

INTRODUCTION

Challenging Norms

Family Planning as a Reflection of Social Change in Twentieth-Century Eastern Europe Introductory Remarks



Heidi Hein-Kircher and Elisa-Maria Hiemer

In current discourses on family planning practices like abortion and even surrogate motherhood, the image of the “traditional” family has been challenged by more diverse ideas about how a family could or should be, re-opening debates on the conception of families in societies in and beyond Europe.¹ During recent social, political, and economic crises and this period of rapid social change, family planning has become a target of political attacks, as revealed by the 2021 Polish anti-abortion law and discussions around the lack of comprehensive sexual education.²

From a liberal perspective, juristic decisions that pave the way for surrogate motherhood or queer couples raising children are a sign of progress and an urgently needed outcome of modern ways of life and modern values. From a conservative (backlash) perspective, however, such decisions appear to be a horror scenario, signaling cultural decomposition and degeneracy. Although current criticism of practices of family planning and of family life are linked with right-wing populism that uses it as a “glue,”³ discourses on this topic have been taking place for decades, ever since modernization began to bring about societal and political secularization. This was a time when individual orientation around civil rights and individual social advancement emerged. From then on, social change began to reconfigure the image of family too.

The declining family size of and shifts in people’s understanding of a “traditional” family seem to be strong indicators of social transformation, so that our book begins by asking how social change brought about by modernization influenced the politicization of reproductive behavior in family and social policies as well as values and norms. The right to determine the

number of one's own offspring became a major demand of women's rights movements while the practice of limiting the number of children had already become obvious. Being related to modernization and changing living conditions and ways of life, it had already started to challenge and change current family norms. As a consequence, the practices of family planning started to change and challenged the established norms of sexual behavior and human reproduction. Around the end of the nineteenth century, it was still, by and large, unthinkable to consider sexuality outside of the context of reproduction.

Our first key premise is therefore that, since the late nineteenth century, public discourses and political practices like the legal restriction of abortion and proceedings on reproductive rights have reflect the changing attitudes toward and practices of family planning. Changes in law and legal proceedings are basically a reaction to social developments as they progress and become visible. Nonetheless, they also form and mirror the reality in which people live, that is, they both reflect and shape societal transformations and value changes, as well as individual attitudes and behavior. As a consequence of cultural, social, and political modernization, "a knot of intertwined transformation processes" can be observed, because "the process of modernization took place not only in the social environment, but also in our minds and hearts," as Hans van der Loo and Willem van Reijen put it.⁴

Our second premise is that tracing these changes provides insights into societal norms and values. The latter have become apparent by talking publicly about sexual behavior and making it an object of policies. The book's chapters mainly focus on a bottom-up perspective and use different approaches in order to discuss the reciprocity of top-down and bottom-up processes in social change and cases in a historicizing perspective in Eastern Europe. Such an approach provides a complementary understanding of social, norm, and value change there and incentives for a comparative social history. The chapters point out how the change and renegotiation of family-related values and norms, and thus women's freedom of choice, are closely linked to social and ultimately political change. The volume thus tracks how modernization and changes in lifestyles, as well as state policies, led to changes in the way fertility and family were understood. Before we outline the state of research, and the concept and structure of the book, our understanding of the term "family planning" and the focus on Eastern Europe require attention. The term "family planning" is motivating for this book insofar as it allows us to understand the development of a social value. Looking back through history, birth control had become politicized by the end of the nineteenth century under the influence of eugenics and social hygiene discourses and also due to state politics, which was searching for answers to the questions of demographical and social change.

While the notion of “birth control” highlights the individual practices of regulating the number of offspring, “family planning,” a term developed and promoted in the United States, particularly by Margaret Sanger, from the 1930s on, encompasses a broader meaning that differentiates between sexuality and reproduction, and refers to individual choice.⁵ An intermediate term is “conscious motherhood,” mainly used in the interwar period, which indicates the shift in attitudes.⁶ Predominantly, however, motherhood continued to be discussed within the narrow framework of biological determinism and the idea of childbearing was seen as a woman’s ultimate life goal.⁷

Although these terms all refer to the limitation of the number of children, “family planning” emphasizes the (right of) women and their partners to make the free and responsible choice to get pregnant, and hence encompasses the “self-determined use of contraceptive methods, which should enable the number of children and the regulation of pregnancy to be adapted to the individual wishes of a couple or the mother according to the respective life circumstances.”⁸ Until the development of “the pill,” aspects of family planning focused mainly on abortion, as well as the use of other anti-contraceptive and pregnancy-preventive tools like pessaries and condoms and practices like coitus interruptus. Today, it includes not only pregnancy prevention and abortion but also measures that support fertility, and education on sexual health. The Proclamation of Tehran in May 1968 concretized family planning in a juridical sense and established it as a basic human right.⁹

In our book, we want to explain the emergence and establishment of family planning practices in Eastern European societies in the twentieth century—communities that were deeply affected by dissolving imperial rule and nationalist attitudes associated with World War I, but also by a general demographic decline that was caused by the war and continued until 1921, exacerbated by supply shortages and epidemics. Then, the Soviet legalization of abortion, as part of the Bolshevik social transformation, became a point of reference for all political activists agitating for “conscious motherhood.” In the period of peace from 1918/1921 until 1939, national states developed strict nationalizing politics and tried to emancipate themselves from legal norms imposed by the former imperial powers, as the debates on abortion and family laws in Poland at the end of the 1920s show.¹⁰ Although methods and policies around birth control were discussed intensively, especially after World War I, Poland’s steady population growth was also regarded as a guarantor for its place on the map, being the sixth-largest state in Europe in terms of population. Juristic and medical experts, on the other hand, considered the high number of children as a main aggravating factor in the pauperization of the country (a problem that also became

recognizable in interwar Yugoslavia, as Ivana Dobrivojević Tomić shows). Thus, even though the number of inhabitants played a geopolitical role,¹¹ Poland did not actively pursue pronatalist policies, which shows the contradictory position of family planning in political discourses.

World War II brought about population decline, so that pronatalist politics were pursued during the first postwar years. In sum, the Socialist politics developed contradictorily in the 1950s, since socialist regimes implemented ideas on women's emancipation by freeing women from family duties so that they were available for contributing to build the socialist societies. But abortion on demand was only legalized from the mid-1950s—with exception of Romania—giving rise to what has often been labeled “abortion culture”¹² in academic discourse to distinguish between methods of birth control in the East and the West, especially after 1989. However, despite official claims of gender equality and the emancipation of women, as Fanni Svégel shows in the case of Hungary, particularly during economic crises, motherhood and the notion of “the housewife” were promoted by the state. Therefore, the development of the notion of family planning in Eastern Europe was the subject of diverse political regimes, and “family planning” as a research perspective can thus be used as a lens for a broader understanding of social change. Furthermore, Eastern Europe can be studied as a kind of laboratory of value and norm change, because of the interrelation of nationalism, multiethnicity, and the regime changes.

While practices around controlling human fertility have always existed, only since the population decline in the nineteenth century, which was experienced all over Europe, and the emergence of modern ideas (like Malthusianism), (biologistic) ideologies (like eugenics and racial hygiene), and medical knowledge, did it become a subject of public discourse. Such ideas mirrored intensively changes in behavior and attitudes since they radically questioned societal values and conceptions of the family and its size, which also carried moral and classicist¹³ or racist implications: Practicing restraint, becoming a mother, and sacrificing herself in marriage was a way for a woman to increase her social status. On the one hand, the lack of sexual restraint resulting in children out of wedlock, or a high number of offspring, was considered a sign of lacking education, typical for people from lower classes,¹⁴ and a particular problem of prostitution, which is discussed in our volume by Dominika Kleinová. On the other hand, maternity obligations toward the society were ubiquitous in nationalizing discourses,¹⁵ and being childless or having only one child undermined the ideal of securing the future of the nation. The examples of Upper Silesian plebiscite propaganda discussed by Allison Rodriguez and of the wartime Slovak Republic (Eva Škorvanková) show clearly how motherhood was politicized, even ideologized, and elevated for political goals.

Political and social actors drew different conclusions regarding the state of the societies, depending on the ideological or political position of the respective speaker. From a top-down perspective, the notions of “birth control” and “family planning” became politicized and political, and societal actors took measures to support the regulation of the birth rate, for example through the legalization of abortion and the approval of “the pill,” or to contain or prevent birth control practices, for example through the criminalization of abortion and supportive social policies like child allowances.

In contrast to democratic and pluralistic societies, the Soviet legalization of abortion as part of a wider Bolshevik vision of social transformation became a point of reference for all political activists agitating for “conscious motherhood” also outside the Soviet Union. Later on, in socialist regimes, the achievements of women who had been “freed” from family obligations were celebrated; this was part of a social engineering policy whereby controlling the number of births was considered a key aspect of building a strong socialist society,¹⁶ for example, through the legalization of abortion in the early period of the Soviet Union. This approach was diametrically opposed to the criminalization of abortion between 1936 and 1955 and the awarding of mothers having numerous children. It demonstrates the volatility of state family planning policy, which was subject to political conjunctures. After the relegalization of abortion in the 1950s, politics in the Soviet Union and its satellites regarding motherhood became ambiguous, as Ieva Balčiūnė discusses through the example of a Soviet Lithuanian women’s magazine, which instrumentalized motherhood and family planning to indoctrinate women with Soviet ideology. Although previously used in medical and demographical discourses, “family planning” came into use for health policies only during the late period of the Soviet Union, as Nataliya Shok and Nadezhda Beliakova highlight.

After the emergence of “family planning” as a topic of societal and national importance, the discourses ranged ultimately between two poles: In a way very similar to today’s polarized views, some highlighted “societal progress” and “freedom of choice” in the twentieth century, while on the other side of the broad range of attitudes toward family planning, contraception, and families in general, we find discourses condemning the “demoralization” and “degeneration” of society. Such discourses are often accompanied by complaints about how the more liberal family planning practices and policies endanger the strength of the nation or state.¹⁷

The negotiation of family planning practices and hence of the broader conception of family thus became an important reflection of changes in individual behavior and in societal attitudes during modernization, tending to calibrate them. For example, in interwar Greece and Hungary, the transforming family patterns were closely linked with the challenges of social

and cultural modernization, even in rural areas, as Tryfonas Lemontzoglou and Gábor Koloh explain. Thus, the analysis of such negotiations allows us to gain insights into the behavioral change of individuals and its justification, as well as into prevailing moral standards, values, and norms.

A comparative and contextualizing historical perspective on different forms of family planning allows us to trace such social and value changes on the micro level and their consequences for individual behavior, which are often silenced because of their intimate character, but are necessary to understand the macro-level processes within societies. The lens on “family planning” allows us to reconsider social history in Eastern Europe, which should take, into consideration the new periodization of normative change in the twentieth century, proposed by Isabel Heinemann in her chapter.

A Brief Outline of Research

Historiography on family planning practices emerged about two decades ago in several different contexts that we outline only very briefly here, while the chapters offer broader overviews of the state of research. One of the most influential books has been Dagmar Herzog’s synthesis *Sexuality in Europe*,¹⁸ in which Eastern Europe is only mentioned as a suggestion for further investigation. In general, research on family planning practices has been—naturally—a topic for the histories of medicine and science,¹⁹ while histories linking this topic with transnational knowledge transfer²⁰ and value change have yet to be written. Even if a rich literature for single states and periods²¹ mainly written by anthropologists, ethnologists, political scientists and medical historians exists, we find hardly any trans-epochal²² or trans-regional and comparative studies with a historical focus.²³ Hence, we can cluster existing research quite roughly: most recent studies (mainly in edited volumes) focus on one period like the interwar years²⁴ or the post–World War II period, which is more popular for transnational comparisons.²⁵ Other studies only focus on one aspect of family planning like eugenics,²⁶ birth control,²⁷ and gender relations,²⁸ or most recently on the impact on subjectivities²⁹ and in relation to “biopower.”³⁰ Of all these publications, most do not take Central and Eastern Europe into deep consideration; if such countries are mentioned, they stand for Eastern Europe as *pars pro toto* and are often placeholders to allow for “West–East” contrast rather than a lens to examine transfers and similar developments.³¹ Overall, interest in the topics of sexuality and reproduction in Eastern Europe has been increasing only in recent years.³² We now find research on sexuality³³ with holistic approaches to human relationships, yet with different interpretations of liberalism³⁴ mirrored in the respective countries’ sex educa-

tion programs,³⁵ but most of the studies or edited volumes only focus on one country or period and do not conceptualize value and norm changes.³⁶

With regard to the periods that have been most intensively researched, the interwar period and socialism seem to be the main focus. Particularly, the activism in favor of “conscious motherhood” in connection with the discourses on a new family and abortion law in Poland around 1930 has been broadly discussed and seems to have produced the most rich research for an Eastern European state in the interwar period. Nonetheless, as Sylwia Kuźma-Markowska makes clear in her chapter, not all the existing studies have been interlinked yet.

In summary, a comparative history of family planning in Eastern Europe as an outcome of social and value change with a broad temporal scope is still a desideratum. In the field of social sciences and social history,³⁷ important steps have been made toward scrutinizing the region in a comparative way; however, the existing research does not contextualize the issue of family planning and its practices against the backdrop of changing reproductive regimes.³⁸ Combining macro and micro perspectives on historical processes seems to be an urgent challenge of historiography—one to which this volume will make a significant contribution. Hence, analyzing the understanding of family planning will be a valuable lens for research on social impacts on value and norm changes, and vice versa, on the impact of changing values and norms for social change.³⁹ Both historical⁴⁰ and contemporary⁴¹ statements by religious authorities illustrate well the long-term struggle for interpretative power over human sexual behavior, or, more precisely, the creation of a new cultural reality where an “increasing number of matters can/should be analyzed without religious assumption.”⁴²

Conceptual Premises

Understanding family planning as a practice that resulted from value changes in turn caused by social changes allows us to include examples in a micro-historical perspective on reproduction, and thus enables us to trace and understand social change. In doing so, we are aware of the normative notion the concept of “value” might carry (i.e., the level of “desiredness” for a certain behavior), but we want to introduce value change as an analytical perspective for understanding mutually stimulating social processes that are dependent on the given social situation of women or couples. Since birth control was quite a common practice, as the decline in the birth rate and the politicization of the topic show, its negotiation gives us insights in the moral standards of a society, as well as its values and norms and how these changed with regard to sexuality, reproduction, and family values in general. Hence, we can observe a correlation between value and norm

changes at the individual, societal, and state level. “Family planning” discourses and related value and norm change can thus be considered as an analytical lens for tracing social change in different historical situations and under different social, economic, and political conditions.

Even though “value change” originated as a sociological term for characterizing societal changes in the 1950s and 1960s, it lends itself beyond that context as a tool to examine historical change in value concepts and norms. The German historian Andreas Rödter, for example, conceptualized it as a historical research perspective that uses sociological approaches as an incentive and interrelates with (historical) research on political cultures.⁴³ Using Rödter’s concept as a starting point, we define values or value concepts as “general and fundamental normative ideas of order” that prescribe the way individuals and collectives think, talk, and act, and can therefore be explicitly articulated or implicitly assumed.⁴⁴ They are seen by contemporaries as designed for stability and permanence, even if they are not passed on in their entirety intergenerationally. What becomes clear in a historical perspective is that these attitudes may well change in the long term as a result of influences such as modernization, changing living conditions, and other factors. Therefore, we can understand values “as a property that is directly dependent on the perspective to which it is attributed. Values are not something that precedes what is evaluated, but something that emerges from what is evaluated. Values are not presupposed, but derived. They are not premises, but results of the evaluated.”⁴⁵ Swiss philosopher Urs Sommer therefore assumes that concepts of value developed when “the framework of what was commanded and forbidden in Old Europe broke away,” that is, when societies became secularized and modernized, and in order to “solve the justification problem of non-religious morality.”⁴⁶ At the same time, they are an expression of general democratization and individualization.⁴⁷ If values provide orientation, they are also “conceptions of the desirable”⁴⁸ and thus express individual and collective ideas of goals that go beyond needs. They are therefore “vocabularies of motives . . . they are internalized by the person and operate as mechanisms of social control,”⁴⁹ whereby one can justify not only future but also past actions, because motive attributions and expectation attitudes become equally possible.⁵⁰ Through this, values form the basis of social norms, which regulate supra-individual behavior and thus determine social life, so that values express and reflect people’s basic dispositions and their position in a group.⁵¹ Hence, they are coined *inter alia* by ideologies, the state and its institutions, socioeconomic and political conditions and constraints, as well as by (culture and gendered) morality. Accordingly, norms are changeable.⁵²

To historicize value change therefore means to focus on the change of social norms and on the transitions of human dispositions. Family plan-

ning is particularly suitable for this purpose, since, after the individual, the family (the couple) is the smallest unit of a society. The “change in attitudes toward the individual and his or her position in society (sexuality, gender norms, parent–child relationship, relationship between state and individual),”⁵³ that is, the relationship between changes in values and norms and social but also political change, can be worked out from this bottom-up perspective as applied in this volume. Our understanding of family planning is therefore a reflection of family images and values and develops at the interface of individuals, society, and state. Although transnational transfers (as Isabel Heinemann highlights in her chapter) and shared argumentation are discernible, our understanding of family is adapted to the respective situation: the family planning discourses that are acted on in the respective societies sharply reflect attitudes to women and overall societal concerns. They point to contemporary understandings of one’s own society or nation and, within these, the roles of men and women.⁵⁴

Looking at the macro or state level, it is clear that states did recognize a danger in underlying conceptions of family and the resulting practices. All measures linked to family planning—from midwife policies to birth and childcare, family or child allowances, and access to abortion—underwent multiple changes in the twentieth century. Whereas in the early period of the Soviet Union, for example, abortion was legalized, it was criminalized between 1936 and 1955, before being legalized again, while in Socialist Rumania from 1966 to 1989 it was prohibited. Other states, for example Slovakia⁵⁵ and Hungary,⁵⁶ as well as right-wing movements⁵⁷ encouraged couples to have numerous offspring and thus to create a “strong body of people”⁵⁸ in the interwar period. Although it was particularly important for East Central European states where people were deprived of agency under foreign rule for a long time and the concept of securing statehood played a huge role in national self-determination, Poland established a progressive legalization of abortion in 1933.⁵⁹ The strength of the (newly emerged) East European nation-states, which always had a significant population percentage (up to one-third) of national minorities before World War II, was key to public discourses on birth control, while the respective national minorities were interested in strengthening their communities through consolidation of their families.⁶⁰ Then, as Jakub Gałęziowski shows, the issue of war rape challenged political and clerical actors as well as gynecologists in terms of their attitude toward abortion, because they were faced with “unwanted pregnancies/children” resulting from these sexual violations; decisions were made on an individual, case-by-case basis.⁶¹ However, in the first decade after World War II, East European states generally pursued pronatalist politics, with the important exception of Czechoslovakia’s policies against the Roma population in Slovakia.⁶²

From the late nineteenth century onward, therefore, European states began to respond to political and social events by introducing social and family policy measures, such as legal bans on abortion (for example, sections 218–20 in the German penal code in 1871), and the introduction of maternity protection periods as part of the trade regulations in the Habsburg monarchy in 1885 and in the German Empire in 1878. Such regime-led policies around reproduction form a key difference from earlier periods. Until the noticeable decline in birth rates in the nineteenth century, population and thus biopolitics (a term coined by Michel Foucault⁶³ referring to political intervention into people's private lives by the state) were not in the field of vision of state policy. After that, however, the private sphere and thus conceptions of the family became increasingly politicized, so that, even before World War I, the social democrat and hygienist Alfred Grotjahn could state that birth control is “no more a private affair, but of cultural, national and eugenic concern.”⁶⁴ At that time, although churches still promoted the biblical command to “be fruitful and multiply,”⁶⁵ in the course of social secularization after the Enlightenment, the increasing influence of political ideologies such as neo-Malthusianism, and the emergence of eugenics in the late nineteenth century, the church finally lost its supremacy over the interpretation of family constellations and sexuality during twentieth century, because couples practiced birth control without taking religious dogmas into account,⁶⁶ as Michael Zok controverts with regard to Poland particularly in the 1980s. Nonetheless they continued to exert a certain influence on legislation regarding fetal rights, as the examples of Ireland and Poland discussed by Anja Titze show.

Structure

Protests and discourses against restrictions on birth control make it clear that this issue is perceived and advocated as a right of women to choose; it has had a considerable mobilizing effect to this day⁶⁷ and motivates women to self-empowerment, since this issue is essentially about their fate. The possibility for a woman or a couple to practice family planning according to their own needs and wishes has become a freedom-inspired social value in modern, urbanized, industrialized societies. This is seen in the three chapters following the book's first part on “transnational perspectives” and preceding the concluding remarks in part V. Isabel Heinemann writes on the interrelations of family planning, reproductive decision-making, and health feminism as a mobilizing and self-empowering movement. Anja Titze discusses the development of the concept of fetal rights as a juridical restriction on women's rights from a comparative perspective, using

Irish and Polish case studies. Both contributions scrutinize the interdependencies between right-wing and conservative movements propagated by political or religious leaders and legal developments and their confrontation with national women's rights initiatives that try to defend the right to self-determination. Agata Ignaciuk's final remarks tie together the different approaches of this publication, framing the chapters and case studies by stimulating further debates. Arguing for a holistic approach that also considers the history of technology, she suggests historicizing research on the diverse developments that impacted family planning and birth control activism. In part II, "On the Stage: Negotiating the Intimate/Private," three chapters focus on historical events that catalyzed public discourse about the intimate and private sphere of the family. Allison Rodriguez scrutinizes the gendered nature of the 1921 plebiscite election posters in Upper Silesia, where women solely appear as mother figures in both the Polish and German imaginary. The national burden of motherhood became a challenge for women who fell victim to war rape; Jakub Gałęziowski describes cases where women had to deal with both an unwanted child and societal stigma, having been deprived of access to abortion. After 1945, Poland's leaders imposed pronatalist policies, creating the image of one big Polish family to which every man and woman should contribute.⁶⁸ While illegitimacy is usually considered normatively as not conforming to traditional family values, Tryfonas Lemontzoglou's study of Greece challenges these traditional paternalist notions of parenthood and values by demonstrating a positive correlation between out-of-wedlock births and long-term relationships, which runs counter to the thesis of the social vulnerability of these family constellations.

Part III, "Against the Norms: Revisiting Family Concepts," offers four studies about the politicization and ideologization of family planning entangled with individual life challenges and how the ideological load of family as a value influenced the view of women. Gábor Koloh's chapter about German Catholic and Hungarian Calvinist farming communities in nineteenth-century Hungary reveals that the lower birth rates in Calvinist families positively affected the upbringing of children. Moving onward to the interwar period, Dominika Kleinová scrutinizes the public discourses of prostitutes and motherhood in Czechia. She sheds light on the specific birth control methods that were used throughout the century and looks at the idealizations of family that were inherent in that discourse. The idea of sexuality and love as a political battlefield for Polish politics is analyzed by Michael Zok from the late communist era up until today. He argues that Polish society is split, and that the current conservative backlash is widening the gap. The section finishes with a *longue durée* approach by Fanni

Svégel, who traces Hungary's journey from so-called abortion culture to family planning. She identifies five childbirth paradigms induced by historical turning points of the twentieth century.

An important premise for our comparative volume is not only to trace conceptions as symptoms of social change on a national level, but also to emphasize the transnational exchange of activists. Since the politicization of birth control began under imperial auspices through the application of central state regulations, the respective national groups developed their own variants of the discourses around birth control.⁶⁹ The formation of nation-states after the end of World War I was a catalyst for change in family concepts, since the aim was now to consolidate the statehood that had been achieved or, in the case of Greece, confirmed, also in terms of population policy. At the same time, attitudes developed under the influence of the Soviet model, as birth control through (free) abortion was received as women's right to choose, first until 1936, then from 1956. Another turning point was World War II and the German occupation of Central and Eastern Europe, which caused societies to suffer significant population losses. After 1945, the aim was to increase the population, but the new hegemonic Soviet vision included promoting the liberation of women from domestic childrearing. Accordingly, family values and concepts changed under Soviet influence.

Knowledge transfer and mutual influence through networks are highlighted in the fourth part, "Across Borders: Shaping the Knowledge," where Sylwa Kuźma-Markowska's chapter provides a comprehensive insight into liberal, socialist, Catholic, and Jewish discourses in interwar Poland and points out surprising similarities of opinions among groups that were ideologically opposed. Eva Škorvanková analyzes the pronatalist policies of the wartime Slovak Republic, its ideological influences from Nazi Germany and fascist Italy, and the Slovak Catholic discourses that resulted in a clerofascist symbiosis. Ieva Balčiūnė's chapter sheds light on the Sovietization of Lithuanian society through the magazine *Soviet Woman* and depicts its strategies for implementing traditional gender roles by constructing anti-Western attitudes.

To conclude, the authors approach our leading question from different angles and with different modes of analysis. They discuss the importance of education as a precondition for decision-making, enabling people to act on their own terms rather than conforming to state interests. They also shed light on how processes of social, value, and norm change have been tightly intertwined since the nineteenth century, including liberalization, individualization, and secularization due to mental, political, and cultural modernization, and through the development of science, technology, and medicine. In every chapter, we see that there were frictions between what was desired and realities of everyday life. However, these frictions can be

used as indicators of social transformations. All cases discussed in our volume show that family planning shaped social values and norms in the long term, by revealing how the specific conditions for family planning in Eastern Europe were in transition before conceptions of state, nation, and societies changed.

Our volume focuses on the intersections of various disciplines and wishes to create a comprehensive picture of family planning in modern East European history. Through the different but ultimately complementary perspectives our authors contribute, we seek to bring together current research approaches on different groups in this region, particularly in the multiethnic areas of East Central, northeastern, and southeastern Europe. With this book, we want to stimulate cross-disciplinary dialogue that offers a historicizing and comparative glance at the perception of Central and Eastern Europe's processes of societal modernization and the understanding of modernity from the perspective of family conceptions and values. We also hope that this work will provide an incentive for others to include analysis of family conceptions in this region in future research and that it will inspire more and deeper comparative analyses.

PD Dr. Heidi Hein-Kircher is director of Martin Opitz Library (Herne) and professor at Ruhr University Bochum. Between 2003 and 2024, she was on the research staff of the Herder Institute for Historical Research in East Central Europe in Marburg, Germany, where she was head of the Academic Forums since 2009. She earned her MA and PhD from Heinrich Heine University in Düsseldorf. In her research, she focuses on gender and family history, urban history, historical security, and minorities studies, as well as on the emergence of modern values and norms in Eastern European societies since the nineteenth century. She is the author and editor of several books.

Elisa-Maria Hiemer is a postdoctoral researcher in the ERC project "Democratising the Family?" at Freie Universität Berlin. Previously she was a researcher and project lead at the Herder Institute for Historical Research on East Central Europe, Marburg. She received her PhD in Slavic Studies with a thesis on German Jewish and Polish Jewish literature in 2018. Her research is based on the intersection of literary sciences and history. With a focus on narrativization and marginalized viewpoints, her topics include Polish-German relations, memory, and gender studies. She is currently finishing a book on sexuality and abortion in interwar Poland and is coeditor of the *Handbook of Polish, Czech, and Slovak Holocaust Fiction*, which was published in 2021.

Notes

1. For more detailed examples, see Heinemann and Titze in this volume.
2. Dora, "Lepiej nie mówić."
3. Kováts and Pöim, *Gender*; Gwiazda, "Right-Wing Populism," Kováts, "Questioning Consensuses," Kulczycki, "Between a Rock and a Hard Place," Heinemann, *Gender*.
4. van der Loo and Reijen, *Modernisierung*, 11.
5. Heinemann, "Vom Kindesegen."
6. Rubinraut and Budzińska-Tylicka, *Skuteczne i nieszkodliwe środki zapobiegania ciąży, 1-4*
7. Bołdyrew, "Działalność lekarek i pedagożek," 111.
8. Przyrembel, *Klinisches Wörterbuch*, 453.
9. Holzwarth, *Das Recht*, 2 and 8.
10. Czałczyński, *Przestępstwo spędzenia płodu*; Car, *Z zagadnień*, 11; Glaser, *Kilka uwag*.
11. Labbé, "Reproduction," 36.
12. Stloukal, "Abortion Culture."
13. Schneider and Schneider, "Festival of the Poor."
14. Lorenz, *Clit*, 167–69.
15. Budrowska, *Macierzyństwo*, 47.
16. Hein-Kircher and Nešťáková, "The Nation at Stake?," 7.
17. For example, Nešťáková, *Be Fruitful and Multiply*, 77–138.
18. Herzog, *Sexuality in Europe*; see also Herzog, *Sex after Fascism*.
19. For example, Sylwia Kuźma-Markowska and Agata Ignaciuk, "Family Planning Advice."
20. Kościańska, *To See a Moose*.
21. For example, Hiemer, *Maternity in Times of Crisis. Debates on Sexuality and Abortion in Interwar Poland*; Kuźma-Markowska, "Marx or Malthus?"; and Kuźma-Markowska and Ignaciuk, "Family Planning Advice."
22. For example, Guzowski and Kuklo, *Framing the Polish Family in the Past*; Leinartė, *The Lithuanian Family*; and Ilić, *The Palgrave Handbook*.
23. A recent contribution from social studies is Inglot et al., *Mothers, Families or Children?*
24. Hein-Kircher and Hiemer, *Birth Control as a National Challenge*.
25. Hein-Kircher and Nešťáková, *The Nation at Stake?*, David, *From Abortion*.
26. Felder and Bashkuev, *Baltic Eugenics*.
27. Niethammer and Satjukow, "Wenn die Chemie stimmt . . ."
28. Gembries et al., *Children by Choice?*
29. Hüchtker et al., *Begehren macht Akteur*innen*.
30. Klich-Kluczewska et al., *Biopolitics*.
31. Niethammer and Sajtukow, "Wenn die Chemie stimmt . . ."
32. Lišková, "Sex in the Cold War"; Lišková, *Sexual Liberation*; Demény, "From Eugenics."
33. Kościańska, *To See a Moose*; Lišková, "Sex in the Cold War"
34. Lišková et al., "Sexuality and Gender in School-Based Sex Education."
35. Hiemer, "Sexualität erzählen." A comparative view addressing the East–West divide is, for example, Varsa, "Sex Advice."
36. For example, Carlbäck et al., *And They Lived*.
37. Tomka, *A Social History*; Inglot et al., *Mothers, Families or Children?*

38. Kuang and Brodsky, "Global Trends."
39. Hein-Kircher, "Ein Brennglas."
40. Janowski, *A Marriage of Convenience*, 47.
41. Coldwell, "Pope Francis upholds Catholic ban on contraception."
42. Janowski, *A Marriage of Convenience*, 47.
43. Rödder, "Wertewandel in historischer Perspektive."
44. Idem.
45. Sommer, *Werte*, 56.
46. Ibid., 40–41.
47. Ibid., 165.
48. Kluckhohn, *Values*, 388–464; van Deth and Scarbrough, *The Impact of Values*, 46–47.
49. Gerth and Mills, *Character and Social Structure*, 17.
50. Thome, *Beiträge zur soziologischen Werte- und Gewaltforschung*, 7.
51. Bourdieu, *La Distinction*.
52. Heinemann, *Wert der Familie*, 13–14, resp. idem, *Family Values*.
53. Idem, *Wert der Familie*, 13.
54. Hein-Kircher, "Ein Brennglas."
55. Nešt'áková, Denisa. *Be Fruitful and Multiply*; and idem, "In the Name of Helping Women."
56. Svégel, *The Role of Women*; Sipos, *Women and Politics*.
57. Oppermann, *Changing Contexts*; Petö, *Women*.
58. Hiemer, "The Family as 'Best Weapon'"; Thomas, *The Bohemian Body*.
59. Connolly, *From Peoples into Nations*, 25.
60. Hein-Kircher, "Debating Social Change."
61. See, for example, also Korhel, "Children."
62. Škorvanková, "Slovak Families."
63. Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*; and Foucault, "The History of Sexuality"; see also Lemke, *Biopolitics*.
64. Grotjahn, *Geburten-Rückgang*, 316.
65. The realities of this claim is research by Nešt'áková, *Be Fruitful and Multiply*.
66. Bujak, "Duchowieństwo katolickie." Since this volume emphasises the bottom-up perspectives, the role of the church will not be scrutinized in the chapters. Reading suggestions for the situation in several countries: Perica, "The Most Catholic Country?"; Githens, "Reproductive Rights"; Jarska and Kuźma-Markowska, "Explaining the Calendar"; Ignaciuk and Kościańska, "Regendering Childbirth"; and Kościańska et al., "Catholic Intimacies."
67. Nawojski and Kowalska, "Uwaga, uwaga tu obywatelki!."
68. Hiemer, "Politicizing Family."
69. Hein-Kircher, "Debating Social Change."

Bibliography

- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1976. *La Distinction. Critique sociale du jugement*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.
- Budrowska, Bogusława. 2000. *Macierzyństwo jako punkt zwrotny w życiu kobiety*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Funna (Monografie Fundacji na Rzecz Nauki Polskiej).

- Bujak, Grzegorz. 2019. "Duchowieństwo katolickie wobec zmian społecznych w okresie międzywojennym. Zarys problematyki badawczej." *Archiwa Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne* (112): 73–92.
- Boldyrew, Aneta. 2021. "Działalność lekarek i pedagożek w Królestwie Polskim na początku XX wieku na rzecz popularyzacji wiedzy o nowoczesnym macierzyństwie." *Przegląd Pedagogiczny* (1): 110–24. <https://doi.org/10.34767/PP.2021.01.06>.
- Caldwell, Simon. 2023. "Pope Francis Upholds Catholic Ban on Contraception," *The Catholic Herald*, 2 May 2023. Retrieved 2 February 2024 from <https://catholicherald.co.uk/pope-francis-upholds-catholic-ban-on-contraception/>.
- Carlback, Helene, Yulia Gradska and Zhanna Kravchenko. 2012. *And They Lived Happily Ever After: Norms and Everyday Practices of Family and Parenthood in Russia and Central Europe*. Budapest: Central University Press.
- Connelly, John. 2020. *From Peoples into Nations: A History of Eastern Europe*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Car, Stanisław. 1929. *Z zagadnień wymiaru sprawiedliwości*. Warszawa.
- Chelstowska, Agata, Agata Ignaciuk and Agnieszka Kościańska. 2022. "Catholic Intimacies: Negotiating Contraception in Late Communist Poland." *Journal of Religious History* 46(3): 483–502.
- Czałczyński, Karol. 1930. *Przestępstwo spędzenia płodu w Komisji Kodyfikacyjnej Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*. Warszawa.
- David, Henry P. 1999. *From Abortion to Contraception. A Resource to Public Policies and Reproductive Behavior in Central and Eastern Europe from 1917 to the Present*, ed. Henry P. David. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Demény, Enikő. 2018. "From Eugenics and 'Race Protection' to Preventive Medicine and Family Planning in Hungary." In *Understanding Central Europe*, ed. Marcin Moskalewicz and Wojciech Przybylski, 397–488. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Dora, Marta. 2013. "Lepiej nie mówić. O edukacji seksualnej w Polsce." *Przegląd Pedagogiczny* 2: 101–7.
- Gwiazda, Anna. 2021. "Right-Wing Populism and Feminist Politics: The Case of Law and Justice in Poland." *International Political Science Review* 42(5): 580–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512120948917>.
- Felder, Björn, and Vsevolod Bashkuev, ed. 2023. *Baltic Eugenics: Bio-politics, Race and Nation in Interwar Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania 1918–1940*. Amsterdam: Radopi.
- Foucault, Michel. 1978. *The History of Sexuality*. New York: Penguin.
- . 2011. "The Birth of Biopolitics." In *Michel Foucault: Ethics, Subjectivity, and Truth*, ed. Paul Rabinow and James D. Faubion, 73–79. New York: New Press.
- Gembries, Ann-Kathrin, Theresia Theuke, and Isabel Heinemann, ed. 2018. *Children by Choice? Changing Values, Reproduction, and Family Planning in the 20th Century*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Gerth, Hans, and Wright Mills. 1953. *Character and Social Structure: The Psychology of Social Institutions*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co.
- Glaser, Stefan. 1927. *Kilka uwag o spędzeniu płodu : ze stanowiska prawa karnego*. Warszawa: Księgarnia F. Hoesick.
- Githens, Marianne. 2013. "Reproductive Rights and the Struggle with Change in Eastern Europe." In *Abortion Politics*, ed. Marianne Githens and Dorothy McBride Stetson. London: Routledge, 55–68.

- Gradskova, Yulia. 2007. *Soviet People with Female Bodies. Performing Beauty and Maternity in Soviet Russia in the mid-1930–1960s*. Stockholm: Södertörn University.
- Grotjahn, Alfred. 1914. *Geburten-Rückgang und Geburten-Regelung im Lichte der individuellen und der sozialen Hygiene*. Berlin: Louis Marcus.
- Guzowski, Piotr, and Cezary Kuklo. 2022. *Framing the Polish Family in the Past*. Abington: Routledge.
- Heinemann, Isabel. 2018. *Wert der Familie: Ehescheidung, Frauenarbeit und Reproduktion in den USA des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Hein-Kircher, Heidi. 2023. “Debating Social Change and the Jewish Nation: The Polish-Jewish Weekly Ewa on Jewish Families and Birth Control (1928–1933).” Special issue: *Challenging Norms and Narrations: Family Planning and Social Change in Europe. The Journal of Family History* 48(3): 278–92. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03631990231160070>.
- Hein-Kircher, Heidi, and Denisa Nešťáková, eds. 2023a. Special issue. *The Nation at Stake? Ideologizing Conceptions of Family Planning in East Central Europe Since 1939. Central Europe* 21, 2.
- . 2023b. “The Nation at Stake? Ideologizing Conceptions of Family Planning in East Central Europe Since 1939.” Special issue: *The Nation at Stake? Ideologizing Conceptions of Family Planning in East Central Europe Since 1939*, ed. by idem, *Central Europe* 21(2): 68–77. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790963.2023.2294407>.
- Hein-Kircher, Heidi, and Elisa-Maria Hiemer, ed. 2020 [2023]. “Ein Brennglas für Werte- und Normenwandel: Das Verständnis von ‚Familienplanung‘ von der Jahrhundertwende bis 1939 – Polen als Beispiel.” *Nordostarchiv* XXIX: 60–74.
- . 2023. Special issue. *Birth Control as a National Challenge. Nationalizing Concepts of Families in Eastern Europe 1914–1939. Journal of Family History* 3.
- Heinemann, Isabel. 2020a. “Vom „Kindersegen“ zur „Familienplanung“? Eine Wissensgeschichte reproduktiven Entscheidens in der Moderne 1890–1990.” *Historische Zeitschrift* 310(1): 23–51. <https://doi.org/10.1515/hzhz-2020-0002/html>.
- . 2020b. *Wert der Familie. Ehescheidung, Frauenarbeit und Reproduktion in den USA des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- . 2021. “Von Birth Control zu Human Rights: Semantiken reproduktiven Entscheidens im langen 20. Jahrhundert.” In *Semantiken und Narrative des Entscheidens vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart*, ed. by Philip Hoffmann-Rehnitz et al. Göttingen, 448–65. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 2022. “Gender and Far-Right Nationalism.” *Journal of Modern European History* 20(3): 311–21.
- . 2023. *Family Values. Divorce, Working Women, and Reproductive Rights in Twentieth-Century America*. München: Oldenbourg-De Gruyter.
- Herzog, Dagmar. 2005. *Sex after Fascism: Memory and Morality in Twentieth-Century Germany*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 2011. *Sexuality in Europe: A Twentieth-Century History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hiemer, Elisa-Maria. 2025. “Sexualität erzählen. Körperlichkeit in polnischen Eheratgebern vom 19. Jahrhundert bis 1939.” In *Transformationen in slawischen Literaturen und Kulturen*, ed. Magdalena Baran-Szołtyś and Ingeborg Jandl. Wien: Böhlau, 268–288.

- . (forthcoming). *Maternity in Times of Crisis. Debates on Sexuality and Abortion in Interwar Poland*. Vienna/Budapest: CEU Press.
- . 2023. "The Family as 'Best Weapon': Instrumentalising German health care discourses in Upper Silesia during the Interwar Period." *Journal of Family History* 3: 261–77. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03631990231160093>.
- . 2024. "Politicizing Family in Post-War Research on Family Planning. The Institute for Mother and Child in Warsaw." Special issue in *The Nation at Stake? Ideologizing Conceptions of Family Planning in East Central Europe Since 1939*, ed. by Heidi Hein-Kircher and Denisa Nešťáková, *Central Europe* 21(2): 111–26. <https://doi.org/0.1080/14790963.2023.2294411>.
- Hilevych, Yulia. 2015. "Abortion and Gender Relationships in Ukraine, 1955–1970." *The History of the Family* 20: 86–105.
- Holzwarth, Andreas. 1997. *Das Recht auf ungestörte Familienplanung als Konkretisierung des zivilrechtlichen allgemeinen Persönlichkeitsrechtes*. Tübingen: Universität Tübingen.
- Hüchtker, Dietlind, Claudia Kraft, and Katrin Steffen, ed. 2020 [2023]. Special Issue *Begehren macht Akteur*innen. Praktiken der Subjektivierung im 20. Jahrhundert / Desire Creates Involvement. Practices of Subjectification during the 20th Century*. Nordostarchiv XXIX.
- Ignaciuk, Agata, and Agnieszka Kościańska. 2023. "Regendering Childbirth: Catholicism, Medical Activism, and Birth Preparation in Post-War Poland." *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 78(3): 249–69.
- Ilič, Melanie, ed. 2018. *The Palgrave Handbook of Women and Gender in Twentieth-Century Russia and the Soviet Union*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Inglot, Tomasz, Dorotyya Szikra, and Cristina Rat, ed. 2022. *Mothers, Families or Children? Family Policy in Poland, Hungary, and Romania 1945–2020*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Janowski, Maciej. 2017. "A Marriage of Convenience. The Roman Catholic Church and Modernity in Nineteenth-Century Europe." *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 124(1): 43–90.
- Jarska, Natalia, and Agata Ignaciuk. 2022. "Marriage, Gender and Demographic Change: Managing Fertility in State-Socialist Poland." *Slavic Review* 8(1): 142–62.
- Jarska, Natalia, and Sylwia Kuźma-Markowska. 2023. "Explaining the Calendar: The Catholic Church and Family Planning in Poland, 1930–1957." *The Historical Journal* 66(3): 666–88. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X23000018>.
- Klich-Kluczewska, Barbara, Joachim von Puttkamer, and Immo Ribitschek, ed. 2023. *Biopolitics in Central and Eastern Europe in the 20th Century*. Abington: Routledge, 2023.
- Kluckhohn, Clyde. 1951. "Values and Value-Orientations in the Theory of Action: An Exploration in Definition and Classification." In *Toward a General Theory of Action*, ed. Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils, 388–464. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Korhel, Michal. 2002. "Children as Collateral Damage: of Nationalization Campaigns? The Persecution of 'Nationally Unreliable' Persons in Czechoslovakia after the Second World War." In *Children Born of War: Past, Present and Future*, ed. Sabine Lee and Heide Glaesmer, 212–31. New York: Taylor and Francis.

- Kościańska, Agnieszka. 2021. *To See a Moose: The History of Polish Sex Education*. New York: Berghahn.
- Kovács, Eszter. 2018. "Questioning Consensuses: Right-Wing Populism, Anti-Populism, and the Threat of 'Gender Ideology.'" *Sociological Research Online* 23(2): 528–38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1360780418764735>.
- Kovács, Eszter, and Maari Põim, eds. 2015. *Gender as a Symbolic Glue: The Position and Role of Conservative and Far Right Parties in the Anti-Gender Mobilizations in Europe*. Brussels: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung. <https://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/budapest/11382.pdf> (accessed 18 May 2024).
- Kuang, Bernice, and Isabel Brodsky. 2016. "Global Trends in Family Planning Programs, 1999–2014." *International Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health* 42(1): 33–44. <https://doi.org/10.1363/42e0316>.
- Kulczycki, Andrzej. 2023. "Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Abortion, Catholicism, the Populist Right and Public Health Threats in Poland." In *Religions* 14(10): 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel14101271>.
- Kuźma-Markowska, Sylwia. 2019. "Marx or Malthus? Population Debates and the Reproductive Politics of State-Socialist Poland in the 1950s and 1960s." *The History of the Family* 4: 576–98.
- Kuźma-Markowska, Sylwia, and Agata Ignaciuk. 2020. "Family Planning Advice" in State-Socialist Poland, 1950s–1980s: Local and Transnational Exchanges." *Medical History* 64(2): 240–66.
- Labbé, Morgane. 2014. "'Reproduction' as a New Demographic Issue in Interwar Poland." In *A World of Populations: The Production, Transfer, and Application of Demographic Knowledge in the Twentieth Century in Transnational Perspective*, ed. Heinrich Hartmann and Corinna R. Unger, 36–57. Oxford/New York: Berghahn.
- Leinartė, Dalia. 2017. *The Lithuanian Family in Its European Context, 1800–1914. Marriage, Divorce and Flexible Communities*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- . 2021. *Family and the State in Soviet Lithuania*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Lemke, Thomas. 2011. *Biopolitics: An Advanced Introduction*. New York: New York University Press.
- Lišková, Kateřina. 2018. *Sexual Liberation, Socialist Style: Communist Czechoslovakia and the Science of Desire, 1945–1989*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2021. "Sexology's Unexpected Progressiveness in the Cold War East: Shaping People's Sexual Selves, Creating Socialist Societies." In *Histories of Sexology: Between Science and Politics*, ed. Alain Giami, 25–39. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- . 2022. "Sex in the Cold War." *Contemporary European History* 2: 299–307.
- Lišková, Kateřina, Natalia Jarska, and Gábor Szegedi. 2020. "Sexuality and Gender in School-Based Sex Education in Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland in the 1970s and 1980s." *The History of the Family* 4: 550–575. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1081602X.2019.1679219>.
- Lorenz, Louisa. 2022. *Clit. Die aufregende Geschichte der Klitoris*. München: Heyne.
- Nawojski, Radosław, and Beata Kowalska. 2019. "Uwaga, uwaga tu obywatelki! Obywatelstwo jako praktyka w Czarnych Protestach i Strajkach Kobiet." In *Bunt kobiet. Czarne Protesty i Strajki Kobiet*, ed. Beata Kowalska, Claudia Snochowska-Gonzalez, Elżbieta Korolczuk, Jennifer Ramme, Jenny Gunnarsson Payne, and Radosław Nawojski, 45–81. Gdańsk: Europejskie Centrum Solidarności.

- Nešťáková, Denisa. 2023a. *Be Fruitful and Multiply: Slovakia's Family Planning under Three Regimes (1918–1965)*. Marburg: Herder-Institut.
- . 2023b. “Family Conceptions at the Intersection of Feminism, Public Health, and Nationalism in Czechoslovakia (1918–1939).” Special issue *Birth Control as a National Challenge: Nationalizing Concepts of Families in Eastern Europe, 1914–1939*, ed. by Heidi Hein-Kircher and Elisa-Maria Hiemer. *Journal of Family History* 48(3): 309–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03631990231160095>.
- . 2023c. “In the Name of Helping Women. Women Against the Family Policy of the Slovak State.” Special issue *The Nation at Stake? Ideologizing Conceptions of Family Planning in East Central Europe Since 1939*, ed. by idem and Heidi Hein-Kircher. *Central Europe* 21(2): 78–96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790963.2023.2294409>.
- Niethammer, Lutz, and Silke Satjukow, ed. 2016. “Wenn die Chemie stimmt” *Geschlechterbeziehungen und Geburtenkontrolle im Zeitalter der “Pille.”* Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag.
- Oppermann, Paula. 2022. “Changing Contexts, One Agenda. Latvia’s Fascist Pērkonkrusts from Inter- to Postwar.” PhD thesis, Glasgow.
- Perica, Vjekoslav. 2006. “The Most Catholic Country in Europe? Church, State, and Society in Contemporary Croatia.” *Religion, State and Society* 34(4): 311–46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09637490600974401>.
- Pető, Andrea. 2020. *Women of the Arrow Cross Party Invisible Hungarian Perpetrators in the Second World War*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rödder, Andreas. 2013. “Wertewandel in historischer Perspektive. Ein Forschungskonzept” In *Gab es den Wertewandel? Neue Forschungen zum gesellschaftlich-kulturellen Wandel seit den 1960er Jahren*, ed. Bernhard Dietz, Christopher Neumaier, and Andreas Rödder, 17–39. Munich: DeGruyter Oldenbourg.
- Rubinaut, Henryk, and Justyna Budzińska-Tylicka. 1933. *Skuteczne i nieszkodliwe środki zapobiegania ciąży*. Warszawa: Poradnia Świadomego Macierzyństwa.
- Przyrembel, Willibald. 1994. *Klinisches Wörterbuch*. 257. ed. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Schneider, Jane C., and Peter T. Schneider. 1996. “Festival of the Poor. Fertility Decline and the Ideology of Class.” Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Sommer, Urs. 2016. *Werte: warum man sie braucht, obwohl es sie nicht gibt*. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler.
- Sipos, Balász. 2019. *Women and Politics: Nationalism and Femininity in Interwar Hungary*. Trondheim: Trondheim Studies on East European Cultures and Societies.
- Škovanková, Evá. 2024. “Slovak Families in the Clutches of the Builders of Socialism. Population and Family Policies in Slovakia in the 1950s and 1960s.” Special issue *The Nation at Stake? Ideologizing Conceptions of Family Planning in East Central Europe Since 1939*, ed. by Heidi Hein-Kircher and Denisa Nešťáková. *Central Europe* 21(2): 97–110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790963.2023.2294410>.
- Stloukal, Libor. 1999. “Understanding the ‘Abortion Culture’ in Central and Eastern Europe.” In *From Abortion to Contraception. A Resource to Public Policies and Reproductive Behavior in Central and Eastern Europe from 1917 to the Present*, ed. Henry P. David, 23–37. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Svégel, Fanni. 2023. “The Role of Women as Agents and Beneficiaries in the Hungarian Family Planning System (1914–1944).” *Journal of Family History* 48(3): 338–53. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03631990231160222>.

- Thomas, Alfred. 2007. *The Bohemian Body: Gender and Sexuality in Modern Czech Culture*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Thome, Helmut. 2022. *Beiträge zur soziologischen Werte- und Gewaltforschung*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Tomka, Béla. 2013. *A Social History of Twentieth Century Europe*. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis.
- Van der Loo, Hans, and Willem Reijen. 1990. *Modernisierung. Projekt und Paradox*. Munich: dtv.
- Van Deth, Jan W., and Elinor Scarbrough, ed. 1995. *The Impact of Values*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Varsa, Eszter. 2020. "Sex Advice East and West: Sex Education and Family Planning in Cold War Austria and Hungary." *The History of the Family* 25(4): 649–70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1081602X.2019.1702890>.