

OCTOBER, 1969 Vol. 1 No. 1

CONCERNED DEMOGRAPHY

WHITHER CONCERNED DEMOGRAPHY ?

While the next Population Association meeting is almost seven months away, Concerned Demographers has already begun the necessary task of preparing for convention programs and activities.

The most immediate task is organizing for two regular program sessions which will heavily involve the membership of Concerned Demographers. One panel session will feature a discussion of the relationship between foundations, the government and the demographic researcher. The other session will consist of papers evaluating current trends in demography.

Concerned Demographers will also prepare a constitutional amendment which would permit equal voting rights for both regular and student members. Current voting rights for students are based on the ability of the student to afford the \$20 regular membership, which permits voting, as opposed to the \$6 student membership which forbids voting.

Concerned Demographers also hopes to print one or two more newsletters before the convention. These would hopefully deal in detail with various issues in the profession of demography.

Establishment of the two regular program sessions was achieved after negotiation with Daniel Price, PAA

WHY A NEW ORGANIZATION ?

In a nutshell, Concerned Demographers has been formed to raise issues about the relationship of the profession of demography to the outside world. It sees the demographer as both a scholar and a responsible citizen of the world.

Concern with social issues is not new to demography. In comparison with many disciplines, demography has shown a clear scholarly interest in such commonly identified social issues

(continued page 3)

CALL FOR MONEY

Concerned Demographers has a small operating budget. But unfortunately, its sources of income are even smaller. Currently, the organization is supported financially by a few demography students at Wisconsin.

Individuals and organizations interested in perpetuating Concerned Demographers are urged to make donations of \$2 to Concerned Demographers, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin, Madison. A contribution will entitle you to copies of future newsletters and other literatures.

8408 5

(continued page 5)

BEGINNINGS OF CONCERNED DEMOGRAPHERS

How was Concerned Demographers founded? In essence, students from the University of Wisconsin came to the 1969 Population Association meeting with some critical ideas about the profession. They found in several discussions that other demographers shared their concern. And the result was a tentative agreement to organize an informal group within the PAA to stimulate discussion on issues of mutual concern.

The critical ideas evolving at Wisconsin have developed as the population studies center has grown in students, faculty and research. Students through mutual interchange with faculty have hammered out positions on demographic training, the role of the demographer as a responsible researcher and needed areas of research in population.

The events at Wisconsin represent a microcosm of what is or should be happening at the rapidly growing population centers across the country.

While not all have agreed, most Wisconsin students have supported increased involvement of students in the administration and organization of the center. Their arguments have been based on the premise that many areas such as faculty hiring, library book ordering and recruitment of students have a direct and integral relationship with their lives. Thus, these areas would benefit from the advice of the persons most concerned with them.

The students have always made clear their strong determination to refrain from interference in areas of traditional scholarly freedom. These areas include the independent pursuit of research and determination of course grades.

Some of the other concerns at Wisconsin are outlined in the lead article in this newsletter.

The main impetus for the national organization of Concerned Demographers came at an informal discussion the first night, Thursday,

of the 1969 PAA meeting. For at least two hours, several score demographers -- of all viewpoints -- traded ideas on the current state of population studies. As one participant noted, "This was the best session I've ever attended at the PAA."

Most of the criticism of the PAA were met with varied replies. O. D. Duncan, PAA President said that the dissidents could always get out if they did not like the organization. However, some other members felt that the critics should be heard since they generally represented the future generation of professionals.

Another defender of current trends in the population profession felt that the critics were spoiled because they generally had not suffered the hardships of the Great Depression. "We had to live out of the garbage can," the demographer pointed out.

Some critics attacked alleged links between U.S. family planning and military programs abroad, but this was denied by other demographers, who wanted to know evidence of the links.

Other critics were concerned about the lack of research on the relationship between social structure and population. A defender of current trends rebutted this argument by exclaiming that the speaker was "a jerk."

Other criticisms were made of the PAA program sessions, on the

(continued page 6)

OFFICIAL STATEMENT

Concerned Demography is the official publication of Concerned Demographers, an organization of scholars at U.S. population studies centers. The Newsletter will be published two or three times a year. Subscription is \$2 per year. Mailing address: Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 53706. Editor of the publication is Charles Hirschman.

WHY... continued from p.

The use of demographers as uninformed propagandists may have dire consequences. If birth control programs are not effective by themselves in reducing birth rates, public confidence may be shaken in the scholarly competence of demographic research. Furthermore, the heavy reliance on birth control programs could distract from the need for social and economic reforms which may be necessary before economic development and fertility declines will occur.

While critical of aspects of family planning programs, Concerned Demographers approves of the use of birth control devices and some of the purposes of family planning. Family planning clinics, for instance, may permit greater freedom of choice for women in the type of method used for fertility control.

(2) Many demographers are concerned because their research results and debates are rarely understood or presented in the public. For instance, a few noteworthy criticisms of the success of family planning programs have been written. But the educated public has almost no knowledge of the main points of these articles. As another example, while some research suggests that our central cities are not really deserted by the middle class, many of the current urban social policy considerations are based on opposite premises.

The problem stems from the fact that debates and results are presented only selectively by the communications media, generally to support their positions. Selective presentation is most true of some U.S. governmental publications, particularly those of the Agency for International Development.

Obviously, the answer to the problem of selective presentation is not simple, but the demographic profession does not even discuss the problem. As one simple measure, demographers in the Agency for International Development could make sure that their publications discuss fairly both sides of population issues.

(3) Many demographers are concerned because little information is available on procedures for determining national research priorities. And the

little current information suggests that priorities are often determined by a limited number of persons. This issue will become increasingly important with the growth in the amount of government and foundation money for population research.

Will the direction of population research be determined almost completely by a small number of officials in the Population Council, the Ford Foundation and the new U.S. Government Population Research Center? Or will clients and subjects of the research be consulted about their needs? For instance, why have U.S. black organizations rarely been consulted on their needs for knowledge? How many family planning programs have involved the active participation of the clients in setting up the program administration and goals?

(4) Many demographers are concerned because the profession of demography has made little effort to evaluate and upgrade its education. While formal committees exist on demographic education, their activities are either non-existent or not publicized. This issue will become increasingly important as demography expands, encompassing more students and training centers.

The lack of concern with demographic education extends to basic definitions of the field. Since the Hauser and Duncan volume The Study of Population appeared in the late 1950's, little effort has been made to define demography, population studies or the relationship among the two.

In evaluating and administering demography programs, almost no effort has been made to consult demography graduate students on the strengths and goals of their programs.

Almost no literature is widely available on the organization and philosophy of demographic training programs around the country.

(5) Many demographers are concerned because the profession

(continued page 6)

WHY... continued from p. 1

as the high population growth rate, race relations, the food crisis, urbanization, and educational and occupational mobility.

As citizens, demographers have been in the forefront of movements for social justice. For instance, some demographers successfully worked for the inclusion of questions on education and income in the 1940 census. The result was a mass of data documenting the inequities of the U.S. social system.

The current concern stems from a feeling that several issues have been ignored or superficially analyzed by the field of demography. While many individuals are concerned about current trends in demography, they have lacked an organized vehicle. Concerned Demographers will provide a forum for the discussion of some of the issues that have been expressed only individually.

Some may think that Concerned Demographers is simply another radical organization. This is hard to deny in the sense that the members act ethically as citizens in support of radical values which cannot be researched to prove their correctness -- mass democracy, civil liberties and rights, equal opportunity. The claim will be wrong in the sense that the members see the role of the demographer as that of a scholar with social responsibilities, not that of a social activist who perverts his scholarly results to fit his own ideology.

PAPERS NEEDED

Concerned Demographers desperately needs papers for the session at the next Population Association meeting entitled "Evaluations of Current Trends in Demography." These papers should be essays evaluating the current state of population studies in various areas. This session is described in more detail in the article in the Newsletter on future plans of Concerned Demographers. Ideas for papers should be sent by Nov. 1 to Karl Taeuber, The RAND Corporation, 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, California 90406.

More specifically, what are some of the concerns among individual demographers?

(1) Many demographers are concerned because population scholars are being used as uninformed propagandists in world-wide family planning programs.

Increasing U.S. governmental reliance on birth control devices as a cheap means of encouraging economic development has led to the wholesale hiring of demographers as administrators and public relations agents. These demographers are now claiming that family planning will reduce the population growth rate which in turn will free capital from feeding and clothing excess populations. The free capital can then be used in development projects.

But in their rush to propagate clinics and control devices, demographers have almost completely ignored their basic skill -- careful, well-designed research. As a result, we know almost nothing about the relationships among the above variables, which supposedly produce economic growth.

Certainly, the advocacy of political positions by scholars should be admired. But the scholar has the responsibility to base his arguments on documented research.

The involvement of demographers in national family planning programs may also be criticized on other grounds. The family planners have generally failed to distinguish between the values and facts in their arguments, a crucial responsibility for the scholar.

For instance, it is still unclear whether women in underdeveloped countries actually want to reduce their family size. Attitude studies show they do, but actions do not support the attitude studies. Many family planners seem to confuse their value judgment that women should have smaller families with the actual facts.

(continued page 4)

WHITHER... continued from p. 1

program chairman. Regular space and facilities at Atlanta, Georgia, will be provided for the sessions.

One session on the relationship between foundations, the government and the researcher is being organized by Avery M. Guest, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin. This panel session will hopefully feature different positions on the role of the demographic scholar, both in accepting money and in carrying out his research. For instance, some Concerned Demographers have been bothered by the wholehearted espousal of governmental family planning programs by demographers without much empirical basis for their opinions.

Another important question revolves around how priorities will be established for demographic research supported by the increasingly large amounts of foundation and governmental funds.

Guest needs the names of potential panel members who would represent a wide variety of viewpoints. He also needs suggested topics for discussion.

The session on evaluation of current trends in demography will be chaired by Karl E. Taeuber, The RAND Corporation, 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, California. Taeuber shares the interest of Concerned Demographers in relating demography to the larger world. However, his position as chairman in no way indicates his agreement with the various positions of Concerned Demographers.

For this session Concerned Demographers hopes to obtain essays on the state of demographic knowledge in various areas. These papers would be critical of current research trends and hopefully suggest new directions for research activity. The papers would not have to be based on specific empirical research of the author.

Papers have already been suggested on such subjects as The Demography of Elites, the Relationship of Marxist Thought to Human Ecology, Needed Demographic Studies of the Black Population.

Papers are desperately needed on the current state of family planning

programs, particularly in regard to the question of their effectiveness in reducing birth rates. Another paper is sought on the philosophical premises underlying recent social stratification research, particularly as expounded in the recent Blau and Duncan book, The American Occupational Structure.

Persons who wish to communicate their ideas for papers, however tentative, should contact Guest or Taeuber in the very near future.

In regards to student voting rights, Concerned Demographers has a committee working on a constitutional amendment which would permit student members to have equal voting rights with regular members. The names of at least five regular members must be obtained so that this amendment may be submitted to the regular membership.

The reduced student membership fee was instituted to permit some student participation in the Population Association, including receipt of the various publications. This was a praiseworthy effort to recognize that demography students are less able to afford the regular membership than paid employees in the area of population.

The constitution, as it now stands, does not forbid student voting as long as \$20 is paid for a regular membership. Of course, most graduate students cannot easily afford this \$20, even though they have a strong commitment to the profession of demography.

Neither does the present constitution intend for voting to be on the basis of amount of professional training. Any person in the area of population, regardless of his education, is entitled to a regular vote if he pays the \$20 membership fee and indicates a continuing interest in population.

In essence, the constitutional provisions on voting cannot be interpreted as discrimination of the basis of professional

(continued page 6)

BEGINNINGS...from p. 2

grounds that they were narrow-ranged in topics and often represented only one viewpoint. Duncan urged the critics to make formal suggestions for change.

The following day, Friday, another session was held to establish a more formal organization. Representatives of Wisconsin, Pittsburg, Massachusetts, Brown, Cornell, Michigan and Temple expressed interest in the organization. The session unanimously agreed that the students from Wisconsin would collectively serve as chairman school for the first year.

The Wisconsin students attempted on short notice to prepare a constitutional amendment which would abolish special voting rights for regular members as opposed to student members. Unfortunately, a misunderstanding on the constitutional procedure and a lack of time necessitated postponement of action.

Beyond the immediate goal of forming an organization, the Concerned Demographers activity at the PAA meeting has two immediately positive benefits:

(1) It served as a means of communication for the numerous young demographers. Previously, the large number of students at the convention had little basis on which to meet each other and discuss interests and activities.

(2) The activity also indicated to the more established PAA members that a large proportion of the membership was disgruntled with the current convention program. Undoubtedly, the program will be livened up in future years.

WHY...continued from p. 4

has made little effort to recruit members of U.S. minority groups. While significant efforts have been made to recruit non-U.S. foreigners, almost no attention has been devoted to the foreigners within our boundaries, the black population.

An increased number of minority group members may not insure technical improvement in studies. But a wider social base in the demographic

profession may bring new perspectives on the key social issues which demography should be studying.

Furthermore, the recruitment of more minority group members will be a small but significant contribution in the development of a social system of equal opportunity in the United States.

WHITHER...cont. from p. 5

training but simply discrimination on income.

Since students now comprise between one-fourth and one-third of the PAA membership, decisions of the organization are made without any consultation with a very large proportion of the membership. The granting of full membership rights to students should insure a more representative organization and involved membership.

Future issues of the publication Concerned Demography will hopefully deal with several important issues in the demographic profession. Tentatively, for the next issue the newsletter staff plans a series of articles evaluating demographic training at various population centers. Students or faculty members interested in writing these articles should contact Charles Hirschman, editor, Concerned Demography, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR ENCOURAGED

December, 1969

Vol. 1 No. 2

CONCERNED DEMOGRAPHY

POPULATION - THE SECOND FRONT

President Nixon's July special message on population is important for two reasons. First, it represents the new official interpretation of the prime cause of poverty--overpopulation or too many children. Second, it calls on the demographer-scholar to serve as an agent for legitimizing this view and spreading the ideology of family planning.

The 3,500 word message was presented in a press conference to a yawning Congress and American people. A prime architect of the message was Daniel Patrick Moynihan, liberal academia's representative in the White House. He has increasingly come to see population as the root of all evil.

While the message desperately needs discussion in the profession, demographers will probably devote almost all their energies instead to formulating research proposals for the money made available as part of the message. To date, they have not thought much about the implications of the message for the types of research they will be permitted to undertake. Nor have they thought much about how scholarship is being used to further the national interest as formulated by Nixon.

The message's interpretation of poverty works at two levels, explaining the differences in poverty between nations and within nations. Both explanations are not new but represent the first concise, relatively coherent statements by an American president.

The Nixon interpretation of poverty within nations directs most of its attention to the United States. A large proportion of the poor fell into that state, the argument runs, because they have too many children. Supposedly, several million families could be removed from poverty if they only reduced their libidinal drives or at least capped them with intra-uterine devices. With a smaller number of children, the argument continues, families would have more money to spend per capita.

This argument is essentially old wine in new bottles. It implies that the problem of the poor is due to their moral laxity and ignorance of means of preventing births. Sections of the American middle class have been arguing this for decades.

The message's solution to the problem, family planning, is very similar to the proposals of the eugenics movement. Now, instead of sterilizing the poor or the less able, the poor will be provided with contraceptives so they can reduce their numbers and not be a burden on the income earned by the sweat of all the hard working, decent Americans.

In essence, Nixon's message on population contains his most explicit positive program to date in the area of race relations--an I.U.D. for every black American. Somehow if the blacks go away, the problems of civil rights

NIXON ADDRESS (CON'T FROM PG. 1)

racial equality also ought to disappear.

Many poverty families could undoubtedly benefit from the services of family planners. We know, for instance, that black women have more children than they desire. But for most of the poor, the allegedly larger family size is a symptom of familial chaos and lack of planning which result from poverty, not cause it. Furthermore, it is somewhat doubtful that the fertility of the poor is very excessive, once rural background is considered. The excessive fertility of the poor may be seen as a consequence of the social norms and organization of rural life.

The explanation of poverty between nations represents the fruition of only partial success by U.S. academics and public servants in explaining why Walt Whitman Rostow's model of economic development has not been working. The so-called underdeveloped countries have not been churning into the industrial and post-industrial age under the guiding hands of the Agency for International Development and the protective might of the U.S. military. For a short time, policy makers flirted with the idea that the backward countries lacked the achievement motivation that had allegedly been so key in our own triumphant rise to success. But more recently, the real villain has been identified--overpopulation. The argument is simple: High growth rates force high expenditures on feeding, clothing and schooling non-employed hordes of young people. Potential development capital is thus lost.

It would be silly to deny that world population growth rates are not potentially disastrous. If population does actually double as predicted in the next 30 years, resources and environment as we know them may be severely strained. The quality and styles of life around the world may have to change. Certainly, the current high growth rates may also have a

deleterious effect on economic growth, although the evidence is a lot less conclusive than Nixon would suggest.

Being a good politician, Nixon has blended a mix of truths, half-truths, philosophies and pseudo-scientific theories about these problems into an explanation of why the world does not consist of happy, well-fed faces. The argument appeals to humanitarians, who are undoubtedly impressed with Nixon's concern for poverty and hunger around the world. It appeals to Catholics because no mention is made of abortion, which has been the most effective means of reducing birth rates in some socialist countries. It appeals to the military and the elites of underdeveloped countries because no changes are suggested in the current social structures. And it has appeal for the U.S. Congress because the solutions will cost almost nothing.

Nixon's only serious suggestion for the underdeveloped countries is family planning, but this time on a national basis instead of just for the unwashed as in the United States. Supposedly, family planning programs provide the contraceptive devices which women are eagerly awaiting so they can prevent unwanted births. Thus, family planning becomes the means of reducing population growth which in turn will lead to economic development.

The only problem with family planning on a world-wide basis is that it does not always work. Regardless of which explanation for its failure is accepted, family planning has not clearly reduced the rate of population growth of any underdeveloped country. Possible exceptions might be Formosa and South Korea, but massive social and economic changes have also been occurring in these countries. Most of these changes such as urbanization and

economic development have been associated with the fertility decline in the West, regardless of family planning. Most of the arguments for the failure of family planning have revolved around two issues: (1) Numerous institutions in traditional society support high fertility, and (2) National growth rates would still be far above zero even if women had the number of children they desired.

The perversion of family planning into an instrument of national policy is distressing to those who see its positive aspects. No doubt many women throughout the world could use its services to space children and prevent unwanted births. In individual cases, it may be helpful in eliminating family poverty.

President Nixon's call to demographers to join him in the war on population consisted of a proposal for a national study commission and increased research funds. This call represents a further threat to the scholarly integrity of the population profession. Already, demographers are being used as administrators and public relations men for governmental family planning programs around the world. The pages of Demography and other population journals have been filled with glowing reports of family planning. To the layman, these reports have the ring of scholarly objectivity and truth. To many professionals, they have become the ultimate in slipshod methodology, half-baked interpretations and outright lies.

Now, more demographers will undoubtedly be hired as propagandists for family planning, although they may be called researchers. When the educated public finally catches onto the chicanery, the integrity of the profession of demography will fall to a new low.

Several good analyses of family planning have appeared, but unfortunately these are lost in the numerous slick reports of foundations

and government bureaucracies such as AID, which are mobilized to push a viewpoint, that family planning is the solution to man's ills.

Some respected demographers feel that sound studies of family planning will soon appear. But pressure is still strong in many population centers to restrain criticism of family planning, for fear that government and foundation research contracts will be jeopardized in other areas of population research.

The establishment of a national study commission on the future population trends is encouraging in the sense that very little is known about the relationship between population and society. But it is discouraging in that it represents another attempt to grapple with a problem by studying it to death. We have already seen study commissions on civil disorders and violence. How many policy changes have resulted from their deliberations?

How much more study do we need to verify the hypothesis that fertility invariably falls when mortality drops and urbanization and industrialization occur? What is preventing the Nixon Administration from urging large doses of economic and technical aid to encourage industrialization and economic development around the world? One answer is simple: Industrialization is not to our economic benefit. While little is known about the symbiotic relationships among nations, it is clear that much of the dynamism of American industrial life is supported by the exploitation of the resources of underdeveloped countries. In other words, resources are extracted cheaply from the underdeveloped countries to feed our furnaces and faces. Economic development would provide more challengers for world resources and would eliminate sources of cheap industrial inputs.

(continued page 7)

THE DEMOGRAPHY OF JOY

To the outside world, the journal of Demography represents the best and the most typical thinking in the population field. The advancement of a discipline is largely determined by the types and styles of article which appear in its leading journal.

Where, then, has Demography been leading us? The answer is clear: toward propaganda for family planning, away from concern with crucial domestic issues related to urbanization and race relations, toward continued non-concern with demographic theory and training, toward individual rather than social structural or human ecological studies of society.

Demography has marched during its first five years under Donald J. Bogue, the leading guru of the world family planning crusade. Bogue has now been replaced by Beverly Duncan, apparently with the encouragement of the Population Association Board of Directors. The quality of Demography has improved noticeably under Mrs. Duncan's short editorship. But the PAA Board has not absolved itself of guilt for the long-term failure of Demography. If the Board had really been concerned about the journal, it would have acted before the end of five years, either by appointing another editor or by providing more editorial help for Bogue.

The traditional response to criticisms of scholarly journals is that the editor can only select from the material he receives. This argument is fallacious on several grounds: (1) The journal could easily have been smaller in size and thus more selective; (2) The editor sought articles in his particular areas of interest; (3) Persons with deviant or unconventional viewpoints often must be encouraged to publish. Bogue rarely printed conflicting viewpoints on issues.

The primary concern of Demography has been fertility and

family planning. Of the 282 articles, research notes and book review articles, some 39 per cent dealt with these areas. This emphasis should not necessarily be condemned since fertility problems are commonly proclaimed as key to the solution of other problems such as hunger and poverty. But, of the scores of articles on family planning, how many were actually critical of its effectiveness? The search by the Concerned Demography staff produced one article, a book review by Philip M. Hauser in a 1967 issue. The neglect of criticism would have been acceptable if no one had ever argued publicly that family planning programs had problems. But other demographers such as Kingsley Davis had already raised questions elsewhere. And certainly, any sociology student with a course in elementary research methods could have picked out the numerous methodological flaws in scores of Demography articles on family planning.

Another related issue is the lack of discussion of the motives and effects of the family planning movement. In last year's special issue on Family Planning Around the World, the reader started with special reports on the benevolence of the Ford Foundation, the Agency for International Development, the Population Council, and the Planned Parenthood Federation. But where was a discussion in depth of the distrust of the family planning programs by many liberal-minded intellectuals in Latin America? Where was the serious discussion of the role of family planning as part of U.S. foreign military and economic relations? In an article on the Population Council, Frank Notestein, stated that the "mounting tempo of growth among the world's poorest people" is a threat to political stability. Isn't

"political stability" the international equivalent of domestic concern for "law and order."?

Among the 282 articles, only 21 dealt with population distribution, urbanization or human ecology. Twelve of these articles were published in the first two volumes, in 1964 and 1965. In other words, as the urban and racial crisis in this country has grown, Demography has increasingly ignored it. The lack of concern with this topic is surprising since demographers and ecologists at the University of Chicago, Bogue's own school, have long been in the forefront of research on this topic.

The continued concern of Demography with pure description is indicated by the fact that only three articles were found which dealt directly with the topic of demographic theory. While other articles directed themselves to topics which might loosely be called "demographic theory," the total output could only be termed horrendous. We have advanced only a few steps beyond Lotka.

Only one article has appeared on demographic training and recruitment, during a period of rapid expansion of training programs and doctorates awarded in demographic areas. Perhaps a purely scholarly journal should not be concerned with this topic. But then, where else is there a place for discussion of the topic? Certainly one head of demography should know what the other head or the foot is doing.

In a related area, no one during the first five years of the journal has directed himself to the question, what are demography and population studies? What are the key areas for study? How does population study distinguish itself from other academic disciplines? These ideas have been discussed elsewhere but not since the rapid expansion of the profession in the 60's.

What about the future? No doubt, the Don Bogue style of demography will live on since his editorial decisions have shaped the style of ongoing research projects. In other words, why undertake research unless you have a chance for publication? The increased governmental concern with family planning as the solution for world poverty will also undoubtedly lead to a further flood of shoddy articles by half-trained government bureaucrats. The new editor will probably have a hard time resisting these pressures.

But the Demography of the future will probably reflect a more balanced viewpoint on the goals and areas of population research. Mrs. Duncan's wide experience as a scholar in numerous areas should lead to better editing and a wider variety of articles. It still remains to be seen, however, whether Mrs. Duncan will actively encourage different viewpoints on key scholarly issues. It is also unclear whether Demography will be a forum for discussion of general issues on the direction of demographic research and education.

STAFF BOX

Concerned Demography is an occasional publication of Concerned Demographers, Center for Demography and Ecology, Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin, Madison 53706. Concerned Demographers is a national organization of scholars interested in relating demographic research and training to the larger society. It has no official ties with the Center for Demography and Ecology of the University of Wisconsin. Subscriptions are available at \$2 per year. Editor-in-Chief is Paul Schollaert. Executive Editor is Ezekiel Cumings.

NIH, NSF: Up Against the Wall? ⁶

Slowly but surely the last bastions of objective social science are falling. Ten years ago, almost every right thinking social scientist knew that his discipline looked at issues in a value-free manner and worked in an atmosphere of non-governmental interference. But in the past year, two of the last centers of value-free research, NIH and NSF, have been exposed as the political arms of the government.

Earlier this year, President Nixon vetoed a proposed director of the National Science Foundation, Dr. Franklin Long, because he happened to oppose the Vietnam War. Nixon eventually admitted that his interference was wrong, strictly speaking. But the warning was clear to all aspiring scientific bureaucrats--don't take too strong a stand against the government.

More recently, the New York Times has exposed in several stories the fact that NSF and the National Institutes of Health prohibit membership on their advisory panels by scores of scientists who have political leanings to the left of Hubert Humphrey. This practice has been followed since World War II, the Times reported. The blacklist includes some scientists whose most flagrant sin has been active opposition to the Vietnam War. Most of these scientists have received security clearance from cautious agencies such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Caught with their value-free pants down, NSF and NIH said they would probably abolish the lists. It turned out that they simply abolished some of the names on the list, but not the lists themselves. The Times has editorially condemned any list.

What does this all mean for demography? It means simply that some of the most unconventional members of our profession have not been on panels that have evaluated research projects and proposals for population training centers.

Of course, issues of academic freedom are involved. But just as importantly the substance of American population research has undoubtedly been shaped by the policy. We will probably never know to what degree "safe" men have picked "safe" research projects and population centers with "safe" students and faculty.

Perhaps the most dismal aspect of the NSF and NIH situations is the fact that scientists have not publicly blown the whistle on this practice previously. Certainly, top social scientists in the government must have been aware of this practice. The willingness of scientists to maintain silence in itself suggests the extent of the subservience of academia to the political goals of the government.

Concerned scholars have already begun to mobilize their forces in opposition to any political interference in social science research. These rapidly forming groups could use the active help of distinguished demographers, who really believe in academic freedom.

The great mass of the demographic profession can also collectively protest this political interference.

As a first step, all major population studies centers around the country should collectively agree to refuse further government aid until evaluation panels are selected on a non-political basis. Obviously, the opposition of one center would have little effect. But the government, which wants to undertake population research, will have to surrender if all potential recipients work together.

As a second step, both the board of directors and the general membership of the Population Association of America should pass resolutions condemning the selection of panel members on the basis of political beliefs.

"WHOM CAN YOU TRUST?" ⁷

The policy of the journal, Demography, regarding the anonymity of authors sorely needs review. Unlike many scholarly journals, Demography keeps the names and positions of authors on their articles when they are sent to referees. This is primarily so, we have been told by an editor, because "the referees know whom they can trust." In other words, the referees will not have to waste time reviewing or correcting sections of articles written by authors they respect.

This rationale for the policy is the main reason why it should be changed. Since at least parts and often whole articles are apparently evaluated on the basis of the authorship, the "stars" of the profession are bound to have almost all articles published. This would not be a bad policy if the "stars" produced consistently high quality work. Unfortunately, this is not the case, either in demography or other scholarly disciplines. Since the "stars" are apparently almost guaranteed a place in the pages of Demography, less space is available for the work of younger and less known scholars.

We have also been told that removing the names of authors would have little effect anyway since most authors tend to have their subjects and style of work, which are readily identifiable. This rationale may have had some validity during the formative years of the profession when most demographers were located at three or four universities and in Washington. But the size and scope of the profession no longer makes this argument highly plausible, although undoubtedly identification is possible in many cases.

The only ill effect of a policy of anonymity would be more effort required by the referees to review work of the "stars." This might be beneficial to both the "stars" and the referees, if some articles in the first years of Demography are any indication.

The Demography editors assure us that no name will be kept on an

article if the author indicates his desire. If Demography refuses to change its policy, we suggest all scholars ask for anonymity when they submit their work.

Nixon
(Continued from Page 3)

What would be the response of the demographic profession to President Nixon's message? One response would be two resolutions passed by the next meeting of the Population Association of America. The first resolution would commend Nixon's concern with population as a serious world problem. But it would condemn Nixon's emphasis on population as the sole or most important cause of poverty within and between nations. A second resolution would commend the increased interest in population research but would also make clear the determination of the demographic profession to undertake and evaluate research in an atmosphere of academic freedom. The resolution would further state that the PAA has no position on the value of family planning at least until further research is available.

What is the solution to high population growth rates? History teaches that the traditional solutions have been war, disease, and famine--all leading to death. In the past two centuries, only technological improvements in agriculture have thwarted even higher rates of death. The world is dominated today by a nation which is dedicated as previous powers to preservation of the status quo, through military and economic power. Unless agricultural technology responds to the challenge, there is little reason to believe that future solutions to overpopulation will be different than the past.

BOOK REVIEWS

Editor's Note--In some issues Concerned Demography will present reviews of current books in the area of population. This issue, two of the leading introductory textbooks are reviewed: Donald Bogue, Principles of Demography (John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1969); William Petersen, Population (Second Edition) (The Macmillan Co., 1969).

BETTER DEAD THAN RED

Careful reading of William Peterson's revised edition of the undergraduate textbook, POPULATION, may reveal more about "the politics of population" than did an earlier work of that very title by the same author. It is a fitting demographic contribution to the "sociology of the smooth society" typified by such writers as S.M. Lipset, Daniel Bell or Richard Hofstadter. The book reaffirms the American experience as one of consensus and integration, while blasting our commie enemies in superlative cold war rhetoric. Unfortunately, as an important undergraduate textbook, it may serve as the major statement on population processes, problems, and policies for a large number of students.

The volume is quite lacking in its discussion of population theories. A very complete statement of Malthusian principles is presented early in the book, along with the many modifications and clarifications since added to this scheme. But the major theoretical critic of Malthus, Karl Marx, is treated in a most unscholarly fashion. Marxist population principles are relegated to a minor position in the chapter on the "The Population of Totalitarian Societies," where the discussion is distorted by peppering it with quotes appropriate to nineteenth century scholarship styles. In one passage,

(continued)

SCORE

DON BOGUE 0
OPPOSITION 87

Don Bogue is cheerleader, coach and quarterback of the world family planning movement. He attempts to lead the team onto victory in his action-packed 917-page introductory demography text.

The opposition is clear: Parson Malthus who argued that population and resources were in a precarious balance; Karl Marx, who argued that social structure might somehow be related to problems of population quantity and quality. Why is the opposition wrong? Because almost everyone is as rational as Bogue. Everyone sees that population growth rates are the prime cause of poverty, ignorance, poor education, inadequate housing and whatever other ills are afflicting the world. Everyone is rushing out to get I.U.D.'s from his local friendly family planning agent.

Bogue tells us that the book was "moonlighted" during the past six years while he attempted to stick his finger in the fertility dike. But even while he "moonlighted," Bogue could not escape from the obsession which runs through the book and prevents consideration in depth of any other issues.

Unlike William Petersen's introductory text, this book is not filled with tales of commie atrocities. In fact, Bogue drops in a note here and there that he actually gets along well with his communist demographer colleagues. The only enemies, Bogue implies, are those who suggest that fertility rates may have something to do with social conditions.

If this book were well-written, it would probably be a hot number in the textbook market. In spite of this flaw, the book may sell anyway because it certainly espouses

(continued)

Petersen
(continued from page 8)

Petersen jabs at Marx for referring to Malthus as a "shamless sycophant of the ruling class."

While urging us to consider the writings of Malthus within their temporal context, Petersen would be well advised to do the same when discussing Marx and his followers. Even more importantly, the author has failed to consider reformulations and reinterpretations of Marxist theory in the way he did when discussing Malthus. This clearly throws suspicion on any discussion of the differences between the two.

Though the second edition of this book differs very little from the first in either philosophy or content, a much heralded addition was the increased emphasis on the population of underdeveloped nations. While there is a chapter on industrialization and population growth, it is little more than an excuse to talk about family planning programs. The entire discussion is based on the not so obvious premise that population growth is clearly detrimental to economic growth, although no real evidence is offered to support this proposition. From this assertion, Petersen naturally concludes that family planning programs are the panacea for world problems. Thus, we read about the operation of such programs in countries favorably disposed to the west--India and Taiwan. Although the author lacks Don Bogue's enthusiasm for these programs, he must feel that they are fairly complete solutions, for he fails to consider any other possible causes of growth. For example, he skims over the effects of social structure, claiming only that nationalism in underdeveloped countries will create higher fertility because such countries are likely to reject western patterns, including the western low fertility model. Of course, the question which is never raised is why these countries are apt to reject the west. Thus, we find the "new" material

(continued)

Bogue
(Continued from page 8)

the current conventional wisdom on the population problem. In any case, Bogue's obsession with holding back the fertility tide has apparently not left much time to think about writing. Chapters read like a stream of consciousness reports, one idea reminding Bogue of another. Whole sections of other books are quoted word for word. Tables with no significance run on for pages. Whole topics such as "marital status" are repeated in two different chapters. One table becomes the subject for pages of interpretation. Most of the significant articles and books in the past 10 years are not considered at all, although often listed in the extensive bibliographies.

The book might have some redeeming value if a few conceptual ideas linked the chapters. But topics appear or do not appear as if by chance. Apparently, Bogue does not like the Duncan occupational prestige scores, so he flips in his own hideous effort to do Duncan one better. To soften the blow of his new discovery on Duncan, Bogue says that Duncan would probably agree with him but that Peter Blau would not. Where did Peter Blau come from? Oh, he happens to be a colleague of Bogue's at Chicago who wrote a book with Duncan which used the prestige scores. Bogue presents a very extensive discussion of U.S. regionalism, at least as he saw it 10 years ago, but he has not kept up much since then. He assures us that he planned to write a chapter on Population and Economic Development, but alas, he never had time to write it.

Where were we? Oh yes, back to fertility control. Everywhere fertility rates are heading for a balance with death rates, Bogue assures us. This is happening in the United States too, Bogue announces, although

(continued)

Petersen
(Continued from page 9)

10
Bogue
(Continued from page 9)

on developing nations to be little more than a flacid regurgitation of the worst of the family planning propaganda.

Petersen lets his anti-communism get the best of him in the discussion of contemporary populations. He gives no real attention to repressive population policies in western countries--for instance, he nearly sidesteps the British Enclosure Law by claiming that their effects were minimal. Furthermore, he has no discussion of the ramifications of colonial policies on population. But in writing about nations in the Communist block, the text abounds with governmental atrocities described in glowing cold war rhetoric. For instance, the reader is left with the impression that the Russian leaders during the 1930's somehow wanted the population to starve. Another attempt to discredit the Russians is made by comparing their policies toward Jews to those of Nazi Germany. This attempt to throw the far left and the far right into the same bag is an old trick which has been mastered by our "smooth society sociologists". These alleged Russian policies, if true, are deplorable. But Petersen totally ignores, in the same context, American policies toward minority groups such as the blacks or the American Indians. Instead, he insists that we are moving toward an assimilated society. Nor does he comment on the American genocide in Vietnam. Surely these programs are equally deplorable, and an "objective" scholar would want to take account of them. These attempts to identify and discredit the enemy, rather than trying to synthesize some of the common experiences of nations undergoing demographic change are certainly out of place in a textbook.

In sum, this book is but another example of the non-neutrality of social science and the important place of values in scholarship. I would suggest that if it has a place in undergraduate instruction at all, it be in the illustration of these concepts, not in the teaching of a population course.

he does not bother to discuss the rich data to the contrary. Why are birth rates relatively low in the United States? The answer is simple, Bogue says: people use contraceptives. Thus, contraceptives will cause the decline in birth rates around the world.

Bogue does not completely scorn a concern with social structure. For instance, on page 166, he talks about "effeminate" and "virile" nations and the resulting sex compositions. You may be surprised to know that no differences exist between the two types of social structures in their sex composition.

Finally, Bogue does restrain himself on one issue. He admits that his mind is not made up on the value of eugenics. More research must be done, he tells the reader.

Get Your Copy...

Concerned Demography is putting together a mailing list for all future issues. It isn't necessary to contribute \$2.00 in order to be on the mailing list, although it does help. If you have not already written to us, please clip the form below and return it to: Concerned Demography, Center for Demography and Ecology, Social Science Building, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706.

____ I wish to be on the mailing list.
____ I would like to contribute ____.
____ Please remove my name from your mailing list.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY & STATE _____

CONCERNED DEMOGRAPHY

February 1970

Whose Environmental Crisis?

One of the sickest jokes of our age may be the so-called environmental, urban and population crises. Within a short period of less than a year, almost every public official from President Nixon to our local city council candidate has embraced with open arms the ideology of the three crises-in-one. And huffing and puffing close behind, many academicians have rushed to jump on the band wagon. Newspapers and magazines are filled with the academicians' "objective" solutions to the crises.

Up and
Coming

Don't miss the action-packed next issue of Concerned Demography -- The Convention Special. This issue will be distributed at the April meeting of the Population Association of America in Atlanta. We shall also send copies to our regular mailing list. This special issue will contain a full preview of all the thrills and chills you may expect at the PAA convention. Included in this issue will be a special article containing tips on how to recognize and meet all the demographic stars at the convention. Information will be provided also on the Concerned Demography party at the convention which will be called "Freak Out with the Concerned Demography Elites."

The sickness of the situation arises not from the falseness of the basic issue, the quality of the environment, but its use to divert attention from other issues such as the nature of American foreign policy and social inequality at home. During the 1960's, American military-foreign policy, particularly as enunciated through the Vietnam War, became exposed as a force for the repression of nationalism and economic development in underdeveloped countries around the world. It has become increasingly clear that the United States is dedicated to maintaining unrepresentative elites in power wherever possible. At home, a welfare program developed during the 60's which emphasized self-help and education as the panaceas to poverty problems. But the failure of this approach has indicated to many that the causes of poverty may actually lie in the society's unwillingness to redistribute its income.

Further public attention on these issues would probably have led to a crisis in government and industrial circles. Large segments of the population were coming to feel that on significant changes in society could lead to the end of American poverty and imperialism abroad. Unless public attention could be shifted to other issues, the positions of ruling business and military groups within the society would have been severely challenged. The environmental crisis

is a particularly welcome relief since the solutions of its concerned citizens call for no real changes in the organization of American society. The two major political parties have been especially eager to jump on the environmental crisis bandwagon. Since traditional "free enterprise" approaches have failed to solve domestic problems, the two parties were unable to propose any new program. The environmental crisis provides the Democrats and Republicans with issues to justify their existence.

Manipulation of the American public will be indicated by Presidential pronouncements on the environmental crises. While President Nixon proclaims his devotion to the "quality of life," he will propose very few concrete programs to support his rhetoric. Few of Nixon's proposals will actually require industrialists and automobile manufacturers to curb their pollution activities, which cause most of the problem. Most of the anti-pollution expenditures will be drawn from federal revenues, in other words from the ordinary citizen's pay check. Interestingly, many of the serious Nixon proposals to improve the quality of life involve "research on the environment." This is another effort to study a problem to death, much as periodic commission reports on civil disorders, violence and population. Some of the governmental efforts will be also devoted to using the tax payer's money to find technological devices to control pollution, at no cost to the polluters. Of course, whether these devices will be found is a problematic question. In any case, pollution will continue until technology solves the problem.

And in the meantime, the last vestiges of the meager governmental effort against poverty will be wiped out

and the military budget will continue to balloon. It is noteworthy that President Johnson also briefly expressed his concern about the "quality of life" when he cut back domestic programs in the middle 60's to support increased war spending. However, his concern failed to catch the imagination of the American public at the time.

The present concern with the environmental, urban and pollution crises has arisen out of upper middle class America. This can be discerned by looking at the membership lists of any of the involved organizations such as Zero Population Growth, the Population Reference Bureau and the Population Crisis Committee. Big industrialists and military representatives have also been involved, both on the board of directors of the organizations and as principal financial contributors, particularly for large ads in newspapers such as the New York Times. One of the foremost military representatives has been General William Draper (U.S.A.-Ret.), chairman of the Population Crisis Committee. Among the increasingly concerned upper middle class Americans are some quite liberal reformers such as Sen. Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin. While these persons have previously been sincere in their desire to eliminate poverty and curtail the military, their talents will now be lost in a probably fruitless struggle to improve the environment.

The causes of the concern about the environment among sizable segments of the population are easy to discern. Frequently conservationists and campers, the environmentalists are concerned about the overtaxing of recreational and camping facilities around the country. They are bothered that their cities are not beautiful

places to view. They are concerned that movement from one part of the city to another is slow and time consuming. In essence, they are bothered because their incomes do not bring them all the aesthetic joys and pleasures they seek. In any case, they are basically correct: our environment is ugly and overtaxed. One has only to look around in any city or park to realize that the environment could be much improved.

But then the environment has always been bad. In fact, in terms of its effect on human health and vitality, the environment has never been better than now. Infant mortality and disease rates less than 60 years ago indicate that very high proportions of the population lived very short lives. On the average, persons only lived two-thirds as long as they do now. In general, the air and water in centers of population concentration must have been rather foul. A look at photographs of immigrants districts 30 years ago will also suggest that today's environment is a paradise by comparison.

It is instructive to present the tenets of the crisis ideology and then discuss their validity:

1. The environmental and urban crises arise because too many persons are using the available facilities. If fewer persons used the facilities, there would be more facilities to go around.

2. There are too many people in the United States primarily because the poor are having too many children. The crisis people also believe that some middle class families may be having too many children.

3. The solution to the large family size of the poor is the use of family planning or birth control. Thus, the government should set up more family planning clinics. An often mentioned subsidiary tenet holds that

abortion should be legalized, but this is generally proposed less frequently than family planning.

4. The country would have more wealth to spend on facilities if the population were smaller. Large families have less money per capita than small families. Therefore, nations with high growth rates or large families must be poorer than nations with low growth rates or small families.

5. One solution to the environmental crisis is burying your trash and driving your car less.

6. The other principal solution is petitioning your government. In turn, government should ask businessmen to stop pollution. In general, the appropriate government action is poorly specified.

For most of the concerned Americans, their current ills would not have been encountered 15 or 20 years ago. It is the unparalleled rise in the prosperity of the American middle class since World War II which has permitted individual opportunities to enjoy the environment. The rapid increase in the number of automobiles per family and the number of highways have led eventually to crowded roads, campgrounds and recreational areas. Of course, a general growth in population has been associated with the overtaxing of facilities. While the 10 per cent increase in U.S. population in the past decade has undoubtedly led to further crowding and congestion, the problem has primarily resulted because our government has not planned for the changes. With more than 80 per cent of the budget ticked annually for the destruction of people, it has been impossible to plan for an anticipated growth in population size. If our government

really desired to build a suitable environment, it could do so. In any case, even with a rapidly expanding population, it will be several decades before we approach the population density of most European countries.

Even if one argues that the United States has too many people, it is difficult to accept the other tenets of the environmental crisis. While the very poor do have larger families, few persons have bothered to investigate empirically why this is true. Some evidence suggests that their excessive fertility may be attributed frequently to their rural backgrounds. Rural dwellers or rural born persons have traditionally had high fertility which has declined after a generation or so in the city. However, it is clear that some fertility among the poor, particularly Spanish speaking and blacks, is higher than rural backgrounds would predict. To date, most family planning programs have been only moderately successful with lower socio-economic groups in our society, primarily because most contraceptive devices require more planning of fertility than most lower socio-economic status women are able to manage. When life is continually chaotic, it is difficult to carefully manage family size through the proper use of contraceptives.

For lower SES women, and in fact, for most women in our society, legalization of abortion may provide a simple means of reducing the national growth rate to zero. Several recent studies, particularly by Westoff and Bumpass, suggest that American women have a great number of unplanned and unwanted births which might be prevented at the last moment by abortion. Certainly abortion has worked in Japan and Eastern European countries to reduce national growth rates to zero. Thus, for those who want action on the population front, a simple strategy might be concentrated effort to legalize abortion.

The argument about the ill effects of large families on national growth rates is still a question open for debate.

Finally, the emphasis of the environmentalists on individual responsibility to clean up one's own pollution and voluntary clean ups by business is just what U.S. industrial and governmental elites want to hear. In essence, these proposals will require them to do nothing. And they will do nothing.

For Americans concerned about really reducing imperialism abroad, inequality at home, and environmental pollution, the early 70's will be a trying period. While President Nixon appeals to the American people to bury their garbage, military spending will undoubtedly sky rocket and the paltry governmental concern with poverty will disappear. Eventually, Americans will begin to discover that governmental concern with the crisis is a fraud, that the quality of the environment can be improved significantly only if major controls are placed on American businesses. Given the nature of our government, where the industries control the regulatory commissions, this will be an improbable prospect. A more likely prospect is that some large segment of the American population will raise some new issue, such as health services. The government will grab the issue, diverting attention from the reasons why we have been unable to conquer the environmental crisis. And then that cycle of issues will be played out. America will be taken on a new joy ride with a new issue. We will be fed high sounding rhetoric again about our society's commitment to alleviating the problem. But the problem will not be alleviated. The real question before our society is:

How many issues will pass before the citizenry finally sees that our government is completely unresponsive?

For many scholars, the 1970's will undoubtedly be a golden opportunity to distribute intra-uterine devices and to urge in the best scholarly jargon that Americans burn their garbage and have only two children. Popular antagonism to the intellectual community will continue to rise as it becomes more obvious that academia is a means of spreading industrial and government ideology, not a place to study what is really happening in the society.

For scholars concerned with studying the urban, environmental and population crises, we would suggest some of the following studies which would drive to the root of the problem: (1) Participant observation studies of the board of directors and top officers of major industrial corporations such as General Motors. Individual researchers would be assigned to individual company officials to follow them through their activities for several months. How do companies combat attempts to regulate their pollution? How do companies decide which rivers to pollute and where to build their smoke stacks?

(2) Intensive interviews with state legislatures and the national congress on why they are raising their salaries but cutting back on welfare payments. Find out how public officials feel that lower incomes will help the poor raise themselves out of their current states.

(3) Surveys of French military leaders in the 1950's and American military leaders in the 1960's about their successful population control program in North Vietnam. Find out what techniques were used so that North Vietnam has the lowest birth rate in Asia.

Many scholars may not be daring or foolish enough to make similar proposals

to the National Science Foundation. After all, study of the people who make decisions in our society is generally a taboo subject for American social science. The NSF would rarely grant the money. For those less daring or foolish, we would suggest a policy of human decency. Study in an honest and competent manner those subjects which are not taboo and which can be empirically researched. What is the real relationship between population growth and income growth? What are the correlates and causes of various income distributions? Why do some cities have more environmental pollution than others? What types of control do social democratic countries such as Norway and Sweden use to hold down their environmental pollution? In any case, let us not become caught up in the governmental put on, continually pulling out of the hat social problems such as environmental pollution to hide failures in solving other social problems. Social scientists as citizens can push for democratic revolution in our form of government. Social scientists as researchers can provide data and understanding of social relationships for the new social order which hopefully will arise. Then, we shall solve the environmental crisis.

6
Feng Shui and Economics

Another View

of the
Population Bomb

Editor's Note---This article was written by members of the Population Action Group at the University of Pennsylvania. Members who prepared this paper were Maryanne Appleby, Sally Childs, Gail Cooper, Robert Factor, Dotsie Filanowski, Scott Gassler, Dan Snyder, Ingrid Waldron and Steven Zoloth.

World population will probably double within the next forty years. Widespread famine with accompanying riots and anarchy are predicted by 1975.¹ Increasing pollution of air and water and a greater risk of international conflict may cause widespread deaths. Such high death rates would be one way of reducing population growth. The only other way to stop population increases is to reduce birth rates. The number of people increases as long as birth rates exceed death rates.

Professional biologists have proposed that we solve these problems as follows: develop a sterilizing virus, put it in the water, and provide limited supplies of a temporary antidote through the United Nations²; put pressure on India to adopt Dr. S. Chandrasekhar's proposal to sterilize all Indian males with three or more children³; and, conserve scarce food resources by cutting off all food aid to "those countries that are too far behind in the population-food game (sic)"⁴. These solutions are nearly as draconian as the problems. Action is needed and any action will raise serious human and political problems, but more acceptable

solutions can be found. These more acceptable solutions depend on postponing somewhat the date when the supply of resources is exhausted and population growth is thus stopped. With more efficient use of resources, our finite earth will be able to support a somewhat larger, though still definitely finite, population. This will provide additional decades of time which we must use to pursue urgent but more humane methods of reducing birth rates to stop population growth.

Is population growth the problem?

The rate of population growth may soon exceed the rate at which food production increases. The consequent decrease in per capita food consumption would then present an extremely serious problem, since about two-thirds of the world's people (mostly children) are undernourished right now. An estimated four million or more people died of starvation this year.⁵ Yet at the same time Canada had a "wheat surplus"...because the starving people lacked money to buy wheat. In other words, hunger today is not due simply to limited land, water, and other resources. Food that exists is not given to undernourished people; food that could exist is not grown, because in our economic system food is grown for profit, not for people who need it but have no money to pay for it. The United States, for example, spends billions to keep land idle: this land could supply enough food to

7
Population Bomb (cont'd).....

make up all current caloric deficits.⁶ This would involve using only totally idle land, not land lying fallow in a normal farming cycle. Similarly, in southern Chile, rich valley land which could be used to grow food has been converted by absentee landlords to profitable pine plantations. Nearby poor people, struggling with small grain crops, contend with rapid erosion on steep hillsides.⁷

Potentially even more important than better use of land are the new grain breeds adapted to semi-tropical conditions. Use of these new breeds in India has increased wheat production 50% within the last four years.⁸ The dramatically higher yields and great responsiveness of these plants to fertilizer have provided effective incentives for change in traditional peasant habits. However, many peasant farmers have not been able to obtain loans to buy the new seeds and fertilizer. Poor farmers and landless laborers have already rioted in places where only the more prosperous farmers have been able to benefit from the new grains.

Meat production could also be substantially increased. For example, if enough veterinarians were available to reduce by half the very high disease rate in the herds and flocks of economically underdeveloped countries, meat consumption could be increased by 25%.⁹

In conclusion, major increases in food supply are possible without the use of exotic technology or major changes in people's dietary habits. If governments paid for all food produced and distributed it to all in need, resources would be available to feed adequately the current population and the projected increases for at least the next twenty years.¹⁰ Prediction beyond that time is virtually impossible, because too much is still unknown, such as new technological developments.

Another major reason for concern about population growth is the fear that the accumulated savings of economically underdeveloped countries will be used merely to accommodate rapidly growing demand for housing, health facilities, schools, etc., and thus funds will not be available for investment in industrialization and economic development. However, people under population pressure appear to produce more because they work harder and are more willing to accept technological innovations.¹¹ In fact, these two phenomena appear to nearly cancel out: in the last decade economic growth has been faster in countries with rapid population growth, so that per capita income has increased almost as much in non-industrialized countries with rapidly growing populations as for those with slowly growing populations.¹²

Why then has economic development of the Third World been so slow? The answer lies at least partly in the fact that industrialization is expensive and the resources available to the economically underdeveloped countries are small. All these countries combined have a gross national product of about \$500 billion (\$200/person), while the United States has a GNP of \$900 billion (\$4500/person).¹³ In the former case, there is little surplus available for investment. The U.S. government sends \$4 billion annually to these countries and receives \$1 billion as repayment on previous loans. U. S. private enterprise annually sends less than \$2 billion in loans and investment, and receives \$4 billion as repayment and profits.¹⁴ Thus the net cost to the U.S. economy of the public and private capital sent annually to the Third World is only \$1 billion. If we sent instead the \$80 billion worth of goods and services which our annual

6
Feng Shui and Economics

Another View

of the
Population Bomb

Editor's Note---This article was written by members of the Population Action Group at the University of Pennsylvania. Members who prepared this paper were Maryanne Appleby, Sally Childs, Gail Cooper, Robert Factor, Dotsie Filanowski, Scott Gassler, Dan Snyder, Ingrid Waldron and Steven Zoloth.

World population will probably double within the next forty years. Widespread famine with accompanying riots and anarchy are predicted by 1975.¹ Increasing pollution of air and water and a greater risk of international conflict may cause widespread deaths. Such high death rates would be one way of reducing population growth. The only other way to stop population increases is to reduce birth rates. The number of people increases as long as birth rates exceed death rates.

Professional biologists have proposed that we solve these problems as follows: develop a sterilizing virus, put it in the water, and provide limited supplies of a temporary antidote through the United Nations²; put pressure on India to adopt Dr. S. Chandrasekhar's proposal to sterilize all Indian males with three or more children³; and, conserve scarce food resources by cutting off all food aid to "those countries that are too far behind in the population-food game (sic)"⁴. These solutions are nearly as draconian as the problems. Action is needed and any action will raise serious human and political problems, but more acceptable

solutions can be found. These more acceptable solutions depend on postponing somewhat the date when the supply of resources is exhausted and population growth is thus stopped. With more efficient use of resources, our finite earth will be able to support a somewhat larger, though still definitely finite, population. This will provide additional decades of time which we must use to pursue urgent but more humane methods of reducing birth rates to stop population growth.

Is population growth the problem?

The rate of population growth may soon exceed the rate at which food production increases. The consequent decrease in per capita food consumption would then present an extremely serious problem, since about two-thirds of the world's people (mostly children) are undernourished right now. An estimated four million or more people died of starvation this year.⁵ Yet at the same time Canada had a "wheat surplus"...because the starving people lacked money to buy wheat. In other words, hunger today is not due simply to limited land, water, and other resources. Food that exists is not given to undernourished people; food that could exist is not grown, because in our economic system food is grown for profit, not for people who need it but have no money to pay for it. The United States, for example, spends billions to keep land idle: this land could supply enough food to

7
Population Bomb (cont'd).....

make up all current caloric deficits.⁶ This would involve using only totally idle land, not land lying fallow in a normal farming cycle. Similarly, in southern Chile, rich valley land which could be used to grow food has been converted by absentee landlords to profitable pine plantations. Nearby poor people, struggling with small grain crops, contend with rapid erosion on steep hillsides.⁷

Potentially even more important than better use of land are the new grain breeds adapted to semi-tropical conditions. Use of these new breeds in India has increased wheat production 50% within the last four years.⁸ The dramatically higher yields and great responsiveness of these plants to fertilizer have provided effective incentives for change in traditional peasant habits. However, many peasant farmers have not been able to obtain loans to buy the new seeds and fertilizer. Poor farmers and landless laborers have already rioted in places where only the more prosperous farmers have been able to benefit from the new grains.

Meat production could also be substantially increased. For example, if enough veterinarians were available to reduce by half the very high disease rate in the herds and flocks of economically underdeveloped countries, meat consumption could be increased by 25%.⁹

In conclusion, major increases in food supply are possible without the use of exotic technology or major changes in people's dietary habits. If governments paid for all food produced and distributed it to all in need, resources would be available to feed adequately the current population and the projected increases for at least the next twenty years.¹⁰ Prediction beyond that time is virtually impossible, because too much is still unknown, such as new technological developments.

Another major reason for concern about population growth is the fear that the accumulated savings of economically underdeveloped countries will be used merely to accommodate rapidly growing demand for housing, health facilities, schools, etc., and thus funds will not be available for investment in industrialization and economic development. However, people under population pressure appear to produce more because they work harder and are more willing to accept technological innovations.¹¹ In fact, these two phenomena appear to nearly cancel out: in the last decade economic growth has been faster in countries with rapid population growth, so that per capita income has increased almost as much in non-industrialized countries with rapidly growing populations as for those with slowly growing populations.¹²

Why then has economic development of the Third World been so slow? The answer lies at least partly in the fact that industrialization is expensive and the resources available to the economically underdeveloped countries are small. All these countries combined have a gross national product of about \$500 billion (\$200/person), while the United States has a GNP of \$900 billion (\$4500/person).¹³ In the former case, there is little surplus available for investment. The U.S. government sends \$4 billion annually to these countries and receives \$1 billion as repayment on previous loans. U. S. private enterprise annually sends less than \$2 billion in loans and investment, and receives \$4 billion as repayment and profits.¹⁴ Thus the net cost to the U.S. economy of the public and private capital sent annually to the Third World is only \$1 billion. If we sent instead the \$80 billion worth of goods and services which our annual

Population Bomb (cont'd)

military budget could purchase, if the \$100 billion in military budgets for the rest of the world were added to this, and if the total were used for developmental purposes by leaders in the Third World, then economic development in these countries would proceed apace. Although such widespread industrialization could present serious potential problems of pollution and exhaustion of raw materials, these problems could be avoided by better salvage of materials, elimination of planned obsolescence, plus more concern for the environment in planning technology. For us in the United States the distress consequent on a failure of economic development in the Third World will not be immediate, but disruptions there may well cut us off from minerals that are needed in modern technology and very expensive or impossible to mine in North America (E.g. tantalum, manganese, and industrial diamonds¹⁵).

What problems can we expect as population increases in the United States? People feel increasingly overcrowded, and the environment becomes increasingly polluted. However, this is not due simply to population increases. Two-thirds of our population is crowded into metropolitan areas, primarily because employment can be found there since these are the most profitable locations for many businesses. We could alleviate this problem by adopting the English and Swedish policy of building entire new cities scattered in rural regions. Furthermore, densely populated cities do not have to be oppressive if adequate housing, schools, jobs, etc. are available. The pollution that plagues Philadelphia and other cities could be much alleviated by proper processing of wastes, enforcement of existing codes against air pollution, and installation of convenient and rapid public transportation which would make

the automobile largely obsolete for in-city use. Thus, many immediate improvements are possible with available resources, although an ultimate solution undoubtedly depends on ending population growth.

In conclusion, the most immediate problems attributed to excess population could be solved by a better use of resources - a massive reallocation of resources towards solving problems, rather than for profit-making or military might. Such a reallocation of resources will be very difficult to achieve politically. But without better use of resources, very few of these problems can be solved, even if a halt in population growth does occur. Furthermore, the next section shows that it will be enormously difficult to end population growth in any short time. Of course, in the long run, population growth must be stopped or we will exhaust the supply of space and other resources. Indeed, in order to optimize the possible quality of life, it would be wise to stop population growth relatively soon before we reach the absolute limits of the earth's carrying capacity. Therefore, we should begin to slow population growth now, at the same time that we begin massive efforts to improve conditions for those already living.

Population growth occurs when birth rates are higher than death rates. Many fear that population growth will be halted only by increased death rates due to nuclear war or failure to devote enough resources to growing food. Less powerful groups in society fear that birth rates will be lowered by more powerful groups arbitrarily preventing them from having children. Villagers in India, for example, believing a rumor

that the visiting sterilization team was going to forcibly sterilize all men with more than two children, attacked the team with hoes and shovels, and had to be put down by the local guard.¹⁶ Blacks in this country fear that, if there is a sterilizing virus in the water, the antidote will be handed out the same way draft exemptions are. Proposed involuntary reductions in birth rates raise many ethical questions and arouse resistance that may lead to anarchy. So we must turn our attention to voluntary programs for reducing birth rates.

The most widely favored of such programs are family planning programs, which make contraceptives available and encourage people to use them. Such programs have rarely resulted in significant decreases in birth rates.¹⁷ In India and Egypt, high birth rates persist, despite extensive programs involving many clinics.¹⁸ Taiwan is often cited as a success story for such programs, even though the decline in birth rates began twelve years before the family planning program began.¹⁹

For Taiwan, as for almost all countries where birth rates have fallen significantly, the time of declining birth rates coincides with the period of late industrialization for that country.²⁰ During late industrialization, the number of children decreases because parents begin to plan family size and begin to use contraception effectively.²¹ This occurs partly because children "cost" more: urbanization limits space and eliminates field work as a use for child labor; increased mechanization of the factory replaces the demand for unskilled child labor with a demand for educated adult labor. Also, as industrialization progresses, attitudes change from fatalism and the sense of being part of nature, to more planning and manipulative attitudes.

How long do such changes take? In Western Europe, where family planning couples had to master the rather difficult method of withdrawal (coitus interruptus), the transition from high to low birth rates took approximately fifty-five years. In Japan the same transition took about thirty years.²² This was apparently accelerated by the recent availability of abortion and the loop, both of which make small demands on the regularity of the novice family planner. Thus family planning programs could facilitate the transition to low birth rates, particularly if they would support abortion rather than condemn it.²³ However such programs can help people to have fewer children only if they want fewer children and if they believe in the effectiveness of contraception enough to practice it. Such changes in people's attitudes have previously occurred with the socioeconomic changes brought about by late industrialization.

We have already argued that economic development could occur if there were a major reallocation of resources for this purpose. Now we argue that such economic development would be the best way of bringing a major reduction in birth rates in the Third World. Making sufficient resources available for economic development would involve considerable cost to those currently in power in this and many other countries. So this solution to population problems will prove to be ephemeral and impractical unless we can bring about a shift of power to new leaders, leaders who would make the necessary large reductions in profits and military spending to free the resources needed for economic development and food production. Such leaders would also support governments in other countries devoted to development rather than upper class interest.

Population Bomb (cont'd) . . .

One further problem remains: even in most industrialized countries birth rates still exceed death rates, so that populations are expected to double about every ninety years. This growth rate, though relatively slow, represents a potentially significant drain on world resources, since our per capita consumption of materials is so high (four times as much grain,²⁴ fifteen times as much steel²⁵ per U.S. resident as for the average resident of an underdeveloped country). For the most part, continued population growth is not due to a failure to practice contraception effectively. Rather, the average American couple wants three children, when an average of only 2.2 children/couple is required for maintaining a stable population.²⁶ Seventy percent of the births which are in excess of this required 2.2 children/couple occur in middle class families, only thirty percent in poor families; Catholic families contribute no more than Protestant families on the average.²⁷ Thus typical couples must somehow be motivated to want fewer children. The most optimistic possibility is to provide opportunities for alternative adult activities that are meaningful and rewarding so that couples will want fewer children to allow more time for these other activities. A beginning of this possibility is seen in the smaller families borne by college-educated or employed women.

In conclusion, current population growth presents us with two alternatives. We can be spurred by the difficulties to restructure our societies to provide the material needs of all and encourage adult non-procreative creativity, so that quality of life goes up and birth rates come down. Or we can

continue our present course to ever-increasing hunger, rebellion, repression and destruction of our earth's resources.

REFERENCES

1. Paddock, W. and Paddock, P. (1967) Famine, 1975!
2. Scheiber, R. (1969), quoted in Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 2, p. 17.
3. Ehrlich, P. (1968), The Population Bomb, p. 165.
4. Ibid., p. 160.
5. Ehrlich, P. (1969), to be published in Bioscience.
6. Heady, and Mayer, J. (1967), Food Needs and U.S. Agriculture in 1980.
7. Park, C. (1968), Affluence in Jeopardy.
8. Critchfield, R. (1969), in New Republic, Oct. 25, pp. 16-19.
9. Pritchard, W. R. (1966), in Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. 56:360-369.
10. Mayer, J. (1969), in Columbia Forum, Summer Issue, pp. 5-13.
11. Boserup, E. (1965), Conditions of Agricultural Growth.
12. Easterlin, R. (1969), in Contemporary Economic Issues, ed. by N. W. Chamberlin and Frederiksen, H. (1969), in Science, 166:837-847.
13. Population Reference Bureau (1969), Population Bulletin 25, No. 1.
14. U.S. Government, Dept. of Commerce, (1969), Survey of Current Business, Balance of Payments Tables.
15. Park, C. (1968), op. cit.
16. Povey, G. private communication.
17. Kiser, C. V., ed. (1962), Research in Family Planning.
18. AID Report (1968), in Population Crisis, Senate Subcommittee Hearings, Part 3.
19. Davis, E. (1967), in Science 158: 730-9.
20. U. N., Dept. of Social Affairs (1953), The Determinants and Consequences of Population Trends.

(continued on p. 22)

Family Planning Programs: WHO BENEFITS?

A Look
at

Corporate Philanthropy

Editor's Note---This is a book review of Bernard Berelson, editor, Family Planning Programs. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Several centuries ago, elites ruled by divine right. They were able to exercise their power with little regard for justification of their authority. Since the advent of democratic institutions in many parts of the world, it has been necessary for the rulers to take more cognizance of the ruled. After all, if the people saw that their leaders were not governing in the people's interest, they could vote the leaders out.

However, reality is considerably more complicated. Often those in power have a great deal of influence over the information and communication patterns of a society. One favorite method used by those in power has been to raise false issues with the electorate. A false issue is one that has nothing to do with the general welfare of a population, but is raised in order to divert attention from the basic contradiction of elite domination and the basic economic and social interests of the common man. International wars, ethnic and racial prejudice, and appeals to old virtues are typical examples of the false issues raised by those in economic and political power.

It is perhaps reflective of the advanced state of the art that it has presently become popular to even use real issues as false issues. Perhaps the most conspicuous example of this pattern has been the cry for "law and order".

Certainly the prevalence of crime and the safety of the citizenry is a real issue, but it has been used as a smoke screen tactic in order to confuse the voters rather than focus upon the basic causes of this most serious problem.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the issue of birth control or family planning is being transformed from a real issue into another false issue. Almost no responsible social scientist will deny that growth in population size and changes in population distribution and composition pose important problems for society to face. Few educated persons today would want to deny American or foreign ~~children~~ ^{parents} the right to space or limit births through contraceptive devices. But the present concern for population problems at home and abroad by the U.S. government and foundations is quickly becoming a smoke screen tactic. Population is now being blamed as the sole cause for most of the ills of the world -- poverty, low economic growth rates, air and water pollution. Rather than confront the social structural causes of these problems, U.S. elites are increasingly discovering that "population" is a neat escape valve. Family planning programs cost little money, and they call for no change in social structural relationships at home or abroad.

The appearance of a recent book, Family Planning Programs, edited by Bernard Berelson, gives further evidence that the population crisis

FAMILY PLANNING (cont'd)

has already become a false issue. The book is a collection of articles on family planning aimed at a general audience, rather than a professional one. The volume originated as a series of talks in the Forum series of the Voice of America. The book consists of 26 articles on a variety of topics, including various national programs in the Third World and the United States, new techniques in the family planning area, and the role of international advisory services in the field. As one has come to expect from academicians indebted to the foundations and U.S. government for their bread and butter, the book presents a cheery picture of the foundation and government family planning programs. Perhaps it is asking too much to expect employees to take a somewhat detached view of the programs of their employers. From various fragmentary and fugitive sources, we know that most of these programs are anything but successful in reducing population growth rates and, as a result, eliminating other societal ills.

The book leads off with an article by John D. Rockefeller, III, who has the dual honor of being one of the largest financial supporters of family planning programs abroad and one of the largest foreign investors abroad. As his title "Toward the Enrichment of Life" implies, Rockefeller believes that population growth inhibits economic development and thus the welfare of mankind. Did the original John D. gain his wealth through the liberal personal use of contraceptives? Rockefeller recalls his assistance in establishing the Population Council in 1952 to solve the pressing population problem and rescue mankind. However, it is interesting to note what Rockefeller leaves unsaid. The Standard Oil Company, which has long association with the Rockefeller family, presently earns 52 per cent of its profits from foreign investment. What proportion of these

foreign profits ever return to the native countries, in the form of family planning aid or other assistance? John D.'s concern is similar to that of other philanthropists who are financing family planning abroad. For the U.S. economy as a whole, profits from foreign investments have increased from about 10 percent in 1950 to nearly 22 percent in 1964. Economic growth in the developing countries might have risen faster had these profits remained abroad. Historically, population growth rates have dropped as a result of economic development. While financial assistance from the relatives of U.S. corporate enterprise should not be rejected out of hand, it is important to look beyond immediate rhetoric to see whose interest is being served.

The articles on specific countries are all rather optimistic. Programs in Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Malaysia, Singapore, India, Pakistan, Turkey, Puerto Rico, Jamaica, Chile and the United States are all described by nationals of each country. It is good to see that the usual academic imperialism did not lead to Americans telling us about the rest of the world. Most of the authors feel that family planning programs will lead to lower growth rates and a better life. The size of these programs can generally be predicted by the political nature of the government: The more right wing the government, the larger the family planning program. The article on Japan could have been more relevant with a more thorough discussion of the effect of legalized abortion. Most scholars would agree that the steep drop in Japan's birth rate has been associated

FAMILY PLANNING (cont'd)

with a legalization of abortion. It would also have been interesting if articles on China and North Vietnam had been included, for comparative purposes if nothing else. The usual estimate of the crude birth rate in China is 34/1,000 which is considerably less than most other developing nations. North Vietnam has the lowest birth rate in Asia, significantly lower than South Vietnam. Could these low birth rates have anything to do with recent social structural changes in the societies? We will leave this as a future question for research.

The article on the United States by Leslie Corsa contains the usual over-emphasis on population factors as the source of all mankind's ills. Dr. Corsa says "More and more Americans are recognizing that population size, distribution and density are critical underlying causes of many present American problems such as air and water pollution, urban decay, and inadequacies of transportation, higher education, health services, and recreation space." He does not point out that these problems, especially population density and distribution, may be functions of the economic and political organization of the country.

In another article on the making and marketing of birth-control products, we learn that the contraceptive industry is a very profitable one. In fact, the "potential market of Asia, Africa, the Near, Middle and Far East, and Latin America is waiting to be tapped with these new products..." So our altruistic endeavors in fertility control can be rather profitable at the same time...how delightful!

The last section of the book is devoted to the programs of U.S. philanthropic foundations and national governments. It is interesting to note that Sweden shortly hopes to devote 1% of her gross national product to foreign aid. At present, Sweden allocates 50 percent of its development aid through

multi-lateral mechanisms to insure no political strings are attached. The article on the U.S. program cites the expanding role of our assistance in world-wide family planning programs. This fact is important because aid for family planning has been increasing at the expense of technical aid. Per capita, we give one-tenth as much foreign economic aid as Sweden. And U.S. foreign aid is at its lowest level in 20 years. Thus, it seems that our government has accepted family planning assistance as a cheap solution to the problems of the developing nations. This type of aid also poses little threat to our corporate and military empire. Economic competitors will not be created to challenge humanitarians such as John D. Rockefeller III.

The last article by Bernard Berelson is so balanced that it appears out of place in the book. He cites evidence both pro and con on the economic and political issues in fertility. Berelson is one of the few active family planners who could be described as both intellectually smart and honest. Is it possible that men like Berelson can redirect policy toward a more realistic and rational direction? Or, will he serve as an academic spokesman for the creation of another false issue by the economic and political elites of the day?

Concerned Demography welcomes manuscripts from all corners of the academic and political spectrum. Footnotes and references are not encouraged because they clutter up the pages.

20

Where is Robert Park -- Now that we need him?

Editor's Note---This is a book review of Robert E. L. Faris, Chicago Sociology: 1920-1932. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1967.

Once upon a time, there was a perspective in population studies and sociology known as human ecology. Formulated in the 1920's and 1930's by such men as Robert Park, Ernest Burgess and R. D. McKenzie, human ecology was particularly interested in the symbolic and real role that territory and space played in the organization of society, particularly urban society. The human ecologists also argued that social organization might be affected by aggregate or collective forces such as technology, environment and population size and composition. Eventually, that perspective practically died out for three reasons. Today, only a few scholars around the country still keep the faith. The first reason for human ecology's decline lay in the attacks launched against it. American social scientists decided individually and collectively that the organization of society could be understood only by investigating the reported attitudes or characteristics of individuals. It is unclear how they reached this conclusion, except perhaps by visions, since they never cited much evidence to prove their points. The second reason lay in the fact that many human ecologists were embarrassed by these attacks. Rather than do battle, they quietly crawled off into the never-never land of Guttman scaling and psychological factors. The final reason stemmed from the fact that foundations and the feds have always been much more willing to support individual than ecological research. The reason why will become clear shortly.

Human ecology is now back "in" in American social science, but in a very different form. Most of the thought of today's noted human ecologists such as Roger Revelle of Harvard bears little

resemblance to the ideas of the early members of the Chicago school. Today's "new" human ecologists on the whole are more concerned with urging us to clean up our backyard garbage rather than understanding the collective forces which lead to a "garbage" society. They posit various causes of environmental problems but make little effort to verify their effects. In other words, human ecology today is an ideology of concern with society rather than a concerned approach to the study of society.

For those among the dying remnants of the "old" human ecology, a reading of Faris' lively account of the Chicago school in the 1920's and 1930's can only evoke images of a creative sociology and population studies that-might-have-been. The Faris book actually covers the entire spectrum of intellectual interests in the department, but a large number of those perspectives were crucially related to human ecological thought. These Chicago human ecologists combined imagination, intellectual brilliance, social concerns and a deep desire to investigate actively the causes of social organization. But their enterprise was clearly doomed from the start. As a means of justifying the existence of our free enterprise society, our institutions of social control such as universities have relentlessly hammered home the point that all social phenomena can be understood only in individual terms. For instance, we are told repeatedly that slums result from the laziness, poor education and lack of achievement motivation among slum dwellers. Park and Burgess would tell us that slums result from the nature of our free enterprise society. If you want to find out why, try reading the Faris book or Park and Burgess in the original some day. In any case,

21

Robert Park (continued)

if the mass of the American population ever understood that social problems result from the organization of the social system, our dominant elites might be threatened. In truth, a human ecology in the Park and Burgess tradition will never be allowed to grow in presently organized America. But hopefully, there will be a faithful few who will keep alive the threads of their thought in the hope of a better day, and a new society.

As Faris' book makes clear, the Chicago ecologists were profound optimists on the nature of American society. They saw it as a rather boundless land of opportunity where all segments would eventually be assimilated into one big, happy family. Their optimism was rather incompatible with their basic theoretical formulations. Their image of capitalist society as basically competitive and ruthless could only lead to the intellectually consistent conclusion that those who "had" would continue to have and those who were "out" would continue to be out. The only way that Park and Burgess could justify American society involved the use of "culture" or cooperation as a superstructure over the all-pervading conflict. This vague, semantic device seemed to be little more than an attempt by Park and Burgess to justify their ideological beliefs. But then, one can hardly blame them for failing to come to the realization of we younger "old" ecologists. After all, we young ecologists are children of a society which has rapidly been striped bare of its candy cane cover.

The Chicago ecologists were hardly bad guys for their day, nevertheless. Where Robert Park left shaving cream in his ear and didn't knot his tie, most of us today don't bother to shave or wear ties. Where Park believed in actively working for racial opportunity through the NAACP, we younger ecologists

have much more sympathy for the Black Panthers. Where Park wanted to help solve the urban crisis of his day by supplying public officials with the results of his studies, we ecologists of today know that our urban crisis will be solved only by replacing our public officials, by overturning our whole social system.

Faris' book tells it like it was, to coin a modern term. We find out how classic sociological studies were formulated and carried out. We find out that Park was usually late for supper. We find out about the ecology of the Social Science Building at Chicago which resulted in Park and Burgess sharing an office together. How rich we are for that chance event.

Will the same type of book ever be written about a current population studies center or department of sociology? Will it be worth writing?

Staff
Box

Concerned Demography is published periodically by students at the Center for Demography and Ecology, Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin, Madison 53706. They have no official ties with the faculty of the Center for Demography and Ecology. Articles for publication or correspondence should be sent to the above address. Subscriptions cost \$2 per year, and checks should be made out to Concerned Demography. Editor-in-Chief of Concerned Demography is selected by a table of random numbers. Technical assistance in this randomization project was provided by Prof. Robert M. Hauser. Picked this month as editor was A. M. Guest. The permanent executive editor is Ezekiel Cumings.

Population Bomb...

21. Berelson, B. et al. (1966), Family Planning and Population Programs.
22. U. N. (1953), op. cit. and subsequent U. N. Demographic Yearbooks.
23. Stycos in Kiser, C. V. ed. (1962), op. cit.
24. Brown, L. R. (1968), in Studies in Family Planning 32:1-6.
25. Park, C. (1968), op. cit.
26. Rainwater, L. (1965), Family Design: Marital Sexuality, Family Size, and Contraception.
27. Kiser, C. et al. (1968), Trends and Variations in Fertility in United States.

Pittsburgh.....

department needs a set of priorities so that the student is not entirely dependent on himself or chance for exposure to the administrative and research tools he can use on the job. While neither students nor faculty can always predict what training will be most useful in the future, the student can sense the quality of whatever training he is getting and is capable of making reasonable demands as to what that training should be. Up to now, here at Pittsburgh, gaining insight in the classroom or having a valuable research experience, not to mention the non-existent field placement, has been mostly a matter of taking pot luck.

Black Demographers..

Within demography, it would seem appropriate that the Population Association of America set up a special committee to study the feasibility of

training more Afro-Americans as scholars in demographic studies. Demographers have long been interested in the study of race relations, partially to obtain data which could be used in the solution of race problems. Quite appropriately, demographers could now take the lead in removing racism from universities.

In terms of training students, blacks or whites, demography is in a particularly plush situation. The recent interest in the population explosion has led to large amounts of foundation and government money being made available to population study centers. It would seem very feasible to divert some of the bounteous funds to the training of more Afro-Americans in demography. Since there is generally a shortage of graduate students interested in studying demography, it would seem reasonable for population studies centers to actively recruit among Afro-Americans.

Subscription? Anyone

CONCERNED DEMOGRAPHY SUBSCRIPTIONS

Yes. I think Concerned Demography is the greatest thing going. I want to subscribe.

No. I think Concerned Demography is terrible, but I want to subscribe anyway.

Please take me off your mailing list.

Mail \$2.00 for a one year's subscription to Concerned Demography, Center for Demography and Ecology, 3224 Social Science Building, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706.

NAME:

ADDRESS:

CONCERNED DEMOGRAPHY

Vol. 1, No 4 April, 1970

THE PAA:

A Time For Change.

During most of its more than 30 year history, the Population Association of America has been a small club of persons interested in demographic studies. But in the past few years, the membership and attendance at annual conventions have grown into the hundreds. And the growing interest in population suggests that the profession and organization will grow even more rapidly in the years ahead. We are faced, indeed, with a demographer explosion.

Through most of its history, the PAA has faced the future and the society about it with timidity. Now, in this transitional period of growth concerned members of the PAA must attempt to change the tenor of the PAA so that it actively discusses and confronts the numerous social issues of the day, which are relevant to demographers, population studies, and society at large.

Within the PAA, annual meetings have invariably consisted of papers on narrowly focused substantive topics. The journal of the Association, Demography, also reflects this narrow viewpoint. The PAA has rarely attempted to entertain discussion of the role of the social scientist as researcher and advocate,

of the political implications of demographic research activity, and of the proper relationship between the scholar and established institutions of society. Furthermore, the organization has infrequently entertained discussion of the underlying values of American social scientists. This year, following the founding of Concerned Demographers, the PAA convention program indicates a broader concern with some of these often neglected topics.

Organizationally, the PAA has fought the increasing trend for democratic participation in the United States. While the organization has never considered itself solely "professional," it excludes student members from voting privileges. Any other person interested in population, regardless of his training, is permitted a vote. Students, because they are students, are also excluded from any voice in the board of directors and the operation of PAA publications.

It its relationships with society, the PAA has been an active

advocate of the established order while denying its role just as actively. Various committees of the PAA are clearly intertwined with governmental agencies such as the Census Bureau and the Agency for International Development and semi-governmental agencies such as the Ford Foundation and the Population Council. These ties, if not always overt, have been implicit in that demographers from these agencies are almost always included on PAA committees. Through its various ties with these organizations, the PAA has thus been involved politically.

Among the PAA's more active recent societal involvements has been co-sponsorship with the Ford Foundation of a special issue of Demography in 1968 which basically was a propaganda sheet for the A.I.D.-Nixon position on why family planning is needed around the world. This position basically argues that family planning, rather than social structural change, is the prerequisite to economic development. While the PAA board of directors later officially disaffiliated themselves from the point of view of the issue, it is ludicrous to believe that they did not know about it beforehand. In the past year, the PAA has also been one of the most active lobbies against any changes in questions or procedures for the 1970 Census. Many relevant issues about the census had been raised by congressmen who are strong civil libertarians. There is some question whether the so-called census guarantee of anonymity is credible with the present Nixon administration and Justice Department attempting to enact anti-civil liberation legislation almost daily.

Political positions by an organization are not suspect; statements of being "value free" and non-partisan are hypocritical.

Our desires for a more open and wide-ranging PAA stem from our analysis of society. We make no bones about our values. We are women and men of the left, who believe in the development

of a more egalitarian and democratic social structure at home and the encouragement of social revolution and economic development abroad. We see an unrepresentative and imperialistic government as a primary obstacle to these changes. Just as the leadership of the PAA sees us a threat to their sinecures with the government and foundations, we see these ties as part of a much larger social structure which is non-responsive to societal demands at home and abroad.

To hope that the PAA will become a serious agent of change in our society is a foolish dream. After all, most PAA members benefit from the current social structure in terms of very high salaries, consulting fees and prestige. The most we can expect is the perpetual raising of issues in the PAA so that the established PAA scholars are continually forced to justify themselves. In the process, we may convince some of the older and many of the younger demographers that the established role of the PAA is not necessarily the correct one.

We do not want to make the PAA into a political organization, ready and willing to take stands on every issue. We see the PAA as primarily an organization of scholars. We do believe, however, that it is reasonable to seek PAA stands on issues which are directly relevant to the functioning of the scholarly community, are consistent with basic American values, and are supported by a clear majority of the members. The delineation of "appropriate areas" is a pressing issue which should be debated openly.

Because we believe in peaceful change, Concerned Demographers are committed to working within the established framework of American society, no matter how undemocratic it often may be. Violent revolution in this country, without the support of the mass of the people, is damned

to failure and will certainly bring drastic repression against the forces of change. Given our philosophy, the frantic discussion last year by the PAA board of directors on how to handle our potential "disruptions" becomes a ludicrous travesty on their misconceptions about the nature of their organization.

In this Atlanta convention, Concerned Demographers will be making proposals which represent our views of a relevant PAA. Most of these proposals are discussed at other points in this issue of Concerned Demography. For the first time, the PAA will be asked to give full voting power to student members, who are as deeply involved in scholarly activities as many regular members. This request will be in the form of a constitutional amendment. The convention will also be asked to pass three resolutions directly pertaining to the conduct of demographic education and research. One will call for more student participation in planning their educational training; a second will urge population centers to seek more students from minority group backgrounds; and a third will condemn all security tests for government employees.

Two important paper-giving sessions will also be held. One, Demographic Ethics, is scheduled for a Thursday afternoon session; the other, Evaluations of Current Trends in Demography, will be held on Friday afternoon. Two of the three papers in each session will be given by Concerned Demographers. Unfortunately, more papers could not be obtained this year.

An important step in discussing some of the issues involving the relationship of the demographer to the larger society would be establishment of a regular journal for this purpose. This journal, perhaps published once or twice a year, could contain several articles on the current state of demographic education, the role of the demographer in government, and the uses of demographic research. Some professional associations such as the American Sociological Association already

have such publications. Some persons might argue that PAA Affairs already fills this role. However, this publication does not permit a full discussion of various issues.

Concerned Demographers also will eventually propose the establishment of Poor People's Advisory Committees which would meet with various civil rights, minority and lower income groups to find out their needs for research information and how the PAA might facilitate necessary studies. This committee would be analogous to the current PAA group which advises the Census Bureau on its needs.

Finally, in the near future, the Concerned Demographers will propose the establishment of a PAA Committee on Ethics, similar to present committees in organizations such as the American Political Science Association. This committee would define certain broad outlines for the role of the researcher in relationship to the institutions of society.

Obviously, most of these changes will not be accepted in this year or the next few years. While most have been adopted by other scholarly organizations, they are probably too advanced for the current PAA. But hopefully, with perpetual prodding from the concerned few now in the PAA, the organization will turn itself from a role as the servant of the established powers in society to a vision of itself as one limited force for the liberation of man.

Moynihan: The Facts | Moynihan: The Man

Daniel Patrick Moynihan in his recent memo to President Nixon claimed that "the American Negro is making extraordinary progress" and proposed that "the time may have come when the issue of race could benefit from a period of benign neglect." Here is an analysis of some of Moynihan's arguments in the memo. The data are drawn from a recent report of the Current Population Survey, "The Social and Economic Status of Negroes in the United States, 1969":

1. Income. In his memorandum to the President, Moynihan states "the nineteen sixties saw the great breakthrough for blacks. A third (32%) of all families of Negro and other races earned \$8000, or more as compared, in constant dollars, to 15% in 1960." The data suggest that this statement is true. Blacks, indeed, have made absolute gains during the past decade. This analysis, however, is incomplete and terribly misleading. Absolute levels must be studied in reference to their complimentary statistic, the racial differential. Moynihan refuses to deal with this fact.

Negro progress when looked at in this light is more suspect. The difference between the per cent of white families and of black families who earned \$8000 increased during the decade, (24% to 26%). Furthermore, the difference in median family income increased from \$3063 in 1960 to \$3347 in 1968. In addition, Moynihan neglects to look at the lower end of the income scale where 45% of the black families earned less than \$5000, (23% less than \$3000). Moynihan also might have noted such qualifying facts as that in a typical middle income category (around \$7000) it took three earners in a Negro family to equal one earner in a comparable white family.

Census and Labor Department statisticians who prepared the source report were especially upset with one statement in the memorandum -- that "outside the South, young husband-wife families have 99% of the income of whites." Moynihan should have noted that this was true of only 135,000 out of 1.5 million non-Southern Negro families.

Is Daniel Patrick Moynihan just a buffoon who should be laughed off as a harmless scatter-brain? Or is Pat Moynihan the symbol, writ bold, of the misuses of American social science in the 1960's and 1970's?

For those who believe in Pat Moynihan the buffoon, there is plenty of evidence to support their position. The most recent piece is the now infamous memorandum to Nixon which advocated a period of "benign neglect" in race relations due to the "extraordinary progress" in the 60's of the Negro population. Who else but Pat could see the "alarming rate of fires" in ghetto areas as the most serious urban problem of the day? Who else could believe that income figures for less than one-eleventh of the black population represented the total situation of blacks in this country? Moynihan pointed out that the incomes of young husband-wife families in the non-South were on the average 99 per cent that of whites. He did not mention that average Negro family income is still only three-fifths that of white income. The continuing, distressing situation of blacks in America is documented by the most recent current population surveys of the Census Bureau.

For those who believe in Pat Moynihan as the personification of American social science, there is also plenty of evidence to support their position. Pat does not represent the views or the style of the overwhelming majority of American social scientists. But he does represent the views of the social scientists who invariably manage to gain fame and fortune and entry into the halls of power. Moynihan is just another in a long line of "experts" such as Seymour Martin Lipset, Edward Banfield and Daniel Bell, whose ideas, cloaked in the jargonese of social scientists fit the baser thoughts of America's power brokers. Marty Lipset, after looking at a few

The Facts...

2. Employment and Occupational Status: The statistics for employment and occupation are no less revealing. Moynihan's congratulations for our "dramatic changes" in unemployment are hardly well deserved. While it is true that the rate of Negro unemployment has recently declined, this change represents a secular trend for the entire society. That blacks continued to have twice the unemployment rate of whites is the important statistic and should not be hidden by meaningless rhetoric.

Moynihan's statement that black occupational status "improved dramatically" is also mysterious. During the decade blacks increased by 2% as a per cent of all professional and technical workers, 3% as a per cent of all teachers, and 1% as a per cent of all managers, officials and proprietors. To call this a dramatic improvement is pure lunacy. Furthermore, blacks continued to be vastly overrepresented as a per cent of all workers in such menial and debasing categories as unskilled labor (27% to 24%), private workers (46% to 44%) and waiters and cooks (15% to 14%). These then are some of the "quantitative" and "reliable" data upon which Mr. Moynihan based his suggestion for a period of benign neglect.

attitude surveys, pointed out that the working class, not the middle class, was racist and anti-democratic. Ed Banfield has pointed out that Negro riots result from the "animal instincts" of the rioters. And Dan Bell has assured us that everybody is happy in post-industrial society. These men, including Moynihan, essentially distort the desire of most social scientists to use facts carefully in reaching conclusions. Why do American men of the left never gain entry into the halls of power, no matter how careful their analysis?

On the face of it, Pat Moynihan should be relegated to a bush league college. His educational qualifications as an urbanologist include a Ph.D. in international affairs. He first achieved fame as the author of a series of anecdotes on the New York Irish in Beyond the Melting Pot, a book which verbally assured us that class was unimportant in American society. The statistics in the book led to different conclusions. Pat then moved on to author the Moynihan Report which included some hurriedly thrown-together statistics, drew heavily from the ideas of E. Franklin Frazier without footnoting them, and then concluded with hardly a shred of evidence that the Negro family must be strengthened before the Negro could achieve economic equality with the white. More recently, Moynihan has become the resident "liberal" expert in the Nixon Administration on urban problems, which more strictly means, WHAT TO DO ABOUT BLACKS? Moynihan's memos are fitting into a Nixon strategy of ignoring the plight of the Negro in American society.

American social scientists have felt very ambivalent about their stars such as Moynihan. They are very reticent to criticize the Moynihans because "they're our representatives in the White House."

Moynehan: The man...

p. 6

In some ways, this is a valid point since social scientists have rarely had a representative in the White House. But Moynehan, by his presence, is legitimizing a view of social science as a tool of the powers, not an independent force. Moynehan is in the White House because he is "value free," in other words, he argues that the prevailing society is good, and the best way to maintain a good thing is by not attacking it. Social scientists also tend to approve of Moynehan because he believes that the organization of society may be understood empirically. The only problem with Moynehan's viewpoint on this issue is his lack of integrity in using statistics. His "benign neglect" memo was an example of the outright distortion of statistics.

American social science must bear a measure of self-guilt for permitting Moynehan to dance around, unchallenged. Rather than seriously studying the relationship of the Negro family to achievement and social rank in American society, social scientists have dragged up a few statistics here and there to make a few harmless comments on the Moynehan arguments. For an example, see the Rainwater and Yancey book on the Moynehan controversy. The only good research on the question has been reported in several excellent articles by Otis Dudley and Beverly Duncan and by Reynolds Farley.

For the future, there are several solutions open to concerned social scientists who want to fight the Moynehan syndrome.

A first step would be the drafting of a resolution which condemns Moynehan's recent benign neglect document on the grounds of statistical inaccuracy, if nothing else. Hopefully, the resolution would also condemn Moynehan for his perversion of the goals of empirical social analysis. Amidst all the furor over the "benign neglect" memo, we could find little evidence that social scientists, individually or collectively, responded publicly to the Moynehan arguments.

A second, and broader step, would be a massive effort on the part of American social scientists to establish a Council of Social Advisers to the President. In the rudimentary days of social science, it is inane to believe that any one social scientist can know the answers, much less the facts, about any social issue. If nothing else, a number of social science advisers would insure that a variety of views would be presented.

Since social scientists must work in an atmosphere of some detachment and intellectual freedom, it is important that this council have some independence from the Executive and Legislative Branches, much as the Judiciary. A Council of Social Advisers might consist (1) partially of persons appointed for several year terms by the President with the concurrence of Congress, and (2) partially of persons appointed by scholarly bodies themselves with some sort of public approval. It should be understood that the persons appointed by the President would represent various interest groups in American society, much as the current Judiciary. Civil rights, labor, business and ethnic groups should all be represented on the Council of Social Advisers.

If the government refuses to establish such a committee, then scholarly bodies should do so themselves. This could easily be initiated and financed through the National Academy of Sciences. A non-governmental committee could serve as a partial check on the more outrageous statements of Nixon underlings such as Moynehan.

Of course, these proposals are probably too optimistic. As long as America maintains a tweedledum-tweedledee political party system in which the Democrats represent one business group and the Republicans represent another group, we should not

(continued p. 15)

The Rockefeller Commission: Hope^{p.7} for whom?

In recent years, the appointment of governmental commissions to study various social problems such as civil rights and disorders has been a principal means of then ignoring the problems. Moderate to liberal citizens are appointed to the commission; the commission reaches moderate to liberal conclusions about necessary social changes in this country; and then our governmental institutions move merrily along in their previous paths. In general, the publication of the reports has been taken as the solution to the problems. Publication of our guilt removes our guilt.

The recent appointment of John D. Rockefeller III as chairman of the President's Commission on Population may signify a new stage in the use of commissions. Consistent with Rockefeller's statements, population growth rates will be used as the prime explanation of most of the social problems around the world. The commission will conclude that growth rates are the primary cause of slow economic development, poverty within nations, riots, war and whatever other ills afflict man. The commission's report will then be used to justify our inaction on tackling the real, complex causes of these problems around the world.

Rather than disagreeing with current government programs, the commission will decide, as Rockefeller has, that we need more of the same, primarily family planning. Of course, family planning has never had more noticeable effect on anything, much less population growth rates.

The commission under Rockefeller will have 19 members and be given 1 1/2 to 2 years to make a report. From well documented newspaper reports, it appears that most of the members of the commission will be well to the political right, clearly far from the liberal wing of either political party.

Rockefeller's attitudes on population are indicated by a 1966 statement in the book Family Planning and Population Programs (University of Chicago Press): "...no program is more urgently important to the well-being of mankind

than the limitation of population growth. It is a world problem demanding the attention of all nations, East and West, large and small, developed and developing. In many parts of the world it obstructs much needed economic growth even as it fosters social unrest and political instability."

We have no quarrel with Rockefeller's desire for a relatively stable world population; but population growth rates have very little to do with most of the world's ills. The real problems abroad are symbolized by the name Rockefeller. American industries, such as those owned by the Rockefellers, are draining foreign countries of their resources. They have done little to develop native enterprise or create local jobs commensurate with funds invested in the countries. In fact, the appointment of Rockefeller serves as a slap in the face to people around the world who are trying to resist U.S. exploitation.

The Rockefellers can also claim a great deal of credit for our problems of poverty at home. Their annual incomes, as those of the other wealthy families in this country, could remove thousands of persons from poverty. When 5 per cent of the population controls more than 20 per cent of the income, some part of the population must be relatively poor.

PAA Business Meeting No Yawns This Year!

p. 8

Almost everyone attending the annual PAA meetings skips the usual Friday morning business meeting. Unless one really grooves on treasurer's reports and the like, there is little of interest. This year, Concerned Demographers plan to support a constitutional amendment and three resolutions at the business meeting. The session should be more interesting and educational than ever before.

The constitutional amendment would give student members of the PAA the right to vote and other privileges usually reserved for those who have regular membership in the association. The three resolutions being sponsored concern the encouragement of Black Americans to enter the field of demography, the security clearances which many government agencies require, and the role of graduate students in University programs of demographic training.

The motivation behind these resolutions is not one of confrontation with the establishment. Indeed we expect a lot of support from many of the more senior members of the profession. Our reasoning is based upon the premise that scholars and especially the field of Demography cannot ignore the society in which we live. However, the motions being supported by Concerned Demographers do not suggest that the PAA take an active role in American political life, but rather these resolutions are primarily concerned with the internal structure and policies of the field of population studies.

Probably most important is the proposal for a constitutional amendment which would enfranchise students and give them the right to hold office and serve on committees. According to the present laws of the PAA, a proposed constitutional amendment must be debated at the annual business meeting, and then be passed by a two-thirds vote on a mail ballot to all regular members. A constitutional amendment must be introduced by five regular members of the PAA. Professors Norman Ryder, Richard Easterlin,

Dorothy Thomas, Horce Hamilton, and Paul Demeny have consented to introduce the motion.

Unlike other organizations such as the American Sociological Association, the PAA does not restrict membership to Ph.D.'s or persons with extensive research or teaching experience. Anyone who is interested in population and can afford \$20 is accorded regular membership rights and privileges in the PAA. To most graduate students who only earn from two to three thousand dollars a year, often with a family to support, the \$20 fee is beyond their means. In other words, students are not legally disenfranchised, they are economically disenfranchised.

Many members of the PAA fear that students are not yet mature enough or knowledgeable to be given responsibilities. However, this view seems to be based more on stereotypes of students, than an honest appraisal of the evidence. Most graduate students are in their middle or late twenties, having accepted most of life's responsibilities. If they are in graduate programs of population studies, they have generally made lifetime commitments to the profession. Any glance at the articles in Demography or the papers presented at the PAA meetings will show that many students have shown that they possess considerable intellectual talent. Students would probably always remain a minority within the organization, and they probably differ widely in their views, just as the regular members do not always share a consensus. We hope that the present generation of professionals in the PAA will welcome their future colleagues as equal members in their scholarly organization rather than fear them as a threat.

The other three resolutions being sponsored by Concerned Demographer need only be approved by a majority at the annual business meeting.

No Yawns...

p. 9

The first of these resolutions would have the PAA encourage training programs in population studies to actively seek Black Americans and other members of American minorities as potential students. Although Blacks constitute over 10% of the American population, they are only about 3% of all academics. As a field that has pioneered in the scientific study of race relations, Demography should be at the forefront of those disciplines which seek out Afro-Americans as potential scholars. Not only would such an effort be a minor contribution in creating greater opportunity in our society, but it also might increase the potential for more insightful research. The experience of being black would probably give added insights and awareness into the experiences of minority status which might lead to more fruitful research.

To say that the criterion of race is irrelevant for recruitment to our profession is to discriminate because our society is already organized on the basis of race. The number of Black Americans and other minority group members who would seek out demography as their vocation through normal channels is woefully small. The PAA must encourage all institutions which offer training population students to actively search for Black Americans and other minority group members.

Recently, a minor scandal arose when it was discovered that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare maintained a blacklist of American scholars who were judged suspect because of their political beliefs. Because of this many respected academics were ineligible to serve on advisory committees or as consultants for the Department of HEW. Among the crimes of these scholars was participation in teach-ins against the Vietnam War. Although the Department of HEW claims to have destroyed its blacklist, it is common knowledge that other government departments and agencies require security checks

for many appointments. These political tests are probably unconstitutional, and are completely contrary to academic freedom. We urge the PAA to condemn all security checks and political tests by the federal government.

The third resolution to be introduced would have the PAA encourage training centers which offer graduate education in population studies to give students a significant voice in the organization and planning of their educational program.

This would not imply that students could infringe upon professors' freedom to teach or to do research. But most students have some knowledge of their future goals and interests, and should have some say in the planning of their educational program of courses and research opportunities. The exact mechanisms for increased student participation should be left to the students and faculty of each institution to work out together. It seems that a more democratic organization of the academic community would enhance the educational process as well as the necessary trust between students and teachers.

Staff Box

Concerned Demography is a periodic publication of students at the Center for Demography and Ecology at the University of Wisconsin. The students have no official ties with the faculty of the Center for Demography and Ecology. All correspondence and manuscripts are welcomed, from all points of view. Subscriptions cost \$2 per year for approximately four issues. Mail should be sent to Concerned Demographers, 3224 Social Science Bldg., University of Wisconsin, Madison 53706. Editor of this issue is Norma F. Nager. Permanent executive editor is Ezekiel Cumings.

Reader Response—Pro and Con^{p. 10}

Editor's Note---We hope to print a representative sample of the letters to Concerned Demography. So far, most of our mail has been favorable. Since the primary goal of Concerned Demography is to serve as an educational forum, we encourage those with differing viewpoints to send us their comments.

To the Editor:

I read your first issue of Concerned Demography with great interest, and I am enclosing a donation of two dollars. I had discussed the sessions which your group is sponsoring at an earlier time with Dan Price, and I am pleased that he has them all lined up.

My own feeling is that one of the great failings of demography is the lack of theory which connects demographic findings with social structure and social change. I also share your concern that demographic research is not presented in ways the public can understand. There are media, however, that are open to intelligent debate and I urge your members to use them, as well as submitting articles for Demography.

I look forward to seeing you in Atlanta. If I can be of any assistance to you, please let me know.

One final suggestion. Perhaps it might be useful if your group surveyed black organizations as to their needs for demographic information. If they have not been properly consulted, as is suggested in Concerned Demography, you could accomplish a very useful task.

Everett S. Lee
September 30, 1969

To the Editor:

Good luck with Concerned Demography. You are on the right track.

A. J. Jaffe
Columbia University
October 14, 1969

To the Editor:

I recently received my first copy of Concerned Demography. It is the worst piece of antiintellectual propaganda I have ever had the misfortune to read. National circulation of such trash does a disservice to yourself, the field of demography, and the University of Wisconsin.

Remove my name immediately from your mailing list.

Thomas E. Steahr
The Univ. of North Carolina
December 12, 1969

To the Editor:

You kindly sent me the December copy of Concerned Demography. On the front page there is a casual reference to "the proposals of the eugenics movement." The inference which follows seems to me unjustifiable today, although it is widely put forward by many "advanced" liberals.

In saying that the inference you draw is incorrect, I am presuming that the American Eugenics Society is the major and authoritative representative of eugenics in this country. It has been in existence over fifty years. Its journal, Social Biology, has a circulation of about 1500. Its membership is drawn entirely from medicine and public health and scientists in the fields of genetics, demography, anthropology, psychology, and other related disciplines.

For many years the position of the American Eugenics Society has been that there is little if any scientific data on average capacity for intelligence between different racial, social, or economic groups in this country, though it is evident that, if there are such differences, in average capacity, they are small. On the other hand, there are known large and measurable differences in genetic capacity between individuals and individual family stocks within all of the larger groups of the population, and it is to the change in

Reader Response...

p. 11

frequency of individual types within groups to which we must look for genetic improvement.

Considering that some 2% of our population is born with more or less serious genetic defects, and that a considerable portion of the low I.Q.'s found in all sections of the population have a genetic base, we believe the subject is important enough to be properly presented, and in this we beg your assistance.

Frederick Osborn
American Eugenics Society, Inc.
December 11, 1969

Editor's Note---Concerned Demography in no way meant to attack the American Eugenics Society. As we pointed out in the article, however, many individual eugenicists have advocated sterilization of the poor and blacks. Quite simply, we oppose this position, as the American Eugenics Society does.

To the Editor:

I read Vol. 1 #2 today and liked it very much, especially the article "Population - The Second Front." I am new to demography and am surprised and happy to see this kind of analysis being applied.

Lorenz J. Finison
Columbia University
December, 1969

To the Editor:

I have just finished reading Vol. 1, No. 2 of Concerned Demography, which I found both interesting and helpful. I look forward to future issues, and would like to help them along, at least to the extent of becoming a "paid" subscriber.

With best regards,

Thomas K. Burch
Georgetown University
December 11, 1969

To the Editor:

Good Luck.

James Beshers
Queens College
December, 1969

To the Editor:

I agree with you; the profession needs a publication like yours. Enclosed is my contribution toward that end. Please put me on your mailing list.

With best wishes for success,
Murray Gendell
Georgetown University
December 17, 1969

To the Editor:

Some useful functions can be performed by your new journal and I look forward to seeing the next two issues.

Charles B. Nam
The Florida State University
December 22, 1969

To the Editor:

With the hope that your editorial matter will come up to the properly high standards which you set for books reviewed.

Conrad Taeuber
Hyattsville, Md.
December, 1969

To the Editor:

Thank you very much for a welcome critique of the field, and my heartiest wishes of a successful enterprise. I look forward to further communications.

Barbara Lee Heyns
Harvard University
December, 1969

Reader Response...

p. 12

To the Editor: I recently saw a copy of "Concerned Demography" and was extremely interested in what it had to say. The unthinking enthusiasm of many of those who view family planning programs as a necessity and/or solution to the problems of the world certainly must be challenged. I am a demographer working in family planning evaluation at the National Communicable Disease Center (oddly enough), and am often of the opinion that many of those medical people in family planning, although sincere and well-meaning, have little background knowledge in demography, sociology, ecology, statistics, or any other such discipline. This may make it difficult for them to place their efforts in an intellectual framework which might enable them to examine their views more objectively.

Warner Tillack
Family Planning Evaluation
National Communicable Disease
Center
February 12, 1970

To the Editor: Keep up the good work!

Mason Taylor
University of Kentucky

To the Editor: With much pleasure I receive your successive issues, but also with a fundamental criticism.

Demography as a humanistic discipline comes very close to questioning the purposes and aims of our being. It is to be taken more seriously than many another discipline requiring similar or greater amounts of intellect.

Concerned Demography very ably raises fundamental issues, but with them rather jestfully, much ado is made nearly everything is treated as a mere matter of fun.

The February article on pollution for instance, might have included considerations of semantic pollution, of all the existing pollutions the most serious. We are exposed to so many noises, most of them irrelevant and

many of them only peripheral to our being. The more is being published, and Concerned Demography adds to publications, the greater is the semantic pollution. Public news media confuse our thinking because they systematically fail to distinguish between the important and the trivial. For purposes of clear thinking, a radical distinction must be made. Demography is such a serious subject, that Concerned Demography should leave the jokesters doing their jokes (presumably mostly for their self-applause) and attack fundamental issues.

Another issue being hinted at, and quite correctly, is the need for some rather fundamental change. It is to be doubted whether this can be well brought about while maintaining our thought along traditional lines of political theory. It is not simply a political matter, but one much deeper.

Ever since the eighteenth century the Occident, and eventually the world, has gone through a sequence of "revolutions": scientific; agrarian; political; industrial; social; economic; cultural; etc. Time has come for a more radical revolution, possibly less painful than some of the preceding ones, each of which has been disappointing. Time is at hand to undergo a philosophical revolution concerning the human stand in life, and the fundamental lines of thought apt to promote it. Cultural, political, economic, etc. revolutions may follow once the basic thinking has become more fundamental.

Thanking you for this opportunity, yours sincerely,

(pseudonym): Witness
March 7, 1970

To the Editor: While I have enjoyed reading recent issues of your publication, I am dismayed by the lack of attention to one of the most pressing issues for all demographers:

Reader Response

p. 13

Welcome... (continued)

the liberation of women. Fertility rates around the world will not be brought down until women are liberated from their role as a tool in the means of production, until they are freed from the degradation of being a baby producing machine.

I have also noticed that all three editors of your issues have been men. The executive editor, Ezekiel Cumings, is also male. This discrimination against women is indicative of the general situation in demography and social sciences, where women are permitted to be clerical assistants but rarely are seen in the classroom. Are half the papers at this year's convention given by women? I bet that half of the work was done by women clerical assistants.

Carrie Nation
March 3, 1970

Editor's Note---We apologize to Miss Nation (pseudonym) for our neglect of women. You will note that a woman, Norma F. Nager, is editor of this issue. We agree with the importance of liberating women from the child-bearing role. We would also like to know why so few women ever give papers at the PAA meeting.

From the Waste basket
Welcome
to Convention '70

For many students, who aspire to be "professional demographers," the annual convention of the Population Association of America is a very exciting and bewildering event, indeed. The convention is exciting because this is the aspiring student's first opportunity to rub shoulders with the "stars" of the profession. And who knows, perhaps a fat job with the Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) or the University of Michigan or Cornell or the Census Bureau awaits the student who knows how to rub shoulders properly.

The convention, however, may be quite bewildering because the stars are apt to ignore you, the aspiring professional. The stars will be spending most of their time in various booze parties. No doubt, you will spend most of your time hearing other graduate students present boring papers or eating Southern fried chicken at a nearby greasy spoon restaurant.

With the hope of making this convention a completely exciting event for every student, we are passing along a few tips on how to avoid the bewilderment, on how to recognize the stars and be recognized yourself. Of course, the best way to be recognized is by crashing a booze party yourself, just as drunk as the stars. But it is also helpful to have some substance to your drunkenness, and that is what this article is all about.

As a first tip, we suggest that you stay clear of the Concerned Demographers' crowd. This bunch of crackpots, mostly students from Wisconsin, Michigan and Cornell, are here to cause nothing but trouble. They talk loosely about "social concern" and "relevance," which are anathema to the properly "value free" demographic star. Never mind that many of the value-free stars spend most of their time handing out intra-uterine devices or advising the President on social policy. Their objectives and minds are clearly value free. The Concerned Demographers crowd may be recognized by the stars but only for purposes of police identification. At last year's meeting, the stars of the profession on the PAA board of directors spent much of their meeting on how they would handle the Concerned Demographer if they got uppity. Sorry to say, the stars never had a chance to call the cops.

Welcome to the...

Now, to the substance that you should present. There are several positive roads to success. You must remember that many of the stars do not agree among themselves. Some demographic professionals such as the A.I.D. boys are really keen on family planning as the panacea to the world's ills. Their motto is -- Give a poor family an I.U.D. and tomorrow they will be as wealthy as the Rockefellers. They are concerned with social action, but primarily to the extent of inserting contraceptives into ladies. Then there are the path analysts who will primarily be discussing the possibility of putting new variables, hopefully hypothetical, into their path models. Their motto is -- No residual correlation greater than .10. The path analysts are interested in improving the Negro's plight by increasing the path from their educational achievement to their income attainment. Then there are the econometricians, who will primarily be discussing whether achievement motivation may be measured by marginal propensity to save or by use of the condom. They are primarily interested in a social policy which is based on variables with regression coefficients at least twice their standard errors. We should also note the "Politics of Population" clique. This group will be interested in hearing about any new communist atrocities you can dig up. Their motto is -- Oh, will there ever be another czar like Alexander?

Let us take each of these groups in turn. We will let you choose the group with which you would like to associate. Remember that association with one group means exclusion from the other.

Since the A.I.D. gang is primarily interested in contraceptives, you should stick to this subject. For instance, a good introductory device is wearing an I.U.D. on a chain around your neck. Walk up to an A.I.D. man and tell him that you know of a family planning program that reduced a population

growth rate. You will be immediately surrounded and bombarded with questions. If you really sound impressive, they will invite you to Washington to talk with Pat Moynihan, Mel Laird and maybe even the President. Perhaps a job advising a military dictatorship on population will be awaiting you. Another good conversation piece is the suggestion that you have a new model showing that one I.U.D. leads to more economic development than one tractor. Also, point out how your model shows how the production of I.U.D.'s in itself is a stimulant to economic development as long as the plants are operated by private enterprise.

The best way to be recognized by the path analysts is wearing a sandwich board with a big model painted on it. But not any model will do. Primarily, you need a new variable or you must drop a path in the old model without having the residual correlation between variables rise above .10. The best new variables, or the most sought variables, are psychological characteristics. Some good ones are "wish fulfillment," "need to be dominant," "feelings of joy," "love of mother," "love of friends," and "N-ach to the fourth power." If you want to drop paths, the most ingratiating places to drop them are between father's occupational and educational achievement and son's occupational and educational achievement. This will show, provided the residual correlations are not too high, that America is really the great land of opportunity after all.

The econometricians also are seeking new variables. But they do not want variables that would fit in some orderly nodal; they just want variables. If you have some time during the convention, leaf through the World Almanac. Randomly pick two or three variables from each page and then submit them to a group of econometricians who are chatting

Welcome to... (continued)

Moynihan... (continued)

together. You might note which variables will drop out of the equations when other variables are entered. Point out that if all variables in the world were run against each other in a series of multiple regression equations, we would understand the essence of life. They will love that statement. A word of caution -- do not suggest any concepts with your list of variables. The econometricians do not lack concepts; they just lack variables to measure them.

The "Politics of Population" group will be identified by the red, white and blue suits. Walk up to them and announce, "The best way to reduce the population of the world is elimination of all the commie nations." Tell them that you think socialism and fascism are in the same bag, that Marx was a dirty hippie and Hitler looked like a communist. Suggest that the foremost goal of demographic research should be understanding why the Soviet leaders wanted to kill all their populations during the 20's and 30's, and point out that this goal will not be achieved until the present Soviet leadership is overthrown with help from the United States.

Good Luck!

expect a very representative Council of Social Advisers. Milton Freedman has pointed out that most government regulatory agencies come to represent the businesses which are to be regulated. In the same way, a Council of Social Advisers would probably come to represent the Wall Street and corporate liberal view of how society operates. The President's Council of Economic Advisers, appointed directly by the President, has basically represented a business view of economics through the 1950's and 1960's. But hopefully, a council of numbers, with some independence, would show some courage in pointing out and analyzing social trends.