to 100 page bi-monthly TPR periodical published since 1961. Intended for specialists, the periodical contains scientific reports on sociological, psychological and sexological research in planned parenthood. 4000 copies of each edition are printed. Price 16 zł per copy.
- *Biuletyn Poradnictwo Przedmażeńskie i Rodzinne* (Bulletin on premarital and family counselling) – 40 to 60 page bulletin published since 1975 by TPR. The

bulletin contains information on different aspects of counselling and is circulated free-of-charge to professionals working in this field. 3-4 issues produced annually in an edition of 200.

- *Fakty i Wydarzenia* (Facts and events) - single information sheet published occasionally by TPR in an edition of 50-200, containing items on TPR and IPPF activities, and on Polish and foreign research activities in eg. demography and sex education. The information is circulated free-of-charge to TPR branches and to the press, radio and TV.

The following books and booklets are published by TPR and sold to the general public:

Macierzyństwo (Motherhood - for pregnant women) by J. Beaupré (1972). 60 000 copies. 8 zł.

Nie Wierze w Bociany (I do not believe in storks - for children up to 12 years) by E. Jackiewiczowa (1971) 60 000 copies; (1974) 30 000 copies. 5 zł.

Poradnik Młodej Mezatki (A guide for the young wife) by W. Jackubowska & H. Kowalska (1973). 30 000 copies. 5 zł.

Antykoncepcja nowoczesna (Modern contraception) by K. Jordan (1973). 30 000 copies. 5 zł.

Metody Zapobiegania Ciazy (Contraceptive methods - leaflet free-of-charge) by K. Jordan (1974) 150 000 copies; (1976) 50 000 copies. 8 zł.

Nim Staniecie sie Kobietami (Before you become a woman - for girls of 12-14 years) by M. Kozakiewicz (1973 - second edition). 60 000 copies. 10 zł.

Seks i Wychowanie (Sex and education - documentation from Jablonna seminar) ed. M. Kozakiewicz (1975). 5000 copies. 20 zł.

Sex-Society-Education (in English) ed. M. Kozakiewicz. Mimeographed 1976. 300 copies. Free-of-charge.

Zaburzenia seksualne w małżeństwie (Disturbed sexual relations in marriage - for young couples by R. Sikorski (1974). 30 000 copies. 24 zł.

Bede Matka (The mother-to-be - course and development of pregnancy) by Z. Sternadel (1971). 30 000 copies. 8 zł.

Csy jestem w ciąży? (Am I pregnant?) by Z. Sternadel (1973). 30 000 copies. 6 zł.

Macierzyństwo świadome i nieświadome (Planned and unplanned motherhood - general family planning and specific contraceptive methods) by B. Trebicka - Kwiatkowska (1972). 60 000 copies. 8 zł.

Antykoncepcja-tak, przerywanie ciąży-nie! (Contraception versus abortion) by B. Trebicka - Kwiatkowska (1974). 30 000 copies.

- *Slide sets* (36 slides, all with printed, some with taped commentaries). Brzozowska, I. *Newborn care* (1974) - 316 sets.

Brzozowska, I. *Pregnancy, birth and postnatal care* (1975) - 300 sets.

Kozakiewicz, M. *Basic course in sex education* (1973) - 450 sets.

Kozakiewicz, M. *Marriage in Poland* (1976) - 360 sets.

Sternadel, Z. *Methods of contraception* (1972) - 200 sets.

These slides are distributed to schools, hospitals, MCH centres price 180 - 600 zł. Each TPR branch is supplied with the slide sets free-of-charge. The slides are used in schools and in out-of-school lectures for young people and adults.

- *Tapes* (recorded lectures and talks).

Puberty; sexual maturity; menopause (1973) - 100 copies each.

Newborn and infant care (1974) - 300 copies.

Hygiene of pregnancy and birth (1975) - 300 copies.

Contraceptive methods (1973, 1974) - 300 copies.

The tapes consist of 10-12 lectures averaging 5 minutes each, read by professional speakers for use in broadcasts in student hostels, military barracks, hospitals and MCH reception areas. Price ca. 300 zł.

In addition to the above material, the following popular books and

research studies prepared by TPR have been produced by other publishers:

When Mendelsohn's wedding march stops by Z. Celmer & D. Markowska (1975). 246 pp. 35 zł.

The contemporary family in Poland (a synthesis of Polish family research 1945-1975) by A. Dodzuik-Lityńska. 287 pp. 37 zł.

The family in rural areas - continuity and transformation (a synthesis of scientific research) by D. Markowska (1976). 269 pp. 40 zł.

My marriage and family (selection of diary entries from TPR competition). (1974) ed A. Musiałowa. 547 pp. 50 zł.

Contemporary man as husband and father (selection of diary entries from TPR competition) (1976) ed A. Musiałowa et al. 350pp. 38 zł.

These books are sold to the general public, as part of TPR endeavours to promote scientific knowledge of marriage and family.

Portugal - Associação para o Planeamento da Família, Rua Artilharia Um, 38-2º Dto Lisbon 1

- *Um filho desejado por seus pais é uma criança feliz* (A wanted child is a happy child)

- 12 page illustrated leaflet on family planning and contraceptive methods published by the APF. The leaflet is distributed free-of-charge to the general public via MCH and other health centres, in family planning clinics and hospitals. The leaflet, which has been well received by the public, was produced in an edition of 50 000 copies, financed by Instituto Pasteur

- *Posters* - the APF has published two posters, also financed by Instituto Pasteur: *O Pedro é feliz* (Peter is happy) - phototheme of mother and son, with space for address of family planning clinic; *Planear à família é ter somente o número de filhos que puder criar e educar* (Family planning is having only the number of children you can bring up) - phototheme of family with two children and information on APF services. The posters, distributed free-of-charge to the general public via the same outlets as

above leaflet, were produced in editions of 10 000 and 1000 copies respectively.

Additionally, two posters produced by pharmaceutical companies giving simple information on contraceptive methods are distributed free-of-charge to those working in family planning clinics and health centres: *Métodos de agora de controlo da concepção* (Modern methods of conception control – *Ortho*); *Guia de planeamento familiar* (Family planning guide – *Upjohn*).

- *Alguns aspectos dos problemas emocionais do planeamento familiar* (Some aspects of emotional problems in family planning) – 16 page community research study presented at a meeting of the Portuguese Society of Psychiatry and Neurology. The study, published in 1976, is intended for health personnel and social workers. Price: Esc. 2.50. 1000 copies produced at a cost of Esc. 1000.
- *Planeamento familiar – o direito de ter os filhos que se quer* (Family planning – the right to plan the number of children desired) – 16 page leaflet giving general information on family planning and details of clinics. The leaflet, published in 1976 by the government *Comissão da Condição Femenina*, is available free-of-charge to health personnel and social workers. 2000 copies produced.

In addition to the above, the *APF* has collaborated in producing numerous articles on different aspects of planned parenthood, status of women, etc, published in *Mulher* (Woman) a weekly women's magazine with a circulation of 23 000. Price Esc. 15.00

Yugoslavia – Family Planning Council of Yugoslavia, Bulevar Lenjina 6, Belgrade 11070

- *Bilten izdavač: Savet za planiranje porodice Jugoslavije* – 60–70 page bi-monthly bulletin, published since 1967 by the FPCY in Serbo-Croat, containing information on different aspects of family planning, different experiences in the eight Republics and Autonomous Provinces, and reports on Federal, Republic and

Provincial meetings. The bulletin is sometimes devoted to special issues. It is circulated free-of-charge to interested professionals, health personnel, social scientists, politicians and to FPCY members. 1500 copies of each edition are printed at an annual cost of 30 000 dinars.

- *Vaspitanje omladine za Humane i zdrave odnose medju polovima za skladne i odgovorne odnose u braku i porodice* (Education of Youth for healthy human relations between sexes and for harmonious and responsible marital and family relations) – 94 page annotated bibliography, published 1976 in Serbo-Croat for FPCY by the Bureau for the Advancement of Education. The bibliography lists 110 books and 47 articles (58 items in other European languages) on health, biology medicine, psychology, education, ethics, sociology, law, ideology, preparation for marriage and family life, and family education. It is available free-of-charge to primary and secondary school teachers, teacher training colleges and to the general public. It is envisaged that the bibliography will be updated from time to time. 1500 copies have been produced at a cost of 50 000 dinars.
- *Pravo čoveka da slobodno odlučuje o rađanju u SFR Jugoslaviji* (The Human Right to Free Choice on Childbirth in the SFR of Yugoslavia) – 100 page monograph by *Nevenka Petrić* in English and Serbo-Croat published on the occasion of International Women's Year 1975. Intended for the same readership as the bulletin; also provided to Yugoslav embassies and consulates and to visitors to Yugoslavia as general information. Publication of 3000 copies of the English edition was financed by the Federal Government (100 000 dinars); the same number was published in Serbo-Croat by a women's magazine (80 000 dinars).
- *A selection of articles and speeches on the Status of Women and Family Planning* – 112 page book by *Vida Tomsic*, published 1975 in English by the FPCY – intended for a readership similar to the above monograph. 3000 copies printed at a

cost of 100 000 dinars.

- *Izgradnja društvenih stavova o populacionoj politici u Jugoslaviji* (Social attitudes to population policy in Yugoslavia) – 688 pages (tables, maps, etc.) published by FPCY in Serbo-Croat. Proceedings of a symposium held in Belgrade 1975 on: development of the marxist approach to population theory and policy; world survey of population trends and approaches to population policy; demographic developments in Yugoslavia; family planning in Yugoslavia; population policy for the present and future needs of Yugoslavia.
- *Ostvarivanje ustavnog načela o pravu čoveka da slobodno odlučuje o rađanju dece* (Realisation of constitutional principle of the human right to free choice on childbirth) – 428 pages (tables, maps, etc.) published by FPCY in Serbo-Croat. Proceedings of a symposium held in Bled 1974 on medical, social welfare and legal aspects of planned parenthood.

The two conference proceedings are intended for the same readership as items 1, 3 and 4 above, and for more specialised audiences. Available free-of-charge, 1500 copies of the proceedings were printed, each at a cost of 180 000 dinars.

Future publications planned are:

The proceedings of a symposium on *the role of high schools and universities in the humanisation of relations between sexes*, held in Split 1975 (to be published in April 1977). The proceedings of a symposium on *the inclusion in teacher training curricula of the subject of humanisation of relations between sexes* (to be published at the end of 1977).

A Dictionary of family planning terms and concepts is being prepared by the Institute for Social Sciences Centre for Demographic Research, on behalf of the FPCY (to be published at the end of 1977).

In addition to the above material, a wide range of leaflets, booklets, posters, etc. on contraception is published by Federal, Republic and Provincial medical institutions.