

Georgia State University

ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

Communication Theses

Department of Communication

8-2-2006

The Discourse of Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area: 1964 – 1972

Melissa N. Miller

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/communication_theses



Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Miller, Melissa N., "The Discourse of Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area: 1964 – 1972." Thesis, Georgia State University, 2006.

https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/communication_theses/13

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Communication at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Communication Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

**THE DISCOURSE OF PLANNED PARENTHOOD
OF THE ATLANTA AREA: 1964 – 1972**

by

Melissa Miller

Under the Direction of Michael Bruner

ABSTRACT

Objectives. The purpose of this study is to determine whether or not the mainstream reproductive rights organization Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area (PPAA) considered reproductive justice issues typically advocated for by non-traditional reproductive rights organizations.

Methods. This research was a qualitative content analysis of discourse internal to PPAA (meeting minutes) and discourse communicated to the public externally via print media channels.

Results. A total of 105 documents were analyzed as part of this study: 57 meeting minutes and 48 press clippings. The analysis revealed that, internally, PPAA did consider reproductive justice issues but that this was not directly communicated to the public via print media channels. Most noticeably, press characterizations of PPAA were slanted too heavily on the organization's proliferation of population control as a goal and did not give enough consideration to its consideration of racial diversity.

INDEX WORDS: Qualitative Content Analysis, Planned Parenthood, Reproductive rights, Reproductive justice, Atlanta

THE DISCOURSE OF PLANNED PARENTHOOD
OF THE ATLANTA AREA: 1964 – 1972

by

MELISSA MILLER

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment for the Degree of
Master of Arts
in the College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University

2006

Copyright by
Melissa Nichole Miller
2006

THE DISCOURSE OF PLANNED PARENTHOOD
OF THE ATLANTA AREA: 1964 – 1972

by

MELISSA MILLER

Major Professor: Michael Bruner
Committee: Marian Meyers
Merrill Morris

Electronic Version Approved:

Office of Graduate Studies
College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University
August 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
PPAA History and Contextual Considerations	7
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	18
First Wave Reproductive Rights – Margaret Sanger and Legalized Contraceptives	22
Second Wave Reproductive Rights – “The Pill” and Legalized Abortion	26
Third Wave Reproductive Rights – Lost Issues and Overlooked Constituencies	32
Summary	39
III. THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE AND METHODOLOGY	41
Methods	48
Limitations of Methods	58
Summary	60
IV. ANALYSES AND FINDINGS	62
Mainstream Reproductive Rights	64
Reproductive Justice	76
Discussion	87
V. CONCLUSION	97
Review	101
REFERENCES	

Primary References	105
Secondary References	113

APPENDICES

Coding Agenda	122
Coding Sheet	128

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER III:	
THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE AND METHODOLOGY	
Table 1 – Breakdown of Common Themes in Meeting Minutes and Press Coverage	64

The Discourse of Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area: 1964 - 1972

Many people, when confronted with the term “feminism,” struggle to come up with a suitable definition. Among the many characterizations of feminism is this one, which appeared in Naomi Wolf’s *Fire with Fire* (1993): “‘Feminism’ should mean, on an overarching level, nothing more complicated than women’s willingness to act politically to get what they determine they need” (59).¹ Historically speaking, there are many instances of women in this country forming coalitions to act politically to get what they need, but one of the most notable examples has been the continued fight for the reproductive rights. Throughout the past century, women have challenged legislative and popular opinion to acquire (among other reproductive entitlements) access to safe and effective contraception and the right to choose an abortion. Reproductive rights activists have faced obstacles such as prohibitive male-dominated societal structures, and in spite of their accomplishments they have sometimes been criticized as promoting the movement from a narrow white, middle- to upper-class female standpoint that claims to benefit all women while really only meeting the needs of a few.

Texts such as *Undivided Rights: Women of Color Organize for Reproductive Justice* (2004) and *Killing the Black Body* (1997) accuse the constituencies of mainstream reproductive rights organizations like Planned Parenthood Federation of America of consistently sending a message of

¹ The word “political” could be interpreted as meaning to deal with governmental affairs, but I interpret the word “political” in this case as relating to any social relationship involving authority or power.

legitimizing and legislating women's freedoms of reproductive "choice."² Reproductive choice is interpreted as meaning "individual autonomy and freedom from government interference; it is primarily concerned with the interests of white, middle-class women; and it is focused on the right to abortion" and to safe and effective contraception (Roberts, *Killing* 6). These texts explore the harsh criticism of mainstream reproductive rights activism by marginalized groups who claim that "reproductive 'choice' implies options in which women's right to determine what happens to their bodies is legally protected, ignoring the fact that economic and institutional [and many times racial] constraints often restrict their choices" (Silliman, Fried, Ross, and Gutiérrez 5).

The strategy of non-traditional reproductive rights organizations seems to at least partially consist of a call for mainstream organizations to frame their activism in terms of reproductive "justice" or reproductive "liberty" instead of reproductive "rights" or "choice." On one level, the term "reproductive justice" is a more broad approach to reproductive rights than is the term "reproductive choice." To explain, reproductive justice activism is concerned not only with issues of contraception and abortion, but with a wide range of reproductive concerns that are primarily experienced by individuals who fall outside of the mainstream (i.e. women of color, poor women, GLBT persons, etc.).³ These issues may include limited access to abortion and contraceptive services and

² Throughout this paper, the term 'mainstream reproductive rights organization' is meant to identify groups whose members and values closely resemble the archetypical feminist activist – white, heterosexual, and middle-class. The term 'non-traditional reproductive rights organization' is meant to identify groups whose members exist from outside of that category – women of color, lesbians, poor women, women of differing religious and ethnic backgrounds, etc.

³ GLBT = Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender

information, forced/coerced contraception and sterilization, adoption rights, reproductive health (including issues of HIV/AIDS and other sexually transmitted infections), maternal mortality, violence against women, lack of affordable prenatal care, teenage pregnancy, the effects of poverty on reproductive health, language barriers, and more (“Feminist Campus Activism Online”). More specifically, non-traditional reproductive rights activists interpret “reproductive choice” as being coined by a group of individuals who interpret the reproductive lives of women to be oppressed as a result of patriarchal systems of authority. Thus, the term “reproductive justice” was created to counteract that one-dimensional approach. The term is intended to imply an approach to reproductive rights activism that acknowledges that women are not oppressed by patriarchal forces alone (Ross 161).

It is important to note that the push to frame reproductive rights activism in this way is not a cry against racism in the movement, but a call for attention to the diversity that exists within it; while the strides mainstream reproductive rights activists have made over the years to secure reproductive choices are valued and appreciated, their actions are thought to have unintentionally marginalized many groups of women. By reframing reproductive rights activism in terms of justice or liberty, the discourse of mainstream organizations would reflect the recognition that “identity is a construction, not an essence [and that many] women have had to learn to construct themselves in a society that denied them full selves” (Harris qtd. in Roberts, *Killing* 302). According to Dorothy Roberts (1997), the concepts of self-definition and personhood connected with the terms “liberty” or “justice”

celebrates women who are transcending oppression. To women who have historically been devalued, the granting of “rights” upon them is symbolic of the denied aspects of their humanity. The term “rights” implies a level of acknowledgement that elevates one’s status from merely a human body to a social being. Thus, non-traditional reproductive rights organizations’ use of “justice” and “liberty” is a rebellion against social degradation, a demand for social recognition, and a transformation of mainstream “rights” discourse and its stereotyping of the human experience of reproduction (303).

The criticism of members of mainstream reproductive rights organizations by members of non-traditional organizations does not suggest the personal indictment of the women who participated in the ideology of “choice” out of necessity. Rather, the critique is intended to influence mainstream reproductive rights organizations to consider whether the “choices” they are advocating are real for the majority of women. The point is not to condemn the status quo, but to encourage the consideration of ways in which “diverse groups, situated by cultural and economic materialities, might come to better, if always imperfect, concordances” (Condit, *Clouding* 199). This might lead one to wonder at what point, if any, did non-traditional reproductive rights activists transgress traditional reproductive rights discourse to contribute to the mainstream reproductive rights discussion. Unfortunately, without a complete genealogical review of the *entire* reproductive rights movement it would be difficult to know the full answer to this question, but the scope of this research project will not allow for such a detailed analysis. Instead, the project focuses on the analysis of discourse produced at a

particular interval during reproductive rights activism and is designed to answer a question distinctive to that specific scene. Specifically, discourse produced by Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area (PPAA) within the first decade of its operation will be analyzed to determine the answer to this question: Did Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area (PPAA) discourse during 1964-1972 address issues of reproductive justice?

The choice to narrow the project in this way was reached after much consideration. One reason PPAA messaging has been chosen as an object of analysis is because PPAA's parent organization, Planned Parenthood Federation of America, has the distinction of continuously having been at the forefront of reproductive rights activism in this country and was, in fact, the only national reproductive rights organization until the late 1960s when abortion rights activism became more prevalent (Gordon 341). Another reason for narrowing the project in this way includes the possibility that by focusing on one organization the research project can act as an interesting case study – a snapshot, if you will, of an activist organization challenging reproductive norms during an historically significant era. PPAA was founded – and is still headquartered – in Atlanta, Ga.⁴ By concentrating on PPAA discourse, an historically intriguing organization can be explored while themes in mid-century reproductive rights messaging are revealed in an attempt to demonstrate the rhetorical forces that constrained and influenced reproductive rights activism. The analysis of this organization during this time period provides the opportunity to see how marginalization of

⁴ In 1997, PPAA joined with other Planned Parenthood locations in Georgia to form a single, statewide affiliate. The organization is now known as Planned Parenthood of Georgia (PPGA) (“40 Year Timeline”).

reproductive justice issues may have occurred in one area of feminist activity in a racially charged era in the southern U.S. Additionally, many people are aware that Atlanta was the birthplace of civil rights leader Martin Luther King, Jr., and was a site where marginalized racial minorities fought to reshape societal norms during the middle part of the twentieth century, but fewer people are aware that Atlanta is also the site of origin for the *Doe v. Bolton* abortion rights case that was tried in front of the US Supreme Court as a companion to *Roe v. Wade*, which situates the city as a significant landmark in reproductive rights legislation and history.

This study will prove whether PPAA considered reproductive justice issues in the organization's internal operations and, if so, whether those considerations were communicated via print media channels where publics external to the organization would have been most likely to have gathered the information they needed to form their characterizations of PPAA. First, the project will reveal a disciplinary history of mainstream reproductive rights activism that has provided fertile ground for rebellion among non-traditional reproductive rights activists who perceived that their needs were being disregarded by mainstream organizations like Planned Parenthood. Then, several germinal reproductive justice texts will be analyzed to help identify ideals of reproductive rights activism as practiced by mainstream reproductive rights organizations as well as ideals of reproductive justice activism as practiced by non-traditional reproductive rights organizations. Finally, using qualitative content analysis, these ideal categories will be applied to two sets of PPAA

discourse: internal PPAA meeting minutes and external press clippings. By doing so, it can be determined how representative PPAA was of reproductive justice ideals, both in its internal operations and in its external characterization. First, however, an overview of the organization's beginnings and a discussion of the events occurring in Atlanta during that time are offered to help establish background and context for the study.

PPAA History and Contextual Considerations

To more effectively understand the significance of choosing PPAA as a site for study it is beneficial to consider the origins of the organization and the contextual environment in which it was formed. An oral history of PPAA founder Esther Kahn Taylor, housed at the Breman Jewish Center in Atlanta, has been particularly pivotal in revealing her experience forming PPAA. This document shows that Taylor began displaying her ambitious spirit long before establishing the Atlanta area's first Planned Parenthood family planning clinic. PPAA founder Esther Taylor was born Esther Kahn in Atlanta in 1905 to Jewish Russian immigrants. In her youth, she was a superior student who showed promise as a piano player; Kahn's popularity playing ragtime for students at lunch earned her a pass as student body president. After graduating high school at the age of 16, Kahn's intentions of attending college were dashed when her father informed her that the family could not afford to pay for her to go. As a result, Kahn began teaching first and second graders, becoming the first female instructor at the United Hebrew School of Atlanta.

Within two years, Kahn met and married Herbert Taylor, a financially secure druggist (and later builder/developer) ten years her senior and began a life of society and privilege. Of married life, Ms. Taylor commented that life with her father was very strict (“He made the rules in our house,”), but life with Herbert was much more liberating since he allowed her to do as she pleased (“My husband always encouraged me by supplying funds”) (Taylor, *Written Response* 1-7). After marriage, Taylor began traveling and became active in several area civic organizations including the League of Women Voters and Jewish Women’s Council, but she never abandoned her love of music; Taylor played recitals city-wide as well as continued teaching music to children at the Boys and Girls Club. Eventually, Taylor convinced her husband to pay for her to attend The Juilliard School in New York.

It was while Taylor was studying in New York that she first discovered the Planned Parenthood Federation. Taylor had been interested in family planning since her youth when she lacked the capacity to articulate that interest. As a teen, Taylor had been a member of a book club that had once hosted a guest speaker who came to discuss what she termed a “trial marriage” between young people in which they “tried things out” before marriage to see if they were compatible (Diamond 114-15). Years later, Taylor recalled:

Masturbation was a sin, men could not take up with a girl, so young men visited whorehouses or lied about masturbation ... When I found out about Planned Parenthood... at least we have some semblance of giving a

woman the choice and the right not to have a baby, and it gives the man a chance to have sex without lying. It seemed the only way we would have a decent world (Diamond 115).

Of her book club experience, Taylor stated that her friends were shocked, but she found the idea of a “trial marriage” intriguing and later let this idea influence her decision to pursue forming a Planned Parenthood affiliate in Atlanta.

Though Taylor was interested in establishing a Planned Parenthood affiliate in the Atlanta area, she was hesitant about undertaking the project and about being successful with such a controversial issue in the South. Taylor had every right to be hesitant; others had tried to establish family planning programs in Atlanta with little success. In fact, an organizer for Planned Parenthood had visited Atlanta in 1945 to launch an affiliate and failed due to a Georgia law on the books that forbade dispensing family planning advice unless it was specifically asked for (“History of Planned Parenthood”). An additional roadblock to the establishment of a Planned Parenthood facility at that time was opposition to the organization’s plan to make the clinic multiracial (“History of Planned Parenthood”).

By the time Taylor began her journey toward organizing a Planned Parenthood affiliate in Atlanta in 1963, the social climate had shifted and was more hospitable for such an organization. Atlanta’s Grady Hospital had recently established a family planning clinic at the hospital site, but Taylor recognized that to get into Grady patients needed have to have a card; “the process is long and

complicated sometimes lasting all day, even if some wanted to go they would have been unable to get off work” (Diamond 49). Furthermore, Grady only served post-partum patients. She discussed her plans to establish a Planned Parenthood affiliate with her husband who was doubtful of her ability to pull it off, but agreed to supply the money she would need to begin. According to Taylor, “That’s all I needed” (Taylor, *Personal Communication 2*).

In early 1964, Taylor wrote to the national headquarters of Planned Parenthood Federation of America who advised her to go to the library and research names of women’s organizations that had social service programs. On their advice, and in somewhat of a clandestine manner, Taylor wrote to civic minded women’s organizations throughout the city and invited them to brunch in her home “to hear about something extraordinary, very new, and unusual,” but did not tell them what. About forty women attended the brunch where they were introduced to Russell Richardson, a Planned Parenthood representative from New York who came to discuss the organization’s wide-reaching mission to provide professional family planning services to women who could not afford a private physician, including pap tests, breast exams, and contraception. A unanimous show of hands at the end of the presentation demonstrated an exceptional perception of need by those in attendance for such services in the Atlanta area. This reinforced Taylor’s decision to continue to pursue bringing Planned Parenthood family planning services to Atlanta.

By November of 1964, Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area was officially formed as an organizing committee to establish a fully operational

Planned Parenthood affiliate clinic in Atlanta. PPAA's organizing members were comprised of a group of civic leaders, public-health officials, medical doctors and clergymen with Taylor officially recognized as the organization's leader. To meet their goal of opening a clinic, the group initiated an extensive letter writing campaign to gain community and monetary support. Fifty-thousand letters were stuffed into envelopes and addressed and stamped by fifteen volunteers at Taylor's home over a period of two months. Taylor followed this effort by launching a campaign to gain support for her organization from a wide range of government officials and other decision makers. Accompanied by Dr. Louella Klein, obstetrician and organizer of PPAA's Medical Advisory Committee, Taylor orchestrated visits to newspaper editors, the governor, mayor, county commissioners, and public health director. Though many had never even heard of Planned Parenthood as a national family planning organization, all were courteous and listened to what the women had to say. Taylor recalled later that, "They didn't promise anything. The only thing I can say about it was that they knew that the time had come" (Diamond 49). The lackluster response Taylor received from these meetings did little to slow her down and she soon launched what can only be described as a full-blown grassroots effort to bring Planned Parenthood to Atlanta.

Taylor began to ask for everything from money to supplies to the manpower that would be necessary to get the organization up and running and keep it afloat. All her paper products were donated by friends who owned a paper factory, and all the work was done from her house. Eventually she garnered

enough support and in 1966 opened Atlanta's first Planned Parenthood clinic, in a space donated and renovated by the Bethlehem Community Center. Potential patients were informed of the new clinic by word of mouth from flyers passed out by neighborhood volunteers. Taylor embarked on a city-wide public speaking tour of civic organizations to recruit volunteers and solicit donations to keep the clinic open and open new clinics in other areas throughout the city. By the 1970s, there were several satellite offices in operation throughout the Atlanta area.

When looking at the origins of PPAA from this singular perspective, it might be easy to assume that Taylor founded and operated the organization in a manner consistent with what non-traditional reproductive rights activists would expect of a mainstream reproductive rights organization. PPAA was a local affiliate of the largest national reproductive rights organization, founded by a wealthy white woman with help from other white women. However, the contextual situation in Atlanta at the time of the organization's origin was such that racial and economic disparity among the city's residents was prominent and could have influenced the way in which PPAA decided to treat the issue of reproductive rights. For example, racial discrimination in Atlanta in the 1960s was commonplace. The onset of the decade saw the city's citizens constrained by restrictive Jim Crow laws.⁵ Not only were citizens of differing races prohibited from intermingling in public places such as restaurants and schools, but there was

⁵ Named after a black-face minstrel act popular in the United States during the early 1800s, "Jim Crow laws were made to enforce racial segregation, and included laws that would prevent black people from doing things that a white person could do, and vice versa. For instance, Jim Crow laws regulated separate use of water fountains, public bath houses, and separate seating sections on public transport" ("Jim Crow Law").

also a color-line in the allocation of housing and land resources. For example, 36% of Atlanta's population in 1959 was African-American, yet they only occupied 16% of the city's available residential land. In fact, barricades were often erected along residential areas to prevent African-American residential expansion into white neighborhoods. Courts ordered their removal in 1962, a decision credited with accelerating the emigration of white residents into Atlanta's suburbs ("Ivan Allen, Jr.," "New Georgia Encyclopedia").

The scene in Atlanta in the 1960s was ripe for social activism with a goal of achieving racial equity. With the "white-flight" during the 1960s, the racial demographics of Atlanta began to shift; the white population of the city declined by 60,132 citizens while the African-American population grew by 68,587 ("New Georgia Encyclopedia"). African-American citizens began using their growing numbers to assert their political presence in an attempt to acquire civil rights and overturn Jim Crow laws. For example, in October of 1960, civil rights leader Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and several students from historically black colleges staged non-violent acts of civil disobedience called "sit-ins" to protest the racial segregation of the city's public facilities. The most historically prominent of these sit-ins occurred on the 19th of October at the lunch counter of Rich's Department store, which resulted in the arrests of Dr. King and approximately 60 others – arrests which drew national media attention to the burgeoning Atlanta civil rights movement. The following year, the city of Atlanta also began the desegregation of its public schools by allowing nine African-American students to

be bussed to four different high schools city-wide (“Atlanta, Georgia”; “Ivan Allen, Jr.”; “New Georgia Encyclopedia”).

Many of the gains in racial equality in the city of Atlanta during the 1960s occurred during the administration of Mayor Ivan Allen, Jr. Mayor Allen openly supported the efforts of Dr. King and other civil rights champions, and upon accepting office he “ordered ‘white’ and ‘colored’ signs removed from City Hall, desegregated the City Hall cafeteria, and gave the forty-eight black officers in a force of 900 the authority to arrest whites,” and began desegregating the hiring practices of the Atlanta Fire Department (“Ivan Allen, Jr.”). Later, Allen became the only elected Southern official to testify in front of Congress in favor of the 1964 Civil Rights Act (“Ivan Allen, Jr.”).⁶

By the beginning of the next decade, African-Americans had firmly established a presence in the Atlanta political landscape. In 1972, Andrew Young became the first African-American Congressman from Georgia since the Reconstruction era, and 1973 saw Maynard Jackson as Atlanta’s first African-American mayor. Furthermore, African-American representation on Atlanta’s city council grew equal to that of whites, and African-Americans enjoyed majority representation on the city’s school board (“New Georgia Encyclopedia”).

As in other parts of the country during the 1960s, Atlanta was also a site of activity in the women’s movement. American women were struggling with

⁶ The Civil Rights Act of 1964 outlaws discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin and prohibits discrimination in public facilities, in government, and in employment. As a result of the Civil Rights Act, Jim Crow laws in the South were abolished, and it became illegal to compel segregation of the races in schools, housing, or hiring (“Civil Rights Act of 1964”).

gender inequality in the home and workplace. Perhaps ironically, because women were not subject to the time constraints of jobs outside of the home, they were prime agents for activism. Many women joined in the movements surrounding the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and, later, anti-war protests inspired women to jump on the activism wagon. Women were among the more active participants in the civil rights movement and it was here where they developed the skills and techniques needed to act politically for social justice on their own behalf. Like racial minorities, women were being discriminated against in the workplace and soon began making specific recommendations for improvement, including pushing for fair hiring practices, paid maternity leave, and affordable child care (Imbornoni). Women's financial well-being was dependent upon men: credit cards were not issued in their own names; women were ineligible for bank loans without a male co-signer; "help wanted" ads were segregated by gender and there were many jobs for which it was illegal for women to even apply (Eisenberg and Ruthsdotter).

The early part of the 1960s saw the congressional passage of the Equal Pay Act, which made it illegal for employers to differentiate pay between workers of the differing gender who are doing the same job, and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which outlawed discrimination in several areas including race and gender. However, initial enforcement of these new laws was slow, and social norms of gender discrimination were even slower to change. In spite of their ardent activism in support of racial equality and the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, women found that their work often went unappreciated and their skills were

undervalued by the men in charge. Many men involved in the civil rights movement felt that women's duties should be limited to preparing food and running copies, and when the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was amended to include civil rights for women as well as racial minorities, many civil rights activists steadfastly opposed and feared that the inclusion of gender in the text of the act would inhibit its chance of passing (Eisenberg and Ruthsdotter; "Civil Rights Act of 1964").

It was the consideration of contextual situation in which PPAA was founded that made this study particularly interesting. The question, again, is whether or not PPAA discourse during its inaugural decade considered issues of reproductive justice. PPAA could have gone either way. Since the organization was founded on a national model by a white, middle-class constituency, non-traditional reproductive rights interpretations of mainstream reproductive rights may apply. However, since the social context of Atlanta was such that attention to diversity among the city's citizens was prominent and issues of social justice were at the forefront, PPAA's founders may have approached reproductive rights from a justice perspective. Given this possibility, at the conclusion of this study I expected one of the following four scenarios to have been revealed:

- 1) PPAA discourse did not address issues of reproductive justice.
- 2) PPAA discourse did address issues of reproductive justice.
- 3) PPAA discourse was split; that is, internal (or private) discourse addressed reproductive justice concerns, but external (or public) discourse did not.

- 4) PPAA discourse was split; that is, internal (or private) discourse did not address reproductive justice concerns, but external (or public) discourse did.
- 5) Evidence of reproductive justice concerns appears in both internal (or private) and external (or public) PPAA discourse.

In fact, at the conclusion of the study it was the fifth scenario that was revealed. To explain, while both internal and external PPAA discourse addressed reproductive justice issues, these issues were more prominently featured in PPAA internal documents. Conversely, mainstream reproductive rights issues were also addressed in both internal and external PPAA discourse, but these issues were more prominently featured in external documents. To reach this conclusion, a qualitative content analysis was conducted on two sets of PPAA texts: private PPAA meeting minutes which reveal the organization's strategy, and public press clippings representative of the organization's external messaging execution. A detailed description of the project's methodological process will be discussed later. First, it is important to review the literature on reproductive rights activism to appreciate its history and to disclose the criticisms of it presented by non-traditional reproductive rights activists and scholars. By doing so, cause for division between mainstream reproductive rights organizations and non-traditional activists of reproductive justice can be revealed.

Chapter II: Literature Review

Reproductive rights activism began to emerge near the beginning of the twentieth century. It continued to grow and flourish as women began to publicly assert their independence from men and move from within the confines of their individual private households and out into the public sphere. Subservient to men economically, politically and socially, women began to work in great numbers to change their roles in society and resist male-dominated culture. This form of activism by women became known as feminism.

There are three identified “waves” of feminist activity in this country. The first and second waves of feminism (common titles given to those eras of feminist activity in this country that are popularly associated with the suffragist and the “women’s-libber” of the 1960s, respectively) can be identified as feminist activity occurring during the 1800s and into the middle part of the last century in which women positioned themselves as intelligent, independent, and self-sustaining individuals who were out to challenge gender barriers. Feminists of this era were driven by the quest for gender equality and autonomy. Specifically, the first wave of feminism was predominantly characterized by abolitionists and suffragists addressing legal issues that kept women silent and politically powerless (Block; Hawkins; Hill). The first wave of feminism was a “movement working for the reform of women's social and legal inequalities in the nineteenth century. The key concerns of first wave feminists were education, employment, marriage laws, and the plight of *intelligent middle-class single [white] women*. They were *not* primarily concerned with the problems of working-class women ... [and they]

largely responded to specific *injustices they had themselves experienced*" (Hill).⁷ Though the first wave feminist worked against injustice, by ignoring issues important to women of other backgrounds and experiences, she was just as guilty of perpetuating it. "[Women's] suffrage ... was a social, economic and political reform movement aimed at extending the suffrage (the right to vote) to women, advocating *equal suffrage* (abolition of graded votes) rather [than] *universal suffrage* (abolition of discrimination due to, for instance, race), which was considered too radical" ("Women's Suffrage").

Whereas first wave feminism has been associated with guaranteeing women equality in the public political sphere, second wave feminism has largely been recognized for raising national consciousness about the rights of women in the home and in the workplace by advocating for women's liberation in the private sphere (Block). Second wave feminism is largely associated with the publication of Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique*, which identified the suburban middle-class woman's "problem that has no name;" that is, the aching, empty feeling that there has got to be something more than the house, the husband, and the kids. Friedan's manifesto has been credited with urging women to break free from the domestic role they assumed post-WW II, and by 1970 more than forty percent of all women worked outside the home. Worried by loopholes in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that might not have protected women's rights in society and secured their release from second-class citizenship, feminists began to rally around an Equal Rights Amendment that was first introduced to Congress in 1923, shortly after women were granted the right to vote. The Equal Rights

⁷ Emphasis added.

Amendment (ERA) was designed mainly to invalidate many state and federal laws that discriminate against women; its central underlying principle was that gender should not determine the legal rights of American men or women. Advocates of the ERA, led primarily by the National Organization for Women (NOW), charged that many sex-discriminatory state and federal laws perpetuated a state of economic dependence among a large number of women and that laws determining job opportunities should be designed for the individual rather than for one gender.⁸ It was finally approved by the U.S. Senate 49 years after its introduction, in March 1972, but was never ratified by the requisite majority of 38 states (“Equal Rights Amendment”).

Hawkins (2003) describes second wave feminism as the “mainstream face of feminism” characterized by the goal of “freedom and autonomy from unwarranted restrictions by others” and the presumption of “sameness between men and women” (Hawkins 9). It is the assumption of “sameness” that has motivated third wave feminists to act. Third wave feminism, instead, focuses on difference – i.e. racial differences, differences in social class, and differences in sexuality – and expands upon first and second wave feminism to include the quest for equality in the social sphere. Third wave feminism does not assume that gender inequity is the only inequity women experience and focuses on other aspects of identity as well. Third wave feminism recognizes that women experience inequity in the areas of education, race, socio-economic levels, and

⁸ Founded in 1966 by Betty Friedan, Germaine Greer, Gloria Steinem, and other notable feminists of the day, the National Organization for Women’s goal has been “to take action” to bring about equality for all women. (<http://www.now.org>)

other social-class inhibitors and works toward the rise of women in all social classes (Prokhovnik; Bailey; Hill).

It should be noted that the previous discussion of first, second, and third wave feminism is not exhaustive and should not be considered a comprehensive review of the history of feminist activity. However, it is important to have established a foundation and comparison of the three waves of feminism since reproductive rights activism has long been a component of feminist activity and appears to have mirrored feminisms maturation as a social movement. Like third wave feminists who have criticized previous waves of feminist activity for being too narrowly focused, academic feminists studying reproductive rights activism too have criticized the proliferators of the movement in the early-to-mid part of the twentieth century for being centered on the desires and choices of a relatively narrow portion of the population – middle to upper-class white females who typically would not experience anything other than gender inequity. For example, several recent studies quantitatively identify the injustices many women face (and many activists may have ignored) when trying to exercise their reproductive freedoms – poverty, cuts in Medicare, forced/coerced sterilization, etc. (Matthews, Ribar and Wilhelm; Haas-Wilson; Henshaw and Finer). Additionally, qualitative studies call attention to specific instances in which women's reproductive choice has been compromised (Young; McCarthy; Charo). Other studies urge reform within reproductive rights activism (Mills; Porter; Smyth). Also, as already noted, some studies have documented the actions of non-traditional reproductive rights groups working to change the focus of reproductive

rights from fighting for "choice" to fighting for "freedom" (Silliman et al.; Ikemoto). What follows, therefore, is a brief historical review of reproductive rights activism in this country intended to characterize the "disciplining nature" that has existed throughout the movement, or more specifically, those attributes of reproductive rights that caused individuals to call for change in the system and rebel against the mainstream views of reproductive control.

First Wave Reproductive Rights –

Margaret Sanger and Legalized Contraceptives

In 1912 Margaret Sanger, nurse and mother of three, launched a personal crusade of "emancipating women via contraception, from sexual servitude [for, in her eyes,] every child should be wanted by parents who are prepared to care for that child" (Center and Jackson 266). She saw reproductive matters as matters of choice; women should be able to choose how many children they wanted to parent and be able to choose when they wanted to conceive those children. Two years later, she was indicted on obscenity charges for violating the Comstock Law of 1873 that prohibited (among other things) the dispensing of contraceptive devices and information on the basis that such items were deemed obscene. Sanger, a nurse working in the impoverished areas of New York's Lower East Side, saw the devastating effects of the Comstock Law firsthand in the eyes of women delivering unwanted babies and on the bodies of women who had died from self-induced abortions. Sanger recognized the threat unwanted pregnancy posed to a woman's survival and saw an opportunity to change these dire circumstances for the better, despite the Comstock Law. Sanger's strategy was to

take the Comstock Law head-on: to test the law by breaking the law. She began to research birth control by traveling to Europe, where family planning was an accepted part of life, to interview doctors, midwives, druggists, and women, and to collect birth control formulas, techniques and devices. Her visit included a trip to the world's first birth control clinic in Amsterdam where she was coached in cutting-edge contraceptive techniques of the time. Using what she had learned while traveling abroad, Sanger began an education campaign by establishing a magazine and publishing a pamphlet entitled *The Woman Rebel* and *Family Limitation*, respectively. Subsequently, she would embark on a series of lecture tours (which would continue intermittently throughout her lifetime). She also established the first birth control clinic in this country as part of the American Birth Control League in an underprivileged area of Brooklyn.⁹

After publishing *The Woman Rebel*, Sanger was threatened with imprisonment and a \$5,000 fine. When she opened her clinic sometime later, she found no physician willing to operate it, for they all feared being prosecuted for violating the law. When she ran it herself, she was arrested several times and served thirty days in jail. For Margaret Sanger to suggest that women be permitted to choose to limit family size and have access to the information and devices required to do so resulted in her indictment on obscenity charges related to her publication of *The Woman Rebel*. The Comstock Law operated as a disciplinary mechanism in that it naturalized maternity and moral standards glorifying women's roles and duties as childbearers. Sanger's defiance of the

⁹ Sanger's American Birth Control League birth control clinic in Brooklyn matured into Planned Parenthood Federation of America, which today boasts of 850 reproductive planning centers nationwide ("Planned Parenthood - Health Centers").

Comstock Law positioned her as being in opposition to motherhood and labeled her as being of “vile, obscene, and filthy character” (Indictment). The 1936 trial that followed her final challenge of the Comstock Law resulted in its death knell, as the presiding judge lifted the federal ban on birth control, effectively ending use of the Comstock Law to prohibit the distribution of birth control information and devices (267).¹⁰ In that decision, Judge Augustus Hand stated that if “Congress of the 1870's had possessed the same clinical data on the dangers of pregnancy and the usefulness of contraception that were available in the 1930's, it would never have classified birth control as obscene” (“Get the Facts”). This action symbolically shifted Sanger from being perceived as contrary to maternity to becoming an advocate of responsible motherhood.

Even though Sanger transgressed law, she was later criticized for being disciplinary in her own way. That is, she was operating in a way that potentially silenced the concerns of non-elite members of society. Though her work was seemingly inspired by the reproductive injustices she encountered as a nurse in the slums of New York, Sanger and the American Birth Control League operated "with the support of a national council composed of physicians, scientists, and prominent New York-area society women" with apparently little input from the populations she was intent on serving ("American Birth Control League"). She has often been accused of being a eugenicist: of having a goal to control human reproduction with the intent of lessening the burden on society of children born to

¹⁰ The case referred to here is U.S. v. One Package of Japanese Pessaries. Margaret Sanger ordered a new type of diaphragm (pessary) designed by a Japanese physician. The shipment was seized and confiscated under Section 305 of the Tariff Act, an outgrowth of the Comstock law (“Get the Facts”).

the poor and to racial minorities while improving hereditary qualities possessed by Caucasians ("Margaret Sanger"). While answering the question "Was Margaret Sanger a racist?" in her text *Killing the Black Body* (1997), Dorothy Roberts reveals that Sanger never assigned reproductive fitness to one ethnic group over another. However:

Sanger [did promote two] tenets of eugenic thinking: that social problems are caused by reproduction of the socially disadvantaged and that their child bearing should be deterred. In a society marked by racial hierarchy, these principles inevitably produced policies designed to reduce Black women's fertility. The judgment of who is fit and who is unfit, of who should reproduce and who should not, incorporated the racist ideologies of the time (81).

Because Sanger did not publicly endorse racial eugenics does not mean that others could not interpret her stance on reproductive control as being racially discordant in that way.

Several of Sanger's American Birth Control League colleagues have been accused of publicly endorsing racially eugenic policies while promoting the goals of the organization, including Dr. S. Adolphus Knopf who "warned of the menace posed by the "black" and "yellow" peril," Lothrop Stoddard "who described the eugenic practices of the Third Reich as 'scientific' and 'humanitarian,' [and] Dr. Harry Laughlin, [who] spoke of purifying America's human 'breeding stock' and purging America's 'bad strains'," which included the "shiftless, ignorant, and

worthless class of antisocial whites of the South" ("The Truth" 1). However, Roberts (1997) surmises that Sanger's eugenic stance was one of political strategy – the eugenic stance offered an opportunity to discuss reproductive control in sexually neutral language. The scientific approach employed by eugenic theory allowed her to skirt the religious opposition to birth control (79). Considering Sanger's messaging strategy during this era was important when analyzing PPAA messages created in the mid-twentieth century. Since Sanger's associates during her own time were potentially misinterpreting her eugenic stance, future local Planned Parenthood chapters (being influenced by her rhetorical arguments) may have perpetuated a narrow approach to reproductive rights as well. In fact, the analysis will show that evidence suggests that PPAA did engage in a potentially marginalizing act of political strategy similar to Sanger during their efforts to engage public interest in their organization and its goals.

Second Wave Reproductive Rights –

“The Pill” and Legalized Abortion

Reproductive choices and birth control options changed by leaps and bounds in the years following Margaret Sanger's initial birth control crusade, resulting in new challenges. With the introduction of “the Pill” in 1960, women were able to take more control over contraception. For example, the pill was more convenient than other methods of birth control; sex acts between partners could become more spontaneous. More importantly, the pill freed women from reliance on a male partner who might not be willing to utilize a barrier method of contraception such as a condom. Despite any advantages presented by the pill, its

use as a contraceptive was still subject to public criticism. For instance, Enovid, the first birth control pill, was effective against pregnancy but was accompanied by several side-effects ranging from the mild (headache, nausea) to the severe (cancer, blood clotting) (Sigal 1). Though it was eventually discovered that the recommended Enovid dosage was ten times higher than was required, some women had already come to the conclusion that health care professionals were more interested in profit gains rather than in the well-being of the women to whom they were prescribing the drug.

A 1970 article by Reggie Sigal was particularly critical of the birth control pill in general and Planned Parenthood in particular. The article, *Planned Parenthood*, criticized Planned Parenthood physicians for their impersonal “get ‘em in and get ‘em out” healthcare approach to treating women – an approach that Sigal charges they would never take with their private patients. Sigal’s interviews with Planned Parenthood personnel and physicians reveal that physicians take the time to discuss several options for birth control with their private patients before allowing their patient to choose. One reason to which Sigal attributes this imbalance of treatment between the physician’s (presumably) wealthier private patients to the physician’s poorer Planned Parenthood clientele is that the physician has more time available to spend with their private patients since they pay for it. In recounting her experience at the Planned Parenthood clinic, Sigal describes herself being “hustled” into the examining room, experiencing a “fifteen second” examination, and subsequently being “rushed out the door” (2). She also attributes the disproportionate healthcare received by Planned Parenthood patients

to the lack of an overall policy by Planned Parenthood that outlines for their physicians the organization's expectations for informing women of birth control options and the risks associated with those options. Instead, Sigal alleges that physicians simply prescribed to the patient the birth control method they themselves preferred (2).

Sigal's conclusions in this article are relevant to the proposed study in several ways. First of all, the article demonstrates the "one size fits all" approach to reproductive rights of which reproductive justice activists are most critical – a "one size fits all" approach to reproductive rights utilized by one Planned Parenthood affiliate during a time that is concurrent with the era upon which this study will focus. Additionally, that Sigal mentions that visits to Planned Parenthood are inconsistent is interesting. That a visit to one Planned Parenthood clinic may not have been the same as a visit to another Planned Parenthood clinic suggests strategies and tactics used by one affiliate may differ from another. Whereas Sigal describes an encounter at a Planned Parenthood clinic that could be interpreted as reproductive injustice (obstructed access to legitimate reproductive health service and information), her experience at PPAA during that time may have been more just.

While access to birth control was legal, there were still laws on the books that disciplined women's reproductive lives. In 1970, Norma McCorvey was 21, pregnant with her third child, and desirous of obtaining an abortion. Though some states allowed abortion at that time (i.e. California and New York), in Texas abortion was illegal except to save the life of the woman ("30th Anniversary").

Through her adoption attorney, she was introduced to Sarah Weddington, a young lawyer forming a class-action lawsuit against the state of Texas to declare abortion laws unconstitutional. McCorvey became the lead plaintiff in the case under the name of “Jane Roe,” to secure her anonymity. Weddington tried her case in Texas court against District Attorney Henry Wade (“Roe vs. Wade”). That same year, 22-year-old Sandra Besing approached the Atlanta Legal Aid Society to help her find a lawyer to aid her in divorcing her abusive and absent husband and reclaim her children from foster care. Legal documents also claim that she wanted to obtain an abortion but was denied one at Atlanta’s Grady Memorial Hospital, even though she had a history of mental illness.¹¹ In April of 1970, her Legal Aid attorney Marjorie Pitts Hames renamed her “Mary Doe” and filed *Doe v. Bolton* (“Doe vs. Bolton”).¹²

Both suits were appealed to the United States Supreme Court and tried as companion cases. On January 22, 1973, the Supreme Court announced its decision in which both Weddington and Hames emerged victorious in their quests to prove abortion laws to be unconstitutional. The Supreme Court’s decision in Hames’ *Doe* case—in conjunction with Weddington’s *Roe*—states that the Fourteenth Amendment protects a woman’s right to an abortion.¹³ Weddington

¹¹ Georgia law as it related to abortion stated that the only circumstances in which a woman could obtain an abortion were in cases to preserve her physical or mental health.

¹² “Bolton” refers to Georgia Attorney General Arthur K. Bolton who was in charge of defending Georgia state law at that time.

¹³ The Fourteenth Amendment states that, “[n]o State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws” (“Fourteenth Amendment”). The Supreme Court interprets this clause to guarantee citizens the right to privacy, that the decision on whether or not to obtain abortion services is a private matter, and that state governments cannot impede women’s abilities to obtain abortion services.

has said that if she knew the case would be contested to the Supreme Court she never would have taken it on, but she was interested in arguing a case that might be part of a process of giving women expanded reproductive choices (“30th Anniversary”).

During their tenures in the U.S. reproductive rights movement, women like Sanger, Weddington and Hames helped to define the issues associated with birth control, bring about changes in laws affecting women’s access to birth control, and develop public support and understanding of the need for birth control. The problem is that many women do not recognize the motives of these reproductive rights champions and those like them to be inclusive and inspired by achieving gains for all women. In fact, both McCorvey and Besing (now, Cano) have both criticized the attorneys in their respective cases of taking advantage of their ignorance and poverty and coercing them to take part in legislation neither woman was interested in challenging. McCorvey says, "I did not go to the Supreme Court on behalf of a class of women... I went to Sarah Weddington asking her if she knew how I could obtain an abortion... Sarah and Linda [Coffee, co-counsel] were just looking for somebody, anybody, to further their own agenda. I was their willing dupe" (“The ‘Roe’ of Roe v. Wade”)

Women of color seemed absent from the abortion rights discussion.

According to Loretta Ross (1998), one reason for this may have been because reproductive rights were not seen as civil rights. To support abortion rights in the 1960s and 1970s seemed to support arguments of racial genocide even though “septic abortions were a primary killer of African-American women. One study

estimated that 80 percent of deaths caused by illegal abortions in New York in the 1960s involved Black and Puerto Rican women. In Georgia between 1965 and 1967 the Black maternal death rate due to illegal abortion was fourteen times that of white women” (161). One criticism of abortion as a tool of racial genocide found its roots among some extreme groups of Black Panthers and Black Muslims who saw reproductive control efforts as a “conspiracy by whites to eradicate people of color” and they encouraged procreation so that “each [non-white] child born will be one more revolutionary that the power structure will have to deal with (Nelson 86). However, as black women began to engage in feminist activity, these attitudes began to shift to accept methods of reproductive control when voluntarily chosen. Many non-white groups distrusted mainstream reproductive rights organizations and worried that they “consciously obscured their population control aims with rhetoric about aiding the [non-white community, but] that an absence of minority representation in Planned Parenthood’s local programs betrayed their hostile attitude toward the black population” (Nelson 90). Another explanation Ross presents to account for a lack of presence among women of color in traditional reproductive rights activism is that non-traditional activists had been pursuing their own interests for some time and they were simply being overlooked by mainstream activists. “Perhaps the question is not really where are women of color in the abortion rights and reproductive rights movement. Rather, where is the primarily white middle-class movement in our struggles for freedom?” (Ross 162) For example, Black Panther groups began offering reproductive advice that included a focus on total health care that included

prenatal care, preventative adult and child health care, screenings for sickle-cell disease and more. They called it “black community-controlled health care” and their premise was to serve the needs of the community as determined by its members (88).

Third Wave Reproductive Rights –

Lost Issues and Overlooked Constituencies

In recent years, there seems to have been a concerted effort by traditional reproductive rights organizations to move away from single-issue agendas (i.e. birth control and abortion rights) and more towards working for the broader concept of reproductive justice. In an effort to make their goals more democratic, mainstream organizations have expanded their objectives to include issues that impact women disproportionately based on race, socio-economic status, geography, or sexual identification/orientation. The need to examine differences in the reproductive rights movement is important to prohibit developing too homogenous a pool of reproductive rights resources. For this reason, the projects of many mainstream reproductive rights organizations expanded in an attempt to diversify the concept of reproductive freedom. "For example, some organizations have made a very clear and somewhat effective effort to ask women of color to join the staff or board that was not diverse beforehand in an effort to try to get grounded information to change their agendas. There have also been coalitions ... between mainstream organizations that are predominantly white and middle-class and organizations that are more representative of [other] communities" (Ikemoto 231). The 2004 March for Women's Lives is a visible example of this

kind of coalition work. The event was the first of its kind to be organized by seven different reproductive rights agencies to create a diverse agenda – each agency represented its own unique constituencies and had established its own interpretations of "reproductive rights." Organizing agencies included The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), Black Women's Health Imperative, Feminist Majority, NARAL Pro-Choice America, National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health, National Organization for Women (NOW), and Planned Parenthood Federation of America. Among the marchers were members of PPGA.

While the 2004 March for Women's Lives was organized under the umbrella over one, central cause, it was unique in embracing different ways of interpreting reproductive rights and health. Though the event was representative of a myriad of reproductive rights organizations, mainstream reproductive rights organizations (like mainstream feminist organizations) have predominantly been composed of white, middle-class women and the agendas of those organizations reflect their needs and concerns. As pointed out by Lisa Cheyemi Ikemoto (2002), due to their class status and the related aspects of money and education, these groups inevitably are the ones with the most access to, and able to manipulate the processes of, power; they have the most influence and control in shaping reproductive rights legislation. However, several activists still assert the need to address overlooked reproductive injustices such as those discussed in the paragraphs that follow.

Issues of reproductive *control* have long been a point of controversy for non-traditional reproductive rights organizations. For mainstream organizations, birth control options such as Norplant, Depo Provera and others are lauded and praised as convenient birth control alternatives for women who do not want to deal with the hassles of remembering to take a pill each day or with the inconvenience that accompanies barrier methods such as condoms or diaphragms. For others, these options are criticized as being modern-day tools for the practice of eugenics; that the power of reproductive control has been ripped from the control of individual women and placed firmly into the hands of healthcare providers or government officials (Young; Charo). Methods like Norplant and Depo Provera are attacked because the woman to which they are prescribed is not required – or permitted – to be an active user. In the case of Depo Provera, the drug is injected every three months. Though the process has been compared to the injection of insulin – an act that patients can perform for themselves – the Depo Provera shot must be injected by a healthcare provider. Norplant is implanted by a clinician under the arm and remains in place for up to seven years until it is removed by a clinician at a cost of up to \$200 (“Planned Parenthood Federation of America – Birth Control”).

Non-traditional reproductive rights organizations charge that because women who used Depo Provera or Norplant were forced to relinquish some of their individual control, the drugs became popular tools of punishment for government officials. As the drugs’ popularity grew and judges became more aware, they began ordering women to use Depo Provera or Norplant as a

condition of criminal sentencing, usually as punishment for crimes or drug or child abuse, and as a condition of receiving welfare benefits. Though the drug is no longer prescribed, in the 1990s several states were proposing legislation that would require women to be implanted with the drug before receiving welfare benefits, and in 1991 a California judge ordered a woman convicted of child abuse to have the drug implanted or face jail (Charo 1104). Margot E. Young (1995) states that such procedures are rendered socially palatable because mandated Norplant use does not forever deprive one of a basic liberty – the right to bear children. Still, for non-traditional reproductive rights activists, this policy is seen as a colonizing disciplinary tactic reminiscent of the sterilization abuses that occurred in the 1970s and 1980s.¹⁴ Regardless of whether Norplant is a temporary form of contraception, its forced use is a violation of a woman's reproductive autonomy and rarely impacts the issues its use is designed to solve. For example, in the case of the woman implanted with the drug as a punishment for child abuse, Norplant would surely prevent her from conceiving future children who may suffer her abuse, but what does it do to address the abuse of the children she already has? Furthermore, forced contraceptive use does not account for possible damage to a woman's body as a result of side effects. Norplant has been known to carry with it a range of unpleasant side effects, including "severe

¹⁴ "Forced sterilization of women, which began in the early 1900s as a classic eugenic measure against proliferation of genes for retardation and 'criminality', was soon applied to those who were poor, non-English speaking, or non-white. Although these abuses were largely eliminated by mid-century ... 'recalcitrant' women (those unable to comply with physicians instructions), generally poor and non-English speaking, were forced to undergo caesarean section deliveries, supposedly to give the best chances of having a healthy infant" (Charo 1105). Additionally, many women who were incapacitated either by language barriers or the labors of childbirth consented to tubal ligations or radical hysterectomies without fully understanding the effects of the procedures, and many African-American women on welfare had their babies delivered only if they consented to sterilization (Young 264).

pain in the stomach or abdomen; unusually heavy or prolonged vaginal bleeding; a new lump in [the] breast; pus, bleeding, and increasing redness or pain at site insertion; capsule[s falling] out; arm pain; and migraines or other severe headaches” (“Planned Parenthood Federation of America – Birth Control”). In her essay *Ethics of Reproductive Control* (1999), Claudia Mills remarked that even though some programs made provisions for the removal of Norplant, it was often too difficult for women to take advantage of those options. Women had “to encounter vigorous resistance in the form of required ‘counseling’ sessions before they could proceed with removal,” as well as had to “bear considerable costs of the complicated removal procedure” (47). As stated earlier, the cost of removal is typically around \$200; to a welfare recipient already struggling to make ends meet, \$200 may be an unattainable sum.

Non-traditional reproductive rights activists are also concerned about the undue burden some women encounter when trying to access their legal right to an abortion. For example, geography can be an inhibitor for women who live in rural or otherwise nonmetropolitan areas. The abortion rate for women living in nonmetropolitan areas “is half that of women who live in metropolitan areas,” most likely due to distance from services since “86 of the country’s 276 metropolitan areas and almost all nonmetropolitan areas have no abortion provider” (Henshaw and Finer 63). Cost can also be another barrier to women seeking abortions. On average, facilities charge \$468 for a surgical abortion at 10 weeks past the last missed period, \$774 at 16 weeks, and \$1179 at 20 weeks (19). While these fees may be moderate to some, low-income women are likely to find

the burden of coming up with funds insurmountable and may rely on government health programs such as Medicaid to help cover the costs. Unfortunately, Medicaid only covers the cost of abortion in cases of rape; many women are left with nowhere to turn and no other options.

It has been argued that restrictions on abortion – such as the lack of Medicaid funds to cover the cost – may “lessen sexual activity and thereby reduce the pregnancy rates and birthrates” (Haas-Wilson 228). This argument assumes that women will have access to birth control and abortion information before engaging in sexual activity, and that the abortion rates will decrease because of the proper use of this information by those women. “The incidence of abortion is found to be lower in states where access to providers is reduced and state policies are restrictive ... In addition, birthrates ... are higher because access to obstetrician-gynecologists and family planning services is reduced” (Matthews, Ribar and Wilhelm 52). “Between 18% and 35% of Medicaid-eligible women who would have had abortions instead continue their pregnancies if funding is unavailable” (Henshaw and Finer 23). Despite the legal availability of abortion, economic barriers make obtaining one out of many women’s control.

Sterilization abuse, forced contraceptive use, and inaccessibility of reproductive services are just some of the issues of interest among non-traditional reproductive rights organizations that have been studied and written about in recent years. Perhaps the most inclusive volume of compiled histories of reproductive rights organizations and issues that have traditionally existed from outside the mainstream is *Undivided Rights: Women of Color Organize for*

Reproductive Justice (Silliman et al.). Featured organizations include National Black Women's Health Project, The Mother's Milk Project, Native American Women's Health Education Resource Center, Asians and Pacific Islanders for Reproductive Justice, and the National Latina Health Organization. This book details the organizing approaches of each group, while demonstrating the far-reaching definitions of "reproductive rights," as opposed to those definitions provided by traditional reproductive rights organizations like PPAA. The common themes among these organizations are their visions of reproductive rights as basic human rights and their battles for reproductive freedoms as ones of social justice for their constituents, and the language they use in pushing their agendas reflects their viewpoint. These groups recognize that "rights do not exist in a social vacuum ... even where the 'right' is legally established, there are economic and social impediments to [access]" (Porter 78). They see the terminology of "choice" that may be used by mainstream organizations like PPAA as being exclusionary; that "the meaning of the term 'choice,' generally defined both legally and culturally [is] an aggregation of ideas of privacy and autonomy" (Smyth 335). The concept of choice should be extended "with regard to the inaccessibility of some choices... to poor women, disproportionately women of color" (Cloud 195). Choice among reproductive rights is restricted, and so is the autonomy and reproductive control of women who exist outside of the mainstream to control their reproductive choices; therefore, the focus is turned on the fight for justice and in ensuring that reproductive rights are available to everyone.

Summary

Just as first, second, and third wave feminist activism evolved over the past century, so has reproductive rights activism. Additionally, just as feminist activism has been criticized as being marginalizing of non-elite groups, so has reproductive rights activism. The preceding discussion of reproductive rights activism demonstrates that marginalization of reproductive rights has historically existed and serves to establish cause for understanding how dissent among non-traditional reproductive rights activists could occur.

For example, though Margaret Sanger did not publicly endorse eugenic theory while pursuing her goals for legalizing contraceptive devices and information, neither did she denounce it. This act invites the perception that the single issue of birth control was the only issue of importance, rather than the multi-faceted issue of not only legalizing contraception but ensuring its fair use and availability among members of all groups. Furthermore, as reproductive rights activism progressed, new issues emerged, yet they were still being approached from the singular perspective of simply making them legal. The middle era of reproductive rights activism saw the birth control pill and abortion become legal, but mainstream reproductive rights activists gave little consideration to ensuring these options for women whose reproductive control may be potentially impacted negatively by race, socio-economic status, or geography.

As reproductive rights activism matured into the modern era, new groups have become visible to help overlooked populations of women claim absolute

control of their reproductive decisions. These new groups began addressing issues such as disproportionate quality of reproductive healthcare based on race or economics, imbalanced availability of reproductive options or services, and miscarriages of justice experienced by women forced to engage in contraception or sterilization against their will. By not ensuring reproductive control for all women in all circumstances, non-traditional reproductive rights activists assert that true reproductive choice does not exist and that activism must be modified to include reproductive justice for everyone. Non-traditional reproductive rights activists have generalized their blame and insinuate that mainstream reproductive rights organizations are negligent in addressing these issues. By examining mainstream reproductive rights organizations singularly, it is bound to be revealed that not all mainstream reproductive rights organizations are guilty of ignoring issues of reproductive justice. That PPAA as an organization representative of mainstream reproductive rights did consider issues of reproductive justice was uncovered by the methodological process discussed in the following chapter.

Chapter III: Theoretical Perspective and Methodology

Of central importance to this project are feminist theories and concepts – most specifically, how those concepts are linked to dominant ideology and power relations, and how ideology and power may result in the marginalization of voices within feminist and reproductive rights activism. For example, dominant ideology is understood to reflect the interests of the dominant class in a society. However, society is made up of many groups with varying degrees of power who affect its discourse to greater or lesser degrees. “All parties have the right to articulate their own interests... ‘good’ public discourse is maximally polyvocal [and must accommodate] all agents, rather than representing a single interest” (Condit, *Hegemony* 210). It should be diverse.

The exclusionary nature of mainstream reproductive rights activism has motivated non-traditional reproductive rights activists to demand that all reproductive rights groups and issues be considered. This project is guided and influenced by the diverse concept of reproductive justice and finds its basis in learning about the polyvocality of reproductive rights activism. As such, this study should be considered a project of feminist research. In *Feminist Methods in Social Research* (1992), Shulamit Reinharz declares that feminist research methodology is influenced by the diversity of several feminist perspectives. She identifies ten themes that occur in feminist research. Included among these themes are several that are of central importance to this project: (1) Feminism is a perspective, not a research method; (2) Feminist research strives to represent human diversity; and (3) Feminist research frequently includes the researcher as a

person (240). Foremost in feminist research is the recognition that feminism guides and influences a research method, but is not designed to be a methodology. It is important that feminist researchers understand that just as there are multiple interpretations of the term “feminism,” there are multiple viewpoints from which feminist research can originate. The key in utilizing a feminist research perspective is recognizing that females are not “‘put’ into their scholarship so as to avoid being sexist. Rather, for feminist researchers, females are worth examining as individuals and as people whose experience is interwoven with other women” (241).

Reinharz’s second characteristic of feminist research is that it should strive to represent human diversity. Women have historically been portrayed as a homogenous group that experiences difference in only one area – they are not men. Instead, feminist research should be examining challenges created by the fact that women are all alike in some ways and dissimilar in others. This common-sense notion reinforces the fact that there are broad and diverse points of view, based on individual and group experiences in society with members of different racial, cultural, and economic groups (252-255). This project will involve analyzing PPAA documents to gauge how representative the organization was in the area of racial diversity, as well as how the issues addressed by the organization considered different challenges women face based on geographic location, cultural concerns, and economic barriers.

To reiterate a point from the previous chapter, feminist activists in general, and reproductive rights activists specifically, have been criticized for acting one-

dimensionally. The issues of power and marginalization are critical to feminist thought and inherent in social systems in which populations are diverse; practices of power among one group of feminists can perpetuate domination if those feminists overlook or ignore certain struggles among other groups of feminists. Feminist activism, beginning in the 1800s through the mid-point of the last century, has been criticized for being classist and racist – of being for middle- and upper-class white women, by middle- and upper-class white women. "The trouble is that [women] came to see feminism as having only one face, rather than having as many faces as there are women" (Wolf 77). Feminists were so busy fighting against a patriarchal hegemony that they neglected to see the hegemonic power emerging among middle and upper class white women within the movement. Scholar Jane Roland Martin (1994) accuses feminists of perpetuating a myth of "false unity"; they committed a grave error in assuming that all individuals referred to as "women" were exactly alike (631). "[I]n the early phase of the late 20th century women's movement it was the discovery that the experience of others was so like one's own that was at once comforting, illuminating and energizing. Sadly, it has turned out that this discovery was a mere invention" (646). Little attention was paid to differences among women in such areas as religion, race, socio-economic class, or sexual identification, and this resulted in a homogenized movement that was perceived by many to be motivated by the expected gains of a selfish few while under the guise of benefiting of everyone. "[Many] women are personally uncomfortable with the term feminist... [Feminists] are seen by many as being more out for themselves

than out for ordinary women and their families" (Wolf 58). "[Some] feel there is no line-item veto for feminism... As strong as their allegiance is to individual women's issues, most [feminists] are deeply resistant to committing themselves to what they see as an unwieldy package of attitudes that others cobbled together" (60).

As a result, modern feminism has morphed into a much more fragmented movement than anything it has been before, and it has established a reputation for being more accepting of – even promoting – differences among groups of women. Opposition to mainstream feminism emerged as a result of mainstream feminists' lack of consideration of the needs of different groups of women. Thus, modern feminists strive to "combat [marginalization] that [women] face as a result of [their] age, gender, race, sexual orientation, economic status or level of education" (Hill). Diversity is so embraced it is as if individual differences have become the norm in modern feminist activity. The same can be said for modern day reproductive rights activism. As evidenced by the 2004 March for Women's Lives, the modern era of reproductive rights activism is shifting from a singular movement based on the assumption of freedom of choice to a polyvocal movement influenced by activists representative of several backgrounds and organizations based on ensuring ideals of justice which advocate individual control over reproductive choices regardless of differences in race, economics, age, and other factors.

A third characteristic of feminist research is that it includes the researcher as a person. Many feminist researchers may use personal experiences to inform

their research questions, to guide their involvement in the research process, and to help interpret results. Such is the case with this project. I have chosen to pursue research in the area of reproductive rights because I have a long-standing personal attachment to the topic. Growing up, my mother was sort of a prophet of birth control. She openly engaged in sexual discussion with my brother and I, and when my friends or fellow Girl Scout troop members were too embarrassed to ask their own parents, she was often the source of information for them, too. Though it was exceptionally embarrassing at the time, her attitude about sex education and reproductive control motivated me to take an interest later in life.

As an adult, I volunteered for an organization known as Georgians for Choice (GfC), which is a coalition of reproductive rights organizations that strives to develop opportunities for citizens to exercise their constitutional rights regarding reproductive health. It was here that I first heard of framing reproductive rights in terms of social justice. Of the events in which I participated with the group was the 2004 *New Conversations for Reproductive Freedom* symposium, during which the theme of the historic marginalization of minority groups throughout the history of reproductive rights activism was echoed. The mood of the event was not necessarily accusatory – the participants just wanted to acknowledge that mainstream reproductive rights activists can be short-sighted in their interpretations of the scope of the problem. My participation in GfC was a driving factor for me as I worked to repurpose my topic into something more manageable than the original plan to conduct a genealogy of the whole of reproductive rights discourse. As a result, this project will act as a record of a

single organization (PPAA) that demonstrates whether marginalizations of reproductive justice issues occurred in a historically significant subset of that organization's discourse.

Since feminist power struggles are a key influence on this project (specifically, the struggle between mainstream and non-traditional reproductive rights activists), it only seems natural that this project should also be at least marginally influenced by Foucauldian theory, particularly Foucault's notions of power as a disciplinary function. Foucault recognizes that discourse does not occur independently but is part of a network of forces, and that the context in which discourse is produced must be studied as well as the discourse itself to gain an understanding of its complete meaning. As Foucault describes it, the researcher must consider the matrix of discourses that form each text, "the events of history, its jolts, its surprises, its unsteady victories and unpalatable defeats – the basis of all beginnings ... to dispel the [illusion] of the origin, or the illusion that history is only one story – one discourse – instead of the collage of discourses it really is" (*Foucault Reader* 80).

Foucault's approach is complementary to feminist research as it can be applied to attempts at liberating women "from the oppressive effects of prevailing modes of self-understanding inherited through the humanist tradition" (Sawicki 26-7). By including non-dominant histories such as those presented by non-traditional reproductive rights activists, Foucault encourages the development of a record of the past that demonstrates the dominant historical record as being dependent upon, and influential of, several other events. "Ways of knowing are

equated with ways of exercising power over individuals” (Sawicki 22). The concept of “power” is often misunderstood as being oppressive by restricting certain people from access to aspects of knowledge or information. Foucault, however, identifies power as being productive.

We must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms: it “excludes,” it “represses,” it “censors,” it “abstracts,” it “masks,” it “conceals.” In fact power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him (sic) belong to this production (Foucault, *Discipline* 194).

In short, it is because mainstream reproductive rights activists are the way that they are, that non-traditional reproductive rights activists can be the way they can be. That is to say, if the dominant ideology of mainstream reproductive rights activists was not perceived to be exclusionary, then there would be no cause for non-traditional reproductive rights activists to advocate in the ways in which they do.

It should be noted that, according to Lye (1997), dominant groups like mainstream reproductive rights activists do not necessarily plan to marginalize people. Methodology employing ideological criticism recognizes this. The dominant ideology of the way things are and the way things should be is influenced by context and embeds itself in cultural symbols and practices such as in churches and schools, but also in literature, public speaking, and media (1). It

is from these apparatuses that non-traditional reproductive rights activists likely formed their perception of mainstream reproductive rights organizations and it is this concept of dominant ideological criticism that help guide the selection of objects of analysis for this study, which will be discussed in detail in the following section.

Methods

Dominant ideology criticism employs techniques of close textual analysis of discourse in which the critic focuses on “Key words, metaphors, themes, narratives, images ... its central focus is on describing the dominant themes and hidden contradictions in the discourse [to show] how these serve the status quo or ruling interests” (Condit, *Hegemony* 211). The analysis of these texts will require a “tally of various themes, perspectives, and agents represented in the public discourse. Once a representative and comprehensive description of the themes in the discourse has been assembled, the critic examines the interaction between the themes voiced in the text and the social placement and interests of the agents who articulate various perspectives” (216). I intend to meet the parameters of dominant ideological criticism by conducting a qualitative content analysis.

In order to fully explore how PPAA discourse may or may not have considered issues of reproductive social justice I will conduct two increasingly extensive content analyses. The first is an analysis of a simple sample of four prominent texts produced from a non-traditional reproductive rights perspective that promotes activism based on goals of reproductive justice. The analysis of these texts is intended to reveal the dominant ideology of non-traditional

reproductive rights activists, as well as their interpretation of the dominant ideology of mainstream reproductive rights activists. The second stage of content analysis will consist of applying these characteristics to examples of internal and external discourse of PPAA, an affiliate of a historically mainstream reproductive rights organization.

The first phase of the analysis involved gathering descriptors of reproductive justice from texts produced from that perspective. The four texts chosen were the 2004 March for Women's Lives website, *Undivided Rights: Women of Color Organize for Reproductive Justice* (2004), *Women of Color and the Reproductive Rights Movement* (2003) and *Killing the Black Body* (1997). The selection of each of these texts was influenced by several factors. First of all, one or more of the designated texts were discussed at the *New Conversations for Reproductive Freedom* symposium as resources for reproductive justice activism. Additionally, each of these texts (or its author) was cross-listed as a reference in at least one of the other texts. Finally, as I have progressed through my research and discussed my project with interested individuals, these texts have been consistently recommended as required reading material by fellow students, instructors, or reproductive rights activists.

The 2004 *New Conversations for Reproductive Freedom* symposium occurred less than six months after the March for Women's Lives, the first nationwide reproductive rights demonstration to be planned and executed from a reproductive justice perspective by a coalition of several reproductive rights organizations. Among the keynote speakers were Loretta Ross, founder and

former Executive Director of the National Center for Human Rights Education, Co-Director of the March for Women's Lives, and co-author of *Undivided Rights*. She spoke about how the March planning shifted from protesting restricted abortion rights to promoting reproductive justice. She also noted that what may have helped make the March the largest protest ever on the Mall was its reliance on the grassroots organizing that is typical of social justice groups. Relying mainly on word of mouth and the internet to organize, sponsoring organizations NARAL Pro-Choice America, the Feminist Majority Foundation, Planned Parenthood, the American Civil Liberties Union, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the National Organization for Women, and Black Women's Health Imperative were able to attract an estimated 1.15 million marchers, making the march the largest protest of any kind in the nation's history.

Undivided Rights continues on the March for Women's Lives' theme of advocating for a holistic approach to reproductive rights. The authors describe the history of women of color organizing for reproductive justice on their own behalf using organizational case studies and personal interviews that demonstrate how Latina, African American, Native American, and Asian American activists have resisted coercion of their reproductive abilities and have defined and implemented expansive reproductive health agendas that address the wider needs of their communities. The authors urge mainstream reproductive rights activists to push beyond their traditional, pro-choice goals to include strategies that speak

to all women by including non-traditional reproductive rights activists in their planning processes.

Jennifer Nelson's *Women of Color and the Reproductive Rights Movement* seeks to debunk the assumption that the movement to secure voluntary reproductive control for women centered solely on abortion rights by asserting that, for many groups of women, abortion was not the only, or even primary, focus. Nelson does this by exploring the activities engaged in by several groups of reproductive rights activists, beginning with mainstream reproductive rights activists in the 1960s – 1980s who were solely concerned with a woman's right to choose to limit the size of their families. She also engages in the analysis of the other side of the coin, Black and Puerto Rican Nationalists who were concerned that women have as many children as possible for racial prosperity, as well as the activism of other women of color who negotiated between the two extremes. Nelson argues that women of color were able to successfully engage in activism to ensure their own reproductive liberty by broadening the scope of traditional reproductive rights activism by addressing sterilization abuse, access to affordable childcare and healthcare, and ways to raise children out of poverty.

Dorothy Roberts' *Killing the Black Body* looks at the often overlooked African-American woman's battle for reproductive rights. Roberts asserts that African-American women have been engaged in an ongoing fight to gain control of their reproductive lives. Roberts takes mainstream reproductive rights activists to task for working mostly for freedom of choice regarding reproduction; that is, the right of women to not have the government involved in their reproductive

decision-making. However, she claims that this approach, which is focused mainly on government non-interference, ignores issues such as access to contraception or reproduction technologies. According to Roberts, social inequality is more of a barrier to women's reproductive freedom than any legal interference.

I closely examined each of the previously identified texts, highlighting words that were used as descriptors of reproductive rights. Next, I compiled all the descriptors I had identified, and divided them into two broad categories – mainstream reproductive rights concerns and reproductive justice concerns. Subsequently, each of these categories was sub-categorized in the following way: mainstream reproductive rights sub-categories are choice, abortion, population control, and racial discordance; reproductive justice sub-categories are justice, health, access, and racial concordance.¹⁵ These categories are representative of the dominant ideological characteristics of both mainstream reproductive rights activism and reproductive justice activism most consistently demonstrated by the non-traditional reproductive rights activists in the analyzed texts. They also act as the basis for the coding of the actual PPAA internal and external documents.¹⁶

The inductive process for determining the coding categories of the content analysis finds its foundation in grounded theory. Central to grounded theory is the process of constant comparison, which is as it sounds – “comparing data set to data set, and later comparing data set to theory” (“Grounded Theory”; Dick 7).

¹⁵ It should be noted that reproductive justice as identified by non-traditional reproductive rights activists does not necessarily exclude the category “choice” mostly identified with mainstream reproductive rights activism. According to non-traditional reproductive rights activists, reproductive justice is, in fact, an extension of choice.

¹⁶ See Appendix A for coding agenda. See Appendix B for coding sheet.

When performing the task of constant comparison, I began by asking a simple question of a text: “What reproductive rights concerns are going on here?” I continued by coding all relevant statements from the text. As the analysis progressed, themes and categories between texts began to emerge; those categories with the highest frequency of mention were treated as core categories. Notes were recorded about connections that emerged between categories – generally about whether the text criticized activists that focused on a reproductive rights category, or whether the text advocated for reproductive rights activism to include a particular category. The process involved the constant maneuvering back and forth between texts, comparing notes. The goal was to become theoretically sensitive; to allow the readings to determine the emergent theory (Glaser 34). In other words, according to these texts, what characteristics define the theory of mainstream reproductive rights activism as seen by non-traditional reproductive rights activists? What characteristics define the theory of reproductive justice as seen by non-traditional reproductive rights activists? These characteristics emerged from the constant comparison of texts while considering my own theoretical background and research question. Subsequently, each characteristic was given explicit definitions, examples and coding rules, and then put together within a coding agenda to be applied to a text to complete the qualitative analysis.

Completing the qualitative content analysis was a deductive process that involved taking the previously formulated, theoretically derived aspects of analysis outlined on the coding agenda and bringing them in connection with the

texts. Category definitions, prototypical text passages, and rules for distinguishing different categories were formulated in respect to theory and material, and were completed step by step throughout the analysis, but the coding agenda was not set in stone. In fact, the coding agenda was designed to accommodate any new themes that may have emerged while analyzing each set of PPAA documents. As I maneuvered through the texts, any new themes that surfaced were recorded so that their relevance could be determined. The benefit of conducting a qualitative analysis in this way was that I was able to take into account all aspects of the content under analysis.

Of the archival artifacts housed at PPAA that are available from the ten-year period between 1963 and 1973, this study analyzes two samples of discourse: that which was disseminated to the public via newspaper articles and that which was intended to remain private, recorded in minutes transcripts from the organization's board of directors meetings. Analyzing internal documents will reveal whether PPAA considered issues of reproductive justice when managing the day-to-day operations of the organization. Analyzing press clippings revealed whether or not the organization's internal considerations were communicated to the public. The documents analyzed for this project are dated beginning in 1964, even though the proposed study was to involve an analysis of documents encompassing the years of 1963 through 1973. In 1963, Esther Taylor began to mobilize and work with interested citizens to establish a Planned Parenthood affiliate in Atlanta. While PPAA can trace its roots to 1963, organized record keeping did not occur within the organization until the affiliate was formally

developed in 1964. If the PPGA archive of press clippings is any indication, newspaper editors stayed true to their promise to Mrs. Taylor to start covering the organization when it got off the ground; print coverage housed at PPGA also begins in 1964.

It should be noted that a gap between the analyzed meeting minutes and press clippings does occur. During the course of the study, PPGA moved from its longtime location in the United Way building in downtown Atlanta to a new space in the Citizen's Trust Bank Building on Piedmont Avenue two blocks away. After the move, it became evident that several years of board meeting minutes beginning in 1970 through approximately 1987 were misplaced. To date, these documents have not been recovered. Therefore, analyzed meeting minutes span from dates beginning in 1964 and ending in 1969, while press clippings were analyzed from years beginning in 1964 through 1972.

Shulamit Reinharz (1992) suggests that available meeting minutes and media clippings are relevant as objects of analysis because they possess a naturalistic, "found" quality. Since they were not created for the purpose of study, these artifacts expose trends and social norms that may presume to tell women what their true nature is and offer an ideological representation of the social world in a given time frame (147, 171). By analyzing internal meeting minutes, the intentions of the organizing members are expected to be revealed. Meeting minutes are bound to most closely reflect the dominant ideology of the organization because the discourse originates "from the horse's mouth," so to

speak. Analyzing these private documents can tell us about the actual agenda of PPAA.

Again, the research question is as follows: Did Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area (PPAA) discourse, both internal and external, during 1964-1972 address issues of reproductive justice? Even if the analysis of PPAA meeting minutes reveals that the organization did consider reproductive justice issues, unless non-traditional reproductive rights activists had access to these internal documents they may never have known. Without being privy to what mainstream reproductive rights organizations were planning or discussing behind closed doors, non-traditional reproductive rights activists would have been forced to form their opinions about the agendas of mainstream reproductive rights organizations based upon those organizations' public activities or public portrayal in the media. Therefore, to effectively answer the question, discourse publicly accessible to persons outside of PPAA must also be analyzed. For this reason, press clippings regarding PPAA activities have also been selected as an object of analysis.

When selecting documents containing information that were accessible to persons outside of PPAA, the decision to analyze *only* press clippings featuring PPAA was reached for several reasons, not the least of which was because these documents were readily available. Arguably, it may make sense to analyze brochures, pamphlets, newsletters or other messaging channels that originate from PPAA (unlike press clippings which originate from an outside source with messages merely attributed to PPAA); however, these documents have proven to

be difficult to find. The PPGA archive has no brochures or pamphlets from 1964-1972 on file, and only one newsletter from that era has been discovered.

A search was launched to locate persons who may have been active within PPAA during its inaugural decade to determine if they have these documents available for loan in their personal libraries and collections. Unfortunately, while examining the Esther Taylor oral history it was revealed that many of the founding members were already into their 60s when the affiliate was launched. Indeed, of the active PPAA members of that early era who were able to be located, only two (Dr. Louella Klein, obstetrician and organizer of PPAA's Medical Advisory Committee and Nan Pendergrast, PPAA Public Relations Counsel) were found to be alive. Letters requesting information from them were sent to both parties, but no response was ever received.

Incidentally, a chance meeting with Elaine Taylor-Klaus, current PPGA board member and granddaughter of PPAA founder Esther Taylor, led to a discussion about her grandmother and the early days of the Atlanta Planned Parenthood affiliate. The conversation revealed that the brochures and pamphlets distributed by the organization at that time were published by the national office of Planned Parenthood and would not have directly reflected the ideology of the PPAA affiliate.¹⁷ Furthermore, newsletters were published only sporadically – very few from that era ever existed.¹⁸ Instead, Taylor relied on her past position

¹⁷ This information from Taylor-Klaus is supported by statements made in meeting minutes. Specifically, in the transcript dated September 21, 1966 the board discusses ordering ephemera from “national” to be placed in PPAA clinics and suggests that nurses in each clinic be given a sample of the selection from which they could choose the documents most relevant to their clientele.

¹⁸ This information is also supported by comments made in meeting minutes. In the transcript dated March 21, 1967, the board discussed terminating the newsletter due to lack of consistent

in Atlanta society and used prior relationships with society reporters to publicize the organization and its message. Therefore, the reason why brochures, pamphlets, newsletters and other messaging materials that would have been produced from within the organization are not as equally represented in the PPGA archive as press clippings are may not be the result of poor archiving, but more likely is due to the fact that these documents were not recognized as a valuable messaging channel by PPAA members at that time and they likely never existed.

That brochures, pamphlets, newsletters and other messaging materials that would have been produced from within the PPAA are unavailable eliminates them as a third category of analysis, but in no way negates the validity of analyzing press clippings. Though brochures, pamphlets, newsletters and the like are representative of internally controlled discourse generated by the organization for public consumption, this kind of information would have only been available to those individuals who were seeking it. Press representations of PPAA would have been accessible to mass publics and would have reached a much wider audience.

Limitations of Methods

There are additional possible limitations with the way this study is constructed. First, I am limited by my own consistency. Perhaps the texts that I code last or first or in the middle will be analyzed from varying moods or degrees of excitement which could effect how I view the texts.

content contributions from PPAA members. Despite the apparent lack of interest the board decided not to do so at that time.

Other limitations to the project may exist in the use of media clippings as an object of analysis. For example, the library of print media coverage to which I have access is not inclusive. It is merely what PPAA members chose to collect and save. Furthermore, the type of story is not always obvious among PPAA press clippings. That is to say, one can not always discern whether the article is an example of an editorial or opinion piece, hard news coverage, a feature story, etc.

Additionally, a main concern about the validity of media clippings as a source of messaging is that the message communicated within the media clipping may not necessarily be the one that the originating source intended. This is because the message must travel through reporters, editors, and other gatekeepers before reaching its intended audience. The likelihood that the message will be altered in some way is significant. However, the strategy of using print media as a channel of message dissemination was prominent within PPAA in its early years. That their message would be edited by gatekeepers such as reporters or editors is a risk they took. Despite the fact that the published record of the PPAA message may not have originated from the organization, the press attributes it to them, and the reading public still associates that discourse with PPAA. Furthermore, public information materials published directly from the organization such as brochures, pamphlets, newsletters, etc. were most likely to have only been seen by members or clients of the organization. If, as non-traditional reproductive activists claim, access to the clinics was a problem, then print media channels (for them) would have been a more likely source of

information about the organization. Furthermore, the press clippings may be more relevant than public information materials published directly from the organization for revealing how a non-traditional reproductive rights activist may have formed her opinion about the ideology of the organization. Public information materials published directly from the organization would most likely reflect the setting in which the organization would have most liked to have found itself, whereas press clippings serve to establish the cultural context in which PPAA actually found itself.¹⁹

Summary

The exclusionary nature of mainstream reproductive rights activism has motivated non-traditional reproductive rights activists to demand that all reproductive rights groups and issues be considered. This project is guided and influenced by the diverse concept of reproductive justice and finds its basis in learning about the polyvocality of reproductive rights activism. This study involves an analysis of a sample of four prominent texts produced from a non-traditional reproductive rights perspective that promotes activism based on goals of reproductive justice. The analysis of these texts is intended to reveal the dominant ideology of non-traditional reproductive rights activists, as well as their interpretation of the dominant ideology of mainstream reproductive rights activists. The four texts chosen were the 2004 March for Women's Lives website, *Undivided Rights: Women of Color Organize for Reproductive Justice*

¹⁹ It is important to note here that the press has a tendency to construct its own narrative and stick with it. However, this research project is not designed to identify or discuss how the print news outlets analyzed for this project made their decisions about reproductive rights coverage. It is merely meant to map the characterizations of PPAA and reproductive concerns in a small representation of press coverage from 1964-1972.

(2004), *Women of Color and the Reproductive Rights Movement* (2003) and *Killing the Black Body* (1997).

After analyzing these texts, reproductive rights descriptors were identified and divided into two broad categories with smaller subcategories: mainstream reproductive rights with sub-categories of choice, abortion, population control, and racial discordance; and reproductive justice with sub-categories of justice, health, access, and racial concordance. These categories will be applied to two samples of PPAA discourse (private minutes transcripts from the organization's board of directors meetings and public newspaper articles) using qualitative content analysis methodology. Analyzing internal PPAA documents will reveal whether the organization considered issues of reproductive justice when managing operations of the organization, yet even if the analysis of PPAA meeting minutes reveals that the organization did consider reproductive justice issues, non-traditional reproductive rights activists may never have known unless they had access to these internal documents. For this reason, the choice was made to also analyze PPAA press clippings. Without being acquainted with what mainstream reproductive rights organizations were planning or discussing behind closed doors, non-traditional reproductive rights activists would have been forced to form their characterizations of mainstream reproductive rights organizations based upon those organizations' public activities or public portrayal in the media. The following chapter reveals the results of the analysis and engages in a discussion of the project's findings.

Chapter IV: Analyses and Findings

Before determining whether or not PPAA discourse produced between the years of 1964-1972 addressed reproductive justice issues, I first had to conduct a search of PPGA archival materials. At periodic intervals in the months preceding the actual analysis of PPAA documents, I visited the PPGA document archives which are currently stored at the affiliate site in the Citizen's Trust Bank Building in downtown Atlanta. I immersed myself in over 40 years of documents in an attempt to separate only those documents produced between 1964 and 1972. The process was long and arduous, involving hours of sifting through documents stored in unmarked boxes and in binders haphazardly stacked on shelves. Once PPAA documents from 1964-1972 were identified, they were divided into three groups: internal documents (meeting minutes), press clippings, and external communications (speech transcripts, newsletters, etc.). Since there were minimal documents representing PPAA external communication, this group was eliminated from the study as objects of analysis. The pool of press clippings was subsequently narrowed by eliminating those documents which did not distinctly identify PPAA as a source of information. For example, many press clippings housed in the PPGA archive address issues concerning the organization (i.e. new contraceptive technologies or reproductive rights legislation in Georgia and elsewhere) but did not specifically identify PPAA in the article. These documents were eliminated from the study. Furthermore, several clippings refer to PPAA members, but unless their relationship as a representative of PPAA was clearly established, those documents were removed from the study as well. In all, 105

documents were analyzed as part of this study: 57 meeting minutes and 48 press clippings.

After the objects of analysis for the project were identified, ideals of mainstream reproductive rights activism and reproductive justice activism were defined. For the purposes of this study, these indicators illustrate mainstream reproductive rights activism and reproductive justice activism from the non-traditional reproductive rights activist point of view. For PPAA discourse to have considered reproductive justice issues, it will have to include aspects from the categories representing reproductive justice in greater or equal proportion to those categories representing mainstream reproductive rights (On the following page, Table 1 illustrates how often the more common mainstream reproductive rights and reproductive justice ideals appear in both meeting minutes and press coverage). The analysis will show how representative PPAA discourse is of each mainstream reproductive rights or reproductive justice ideals and demonstrate whether or not PPAA's internal operations and considerations were adequately characterized to the external reading public via press articles. The following sections include a description of each category (beginning with mainstream reproductive rights ideals before continuing with reproductive justice ideals) accompanied by a record of the findings. Subsequently, discussion of conclusions drawn from the analysis will occur.

	Minutes	Press
Choice	4	10
Abortion	3	2
Population Control	5	12
Justice	5	3
Access	27	15
Health	10	6

Table 1 – Breakdown of Common Themes in Meeting Minutes and Press Coverage

Mainstream Reproductive Rights

Choice

The first major category is choice, a term symbolic of independence and freedom in reproductive decision-making. At its most basic level, choice exemplifies a woman’s right to make the decision whether or not to have children. In many cases, phrases as specific as “right to choose” will be used to communicate the ideal of choice. More generally, however, choice is communicated through words and phrases indicating that women’s reproductive decisions are being made autonomously on an individual level; that is, free from influence or restriction from anybody (i.e. husbands, boyfriends, parents, medical professionals, but especially the government). Examples of choice in PPAA discourse may include statements that discuss access to sterilization as a reproductive tool, autonomy and privacy in reproductive control decisions, or voluntary contraceptive use to prevent unwanted births.

Within the discourse of PPAA meeting minutes, the concept of choice as previously described in the preceding paragraph is not prevalent. Examples of choice in meeting minutes were seldom, only four instances beginning in the document dated March 23, 1965, again on August 15, 1967, June 18, 1968, and ending with January 13, 1969. The first instance occurs when Dr. Louella Klein, member of the organization's Medical Advisory Committee, compels PPAA members to engage in a letter writing campaign directed to the Georgia State Board of Health in an attempt to urge them to authorize the use of pills and IUDs in public health clinics. The board had recently issued a statement condemning the use of pills in clinics unless they are directly dispensed by a pharmacist. PPAA's position was that by limiting the use of pills in this way, women's choices of contraception were also limited. Since pills and IUDs were "the means of birth control most effectively used today [1965]," public health clinics should be allowed to offer both as options to patients and allow her to choose the method most appropriate for her.

The second instance of choice in PPAA minutes occurred on August 15, 1967, when PPAA minutes document how the affiliate had entered into a student project designed to study the motivations in women's reproductive decisions. On behalf of PPAA, students volunteered to examine why women made the contraceptive decisions they did. Guiding factors included assessing why pills were more popular than IUDs, the basic motivating factors in women's decisions to pursue contraception, and the level of autonomy in their choices – specifically, the level of support or opposition by husbands to their decision to pursue birth

control.²⁰ The third instance of choice occurred in June of 1968, when it was recorded that PPAA board member Alan Bonser was to appear on a local Atlanta talk show aired on WQXI-TV to support the affiliate's view that sterilization was a viable means of birth control and that its voluntary use as contraception should be available to those women who want the procedure.

A final appearance of the ideal of choice was specifically stated in the document dated January 13, 1969. On this date, the organization issued a series of policy statements regarding family planning, abortion, and sterilization. Included in all three policy statements is the phrase, "[W]e must be vigilant to preserve freedom of choice about family size" (Bliem, *January 13, 1969*).

Choice is more prominently linked to PPAA in press clippings. Of the 48 press clippings analyzed for this project, the concept of reproductive choice appears in ten documents. Among the themes related to choice, the press clippings demonstrate the highest occurrence among the theme of exercising reproductive choice to prevent unwanted children, followed by autonomy in decision-making (Hatcher, *Contraceptives*; Rock, *Party Time*; Marvin, *Nobody*; "Forced Sterilization"), and sterilization as a birth control option ("Sterilization: No Coercion"). When discussion of choice to prevent unwanted children does occur, the statements that characterize it are generally brief, overt, and similar to "Planned Parenthood means that every baby born will be wanted," "Our purpose is to prevent unwanted children," or "Parents determine the number of children they have and how they will be spaced" (Lockerman; Hopkins; Carrollton, *What*

²⁰ If this study was ever conducted and if results were ever received by the organization is unclear as documentation could not be located in either transcripts of meeting minutes or elsewhere in the PPGA archives.

it Means; "Planned Parent Group Opens Atlanta Clinic"). Sometimes, however, these declarations are accompanied by terse statements that seem to situate children as being burdens upon struggling families. For example, in Doris Lockerman's piece entitled "Growing Atlanta Wakes Up," unplanned children are not only characterized as being a burden, but as also being in danger of "revolting against the society that brought him here against his wishes." Incidents of choice as characterized by autonomy in decision-making were also succinct, typically stressing that contraceptive decisions be made by women voluntarily and position the organization as one that "continues to try and overcome the attitudes which hinder efforts to deliver voluntary family planning and services" (Hatcher).

The lone occurrence of the notion of sterilization as a contraceptive tool is somewhat notable. In characterizing sterilization as a viable birth control option as an ideal of choice under mainstream reproductive rights activism, non-traditional reproductive rights activists typically mention female sterilization, which makes the article entitled "Sterilization: No Coercion" dated June 27, 1971 particularly interesting. The main purpose of the article is to situate PPAA in opposition to a recent proposal before the State Board of Health that abortions be funded with state money, but only if accompanied by sterilization. However, the article ends with the statement that "sterilization is a medical procedure that should be settled between the parties involved," and that "many men, and women, are choosing voluntary sterilization today." The statement appears almost as an afterthought and is slanted toward male sterilization as a viable option for reproductive control. Vasectomy is also prominent in the article entitled

“Popularity of Vasectomy Grows” (Coogler), as well as in the meeting minutes of October 15, 1968, during which the medical advisory committee suggests including males in family planning.

Abortion

The second category under mainstream reproductive rights is abortion. According to the non-traditional reproductive rights perspective, abortion is the issue du jour for mainstream reproductive rights activism. According to Dictionary.com, an abortion is the termination of pregnancy by surgical or chemical means that results in the expulsion of an embryo or of a fetus that is incapable of survival on its own. The argument is that as a tool for reproductive control, abortion should be available as a legal elective procedure performed by medical personnel at the discretion of the patient and her physician. Abortion discussion is often accompanied by choice discussion. Examples of abortion in PPAA discourse may include content that suggests the need for legislation to ensure women have the right to a safe and legal abortion.

Abortion is all but non-existent in the discourse of the meeting minutes of PPAA, appearing only three times – once in a discussion about engaging men in the birth control discussion, and twice when the organization was seeking to establish a policy statement regarding their stance on the procedure. It is surprising that there is not more of a record of the organization discussing the issue for two main reasons. The first reason is because the state of Georgia, and the city of Atlanta specifically, was an epicenter of national abortion legislation (Doe vs. Bolton, tried as a companion case to the more well-known Roe vs.

Wade). The second and more astounding reason exists in that PPAA was named as a plaintiff in that landmark court case. A loose sheet of carbon paper stored with the PPGA archives dated April 16, 1970 and entitled “Legal Representation Retainer” establishes that PPAA gave their permission to attorney Margie Pitts Hames “to file suit on its behalf and on behalf of others, contesting the constitutionality of the Georgia Abortion Statute.” It seems unusual that the abortion issue would loom so far under the PPAA radar in the years prior to the organization signing on as a plaintiff in this case, but, until October 1968, no mention in the meeting minutes of abortion is made. On this date, the organization discusses abortion as part of a conversation to determine how to get males more involved in the birth control process: “Abortions are becoming more important to back up other means of birth control ... condoms are widely used, but only consistently used 29% of the time ... the role of the male should be an integral part of the PPAA program” (Bliem, *October 15, 1968*).

In January of the following year, the organization issued its first policy statement regarding abortion, which stated that abortion should not be regulated by the state: “Planned Parenthood believes that since abortion is a medical procedure, it should be governed by that same rules that apply to other medical procedures in general when performed by properly qualified physicians with reasonable medical safeguards” (Bliem, *January 13, 1969*). Later, in November of the same year, the organization developed a second abortion policy statement which also outlined their stance on pregnancy counseling. In short, PPAA recognized that birth control devices were the best method of contraception, but

they are not fail-proof. The statement reflects the organization's stance that abortion should be made available to help women plan their families. However, in agreement with Georgia law, which prohibited abortion except in the cases of physical or mental harm, women seeking abortions or abortion information from the organization would receive only counseling or a referral to area doctors who could determine if she met legal requirements for the procedure.

In PPAA press coverage, the organization is not associated with abortion until February 23, 1971, in an article written by Ginger Hames entitled "Georgia's Unwed Pregnant Teen: Condemn Her?... or Counsel Her?" At this point, the organization's position on abortion referral is stated publicly for what may be the first time; however, it seems to have shifted from the policy published in the November 1969 meeting minutes. At that time, PPAA referred patients to physicians who would determine their eligibility to receive an abortion under state law; now it seems they refer patients to doctors willing to perform the procedure outright. The article attributes PPAA nurse Helen Ford as saying that the organization refers interested patients to doctors in both Georgia and New York willing to perform the procedure, though the patient is responsible for making all of her own arrangements. This seems to be supported in an article published two days later by author Faye Bell entitled "Planned Parenthood Goal: Children Should Be Wanted," which states that the referral service is an option up until the twelfth week of pregnancy.

Abortion is mentioned only one other time, in January of 1972, in an article recounting the Planned Parenthood of Atlanta Annual Meeting. In the

article entitled “Dr. Mason Heads Planned Parenthood,” State Representative and PPAA member Kiliaen Townsend urges the public to write their representatives in the Georgia Assembly to announce their support for abortion reform as a method of counteracting the letters sent by those against abortion: “They’ve called us killers and said we have no right ... yet no one has written in favor of abortion reform and I urge you to do so. Letters mean a lot.”

Population Control

The third category under mainstream reproductive rights is population control. Population control, in this case, is the reduction in the overall birth rate as a response to poverty and other catastrophic factors. The guiding principle is that the process of reducing birth rates must be voluntary, and the terminology of population control is accompanied by a message that reducing birth rates ensures that the children who are born are wanted, able to be cared for, and that overpopulation results in disastrous effects. The goal is to educate women about contraception and that availing them of contraceptive devices is in the social interest. Examples of population control in PPAA discourse may include discourse that indicates that with voluntary contraception natural resources are preserved, children are able to be properly cared for, lower crime rates will result, and instances of poverty will decrease.

Within the discourse of PPAA meeting minutes, the concept of population control is not especially prevalent and appears in five out of the 57 meeting minutes documents. In the second meeting of PPAA dated January 15, 1965, during which the organization established its bylaws, population control plays a

prominent role and it seems as if it may be the guiding factor for the operations of the affiliate. On this date, a resolution was adopted that stated that “because there is a need to gain interest and support of our community before embarking on the broader objective of direct service for family planning, [we must] ... alert citizens of Atlanta to the gravity of the population crisis, not only in the world, but in Atlanta ... [we must] publicize facts to show tax payers and public officials how millions of dollars could be saved through birth control clinics.” With this early emphasis on population control, it is hard to understand why, in the transcripts that follow, the concept is rarely touched upon again. In November of 1965, population control was briefly acknowledged as part of an information campaign that required mailings of a pamphlet entitled “The Poverty of Abundance,” and later in July of 1968 a brief mention of the concept was alluded to as part of a “let’s pat ourselves on the back” exercise in which the affiliate director read a letter from a patient in a “poverty area” that shared how family planning helped save her neighborhood and bring to it a “happy ending.”

But no significant endorsement of the concept of population control emerges until August 20, 1968, when a telegram was drafted to be sent to Hale Boggs, Chairman of the Platform Committee of the Democratic National Convention, in which PPAA implores him to adopt President Johnson’s population platform. It also states that “poverty in the over-populated areas of the world is already out of control, and unless something is done to provide for planned families within the economic boundaries of the parents, only a major catastrophe can be the ultimate result.” The statement goes on to say that “family

planning is second only to the search for world peace” (Bliem, *August 20, 1968*). There is no other mention of population control until October 21, 1969, when the affiliate agrees to adopt a resolution similar to that of former President Johnson’s population platform.

The early emphasis on population control as illustrated by the statement adopted by PPAA in January of 1965 does not conform to the significant decline in the concept’s appearance in the meeting minutes that follow. However, it may signify or explain why population control is disproportionately represented in PPAA press documents. Perhaps the statement that the organization must “alert citizens of Atlanta to the gravity of the population crisis, not only in the world, but in Atlanta ... [we must] publicize facts to show tax payers and public officials how millions of dollars could be saved through birth control clinics” is an outline of a messaging strategy that the affiliate intended to use in its dealings with the print press. Out of 48 press clippings, 12 address population control.

Occasionally, the framing of the message is simple, rational and straightforward: “Increase in population directly relates to problems in employment, housing, education, taxes, and social welfare. Current standards of living cannot be insured for the next generation unless the American population growth is brought into balance” (Lundy). Typically, though, the language used when discussing population control in the press is much more severe and sensational than that used by PPAA in their internal documents. For example, statistics are designed to shock: “Sixty percent of mothers of illegitimate children have 10 or more children[!]” (“Unplanned Parenthood”), and melodrama is

employed to paint a most horrific picture of a society reproducing like rabbits: “A child who is a burden soon begins to revolt against the society that brought him here against his wishes ... Even now, think of the number of people who gather at such places as Stone Mountain on any holiday. We do not need more people. We need better cared for, healthier, better educated and less aggressive ones” (Lockerman). Regardless of its characterization, the concept of population control is consistent throughout the analyzed years of PPAA press clippings, with the first instance occurring in 1964 and the last in 1971.

Racial Discordance

The fourth category of mainstream reproductive rights is racial discordance, or segregation in racial representation. For example, this could mean that the representation within the organization is predominantly white while the constituency of the organization is black. It could also mean the representation within the organization and among its constituency is predominantly white and exclusionary of other racial representation. In short, the category of racial discordance means representation of race within the organization that is anything less than equitable.

Race is an important issue among non-traditional reproductive rights activists when advocating for reproductive justice. However, when referring to race in terms of mainstream reproductive rights, non-traditional activists claim that “the mainstream reproductive rights organizations like Planned Parenthood, the National Abortion Rights Action League (NARAL), and the National Organization for Women [have been] predominantly made up of white middle-

class or well-to-do women. They have set the mainstream agenda on what reproductive rights mean, [and they have] historically failed to address the different issues that [women of color] are concerned with or [their] reproductive decision making” (Roberts qtd. in Johnson 3). Examples of racial discordance in PPAA discourse would be any indicator of incongruity in racial representation among both the decision-makers within the organization and among those PPAA claimed to serve.

Racial representation among members of the board was difficult to determine. Though many names were listed throughout the meeting minutes, photos were not stored with the documents, and racial clues were almost impossible to uncover in the context of the information. When comparing meeting minutes to press clippings, some racial indicators were revealed so that it can be stated with certainty that not all of the ruling members of PPAA were white. For example, Andrew Young, William Mason, Asa Yancey, Nurse Andrea Wynn, and others were African-American. While it cannot be stated with any certainty the exact proportion of white members to non-white members there were serving on the incarnations of the PPAA board, it can be stated with certainty that the board was somewhat racially heterogeneous. However, press characterizations of the organization in its very early days could have indicated to non-traditional reproductive rights activists that PPAA’s involvement in the reproductive rights movement was promoted from a narrow white, middle- to upper-class female standpoint. The earliest characterizations of the organization were relegated to the society pages and read more like a “who’s who” in the

organization rather than giving the reader an indication about the issues the organization represented. Headlines like “Dickeys Plan Party,” “Taylors Hold Reception for Dr., Mrs. Guttmacher,” “40 Leaders Support Planned Parenthood,” and others, could have led some to perceive the organization as an elite social club typical of Atlanta’s white residents in the 1960s. However, the organization’s placement in the society pages may have been less due to the organization being a social club and more due to founder Esther Taylor utilizing connections she made in her days as a recitalist.

Reproductive Justice

The preceding section identified four categories discussed in non-traditional reproductive rights texts as being characteristic of mainstream reproductive rights organizations. In this section, each category was defined and qualities representing the categories were described. Additionally, the representation of the category in PPAA discourse as revealed by the analysis was discussed. The following section regarding reproductive justice categories will follow similar protocol: each category will be defined and described and its representation in the analysis findings will be revealed. Subsequent to this section will be a discussion of the conclusions reached as a result of the analysis.

Justice

Justice is the term given to this first category. To reiterate an earlier point, the term “justice” as used by non-traditional reproductive rights activists does not necessarily negate the term “choice” that is mostly identified with mainstream reproductive rights activism, justice is in fact an extension of it. Whereas choice

tends to refer to women's ability not to bear unwanted children, justice extends the concept to include women's ability to bear the children that they want. Roberts (1997) uses the example of restrictions placed on welfare mothers and argues that, by limiting the number of children women on welfare may have, it sends a message that they are not worthy enough as human beings to be allowed the privilege of procreating. "Denying someone the right to bear children or punishing her for exercising that right denies her of a basic part of her humanity" (305). Exemplars of justice in PPAA discourse might include opposition to coerced/forced sterilization (temporary or permanent), opposition to birth control as punishment (for welfare mothers, drug addicted mothers, etc.), opposition to state funding for permanent methods of birth control (i.e. sterilization) while the state simultaneously refuses to fund temporary methods (contraception/abortion), and support for general economic reform (allowing families the opportunity to provide for their families).

As the sterilization issue began to heat up in the late 1960s to early 1970s, PPAA addressed the issue from a justice perspective in both their internal conversation and in the press. In the meeting minutes of January 1969, the organization issued a policy statement in which they advocate for sterilization as a valid contraceptive tool, but the following month amended their position and went on record as opposing a sterilization bill that could allow for women to be coerced into accepting the procedure. In a series of articles published in different newspapers between June 25 – 27, 1971, the organization stood strong against the use of coerced sterilization. At that time, a proposal was being considered by the

State Board of Health that would pay for abortions for interested women, but if they had two or more illegitimate children they would be forced to undergo the sterilization procedure as well. In each of the articles, the organization declares sterilization to be a medical procedure. Therefore, it should be a decision made solely by the woman and her physician without government interference. The articles further characterized the organization as being “horrified” that compulsory sterilization would even be considered by state agencies. According to PPAA, a proposal of forced sterilization “only serves to feed the suspicion ... that population control is a phrase used by more affluent whites to maintain numerical superiority” (“Sterilization: No Coercion”).

Though press documents only associate PPAA and justice with the theme of anti-sterilization, PPAA addresses justice in other ways in its meeting minutes. For example, in the document dated April 14, 1965, the organization agrees to engage in advocating for state programs (i.e. War on Poverty) that fund contraception. But more interestingly, though the organization did not intentionally take part in programs for general economic reform (i.e. programs that would help parents become economically viable in society), they did (unexpectedly) create a job training program for individuals in the areas in which the organization operated. April of 1968 is the first indication of what was to come. On this date, the organization began talking about a new program to recruit volunteers to work in the clinics and spread the word about the organization. These volunteers were to recruit patients by going door-to-door in the neighborhoods in which the clinics were located. The project was so successful

that in July of the same year the organization attributed an influx of new patients to the work of the volunteers and began paying them \$1.60/hour. Though some of the volunteers were local social workers or teachers, most were previously unemployed neighborhood residents. By October of the following year, the organization was reporting a shortage of qualified volunteers because they had used the skills they had acquired by volunteering for PPAA to get stable work in area corporations.

Access

The second category under reproductive justice is access. A major criticism of non-traditional reproductive rights activists is that simply legalizing abortion and other methods of reproductive control is not enough to ensure that they are available options for every woman. Services tend to be located in more metropolitan areas; some women travel hours to obtain legal abortions or reproductive health services. Furthermore, even if they are located within reasonable proximity to the service, cost tends to be a barrier in women's decisions to use them. Examples in PPAA discourse that indicate that the organization considered equal access to services might include conveniently located facilities, low or no fees, transportation to services, childcare for existing children, flexible operating hours, and consideration to restrictions due to a patient's age.

The concept of access seems to be well represented in both PPAA meeting minutes and press coverage; 27 out of 57 minutes documents address access while 15 out of 48 press clipping address access. Though most of the discussion in both

meeting minutes and press clipping regarding access concerns location and operating times of clinics, all of the themes characteristic of access as indicated in the previous paragraph are addressed – again, in both meeting minutes and press clippings. That the services are able to be easily located was of supreme importance to PPAA. At one point, the organization had at least nine clinics in operation throughout the city of Atlanta (including Bethlehem Center, Perry Homes, West End, Wheat Street, Georgia Avenue, Marietta Street, East Lake, Parkway Drive, and Roswell) with many more areas interested. In the meeting minutes of November 1969, the organization was discussing employing a “mobile unit so it could travel into underserved areas to provide contraceptive advice,” but it is unclear if this ever came to fruition. PPAA’s most comprehensive explanation regarding its motivation for operating several smaller clinics instead of one large one appears in the meeting minutes of March 1968:

The clinic locations selected by PPAA have been chosen to be as convenient as possible for the clients and prospective clients using the advice of the community Council, Atlanta Housing Authority, and Fulton County Board of Health. Most of our clinic sessions are in the early evening [generally from 5pm until 9pm] for the convenience of our clients. In operating our clinics in decentralized areas and in the evening hours, more costly operations result than would be expected at one central location with daytime

hours, but experience indicates that more clients are reached.

Press clippings indicate that transportation to the clinics was made available to patients if they were to request it (Deal), and this is confirmed in the meeting minutes of both May 18, 1965, which sets aside \$50/month in the budget for transportation, and again in October 1967, which saw an increase in the budget to \$1000/month.

Press clippings also report that clinic visits were free for all (“Planned Parenthood Drive”; Rock, *Party Time*; Hopkins; Carrollton, *Horror*), another point that is continuously reiterated throughout PPAA meeting minutes, except for a brief stint documented in January 1969 when an unidentified clinic was testing a partial payment plan based on a sliding-fee scale. Age was always a consideration for the organization as well. Press clippings and meeting minutes indicate Saturday morning clinics were available for teens, and teens were actively engaged to become participants and volunteers with the organization. Georgia law was somewhat restrictive about teens and contraceptives and required the organization to only see the patient if she were escorted by a parent, guardian, or clergyperson. A teen patient could also bring a note from any of the individuals listed above, or a doctor. If she arrived without any of these, she was escorted to the doctor on duty (instead of a nurse or clinician) so that he could determine if contraceptive information was required and admit her (Bliem, *March 18, 1969*). In addition to teen clinics, some sites even offered makeshift childcare stations (“Planned Parenthood Offices”).

Health

The third category under reproductive justice is health. Unlike the mainstream reproductive rights ideal of population control which operates on the tenet of social well-being, the health ideal operates on the premise of individual well-being for the woman and her family. The aim, from the perspective of reproductive justice, should be that creating healthy moms will result in healthy families; the goal should be to ensure that women are adequately treated for a wide array of medical issues that threaten their overall health, not just their reproductive health. Exemplars of health in PPAA discourse might include prenatal and postnatal care, promotion of a healthy parent/child relationship (i.e. access to child care, parenting classes, healthcare for children, etc.), general healthcare (i.e. breast exams, physicals, hygiene, etc.), sex education, and general health education.²¹

Overall, health exemplars appeared in ten meeting transcripts and six press clippings. Not only were health issues not especially prominent in PPAA discourse, but several of the exemplars for health from a reproductive justice perspective are nowhere to be found in the analysis of both PPAA meeting minutes and PPAA press clippings. Those exemplars absent from the discourse include prenatal and postnatal care, access to childcare, and healthcare for children. Of the exemplars for health from a reproductive justice perspective as they appear in the discourse of PPAA meeting minutes, the most emphasis seems

²¹ Access to childcare is also indicated as an exemplar in the “access” category. When analyzing PPAA discourse, instances of available childcare while the mother obtained reproductive services were coded under access. Any instance of mothers being able to obtain childcare to meet everyday needs was coded under health.

to have been placed on general healthcare and the patient's well being. It was an issue the organization continued to struggle with, either due to lack of funding or lack of cooperation from area agencies, specifically the Fulton County Health Department. The first mention of healthcare other than contraceptive services appears in the transcript dated March 15, 1966. The transcript indicates that pap smears are conducted as part of the visit and demonstrates the board members' concerns regarding the large number of abnormal pap smears being found at the clinic sites. The clinic, at that time and continuously throughout the dates of the analysis, referred irregular pap patients to Grady and other area hospitals, but as time went on PPAA was able to treat other health problems as patients experienced them. For example, the transcript dated August 16 of the same year reveals that the organization began treating Trichomoniasis and other vaginal infections, and in January of the following year the clinics were offering breast exams.

The goal of offering comprehensive health services was always in reach, but never seemed to quite get off the ground. Meeting minutes from May 16, 1967, demonstrate an attempt to enter into a partnership with Emory and Fulton County Health Department to offer comprehensive care including welfare assistance, general medical care, mental health care, dentistry, and nursing care, but there is no evidence this ever took place. Similar discussion occurred in April of 1968. The organization planned to meet with the Fulton County Health Department about a clinic, and in August of 1969 a grant was being pursued that would allow PPAA to expand services to include blood work, VD checks,

nutrition information for mother and child. If PPAA press clippings are any indication, as late as 1972 the organization was still struggling to offer these health services and more (Deal). Unfortunately, there is no evidence that these events ever took place either.

Despite not being able to launch a fully functioning health care clinic, PPAA did not lose sight of their pap patients. When it was revealed in the meeting minutes of September 1969 that patients with irregular pap smears were not going to Grady as directed because they could not afford treatment, the organization brainstormed ways to address the issue and get their patients the care they needed. The following month reported the PPAA had enlisted the help of the American Cancer Society to assist in treating patients needing care.

Press documents beginning in 1970 indicate that PPAA had started to expand their services from contraception and cancer screening to also include addressing issues of infertility, voluntary sterilization, adoption, and premarital counseling (Rock, *Planned Parenthood*; Hames; Bell). Parenting and sex education classes were also being offered to produce healthy families (Bledsoe; Marvin).

Racial Concordance

The fourth category of reproductive justice is racial concordance. Unlike racial discordance, which indicates non-equitable racial representation, racial concordance would mean that the racial representation among the decision-makers within an organization and those for whom they claim to advocate is in balance and that all sides are being considered. Among advocates of reproductive

justice, there has been much criticism that mainstream reproductive rights organizations overlook the viewpoints of women of color. For PPAA discourse to be representative of racial concordance, it would have to demonstrate balance in racial representation among both the decision-makers within the organization and among those whom PPAA claimed to serve.

In the previous discussion of racial discordance, it was revealed that the racial representation was not completely white, but the exact ratio of black members to white members is unclear. It was also revealed the early characterization of PPAA was that of a social organization, rather than a social service organization. Newspaper accounts focused on the players within the organization rather than the activities PPAA was involved in. As the organization matured and enlisted the guidance of public relations personnel, PPAA began to be framed in the press differently. Beginning in about 1966 with an article entitled “Parenthood Group Backs Study Project,” the organization seemed to publicly be opening itself up to new populations. The study in question was designed to help the organization develop ways of recommending action to various parts of the population in the area of sex education and required the organization to elicit the help of “as many elements in the community as possible.” While this public move to make the organization more inclusive is a bit vague, the organization engaged a more direct strategy beginning around 1970. Fueled by public perception of family planning and contraception as a tool for “black genocide,” PPAA began to approach the issue matter-of-factly. The first instance occurs in an article entitled “Planned Parenthood Seeks Betterment for

All,” in which Dr. William Mason attacks the concept of black genocide by stating:

Some people accuse us of wanting to cut down on the black population by allowing black women to decide how many children they want. They shout “black genocide!” Well, I’m black and I know that’s not true. Genocide is the concept of people who have fears. If one looks at Planned Parenthood intelligently, he sees that it helps the blacks – it helps any poor person – by allowing him to take care of the children he has ... I’d rather see quality people than to have a teeming mass of sick, unwanted, uneducated children.

That goes for blacks as well as whites.

The organization continued to defend itself against racial profiling by issuing statistics about the populations served: “Fifty-eight percent of those served by PPAA in 1970 were white” (Bledsoe), and later by framing the issue with an emphasis more on poverty and less on race: “Although some people feel the problem is racial, statewide 55% of the women who need family planning help are white. Large families are characteristic of poverty more so than they are of racial groups” (Nesmith).

However, because PPAA recognized that racial opposition existed does not necessarily mean that the organization took steps in its organizing process to make sure that concerns from racially diverse populations were being heard and that their needs were being met. However, evidence suggests that the

organization did move in this way. Meeting minutes show that the organization was actively searching for racially and economically diverse areas in which to place clinics to maximize the fair distribution of services (Beach, *June 21, 1966*). Additionally, clinic volunteers were being recruited from the neighborhoods in which the clinics were located, but volunteers had little decision-making capability. That responsibility was reserved for PPAA board members. But on August 20, 1968, this began to change when two members of the board resigned and Dr. W. Newton Long suggested that the seats be filled by members of the areas in which the organization served. By October of that year, the organization was actively searching for “members from the target areas to serve on committees and membership to the board” (Bliem, *October 15, 1968*). According to the transcript dated March 18, 1969, the balance of the board had shifted to include one-third of its members (an average of 15 out of 45) from the areas surrounding the clinics.

Discussion

The four texts that guided the formation of this study written from a non-traditional reproductive rights perspective are rich in examples of how non-traditional reproductive rights activists have mobilized to serve their own agendas. However, they are missing details about the ways in which mainstream organizations overlook their concerns. This research provides several insights as a case study to support or refute non-traditional reproductive rights activists’ claim that mainstream reproductive rights organizations have ignored issues

important to them. What follows is a discussion of the conclusions based on the findings of the previous two sections.

In sum, the answer to the research question “Did Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area (PPAA) discourse during 1964-1972 address issues of reproductive justice?” is yes. But the issue is a bit more complicated. A more precise statement would be to say that the analysis reveals PPAA considered reproductive justice issues as well as issues of mainstream reproductive rights. However, the organization is more closely associated with mainstream reproductive rights in the press. The analysis of the two sets of PPAA discourse for mainstream reproductive rights exemplars revealed abortion was not a guiding issue in either meeting minutes or press clippings, but the exemplars of choice, racial discordance and population control were featured more prominently.

Choice is discussed more frequently in press coverage of the organization than in internal documents, and most accounts of choice are limited to suggesting that every woman should be able to decide when she wants to be pregnant and that child should be wanted. However, some accounts of choice are accompanied by remarks that seem to chastise those who do not choose to use birth control as potentially encouraging poor mental health and behavioral delinquencies in the children they produce (Lockerman).

Racial discordance could not effectively be determined in internal or external discourse; however press coverage of the organizations social affairs could have portrayed the organization as elitist and potentially created the perception of division between races. The ideal of population control was also

disproportionately represented between meeting minutes and press clippings. While the exemplar of population control could be found in approximately 25 percent of PPAA press clippings, it was barely noticeable in meeting minutes except as a possible early external communication strategy for gaining public interest in the organization. Unfortunately, PPAA press clippings of population control tend to sensationalize the issue by insinuating that all social problems could be solved if only population were curbed and suggesting that “we should be smarter than rabbits” (“Unplanned Parenthood”). Any logical population control argument is lost in melodrama.

The culmination of the preceding factors indicates that PPAA is associated more with mainstream reproductive justice ideals in press accounts than in internal meetings, where the organization is more closely linked to reproductive justice ideals. This fact, in conjunction with the press characterizations of these ideals, establishes a foundation for potential criticism among non-traditional reproductive rights activists. Non-traditional reproductive rights activists exposed only to this characterization of PPAA would have had cause to draw the conclusion that the organization’s agenda was not as representative of reproductive justice issues, and that their allegiance to mainstream ideals marginalized non-elite populations, particularly minorities, uneducated, or economically depressed groups. However, analysis of reproductive justice exemplars in internal PPAA discourse suggests that this assumption would not be accurate.

When analyzing the two sets of discourse for reproductive justice exemplars the guiding issues were quite prominent – more so in PPAA meeting minutes than in press clippings. This was true of all exemplars except for the exemplar of justice. Justice is the least represented of all reproductive justice ideals and did not emerge as a guiding issue until later in the era of analyzed documents. The ideal of access was found in almost half of available meeting minute transcripts and almost a third of press clippings. Despite the apparent lopsided coverage, all concepts related to access were conveyed in both sets of documents. The health ideal was not as prominently addressed, appearing in ten meeting transcripts and six press clippings. However the focus on health was primarily on overall methods for maintaining physical health, with several key issues (i.e. childcare, child healthcare, prenatal care and postnatal care) totally ignored.

Racial concordance, on the other hand, was significantly addressed in both meeting minutes and press clippings. However, press coverage served little more than to position the organization as being on the attack against opponents who charged them of racial genocide and did almost nothing to inform the public about how the organization was actively trying to engage the populations it served or to give them an opportunity to help make the decisions that were going to effect them. Yes, the press communicated that PPAA was working with members of several races, but the true ideal of racial concordance was lost. That is to say, press characterizations focus on PPAA as the dominant actor and fail to demonstrate how the organization engaged in activities to expand the scope of

their activities to include the interests of multiple groups – particularly the interests of the racial minorities in the communities in which the organization was operating. Though the PPAA was not completely equitable racially, the organization did take steps to offer opportunities to explore multiple viewpoints of reproductive rights.

That the issues of population control and racial concordance were characterized in press documents in the ways that they were could be significant in explaining how a non-traditional reproductive rights activist who has access only to press characterizations of the organization may perceive PPAA as ignoring reproductive justice issues. For many, the issues of race and population control are closely related. In her essay *Black Women and the Pill* (2000), Dorothy Roberts suggests that, particularly in the 1960s when black Americans were struggling to establish equal rights, many black Americans saw campaigns of birth and population control as white-dominated programs furthering racial injustice (2). Specifically, they saw population control as a “potential means of racial genocide” (2). The concept of population control in itself is based in logic, for example, as population increases so does the demand for resources. To eliminate the strain on natural resources and our ecosystem, steps must be taken to more effectively manage resources and reduce demand. However, PPAA press clippings referring to population control do little to ease the picture of gloom and doom. The messaging strategies surrounding population control are typically fear based. Additionally, despite PPAA’s attempt to characterize itself as racially heterogeneous, in the press documents it is forced to do so in terms of a

“genocide” debate, with PPAA consistently acting to counteract charges of genocide. Fewer than 30 years after WWII, and even now, genocide is a hard term to get past. Regardless of what the organization was trying to say, “genocide” may be all that was heard. It is unfortunate for the organization that this was the focus of press coverage and that their attempts to diversify their goals by creating room on their boards for members of the communities in which they served (which were mostly, but not completely, black) went largely unnoticed. By giving minority residents a voice in the organization, PPAA took a large step in minimizing their potential marginalization within the organization.

This study and the analysis of PPAA documents were not without other surprises. One interesting aspect to be revealed during the analysis was that the organization was constantly struggling with funding issues and was consistently in danger of sabotaging its own goals. The year 1969 was particularly hazardous as both reproductive access and choice were in danger of being suppressed at the hands of PPAA itself. In the transcript of meeting minutes dated July 29, 1969, the organization discusses the dire need for immediate funds and reports that if no funding materializes, and if they continue to operate to meet current demand, they will be forced to close their doors in September until the beginning of the new year. To prevent such drastic action, the board opted to restrict itself by keeping old patients, accepting few new patients, and cease all recruiting. Specifically, the board opted to:

- Phase out low-use clinics
- Influence patients toward IUDs
- Attempt to get local funding to continue
- Attempt to get local health departments to accept a greater share of load

- Attempt to get free pills from manufacturers
- Stop recruiting new patients
- Cut recruiting staff in half and focus solely on follow-up patients (Bliem, *July 29, 1969* 2-3)

Other barriers to reproductive choice and access considered by PPAA included charging patients for contraceptive services at cost (59 cents for pillpacks and \$1.00 for IUDs), offering the IUD as the only free birth control option, and offering only the pill endorsed by the national office of Planned Parenthood so that it might be purchased directly from them in bulk at a lower cost (Bliem, *July 29, 1969, June 24, 1969, November 25, 1969*).²²

Fortunately, these drastic measures were never taken; the PPAA affiliate received a generous donation and was able to maintain normal operation throughout the remainder of the year. However, that they considered taking these actions is significant. It establishes a motivating factor for why a mainstream reproductive rights organization might be forced to make a strategic decision to forgo advocating for issues of reproductive justice. In this case, PPAA made the decision to narrow the population it served and offer limited options in order to prevent not being able to fulfill a need for reproductive services at all.

Yet another surprise revealed through the analysis of PPAA was the prevalence of men within the discourse, specifically the role that men played within the operations of the organization and as a target for reproductive services. Throughout the research that guided the formation of the project, men played no significant role other than as a possible barrier to women utilizing contraception.

²² The influencing factor for pushing the IUD over the birth control pill was that the pill was the most popular choice among women visiting PPAA for contraception and the affiliate had a surplus of IUDs on hand. Furthermore, the cost of IUDs overall was less than pills - \$1.00 for a one-time insertion vs. 59 cents for each pillpack.

The most common example of men acting as a barrier to contraceptive use occurs in discussions of the black liberation movement of the 1960s and 1970s in which black “militant” males call upon their female counterparts to refuse birth control and breed revolutionaries to thwart “the man’s” campaign of black genocide (Roberts, *Black Women* 1-2; Roberts, *Killing* 100-1; Nelson 78-9). In PPAA discourse, men active in working toward women’s reproductive rights were well represented as members of the affiliate’s board. An exact figure is unavailable, but an estimated 54% of the PPAA board from 1964 -69 were men.²³ Perhaps the prominence of men on the board helped the organization recognize a need for men to be a targeted group for education and reproductive control services. Men as a target group are specifically mentioned in the meeting of October 15, 1968, during which the medical advisory committee suggests including males in family planning by offering condoms and instructions for their use. It was also in this meeting that board member Dr. Robert Hatcher suggested creating an entire education program designed for males since they were more likely to consider birth control and family planning tools of genocide. Part of his program was to include information sessions about vasectomy as a tool for contraception.

As the (female) sterilization debate began to heat up in the early 1970s, PPAA became a source of information for men about the option of vasectomy. Though the organization did not perform the operation on site, it did provide information sessions every Saturday morning with both a clinician and clergy, as well as offer referral services (Coogler, *Popularity of Vasectomy Grows*).

²³ This number is not precise and was arrived at by counting the number of male names recorded in the analysis and dividing them by the total number of names recorded in the analysis.

Perhaps PPAA recognized that if contraception, pregnancy, childbirth and prevention of sexually transmitted diseases were exclusively promoted as women's concerns, then it would serve only to reinforce men's lack of involvement in safeguarding reproductive health — both their own and that of their partners — as well as work in opposition to the quest for gender equality that so defined the feminist movement at that time.

The analysis of PPAA documents revealed that the organization considered both mainstream reproductive rights and reproductive justice issues. However, in general, meeting minutes were more representative of reproductive justice ideals than were press documents, and press documents focused more on mainstream reproductive rights ideals than did meeting minutes. It is natural to want to determine why any disconnection between PPAA meeting minutes and press documents may have occurred. After all, the driving reason behind why both sets of documents were examined for the study was based on non-traditional reproductive rights activists' presumed exclusion from mainstream reproductive rights activism. If non-traditional reproductive rights activists were being excluded from mainstream reproductive rights activism, as many claim to have been, then they may never have known if a mainstream organization like PPAA was addressing issues of reproductive justice if the only indication of that act taking place existed in private meeting minutes or other internal documents. Non-traditional reproductive rights activists simply would not have had access to that information. Therefore, the analysis of external communication attributed to PPAA was necessary because these documents were accessible to non-PPAA

members. It is from external communication, like press clippings, that non-members would have formed their opinions about PPAA.

The final chapter includes a discussion of possible reasons for imbalance between the two sets of PPAA discourse as revealed by the analysis, suggestions for future research, and a review of the project.

Chapter V: Conclusion

The previous chapter revealed that PPAA discourse from 1964-1972 considered both mainstream reproductive rights and reproductive justice issues. It also revealed that meeting minutes were more representative of reproductive justice ideals than were press documents, and press documents focused more on mainstream reproductive rights ideals than did meeting minutes. The disconnection between the representation of mainstream reproductive rights categories and reproductive justice categories in PPAA discourse raises the question: How did this occur? Based on information discovered in the analysis of PPAA discourse, here are a few possibilities:

- 1) *Reporters may have misinterpreted PPAA information.* – To garner press coverage for their organization and its goals, PPAA employed many tactics of public relations. They pitched stories to reporters or editors, submitted press releases, and held press conferences regarding reproductive rights issues. In these cases, even though the organization was the initiating party and guided the discussion, it is still up to the reporter to decide what information taken from his or her conversation with the organization is most important. The key point the reporter leaves with is not necessarily the key point the organization was trying to stress, despite their best efforts.

There is at least one instance of this occurring in PPAA press documents. In an article entitled “Clinic Fights Illegitimacy” dated September 4, 1966, reporter Don Winter paints a picture of low-income

Atlanta neighborhoods packed to the gills with illegitimate children abandoned by fathers and cared for by mothers who do not know how babies are made. He cites PPAA's goal as being "to operate clinics to curb illegitimacy ... because it feels too many children work a hardship on poor families," and quotes PPAA founder Esther Taylor as saying "children overcrowd their neighborhoods, they stay out of school because there is not enough money for food and clothing, they grow up to raise families just as large and the cycle goes on ... Ignorance is our biggest problem – some women do not even know the reasons for birth control."

Winter's misinterpretation of PPAA's goals prompted Taylor to respond by writing a letter to the editor, which was published later that month. In the letter, Taylor kindly thanks Mr. Winter for publicizing the organization, but her clear intent is to set the record straight. She states that "the headline 'Clinic Fights Illegitimacy' and several other statements could make it appear that this is the primary focus of our agency. We seek to offer voluntary contraceptive services to all families who cannot afford the expense of a private doctor ... Neither do we seek to tell people how many children they should have. We simply seek to provide them with the means through which to make a responsible choice."

- 2) *The press' characterization of PPAA is an act of planning and strategy.* – When contacted by the press for information, PPAA intentionally framed itself in a way that would have been most acceptable by the masses to try and prevent excessive backlash from the general public. The era in which

this analysis is set was interesting in that it coincides with the dawning of what became known as the sexual revolution, as well as the “women’s liberation,” anti-war and civil rights movements. The social climate of the nation was in a state of flux. While the city of Atlanta did not exist in a vacuum and was changing with the times with the rest of the nation, it was still situated firmly in the “Bible Belt” of the southern United States. Many of its citizens were steeped in tradition and religion and were wary of the sexual permissiveness of the era and its possible effect on young people’s morality.²⁴ Furthermore, the city was just learning to deal with issues of racial equality. Attitudes are not always as quick to change as laws are, and PPAA intentionally worked to frame their information in a way that they deemed socially palatable (i.e. “Birth control helps prevent the mushrooming population explosion and will save our natural resources and our world from poverty”) to avoid individuals interpreting their information in a negative way (i.e. “Your children are having sex with anyone who will let them,” or “We’re helping black families so pretty soon they’ll be ready to take over the world”).

The most notable example of PPAA initiating a messaging strategy firmly based on a mainstream reproductive rights ideal occurred on January 15, 1965. According to meeting minutes, it was on this date that

²⁴ Morality and sex, especially as it related to young people, was an issue of which PPAA was aware and took measures to address. Specifically, an article published in the *Atlanta Constitution* on April 13, 1971, entitled “Unplanned Teen Pregnancies Know No Boundaries” announces the organization’s first clinic directed to teens and states that “it is in no way designed to encourage ... students to become involved in pre-marital intercourse. Rather, it is designed to provide teenagers with a clinic which can answer their questions...” (Hatcher).

the organization established its bylaws, and population control played a prominent role in that day's discussion. A resolution was adopted that seems to indicate that the organization planned to engage in a messaging strategy of population control and states that "because there is a need to gain interest and support of our community before embarking on the broader objective of direct service for family planning, [we must] ... alert citizens of Atlanta to the gravity of the population crisis, not only in the world, but in Atlanta ... [we must] publicize facts to show tax payers and public officials how millions of dollars could be saved through birth control clinics." As indicated within the discussion of the analysis findings, the theme of population control was indeed a prominent presence within PPAA press clippings, appearing in 25% of the documents analyzed.

- 3) *PPAA engaged in imbalanced record keeping.* – It is possible that intentions or plans regarding the path of the organization were revealed in meeting conversations but were never recorded due to several factors including the inability to employ recording technology, different styles and notetaking skills among recording secretaries, lost documents, and more.

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, several opportunities for future research have emerged. For example, performing a similar analysis of PPAA (and later, PPGA) discourse throughout the organization's 40-year lifespan might be interesting as an exploration of how the organization's characterization

of reproductive justice issues has shifted over time. Does the disconnection between print press coverage and internal conversation still exist? Has the organization adapted to changes in the city's demographics (i.e. new patient needs based on race, religion, and language)?²⁵ Perhaps an even more interesting research project would be to perform a similar study on Planned Parenthood affiliates operating in the same era in different parts of the country, especially if similar results were uncovered. The years in which the objects of analysis were published (1964-1972) coincides with the emergence of second wave, or mainstream, feminism, which has been criticized by modern day feminists as being too narrowly focused on the needs of middle-class white women and their assumption that their needs match the needs of all women. Mainstream reproductive rights activism in particular has been criticized as being white dominated and furthering racial, economic, educational and other injustices. If similar research demonstrates a trend of mainstream reproductive rights activists considering justice issues that non-traditional reproductive rights activists claim were ignored, other explanations would have to be explored to account for non-traditional reproductive rights activists' perceptions of being "left out" of mainstream reproductive rights activism.

Review

It has been a main point of this project to demonstrate that, in recent years, several groups of reproductive rights activists have separated themselves from the

²⁵ Another curiosity of PPAA discourse was revealed in the analysis of race and the organization. In both the meeting minutes and press clippings race was discussed only in terms of black and white. This may be explained by the racial demographics of the area which, according to the US Census website, in 1970 was 51% black and 48.2% white (www2.census.gov). The racial demographics of the city have shifted tremendously in the past 36 years.

traditions of mainstream reproductive rights organizations like Planned Parenthood and formed their own coalitions. These non-traditional reproductive rights activists charge that mainstream reproductive rights activism is too narrow in its scope and does not consider the needs of all women. For non-traditional reproductive rights activists, the concept of reproductive choice was coined by a group of individuals who interpret the reproductive lives of women to have been oppressed as a result of patriarchal systems of authority who serve to restrict women's autonomy in reproductive decision-making. For them, barriers to reproductive decision-making are not relegated only to patriarchal systems, but also come as a result of social differences such as class or race among groups of women as well. As a result, many groups of non-traditional reproductive rights activists have formed organizations with the goal of advocating for their own reproductive rights.

It is the claim among non-traditional reproductive rights organizations that mainstream reproductive rights organizations have predominantly been composed of white, middle-class women and the agendas of those organizations reflect their needs and concerns. They charge that the need to examine differences among women in the reproductive rights movement is important to prohibit developing too homogenous a pool of reproductive rights resources – resources which have historically been centered on, first, the right to use birth control, and later, the right to a safe and legal abortion. For this reason, the projects of many mainstream reproductive rights organizations have expanded in an attempt to diversify the concept of reproductive justice and fight for a wider range of

reproductive rights. Reproductive justice activism includes mainstream reproductive rights activism's goals of maintaining safe birth control options and legal abortions, but it also encompasses the right to bear and raise children (as opposed to preventing births), and the ability to access adequate reproductive health care. By not ensuring reproductive control for all women in all circumstances, non-traditional reproductive rights activists assert that true reproductive choice does not exist and that activism must be modified to include reproductive justice for everyone. Non-traditional reproductive rights activists have generalized their blame and insinuate that mainstream reproductive rights organizations have historically been negligent in addressing these issues. The apparent exclusionary nature of the dominant ideology of mainstream reproductive rights activism has motivated non-traditional reproductive rights activists to speak out and demand that all reproductive rights groups and issues be considered. However, with PPAA this was clearly not the case.

By examining historical documents of mainstream reproductive rights organizations on a case-by-case basis, it is bound to be revealed that not all mainstream reproductive rights organizations are guilty of ignoring issues of reproductive justice supported by non-traditional reproductive rights activists. This was, in fact, precisely the case when historical documents of Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area (PPAA) dating from 1964-1972 were analyzed. Analysis of internal meeting minutes revealed that this affiliate of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America had indeed considered reproductive justice issues.

When looking at the origins of PPAA, it might be easy to assume that the organization operated in a manner consistent with what non-traditional reproductive rights activists would expect of a mainstream reproductive rights organization. After all, PPAA was a local affiliate of the largest national reproductive rights organization and was founded by Esther Kahn Taylor, a wealthy white woman, with help from a small group of her socialite friends. Since the organization was founded on a national model by a white, middle-class constituency, non-traditional reproductive rights interpretations of mainstream reproductive rights may have been expected to apply. However, the findings of the analysis of PPAA discourse did not support this. In fact, it was discovered that while PPAA did advocate for ideals of mainstream reproductive rights, they did not do so at the expense of reproductive justice ideals. Reproductive justice ideals of justice and health were both considered, but the greatest representation of reproductive justice ideology in PPAA discourse was found in the categories of access and racial concordance. Unfortunately, these representations are found more prominently within internal PPAA documents than they are in press clippings available to an external audience. Therefore, non-traditional reproductive rights activist may never fully know that PPAA had historically considered reproductive justice issues.

References

Primary References

- Beach, Mae. Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, April 19, 1966. 1.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, July 19, 1966. 2.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, June 21, 1966. 2.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, March 15, 1966. 3.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, May 17, 1966. 1.
- Bell, Faye. "Planned Parenthood Goal: Children Should Be Wanted." Georgia State University Signal February 25 1971.
- Bledsoe, Christena. "Campaign Going on TV to Push for Birth Control." 1971.
- Bliem, Mrs. Carl J. (Elsie). Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting, April 16, 1968. 3.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, April 18, 1967. 3.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting, August 15, 1967. 5.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting, August 20, 1968. 7.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Economic Opportunity Atlanta Office, August 26, 1969. 3.

- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, February 18, 1969. 3.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, February 20, 1968. 3.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Economic Opportunity Atlanta Office, January 13, 1969.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, January 23, 1968. 4.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting, July 18, 1967. 6.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting, July 23, 1968. 3.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Economic Opportunity Atlanta Office, July 29, 1969. 3.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting, June 18, 1968. 3.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, June 20, 1967. 2.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Economic Opportunity Atlanta Office, June 24, 1969. 2.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, March 18, 1969. 4.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting, March 19, 1968. 2.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, March 21, 1967. 4.

- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, May 16, 1967. 3.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting, May 21, 1968. 3.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Economic Opportunity Atlanta Office, May 27, 1969. 3.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Economic Opportunity Atlanta Office, November 25, 1969. 2.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting, November 28, 1968. 2.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, October 9, 1967. 3.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting, October 15, 1968. 3.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Economic Opportunity Atlanta Office, October 21, 1969. 3.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting, September 17, 1968. 3.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Economic Opportunity Atlanta Office, September 30, 1969. 2.
- Brumbaugh, Ruth S. Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Home of Jean Selvage, April 14, 1965. 2.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, August 16, 1966. 2.

- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, February 10, 1966. 2.
 - . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, January 18, 1966.
 - . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Annual Meeting. First Presbyterian Church, January 26, 1966. 4.
 - . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, July 20, 1965. 1.
 - . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. YWCA, March 23, 1965. 2.
 - . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, May 18, 1965. 3.
 - . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, November 30, 1965.
 - . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, October 11, 1965.
 - . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, September 21, 1965. 2.
- Carrollton, Betty. "Planned Parenthood – What It Means and Doesn't Mean."
Atlanta Constitution June 13 1967: 18.
- . "Planned Parenthood Helping Mothers Here to Avoid 'Horror' and 'Worry' of Pregnancies." Atlanta Constitution Undated.

- Cawthon, Frances. "Perhaps Pregnant Look Is a Fad." Atlanta Journal March 27 1972.
- Coogler, Edith Hills. "Popularity of Vasectomy Grows." Atlanta Journal July 4 1971.
- Coy, Kimberly. "Gym Class Not Sex Education." Atlanta Journal and Constitution August 25 1971, sec. B: 1.
- . "Sterilization Confrontation: The Law Backs Her, but Doctor Reserves Judgment." Atlanta Journal and Constitution 1971.
- Deal, Lavice. "Helping Families Plan." Atlanta Journal June 14 1972.
- Fortson, Mary. "40 Leaders Here Support Planned Parenthood Drive." Atlanta Constitution October 21 1964.
- Freedman, Sylvia. Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, February 21, 1967. 6.
- . "Birth Control: Morally Right?" Atlanta Journal August 19 1968.
- Grayburn, Kathryn. "Taylors Hold Reception for Dr., Mrs. Guttmacher." Undated.
- Hames, Ginger. "Georgia's Unwed Pregnant Teen: Condemn Her? Or Counsel Her?" Atlanta Journal Constitution February 23 1971.
- Hardin, Mrs. Allen (Katherine). Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, November 21, 1967. 3.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, September 19, 1967. 4.
- Hatcher, Dr. Robert A. "Contraceptives a No-No for Wacs." Atlanta Constitution Unknown 1966.

- . "Unplanned Teen Pregnancies Know No Boundaries." Atlanta Constitution
April 13 1971.
- Hopkins, Sam. "Many Wives Wonder How to Limit Parenthood." Atlanta Constitution August 29 1967.
- Jeffers, Camille. Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, January 24, 1967. 3.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of Georgia, September 21, 1966. 4.
- Jones, Paul. "Birth Control: A Frank Look." Atlanta Constitution February 21 1965.
- . "Viewers Do Demand Quality: Is a Boycott the Answer." Atlanta Constitution February 24 1965.
- Lockerman, Doris. "Growing Atlanta Wakes up; Tackles Family Planning." Atlanta Constitution July 7 1964: 19.
- Lundy, Walker. "Planned Parenthood Tries to Meet Population Crisis." Atlanta Journal Constitution March 21 1965.
- Marvin, Carolyn. "Nobody Is Embarrassed: A Visit to Planned Parenthood." Atlanta Journal March 21 1971.
- . "Planned Parenthood Goes All Out." Atlanta Journal January 27 1971.
- Nesmith, Achsah. "Poor Are Crisis-Oriented to Medical Aid." Atlanta Constitution December 21 1971.
- Rock, Maxine A. "It's Party Time for Baby Planners." Atlanta Journal July 22 1970, sec. D: 18.

- . "Planned Parenthood Clinics Seek Betterment for All." Atlanta Journal
February 18 1970.
- Taylor, Esther. "Planned Parenthood Information Added – Letter to the Editor."
Atlanta Journal Constitution September 1966.
- Unknown. Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Home of
Mrs. Julian D. Freedman, December 12, 1967. 2.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Innaugural Meeting. Home of Mrs.
Herbert Taylor, January 15, 1965. 19.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Annual Meeting, January 20, 1967.
7.
- . Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Trust Co. of
Georgia, November 15, 1966. 2.
- . "Atlantans Form Committee for Birth Control." Atlanta Constitution
November 18 1964.
- . "B'nai B'rith Sponsors Social Action Meeting." Undated.
- . "Birth Control Clinics." Atlanta Journal Constitution March 20 1971.
- . "Clinic to Aid Family Planning." Atlanta Constitution July 22 1965.
- . "Clinics Give Birth Control Instruction and Materials." Task Force Report
April 25 1966.
- . "Dickey's Plan Party." Undated.
- . "Forced Sterilization Labeled 'Unthinkable'." Atlanta Journal and Constitution
June 25 1971.
- . "Parenthood Association Plans Clinic." Undated.

- . "Parenthood Group Backs Study Project." 1966.
- . "Parenthood Group Sets Election Meeting, Film." January 10 1965.
- . "Planned Parent Group Opens Atlanta Clinic; Mrs. Taylor Pacing Volunteers as President." The Southern Israelite October 8 1965.
- . "Planned Parenthood Drive Set for March." Atlanta Daily World March 1971.
- . "Planned Parenthood of Atlanta against Force Sterilization." Atlanta Daily World June 27 1971.
- . "Planned Parenthood Offices on Marietta Get Face-Lifting." Atlanta Constitution September 17 1971.
- . "Planned Parenthood Organized in Atlanta." Undated.
- . "Planning Clinic to Open." The Roswell Neighbor March 11 1971.
- . "Southeast Planned Parenthood to Meet Here for First Time." February 1965:
5.
- . "Sterilization: No Coercion." Atlanta Journal Constitution June 27 1971.
- . "Students to Talk on Birth Control." Undated.
- . "Unplanned Parenthood: Mrs. Taylor Hits Too Many Births." Undated.
- Winter, Don. "Clinic Fights Illegitimacy." Atlanta Journal Constitution September 4 1966.
- Wise, Ethel. Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area - Board Meeting. Economic Opportunity Atlanta Office, April 22, 1969. 3.

Secondary References

"30th Anniversary of Roe V. Wade: Q & a with Sarah Weddington Regarding the 30th Anniversary of Roe V. Wade". 2003. Website. The Weddington Center. March 20 2005.

<www.weddingtoncenter.com/anniversary_qa.html>.

"40 Year Timeline". 2005. Website. Planned Parenthood of Georgia (PPGA). February 3 2006. <<http://ppga.org/history.php3>>.

Ambrose, Andy. "New Georgia Encyclopedia: Atlanta". 2005. Website.

(December 8, 2005): Georgia Humanities Council and the University of Georgia Press. January 10 2006.

<<http://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/nge/Article.jsp?id=h-2207>>.

"American Birth Control League". 2002. Website. The Margaret Sanger Papers Project. (August 26, 2002): New York University. March 20 2005.

<www.nyu.edu/edu/projects/sanger/abcl.htm>.

"Atlanta, Georgia". 2006. Website. Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia. January 10 2006. <<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atlanta>>.

Bailey, Cathryn. "Unpacking the Mother Daughter Baggage: Reassessing Second- and Third-Wave Feminism." Women's Studies Quarterly 30.3/4 (2002): 138-54.

Block, Naomi. "The Empowerment of Women". 2005. Website. The Elderhostel Institute Network. March 26 2006.

<<http://www.elderhostel.org/Ein/empowerment.asp>>.

Center, Allen H., and Patrick Jackson. Public Relations Practices: Managerial

Case Studies and Problems. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2003.

Chadwick, Neil. "The 'Roe' of Roe V. Wade". Website. October 25 2005.

<<http://www.joyfulministry.com/roevwade.htm>>.

Charo, R.A. "'Mandatory Contraception'." Lancet 339 (1992): 1104-5.

"Civil Rights Act of 1964". 2006. Website. Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia.

January 10 2006.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civil_Rights_Act_of_1964>.

Cloud, Dana. "Concordance, Complexity and Conservatism: Rejoinder to

Condit." Critical Studies in Mass Communication 14.2 (1997): 193-7.

Condit, Celeste. "Clouding the Issues? The Ideal and the Material in Human

Communication." Critical Studies in Mass Communication 14.2 (1997):

197-200.

---. "Hegemony in a Mass-Mediated Society: Concordance About Reproductive

Technologies." Critical Studies in Mass Communication 11.3 (1994): 205-

30.

Diamond, M. "Transcript of Interview of Esther Kahn Taylor." Atlanta, GA,

1986. Retrieved from the Esther and Herbert Taylor Oral History Project

at the Cuba Archives and Genealogical Center, Breman Jewish Heritage

Museum.

Dick, Bob. "Grounded Theory: A Thumbnail Sketch". 2005. Website. Southern

Cross University. January 10 2006.

<<http://www.scu.edu.au/schools/gcm/ar/arp/grounded.html>>.

- "Doe Vs. Bolton." Atlanta, GA: Georgians for Choice, 2004.
- Eisenberg, Bonnie, and Mary Ruthsdotter. "Legacy '98: A Short History of the Movement". 1998. Website. National Women's History Project. January 10 2006. <<http://www.legacy98.org/move-hist.html>>.
- "Equal Rights Amendment". 1999. Website. Women in American History. Encyclopedia Britannica. February 24 2005. <http://search.eb.com/women/articles/Equal_Rights_Amendment.html>.
- Faubion, James D. "Introduction." Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology. Ed. James D. Faubion. Vol. 2. New York: The New Press, 1998. XIII - XLIII.
- "Feminist Campus Activism Online: Reading Room". Website. Feminist Majority Foundation. January 10 2006. <<http://www.feministcampus.org/fmla/program-materials/default.asp>>.
- Foucault, Michel. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. New York, NY: Vintage, 1995.
- . The Foucault Reader. Ed. Paul Rabinow. New York: Pantheon, 1984.
- . Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977. Ed. Gordon Colin. New York: Pantheon, 1980.
- . "Questions of Method." The Essential Works of Foucault - Power. Ed. James D. Faubion. Vol. 3. New York: The New Press, 1994. 223-38.
- . "Useless to Revolt?" Trans. Robert Hurley. The Essential Works of Foucault - Power. Ed. James D. Faubion. Vol. 3. New York: The New Press, 1994. 449-53.

- "Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution". 2005. Website.
(April 6, 2005): Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia. April 6 2005.
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fourteenth_Amendment_to_the_United_States_Constitution>.
- "Get the Facts". Website. Cover My Pills: Fair Access to Contraception. Planned Parenthood of Western Washington. October 25 2005.
<<http://covermypills.org/facts/usvone.asp>>.
- Glaser, Barney G. Emergence Vs. Forcing: Basics of Grounded Theory Analysis. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press, 1992.
- Gordon, Linda. Woman's Body, Woman's Right: Birth Control in America. New York, NY: Penguin, USA, 1977.
- "Grounded Theory (Glaser)". 2006. Website. Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia. January 10 2006.
<[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grounded_theory_\(Glaser\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grounded_theory_(Glaser))>.
- Haas-Wilson, Deborah. "Women's Reproductive Choices: The Impact of Medicaid Funding Restrictions." Family Planning Perspectives 29 (1997): 228-33.
- Harris, Angela. "Race and Essentialism in Feminist Legal Theory." Stanford Law Review 42 (1990).
- Hawkins, Joy. "'Sex and the City' and Third Wave Feminism: Defining Feminisms in Popular Culture." University of Washington, 2003.

- Henshaw, Stanley K., and Lawrence B. Finer. "The Accessibility of Abortion Services in the United States." Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health 35.1 (2001): 16-24.
- Hill, Codye. "1st, 2nd, 3rd Wave". Website. Georgetown College Women's Studies Program. February 24 2005.
<http://spider.georgetowncollege.edu/ws/1st,_2nd,_3rd_wave.htm>.
- "History of Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area." Atlanta, GA: Planned Parenthood of Georgia, Archives, 1977.
- Ikemoto, Lisa Cheyemi. "Redefining Reproductive Freedom to Build Multicultural Coalitions." Berkeley Women's Law Journal 17 (2002): 229-35.
- Imbornoni, Ann Marie. "Women's Rights Movement in the U.S.: Timeline". 2005. Website. Pearson Education as Infoplease. January 10 2006.
<<http://www.infoplease.com/spot/womenstimeline1.html>>.
- "Indictment for Publication of the Woman Rebel, Vol. I, No. 1". Columbia, S.C. Website. The Margaret Sanger Papers Electronic Edition: Margaret Sanger and The Woman Rebel, 1914-1916. Eds. Esther Katz, Cathy Moran Hajo and Peter Engelman. (1999): Model Editions Partnership. October 25 2005. <<http://adh.sc.edu/ms/ms-table.html>>.
- "Jim Crow Law". 2006. Website. Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia. January 10 2006. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jim_Crow_laws>.

Johnson, William. "Alan Keyes, the Republican Party, and the Abortion Debates".

Woods Hole, MA, January 2005. Online Magazine. Z Magazine. March 27 2006. <<http://zmagsite.zmag.org/Jan2005/johnson0105.html>>.

Kendall, Gavin, and Gary Wickham. Using Foucault's Methods. London: Sage, 1999.

Lye, John. "Ideology: A Brief Guide". 1997. Website. (October 18, 1997):

Brock University. November 13 2005.

<<http://www.brocku.ca/english/jlye/ideology.html>>.

"March for Women's Lives". 2003. Website. February 19 2005.

<www.marchforwomen.org>.

"Margaret Sanger". 2004. Website. (August 2004): Planned Parenthood

Federation of America. February 19 2005.

<www.plannedparenthood.org/pp2/portal/medicalinfo/birthcontrol/bio-margaret-sanger.xml>.

Martin, Jane Roland. "Methodological Essentialism, False Difference, and Other Dangerous Traps." Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society 19.3 (1994): 630-57.

Matthews, Stephen, David Ribar, and Mark Wilhelm. "The Effects of Economic Conditions and Access to Reproductive Health Services on State Abortion Rates and Birthrates." Family Planning Perspectives 29.2 (1997): 52-60.

Mayring, Philipp. "Qualitative Content Analysis." Forum: Qualitative Social Research 1.2 (2003): 28 paragraphs.

- McCarthy, Michael. "Women's Lack of Reproductive Choice Highlighted."
Lancet 346.8975 (1995): 630.
- Merskin, Debra. "Adolescence, Advertising, and the Ideology of Menstruation."
Sex Roles 40.11/12 (1999): 941-57.
- Mills, Claudia. "The Ethics of Reproductive Control." Philosophical Forum 30.1
 (1999): 43-57.
- Nelson, Jennifer. Women of Color and the Reproductive Rights Movement. New
 York, NY: New York University Press, 2003.
- "Planned Parenthood - Birth Control". 2005. Website. Planned Parenthood
 Federation, Inc. April 26 2005.
 <<http://www.plannedparenthood.org/pp2/portal/files/portal/medicalinfo/birthcontrol/main.xml>>.
- "Planned Parenthood - Health Centers". 2005. Website. Planned Parenthood
 Federation of America. April 26 2005.
 <<http://www.plannedparenthood.org/pp2/portal/healthservices/findhealthcenter/>>.
- Porter, Elisabeth. "Abortion Ethics: Rights and Responsibilities." Hypatia 9.3
 (1994): 66-87.
- Prado, C.G. Starting with Foucault. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2000.
- Prokhovnik, Raia. "Third Wave Feminism and Post 'Post-Ideological' Politics."
European Consortium for Political Research Joint Sessions Workshops -
 Working with Ideology in a 'Post-Ideological' Age. Uppsala, Sweden,
 2004. 1-24.

- Reinharz, Shulamit. Feminist Methods in Social Research. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Roberts, Dorothy. "Forum: Black Women and the Pill." Family Planning Perspectives, 2000. 4.
- . Killing the Black Body: Race, Reproduction, and the Meaning of Liberty. New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1997.
- "Roe Vs. Wade." Atlanta, GA: Georgians for Choice, 2004.
- Ross, Loretta. "African-American Women and Abortion." Abortion Wars: A Half Century of Struggle, 1950-2000. Ed. Rickie Solinger. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998. 161-207.
- Sawicki, Jana. Disciplining Foucault. New York, NY: Routledge, 1991.
- Sigal, Reggie. "Planned Parenthood." Off Our Backs 1.6 (1970): 3.
- Silliman, Jael, et al. Undivided Rights: Women of Color Organize for Reproductive Justice. Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2004.
- Smyth, Lisa. "Feminism and Abortion Politics: Choice, Rights, and Reproductive Freedom." Women's Studies International Forum 25.3 (2002): 335-45.
- Suggs, Ernie, Tom Bennett, and Maria Saporta. "Ivan Allen, Jr." 2003. Website. Legacy.com. January 10 2006.
<<http://www.legacy.com/Obituaries.asp?Page=LifeStory&PersonId=1132461>>.
- Taylor, Esther Kahn. "Untitled." Ed. Unknown. Atlanta, GA, 1986. Personal Communication from Collection of Esther Kahn Taylor Personal Papers

stored at the Cuba Archives and Genealogical Center, Breman Jewish Heritage Museum.

---. "Untitled." Ed. Planned Parenthood of the Atlanta Area (PPAA). Atlanta, GA: Planned Parenthood of Georgia, Archives, 1986. Written response to PPAA regarding request for biographical information for a banquet to be held in her honor.

"The Truth About Margaret Sanger". 1992. Website. Life Education and Resource Network. January 6 2006.

<<http://www.blackgenocide.org/sanger.html>>.

Wildfire, Puck. "Bitch Reads: "Undivided Rights: Women of Color Organize for Reproductive Justice"." Bitch Magazine Winter 2005 2005: 79-80.

Wolf, Naomi. Fire with Fire. New York: Random House, 1993.

"Women's Suffrage". 2005. Website. Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia.

February 24 2005. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Woman%27s_suffrage>.

Young, Margot E. "Reproductive Technologies and the Law: Norplant and the Bad Mother." Marriage and Family Review 21.3/4 (1995): 259-81.

Appendix A
Coding Agenda

Category: Mainstream Reproductive Rights Activism			
Category	Definition	Examples	Coding Rules
C1: Choice	Women have the right to choose whether or not to have children.		<p>Look for the following exemplars of “choice”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to sterilization as reproductive tool • Autonomy / privacy in reproductive control decisions • Voluntary contraceptive use to control reproduction (prevent unwanted births)
C2: Abortion	Women have the fundamental right to safe and legal abortion.	<p>Jennifer Nelson: “Women’s bodies should not be controlled by men [i.e. male doctors, male legislators].”</p> <p>Safe and legal abortion = women’s liberation</p>	Look for content that suggests the need for legislation to ensure women have the right to safe and legal abortion.

C3: Population Control	Educating women about contraception and availing them of contraceptive devices is in the social interest.	Reducing birth rates ensures that children are wanted and able to be cared for... overpopulation results in disastrous effects.	Look for terminology (population control) and the benefits associated with it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservation of natural resources • Children are able to be properly cared for • Lower crime rates • Lower instances of poverty
C4: Racial Discordance	Racial representation between the decision-makers within an organization and those individuals they claim to represent are unbalanced (generally white women deciding for women of color).	Dorothy Roberts: “The mainstream reproductive rights organizations like Planned Parenthood, the National Abortion Rights Action League (NARAL), and the National Organization for Women [have been] predominantly made up of white middle-class or well-to-do women. They have set the mainstream agenda on what reproductive rights mean.”	Pay attention to both text and accompanying photographs. What is the racial representation?

Category: Reproductive Justice			
Category	Definition	Examples	Coding Rules
C1: Justice	Women must have the right to have, or not have, children and resist strategies of population control that attack the right of bodily determination without conformity to moral rightness or social equity.	<p>Dorothy Roberts: “Denying someone the right to bear children or punishing her for exercising that right denies her of a basic part of her humanity.”</p> <p>“Women of color seek abortions not because they don’t want the responsibility of motherhood, but because they cannot afford it.”</p>	<p>Look for the following exemplars of “justice”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcry against coerced/forced sterilization (temporary or permanent) • Outcry against birth control as punishment (for welfare mothers, drug addicted mothers, etc.) • Opposition to state funding for permanent methods of birth control (i.e. sterilization) while state refuses to fund temporary methods (contraception/abortion) • Call for general economic reform

<p>C2: Access</p>	<p>Ensure the availability of contraceptive services to all women regardless of geographic location or income.</p> <p>A critical problem for reproductive rights advocates is that the reproductive rights debates have been focused almost exclusively on women's access to one medical procedure.</p>	<p>March for Women: "The legal right to abortion remains an empty promise for women who lack financial resources and geographic proximity to actually realize this right. Federal money cannot be used to fund abortion services, penalizing low-income women. Eighty-seven percent of US counties do not have abortion services. Many parental involvement laws prevent young women from accessing reproductive services."</p>	<p>Look for the following exemplars of "access":</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where are PPAA services located? • Who pays for it? • Are there public or private funding sources available for women who need services? • Who is accessing the service?
--------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

C3: Health	Ensure that women are adequately treated for a wide array of medical issues that threaten their overall health, not just their reproductive health.	<p>March for Women: “About 15 percent of the US population (44 million Americans, including 8.5 million children), do not even have health insurance.”</p> <p>Healthy moms = healthy families</p>	<p>Look for the following exemplars of “health”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prenatal / postnatal care • Healthy parent / child relationship (i.e. access to child care, parenting classes, healthcare for children, etc.) • General healthcare – breast exams, physicals, hygiene, etc.
C4: Racial Concordance	<p>Racial representation among the decision-makers within an organization and those for whom they claim to advocate is balanced.</p> <p>All sides are being considered.</p>	<p>Loretta Ross: “African-American women have never been ... one-dimensional activists. African-American women have made consistent and critical activist contributions to the evolution of the reproductive rights movement in the United States.”</p>	<p>Pay attention to both text and accompanying photographs. Take notice of instances when the players are racially diverse.</p>

Category: Other

Use this section to record any new themes or conditions that may emerge during the analysis.

**Appendix B
Coding Sheet**

<p>Type of document? (a) Planning Meeting Minutes (b) Press Clipping</p>
<p>Source documentation:</p>
<p>For Minutes: Name of Transcriber: _____</p> <p>Date of Meeting: _____</p> <p>Place of Meeting: _____</p> <p>Total pages: _____</p>
<p>For Press Clipping: Name of Author: _____</p> <p>Title of Article: _____</p> <p>Title of Publication: _____</p> <p>Date of Publication: _____</p> <p>Total pages: _____</p>

Category: Mainstream Reproductive Rights Activism	
Sub-Category	
C1: Choice	
C2: Abortion	
C3: Population Control	

C4: Racial Discordance**Category: Reproductive Justice****Sub-Category****C1: Justice****C2: Access**

C3: Health

C4: Racial Concordance

Category: Other