

IPPF EUROPE

Regional Information Bulletin

Vol 6 No 4 October 1977

Editorial

In 1973, planned parenthood associations in Europe carried out a self-analysis exercise on policies and future trends. The facts and ideas emerging from the associations were discussed in a Regional Council seminar the same year (see *RIB* Vol 2 No 3 October 1973).

This exercise served, for the Europeans, as a preparation for the IPPF 21st Anniversary Conference held in Brighton in 1973, which was a first attempt by the IPPF as a worldwide Federation to assess achievements in its first 21 years, and to examine what the future role of the Federation might be.

In 1977, a similar exercise has been conducted in the Region. At the 1977 Regional Council seminar, representatives of the associations discussed where they were in the evolution process towards the acceptance of planned parenthood in society; the successes and failures of their associations; the constant process of change; the need to analyse perspectives and to review both the content and organisational structure of their activities (see *RIB* Vol 6 No 3 July 1977).

Throughout 1977 the IPPF as a whole has been carrying out a review of its future role (see *RIB* Vol 6 No 2 April 1977). The results of this study and a draft Three Year Plan will be discussed by representatives of all IPPF member associations in November 1977. While in 1973 the discussion was on an informal basis, since then the formal structure of a Members' Assembly has been established which will meet in November for the first time, and subsequently every three years. The main powers and duties of the Members' Assembly are:

- to review the role and perspectives of the IPPF;
- to review and adopt the Three Year Plans of the IPPF;
- to ratify amendments to bylaws adopted by the Central Council, and to make recommendations on matters relating to the bylaws to the Central Council;
- to consider how to further the aims and objectives of the IPPF;

In this issue

- Editorial
- **Planned Parenthood Reconsidered—Human Rights and Welfare Aspects**, by *Thorsten Sjövall*
- **Planned Parenthood Developments in Hungary**, by *Péter Jozán*
- **Men's and Women's Camps in Sweden**, by *Carl-Gustav Bøethius* and *Helena Jacobsen*

- to provide a forum for exchange of experience among member organisations.

Planned parenthood associations, and the IPPF regionally and centrally, must be constantly aware of the need to act as a voice for the people, while urging governments to provide services and to avoid the establishment of bureaucratic systems which inevitably inhibit change.

During the four years since the Brighton Conference international debate on development issues has continued and broadened. In 1974, the World Population Conference produced the *World Population Plan of Action*, and a similar plan emerged from the International Women's Year Conference in 1975. The so-called North-South dialogue and the New International Economic Order have entered into the everyday parlance of those who discuss development issues. In these issues, for example world food, water and energy resources, common themes are apparent, notably the urgent need to establish a more equitable distribution of global income and resources.

While it is right for the IPPF as a federation of member associations from different countries worldwide to discuss matters relating to its work, and to take account of the international development discussions, it must guard against viewing planned parenthood *primarily* in this context. Essentially, those who subscribe to the principle of planned parenthood as a fundamental human right, and to the notion that the

basic task of an IPPF member association is to enable and to promote access to planned parenthood for all peoples in its society, by a means acceptable to the population, realise that any progress at the global level is a reflection of what is achieved at the "grass roots" level.

In working towards their aims, associations must follow and protect certain basic principles. Discrimination on grounds of sex, race, socio-economic status, religion, to mention some obvious areas, is inimical to the human right to fertility regulation. Discrimination against women, wherever it exists, is not merely a legal question but a question of the position of men and women and children regarding conditions of employment, education and housing for example.

Elimination of such discrimination depends to a significant extent on efforts to improve conditions in these and related areas, and not least in recognition of the rights of the child and the responsibilities of parents and society towards the child. In this sense the 1979 International Year of the Child is a valid occasion for IPPF member associations to voice their views and, hopefully, to demonstrate the contribution which their work can make towards improving conditions for children born into our world.

Thorsten Sjövall who joined the board of the Riksförbundet för Sexuell Upplysning, the Swedish planned parenthood association, in 1948, has been for many years a leading figure in the IPPF, both as a national and a regional representative. He has always recognised the necessity to question accepted concepts of human behaviour and interpretations of IPPF policy and working methods. For the 1973 Anniversary Conference he wrote a paper entitled *Planned Parenthood Reconsidered - Human Rights and Welfare Aspects*, which is published below, and to which he has added a postscript. The Europe Region publishes his paper and additional comments as a background to the discussion of the Members' Assembly on the future of the IPPF, believing that although this paper was presented four years ago it is, in essential points, valid today.

Planned Parenthood Reconsidered Human Rights and Welfare Aspects

Introduction

The last IPPF world conference designed for a full membership representation was held in Chile in 1967 under the title "Planned Parenthood—A Duty and a Human Right". I had the honour of summarising that conference, and in doing so I compared the international planned parenthood movement to a chariot drawn by the four horses, bio-medical sciences, technology, demography and education. In conclusion I emphasised the importance of steering these horses to some kind of concerted action lest the progress towards a widespread acceptance of our message be slowed down.

When we now, after six and a half years, are coming together with the specific aim of calling on representatives from all our member associations to which some thirty have been added since Chile, as well as many distinguished guests, in order to critically consider who we are, where we stand and how we are looking at the future, it seems natural to me to try and follow up the line from Chile, the more so since I have been asked to deal with the main theme of that occasion, the human rights aspect.

The time elapsed since then may seem short, but it certainly has been pregnant with ominous notions both in terms of sharpening our awareness of the problems we already recognised and in adding new ones that we did not see so clearly at the time. To the four "horses" I mentioned in Chile we could easily add quite a number of new ones today which are more or less related to our specific aims. This interrelatedness of various aims and efforts obviously does not diminish the need for finding ways of integration. Unfortunately it also contributes to a general confusion in the overall field of international development, in which the IPPF has a rather specific and limited role to play. Maybe we, although a rapidly growing organisation, should keep this fact in mind and be attentive to the dangers of dispersing our forces over too many subjects and too large areas of action.

For the sake of limitation I shall today make an attempt at adumbrating our problems from the point of view of the tensions that may arise between the large areas of facts and values, between science (exemplified mainly by demography) as *describing* objects and

explaining causal relationships and events on the one hand, and humanism as *sensing* people and *understanding* relationships and actions on the other. I shall try to develop the case for human rights and values to serve as guiding and integrating principles for a globally acceptable planned parenthood movement, with due regard for the necessity of taking scientific contributions into account. I shall have nothing new to say on this difficult subject matter. At best I may be able to point to some not too frequently considered perspectives of it. And I am anxious to emphasise that I am speaking as a representative of a particular part of the world with the inevitable bias and limitations of views that go with being a son of one's land.

The idea of universal human rights

During the last few years a new discipline of knowledge has emerged which is laying claims to predictive powers on a scientifically respectable basis. It is called futurology, and one of its most impressive areas of investigation is the general problems of growth, particularly exponential growth. The collected examples of such growth displayed during the last few years make even the so-called population explosion look rather bleak. In the perspective of scientific futurology, the planet earth has become very small as a result of the speed of certain technical developments and the deterioration of certain life-preserving conditions, and at the same time very large, in view of the task of disseminating a sufficient awareness and responsibility for peaceful and effective collaboration on a global scale.

The paradox of a rapidly shrinking world in the scientific dimensions of space, time and material resources on the one hand, and a frighteningly expanding world in the humanistic dimensions of the demand for general education and shared participation and responsibility on the other, certainly confronts us with a bewildering dilemma at the level of practical action.

Opinions differ as to how this dilemma could best be tackled, and here it seems both justified and important, for purposes of a broad description, to speak about a scientific and a humanistic approach respectively. The existence of this dichotomy is frequently tangible enough but the implications thereof are rarely made explicit, perhaps because any such attempt is likely to raise principle and

ideological matters of a rather cumbersome nature. Most futurologists are putting forward a strong case for the probability of a major world catastrophe within a timespan of a few decades, unless drastic steps are taken now on the basis of what today appear as hard scientific facts. However, if this notion were to be indiscriminately acted upon, it would imply that a few experts should exercise their knowledge on behalf of the vast majority who have not had a chance so far to become sufficiently knowledgeable to understand what is supposedly required for their own benefit. In support of such policy one would point to the remarkable achievements of science during the last hundred years which inspired a still powerful positivistic ideology in the industrialised world. There we still firmly adhere to what we call growth and progress by means of putting the hard facts of science into practice, the faster the better.

But the crux remains that we have to do with human beings, and among those, the sage of this world are still in utter minority. That is to say that any consistent and efficient large-scale application of scientific knowledge would require a concentration of power that is incompatible with widespread democratic ideals of self-determination and, at the global level, with national sovereignty. And at the other end of the issue, we cannot be certain at all that scientific truth is always the needle of the politician's compass. We were, for instance, told earlier this year that the post of Presidential Science Advisor in the White House was abolished, whatever that may signify. In any case, we may reasonably conclude that even the idea of trying to avert a threatening world catastrophe merely by pure reason and scientific facts is somehow politically unfeasible.

Sagacity in itself is simply not enough, and here something which we can only refer to as human nature, the subject of humanism, enters the picture. Whatever laws may be governing this human nature, they so far stubbornly refuse to yield to pure reason and the hard facts of science. This, in a sense, is the strength of human nature in all its conceptual softness; to query itself, to exercise self-criticism, and even to distrust itself and its own achievements. We cannot distrust science as such, that would be meaningless, but we may, for very good reasons, distrust the way human beings are making use of science. Never have such misgivings been stronger and more appropriate than in

our days. Never has there been such abundance of what Rabindranath Tagore called the shameless pact between science and evil.

Already during that fairly recent catastrophe called the second world war, applied science showed its destructive potentialities to such an impressive extent as to stimulate to reconsiderations of the human predicament. The need was felt for a set of rules that in terms of values as distinct from scientific knowledge might serve as guidelines of human affairs. At a conference in San Francisco in 1945 the idea of human rights as an international issue took shape for the first time in history.

This was followed by the UN *Declaration of Human Rights* in 1948. It was described as "a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations", and has hence been regarded as an expression of a world opinion concerning the protection of certain fundamental rights and freedoms of every individual.

The *Declaration* is so far not binding on any nation but several steps have been taken in such directions of which the most notable ones are the European Convention on Human Rights of 1950 with later elaborations, and the UN Covenant of Civil and Political Rights of 1966.

Today, in this 25th anniversary year of the *Declaration* it is fair to state that voices advocating some globally binding international agreements on certain issues of human rights as the perhaps most vital prerequisite for survival are becoming both more numerous and more respected.

The articles in the original *Declaration* which are of a *general* interest to the IPPF are those stating the freedom of thought, speech and the dissemination of information and knowledge through all available channels and, furthermore, those stating the right to education and to participation in scientific achievements and advantages. A recently formulated application of these rules with a very *specific* interest to the aims of the IPPF was presented at the 20th Anniversary Conference on Human Rights in Teheran in 1968 to the effect "that couples have a basic human right to decide freely and responsibly on the number and spacing of their children and a right to adequate education and information in this respect." This statement has by now been signed by some thirty heads of state.

It is to be admitted that in the light of practical difficulties and humble accomplishments through these twenty-five years the *Declaration on Human Rights* may be easily dismissed as so many pious words. And yet, there are many who would reject such an attitude as prohibitively cynical. Those who do so would prefer, I am sure, against what may seem like heavy odds, to regard the *Declaration* and what it has aspired to so far as a groundwork on which a workable code of globally accepted and binding ethic could eventually be built. Such an outcome may seem hopelessly utopian but it is certainly badly needed in view of the discrepancy between our impressive accomplishments in terms of scientific and technological development on the one hand, and our lamentable shortcomings in terms of creating a physically and/or emotionally endurable life for a reasonable majority of human beings on the other. Our experiences in the last few years definitely indicate that such shortcomings are equally obvious for rich and for poor countries. This is to say that we are all, without exception, surrounded by a disproportionately large number of fellow men in various stages of "unmet needs", and the question whether we should and could meet them to a somewhat larger extent than we are doing today seems in the first place to be an ethical one. The question is simply whether we are prepared to accept that any realistic and efficient steps in this direction will inevitably bear on those who are most powerful. It is a commonplace, but worth repeating, that at all levels, individual, organisation and state, the devotion to a cause tends to cool off at the point where self-restriction or even sacrifice are involved.

IPPF policy on human rights and welfare

The ideological position of the IPPF is laid down in Article 1, Section 2, of its constitution in the form of general "beliefs" and a number of specified aims to further these beliefs. In the first version of our Constitution the "beliefs" were three, presented in the following order, 1. "that a favourable balance between the populations and natural resources of the world is an indispensable condition of a lasting world peace", 2. "that such a balance is unattainable unless knowledge of planned parenthood is extended" and 3. "that this knowledge is a fundamental human right".

You can see that from the very start we expressed our basic beliefs in this dichotomised form; population problems and human rights; facts that can be more or less measured and values that cannot; or, as I have chosen to express it here, science and humanism. This is notable from the point of view that pioneer planned parenthood, at least in the rich countries, clearly started out at the practical level from what could be called the humanistic end, that is on the basis of individual welfare considerations. What impressed the pioneer women in this part of the world, many of whom later appeared as founders of the IPPF, was in the first place the poverty, ill-health and general misery as a result of unplanned and unwanted pregnancies, that they met in personal encounters with individuals.

When we formulated those aims in 1953 it was as if the humanistic welfare message of the pioneer women could not really stand for itself, perhaps because of its debatable implication, according to some people, that a woman should have the right to regulate her own fertility, an ethical principle that since then has been much more accepted world-wide. But I also clearly remember that all of us at that time believed in the population control powers of contraception as such, to an extent that later experiences have by no means borne out, and we seemed to seek a sort of scientific support in the allegedly calculable disasters that might ensue from increasing human numbers. Perhaps, with the intention of laying the groundwork for a world movement, we also tried to reconcile a Western welfare approach with a more population oriented one in certain Asian countries.

Be this as it may, the fact is that the word sex and any isolated assertion that sexual knowledge is a universal human right were, and to a considerable extent still are, frowned upon in relevant debates in the West as well as in the East. However, during the first ten years of IPPF work we hardly noticed any dichotomies whatsoever, nor were we in any way troubled by ideological controversies. This may be characteristic of enthusiastic pioneer movements, at least as long as they are still relatively small and stick together in one single unit, as we did during this decade. We also started at the operational rather than at the organisational phase of development, an order of things which again may be typical of pioneer endeavours, although

by modern planners considered a wrong one. We did so by adopting a rather restrictive medico-technical approach in the field which we at the time regarded as more or less self-evident. The fact that medicine, by which we were entirely dominated, so to speak by nature, constitutes an amalgamation of science and humanism may also have paved our way in those days.

Changes that later occurred may be seen as reflected in amendments of the aims paragraph of our constitution which took place twice, in 1963 and in 1971.

In 1963, from our original three "beliefs" the second one stating that a balance between the population and natural resources is unattainable unless knowledge of planned parenthood is extended, was dropped, and the two remaining ones were reversed in order to read: 1. "that knowledge of planned parenthood is a fundamental human right", and 2. "that a balance between the population of the world and its natural resources is a necessary condition of human happiness and peace".

These amendments are quite interesting in my given context and worthy of an attempt at closer analysis. They were adopted at the seventh IPPF world conference in Singapore, and there, for the first time in front of a relevant audience it was emphasised that a balance between population and resources had in fact been attained in industrialised parts of the world without any systematic extension of planned parenthood knowledge whatsoever.

This clarification allowed for at least three conclusions. Firstly, we could no longer honestly uphold our second "belief" that the desired balance is unattainable unless knowledge of planned parenthood is extended, so that formulation had to be deleted. Secondly, we had to accept that there are then factors other than the practice of instrumental contraception that can bring about such balance, and thirdly, to the extent that we from the rich countries are going to teach other countries large scale instrumental contraception, we are embarking on an entirely novel enterprise that has never been sufficiently accepted, let alone consistently adopted in any one country so far. Under such circumstances we may well ask ourselves what indeed is the scientific and experimental basis for what we are trying to teach.

About this a Pakistani collaborator in our field recently had the following to say: "It is ironical that people who, in recent history, have suppressed the human right to plan family size with police force and repressive laws, false propaganda and social ostracism, medical lies and Church pressure should now proclaim themselves as champions of self-determined fertility. In this country (Pakistan) birth control has never been considered aberrant, shameful, immoral, or detrimental to health. Planned parenthood had begun to make sense in South Asia long before sane attitudes prevailed in the West". (Wajih-Ud-Din Ahmed in "Birth Right" vol. 7. No. 2. 1972).

Now, in 1963 the IPPF had reached a size that no longer allowed for the type of centralised and unified government that had been practised up till then. Another important step taken in Singapore was the adoption of certain measures to strengthen the regional structure of the Federation. This opened a possibility for both a decentralisation of work and a more pronounced demarcation of regions with certain characteristics and problems of their own, and with a degree of autonomy in conducting their own business. A process was started by which the full democratic representation of the autonomous member associations was provided for at the regional and not as before at the central level. It goes without saying that the safeguarding of such democratic representation is an absolutely vital human rights issue in the IPPF internally.

This move towards a more pronounced regional crystallisation could appropriately be interpreted not only as a matter of administrative convenience, but also as a recognition of the diversity of conditions and the variety of problems to be tackled in different parts of the world. From this point of view it may seem logical to put a unifying and relatively non-controversial humanitarian principle such as the fundamental right to planned parenthood knowledge at the top of our aims paragraph. However, to what extent such consideration really contributed to the decision of making this shift at this particular moment I would not like to say, but the fact is that the main instigator of the change was the then combined region of Europe, Near East and Africa which happened to house many sympathetic but pronatalist countries in their area.

In any case, the auspices for a further development along explicitly humanistic lines were there after Singapore, but what really happened was in many respects different and, in a sense, paradoxical.

The sixties became the break-through period for an international debate, awareness and action at responsible quarters in regard to population problems, both at the national and the international level. Exponentially increasing human numbers as a result of medical achievements, essentially in terms of a lowered infant mortality, where this had always been very high, was now paradoxically proclaimed as the principal threat to the future of mankind. The cynicism of this proclamation did not seem to strike the experts. I mean the cynicism by which lowered infant mortality becomes an evil, the cynicism inherent in this sudden shift to its opposite of a human conceptualisation immemorial, that procreation is an asset, a human right and even a duty, and in making believe that this shift could be accomplished at anything like a global scale in a reasonably short time by individuals given a free choice based on knowledge and honest conviction.

The IPPF contributed to, and gladly embarked on this eventually marketable international tide of seeking an identified scape-goat for various contemporary discomforts. The flashy spots of make-up adorning our face towards the world became to an increasing extent the last slogans of the over-population preachers, such as "the population bomb", "the population explosion", "zero population growth" and what not, with this final touch of the letterhead we are now circulating around the world indicating that this anniversary is a humble inauguration of the World Population Year in 1974. Ideologies beyond pseudo-demographic elaborations on the theme of unspecified overpopulation as the root of all evil, as well as the human rights and welfare aspects of planned parenthood were conspicuously neglected in central level IPPF mass media presentations during the sixties. The result is that today, in the eyes of innumerable people, we are something between nothing at all and an organisation with the starkly dominating aim of curbing population increase in the world, particularly the poor world. Recent proclamations to the effect that the US and the UK are indeed overpopulated too has so far made little impact on this image.

Instead of consistently pursuing the Singapore vision of a number of profiled regions which, with due respect for their ethnic characteristics, were encouraged to find their way under the guidance of human rights and value principles we helped to widen the already deplorable gulf between the rich and the poor by adding a demographic wedge to the others. And the peoples of the poor parts were, to the extent that our message was reaching them at all, clearly made to understand that theirs was an undesired breed.

This development is a good example of what I in Chile referred to as the possibility of one of our horses running wild. It is regrettable, not only because it maintains and aggravates an unfortunate division of the world, but also because it tends to give the entirely unjustified credit to the rich countries of having solved their own planned parenthood problems, and to indicate that such alleged solutions are in any way suitable for wholesale export.

And yet, the picture I have painted of the sixties may, fortunately and hopefully, be rather superficial in many respects, presenting our facade only but not so much what was really behind it. There was of course much more to be learned and rectified during this period. In the first place, the proposed marriage between planned parenthood, IPPF brand, which means *voluntary* planned parenthood, and the more exuberant population control propaganda did not turn out very happily. In the beginning we may still have been in good faith with an undue optimism as to what technical instruction and clinical services would accomplish in terms of improving both individual welfare and population conditions. But it so happened that one of the great lessons of the sixties was that foreign-inspired "crash programmes" aimed at "target populations" in selected countries proved, more often than not, to be a disappointment. The alternative of motivating individuals at so-called grass-root levels through comprehensive information and education programmes with a heavy reliance on indigenous workers rather than on outside "experts" started to take shape, and was eventually acted upon within the IPPF.

To the extent that the word education here is taken seriously, implying a dialogue in an atmosphere of mutual understanding between educators and

those to be educated, this is again a humanistic approach rather different from any demographic 'crash programme' ideology. It indicated a most important development within the IPPF that also took place during the sixties. It may be described as a gradual transition from our first period of medico-technical dominance to one in which a major investment is being made in multiprofessional and multimedia information and education, with due consideration for local and cultural conditions. It found an expression in the last amendment of our aims paragraph formulated as follows: "to encourage the training of physicians, nurses, health visitors and social workers in the practical implementation of family planning services", now to read: "to encourage and organise the training of all appropriate professional workers such as medical and health personnel, educationalists, social and development workers in the implementation of the objectives of the Federation".

Summing up what I have so far tried to describe, and at the same time putting it into a broader historical perspective we may speak of a *prenatal period* of the planned parenthood movement. It started off with the neo-Malthusian concept of birth-control which was no doubt inspired by a positivistic ideology predominating at the turn of the century. The touch of mechanistic and life-restricting crudeness adhering to the term birth-control contributed to having it replaced, in the 1930s, by the concept of family planning. This provided for a larger operational involvement of a traditionally life-preserving medical profession, as well as for an emphasis on male responsibility in the field, and it added a social and sociological aspect to the matter. The next step was the *birth of the IPPF* and of the concept planned parenthood. This again signified, in my view, a still broader approach, recognising that problems related to regulation of human fertility are by no means restricted to the family institution, and implying that a basic knowledge of sexuality and reproduction should be considered a universal human right.

It seems quite justified to state that the overall developmental process as reflected in these terms, birth-control—family planning—planned parenthood, points to widening humanistic orientation towards our subject matter. This is a challenge and a responsibility that I think an ideologically independent voluntary world

organisation should take very seriously.

As I mentioned already, our *infancy and childhood* went by rather harmoniously. We showed a mixture of pioneer spirit and ignorance which carried us over any overt ideological turmoil. Our *adolescence*, however, which we are now supposed to leave, did show all the signs of turbulence which are so familiar for that period of physical and mental growth. I shall spend a few words on how I believe that came about.

A humanistic perspective of the present situation

The main characteristic of our immediate past and present situation is growth, that is to say the same phenomenon that strikes the futurologists as so interesting, and so fateful. There is little doubt that what ushered in this period in the life of IPPF, and the food, so to speak, that made our present growth at all possible is the tide of worldwide overpopulation concern that started in the mid-sixties. A combination of awe at the level of individual sophistication and various economic interests at the level of political power-seeking seems to have given this tide an impetus that tends to sweep away any idealistic humanitarian principles, which are admittedly nowhere and at no time very easy to sell.

Now, the growth of the IPPF is not only manifested by the recruitment of new member associations but, in my context more importantly, by the establishment of large staffs of full time employed people of which many are professionals outside the field of pure administration. This means, in comparison with our childhood days, an entirely different situation in regard to internal cohesion and power-structure involving many interesting and intricate problems of role-assessment, communication and human relationships. One of the obvious tasks of any growing staff gaining some influence within a pioneer organisation of volunteers is to reverse the order of functioning which I have described as characteristic for such organisations, namely the tendency to start working at an operational end of activities, and then to consider the organisational problems in the light of practical experience. We may say that a pioneer organisation ceases to be so when action of an essentially impressionistic character is being replaced by one founded on systematic planning. As you all-know, this is exactly what is happening in the IPPF at the present time. Planning and

evaluation have become words of honour and necessity to an extent previously unheard of.

But such change can obviously not occur without considerable tension and discomfort, optimistically to be interpreted as growing pains. Planning and evaluation sincerely and consistently confront us with our aims and their implications, and the scene becomes for the first time widely opened for explicit ideological controversies and polarisations. It is now that the tensions between facts and values, between scientific and humanistic orientations, as reflected also in the dichotomy of the aims paragraph in our constitution, inevitably come to the fore, and, if not wisely handled, these may reach levels of threatening disruption.

Take for instance the issue of planning. If the planners tend to become decision-takers with the idea that those planned for were more or less ignorant of what is good for them, then alleged realism has violated humanism; then the principal humanistic basis for communication, dialogue, is no longer respected, and this is a serious infringement of human rights.

Or take the matter of evaluation. You may say that from a realistic and scientific point of view any proper evaluation requires a measurable standard of some kind. But you may also say that for an organisation like the IPPF the only reasonable criterion of efficiency is the extent to which those evaluated are fulfilling our aims, and this is essentially a matter of a more or less subjective interpretation. Since the aims are diversified, and since aspirations and outlooks in different parts of the world are also diversified, a setting of priorities in regard to these aims is not only perfectly legitimate but necessary. Now, to the extent that evaluators tend to determine not only administrative machinery but also such setting of priorities, this would constitute a violation of autonomy, and of human rights.

I do not say that such tendencies are necessarily acted out in practice. I say that they constitute a danger to look out for, and a problem that obviously becomes actualised by the establishment of a large and more or less centralised apparatus for planning and evaluation purposes.

The present structure and, in the opinion of many, the very strength of the IPPF as an international

organisation is vested in some well balanced division of labour between elected volunteers and a staff of employees. But it hardly behoves us to deny that the relationship of the electee to the IPPF is different from that of the employee in several important respects, and that this has some notable implications. To illustrate, I shall quote Mrs. Ottesen-Jensen at the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the Swedish member association earlier this year. She summarised her attitude by saying: "We founded an organisation designed to make itself superfluous". This spirit of modesty may seem exemplary to all of us as emanating from one of our most admired volunteers, but it also illuminates, in a nutshell, the existential difference between the volunteer and the employee. In any organisation structured as ours, it is of course a lot easier for a volunteer than it is for an employee to work sincerely towards his own elimination. You may say that this is not applicable for a foreseeable future anyway and is therefore only of the remotest theoretical interest, but I would submit that this different predicament of the volunteer and the employee deserves our attention already today, because behind it lurks the well-known modern phenomenon of self-maintaining bureaucracy for its own sake. To balance this apparently almost inevitable evil it seems essential to maintain and develop a continuous dialogue between volunteers and employees on the basis of kind of natural division of labour to the effect that, broadly speaking, the volunteers represent the aspects of ideologies and human values, and the employees those of realities as expressed in figures and statistics. To foster a respectful but straightforward and critical dialogue of this kind would, I am sure, be constructive for handling communication problems, for ameliorating any tendencies to rigid polarisation at either side, and thus for paving our way towards comprehensive collaboration for the future.

Such a dialogue would, in a sense, only reflect at a microlevel what is at present taking place at a much larger scale in terms of the ongoing dialectics between humanistic and natural sciences, for long referred to as "the two cultures". Relatively new philosophical and psychological disciplines such as metascience (the science of sciences), system theory and communication theory, in dialectic interaction with biology and other natural sciences,

formed a background for such new disciplines in the range of our own interests as human ecology. By and large there is no doubt that such new ways of thinking have profoundly modified our image of man in his world. One of the most notable of these modifications is that what we previously tended to regard as more or less mechanistic events of a simple linear causation now appear as complicated, multifactorial processes of a circular or feed-back causation, a typical example of which in our field would be, for instance, the relationship between family size and material standards of life. Furthermore, such insights help bridge the former gap between scientific causality and humanistic teleology. As compared with the position of early century positivism I would interpret this as a battle won for humanism in present time conceptualisations.

The importance of all this, as I see it, is that in view of the shattered infallibility of so-called exact sciences, and the speed with which what appear as scientific truths today are replaced by others tomorrow, we seem to have very good reason to ask ourselves whether certain humanistic ideas concerning human rights, health and welfare are not after all *more* universal, persistent and viable as guidelines for action at the global level than much of what at a certain period may pass as scientific facts.

This does of course not mean that we could dispose of science, but it does mean that since, in the last instance, we have to do with human beings our approach might have been unnecessarily lopsided and therefore less constructive than perhaps it could be.

Let me take a simple illustration. As already mentioned we learned as a scientific fact that the main cause of the so-called population explosion was a lowered infant mortality in the third world. Today we learn that as long as infant mortality is as high as it is in Africa, for instance, nobody there would even think of family planning, for fear of childlessness. In order to stimulate contraceptive practices there, we have to secure the survival of infants which would aggravate the population explosion, a rather bewildering situation, as long as family planning is thought of as a device for population control.

Or another example. In some countries in my own region, we sometimes argue

that contraceptive practice may, paradoxically, have a pronatalist effect in so far that it promotes health and wellbeing and with this, sometimes, a positive attitude towards procreation.

Or still another example: We are prone to present instrumental contraception as an indisputable benefaction to mankind. In doing so we disregard, or are unaware, that from a psychological point of view sterility, even temporarily and voluntarily chosen, may constitute an extra burden on the adaptive capacities of the majority of women who have to repress so-called biological needs which they were taught to revere, on the demand of recent social requirements. I do not say that we should necessarily yield to such phenomena, but I do say that we may be better off if we are aware of them and even respect them as perhaps irrational but nevertheless tangible realities.

The only possible way of coping with difficulties of this kind is, as I see it, to embark on the humanitarian, if admittedly slow and cumbersome process of coming to grips with what individuals immediately concerned really think, feel and would be prepared to do, and monitor our steps accordingly.

But I do believe that every single worker in this field should try to decide, honestly and sincerely, what position the principle of a free choice in matters of human fertility regulation has in his personal hierarchy of values. Does it overrule the hint of some futurologists that such idealism is not permissible in view of scientific realities which call for a dictatorial exercise of power to prevent a major world catastrophe, in a conviction that such a remedy would be worse than the evil it is supposed to cure? Does it override also the admonitions from some quarters that certain methods of fertility regulation, although reasonably safe from a medical point of view, are unacceptable? These are the crucial ethical questions which none of us can really avoid. They will no doubt be answered differently by different individuals, but the only way that may offer a decent compromise towards practical action is, in my view, to exercise the method of critical dialectics at all levels of operation.

The welfare aspect

I have said nothing explicit so far about the welfare aspect, for the simple reason that, in my opinion, this is selfevident and axiomatic. It is the origin of our movement and certainly the very

ground on which we stand, in spite of certain tendencies that might be interpreted differently. We have seen enough of human suffering as a result of unwanted pregnancies, enough of misery and poor health among all members of large families who knew little about sex and nothing about contraception, enough of sexual disharmony from misconceived taboos and fear of pregnancy, and of depression as result of infertility. We have seen enough of all this, I am sure, to feel sufficiently convinced of the benefits we have secured for ourselves in terms of knowledge and facilities to bring such discomforts under some voluntary control. We need no scientific investigations to justify our providing such knowledge and such means to anyone who asks for it or can be respectfully motivated to do so. In this context I would like to caution against what seems to me an almost compulsory over-estimation of recorded quantities and facts, as distinct from experienced qualities and values, a disrespect for commonsense and an undue demand for scientific "proofs" of trivial experience.

During these 21 years we have seen several family planning programmes being established for alleged reasons of population control but with no scientifically demonstrable impact on the population situation. On the other hand, we can hardly envisage any family planning programme, established for whatever reasons, which does not have some impact on individual health and welfare. Why then not stick to what we can really and honestly promise, scientifically provable or not? Why not take the less controversial, more unifying and probably more stable concepts of human rights, public health and individual welfare as our leading issues in presenting what we stand for at the global level?

Thorsten Sjövall
Stockholm

Author's Postscript

Rereading the above paper I am pleased to find that there are no main ideas or opinions expressed in it that I feel today require urgent change or even modification. In fact, development during the last few years in many respects seems to have borne out several trends and suggestions outlined in the paper.

The seventies have been conspicuous in adding another phrase to "planning"

and "evaluation", namely "integration". The notion has received such consistent emphasis as to change the whole climate of the international debate. The concept of integration implies consideration of the complexity and intricacy of local development processes, and in the realm of our interests thereby constitutes a anathema to simplicistic and isolated confrontation of any population with instrumental contraception. The events in India and the abortion controversies in several other countries are recent significant cases in point.

As to the world population problem, there seems to be no doubt that the Bucharest Conference of 1974 considerably changed the perspective. No one would venture today to present "overpopulation" as a major plague of mankind, as so many in fact did during the sixties, in any representative international gathering. Instead, "World Population Year" and other UN "Years" during the seventies, although criticised by many for being just large show-pieces without any practical impact, at least have brought to the fore another major problem that seems to attract increasing attention today, namely the gaps in too many respects between the industrialised countries and the so-called Third World.

Last but not least, the recent explicit launching by the USA of human rights as a major political issue, may allow at least some guarded optimism with regard to some ideas outlined in my paper.

Within the IPPF, I think that our recent meetings and seminars have reflected increasing investments in collaborative and educational enterprises, and a waning interest in medical technicalities. We have also fully adopted the concept of integration which, however, poses new problems, such as how to retain our constituted identity under new and rapidly changing circumstances and requirements. Furthermore, the ghost of bureaucracy is still looming. What has been called "the unification of staff" seems to constitute a threat to the idea of collaborating but distinct regions. It remains to be seen to what extent we are willing and able to make the Members' Assembly act as a balance to this threat. For the time being, however, I prefer to see recent efforts in terms of interregional task forces travelling around the world with the purpose of presenting a comprehensive report to the Assembly as a manifestation of development towards constructive integration.

Planned Parenthood Developments in Hungary

The formation of the *Hungarian Scientific Society for Family and Women's Welfare* in March 1976 (the Society became a member of IPPF the same year) established an institutional framework for planned parenthood. Before the establishment of the *Society* planned parenthood was already supported by the National Health Service and appropriate social organisations. Effective contraception became a matter of social policy in Hungary in the second half of the 1960s.

After World War II, a "baby boom" lasted for some years. Despite subsequent pronatalist measures, fertility declined considerably, reaching its lowest level in the early 1960s. In the late 1960s fertility became stabilised at a rather low level. Later, fertility increased, partly as a result of a moderate pronatalist policy, and partly because larger cohorts were entering the most fertile age. In the early 1970s, the mean birthrate was 16.1 per thousand; at the same time, the total fertility rate, allowing for the bias of age-structure, was 2.1 per 1000 women. Fertility subsequently increased, especially following the pronatalist measures initiated in 1973. In 1974-76, the mean birthrate was 17.9 per 1000.

Two questions arise concerning the decrease in fertility: Why did fertility decrease? and, How did fertility decrease? In answer to the first question, we can state that the unusually rapid decline in fertility was the indirect consequence of a radical transformation of society. During a relatively short period, this transformation involved the transfer of the population from dependence on agriculture to industry and services, and migration to urban areas. Another characteristic of the transformation was that women entered employment. Industrialisation, urbanisation, the growth of female employment, and the appearance of the small family ideal of two children, connected with these socio-economic processes, explain the great fall in fertility. (The decline in fertility having occurred after World War II, the decrease in mortality did not play a significant role.)

Fertility decreased due to the fact that fertility regulation began to be generally practised. In this respect, two general stages can be distinguished. In the first stage, married couples regulating their fertility typically used withdrawal and induced abortion. Ineffective contraception accompanied by widespread abortion ensured low

fertility: in the 1960s, the legal abortion rate was one of the highest in the world.

Effective contraception is relatively new in Hungary, although the overwhelming majority of couples have long reflected upon how many children they would like to have and also—though less generally—upon the timing of their births.

About 75% of women of fertile age currently practice fertility regulation; this proportion is much higher among newlyweds, 98% of whom regulated their fertility in 1974. According to the 1974 marriage cohort survey, the ideal number of children was 2.1.

Oral contraceptives were introduced in 1967, when the Szontágh IUD also appeared. Traditional fertility regulation has yielded only slowly to effective contraception. In the early 1970s, oral contraception began to be more widely used. According to recent data, 20% of women of fertile age currently use oral contraceptives. The use of the IUD is also increasing, although the number using this method is not yet significant. The increased effectiveness of contraception contributed to the decline in the number of legal abortions. The legal abortion rate has decreased by 50% (35 per thousand women aged 15-49 years, in 1976).

Hungarian population policy is an integral part of social policy and recognises planned parenthood as a human right.

Most contraceptives are available in the Public Health Service. Barrier contraceptives are usually available in pharmacies, and condoms are obtainable from vending machines. Oral contraceptives are obtainable on a physician's prescription; 85% of their cost is covered by the National Health Service (which every Hungarian citizen has the right to use). Regular medical supervision of women using oral contraceptives is obligatory. IUDs are usually inserted by gynaecologists in hospitals, or in maternity homes. Insertion is free-of-charge, but women pay 15% of the cost of the IUD.

An unwanted pregnancy may be terminated by legal abortion. In 1973, certain indications were prescribed for legal abortion: primarily health grounds. Applications for abortion are seldom refused (in 1976, the proportion of refusals was less than 3%).

In the upper age-range of primary schools, and in secondary schools, the subject "education for responsible family life" promotes the idea of effective contraception. Couples under 35 years old are obliged to attend

consultation sessions before marriage, usually given by a physician. Social organisations, including trades unions, the National Council of Hungarian Women, the youth organisation, the Red Cross, and the Centre for Health Education, together with the mass media, participate in the development of a social atmosphere favourable to planned parenthood.

In Hungary, there is no organised resistance to planned parenthood. Free-of-charge advice to pregnant women, and delivery in a health institution, are general, support the acceptance of the wanted child, and protect the health of mother and fetus. Many social measures improve the living conditions of families expecting a child, and with young children: paid maternity leave up to the age of five months, child care allowance up to the age of three years, progressive family allowance, free-of-charge layette, reduced working time, preference for mothers with children in the allocation of apartments, and low rents.

The views of women and married couples on planned parenthood have been analysed in many studies. Surveys carried out by the Hungarian Central Statistical Office have revealed in detail significant changes in the field of fertility and its regulation over the last two decades.

The Hungarian Scientific Society for Family and Women's Welfare, established within the framework of the Federation of Hungarian Medical Societies, has several roles. It develops and promotes health, social and demographic research concerning family welfare, increases the scientific knowledge of its members, and participates in the dissemination of public knowledge of family welfare. It seeks to develop a public opinion "which promotes harmonious family life, the protection of women and children, and the conditions of healthy reproduction". The *Society* promotes the exchange of views between specialists working in fields relevant to planned parenthood and public opinion, through a quarterly Bulletin. In order to decentralise the work, and to develop activities throughout the country, the *Society* has established five regional organisations. The first scientific meeting of the *Society* was held in Debrecen in November 1976. The first National Congress will be held in November 1977, on the theme 'Biological and Social Aspects of Population Processes'.

Péter Jozán
Central Statistical Office
Budapest

Men's and Women's Camps in Sweden

The struggle of women for liberation, self-determination and equality has been in progress for about 150 years. For them it is nothing new to meet to show solidarity and work towards changing their own sex role. The ideas and sentiments in their struggle have, of course, changed dramatically during the last ten years, but the tradition of working together is longstanding.

The starting point for women has been very different from that for men. The women's social situation has changed fundamentally through working outside the home, which has altered their role—a process which has continued for a long time and which is far from finished.

Men, on the other hand, remain in their situation of working outside the home. They have not experienced any revolution in their conditions: the female role has changed considerably, while the male role has changed very little. The two roles do not complement each other in the way they did formerly.

Yet the man is in a new situation in two ways. Firstly he has lost his historical superiority, vested in the fact that formerly heavy physical labour could only be undertaken by men for the reason, among other things, that he had no pregnancies to manage. Today most work can be conducted equally well by women. This is a great status loss for the man. Secondly, the man today must live together with a woman who does not accept the notion of man's superiority—a notion which is central to the traditional, still surviving, man's role. She also expects the man to be able to communicate at the emotional level, which he however is frightened of because he has been taught that the man should always be strong, controlled and rational. This situation can give rise to a permanent crisis in the man/woman relationship, and in many cases it makes cohabitation impossible: the couple parts.

Some men are determined to explore this problem. They have gathered in so-called men's groups over a lengthy period, even for a year, to critically analyse their own traditional sex role and to try to improve the relationship with their female partner. One such group has functioned within RFSU. The participants learnt a lot and often went through a painful process, but they did not find that they experienced any radical change in themselves.

In 1976, a few of these people decided to establish a different form of activity. Twice RFSU has invited people to a men's camp, with their children if they wished. The first camp lasted for three days and was attended by about thirty people. The second lasted one week, with about sixty participants. The aim was the same as before: to promote awareness of negative aspects of their own male role, with a view to changing this role in order to enable the man to improve his relationship with his female partner.

There are probably not many men who actively desire to take part in such an activity, but they may perhaps become pioneers. Only men took part, because it was considered that the presence of women would link the men with their traditional role, and prevent them from speaking openly about their failures, problems and hopes. In fact openness was greatly in evidence during the two camps.

Another notion underlying the planning was that if one speaks about things on which one normally remains silent, in a large group of people for several days running, the impact on oneself will be much greater than if one discusses in a small select group of close friends a few hours per week. To realise a changed role one must learn to function publicly. That is what is practised at the camp. Boats are burnt. The feeling is not of compulsion but relief.

However, the small group is not rejected. Small permanent groups function throughout the camp's duration to ensure that each person has the opportunity to become absorbed, and to enable a few people to listen for longer time to each person. The small group is essential.

Another feature of the camp is nonverbal communication. People were, of course, talking all the time, but an important aid to promote a sense of contact, confidence, closeness and openness is the physical contact exercises. This proceeds from the theory—and the experience—that all people need to relate to each other not only through words but also physical contact. The sex taboo in western culture has promoted the wholly erroneous idea that all bodily contact except shaking hands means an invitation to make love. If this idea is sufficiently deeply rooted, physical

contact will also be experienced in this way. It is strange and frightening to introduce such a factor into the community. I have come across this form of contact in three camps, two of them for men and women and for men only. My experience is that the taboo is easily and rapidly overcome in a collective and organised situation. Each time it has led to a kind of happy, laughing liberation; an experience of closeness which removes people's fears of each other; a spontaneous feeling of liking each other; a feeling that: they want and need to be open towards me—and I towards them. This does not mean that people get rid of their problems, but only that they dare enter sufficiently into contact with each other that they can work together at their problems. In isolation one is stuck fast, whereas with contact something starts to happen. Nonverbal communication can lead to a verbal communication which is genuine and emotional.

We have sufficient experience of this to know that the effect on the participants continues after the camp, but we do not yet know more. Of about 150 participants in the camp, I have heard of three who through the new experience entered a lengthy and painful crisis. This phenomenon, and the positive experiences, need at some stage to be examined more closely. Physical contact exercises do not sexualise relationships between the camp participants. On the contrary, physical contact between people not having a sexual relationship with each other brings a feeling of wellbeing and even a happy conviviality, which is intrinsically valuable without necessarily being a means to something else. Some people who have experienced this relate that they have gained a larger capacity for including tenderness and closeness in their sexual relationship with their partner.

An example of a contact exercise: a person lies on his back on the floor—a dozen people kneel round the person—at a given signal they all lay their hands on the person with a firm pressure for a few minutes—the person has his eyes closed the whole time—this leads to an intensive sensation of being incorporated physically and psychically with all the people. Superficially, rationally this is an illusion, but at a deeper level I think it means a sudden contact with a lost dimension in life whose absence entails pain.

Everybody in the camp goes through this and other contact exercises. I have already hinted at the effects on the participants' state of mind and ability to communicate. I have observed that nonverbal and subsequent verbal communication has led men to begin to behave differently: they are less remote, stiff and conventional, and are far more open, emotional and lively. Formerly suppressed emotions of sorrow and happiness in one's own life have risen to the surface and have been presented to others—something has started to move.

As this way of establishing contact with people can deeply affect the personality, every camp participant is given a clear picture of what it is all about beforehand.

Carl-Gustav Boëthius
RFSU Chairman,
Stockholm

* * *

"What moved me deepest at the men's camp was to discover that so many of the problems we carried inside us which we thought were unique to us, were things that other men thought about also. We have lived all our lives believing that we were alone in these thoughts and that it was 'unmanly' to have them. It was nice to feel secure among men. The discovery that one could have an emotional relationship with a man is revolutionary when one is used to building one's whole emotional world among women. My whole life I have lived after the playboy ideal: biggest, best and most beautiful. It is a great experience to begin to find one's way to offer something of oneself which the conventional man's role has prevented one from developing." (Personnel Manager, 37 years old).

"It is important for me to find a life of my own now that I have become a widow, and it was fantastic to be together with the younger women and take part in the discussions. It has been a lovely week, now I am going back to my pensioners' club to talk about women's camps.
(Pensioner, 65 years old)

Sixty men with different occupations, political opinions and from different social classes spent one week on an island in Stockholm's archipelago at a men's camp organised by RFSU.

The following week a women's camp

was organised at which eighty women aged 18-65 discussed women's roles, sexuality in society, children, work and emancipation. They talked, exchanged experiences supported each other, sailed, canoed, cooked and sang together.

Why did they come?

"I am an engineer. In my job I only meet men. I have such bad contact with women, and it feels important for me to get to know and like women. I feel lonely in the men's world, and I notice that I feel and think more and more like a man, and that I use the values that exist in the men's world. And I do not like this. This week means a lot to me when I try to think about my role as a woman."

"I am an auxiliary nurse. I have been married for 18 years. I belong to a low salary group and my background is working class. At first I felt a bit lonely, an outsider, but after a few days I felt that there was lots that united us. All the small invisible threads that bind us to a conventional woman's role, make us insecure, suspicious towards each other, disloyal and make us dislike our sisters. It was important to sort this all out and see the connections. It is also important that women are left alone together, without men, so that they can feel their way towards a changed female role, built on self-confidence, loyalty and warmth for other women. It was the finest week of my adult life".

The subjects that were discussed during the week were: sexual-political development; the female role and society's pattern for young people; being a man in today's society; homosexuality; psychosexual development; attitudes towards sexuality.

Why has RFSU chosen to take up sex roles in this way? The woman was regarded in society as deviating from the normal figure, the man. Women were regarded and regarded themselves as "half" without men. Small girls are still educated to be non-aggressive, to be sweet, soft and tender, to please and oblige, an education which undermines independence and self-confidence.

Society at the same time offers prototypes which promote "typical female behaviour" which is further distorted in advertising and the weekly press. The image the woman has of herself, and which is daily confirmed in the mass media, working life, literature and politics, is of little use in a changing

world where, among other things, the Swedish school aims to alter views on the existing sex role pattern.

Social conditions, cultural inheritance and traditions in early infancy divide boys and girls into two completely separate worlds. The sex role to which we are educated is not something we can easily discard. A thousand ties bind us to a stereotyped sex pattern which controls the way we behave, think, act. Women need to be on their own with each other for a long time, to survey bit by bit the oppression in society which, through man, complicates coexistence. Women are exposed to conflicting expectations (one should be an effective worker, 'successful', and at the same time a tender mother/'real' woman). It is not only men who see women as objects. As long as women see themselves as objects, we are bad examples to our daughters.

Strong, warm, brave female prototypes seem more important than ever. Unemployment is widespread among Swedish youth. RFSU promotes the use of contraceptives, and planned parenthood. The question is how one is to get young girls, who fail in school, have bad contact with their parents, poor prospects of further education or a job, to plan their lives so that no unwanted children are born, when the mass media daily offer solutions and churn out pictures of women as sex objects, wife and mother, and the country has a queen who confirms the myth that if only I get a child everything will be all right. In a situation like this to ask young girls to use contraceptives, must for many of them be the same thing as asking them to close the last open door. If one cannot become anything else one can at least become a mother. Looking at it from this aspect it is tremendously important that RFSU, if it is to live up to its proud aim, continues to conduct a deeper and wider discussion of sex roles. In that context the men's and women's camps are a very important development.

Helena Jacobsen
Gotland

ISSN—0306—9303

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