

DEMOGRAPHIC DESTINIES

Interviews with Presidents
and Secretary-Treasurers of the
Population Association of America

PAA Oral History Project

Volume 3—Other PAA Members
Number 1--From 1976 through 1989

Prepared by

Jean van der Tak

PAA Historian 1982 to 1994

Assembled for Distribution by the PAA History Committee:

John R. Weeks, Chair (PAA Historian, 1994 to present)

Paul Demeny

David Heer

Dennis Hodgson

Deborah McFarlane

2005

ABOUT THE PAA ORAL HISTORY PROJECT AND THESE INTERVIEWS

This series of interviews with past presidents and secretary-treasurers and a few others for the oral history project of the Population Association of America is the brainchild of Anders Lunde, without whom PAA would scarcely have a record of its 60-year history. Dismayed by the dearth of usable PAA files he inherited as secretary-treasurer in 1965-68, Andy later determined to capture at least the reminiscences of some of PAA's longest-time members. When written pleas yielded few results, he set about doing taped interviews with past presidents and secretary-treasurers and conducted over a dozen (with help from Abbott Ferriss and Harry Rosenberg) between 1973 and 1979.

Andy also assembled core records of meetings, membership numbers and officers and Board members since PAA's founding in 1931. He established PAA's official archives and arranged--with the help of Tom Merrick and Conrad Taeuber--for their cataloguing and deposit in the Georgetown University library. [*Note: the archives were removed from Georgetown University in the late 1990s, and are now housed in a storage unit rented by the Population Association of America, accessible through the Executive Director of the PAA.*] With Con Taeuber, he organized the "PAA at Age 50" session at the 1981 50th anniversary meeting in Washington, which produced four valuable papers on early PAA history by Frank Notestein, Frank Lorimer, Clyde Kiser, and Andy himself (published in *Population Index*, Fall 1981). And he launched "Vignettes of PAA History," of which 19 have appeared in *PAA Affairs* since 1981. [*Note: three more appeared in the PAA Affairs in the 1990s written by John Weeks.*]

Retired in Chapel Hill, NC (and now a renowned creator of and writer on whirligigs), Andy asked me to take over as PAA historian in March 1982. I was eager to resume the interview series, but had no time until my retirement in 1987 as editor of the *Population Bulletin* of the Population Reference Bureau. Since January 1988, with the PAA Board's blessing and full cooperation of the interviewees, I have added 41 interviews to Andy's list, including reinterviews with six on his list--Ansley Coale, Kingsley Davis, Ronald Freedman, Dudley Kirk, Henry Shryock, and Conrad Taeuber [supplemented in 1992-93 with interviews of Ron Rindfuss, Etienne van de Walle, and Barbara Foley Wilson].

Originally, my goal, as was Andy's, was to have the tapes and transcripts for the record, safely deposited in the archives and available, of course, to "scholars," and also, as reported to the Board in my "project proposal" of March 20, 1987, to print excerpts from the interview transcripts along with other materials on PAA's history in a "Selective History of PAA." However, I found the interviews fascinating as I worked along, knew other demographers would too, and realized that their full flavor and easy accessibility would be lost in this excerpting and archiving. So I decided to assemble this set of the full edited transcripts. (The tapes and transcripts will still go into the archives and excerpts from the transcripts will appear in several "history vignettes" in *PAA Affairs*, but I have now dropped the plan for a printed "Selective History." The "other materials" that were to be included were collected by former PAA Administrator Jen Suter in a special file available in the PAA office.)

The 49 transcripts presented here cover 36 of PAA's 53 presidents through 1990 [updated to 1993], 14 of the 19 secretaries or secretary-treasurers (four of whom were also president), and four others specially interviewed for the series--Deborah Freedman, Alice Goldstein, Anne Lee, and Lincoln Day. This includes all presidents and secretary-treasurers still living as of 1993, except Evelyn Kitagawa (alas, we missed on four tries at a meeting) and Calvin Schmid (now in a nursing home in Washington state—*note: Calvin died in 1995*). I was able to interview most people at their home base (which involved some interesting travels). Nathan Keyfitz, in Indonesia, and Kurt Mayer, in Switzerland, kindly supplied "self-interviews," following questionnaires which I sent them. All my interviewees edited their transcripts. I did further light editing to tighten them up and added

explanatory notes and book titles, etc. All my interviewees signed "release" letters, indicating their agreement to having the edited transcripts released into the public domain.

Going beyond Andy Lunde's original aim of focusing on PAA history, I asked these demographic luminaries about their own careers, recollections of others in the field, and views on key demographic issues over the years they have been involved and for the future, in addition to their reminiscences about PAA. The results provide some unique insights into the personalities, situations, and issues that have gone into the making of demography in the United States as well as of PAA. This will be valuable input to the full histories of U.S. demography and of PAA that should be written someday. Meanwhile, the transcripts make for great browsing. (I recommend a strong reading table to support their hefty volume.) As Jane Menken put it: "Demographers are such *interesting* people," and, I would add, marvelously interconnected, as confirmed over and over in these interviews.

The 46 photos of interviewees [[see the file: "PAA History Photos Pres & SecTreas 1947-1993.PDF"](#)] also included come from Princeton's Office of Population Research, the Population Reference Bureau (by Art Haupt, former editor of *Population Today*), Henry Shryock (photo of John Durand and Frank Lorimer at the 1942 PAA meeting in Atlantic City), George Myers (photo of Joseph Spengler), several from interviewees themselves, and the rest I took at the time of the interviews.

I am grateful to Andy Lunde for conceiving this project, to my interviewees for their ready cooperation, to Population Reference Bureau librarian Nazy Roudi and other PRB people for their expert and cheerful help in tracking down background material, to Conrad Taeuber, Henry Shryock, Suzanne Bianchi, Paul Glick, and Reynolds Farley for encouragement and special help, to the PAA board and current officers for their "enthusiastic" support and two subsidies toward my work on the oral history project, to Joe Brennan, Kathryn Murray, and Artmaster Printers for skilled help with the production of this transcript set, to (former) PAA Administrator Jen Suter for kindly agreeing to handle requests for the set, and especially to my husband, Herman, without whose understanding and financial support this project could never have been accomplished.

Jean van ter Tak ("VDT")

PAA Historian Washington, D.C. (May 1991, updated November 1991)

ABOUT "VDT": I am Canadian and got a B.A. in history from the University of Toronto in 1948 and an M.A. in demography from Georgetown in 1970. I have worked with the Oxford University Press in Toronto and London (where I met my Dutch husband, then at the London School of Economics), the Population Crisis Committee, the Netherlands Interuniversity Demographic Institute, Georgetown's Center for Population Research, the Transnational Family Research Institute (where I wrote and edited books and articles on demographic aspects of abortion and contraception), and 12 years at the Population Reference Bureau. My economist husband-long at the World Bank and now consulting part-time for the Bank-and I have three sons, three daughters-in-law, and two grandchildren. We have lived in London, Geneva, Bangkok, and since 1961 in Washington-with a sabbatical year, 1970-71, in the Netherlands. We retired early in order to travel energetically and in the past four years have hiked, camped, camel-treked, sailed, birdwatched, etc., on all seven continents.

THE OTHER PAA MEMBERS INTERVIEWED

	Name	Interview date, place, interviewer	Page
1	Anne S. Lee	6/18/79, Athens, GA, Abbott Ferris	5
2	Lincoln H. Day	10/28/55, Washington, DC, VDT	9
3	Deborah S. Freedman	12/12/89, Ann Arbor, MI, VDT	42
4	Alice Goldstein	12/14/89, Providence, RI, VDT	54

ANNE S. LEE

Interview with Abbott Ferriss, following the interview with Everett Lee, at the Lees' home in Athens, Georgia, June 29, 1979.

Anne Lee, though never president or secretary-treasurer of PAA (the general criterion for inclusion in this series of interviews), has also had a long association with PAA and a distinguished career in demography. In addition to the following lively reminiscences of PAA "in the early days," she has contributed a PAA history vignette on "Early Women Superstars in PAA," published in PAA Affairs, Fall 1988.

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS: Anne Lee received the A.B. in sociology in 1950 from the University of Pennsylvania (where she and Everett Lee met) and the Ph.D. in sociology from Pennsylvania in 1966. Among her activities in demography, she has done research at the Institute for Behavioral Research at the University of Georgia in Athens and as an independent consultant, and is the author or coauthor of a number of articles and monographs, particularly on internal migration in the U.S.

FERRISS: I have now with me Anne Lee, who, she says, knows some trivia about the early days of the Population Association.

LEE: I first went to the Population Association meeting in 1950. At that time, I was an undergraduate student at the University of Pennsylvania and the meeting was being held at Princeton. I went to the meeting because Dorothy Thomas announced that she expected her students to go and when Dorothy announced this sort of thing, you didn't question it--you went. So a group of us arranged a carpool and drove over to Princeton, just for part of a day's meeting, and then came back afterwards and had dinner at Ed Hutchinson's house.

Very lovely affair. I can remember that meeting well, because I think it was in the School of Architecture and it was a very, very small group in those days. There couldn't have been more than 50 people attending the meeting and everybody clearly knew everybody else. The women were extremely smartly dressed; they all had beautiful, smart suits and smart hairdos.

And I recall the business meeting that was conducted while I was there. In the old days, before they took the business meeting out of the arena, this was where a lot of the fun in the PAA went on. The thing I remember most distinctly was the figure of Fred Osborn, because he must be about 6 foot 6, and he went up to the podium at the front and proceeded to put his foot on it. This was a huge man extending out. At that time, he was on the Atomic Energy Commission and some parliamentary hassle came up which Henry Shryock could not answer. So Osborn said, "Under the rules of the Atomic Energy Commission " such and such would apply. At which point, John Durand asked, "But does the Population Association operate under the rules of the Atomic Energy Commission?"

In those days, there was not a combined secretary-treasurer's job; you had a secretary and a treasurer. Henry was the secretary, but John Durand was the treasurer. When the time came for the treasurer's report, John came up and reached out and took a paper from Henry as he went to the podium and said, "Well, according to the treasurer's report which Henry Shryock has just handed me, these are the figures." So it was much more casual in those days.

In the early days, the meetings were almost always at Princeton. They occasionally wandered afield, but mostly they were at Princeton. There were single sessions; you went and you listened to all of the papers. It was considered poor form if you went to the lobby or anything like that; you were expected to go to the meetings.

The other thing that always happened in those early days was that the International Union [for

the Scientific Study of Population] was very, very exclusive. You could only become a member by being invited [as is still the case, on recommendation of two IUSSP members]. There was a great deal of discussion about this and it was a very closed organization. They [the American National Committee, comprised of U.S. members of IUSSP] always met the night before the Population Association meetings began at Princeton. All of the people who were anybody in this chosen group would go off to the International Union meeting and those of us who were not members would sort of have to mill around and decide what to do with our time until this illustrious body finished its meeting and we could retire to the bar. [Anne Lee was elected to the IUSSP in 1969; Everett Lee in 1957.]

FERRISS: You said that the ladies wore new spring outfits?

LEE: Oh, yes.

FERRISS: Were they a different color every year?

LEE: I don't remember so much about the color; I remember a lot of very smart navy blue ones. In later years, I came to know a bit more about it, because by then I was closer to Dorothy Thomas. When Everett got out of the army [in which he served during the Korean War, but stationed in Italy and at Fort Riley, Kansas, where he completed his Ph.D. dissertation], we went back to Penn in 1952. That was when I became aware of the machinations that went on in the PAA. In those days, they were friendly to outsiders but there was very much of a sort of closed control, not nearly as democratic as it is today. What the PAA did was very much decided by Irene Taeuber, who would talk to Margaret Hagood in Washington and Dorothy Thomas in Philadelphia, and Frank Lorimer, I think, would also talk to Margaret Hagood and they would all get together and decide what was going to be done. These four--there were one or two others, Notestein was involved, I think--when they decided what was to be done, then the Association would do it. They would spend time discussing the meetings long before they came about and then would decide what was to be done.

Before the meetings, I can remember Dorothy always going off to get a new suit and a permanent. There were four single rooms in the Princeton Inn. These were always reserved for Eleanor Isbell, Dorothy Thomas, Margaret Hagood, and Hope Eldridge; automatically, they would get those four rooms.

FERRISS: Would the girls get off to themselves and chat about things?

LEE: Not really. Dorothy was not one for withdrawing with the ladies, nor were the others. At the meetings, they would mingle completely with everyone else.

I can remember also when the meetings moved to Penn for the first time [1957]. In those days, the Association would only go where it had been invited, not the way it is now, where you decide what city is large enough to hold the Association. You would be invited, so the places where the meetings were held, the selection, was dependent on who invited you. The year that the University of Pennsylvania extended an invitation, Joe Spengler was president. The meetings were held in the Wharton School, because it had a new building in Dietrich Hall and it had side-by-side auditoriums. The decision was made that year to go to double sessions. Going to double sessions meant that these side-by-side auditoriums could be used. And people were furious! I was on local arrangements and everybody would come out and mutter to me about how terrible it was that the Association was doing that; the people were just running in and out and the whole flavor had been ruined. [Double sessions actually began at the 1956 meeting at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, with two simultaneous sessions on the first morning. In 1957 at Penn, there were double sessions in four time slots.]

That was the first year that we had the banquet over at the museum [of the University of Pennsylvania], which was a huge success, in part because the university funded a free cocktail

beforehand. Many demographers who came to the cocktail party, planning to go on to the brighter lights of Philadelphia, instead decided to stay, so that we had a crunch on the dinner. The next time we had the meetings in Philadelphia, we again used the museum; that was the year Kingsley Davis was president [1963]. But the decision was made that you would surrender your ticket before you entered the dining room. That year, I got to eat the menu we had so carefully planned.

Another innovation in terms of the meetings was the year that Everett was first vice-president [1968; meeting in Boston]. It used to be that the second vice-president chaired COPS [Committee on Population Statistics] and the first vice-president had the responsibility for the meeting program. Everett was in charge of the program and decided that he needed a committee and, since I was his wife, I should serve on the committee, although I would not be named to it. They decided that not enough people could get on the program. That was the year they tried the innovation of having people who wanted to give papers to submit them [multiple copies] ahead of time and to distribute the papers ahead of time to people that were to come to the sessions. You would sign up for a session and you would have eight or ten papers distributed by title only. Then the people would get together [at the session] and have a discussion. [This innovation, or a variation of it, was started by Ansley Coale, as first vice-president/program chairman for the 1965 meeting in Chicago. See his interview above.]

As I recall, it was a total failure, Everett had piles and piles of papers and no way to discriminate. You'd start checking on whether somebody had a paper ready and you would call and say, "I'm putting you on a session on fertility." And they'd say, "Oh, Everett, I forgot to tell you that my fertility tape never came through; the paper I'm submitting is on mortality." And that is why there were some papers on fertility put in a session on labor force. And people would mail papers to Everett and they never arrived.

FERRISS: He had all the papers?

LEE: Oh, yes--hundreds of them. We had a whole station-wagon-full to drive to Boston. People were not feeling kindly towards him about it.

The other hassle I remember from the early days had to do with the kinds of membership. When I first joined the PAA, I joined as an individual member and paid my five dollars. For years, it was five dollars to be a member. Then the dues went up to ten dollars. By then, Everett and I were married, so I thought in the interest of economy, we might as well become joint members and still be paying ten dollars [together]. There were a few years there when we were joint members.

At some point, the Board of Directors, while Everett was in office, changed the dues structure again and increased the dues. In the course of the deliberations, joint membership disappeared. I'm sure that was the year that Everett was becoming president [president-elect, 1968-69], because by then we had Ed Bisgyer [handling PAA business affairs at the American Statistical Association] and I wrote Ed a note saying, "Here are Everett's dues as a regular member, but where does this leave me as a joint member?" At which point, Ed, to my fury, wrote to Everett and said: "Dear Everett, As you can recall, at the last Board of Directors meeting," and went on with a long, full-page paragraph why they had decided to abolish joint membership; that somebody needed to look into it. All I could reply was to send him my dues as an individual member and say, "As you can see, Everett and I do not discuss Board meetings. Considered confidential." I think at that time Dorothy Thomas told me firmly, when I was telling her my troubles, that, "Well, anybody who is a real demographer should be a member on their own. I don't approve of this joint membership."

FERRISS: You were going to tell us about another incident.

LEE: In the early days, Everett would get to the meetings and I would be home taking care of the children. I could get to the ones that were closer by, but I didn't always make them after we started having a family. I still stayed active and read the journals, but Everett got a whole load of friends that

I knew of, talked to on the phone, but didn't know personally.

One of these was Anders Lunde and another was Ozzie Sagen. Anders had been secretary-treasurer [1965-68] and so we had long correspondence because--again in connection with my joint membership--my ballot would never arrive on time and I'd always have to write Andy and say, "Where is my ballot?" When I went to a meeting after that, both Andy and Ozzie were there. I was getting ready to leave, going off in a rush, and Oz was standing talking to somebody and I confused him with Anders Lunde. I went rushing up to him and said, "I'm Anne Lee, Everett's wife. It's so nice to meet you after all these years of correspondence." Oz sort of looked up in total amazement and I said, "I'm sorry I can't talk longer; I must meet Everett." And I went rushing off, leaving him standing there shaking his head. Of course, in later years I knew them both very well.

LINCOLN H. DAY

Interview with Jean van der Tak at Jean's home in Washington, D.C., October 28, 1988.

Lincoln Day has not held office in the PAA, but he is known as a raconteur and a fund of stories on PAA luminaries and meetings over the years. Also, his own interesting career, divided between the U.S. and Australia, has been unique among U.S. demographers. In this free-flowing interview, he lives up to his reputation, with a stream of sharp observations and warm stories on personalities and matters demographic and otherwise.

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS: Lincoln Day was born in Ames, Iowa, and grew up from the age of five in Denver, Colorado. He received his B.A. in sociology in 1949 from Yale and the M.A. in 1951 and Ph.D. in 1957, both also in sociology and both from Columbia University, where he met his wife, Alice Taylor Day, who is now well known for her research and publications on the elderly in the U.S. and Australia. He has worked at Columbia's Bureau of Applied Social Research and taught sociology at Mount Holyoke, Princeton, Yale, and Columbia. He was Chief of the Demographic and Social Statistics Branch of the United Nations from 1970 to 1973, and since 1973 has been Senior Fellow in the Department of Demography at the Australian National University, Canberra, the first department of demography in the world. He is well known for his research and writing on the implications, and particularly the benefits, of zero population growth and older age structures in industrialized societies, beginning with the popular book, Too Many Americans (1964), written with Alice Day. He has also published on differential fertility, divorce in Australia, population density, and other demographic topics.

VDT [continuing biographical introduction]: There are several distinctive things about Link. Early in his career, he and Alice Day wrote the popular bestseller, Too Many Americans, published in 1964. It had grown out of an article that Link had published in 1960 in the Columbia Forum on "The American Fertility Cult: Our Irresponsible Birthrate," which became a Readers Digest article. There are two interesting things about that, I think. Not so many American demographers, or any demographers, have written for the popular press, although Kingsley Davis always has, and he's been criticized by some academics for doing so. Kingsley has just had another article, an op-ed piece, in the New York Times, "Our Idle Retirees Drag Down the Economy" [New York Times, October 18, 1988]. Also, William and Renee Petersen say of Lincoln in their Biographies of Demographers [1985] that: "Earlier and more persistently than other demographers, he has advocated a zero population growth in Western societies and analyzed its effects." And he has continued to do that. Just this year, he had an article in Family Planning Perspectives [May/June 1988] on what he sees as the good effects of population numerical declines--not just zero population growth--and older age structures in European societies.

Link is also renowned as an American demographer who has been based in Australia since 1973. He shuttles back and forth between the two countries, often with stopovers in between, and I thank you, Link, for making time for this interview during one of your busy visits to Washington. Even while located in Australia, he and Alice have attended PAA meetings faithfully over the years. Other interviewees in this series recommended Link as a good source

of stories about PAA personalities and happenings, which I already knew from my own experience. I wanted to capture those stories for the record, along with something on his own interesting career, which is why I asked him for this interview, even though he hasn't been a PAA president or secretary-treasurer and so technically doesn't meet the criteria for the interview sample.

Now, Link, after that lengthy introduction, let's begin with what led to your interest in demography.

DAY: I first took a course in population as an undergraduate at Yale under Tip Reed--Stephen W. Reed II. He's one of these people who never published much and got tenure, I think, through a sort of old-boy network and was at the time, I would say, one of the most intellectual people on the faculty and certainly in the sociology department at Yale. He was really an anthropologist. He was a disciple of Malinowski, the great anthropologist, and graduated from Yale in the 1930s and went to the University of London to do graduate work with Malinowski. War was looming on the horizon and Malinowski took an appointment at Yale, where he spent his final years. Tip came back from England to Yale and finished up there, doing a highly regarded thesis on New Guinea.

He taught this course in population, which was sort of an anthropological view of it, and I took it in my senior year and really got interested in it. Then I went down that autumn [1949] to Columbia for graduate work in sociology. I had a course with Kingsley Davis and everything about demography was exciting from then on. Kingsley, I think, is one of the really great teachers. I've had a lot of great teachers, but Kingsley is certainly right up there at the top. He had a well-organized course. It was a very sociological course by this teacher who was a very good sociologist before he got into demography; he just spurred us on. Alice, my future wife, came down from Smith in 1950 and asked me about courses and I recommended Davis's course in population and she said she didn't know if she'd be interested in population. I said, "Take it anyway and see what happens." And we've both been hooked on demography ever since.

So that's how I got in. Then Abe Jaffe came up from the Census Bureau a year later. Abe and I just hit it off.

VDT: He came up to Columbia?

DAY: Yes, he joined the Bureau of Applied Social Research; he was never part of the sociology department. I took a one-term course in methods from Abe; that's the only formal training I've ever had in methods. I worked with Abe. He supervised my doctoral dissertation after I'd been drafted into the army and went back to Columbia and Davis by that time had gone off to Berkeley.

Abe was not a great classroom teacher, but he was just an outstanding teacher outside the classroom. Like Davis, he's a very broad-based person. Demography is not a narrow subject and demographers aren't overly specialized to those people. Those people saw demography as something that brought in things from psychology, sociology, anthropology, economics, statistics, biology, history--and we need more like them. That is the approach I think demography should take. To me, demography is something that combines a lot of different things, and I must say I deplore this tendency toward what I think is over-specialization.

On the other hand, in a "publish-or-perish" society, highly competitive, the way one publishes is to get a few data and write them up into a quick and nasty article and get it published. It's too bad.

VDT: You've anticipated one of the things I was going to bring up later which is that you have a broad approach to demography, of which Kingsley Davis is certainly the epitome. I was going to mention that William Ogburn gave the dinner talk at what I think must have been your first PAA meeting--1951.

DAY: My first was 1952, actually.

VDT: Well, the year before, it was at Chapel Hill, Phil Hauser was president, and Ogburn gave a talk on "Population and Social Change" and advocated just that--that demographers should move beyond strictly formal demography and look at the broad picture.

DAY: It's interesting that you mention Ogburn. I never knew him but Abe Jaffe was a great admirer of Ogburn. Ogburn took Abe up as a young man, gave him a job after his father had died. Originally, Abe had to run the family hardware store there in Chicago. A year or two after he'd been working for Ogburn, Ogburn said, "You really ought to go to the university." That's how Abe went to the University of Chicago and then stayed on and wrote his thesis under Ogburn's direction and got a Ph.D.

Abe always had two pictures of Ogburn on the wall at his office. One was Ogburn as a young man with lots of hair and the other was Ogburn as an old man with no hair at all. I had a wonderful thing happen to me. Abe wrote me a year or two ago and said that he considered me in the line with Ogburn--Ogburn, Jaffe, and Day. I felt quite honored about that.

VDT: You mean the way you've approached demography?

DAY: Well, approached demography and sociology in general.

VDT: The broad, total picture?

DAY: I guess that was the sort of thing he had in mind.

VDT: That's great. What was the topic of your dissertation which started under Davis?

DAY: No it didn't, actually. I wrote my master's thesis under Kingsley. That was on patterns of marriage in Puerto Rico and their relation to the fertility rate.

VDT: Where did the data come from?

DAY: Census and vital statistics. Chris Tietze, later at the Population Council, had written a paper in the American Journal of Sociology that I think Kingsley thought missed a few points. What he found was that married couples were having smaller families; there was a fertility decline among married couples. But what happened was just that more people were being registered as married; among unions, the proportion being registered as formally married was increasing. So you had an increasing denominator and an essentially stationary numerator and so what appeared to be a decline in fertility really wasn't at all. I read a bit about Puerto and it was interesting; I'd never been to Puerto Rico.

My Ph.D. was written under Abe Jaffe's supervision. By this time, I'd had two years as a

drafter in the army and had started teaching.

VDT: At Columbia?

DAY: No. I returned to teaching at Mount Holyoke after the army. I asked Abe if he'd be willing to supervise a thesis; there really wasn't anyone around to do it.

VDT: You'd done your generals before you left for the army?

DAY: I'd done everything--the two language exams, the coursework, and the generals--everything except the thesis.

As I said, Abe and I had always gotten along well and Abe, out of the kindness of his heart, said yes. He got no brownie points for it; he certainly got no extra money for it. I was teaching full time and working on this weekends.

VDT: What was it?

DAY: That was, The Age of Women at Completion of Childbearing, United States, 1910 to 1950: Demographic Factors and Possible Social Consequences. How about that! That's the first paragraph.

A funny thing about it. I defended this at Columbia and demography was not appreciated at Columbia in those days, so there were three people from the sociology department there. In addition, Columbia was working on the medieval principle that a thesis defense was open to anybody--like Luther hanging his thesis up on the door to debate with anybody who came by. Well, there was a statistician and an anthropologist--actually Ruth Bunzell, who did the great work on Zunis--and an economist from the Russian institute; they were all there, plus Abe. I had slaved away on this thesis. I thought I ought to put in this one thing on theory about the status of women and and stratification and household composition, all this kind of thing. It turned out I was far in advance of my times; there was a lot on status of women in one chapter. I outlined that chapter in one evening, I remember, and wrote it the next evening; it was all pure Parsonian stuff. So I got into this and everybody around this table started saying what a great thesis this was. It didn't take long for it to dawn on me that they hadn't read the thesis; what they'd read was that one chapter on theory which had taken me two evenings to do and they thought it was just great. As I say, it was pure [Talcott] Parsons and that was the establishment at the time. And they were all saying, "How great!" So I passed.

I'm walking out with Abe and I'm on a cloud, I'd gotten my Ph.D. out of the way, and we get out of earshot of these people and Abe says, in his inimitable fashion, "I suppose you had to put in that last chapter to get it past those guys. But I'll tell you one thing: if you ever publish any of that crap, I'll never speak to you again."

VDT: Did you--publish anything like it?

DAY: As a matter of fact I did publish a bit of it--on social stratification and the wife's employment, what this meant. It was published in the American Journal of Economics and Sociology. It was the only place I submitted it to and they took it.

VDT: What led to your special interest and concern about population growth, especially in the U.S.--in other words, Too Many Americans [1964], the book you and Alice did. You've told me the story before but I'd like to have it for the record. That came not long after defending your thesis [in 1957].

DAY: I got the idea for that article in early 1958.

VDT: The article entitled "The American Fertility Cult: Our Irresponsible Birthrate"?

DAY: Which wasn't my title; I didn't have a title for it really. That title was given by Eric Wensberg, a young Norwegian-American from Nebraska, who had gone to Columbia College for his undergraduate degree--very bright guy, majored in English--and had the idea for this Columbia Forum magazine, which went to everybody who had anything to do with Columbia--former faculty, faculty, students, parents of students, anybody who'd given a dollar to the place. They must have had a readership of a quarter, fifth of a million of the most intellectual people in America at the time, and it was all done by Eric. He was running this magazine in New York and presumably writing the great American novel about a young boy of Norwegian ancestry who comes from Nebraska to Columbia University.

Well, I got the idea for this thing, wrote it up. By this time I was teaching at Princeton. I wrote it up that fall, sent it off to Harper's Magazine, and after about six months I got what one of my Princeton colleagues said was the nicest refusal letter he'd ever seen, from Russell Lynes, who was the editor of Harper's at the time. This chap, whose wife was a novelist and short-story writer, said it was obviously a mixed decision; that Lynes obviously had wanted to do it but the board overruled him.

I sent it off to the Reporter magazine, which was a funny sort of thing going at the time, and I think they sent it back before they even received it; I got it back in about 12 hours, as I remember. Then I sat on it for a while. Then by that time I was working with Abe at the Bureau of Applied Social Research and Columbia Forum had its office on the ground floor of this building and I just stuck it under the door one night after work. And the next morning, Eric Wensberg was on the phone and said he wanted to publish it and had a few comments about style. I went down there and Eric had run a blue pencil through about a third of my deathless prose. I mumbled something about how I always got good grades in English in college and Eric leaned back, looked at me very hard, and said, "You've been studying too much sociology." I couldn't tell you what he'd cut out but it was a lot better.

Well, they published it in the summer 1960 issue and within no time at all I had letters from four leading publishers--Doubleday, Braziller, Houghton Mifflin, Macmillan--saying: "You've got a book; write it for us." [Houghton Mifflin published the book, in 1964.] Then the Readers Digest abridged the article and put it in there.

VDT: That was about 1961?

DAY: That was the autumn of 1960.

VDT: That fast!

DAY: They got it out very fast. And they distilled it even further. I must say I was quite

impressed with how they managed to get the essence of the article into two and a half of their pages. And they paid something ridiculous. That was back in the days when a dollar was a dollar and my salary at Columbia was pretty low, although it was higher than it had been at Princeton or Mount Holyoke. I think they paid something like \$250 a page--printed page. It happened to be in the same issue as a very long abridgment of Barry Goldwater's Conscience of a Conservative, so I would say the Readers Digest was putting a lot of money into the Goldwater campaign.

Well, you asked me how I got onto this topic. My background from Iowa, farm background; I spent bits and pieces of time on a farm. I grew up in Colorado. My parents were always concerned about conservation and waste; they took that Protestant puritanical attitude toward waste. One didn't waste time; one didn't waste resources. Then I worked on a farm in Iowa. An old college friend of my father had this farm; he'd gone back to the family farm in the northeastern part of Iowa, around Waterloo. They weren't relatives at all. This was during the war and I worked for him as a farmhand for three summers. Evan Sage was his name; he died just a couple of years ago. I kept up with him and now his son has the farm. I've seen a lot of changes in these things. I think a lot of these economists who talk about farming and American agriculture being more productive and so on, I think they should have gone out and worked on a farm for a while. I think they really don't know beans about what they're talking about. These people are borrowing on the future. They're not counting in a lot of things that you really need to count in. A good farmer--and this farmer I worked for was a good farmer--counts in things like damage to the soil. He thinks in terms of staying out of debt. We never put any artificial fertilizer on that farm; all the fertilizer was manure that we got from the animals. We rotated crops every year. The three years I was there the pasture was never in the same place, the cornfields were never in the same place, the oatfields were here one season, there the next season--everything was rotated.

And, I suppose, thinking in terms of saving--we had to live very frugally. My father was invalided just a few months after I was born. He was unable to work most of the time and then only on a very limited basis. He was a university graduate and had a good job early on, but he ended up working in the last years of his life as a part-time bookkeeper. My mother was supporting the three of us. But I think, frankly, the family had more money than it spent. We were never in debt and it was always assumed that I would go to college and that I would not have to get a scholarship.

VDT: Were you the oldest?

DAY: I was the only child.

I think being brought up to be frugal and having that experience on the farm and also growing up in Colorado, where there's a lot of evidence of erosion, just set me up for this kind of thing. And then going east to university and developing there, I think, quite a sense of history and appreciation of continuity and historical preservation and things of this kind.

VDT: So you saw the natural resource base of this country being threatened by what you perceived as a too-high birth rate?

DAY: That was part of it. And also going around different places and going back to places I hadn't seen for several years and seeing how they had changed. Denver had grown. When I

grew up in Denver the whole metropolitan area had about 550,000 population; it had a beginning and an end. The same sort of thing when I was a student. I was too far away from home to go home on short vacations; I went home only at Christmas and summers. Between terms and at Thanksgiving, I went off hitch-hiking. I got down into the South as far as Florida. I went out to Michigan once to visit a cousin of mine who was a student at the University of Michigan. I got as far north as Montreal. I traveled around a lot and was able to see changes that were happening even then, and this was before the mass construction of superhighways.

But Denver . . . Denver to me is now one of the most depressing places I know--the pollution, the lack of open space, the lack of amenities. I often thought during the big environmental movement here, that one way we could get support for this was to give everyone a free trip to a place that he or she hadn't seen in, say, five years but remembered very fondly. Particularly in the U.S. where you had a high level of economic growth or--as I found later, now that I've traveled to Europe a great deal--in some places in Europe there's the same sort of thing.

I certainly very early on recognized that economic growth is not an indicator of a high quality of life, that it really doesn't mean much of anything from the standpoint of human needs. I don't want to discount it as an important measure, certainly, but it does not measure quality of life. It certainly tends to overlook the existence of limits. I think I've always, even as a child, been aware of limits. You do not spend more than you have. You could not do this, because you had to do that. You always had to make choices and you always had to establish priorities. I think that's probably a rather good training to have had.

VDT: It certainly is. The baby boom children coming along, you must have realized that they were being offered the world.

At the time you and Alice wrote Too Many Americans [published 1964], the U.S. population was a mere 190 million but adding 2.8 million a year. You projected that if it went on at that rate it would be 260 million in 1980. Of course, it turned out to be 226 million. The latest figures are 246 million [in 1988] and adding 2 million a year, of which a far larger proportion now, of course, is due to net immigration.

DAY: Well, I think they're doing what Alice and I told them to do--limiting the number of children.

VDT: Indeed, they are. Interestingly, last night I was transcribing the interview I had last May with Ansley Coale and got to the place where we were talking about his PAA presidential address of 1968. It was on "Should the U.S. have a campaign to reduce the birth rate?" [published in Population Index, October/December 1968]. This was the time of Paul Ehrlich and The Population Bomb and some people were also concerned about high U.S. fertility--the baby boom. His conclusion in that speech was we didn't need a specific campaign to advocate two or three children--"like Lincoln Day says." For one thing, he felt the birth rate was on the way down, which proved to be correct. The peak of the baby boom was actually in 1957 and certainly by 1968 it was coming down. He believed in trying to influence only at the margin, making the marginal cost of an additional child difficult, making women lose their jobs and so on. And now we have the opposite.

DAY: Let me say something about that. First of all, Alice and I did not advocate a campaign to limit people to only two or three children.

VDT: How about his impression that you did?

DAY: People don't always read books carefully; they have books read for them by somebody else. I'm not saying that was the case with Ansley. I think Ansley was basically correct. I didn't disagree with Ansley; I thought it was fine.

What we wanted was to remove the pressures upon people to have more children than they wanted. We wanted to improve access to birth control--and that included abortion, of course, which has changed; I think the attitude toward abortion has changed. We wanted to open up opportunities for alternative sources of satisfaction, that is, alternatives to the satisfactions that children presumably bring. That would include employment opportunities for women--not just any old job but a rewarding job, so they could get some psychic return in addition to the presumed economic return from employment. That sort of approach. In other words, we took a very institutional approach. Actually, some months ago I had a chance to look again at our final chapter, that chapter on achieving what we called a stable population because we didn't dare use the word "stationary," which has a bad connotation, I think, in American life. You've got a copy there.

VDT: Right, that's from the Population Reference Bureau library and it includes a review that appeared in the New York Times, very complimentary, said it was an excellent book. This copy had been sent to PRB with the compliments of the authors.

Your very last sentence is: "In short [your recommendations could be boiled down to] . . . the decision to bear or not to bear a child should be made solely by the potential parents and most important of all for the goals of a stable population, this decision is made in a social and cultural context in which a family of three children is considered large." So you did mention numbers.

DAY: Oh yes, but not that the U.S. should undertake a campaign to tell people, "Have no more than two children." I think what Ansley was saying was . . .

VDT: Actually, he said with regard to his approach, which was trying to influence at the margin, that "what I find most appealing is the fact that it does not attempt to enforce a limitation of two births or three births per couple, as has been recommended, for example, by Lincoln Day." Well, I guess that's just the impression that people had of you at the time.

DAY: Well, to achieve a stable population in the U.S., we discount what's to be gained from redistribution of resources, redistribution of people, we reject increasing the death rate, and then we get into decreasing the birth rate. Now, how do you go about that? We reject coercive measures entirely--obviously coercion is a matter of degree, I suppose. The first thing we mention is further reduction in infant and child mortality, which of course would increase the number of children, but we saw no reason to achieve it in this manner. Improvement in contraceptive techniques--I don't think anyone can object to that. Education in the need for family limitation; we mention that you can be educated to brush your teeth and put out campfires and so on. We end that with that it's a uniquely individual affair--the decision whether or not to practice family limitation--even if many of the consequences are not. We said greater acceptability of means. Alter the image of the ideal American family; we said why does the

master of ceremonies always have to demand applause for the mother of eight. We suggested a more flexible attitude toward marriage. Alternative activities for women.

I don't think I'd take back any of that.

VDT: I would think not. Then you went on to the opposite tack in a sense; you went on to try to allay the fears that seemed to arise at the prospect of a zero or negative population growth and aging societies, which people became aware of as the inevitable consequences of declining birth rates. For instance, the paper you did for the 1970-72 Commission on Population Growth and the American Future ["The Social Consequences of a Zero Population Growth Rate in the United States," in Research Reports of the Commission, 1972, edited by Charles Westoff and Robert Parke, Jr.], and it became in part a Population Bulletin of the Population Reference Bureau in [June] 1978, "What Will a ZPG Society be Like?"

DAY: Which was the nicest color that you people ever had. I had nothing to do with that color and I think it was the nicest . . .

VDT: That's nice to know. It was blue and I was always concerned about blue; you see I'm wearing blue today. You obviously like blue. That was one of the most interesting Bulletins--and authors--I was ever associated with. One of the nicest things about it was that it required practically no editing. You are very articulate--and Alice is too. How did that come about? You said that Eric Wensberg criticized your earlier writing.

DAY: Actually, Eric required me to read--it was a case of re-reading because I'd read virtually all of his nonfiction and all of his fiction too, for that matter--George Orwell's essay, "Politics and the English language." Eric said, "I insist that you read that." I mumbled something about having read it and he said, "Re-read it. You've just been reading too much sociology; too much jargon." I did well in English; I took a lot of English in college.

VDT: What does Orwell talk about?

DAY: Basically, what it is is a very good statement about writing clearly, being careful about what the meanings of words are, and saying what you mean. I think that had Dukakis and his campaign managers read that and taken it to heart they would never have allowed George Bush to debate the word "liberal," for example.

I always have in the back of my mind that there's nothing so arcane about any of the social sciences--I include economics, sociology, demography and psychology in there--that cannot be made reasonably intelligible to a well-motivated high school student. I have a kind of--call it an anti-intellectual view--that if I read something and can't really understand it, then either the person that's writing doesn't know what the hell he's talking about or he's trying to hoodwink me. And I don't like to be hoodwinked and I don't like being unable to understand some of these things. I've mentioned this to acquaintances of mine and at least one biologist and one physicist have told me they think the same thing could be said about their disciplines. I always have in the back of my mind when I'm writing, "Can that well-motivated high school student understand what I'm saying?"

VDT: More and more demographers are careful how they write, but on the whole they haven't

been that way.

Well, besides liking the color of "What Will a ZPG Society be Like?" and expressing yourself so well, what led to your concern to allay these fears about the consequences of an aging society?

DAY: Well, I think when you look at the alternative--which is a high-fertility, high-mortality population if it's going to be stationary, or an ever-increasing population if it's going to be a younger age structure--when you look at those two alternatives, and those are the only two alternatives, then the idea of an older population isn't so bad.

As you get older yourself and as you look around at people who are getting older--people of an age that when you and I were young we thought was really quite old--we find they're going out; they're trekking; they're riding bicycles; they're participating in the life of the society. And when you go to Europe . . . Alice and I were particularly impressed when we traveled in Scandinavia in 1966--it had to do with the research we were doing--with how old people were getting along, what the care of children was and so on. We spent an afternoon, incidentally, with Gunnar Myrdal, one of the great experiences we had; he actually made tea for us. You looked around and you saw old people very much in evidence and healthy and participating in the life of the society in a way that just didn't seem to be going on in the United States. You begin to think that there are some possibilities that haven't been explored. Here we were in societies that had pretty much not increased their population; certainly Sweden has not increased its population very much. Denmark was on the low side; Denmark was still a relatively young population.

I think the amount of traveling I've done, the fact that I've grown up and had really meaningful experiences in three rather different parts of the United States--the Rocky Mountain West, the Midwest, and New England and the Middle Atlantic--and then of course later living in Australia. We first went there for two years, 1962 to 1964. It's a cliché but travel is broadening, it's educational--it can be. I think I've never stayed in a first-class hotel in my life and I don't intend to start doing that.

VDT: That's interesting. We jumped ahead but let me ask what explains your interest in Australia. What did you do when you went in 1962?

DAY: I was a visiting fellow in the department of demography at Australian National University and I wrote the first demographic study--maybe it was the first study ever--on patterns of divorce in Australia and compared those with patterns of divorce in the United States.

VDT: Who found whom? The Australians found you?

DAY: It was sort of a funny deal. I was working with Abe Jaffe at the time, we were on soft money, and Abe said, "Now we're coming to the end of our project," which incidentally was on disabled workers in the labor force. Abe and I wrote a book on that together; it was under the auspices of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. Abe said, "What do you want to do? Shall I write you into the next project?" I said, "Well, I'd like to travel a bit." I'd been all over the United States, but I'd never been outside the United States except up to Montreal, Canada, very briefly as a student; slept on a park bench up there and then turned around and hitchhiked back. And Abe said, "Where do you want to go?" I said, "It depends on where I can go."

At that time, Abe and I hadn't yet finished our book. Alice and I had started Too Many

Americans but we hadn't finished it; it was well under way. I had one professional article to my credit, I think, that was in Public Health Reports, which was on my thesis, and I had that other one in the American Journal of Economics and Sociology. So I didn't have much of a c.v. And I said I wanted to go where it was healthy, because I had two little children; our daughter was about two then, our son four. All the opportunities were to go to Latin America or the Mideast or Asia and I really didn't feel I should go there. Yet I didn't have much of a c.v. to get into the European countries at the time; those were the ones being sought after--getting Fulbrights and so on.

So Abe just leaned back and said, "Well, let's just write Borrie in Australia and see what's happening there." So he wrote Borrie--a wonderful person, great demographer, and also--talking about people who can write English, Mick Borrie can really write English.

VDT: That's W.D. Borrie? That's what you call him?

DAY: Mick. W.D. stands for Wilfred D. Borrie. Abe wrote Mick Borrie and said I'd been working with him, I was a former student of his, he could recommend me highly, and I was interested in going to Australia--which wasn't exactly true, but anyway. Mick wrote back and said I sounded like somebody they'd like to have. And one thing led to another and I went down there and fell in love with the place.

VDT: You stayed there for two years that first time?

DAY: Yes. One of the dumb things I did was come back.

VDT: You went back and forth. Then there was your time at Yale?

DAY: Then I went to Yale, joined the faculty there. At Yale I took a sabbatical for a half year and went down to . . .

BREAK

VDT: You said you regretted coming back from Australia the first time, but you went back and forth for a while.

DAY: My children were speaking true Australian; we were in Canberra. We came back in 1966 and went down the second time in 1968 for half a year. Then I had a chance to go down on a permanent basis in 1973, so I took it.

VDT: Well, that was serendipity, as so often happens with the careers of people in demography. Let's get into PAA, which was ostensibly my main reason for having you here.

DAY: I've been talking too much about myself.

VDT: I wanted you to! To continue on that, of all the accomplishments in your career, what are you proudest of?

DAY: Oh, I don't know how great my accomplishments are. I'm very proud of Too Many Americans, frankly. That was very much a joint effort with Alice. I really don't think we would have to take back much that we wrote there; I think we called the shots pretty well on that. I think if I were to redo it, the main thing would be probably changing the chapter on the military, for which I was mainly responsible. You see what we tried to do in Too Many Americans was to point out the threat that continued population increase in the United States--and by implication in other industrialized countries--poses to the quality of life. And we tried to answer all the arguments we'd ever heard in favor of continued population increase in the U.S.: the "science-will-save-us-all" argument, which is essentially that there are no limits; the economic growth argument; the military strength argument; and the eugenic argument, which is, well, so you have to have a decline in fertility but let all those inferior people limit their children and let us superior people continue to have as many as we want. Then at the last we had a program for bringing about zero population growth in the United States and by implication other industrialized countries. As I say, I'm pretty pleased about that.

But the military argument, I think, is probably . . . I can tell you a story about this. I was in the Yale reserve book room when I was on the faculty there and had to get a reference that I knew was in our book, so I pulled the book out from the shelf. Actually, before I got to Yale it was being used in three courses, one in biology, a couple in sociology, and one in the School of Forestry. I pulled the book off the shelf and I just happened to open it, it fell open, to the chapter on the military. Now, the Vietnam War was on then and there's a place in there where I rather pompously talk about how no more wars will involve massed armies chasing one another across a border and so forth. And some student had put at the end of this thing: "Thank you, General Westmoreland."

VDT: Oh, boy! Well, I think you can indeed be proud of that book for it has remained one of the outstanding books on population in America.

We've touched on this already, but who have been some of the leading influences in your career? You've already mentioned Abe Jaffe, the professor at Yale whose population course you took, and Kingsley Davis. Tell a bit more about Kingsley Davis. You worked with him at Columbia when you were first there. Can you tell me the story of why he moved to Berkeley? Was he trying to get a department of demography started at Columbia and they were against him or something?

DAY: That I wouldn't know. He moved [in 1955] when I was in the army. He and Judith Blake had just married then, I think [in 1954]. To my way of thinking, it was a great loss to Columbia, but it was a great gain to Berkeley. Kingsley is just an outstanding teacher.

I have to tell you a couple of things, though. I had the privilege of sharing a platform with Kingsley during what they referred to as an "intellectual weekend" at the University of Texas, in 1967. What they do during other weekends at the University of Texas I don't know, but this was billed as an intellectual weekend, and Kingsley and I were down there, along with Senator Gruening of Alaska, Father Lord of Notre Dame, the president of Notre Dame--a freak person but lively; used up most of his time to condemn abortion in a rather emotional way. Kingsley and I had to spend a lot of time with the students, mostly undergraduates. You gave your talk but then they talked with you.

On the way back, we were both sitting there fogged in in the Austin airport for about two-

and-a-half hours, waiting to fly to Dallas for our individual flights. We had a long time to talk; the longest I'd ever been with Kingsley. We talked about the students and how impressed we were--they were a bright, lively, concerned group of students. I said something about that and Kingsley said, "You know, I'd never be admitted to Texas"--you know he did his undergraduate degree [and first master's degree] at Texas--"I couldn't be admitted to Texas anymore." I said, "Why not?" He said, "I wasn't in the top 25 percent of my class."

Kingsley just taught me one more thing. If any of us who have given out grades--and we put so much emphasis on this; we judge people people by the grades they got in school at different levels--and here's this man--at that time I'd probably read most of what he'd written; some of it you could disagree with, you could argue on one point or another, but by golly it was always worth your while to read it--and here was this man who wasn't even in the top 25 percent of a small city high school in Texas. Once again, it just shows that you want to give support, you want to give opportunity to everybody in school, and not just to the high-flyers. I'd sort of known that in different ways. Certainly met a lot of people in the army--if you're an enlisted man in the army you learn a lot of things; the main thing you learn is that the real enemy is the officers in your own army. And the other thing I learned was that people who'd never even gotten through high school are apt to be just as intelligent as people I'd gone to Yale with.

VDT: Well, that was a good lesson learned [but see Kingsley Davis's reaction when Day's story was brought up at the end of his interview, above].

Could you tell another story about Kingsley that you've told me before, about what happened at one of your early PAA meetings in a session presided over by Phil Hauser and the faceoff between Kingsley Davis and Frank Lorimer?

DAY: That was my first PAA meeting, in 1952 at Princeton. I was sitting there with Monroe Lerner; we were graduate students together. In those days everybody went to the [one-at-time] session, nobody was out in the lobby and the numbers were small; everybody was there in one room. Kingsley presented an early version of what became the Davis-Blake thing on intermediate variables ["Social Structure and Fertility: An Analytic Framework," Economic Development and Cultural Change, April 1956]; I guess the cliché now is "proximate variables," but it's still the same thing. And Frank Lorimer got up afterward and said he was interested in this because he, Frank Lorimer, had done something along these lines in an article on fertility in Africa, and he was a little surprised and a bit upset, I think, that Kingsley hadn't referred to this. And Kingsley got up and with that broad Texas accent of his--I think he must practice it to maintain it the way he does--he said, "I'm familiar with your article, Frank. In fact, your article was the inspiration for my article." Then he said something like, "Yours was the most illogical, disorganized sort of thing"--he went on about this for a few seconds. I remember Henry Shryock was there and Henry just turned around and he had the biggest smile on his face. Monroe was terribly disturbed. He said, "I'm working for Frank Lorimer and Kingsley's my teacher!" We were sitting there stunned, the two of us. And Frank Lorimer got up and started taking off his coat and said, "Take off your coat." And Phil Hauser says, "Meeting adjourned to the alley." Everybody started laughing and that was the end of it. But it was really quite exciting. [Philip Hauser and Everett Lee recalled this incident too; see interviews above. It must have occurred at the 1955 Princeton meeting, which is where Davis and Judith Blake gave the first version of their intermediate variables paper, "Recent Research and the Theory of Fertility in Underdeveloped Areas"--also mentioned by Judith Blake in her interview--in a session on "Foreign Studies," with

Forrest Linder as chair and Frank Lorimer as discussant. Everett Lee recalled that "Lorimer commented that Kingsley should have read his book"--presumably Culture and Human Fertility, 1954.]

VDT: That must have been part of one of the classic ongoing debates that Charlie Nam talked about in his interview with me. He said during the meetings in the 1950s there were always two great ongoing debates; one was between Phil Husesr and Joseph Davis of Stanford on projections and the other one was this. Every year there would be this exciting fertility session where Kingsley Davis and Frank Lorimer would light into each other. He explained it that Davis saw fertility change taking place with a social structural framework through the intermediate variables and Frank Lorimer believed in the importance of the cultural context. And everyone looked forward to these sessions.

DAY: I don't remember those others, but I don't see how you can get structure out of the cultural context. It seems to me they're all pretty much the same thing [Kingsley Davis agrees: see above.] But these are the sorts of philosophical things you get into when you don't have very many data.

VDT: That's an interesting point.

DAY: Another thing I do remember about that [1952 or 1955?] meeting was that a dapper young man in the finest of English tailoring, very dark, very Semitic-looking, was introduced as a visitor from England and was the great David V. Glass. He simply got up on the stage and said hello, very gracious, and then sat down. I had heard of him, of course, but alas I never had a chance to talk to him. I certainly have admired his work ever since. I remember that quite well.

And I think it was there that I saw Walter Willcox from Cornell, who was by that time quite an old man and lived to be a hundred or so [103]. My recollection of him was that he had very large ears, but I may be confusing him with somebody else.

But I do remember Glass. I think he should have had more importance attached to his presence there.

VDT: Tell us about some other early PAA luminaries. You've also told me before a nice story about Clyde Kiser enumerating the Poles for the U.S. census.

DAY: Yes. I always use this as an illustration in talking especially to undergraduates, trying to convince them to be careful about demographic data. Just because these things are printed in a nice form and can be calculated to half a dozen decimal places, you have to remember that in the last analysis all these data come out of interviews and therefore they're subject to the same sorts of limitations that any of these data are subject to. They may be about things that people are less likely to forget, like the number of children they have or when they were born, but all the same they are interview data.

Well, Clyde tells about how as a graduate student at Columbia in 1930--he was a boy from North Carolina up there in the big city--and the local arrangements for the census involved his professor of statistics, a man named Chaddock. Chaddock got all the boys in his class in statistics to go down and enumerate the population in the flophouses and things of that kind on the census night. So Clyde went down there and says it was about 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning

and here he was in this Polish flophouse. They had these two long tables with men on either side sitting on benches asleep with their heads on the table. And the enumeration consisted of this young man from North Carolina following the proprietor, who would grab each of these sleepers by the hair on the back of his head, pull the head back, interpret the question to the would-be sleeper, interpret the answer to the young North Carolinian, then put the head back down on the table and move on to the next.

Clyde says he got back to his room at Furnald Hall at Columbia--and I remember Furnald Hall because that's where I lived when I was a student--in the early dawn's light and he had some doubts about the accuracy of the United States census, but he had no doubt about its social relevance.

VDT: That's a marvelous story. Do you have other stories about Clyde Kiser?

DAY: Not about him, but about his roommate, Rupert Vance. They roomed together at North Carolina as undergraduates [first-year graduate students]. I only saw Rupert Vance once. I knew nothing about him, though I'd read some things by him and admired him. When I was teaching at New Haven [Yale], Dan Price got me to come down to North Carolina to give a lecture in a series; Con Taeuber was in the series and Joe Spengler, among others. This came out as The 99th Hour [subtitle: The Population Crisis in the United States, edited by Daniel Price, 1967]. It never got much publicity, but I thought it wasn't a bad book. At any rate, they had this little reception for me before I went in to give my talk and they wheeled this tiny man up to me and it turned out to be the great Rupert Vance. I leaned over and said something about having admired his work all these years and was very glad to have a chance to meet him. And he sort of cackled, with a very strong Alabama accent, and he doubled up into an even smaller ball--you know he was horribly crippled by polio--and he said, "And you know, I did it all with arithmetic."

VDT: Great. You've told me that story; I'm so glad we now have it on record. Rupert Vance was obviously an extraordinary person. I interviewed Dan Price in this series, went down to Chapel Hill in April [1988], and everybody down there is still full of Rupert Vance. He still pervades the scene. And Charles Nam, of course, was full of him; he had recently written an article about him [see Nam interview].

Let's go on to Frank Lorimer. You were said to be somebody who knew Frank well. How did that happen?

DAY: Well, I didn't know him all that well. He came down to a public lecture that I gave in New Haven once.

VDT: Came down?

DAY: From Guilford [Connecticut]; he lived up in Guildford after his retirement. His first wife had died and he remarried some years later and actually had a child by his second wife.

VDT: Petra is her name?

DAY: I think it may be. She's a New Zealander--"Kiwi," as we call them in Australia, and as they call themselves too. Very nice person. He was living with her up in Guilford in a kind of

communal arrangement for a while.

He came down to this and it was a large hall filled with students. It was on population and environment. This was the peak of that period: people were concerned about the Vietnam War and they were concerned about the environment and population. He was the first person to get up and ask a question. I thought this man needs to have a little more recognition and I said, "Just a moment before you ask the question," and I introduced him to the audience. I said he was a former president of the Population Association of America [1946-47] and of the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population [1957-61], one of the world's leading demographers, and also had been a Yale undergraduate. I thought they ought to know that they didn't all become George Bushes or something of that kind--this was before George Bush. And, you know, students are so good. They were a great group of students in those days. They needed shaves and haircuts and neckties, but they were probably the best group of students ever to go to Yale.

VDT: In the late 1960s?

DAY: The whole 1960s. Those students just gave him an ovation! I really appreciated the students doing that.

Frank came out to Australia several times; he was a visiting fellow in the department. He was awfully good with the students. I think the ideal visiting fellow makes himself available to the faculty, to the students. I tried to get him out of Canberra and around, but Frank was quite frail by this time, so he didn't do much traveling.

VDT: This was in the 1970s?

DAY: Yes.

VDT: When he was in his eighties?

DAY: Yes, but he went down to tea twice a day and the students crowded around him. He was just wonderful, and he was so good about sharing his ideas and time. He was out there two or three times. The last time I saw him, he was in Canberra just a couple of days. Even then, he'd want to go to the library and look up something, check on some data. He was still in harness to a certain extent.

VDT: He was writing a book ["The Challenge of the Global Crises"] when he died at 90 [in 1985 in New Zealand].

DAY: He was a student of John Dewey at Columbia; he took his Ph.D. at Columbia [1929]. He was a Congregational clergyman briefly. I don't know how long that lasted [1923-26, before starting on his Ph.D.]. A lovely man. I liked Frank Lorimer.

There are a lot of lovely people in demography.

Talking about that: A colleague of mine in the School of Public Health at Yale wanted to go down to the Population Association meetings when they were at Atlantic City [1969]. Before Atlantic City was a gambling paradise, it was a very good place to hold a meeting because they know how to run hotels down there; they knew how to run kitchens; and they had a boardwalk, which was something to do. This was a woman, very shy and--this will sound sexist--not very

pretty, so nobody was going to go out of his way to make her acquaintance; she couldn't ride on that sort of thing. And, as I say, very shy, so she wouldn't get around and meet people; they were going to have to make the first moves.

Well, Alice and I went down with her and we introduced her to a couple of people and then we went our respective ways and got together with her on the third day and we all went back to New Haven. And she just couldn't get over what a great group these demographers were. She said she had been talking to the most interesting people and said it was unlike all the other professional meetings she'd been to--public health, statistics. She said, "People introduced people to one another!"

VDT: This was in 1969. Do you regret the tremendous growth that makes that more difficult? Or do you feel that despite the explosion to 1,100 at the last meeting [1988 in New Orleans; 1,115 registrants], there's still a certain air about PAA meetings?

DAY: I think you lose something with a larger number. I think still, though, as a group . . . demographers do have the social graces, by and large. There's a kind of basic decency about them in their relations in a situation like that.

VDT: How do you account for that? Does demography produce decent people or do decent people seek out demography?

DAY: I have some theories about this and I'm not so sure I want to talk about them because I think they would be misunderstood. It's just a theory. One part of it is, I think more of them--certainly the oldtimers--come from the Midwest, came from sort of . . . No, I won't go any further than that.

VDT: Okay. Did you ever know Dudley Kirk other than just to meet him at meetings?

DAY: Oh, yes. Dudley's another lovely person. He's a Californian, but I won't hold that against him; there are some very nice people in California. I first met Dudley when he was at the Population Council. Abe Jaffe had this seminar. They called it a faculty seminar but it was open to anybody; it wasn't a course or anything. Columbia had a lot of these things--quite a good idea. People who were interested in a particular topic would just meet together for dinner and a paper and they'd sit around and talk about it afterward.

Abe organized this thing on population and social change and for many years it met in the faculty club once a month during the school year. We had people from the unions, Pop Council, United Nations, Sloan Wayland from Columbia Teachers College, now dean of the college--or I guess he's just retired--and Abe and I were there. Even when I was in New Haven, I used to go down for it. We had people from Fordham and NYU City College and there was one Catholic priest and a couple of actuaries from Metropolitan Life. It was a nice group. Abe once said that he thought when this group was together he had a higher concentration in one room of people who actually used statistics than you could find any other place.

Dudley was one of the regulars there and that's how I first knew Dudley. A very likable person and I think a very thoughtful and thought-provoking person. Again, he writes well.

VDT: And has continued to produce and certainly has been a faithful attendee at PAA meetings.

He still comes, of course.

DAY: I don't think he was at the last one.

VDT: Yes, he was. I have a picture to prove it, at the lunch roundtable of Ansley Coale's and Dudley is in that picture. In recent years, he has organized a special dinner for those who've been members at least 30 years and are over age 70. Two years ago that was publicized in Population Today, the fact that the dinner had taken place, but also we added the note that it had been boycotted by Kingsley Davis as too "agist." Of course, Kingsley quite successfully removed himself, perhaps, from that age group [had a child in 1988].

Did you know Fred Osborn? He was still very active at the time you first joined.

DAY: I only met him once. It was a funny sort of meeting. This was the PAA meeting up at Brown, many, many years ago [1959], and this very tall man and I happened to find ourselves walking diagonally across the Brown campus to wherever they were having the dinner. He was only a name to me and this man, in a very short period of time, checked out my family background, my educational background, and informed me of his numerous progeny, and I thought it all very class-ist. Being a Yale man, I sort of looked down on Princeton people anyway. But it was all very interesting and that was my sole contact with Fred Osborn.

VDT: He was very concerned about his progeny. Everett Lee tells this story [see his interview above]: Fred Osborn at Thanksgiving dinner with the assembled family promised a million dollars to the first child that would produce him a grandchild. When he looked up after saying grace, they'd all left the room to get started!

DAY: Well, eugenicism doesn't appeal to me much. [Frederick Osborn, who made an early fortune and was instrumental in the founding of PAA, Princeton's Office of Population Research, and the Population Council, published books on eugenics, among other topics. According to Frank Notestein, these books and Osborn's support of the Eugenics Society did "much to improve the discourse between biologists and social scientists in this area and to substitute sanity for the exhortations of the lunatic fringe." See Notestein's tribute to "Demography's Statesman on his Eightieth Spring," delivered at the 1969 PAA meeting in Atlantic City, in Population Index, October/December 1969.]

I've known rich and I've known poor and the rich aren't the best; the rich aren't any different. I've known people who never saw the inside of a university let alone a high school, and I'm not impressed that they know any less or that they're any less educable than the people who've gone to a place like Yale. I knew people at Yale who had what I think in the English-speaking world must be the richest intellectual feast prepared for them that any student has anywhere--it was marvelous--and managed to get a degree and do well in their studies without really questioning anything they'd ever been taught by their parents or their churches or whatever. There's more to education than that. What do you need? You need wisdom and kindness, generosity. There are lots of brains around. But that's another matter.

VDT: That's an interesting observation.

What about Phil Hauser? I'm going to interview him in Chicago week after next.

DAY: I really didn't know Phil Hauser much. I met him at meetings a few times and we traded a few things. What he writes is outstanding. He's a very good writer too. I admire Phil a great deal. We tried to get him as a visiting fellow at the Australian National University some years ago but his wife was in very bad health and she subsequently died, so he never did come.

I just remember meeting him at the cocktail hour before the dinner they used to have at the meetings. I remember once he had a big badge--you have to hand it to a man that could do this at a professional meeting--the badge said, "If it moves, fondle it."

VDT: He's always been a great joker.

DAY: I was once traveling some place in the Midwest and ran into a person who was on the faculty at the University of Chicago and he, finding that I was a demographer and sociologist, asked, "Do you know Phil Hauser?" I said, "Oh yes." And he said, "What's his reputation in the field?" I said, "Oh, outstanding--president of the statistical association, the population association, the sociology association." And it came out that he is a real cutup in faculty meetings at Chicago, or was then, and this fellow didn't know whether he should be amused or appalled by him. I think he certainly just has a great sense of humor.

VDT: That's right; it carries him a long way. He's lost an eye in the last year from glaucoma, an operation wasn't successful. But he's very game and tells me to come out, so I'm going to Chicago to meet him.

DAY: Give him my best wishes. He may remember me.

Somebody you haven't mentioned. You've only mentioned people who got to the top office, but there are a lot of people who deserved to be president of PAA. Certainly, Dan Price was right up there.

VDT: He got interviewed in this series because we're also doing secretary-treasurers.

DAY: Well, Dan--and Abe Jaffe, I think. Those two in particular. And Anders Lunde secretary-treasurer, 1965-68], he just added a lot to the meetings, and I don't know if I've told you he was a very good administrator. I remember Anders in particular for the introduction he gave to Everett Lee, before Everett gave his presidential address at the meetings down in Atlanta [1970]. It was so witty and informative and it showed the human Everett Lee and it was just great.

VDT: Fortunately, that has been preserved for the record. I recently interviewed Andy Lunde and I've been in touch with the Lees and Anne Lee sent me that introduction. That set me off trying to get everybody's introduction. It turns out Ansley Coale had introduced three presidents in a row--Sam Preston, Jane Menken, and Paul Demeny--and spoken from notes each time. So there's nothing preserved for posterity.

Andy, of course, started the collection of PAA history, had a strong sense of PAA history. When he became secretary-treasurer in the mid-1960s, he discovered there were no written records. So that set him off on this oral history project and collecting what records there were. He's responsible for this list of meetings, where they were and how many attended. And his work culminated in that session on "PAA at age 50" that was held at the 1981 meeting here in

Washington, at which he himself gave background and Frank Notestein, Frank Lorimer--the only time I ever saw him--and Clyde Kiser gave papers, except Clyde couldn't be there and Dudley Kirk read his paper. So there's a lot for which PAA can be grateful to Andy.

Charlie Nam when he was president in 1979 was the first and only PAA president to invite all the past presidents to come specially. Some of them made an effort to come to the meeting who might not otherwise have come. They were all assembled there on the platform in Philadelphia. Were you there?

DAY: Yes.

VDT: Charlie Nam when he was recalling that in our interview last April suggested it would be a good idea if Harriet Presser could do it next year. So I passed that suggestion on to Harriet; it may not be possible [and was not--program too crowded]. Andy Lunde introduced the presidents in 1979. He would be an ideal person, having known all or most of them, and, as you say, humorous and human. I said to Harriet if she did it, she'd have to find just the right person to fill that role.

DAY: Andy would be the one.

VDT: Did you know John Durand?

DAY: I knew him slightly. I worked as a statistical clerk for a year at the UN. John was in the Population Division; I was in the Statistical Office. The main way I knew him, he used to come up fairly often to Abe Jaffe's seminar at Columbia. He, again, was a very good scholar. But very aloof, almost severe, it seemed to me, in his manner. I really didn't know John Durand well, but his book, The Labor Force in the United States [1948], was the first book I ever read on labor force. Kingsley assigned the whole book to us; I was a graduate student.

Mort Spiegelman--speaking of books Kingsley assigned, another one we had to read all of was Dublin, Lotka and Spiegelman [Length of Life: A Study of the Life Table, 1936]. My only contact with Mort Spiegelman, I think, was being in a session at the American Statistical Association meeting in New York. It may have been just the New York area chapter, which was very big, of course. Spiegelman was the discussant of a paper and this person was making rather a lot out of differences between 3 percent and 2 percent and 3 percent and 1 percent, that sort of thing. Spiegelman just turned it around and said, "They are all situations in which 95 percent of the population doesn't have this thing." I think it was the first time a lot of people in that room had thought in those particular terms.

I often think of this in discussions about infant mortality, contrasting infant mortality in the U.S. with infant mortality in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Japan, West Germany, and so on. You're talking about such a small range and when you get down to a range like that, the differences may be due to the practices that people are following in recording things as much as they are to actual differences in behavior or in the event itself.

VDT: As a matter of fact, the first time I ever met Andy Lunde he was at the Population Reference Bureau and was pursuing international differences in infant mortality in industrialized countries. He pointed out at that time that an infant death was simply recorded differently in Sweden than it was in the U.S. He was apparently one of the first to note that.

DAY: When was he doing this?

VDT: Oh, this was in the late 1970s.

DAY: I remember in 1970 reading the New York Times, I was working at the UN then, and they made an invidious distinction between the infant death rate in Japan and that of the U.S. I got to my office at the UN, which had the Demographic Yearbooks, and got the mortality by age of fetus, for fetal mortality--or I guess I got stillbirths--and then age of the child at the time of its death in the first year. I found that, sure, there was a gap--I think the differential was about one to two between Japan and the U.S. at that time. But when you added stillbirths in--and the stillbirth ratio was substantially higher in Japan than in the U.S.--and devoted yourself only to deaths in the first week or the first four weeks of life, then the differential narrowed appreciably. So what the Japanese were doing was simply counting as stillbirths the expulsions that in the U.S. were being counted as live births and then infant deaths. Now why, I don't know. I suspect that the definition is medical--one breath or one heartbeat, that kind of thing. But in addition, if a child is born in the United States it counts as a dependent for the whole 12 months in figuring out your income tax, and maybe a lot of doctors were ensuring that that way they were going to get their fees paid.

VDT: Interesting! Did you write a letter to the Times on that?

DAY: No. Charlotte Hohn, who's from West Germany, has since written a very good article, published in Population, making international comparisons on this; she's really gone into it. But she didn't do that until about five or six years ago.

VDT: PRB has become rather well known for its listing of international infant mortality rates, comparing the U.S. with other countries, published in Population Today each year. They're due for another one about now, but Carl Haub says he must first really look into these international definitions.

Do you have recollections of any outstanding PAA meetings?

DAY: I think most of them are outstanding in one way or another, or bits and pieces of them are outstanding. I haven't been to all of them; I wish I could have gotten to them. I'm not going to be able to get to the forthcoming one [1989] where Harriet Presser will be giving the presidential address. And I was in Australia when Ansley gave his presidential address [1968].

VDT: You know that Dan Price is going to introduce Harriet.

DAY: That's nice. I think the last one in New Orleans was good [1988]. But here again . . . We hadn't been down in New Orleans for 15 years and just the change that has come about in New Orleans, which was once a lovely place to have a meeting; things were accessible . . .

VDT: We were right in the French quarter in 1973.

DAY: Yes, and this time we went down to the French quarter in the evening, from this big hotel,

and it was not a very pleasant walk and when you were in the French quarter it was noisy. And not once did I hear any Dixieland jazz. I heard hard rock; I heard country Western. I don't want to say they had exceeded limits; they probably exceeded their limits a long time ago. But it's not as nice a place now as it was 15 years ago in many ways that I would consider important, like pedestrian accessibility, noise, variety. I was looking forward to it so much and it turned out that New Orleans was just more American crud.

But the meeting was good. I thought the meeting was very good. I quite enjoyed the author-meets-critics session. I think that was new this time. And I thought that Jay Winter and Mike Teitelbaum, the coauthors of The Fear of Population Decline--Jay Winter is a brilliant historian and Michael Teitelbaum I thought did awfully well and Ansley was sort of the critic but he wasn't really, Ansley did awfully well--and the others were talking about it.

It's a great group. It really is.

VDT: Several of my interviewees who have been at the meetings over the years have said what they miss is the give-and-take between the audience and the speaker. Now most sessions seem to be sets of prepared papers and although there are questions at the end, they don't feel there's the chance for give-and-take that there was when everybody was gathered together in one small room. But perhaps you feel these author-critic sessions answer some of that?

DAY: I certainly felt that one did. And I think we should always try to avoid being in places where they have big halls. The big halls are terrible. I've often thought if I ever organized a meeting I would take pieces of string and rope off the rear two-thirds of the hall, just to make people sit up front. I've even been to meetings--I don't remember it with PAA but in sociology meetings--where people were sitting in the back, could have moved forward, and were asking the speaker to speak more loudly. These are people that are supposedly dedicated to the life of the mind! They have PhDs and everything, but when the chips are down they aren't very bright.

You asked me about other people in PAA and I haven't said anything about Con Taeuber. Now that Alice and I have kind of made Washington our base when we're in America [maintaining an apartment in D.C.], we've gotten acquainted with Con and Dorothy Taeuber, and what an exciting thing that's been! Here again, the work he's published and everything is high standard, but in addition--just being able to associate with a person like this. He's still so bright and alert and he has this conspiratorial way about him. He philosophizes. I've gotten little notes from Con, something he's read that he thought I'd be interested in, or he's saved a reference or a clipping. He's always alert to these things. He's a real professional; a very real colleague.

VDT: That's right. He's one of the good sources for the PAA archives, which he helped get into the Georgetown library, along with Tom Merrick, when Andy Lunde had them collected. Every once in a while, he sends me something for the archives. The last PRB seminar he handed me two issues of Concerned Demography; he's been going through his files.

What about Henry Shryock? I know he's a friend; you are trekkers together.

DAY: We've been on hikes together and that's how we met, actually. Alice was here by herself and she was hiking with the Capitol Hiking Club and Henry and Pauline are very active in that and one thing led to another and we've just had a lot of fun with the Shryocks; very enjoyable people to be with. Again, people with a broad range of interests.

I hate to think of a generation of demographers coming along who'll be narrow, who

won't have those broad interests, who will think that something like the environment or history or psychology or travel, you name it, or what Andy's doing--making those wonderful wind-propelled whirligigs--that that somehow is outside their province, they can't pay attention to that, that's unimportant. I detect this move among younger people. Maybe it's just that as they get older they'll have more opportunity to do these things, but I attribute it to a very considerable extent to the publish-or-perish syndrome, to the competition for funds, to so-called peer review.

VDT: You think that young people are being forced to be so specialized?

DAY: I detect that. I think often some of these younger people in there aren't very interesting to talk to. They may know a fair amount about demography and computers, but they don't seem to have traveled much or read much. If they studied something other than demography, it was often something very narrowing like economics--I don't mean institutional economics, I mean sort of mathematical economics. I think the mathematization of the social sciences is not their salvation; it's not what they really need. I think what they really need is perhaps the anthropologization--I can't say that, but you get more anthropology into it--more getting out there and finding out what people are really thinking and how they define the situation for themselves, how they change over time.

We've been studying fertility 50 years now and do we really yet know why people have the number of children they have or why they don't have some other number? We really don't know very much at all. All the money and research that has gone into this, the careers that have been built on these things--we don't know it all.

VDT: What do you think about your leader [in the department of demography at the Australian National University] Jack Caldwell and his wife Pat Caldwell, who have led the way in this village observation in studying fertility?

DAY: I think what the Caldwells have done is very useful and they're going to continue. I'm not saying this is the only way to do it, but I certainly think it's the sort of thing we need. We need surveys, we need censuses, we need personal interviews--in-depth interviews. The Caldwells haven't done much in-depth interviewing. They've certainly gone into the field and gotten their feet wet. That I think is a good thing. Now, they had to work with interpreters, but so what--that is, they've had to work with intrpreters when they haven't been in Australia.

I think there are a lot of different ways. I used to look down my nose at psychology; I used to think that psychologists really didn't have much to teach us. I'm changing my view. I think it's deplorable that we don't have more people with training in psychology coming into demography.

VDT: I worked with Henry David, who founded the Psychosocial Workshop at PAA, and there were a group of psychologists interested in population in the early 1970s. They're still there, but not so much.

DAY: No. More and more people seem to come to it out of a training in economics. Now, I wouldn't want to say that this is an undesirable thing, but I think economics does not add very much. I think the whole "new home economics" in fertility is just--well, I hesitate to say it's fraudulent, because I'm sure people went into it with the best of intentions--but it's almost

laughable what they come up with.

VDT: Certainly, you can't imagine people doing all that calculation before they jump into bed: "This is going to be the time we conceive a child."

DAY: I remember a professor of economic history at Australian National University, who was an economist by early training, a man named Noel Butlin, very crusty type. He rang me up one day and said Gus Renis, really quite a nice chap in the economics department, was going to give a seminar on population and development in Brazil and was I interested in going with him. I said, "Sure." So we got into this little room and Gus takes the chalk, goes up to the blackboard, and the first thing he said was something like, "Let c equal," and then it was something like " m to the minus u ," or whatever, and he went on in this vein for about four or five minutes. I leaned over to Noel and said, "Are there any data behind all this?" And Noel, who did not suffer fools gladly and also was not embarrassed about anything, turned to me and said in a rather loud voice, "No data that I know of."

VDT: What about your students in Australia, are they becoming as mathematicized and as applied as a large number of American demography students seem to be now?

DAY: No, I don't think so, partly because so many of them come to the ANU in order to study with Jack Caldwell and take this anthropological approach. Many of them have been people who worked for him in the field, in India, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka. In addition, we have a much less organized approach; it's strictly thesis. They prepare work-in-progress seminars and things of this kind, but there's no formal instruction.

VDT: No required coursework?

DAY: No required coursework. They're there about three, three-and-a-half, four years, and at the end of it they have a Ph.D. On the other hand, they all have master's degrees or the equivalent of master's degrees before they take it and that is a coursework thing.

I think we've had really very good students on the whole. I can always think of some you sort of wonder about. But by and large, I'd say they were certainly up to the standard of the graduate students that I had any contact with at all, which is at Princeton, Yale, and Columbia. Certainly up to that standard, I think, and some of them right up there at the top.

The pity of it is, I think very often our best students have the hardest time getting a job, because they tend to have come out of the American or the Australian setting. Although we've had outstanding students from Japan and right now I have an outstanding student from China. And one of those real intellectual types, wonderful person--actually he had a very difficult time finishing his thesis because he was always so interested in a lot of other things too--was an Indian student. And we've always had very good students from Africa. Well, we've had good students all round.

But all the same, some of our best students have had the most difficult job prospects. I think partly it's because they've come out of another culture and they get out of that American job market, if they're Americans. There are not very many openings in Australia, because demography is not an undergraduate or even a graduate course. The Australian students come to us out of undergraduate training in statistics, economics, history, geography, sociology. There's

a very good student in Australia right now, took her degree in sociology. Jack Caldwell took his undergraduate degree in history. Gavin Jones in our department has his undergraduate degree in economics. Gigi Santow, another person in our department, her undergraduate degree was in statistics, as was the case with Christabel Young, who is in my department. Great department. But we certainly don't have to apologize for the students.

VDT: That's great, but they do have a hard time in the job market. Don't you believe that in the U.S. the turn to applied demography is because there are jobs in demography in state and local government and in business?

DAY: I think that's it. Sid Goldstein, who hasn't been mentioned, is a friend of ours and I think his PAA presidential address was perhaps the great presidential address of the ones I can remember--that and Kingsley Davis's ["The Theory of Change and Response in Modern Demographic History," 1963].

VDT: What was it on?

DAY: On migration ["Facets of Redistribution: Research Challenges and Opportunities," 1976]. Sid tells me that the students in the graduate program at Brown are very applied-oriented. They want to learn all the computer things and they're really not all that interested in the kind of broader things that he and I think a graduate student ought to learn. And he says, "I can't really blame them for it, because the jobs all require that you know computer technology and all of these techniques and nobody ever asks you whether you have any interest in the field that you're going to apply these techniques to." It's dispiriting.

VDT: Well, that in a sense answers a final question I wanted to ask you, which is what you see as the outlook for demography, demography training. You say it's going in this applied direction and that's too bad, getting away from the broad . . .

DAY: Well, the funny thing is that when you go in an applied direction, you end up not knowing enough that's worth applying. In that address we heard last night at the dinner [Population Reference Bureau 1988 dinner, Vincent Barabba, former Census Bureau director, on "Relevant Federal Statistics in the Public Interest"], he put it very well. He quoted this person saying something about if something isn't worth doing, it's not worth doing well. I think there's a lot of this. I think there's a lot of busywork.

When I was in New Haven toward the end there, I must have been spending at least a quarter of my time doing nothing more than writing up applications for research grants to study things that you really wonder whether the American taxpayer should be asked to pay for. I think my time would have been better employed trying to do other things. And everyone's tied into it. You have a whole set of people whose jobs depend on processing these things. You have all the people in the government; you have the so-called peers who are engaged in the peer review. In a highly competitive system, it seems to me that even with the best will in the world, they must be tempted--maybe not even know that they're experiencing the temptation--but they must be tempted to say no, if it's something that's going to compete with one of their ideas or compete with one of their applications or compete with funding for something that one of their students wants to do. There must be that kind of thing.

I haven't figured out a better procedure, but I wonder if the universities of this country, the students of this country, the faculty members of the universities of this country, were any less good back in the 1930s and 1940s and into the early 1950s before all this stuff got under way than they are at the present time.

I'm not sure everybody has to go to college anyway. It's the old American system, requiring that everybody has equal opportunity, and then if you haven't done as well financially, it's your fault, because you had equal opportunity. Well, people don't have equal opportunity. Opportunities are not equal. Skin color and gender and family income and all these things have entered in. But this idea that if you get everybody into college that somehow or other we've all had equal opportunity is a bunch of hogwash. It's a divide-and-conquer thing; it drains off the more energetic members of the working classes.

VDT: You mean going to university?

DAY: A lot of them are going to university or something called a university and they figure they're too good for working in the labor unions or on the shop floor and doing things that are certainly more useful than going out and selling ads or writing up ads. Could you face yourself in the morning if you had to go to an ad agency where you're writing up cigarette ads? Your income is going to be a hell of a lot higher than if you're down there repairing a piece of machinery so it won't have to be thrown out, but . . . this kind of thing.

Australia--and we're getting over this a bit in Australia--but Australia has a history of what they call "leveling down"--cutting off the tall poppies. And I think in terms of democracy, political democracy and social democracy, that a lot more can be said for establishing a ceiling above which no one's allowed to go.

VDT: You mean in income?

DAY: Income? Well, education doesn't have to be tied up with income so closely the way it is here. You've got a situation today where people have to have a college degree in order to go out and sell used cars in some places. What's happening is that businesses are letting universities determine whether a person is qualified, say whether he speaks English well enough or he has whatever is necessary to sell used cars.

I think what we want is education that is available over a lifetime, with or without a degree. You want opportunities for people to change the course of their lives. And you want a feeling that you can do these things.

In Australia you have a situation where the gap between the pay for women and the pay for men job for job is really quite narrow; it's still in favor of men but it's really quite narrow. Women have had a hard row to hoe in Australia, there's no doubt about that. But when they go to work, they get a pay rate that's virtually the same as men's. Contrast that with the U.S., where the gap is enormous job for job. But in the U.S., you've got about 15, 16, 17 percent of your work force in labor unions. In Australia, you've got two-thirds of it in labor unions. Now, the basic reason for having labor unions is to make sure that the fellow on the work bench next to yours is not going to compete with you; you have to be treated the same. If he's willing to work for less, if he's willing to work harder, then he's going to affect your pay rate. I think that sort of thing is very widespread in America, and all of these little community colleges, which I think are fine and dandy if people aren't required to go to those things and get some piece of paper that says

they can do this job.

One of our neighbors in Australia is a senior person in the public service, now retired--he smoked himself into early retirement, alas--but this man had never gone beyond high school. Yet he was able, in the Australian system, to do extremely well in his job--a senior public servant in foreign affairs. Australia is filled with people like that.

VDT: What percentage of high school graduates go on to university?

DAY: Well, the real question is what percentage of people didn't go to high school, because a very much higher percentage of the high school people go on to university. The proportion going on to university of the present cohort is getting close to 15 or 20 percent, which is still well under half of what it is in America. In my generation and the generation just following mine, only 5 percent went to university, or what would be comparable to an American university. And, you know, they manage to produce a lot of pretty high-quality minds. It's not just education, it's the space, it's not being a major world power, that's very important.

VDT: What are your plans for the future? Are you going to leave Australia and come back to America?

DAY: Well, our two children, who are old enough to know better, have chosen to live in America. We made the mistake of letting them go to American universities--our son to Brown, our daughter to Bennington. So there's that tie, that tug. When we retire, we'll probably retire to the Washington area. That has a number of things we like. There's no other American city that doesn't have high-rise buildings in it; you can see a lot of the sky here. And we've met a lot of really interesting, wonderful people here in Washington since we first came here when I was a visiting fellow in 1980-81, eight years ago. We quite like it, so what I think we'll do is spend part of the time here, but keep our ties in Australia and as far as I'm concerned spend as much time there as possible, but be commuting between both.

VDT: One last question. What do you see as important issues for demography in the future? You've touched on some of them. Are you discouraged by a too-slow population growth decline in less developed countries?

DAY: I think you have to be discouraged about it in terms of the human beings and their lives, what's happening to their lives and what's going to be available in the way of resources and infrastructure and so on for the generations that succeed them. I think people who talk about these things--usually they're economists--tend to rely only on statistics and only on measures of central tendency as well--per capita this, per capita that. They don't talk in terms of the spread of conditions. They're really quite badly trained for the sort of things they work in--either badly trained or their perspective is unduly narrow.

But, be that as it may, I'm quite heartened by the rapidity with which fertility has declined, especially in China, in Southeast Asia, very upset that it hasn't gone down in the Arab and African countries, heartened somewhat by what's been happening in some places in Latin America.

But all in all, I think things are really pretty awful. And when you figure that these populations are getting younger and for a variety of reasons are enjoying lower morality levels at

the earlier ages which in effect is like adding births, I'm very discouraged.

Discouraged about a lot of things, frankly. I'm a congenital optimist and that's what keeps me willing to get out of bed in the morning and eat breakfast and shave and so on. But rationally, I can't see anything but justification for extreme pessimism.

VDT: In the world population outlook?

DAY: World population, world resources outlook, and for that matter even the outlook so far as war and peace is concerned. With our nuclear weapons, I just fear that there can be chance occurrences. Ansley Coale some years ago calculated the likelihood of a nuclear accident that could cause the outbreak of war. In fact, Ansley, years ago on a contract--he must have been just out of graduate school--wrote a book that Alice and I referred to in Too Many Americans about nuclear war.

VDT: That's right. That grew out of his wartime work; he was an instructor in radar. That became his thesis too. He was detailed to be secretary of a committee on reducing vulnerability to atomic bombs. It was published as a book [The Problem of Reducing Vulnerability to Atomic Bombs] and it became his dissertation at Princeton, with one additional chapter. He went back to it in that Population and Development Review article that you mentioned ["Nuclear War and Demographers' Projections," PDR, September 1985], in which he brought up the fact that even if there's just a 1 percent annual chance of a nuclear war, in 200 years it becomes inevitable.

DAY: Yes. And we have to look after our environmental conditions and we're not doing it. We have to look after our population--everybody in the population and not just the people who are rich or have the right skin color or whatever--we've got to look after all of them; they're as good as we are, all of us. And we're not doing it.

And we just have to make sure that there can be no major military outbreak by chance. Then we have to make sure that even if people wanted to have this by design, they wouldn't be able to get away with it. I'm essentially a pacifist. I don't see any reason for even thinking in military terms. There's no justification for it--the idea of killing somebody. When you kill a human being, when a human being dies, in demographic terms it's just one person but it's the whole network of that person that dies too. Demography deals only with births and deaths, that sort of thing, but only in the physiological sense. When you have a birth, you create a whole network. Psychologists have known this for years. And when you have a death, you upset a whole network; everybody experiences the death. The bell does toll for thee.

VDT: Well, that's a rather gloomy note to end on. However, I'm heartened by the fact that you'll come back to the U.S. and I hope you'll go on letting yourself be heard widely, for years to come.

CONTINUES

VDT: As usual, an interviewee comes up with something particularly interesting after the interview is over. We've just been talking about the fact that Anne Lee has written a vignette of PAA history for PAA Affairs [Fall 1988] on the "Early Women Superstars in PAA": Irene Taeuber, Margaret Hagood, Dorothy Thomas, and Hope Eldridge. You said, Link, that Hope Eldridge was your boss at the UN and I didn't get you to talk about your United Nations period

as chief of the demographic and social statistics branch [1970-73].

DAY: Well, Hope Eldridge was my boss when I was a very minor statistical clerk at the UN. This was before I went back as chief of the whole branch. This was 1951-52. I was a graduate student at Columbia and had done my coursework for the Ph.D. and got this job in the summer, autumn, early winter of 1951. Then I went home to Colorado for Christmas, came back to New York and studied for my oral exams, got them out of the way, and then went back to work for Hope Eldridge at the UN.

I learned a lot about international statistics and how careful you had to be and how uncertain a lot of them were, even though they were all printed up in government documents. Hope Eldridge was really one of the best bosses a person could have. She was a wonderful person, very encouraging.

Then I left the UN in September of 1952, started teaching at Mount Holyoke, and that was sort of the beginning of the end. Because as soon as I started teaching, I had a job and therefore was no longer a student and they informed me I was going to be drafted. So Alice and I, who had become engaged by that time and were planning to get married in June, decided we'd better marry around Thanksgiving time instead. That was 1952.

VDT: You were going to be drafted for the Korean War?

DAY: The end of the Korean War. Actually, what I did was mostly K.P.

We were married the day before Thanksgiving that year. About a month or so before that, in October, we read on the front page of the New York Times that Mr. McCarthy had turned his attention to the UN and zeroed in on two women who worked in the Statistical Office. One was the librarian in the Statistical Office, I think her name was Reid, and the other was Hope Eldridge. I was absolutely stunned by this. I remember Mrs. Eldridge had once talked to me, we had lunch together once and she'd talked about her early career and how she'd been, I think, a physical education teacher at North Carolina Women's University for about six years. She'd said it was a hard sort of thing to do after you got your Ph.D. in sociology, but jobs were very scarce in those Depression days and you took what job you could get.

I don't know what her political views were, except I would say she was a very strong small-l liberal. She believed in racial equality and the rights of human beings, dignity of human beings. She was just a lovely person. So I wrote her immediately and said how shocked I was and would help in any way I could. It was the enthusiasm of youth; there wasn't anything I could do.

Alice and I were married soon after that, in New York, and we invited the whole gang from the UN and Mrs. Eldridge sent a present but she didn't come. Some of the gang said she was so broken up by it that she just didn't appear in public at all.

Her case--hers and Mr's Reid's case--went to the tribunal. There was a tribunal set up to handle these things. The person in charge of hiring at the UN--the hiring and firing of people in the secretariat--was a former president or vice-president of the American Telephone Company, as I remember, and he wasn't about to stand up to McCarthy as he should have. Trygve Lee wasn't willing to stand up to McCarthy either on these matters, because the Americans were the source of so much of the UN money. There may have been other things as well. It went to the tribunal and after many months, during which Mrs. Eldridge, I think, didn't work at all, the tribunal as I understand decided unanimously in her and Mrs. Reid's favor. So there was no case against

them whatsoever.

The reason that they got onto it was that she took the Fifth Amendment. But I was told by lawyers that that was the only thing you were allowed to take in order not to be forced to testify against people you knew. It wasn't really for your own protection. It was that if you didn't take this, then you might have to go down there and start giving names. So this was the only course open to her. But it enabled McCarthy to talk about Fifth Amendment Communists, like "card-carrying ACLU [American Civil Liberties Union] members." A bit of it is even going on now; not nearly as serious.

At any rate, after some months the tribunal decided there was no case against either her or Mrs. Reid and ordered that they be reinstated by the United Nations. And the United Nations, with this chap who was in charge of hiring and firing, refused to do this. The result was that she and Mrs. Reid lost their reputations, lost their jobs, and were given, I think, a year's pay as compensation.

This was during Eisenhower's administration. It was all a very nasty sort of thing. I remember getting a postcard from Mrs. Eldridge at one point. We didn't correspond or anything; I was very junior on her staff. But she did send me a postcard from someplace in Alabama; she was from southeastern Alabama. Then she and her husband went down to Tampa. She said they were down there and she'd been traveling a bit in the South, seeing her relatives, for about a year, and then she said, so far she had "managed to stay out of trouble." And that's the last thing I ever heard of Mrs. Eldridge. A lovely person.

VDT: She seems to have been a particularly sad case. It's been suggested that just about the time she should have become a top officer in PAA, this was happening. It disrupted her career in every way.

Tell a bit about your time back at the UN [1970-73]--I forgot to ask about that--still another phase of your career.

DAY: I liked the UN. I quit the UN [in 1973] only because I had this chance to go back to Australia. People came up to me and said, "Oh, you must be so delighted to get away from all of this bureaucracy and in-fighting and so on that goes on in the UN." I may have been living in a fool's paradise, but I didn't see any of that.

VDT: Was the demographic and social statistics branch in the Population Division?

DAY: No, the Statistical Office.

VDT: Were you working on the Demographic Yearbook?

DAY: The Demographic Yearbook was part of our branch's job--a very minor part, actually. We were mainly concerned with, well, at that time, setting up the African census project and establishing recommendations for the improvement, extension, of coverage of demographic and social statistics. We had a yearbook of housing statistics that we set up.

There were a lot of things going on. It was sort of fun being a boss. We had a lot of people out in the field who were interregional and regional advisers on demographic statistics. But in the office it was sixes: I had 26 people from 16 countries on six continents. They were lovely people to work with; lots of fun.

I had to do a fair amount of traveling and I like traveling, but didn't like being away from home. I had one of the best views over Manhattan. In the late afternoon in the wintertime, the sky would be dark and the lights would all be on. It looked like . . .

VDT: I can imagine that. I interviewed Paul Demeny in June in his 43rd-floor office at the Population Council, just across from the UN, with a similar view. It is spectacular, across the river.

DAY: It is. But I had a better view than Paul, also on the river, but I was facing the Manhattan side rather than the river side, facing all the tall buildings. It's a lousy place to live, but it certainly provided a nice view. I quite enjoyed the UN--people from 16 countries.

VDT: Churning out those statistics for the Demographic Yearbook, the bible of the trade. You believe that too, that it's the standard . . .?

DAY: It's certainly a very useful thing. I suppose the only real contributions I made to the Demographic Yearbook, apart from trying to keep it honest and do a good job, was that I introduced a footnote saying that persons per area of land is a very meaningless statistic, doesn't mean anything at all. I introduced a little footnote saying, in effect, it's meaningless but we're still going to publish it, because every mapmaker and so on wants it.

VDT: Right. Persons per hectare of arable land would be much more meaningful.

DAY: Right. The other thing I added was two tables on abortion.

VDT: Did you really!

DAY: I felt this was something that was happening and our job was to encourage governments to collect statistics on it and try to encourage the best statistics collection you could get. I have to be honest and admit there was a value I was serving and that was I felt that if we were publishing statistics from countries on abortion that was going to make it just that much harder for people to come out and say, "Oh well, nobody will approve of this and it's just terrible and there aren't any statistics on it." This would be a way of legitimizing abortion.

I was told by various people around the UN when I mentioned that I thought we ought to do this that the governments would never go along with this, they wouldn't cooperate. I was also told that WHO considered abortion was in its province, so I would have the devil of a time getting cooperation from WHO. Well, soon after I first mentioned this, I was attending a statistical commission meeting in Geneva and I simply went to W.P.D. Logan, who was head of vital statistics or something at WHO, and told him what I'd like to do and asked, "Would it be all right with you folks?" And he said, "We'd be delighted if you did it. Please go ahead, so we don't have to worry about it." So much for opposition from WHO.

Then we put it into the regular questionnaire that we sent out every year to all the governmental statistical offices. There are a lot of tables there and if they don't have the data for them, they don't put the data in, although I dare say some of them may make up data occasionally. So we just put it in and sat back to see what the reaction would be. When they came back, nobody ever wrote and said, "You dirty people, how dare you ask about abortion!"

Some of them, if they had data--and a surprising number of them did--filled in the tables. So far as I know, they've never had any trouble with it since.

VDT: Does it still appear in the Demographic Yearbook?

DAY: Yes. One other thing. When China was admitted to the UN, the Chinese delegate, within a week of his arrival, was in the Statistical Office not requesting but demanding that we omit all reference to Taiwan. And the problem with this was that Taiwan had a long, rather good statistical history, because the Japanese were there earlier on and statistics were maintained. It was the only low-income population in Asia for which you had fairly good data, for which you had data going back a long time.

The director of the Statistical Office at the time was a Canadian, he had a long distinguished history with Statistics Canada, and he hadn't been at the UN very long and he was all set to say, okay. He first proposed a compromise where the statistics for Taiwan would simply be added to those for China and then a note down at the bottom to the effect that these data referred only to Taiwan. And there were various compromises he proposed. But the Chinese weren't going to buy any of this; there could be no mention. And they also wanted our computer program--we had all these data from previous Yearbooks in our computer program--they wanted all those data removed from the computer. You couldn't remove them from the published books.

So, you know, the UN is supposed to do what the governments tell them to do; it's not supposed to tell the governments what to do. So this good civil servant was all set to remove it. And I--by this time I knew I was going to Australia, so maybe I was a little braver than the others, but the others all accepted it. I was the only one dealing with non-economic statistics; the others were all dealing with economic statistics of one sort or another. Maybe I was braver than the others because I didn't have as much to lose and I said, "Look, this is a symbolic act and I'm not going to go along with it. It's like book-burning, the Nazi book-burning." As it happened, the director was of Jewish background, so I think this meant something to him. I think it did stiffen his resolve and the upshot of it was that they didn't go along with the Chinese request and still retained the Taiwan data. They retained all of them, but not in the form that they would have liked. I think for a long time the Yearbook has suffered because of this. But at least the Taiwanese data are in the UN computer.

VDT: Well, thank goodness for that. Ansley Coale mentioned that as an example of the political disadvantages of the UN--the fact that the Taiwan data, which were the best in Asia, he said, could no longer be published. But they are there in the computer?

DAY: Yes. And they can be retrieved eventually, and I think they can be retrieved in response to requests. That's my guess; I'm not sure about that.

Actually, this Canadian and I had a very interesting lunch once. We were invited to lunch by the member and his deputy from an African country. We were taken to really about the poshest restaurant I've ever been to, not too far from the UN, a French restaurant. This Canadian was able to speak French--I could get just a bit of it--so most of the conversation was in French. What it boiled down to was that we were being appealed to to make sure that this country was in the list of the five or ten poorest countries in the world. We were put in a very expensive restaurant for this purpose! To make sure they were in there, because the UN has special monies

available if you are among the poorest and this country just barely missed it. Well, the director of the Statistical Office said, "We publish what you people give us." In effect, if you want to fix your data yourselves you can do it, but we're not allowed to do it. And everything was very friendly and nice.

But then at the end, this ambassador produced a thing wrapped up in brown paper and presented it to the director as a present. The director unwrapped it very carefully and it was an art object. I wouldn't care for it much. It was a modern type, consisting of pieces of ivory arranged in a pattern on a background. I'd never had anything like this before and all the time I'd been at the UN nobody to my knowledge had tried to bribe me, give me presents, or try to get me to do something, so I wasn't prepared for this. But this Canadian had been around the block. He hadn't been in Statistics Canada all those years at a very high level without learning a few things and he came back with something. He said, "This is simply lovely and I know exactly the place on the wall of my office where I'm going to hang it so everybody can see it." [Laughter]

VDT: Did the guy immediately grab it back?

DAY: No, he didn't. It was too late for that.

VDT: And your colleague walked away with it?

DAY: Oh, yes. And he hung it up in a special place in his office.

VDT: And where did that country land up in the next list?

DAY: I don't remember, actually, but I dare say that even today they're sure to be one of the ten poorest.

VDT: And it was an expensive lunch.

DAY: It was an expensive lunch.

DEBORAH S. FREEDMAN

Interview with Jean van der Tak at the Population Studies Center, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, June 12, 1989.

Deborah Freedman has not been a president or secretary-treasurer of PAA, the general criterion for inclusion in this series of interviews. But she was nevertheless included along with her husband (as were Anne Lee and Alice Goldstein with their husbands), because she and Ronald Freedman make up one of the rare couples who have both had distinguished careers and long associations in U.S. demography.

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS: Deborah Freedman was born and grew up in Iron River, a "very small, very poor" town in the Upper Michigan peninsula. She received all her degrees from the University of Michigan: the B.A. in economics and English in 1940; the M.A. in economics in 1963; and the Ph.D. in economics in 1967. She and Ronald Freedman were married in 1941. At the University of Michigan, she has been a Teaching Fellow (1963-64), Lecturer (1968-71), and Assistant Professor (from 1971) in economics and Research Associate (from 1975) at the Population Studies Center. She is author or coauthor of numerous publications on the interrelationship of economic factors and fertility and on changes in the family, especially in the U.S. and Taiwan. She prepared (with Eva Mueller) the community economic modules for use in the World Fertility Survey and similar modules for surveys sponsored by the World Bank.

VDT: Deborah and Ronald Freedman are one of the rare and most distinguished couples who have both had outstanding careers in U.S. demography. Also, Deborah has shared in Ron's career since the beginning and I presume has been a member of PAA as long as Ron?

FREEDMAN: No, I haven't been.

VDT: I noticed that you were not listed as a PAA member in the 1962 directory.

FREEDMAN: In those days, it was very hard for me to get away from home [for meetings]. I had two young children. I wasn't working in those days, but I was going to school--at first just for an occasional course, then more intensively as the children got older. So I didn't join the PAA until about the time I was studying for my master's degree.

VDT: In the 1960s--you started going regularly to the meetings?

FREEDMAN: Not regularly, but when I could. My children were still young teenagers in the 1960s, so it was nothing I did easily. Besides, it was expensive to hire someone to stay with the children. Actually, I wasn't so interested in demography back in the 1950s. My interest in demography developed from the work I did with Ronald, mainly because he needed my help. He rarely had research money back then, and the little he did get was never enough.

VDT: Tell the story of how you were drawn into the field of demography.

FREEDMAN: It was sort of happenstance, in a way, because Ron thought of going to India. He was asked to teach at the United Nations Chembur [Bombay] demographic center.

VDT: Was that connected with his 1960 trip to India for the Population Council?

FREEDMAN: The Chembur offer predated the Population Council trip. Bogue was there that year [Bogue was at Chembur in 1958-59; see his interview above] and Ron was asked if he was interested. He thought he might like to go some time. When I thought about it, I wondered whether I would find something interesting to do when we were in India. The children would be off to school and I knew I would not want to be idle all the time. Since we were not considering the India offer for a couple of years, I thought it would be wise to enroll at Michigan for a master's degree, because then I would have some credentials which I could use in India, even if I wasn't paid for the work I did. So I went back to school, though I maintained a light schedule at first and then gradually increased it.

We had just returned from a sabbatical in Holland when I actually decided to go to graduate school. I had previously taken some courses at the university, because when I worked with Ron on the GAF study [1955 Growth of American Families], I realized that I needed more statistical training. So I took some statistics in the sociology department and had previously taken a few other courses. I didn't just audit these courses, but always paid the fees, took the exams, and got graduate credit. Tuition was inexpensive in those days. So I was taking an occasional course on the side, while I worked half-time for Ron for free.

VDT: In the GAF?

FREEDMAN: Yes. That went on for a long time. When he asked for a continuation grant, he never asked for enough, so he always needed unpaid help. But I didn't mind; it was interesting.

After taking these few courses, I decided that if I was going to go back to school, I really didn't want to do it in sociology. I hadn't enjoyed the one sociology course I had in college and I didn't want to be in the same department as Ron. So I decided to go back to economics.

I found my first Ph.D.-level course very difficult. When I graduated from Michigan [1940], Keynes had just published his book [The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money, 1936]. By the time I returned to economics, there was a whole new world out there; economic theory had changed radically. I wasn't sure I could make it. But I did--with lots of hard work. Having mastered that first course, I then went on to take one or two courses every semester during my children's school hours.

We never did go to India. So I continued on with my graduate work. I had made friends with a group of young women who were getting their PhDs. They were studying for prelims, and one of them said to me, "You know, by now you're more than halfway to a Ph.D. Have you ever thought of going on?" I talked this over with Eva Mueller, who encouraged me to continue without interruption. My children were now in high school, which made it easier.

I was lucky, because my master's thesis was published in the American Economic Review ["The Relation of Economic Status to Fertility," 1963]. In those days, everyone had to write a master's thesis. I think it's a good idea--gives one some preparation for the Ph.D. thesis.

VDT: What was it about?

FREEDMAN: That article looked at the concept of relative income and how it could influence fertility. If one's income, when one arrives at the childbearing ages, exceeds what is needed to achieve one's desired standard of living, then the couple might have more children than they would otherwise have had. Those whose aspirations exceed their material well-being would limit childbearing so as not to deprive themselves of the desired amenities.

Then I started work on my Ph.D. In those days, you had to have two languages, in addition to taking prelims. Since I had never taken French, I enrolled in freshman French because I thought it would be more interesting than the Ph.D. [French] reading course. I passed the reading exam, but I didn't want to take another language, so I got permission to take demography as an alternative minor. Some people used to take math as a language substitute in those days, because the mathematics requirements for a degree in economics were much less rigorous than they are now. I took three population courses: one from Gayle Ness on developing countries, the basic population course from my husband, and then the methods course, also from Ron.

VDT: You really still thought of yourself as an economist more than a demographer at that time?

FREEDMAN: Actually, I wasn't sure. Probably I did consider myself more an economist, particularly after I started teaching in the economics department. I got my degree in December of 1967 and I started teaching in January. I was a lecturer at that point.

VDT: Your dissertation topic was, "The Role of Modern Consumption Durables in a Developing Economy"?

FREEDMAN: That's right. This is something I've worked many times. We are even incorporating some of those findings in our new book on Taiwan. We are looking at the idea that people's aspirations change over time and that these things have a great effect, in that when people learn that they want things and they are available, it can affect their economic behavior. In my thesis, I was investigating whether people who were innovative were more interested than others in getting new types of consumer durables.

The data for my thesis came from the 1962 Taichung study, which interviewed 2,713 wives in the childbearing age in the city of Taichung. We obtained data about such variables as education of husband and wife, husband's occupation, household income, ownership of modern objects, as well as other familial measures. In addition to analyzing the data in this larger sample, I did a reinterview survey, three years later, of 300 families, randomly chosen from the larger sample, and this time the husbands were interviewed. My thesis chairman, Eva Mueller, had insisted that I do this extra survey and analysis to document changes in purchases of modern durables over the three years, in savings behavior, changes in income, attitudes toward work, etc. I think Eva was right. I learned a great deal about running a survey when you have to design a questionnaire, get it tested, do the coding, and do the additional analysis of how these variables relate to ownership of consumer durables.

After that, Eva and I did a study in Taiwan, in which we interviewed the husbands of an island-wide sample of wives in the childbearing years. This was done in 1969. The wives had been interviewed about a year or two previously, and we went to the same families, but interviewed the husbands. We collected a large quantity of economic data: inputs into agricultural production from the farmers, investments in businesses, savings, ownership of

modern objects, ownership of business and farm equipment. This survey provided the basis for the chapter I wrote in Ronald Ridker's book ["Mass Media and Modern Consumption Goods: Their Suitability for Policy Interventions to Decrease Fertility," in Ronald G. Ridker, ed., Population and Development: The Search for Selective Interventions, 1976].

VDT: In that chapter, you suggested that there might be experiments putting mass media campaigns in place and possibly making modern consumer goods more available as one approach to reducing fertility. Were any experiments like that ever carried out, following your suggestion?

FREEDMAN: No, I don't think so. It would be difficult to mount such an experiment and be sure you could keep out confounding influences. But actually, the spread of modernization influences throughout the world has shown the effects this has created in many countries, even without controlled experiments. When we visited Bangladesh about four years ago on a World Bank mission, we were aware of changes in simple household objects. Formerly, villagers made almost all their cooking pots out of clay. Now they buy the metal pots that you see for sale in little villages. Similarly, in Indonesia in the 1970s, our hosts told us that children were very attracted to the modern conveniences they saw around them. In Bali, for example, young people see the tourists with motorcycles and modern clothing and they want them too. One Indonesian anthropologist told us that sometimes a father will sell land--which is very important to them--so his son can buy a motorcycle.

So I don't think you had to have an experiment. In a world in which communication between different countries has escalated and where television and the mass media bring the new messages to so many populations, I don't think you need an experiment.

VDT: Could you tell about your experience in devising economic modules for the World Fertility Survey?

FREEDMAN: That was an interesting project. The World Fertility Survey was interested in having a short economic module which could be added to the core World Fertility Survey in various countries. I drafted a short economic module and Eve Mueller worked on it with me when I returned to Ann Arbor. In retrospect, I'd say it was a module which was usable in some countries but not others. It probably was not anthropological enough for many countries.

VDT: Why was that?

FREEDMAN: It was less appropriate for countries which had a family-based economy or one where tribal groups dominated, where they did not have the kind of market economy we see in the modern world and more developed Third World countries, like Taiwan, Korea, and Thailand. Our economic module would have required a great deal of individual adaptation for many of the less developed countries.

Actually, it was not used very widely, even in countries where it could have been useful. Korea and Thailand did use it. One reason it was not used more often is that the basic WFS survey was already long and countries were reluctant to add another group of questions, particularly if it required substantial interviewer training. The same problem has occurred in the new survey that is being done in many countries.

VDT: You mean the Demographic and Health Surveys?

FREEDMAN: Yes, they aren't making enough use of the modules on the family and on women's work.

VDT: Modules which can be attached to the surveys?

FREEDMAN: That's right. Karen Mason did one on women's work and we did one on the family, with the Caldwells. They were drafted so as to be usable in many countries, but they have not been used very often. One reason may be that the DHS survey is already very long, with a great number of health as well as population questions, so it's hard to add additional modules to it.

VDT: Let's now talk about your work with the Detroit Area Study. Ron has explained that it was always planned that the 1962 survey, which became the Detroit Family Growth Survey, should be a longitudinal survey. And then you and Arland Thornton carried on so well.

FREEDMAN: Ron had planned this study to be longitudinal and it actually was for the first four years. The original survey was in 1962--for mothers who had a baby in the summer of 1961--and there were shorter follow-up surveys with these mothers in 1963, 1964, and 1966. Then Ron and Lolagene Coombs were busy with work in Taiwan, so that Detroit survey lay dormant for 11 years, until 1977. I was interested in finding some interesting new research and Ron suggested that I might try to mount a follow-up survey with the Detroit sample and he suggested that Arland Thornton, who had just finished his Ph.D. work, might be interested in working with me.

Arland and I decided to go ahead, but before we could write a grant proposal, we had to demonstrate that we could locate the respondents. We obtained a small amount of money, \$3,000, to try this. One thing which made our task easier was that the respondents at each interview had been asked the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of three family members or friends who would always know their whereabouts. We picked a random sample of 100 women from the total original interviewed sample. Actually, some of the initial sample had been dropped from the subsequent interviews if they were no longer married to their original husbands; they were only following married women. So our projected sample was larger than that of the last follow-up done in 1966. Of this random sample of 100, we found and had a short interview with 97 of them. We have now had three reinterviews with these mothers.

The response rate for this study has always been high. The initial interview in 1962 obtained responses from 92 percent of the target sample. Our last interview, done in 1985, still obtained interviews with 86 percent of the initial 1962 respondents. We have tried to maintain contact with our sample by sending each respondent a small booklet containing some of our most interesting findings, once the results have been tabulated.

VDT: You certainly have plumbed those data; it's unique.

FREEDMAN: The last survey, in 1985, took on a new direction, which I find very interesting. We interviewed two generations--the original mothers and the child born in 1961--and we added information about a third generation, namely, the grandparents of our original families. We

asked the mothers about their contacts with both their own and their husbands' parents, both personal contacts and whether they gave them financial assistance.

These are the mothers from our continuing sample. Now they probably range from about 50 to 65 years in age and their husbands are older. The questions we asked included: Were their parents alive; how far away did they live; how often do they visit with them; how often do they talk with them on the telephone; what kinds of help do they give them. We also asked the mother about her contacts with the young respondent in our sample, as well as her contacts with all her other children. Since similar questions were asked of the survey children about contacts with their parents, we can compare the two sets of responses. One area for research will be if there were constraints on the mothers in giving help to children because of the need to help parents, using the information we have on intergenerational exchanges for a number of years.

VDT: Fascinating! That's such an important issue now, the intergenerational exchange, and here you have a longitudinal sample and three generations that you can look at.

Do you think it's been an advantage to be a woman--that a woman would be more likely to think up this kind of research, that is so important? When I was interviewing Jane Menken and we were talking about her PAA presidential address ["Age and Fertility: How Late Can You Wait?" Demography, November 1985] where she talked about the issue of the woman in the middle, squeezed between two generations, I asked her that question: Based on her woman's perspective, did she see that issue perhaps more than a man?

FREEDMAN: I'm not sure. I think my interest in this issue stemmed from discussion with our Asian colleagues, many of whom thought that Americans were less helpful to their parents than was true in Asian countries. Actually, our data show that there are lots of interchanges between elderly parents and their children. Elderly parents in the U.S. probably receive less financial assistance from their children, but one reason for that is that most elderly parents receive social security benefits.

VDT: Who have been leading influences on your career--besides Ron?

FREEDMAN: I think Eva was an important influence. After we did the modules for the WFS, the World Bank was very interested in a larger module. This larger module could be criticized in the same way as the WFS module; it would not be appropriate, without changes, in all countries. It would be impossible, I think, to design one economic module which could be used, without adaptation, in all countries. Actually that economic model has been extensively used; it is now available in at least three languages. Though it's not universally appropriate, it provides a good taking-off point for people who have never drafted a questionnaire or mounted a survey.

VDT: You have had such a broad vision. Did you always travel with Ron?

FREEDMAN: I didn't at first. I went with him in 1962 for the first time. That was to Taiwan. I spent the summer there, when the children were in camp.

That was a great experience. Taiwan was very different from what it is now. Ron drove a car that summer and the only thing you had to watch out for were the buffalo carts in the street. You didn't have any problems driving. There were no cars and almost no motorbikes, just pedicabs and bicycles. Of course, Taiwan has changed dramatically since then.

VDT: You've accompanied Ron on most trips since then?

FREEDMAN: No, I haven't. After all, in 1962 my kids were in junior high school. Ron used to go away, back to Taiwan once those things started, every Christmas for all the vacation, every spring vacation, and every summer vacation for at least part of it. Well, I certainly couldn't afford to go that often and I couldn't leave the kids that often. It wasn't until my daughter graduated from high school that I really began to travel with Ron. She graduated in 1967, I think it was, right before I got my degree.

VDT: Do you have some people whom you would consider your leading students? I first had Arland Thornton here, but I now know he was not your student.

FREEDMAN: No, I didn't have many Ph.D. students. For the most part, I only taught one course at a time. I taught part-time and did research part-time. It wasn't till we got our Detroit study going that I started working full-time.

VDT: What do you see as leading issues in demography over the years you've been involved--both in less developed countries and the changes in the American family?

FREEDMAN: Well, I must say I'm a little more pessimistic about the changes in the American family than some people are. I don't think divorce is an easy thing to go through. Of course, when women couldn't divorce that wasn't easy either, if you had a marriage that wasn't good. But I've always felt that a separation must be difficult, even for people who cohabit. You've got to get another apartment; if the money has been mixed, you have to separate it. All these things, it seems to me, must be very difficult for people. Women lawyers tell me that men are now using child custody in divorce cases. Husbands who don't want to pay a lot to their wives will use child custody as a threat.

VDT: That they will get child custody?

FREEDMAN: They say they want it. She will have to bargain that as against money and that's very difficult.

Another important problem is adolescent pregnancy. I can't help but think that's really devastating for the kids, for their mothers, and for the grandmothers--many of whom end up with the children.

Those are the issues in the U.S. that really bother me. I think divorce and teenage pregnancies are important family problems.

VDT: What accomplishments in your career have given you the most satisfaction?

FREEDMAN: I think the family booklet was one of the things I enjoyed most working on ["The Changing American Family," with Arland Thornton, Population Bulletin of the Population Reference Bureau, October 1983]. But I've enjoyed everything I've done.

VDT: Let's jump into your recollections of PAA. You said you did not attend the meetings until

the 1960s.

FREEDMAN: No. Even when Ron was president [1965], I could only go to the meeting for half a day. His mother was here and she'd had a serious operation and I could only go for one night.

VDT: That was in Chicago. Did you actually hear Ron's presidential address?

FREEDMAN: No, I didn't, but I got there for one night. It was very touchy; it was hard to leave his mother.

Now, thinking about other PAA meetings, I was unhappy with Paul Demeny's presidential address ["Population and the Invisible Hand," *Demography*, November 1986], which I thought was too hard on Sam Preston, who wrote the summary chapter of the National Academy of Sciences's book [*Population Growth and Economic Development: Policy Questions*, 1986]. Paul's speech was a brilliant, but caustic, economic analysis, criticizing that book. Actually, the closing chapter of that book should have made the point that the economic analyses which constituted the book were less applicable to the very poor countries like Bangladesh.

I liked Sam's presidential address about the problems of poor children, which he contrasted to the help being given to the elderly ["Children and the Elderly: Divergent Paths for America's Dependents, *Demography*, November 1984]. Although there is no question that we are shortchanging many of our children, I think there are some political reasons why the elderly fare better. Since old age comes to everyone, the middle-aged generations know they will want some of these benefits when they get older. Also, governmental help to the elderly has eliminated the need for obtaining financial help from one's children. Help for young children also may be more controversial, since the financial assistance must be made through the parents, and some persons may question whether that assistance really reaches the children. Also, children don't have a lobby with the power of that of the senior citizens.

VDT: What else stands out in your memory about PAA meetings?

FREEDMAN: I always like the "authors meet the critics." Those are my favorite sessions.

VDT: We've had those sessions in the past three or four years. [Only two by the time of this June 1989 interview. Initiated in 1988 by Reynolds Farley, then president and meeting program chair, they were repeated in 1989 but not in 1990 and 1991.]

FREEDMAN: That's right. I thought they were good. I've also been impressed as I go to the meetings that some of the groups who were very influential in trying to influence U.S. population policy don't seem to realize our current low birth rates. I remember going to one session where someone was making a strong case for a government population policy. Since the U.S. birth rate is now so low, I think it's time to look at other more pressing issues, such as teenage pregnancy. I think the population policy we might worry about, if we didn't have so much immigration, is whether we're going to have a decline in our population, a decline in people in the working ages.

VDT: Can you remember back in the early 1970s the women's caucus group, campaigning for

more recognition of women in the profession, or equal rights? Of course, it was the general climate of the times. What did you think about that?

FREEDMAN: Oh, I think I'm all for rights for women. In our profession, demography, there have probably been more women doing well than in almost any other field I can think of--which is good.

I think the last two presidential addresses were particularly good. I learned a lot from Harriet Presser ["Can We Make Time for Children? The Economy, Work Schedules, and Child Care," Demography, November 1989]. What really impressed me was the percentage of jobs that women have which go over weekends and nights. The whole issue of child care is really a horrendous one, because, after all, you can't expect child-care people to take care of all weekends and nights either. And for women who work in those kinds of jobs, it's very, very difficult. I hadn't thought quite as much about that. Regular jobs are hard enough, but those must just be very difficult, unless the husband and wife, if there is a couple, can do separate shifts so one can be home. It's not a great way to live, but for a certain number of years you may have to.

VDT: Can you remember a meeting way back in 1956 when it was here at Ann Arbor and both Amos Hawley and Ren Farley have told me that at that time the Hawleys and the Freedmans invited everybody to a joint cocktail party?

FREEDMAN: Oh, I can remember distinctly, because Angus Campbell came to my house and said, "The punch is stronger at the Hawleys'."

VDT: It was possible to have everybody to one party between the two homes?

FREEDMAN: Yes, because we were right next door. But everyone came to both houses. When Howard Brunsman came, he turned around and said, "You're never going to make it to the banquet," and he shoved everybody out the door so they'd get to the banquet. The cocktail party was a pre-banquet affair. He was terribly worried that nobody would get to the banquet. Now, can you imagine with the present PAA that anybody could do that?

VDT: Exactly. I was just going to ask, what do you think of present meetings, which are now up to--well, a record turnout of almost 1,200 [1,193] at the meeting in Baltimore [1989]?

FREEDMAN: Well, I think they have to be more careful about the hotel choice. I thought the Baltimore hotel was not hospitable to small groups who wanted to talk to each other. There was no place to sit down, except in the cafeteria, which was not very big and not terribly good either. So I think they have to recognize that we're larger and pay more attention to the logistics of the hotel to serve people's uses. The year before, which was New Orleans, I thought that hotel was just beautifully suited to make it possible to talk to people. This one was not.

It's now a very large organization. I'm glad they got rid of these special parties that each population center used to have.

VDT: The alumni night, instead of having separate parties in hotel rooms.

FREEDMAN: I loved the separate parties, but we couldn't keep them separate. Originally, it

was for your graduates and the people who'd been fellows here, something like that. Then it was really wonderful. But after a while, it got so people went from one party to the other and you couldn't hear yourself think! So I think what they're doing now is the best possible thing they could do to solve that problem.

VDT: Do you still enjoy the PAA meetings, even though they have certainly grown beyond the time when the Hawleys and the Freedmans could have everybody for one cocktail party?

FREEDMAN: Yes, I do. I don't think I enjoy them quite as much as I used to, because it's so hard to find people. But, I like to see some of the people and talk to some of them. I like some of the sessions.

There's a lot of proliferation. There's a lot more going on there now. You've got all these meetings one day before, two days before; there's a great deal more of that. But we don't go till the first day.

VDT: You don't go to the beer party, on the Wednesday night?

FREEDMAN: Yes, we usually do go. Actually, we didn't this last time, because we went out to dinner and stayed so late, we just got in to say hello and that was it. And we did go to the other [alumni] party for a little while. But mostly I like having dinner with people I don't see often, like Jane Menken and people like that.

VDT: A close, core group.

FREEDMAN: That's right.

VDT: Have you ever been involved with the economic demographers group, the group that meets the day before the main meeting?

FREEDMAN: No, I haven't, because economic demography has gotten so econometric and mathematical that it's beyond my ken. I know what they're driving at, some of it I can get, but a lot of it is really mathematical.

VDT: What do you see as the outlook for U.S. demography and demographers--the shift to applied demography, business and state and local government demography? Is that where the jobs are?

FREEDMAN: Well, I think there are some. I think there are jobs for demographers in business, because they could help with the statistics and help isolate what kind of groups would be interested. A lot of sociologists now are getting jobs in business and I think the demographers can too. I think they would certainly get jobs with insurance firms.

Most of our demographers get jobs. I don't know what they all do, but they get jobs. But for those who really want to teach above everything else and be in an academic environment, it's more difficult--particularly in sociology as a field, which is not getting as great a share of resources as some others. And since so many of the demographers are in sociology, that can complicate things for them.

Economic demographers also have their problems in getting [teaching] jobs. One reason

is that there aren't many economic demography departments. After all, Sam Preston is an economist, but he's been in sociology departments. And if you get a degree in demography per se, then there are very few places to go if you want to teach. So this complicates things a little bit.

I think that our students go out with good training.

VDT: Tops.

FREEDMAN: And lots of contacts. They've done a lot of work with professors. I think they've been pushed to write before they go out. They get a lot of assistance in getting a good thesis topic. I think this whole idea of having fellowships is good. The fact that you can go as a postdoc fellow is extremely good, because nowadays departments are reluctant to hire people who haven't published. And there aren't so many people who graduate who immediately have a publication. Just the review time, even if they've written anything. So that gives them a year or two to write up their thesis findings or get articles from other studies. And I think that's a very important thing for the young people to have.

VDT: That's an interesting point. Is there anything you'd like to add, being half of such a famous, influential couple in U.S. demography?

FREEDMAN: It's been lots of fun. One of the reasons I would not stop what I'm doing is that I like the fact that I can learn a lot. Ron has many more consultancies than I do and I like the fact that I'm attuned to what's going on enough so that I can go with him and cooperate. It doesn't matter if I don't get paid; the important thing is to be able to work on it. And I like that. And it's been a lot of fun. I'm just sorry that we're getting older and can't do as much.

VDT: What are your children doing? You have a grandchild, your daughter has . . .

FREEDMAN: Yes. She's at the University of Delaware. Her husband teaches in sociology and social work--mainly in social work. They have a big undergraduate social work department and he teaches there. And he's busy in foster care, the state foster care association, he works on that. And she teaches in early education and it's fascinating, because this is a girl who was born with a slight reading disability, a minor kind of dyslexia. She didn't learn to read until she was in fourth grade, but she was dying to read and we went to Holland and I taught her how, at home. She learned and she became a very good reader. But she also couldn't spell. She's never going to be a speller, but now she's got a speller on her computer. She's just published her second book and is probably going to start on her third. So you see, it all worked out very well for her.

VDT: Great!

FREEDMAN: And our son got a Ph.D. in history and he teaches in Louisiana. He's considering a job shift. He's considering taking a year here in our library school, which is big on information systems. He's very interested in archival work and that's very integrated with information work. He's considering doing that because history jobs are hard to get and the library jobs are quite open these days. He's been admitted here and we're waiting to see if he'll come.

He's married to a very nice woman. They don't have children and I don't think they're

going to. But we have two grandchildren and that's more than anybody has the right to expect.

VDT: That's wonderful. You have said you've had fun; you've enjoyed your life and your career. And, besides, it's been unique, in a unique field.

FREEDMAN: Besides, I've had a very nice husband. Couldn't have been better. Best thing I ever did. In fact, when I met my husband, I wrote my mother that night and said, "I met just the kind of man I always thought I wanted to marry. Couldn't have been better." She saved the letter.

VDT: You have the proof and you said, "Here I go, the right route." And vice versa. Your husband said--I can't quote the words now--but in the interview, he said the same about you.

FREEDMAN: It's been a good marriage.

ALICE GOLDSTEIN

Interview with Jean van der Tak at the Population Studies Center, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island, December 14, 1989.

Alice Goldstein has not been a president or secretary-treasurer of PAA, the general criterion for inclusion in this series of interviews. But she was included with her husband (as were Deborah Freedman and Anne Lee with theirs), because she too has had a distinguished career in demography, both independently and together with Sidney Goldstein.

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS: Alice Goldstein was born in Germany and came to the U.S. as a child. She received the B.A. in history from Connecticut College in 1953 and the M.A. in history from Brown University in 1979. She and Sidney Goldstein were married in 1953. She was a research assistant with the Norristown Historical and Social Survey at the University of Pennsylvania in 1953-55 and has been on the staff of the Population Studies and Training Center of Brown University since 1966, where she is currently (since 1984) Senior Researcher. She has published extensively on the historical demography of Jewish populations and is also coauthor with Sidney Goldstein of numerous publications on migration and urbanization in Southeast Asia, particularly China.

VDT: Alice Goldstein has shared in Sidney's career from the beginning and increasingly so in recent years, which makes them one of the most distinguished and rare couples with a joint career in U.S. demography. Also, Alice presumably has been a member of PAA and attended annual meetings almost as long as Sid. You are listed at least in the PAA member directory of 1962.

GOLDSTEIN: Yes, I've been a member for a long time.

VDT: So I know she has some special insights that will be valuable to add to this series of PAA oral history interviews.

[From biographical introduction]: Where were you born?

GOLDSTEIN: I was born in Germany.

VDT: I didn't know that!

GOLDSTEIN: I came to the States 50 years ago, in 1939. My parents and I were on the last regularly scheduled American ship to leave Germany before the war. I'm an only child and it was just the three of us who came together at that time. We arrived in late August and the war started in September. I just went to New York a few weeks ago to celebrate my anniversary by visiting the Statue of Liberty.

VDT: Where were you born in Germany?

GOLDSTEIN: In a very tiny village in the southwestern corner of Germany in the state of Baden, not far from the city of Freiburg.

VDT: Where did you and Sid meet?

GOLDSTEIN: We grew up in New London; our families knew each other. I went to school with his brother, who is exactly my age. So we've known each other for a long time.

VDT: You were married in June 1953, just after you got your B.A. and he got his Ph.D. He said it was a triple-header.

GOLDSTEIN: Indeed, it was; it was one weekend after the other.

VDT: Alice received her M.A. in history from Brown in 1979, and we're going to talk later about that long gap. She has been on the official staff of the Population Studies and Training Center at least from the early 1970s.

GOLDSTEIN: Actually, it was probably earlier than that. It depends on what kind of payroll criteria you use. I think I became a regular member on the payroll in the early 1970s. But I was on what's called "miscellaneous payroll," which was kind of ad hoc, freelance work, from about 1966.

VDT: She's now Senior Researcher at the Population Center. She has appeared as coauthor with Sidney Goldstein on many monographs and articles on Thailand, Southeast Asia, and China since the early 1970s and increasingly, I note, you appear as senior author.

GOLDSTEIN: Right.

VDT: She was sole author of at least one article I happened to see, on mortality among the Rhode Island Jewish population ["Patterns of Mortality and Causes of Death Among Rhode Island Jews, 1979-1981, Social Biology, Spring-Summer 1986].

GOLDSTEIN: There is also a monograph that I authored solely, on historical demography [Determinants of Change and Response Among Catholics and Jews in a Nineteenth Century German Village, 1984].

VDT: Could you tell the story of how you were drawn into working with Sid in demography?

GOLDSTEIN: Sid was finishing his Ph.D. research when we first started seeing each other with some regularity. His research was actually in historical demography. He was tracing names in city directories . . .

VDT: He's explained that--the Norristown study.

GOLDSTEIN: As a historian, I was fascinated by this work and helped him do some of the tracing during vacation periods and whenever he came home to visit. He was in Philadelphia at

the time; I was in Connecticut College [New London, Conn.]. So I started actually on his Ph.D., doing some of the research on a very peripheral basis, but because it was historical it fit very well with my own interests.

Then I decided to take a course in demography, because by that time--this was my last year in college--we'd become engaged and I wanted at least to be able to talk to him intelligently about what he was doing. So I took a course in demography at Connecticut College, just to fill in some of my own gaps and get me familiar with the jargon, the whole thought of the field.

Then I joined the center in Philadelphia as a research assistant after we were married and worked on the Norristown study for two years--in the days before computers. And did a lot of the statistical work, which involved hand-cranked calculators and lots of hand-adding and adding again and checking again. So I got in on the real nitty-gritty, sort of ground-floor work of demography very early on.

And, of course, the whole period in Philadelphia I had Dorothy Thomas as a model and she was just a marvelous model for anyone--someone who was really committed both to her profession and to her students.

VDT: That's right. I hadn't got on with Sid to your part in the "pastoral care." Sid hadn't realized that the Caldwells in their book on the Ford Foundation contribution to population [John and Pat Caldwell, Limiting Population Growth and the Ford Foundation Contribution, 1986] speak of the reputation Brown developed for its teaching and "pastoral care" of students [p. 124]. I love that.

GOLDSTEIN: I hadn't heard that!

VDT: The Brown, and particularly the Goldstein, approach to students.

GOLDSTEIN: Well, I think it's really a legacy of Dorothy Thomas, because she certainly embodied that. She was marvelous to Sid and to me and for all of the students that I saw her working with. So that really set the tone for how I saw my role, at least in the Norristown study and in the department here later.

VDT: What was your role?

GOLDSTEIN: What is it now, you mean?

VDT: Well, how did it develop?

GOLDSTEIN: We've always had students at home a few times during the year, because we like to give them a chance to do some informal socializing, not just in class, and I think it adds a nice dimension. I always enjoyed it when I was going to college.

VDT: Did you have that at Connecticut College?

GOLDSTEIN: Yes, it's a small school and small classes, so we had very close relations with our faculty. I liked that and I encouraged that when Sid began teaching. I wasn't on the faculty, but at least I was peripheral and I was able to help encourage that. So we've always had students

at the house, Thanksgiving, at the end of semester, beginning of semester, summers.

That's really how it began, because I wasn't here on location to interact with students until the early 1970s when I began working here on a regular basis. Since then, of course, I've worked closely with students.

VDT: Let's back up. How did you get into--you were raising your children; you consciously took time out . . .

GOLDSTEIN: Took time off. Until our youngest one was in kindergarten, I didn't work outside at all. Occasionally, I edited papers. I did some of the graphics--for example, some of the early work that Sid was doing here at Brown on the Rhode Island population in particular, where there was a good deal of map work to be done--I did all that.

VDT: You are typical of demographic wives. I've heard a lot about those who were at Princeton; that seemed to have been their role, before the computer, to do the graphics. Daphne Notestein did a lot in the early Princeton studies.

GOLDSTEIN: I have a sort of semi-art background also. I've always been interested in art and I did quite a bit of work in college. So that's helpful in doing paste layouts and graphic work and so on.

VDT: Charlie Westoff, who got his Ph.D. from Pennsylvania in the same year as Sid, his first wife was an artist and did work on some of the Princeton studies.

GOLDSTEIN: It must be some kind of propinquity.

VDT: It could well be. But you were also editing and providing other assistance as your children were growing up?

GOLDSTEIN: The editing is something that can easily be done evenings. It doesn't require a lot of equipment; it's something you can do sitting, holding a baby.

VDT: Did you edit in part because you were interested and Sid came to you or--well, Deborah Freedman said there was never enough money; Ron never asked for enough money for his projects and she was the unpaid research assistant. Was that the case?

GOLDSTEIN: It was probably a combination of the two. It helped to stretch the research funds, surely. It was more important to put the research funds into the logistic support, the typists, because one thing I refused to do right from the beginning was type. I said, "Whatever I am, I'm not a typist," and I've never typed Sid's papers.

The other problem with editing is that it takes someone who is familiar with the field to edit well and it's important for someone to have a good sense of the language, and I think I combine those two. So it was quite natural for me to edit his papers.

VDT: Even though your original native language was not English?

GOLDSTEIN: I think especially because. Because if you learn it as a second language, you become much more conscious of the structure of the language.

VDT: I guess that's true. I have a Dutch husband, as you can surmise, and he's a very good editor, in English, on World Bank research papers.

GOLDSTEIN: I think that's right, because I think you're really much more conscious of language then. And I like writing and I've always written reasonably well and I like to be able to do editing; it's a nice challenge.

VDT: You were with Sid in Denmark, the first year abroad [1961-62]. Have you always accompanied Sid on overseas appointments and travels?

GOLDSTEIN: No. All the long-term ones, surely--all the sabbaticals.

VDT: So that means Thailand [1968-69], East-West Center . . .

GOLDSTEIN: That's right. Australia, New Zealand, Southeast Asia . . .

VDT: New Zealand? I knew about Australia; where did New Zealand come in?

GOLDSTEIN: A month before Australia, the same sabbatical [1976-77]; it was the other peripatetic one. I've gone with Sid a lot of the times when it's been basically a research-oriented trip, where there was a specific role for me to play in terms of research. But not so much if he went as a consultant for a week or two of if he went simply to attend a conference, because I've never enjoyed just going for the sake of going. I like to be active and to be able to do whatever's going on, to do the research; I don't like to just sit in a conference. So I haven't gone on many of the very short-term trips that he's taken as a consultant or as a conference participant.

VDT: Where did you really take a first active role overseas in the research--in Thailand?

GOLDSTEIN: In Thailand.

VDT: What did you do there?

GOLDSTEIN: It was small, because I had three small children still, but there I did a lot of the editing of the research. I helped guide the statistical work in the survey. And Sid bounced a lot of what he was doing off me, so that I became . . .

VDT: Statistical work?--and yet you're an historian.

GOLDSTEIN: I'm a renegade from math. That's developed into a lot of computer work which I do.

VDT: And I understand you learned Thai?

GOLDSTEIN: Yes, it was functional Thai. I enjoyed that. I think learning one language makes it easier to learn others, so it wasn't difficult for me to pick up Thai.

VDT: It's not very close to German.

GOLDSTEIN: It's not that. I think it's a switch that your mind gets used to, going from one language to another.

VDT: I should know; my Dutch husband has several languages.

GOLDSTEIN: I learned Danish too, in Denmark. Danish was easy because it's like German. In fact, similarly between German and English; if I didn't understand a word in English, I sort of tried it out in German and it usually worked pretty well. So I learned--all very useful languages--Danish, broken Thai.

VDT: Why did you decide to go back and get a graduate degree? You were already working.

GOLDSTEIN: Yes, but the way the university is structured, there's a good deal of weight given to graduate degrees, certainly. And I really did want a little more formal training in demography per se. Also, I wanted to be able really to tie my demography to history.

VDT: You got your M.A. in history.

GOLDSTEIN: Yes, but my M.A. thesis is historical demography. It was a study of the demographic transition--really the multiphasic response to the demographic transition among the Jewish and Catholic communities in southwestern Germany in the 19th century.

VDT: Where did you get those data?

GOLDSTEIN: It began with a course with John Knodel, who was here as a visitor one year--1975-76, it must have been. I took the course because I was so interested in the contents. He was working on his German data, which involved these village genealogies, and he showed these to me and some of them had sections on the Jews in the village, and that combined my own ethnic cultural interests with the demography and with the history, so it was a marvelous combination. And it turned out that many of the villages were in the area where my family had come from, so that added even a personal note to it. So I did a paper for him in that course, which was published.

VDT: Where was it published?

GOLDSTEIN: In a book on Jewish fertility, which included historical and contemporary work ["Some Demographic Characteristics of Village Jews in Germany: Nonnenweier, 1800-1931," in Paul Ritterbrand, ed., Modern Jewish Fertility, 1981]. So that then sort of laid the groundwork for my wanting to do something more extensive and more thorough for the master's paper. John introduced me to a genealogy for one village that had a substantial Jewish population and it turned out it was the village my ancestors came from.

VDT: Wonderful!

GOLDSTEIN: Here I was looking at this village and I knew it was one that had been talked about in the family. I looked up the family name; there it was. And I was able to trace our own family back to the early 18th century, because of this genealogy.

VDT: Was it in original handwriting?

GOLDSTEIN: No, it's a bound volume--the large book over there.

VDT: It had been done for that one village?

GOLDSTEIN: Well, there's a whole series of these. It was begun initially as a Nazi enterprise to prove people's Aryan blood, so it had a very iffy background. It was taken up after the war as a commercial enterprise and people would do them and sell these things to the villages and the people within them. So it just happened that they picked this village.

So I did a complete analysis of the Jewish population. It uses family reconstitution techniques. And the nice part about it is that the reconstitution is done, so all I had to do was apply the techniques; I didn't have to go through the very tedious work of doing the reconstitution.

It was wonderful, because not only did I have the data, I also had the history of the village there, plus I had a great deal of family lore and sense of place--which I think is so important in research. That was part of what made the research so exciting for me.

VDT: And it's been published?

GOLDSTEIN: Yes, it was published as a monograph, by the Conference on Jewish Social Studies [see above].

VDT: What a fascinating piece of work! And all the while you were working?

GOLDSTEIN: There was a period of two years after we came back from sabbatical [1976-77], from 1977 to 1979, when I was taking courses half-time and I was working here as a research assistant half-time, and then I was doing everything else half-time, because I still had one child at home.

VDT: But great years, obviously.

GOLDSTEIN: It was wonderful; I loved it.

VDT: Have you gone on and done more research on your own? I mentioned that article on mortality of Rhode Island Jews [see above]. It was most ingenious; you had collected the data from Jewish funeral directors and cemeteries.

GOLDSTEIN: It was a follow-up on something Sid had done 20 years earlier. We'd been

wanting to do it for some time, he never had the time, so I finally said, "Okay, I'm doing it." So I got a little grant from Brown and did it.

VDT: Have you done more research on your own?

GOLDSTEIN: Yes, I've done an article that looked at urbanization in Baden, that southwest state of Germany ["Urbanization in Baden, Germany, 1825-1925: Focus on the Jews," Social Science History, Winter 1984]. That involved using census data. It was interesting, because census data is published by religious affiliation, so that it was interesting to be able to trace religious differentials in relation to urbanization and directions of urbanization. That was a rather interesting macro analysis to add onto the micro analysis I had done of the village; it was a nice complement. That was another piece of historical research. That was published; almost all of these things have been published.

I did a study that was part of my master's work of Rhode Island Jews in the late 19th, early 20th century, that period of heavy immigration when many Jews were settling here. I did a study of residential and occupational mobility ["Mobility of Natives and Jews in Providence, 1900-1920," Rhode Island Jewish Historical Notes, November 1979]. That went back to my earliest training in demography, because it used city directories, in addition to using the manuscript censuses for 1880 to 1910.

VDT: Can we skip on to China and the China research? I haven't yet gotten to China with Sid, so I don't know when it was you first went.

GOLDSTEIN: Sid went in 1979. I went for the first time in 1981. I like to describe that as a kind of minuet. Sid's credentials had been pretty well established by 1981, because he'd gone in 1979 and he had had some correspondence in the interval and we had some Chinese students here. I worked with them fairly closely. There was one in particular. The first one who came out of China to get her demographic training came here to Brown, and I worked with her quite closely. By that time, I had done quite a lot of work with students from Asia, because we had students from Thailand . . .

VDT: When you say you do a lot of work, is that helping them get established or what?

GOLDSTEIN: Yes, I help them get established; I help them with their research; I read their papers, given them critical suggestions. They come to me if they have problems with computer programming. I help them with data sources--whatever I can do to facilitate.

VDT: This is part of your official job?

GOLDSTEIN: Yes, it's true. I do it for any student who wants to come in, any of the graduate students. Mostly the LDC students come because they need the extra help, very often. Occasionally, they need a little lecture on American institutions. So they know they can come to me.

VDT: So you went to China in 1981.

GOLDSTEIN: At that time, we were meeting with officials and giving lectures. It was officially billed as a kind of lecture tour and Sid gave several lectures; I gave a couple of lectures.

VDT: What were your lectures?

GOLDSTEIN: We were talking about urbanization and migration, primarily, so I was using some of the Thai data to show how studies of migration can--how one can understand the ties between rural and urban areas, the kind of networking and linkages that can develop.

VDT: Multiplicity?

GOLDSTEIN: Multiplicity was a whole other project I was also involved in at one point, but that's not China.

We insisted that we would be willing to give the lectures, but at the same time we wanted to be able to talk to people about migration and urbanization. And at that time, the Chinese were insisting that they didn't have to study migration, because their system was completely controlled and they knew from their population registration statistics exactly who was moving and what was going on. We said, "Well, that's very interesting, we want to hear more about it." And we would ask questions.

What we did in the various cities where we lectured would be to meet with a combination of university people interested in demography and officials from either the census bureau or city planning or social science academies, family planning units, who were interested in demography also. It was a real give-and-take. At that point, they were still catching up from the 25-year gap that they had had in social sciences because of the Cultural Revolution, so there were trying to catch up on what was happening in demography and sociology, and we were trying to find out what was happening in terms of migration and urbanization. So it was a fascinating dialogue that we would have.

And in the course of it, they became aware that what they thought of as migration, the official change in registration that was captured by their statistics, really only touched on a small part of what was going on.

VDT: So you were the ones who awakened them to that!

GOLDSTEIN: Yes, we are the ones who started that whole issue. And I remember in 1981 when we met with the director of the census bureau and one of the questions we asked him was, "What are you asking about migration in the census?" He said, "We don't need to ask, because we know." He also participated in some of the discussions. And in 1987, when they did their mid-decade census--it was a large survey rather than a full census--they asked several questions on migration.

VDT: And that was thanks to you?

GOLDSTEIN: It was really begun because of this series of talks we had in 1981, and then continued on, and is still continuing. It all began with us. I was very fortunate to be in at that level, really at the beginning of research on migration in China.

VDT: Why is it that your name is appearing more and more often as senior author on your China papers?

GOLDSTEIN: I guess it's a matter of time; I have more time. Sid has had less time. I'm hoping that he'll have more time, now that he's not director of the center anymore. [Sidney Goldstein, who had been director of Brown's Population Training and Study Center since its establishment in 1965, was succeeded in that post by Frances Goldscheider in September 1989.] So he doesn't have all the administrative responsibilities anymore. I'm hoping that will give him more time for research. He's had such limited time for research, so I've carried the burden for a lot of the research that has been done, even in the United States.

VDT: Do you think your input as a woman has given your joint research and publications insights they might not otherwise have had? For instance, who had the idea of really going out and talking to people in China?

GOLDSTEIN: Oh, Sid's always been interested in doing that too. I think both of us are much more social demographers than formal demographers. I feel unhappy, and I know Sid does too, dealing with data that we get only as sets of numbers. I think the contextual part of research is so important and the cultural aspects, the understanding of the population.

I think that's why our Thai research has been successful, because we spent the year in Thailand and we began to understand what the culture was like and that really has made an enormous difference in interpreting the data.

I think a good example of that was when I worked with the Malaysian data. The Rand Corporation had collected a wonderful set of data and we were asked to analyze the migration-fertility interrelations in that set of data. We found some really strange patterns that went contrary to sort of the accepted wisdom that urbanization meant lower fertility and greater use of contraception. Some of the migrants did not follow that pattern at all and we couldn't understand it. We had checked the data to make sure it wasn't simply coding errors or mis-specification; it wasn't. We talked to people at Rand and they didn't have any ideas.

Then the year after we finished that research we finally got ourselves to Malaysia. That was in 1983 when we were doing sabbatical and really focusing on temporary migration. But in the process of talking to people in all kinds of situations in Malaysia, including people who ran the rubber estates--Indians, mainly, from the British legacy--they began to tell us what happened to their people as they left the plantations, and it suddenly became very clear. The kinds of family planning sources that were available on the plantations in the rural areas were not available in the urban areas with the same ease and facility of access, so contraceptive use went down, not because the women didn't want it but because it wasn't as available to them in the urban areas. It was just contrary to the usual pattern, but until we got to Malaysia and started talking to people and understanding what was going on, we couldn't interpret the data properly.

VDT: Which was that migrants to the cities had higher fertility?

GOLDSTEIN: Had low contraceptive use, and this was specific groups of migrants--and some higher fertility. It became very clear once we talked to the people. So that kind of thing, I think, has motivated both of us right from the start.

VDT: To find out the people context of what you're dealing with?

GOLDSTEIN: Yes. I think I've raised Sid's consciousness as far as women are concerned. I think I tend to focus a bit more on women's issues. One of the papers we did on some of the Chinese data, for example, was labor force differentials for women, comparing their status and earnings to those of men. It's especially interesting, because China ostensibly is a very egalitarian society, but in fact, of course, there's a great deal of sexism. And it comes through in the statistics very nicely; one can't argue with them. So it was a very nice demonstration of that.

VDT: It sounds to me like you would indeed, as a woman, have thought of that. Have you done any teaching? You mentioned lectures in China, but have you done any teaching?

GOLDSTEIN: Not formal teaching at the university, no. I did some English-as-a-second-language teaching, for a couple of years [1967-68]. That was before I was involved in demography. I enjoyed doing that; it was fun. I do a workshop on writing here every year. It's just a few sessions on how to write term papers and dissertations and theses.

VDT: To both the American and non-American students?

GOLDSTEIN: Yes, it's necessary for all of them. That really is to get them started earlier on the mechanics, so they don't waste time at the end, having to do all their referencing and so on.

VDT: Is that unusual, in university departments?

GOLDSTEIN: I don't know. I don't know of any other departments here at Brown who do it, but I haven't really checked into it. I just think it's a helpful thing.

VDT: It must be part of the atmosphere at Brown, which is very close.

GOLDSTEIN: I think that's part of it, yes.

And I work closely with the student representative in connection with my arrangement of the colloquium series here. I have charge of arranging for the colloquium speakers that we have. I try to work as closely as possible with the students on that so that we get speakers that are particularly relevant to their research and the kinds of people they would like to see on campus. That's worked out rather well.

VDT: What are you doing now and what will you do on the upcoming sabbatical?

GOLDSTEIN: What am I not doing now! [Laughter] The sabbatical will be pretty well concentrated on the Chinese research.

VDT: Do you have some data in particular that you're working with?

GOLDSTEIN: We have several sets of data. One set is a large survey that was completed in Hubei province in 1988. That's one that has been collaborative right from the start--Brown and Wuhan University in Hubei province. We started at the questionnaire design stage and the sample design and planning the analysis, and we're now just beginning the analysis.

VDT: This is all translated for you--or translated for them?

GOLDSTEIN: Both. Basically it's done in English, because our collaborator--one of them at least from there--was a student at Michigan, so he learned English quite well. It's a back-and-forth business; we begin in English and then they translate it into Chinese. The final version, of course, is in Chinese and then we have it translated a couple of times to make sure that we're getting a proper translation. It's always a problem--there are so many nuances in the language.

VDT: You know something of the language?

GOLDSTEIN: None.

VDT: Have you anything to do with this new Chinese Journal of Population Studies?

GOLDSTEIN: No, that's a Chinese venture. I suppose eventually when we begin writing articles on these data they will be collaborative articles and some of them will be published in Chinese and some may end up in the journal. I assume that would happen. But we don't have anything to do with the journal.

VDT: Who have been leading influences in your career, besides Sid and besides Dorothy Thomas? Any others?

GOLDSTEIN: I guess John Knodel, in showing me that one can really combine the historical with the contemporary.

VDT: He did that with me. One of my favorite Population Bulletins [of which I was editor, at the Population Reference Bureau] was the one he and Etienne van de Walle did ["Europe's Fertility Transition: New Evidence and Lessons for Today's Developing World," February 1980]. When I first heard them give a paper on that topic, I said, "Oh, fascinating!"

GOLDSTEIN: I've been doing that still. I've become active in the Social Science History Association; I'm sort of their "China hand." I like to bring in contemporary LDC data as a kind of counterbalance to the heavy emphasis on historical data that they have at their meetings. Most of them are historians, and some sociologists; it's a nice mix, but heavily historical. What I've been trying to do is look at past patterns of migration particularly or of development in Europe, and then see whether there are similar patterns in contemporary LDCs. Or to look at contemporary LDC patterns and see if they have antecedents in their own past. I've done a couple of papers on that.

VDT: Internal migration, you're talking about?

GOLDSTEIN: Yes.

VDT: Give me an example of that.

GOLDSTEIN: I did one using Thai, Indonesian, and China data, looking at patterns of temporary mobility and seeing how temporary mobility in the 19th century in these countries, at a very early stage of development, played itself out. It was really not so much related to development as related to a continuation of very traditional patterns, and how those same forms of temporary mobility are being carried into the contemporary time, where they're being used not so much for the continuation of the traditional patterns but for a way of moving into modern consumer patterns ["Temporary Migration in Southeast Asia and China: New Forms of Traditional Behavior," Social Science History Association meeting, New Orleans, October 1987].

VDT: Within those countries, you had 19th century data as well as current data?

GOLDSTEIN: That's right. It takes some digging, but it was fascinating to do that. That's the kind of thing I love to do.

This year I gave a paper at the Social Science History Association meeting looking at rural industrialization and migration in China, because what's happening in that area in China is very similar to what happened in the 19th century in Europe. I was trying to show how there are many parallels, despite the very different cultural backgrounds and very different political systems, which has a lot more to say about what's happening in China--and yet there are enormous parallels between the two ["Rural Industrialization and Migration in the People's Republic of China," Social Science History Association meeting, Washington, D.C., November 1989].

VDT: You've obviously been very strongly involved in Sid's work, but developed your own lines too.

GOLDSTEIN: Yes.

VDT: What accomplishments in your career have given you the most satisfaction?

GOLDSTEIN: Just being able to develop my own lines of research has been very satisfying. And to be able to really integrate the historical with the contemporary has been very exciting to do.

The other aspect that I'm moving into more and more now is looking at women's issues, partly in LDCs but also with our other big area of research, the Jewish population of the United States. Sid's done a lot more with that than I have, but I'm moving into it more now, and I'm looking particularly at women and I'm seeing how their roles have played out in the community, within the demographic context.

VDT: Over the years that you have been involved, what have you seen as leading issues in demography? By that, I mean both U.S. issues--obviously you have been concerned about rapid urbanization in developing countries.

GOLDSTEIN: The other major issue has been understanding migration as more than simply a one-time change of residence. I think that's been really exciting work and I think Sid has been really on the forefront of that.

VDT: He has, indeed.

GOLDSTEIN: The whole question of temporary mobility; the different facets of movement. That's been very interesting to pursue. It's been difficult to do, because most research doesn't pay attention to it and most data sets don't have the information on it. But it's getting more feasible, especially as we get data sets of our own that we've developed.

VDT: And what about the future? What will be the big issues?

GOLDSTEIN: I think population redistribution is going to continue to be the big issue. As fertility becomes more under control, I think questions of development are going to depend more on where people are and who goes where than on how many people there are in the area as a whole.

VDT: And what about the future of demography and demographers? You are sitting in a center where everything is running smoothly, but in the U.S., are there still going to be jobs for people like yourself to do basic research in academia?

GOLDSTEIN: I would hope so. I really think that basic research is basic. I think that's where our understanding of what the issues are is going to come from. It doesn't come from applied research. It has to come from the basic researchers, so let's hope there are places for them.

VDT: Sid and I haven't yet gotten on to the prospects for continuing China-U.S. student exchanges.

GOLDSTEIN: That's a big issue.

JVDT: I'm sure it is. Now, let's get to PAA. You mentioned that you have been a member for a long time. Do you remember your first meeting?

GOLDSTEIN: My first meeting was in 1953, before we were married.

VDT: You married in June of 1953, so it would have been the one in . . .

GOLDSTEIN: In Cincinnati.

VDT: It was in two different places.

GOLDSTEIN: That's right.

VDT: Cincinnati and Oxford, Ohio. What do you remember about that meeting?

GOLDSTEIN: It was lovely, because it was small. There was one session per time slot. Everybody knew everybody else. I got to meet all of these people whose books I had been reading.

VDT: And you were only the fiancée of a graduate student.

GOLDSTEIN: Being with Dorothy made such a difference, because she always treated people as equal; she was never condescending. So I was always part of the group and it was marvelous. I loved those meetings; it was such a nice introduction.

Then I went to the ones in Charlottesville in 1954 and then there was a big gap when I didn't go at all, while the children were little. I went to the one that was in Providence, of course. That was in 1959.

VDT: But you didn't leave children with baby-sitters and go, in those years?

GOLDSTEIN: No, I didn't, because it was really before I saw myself as a professional demographer. And it was part of the times: You had little kids; you stayed home and took care of them. Few of us did otherwise, although Anne Lee certainly did, and Ann Miller certainly did. But I came from a much more traditional background, and . . . I don't know. That's how I behaved, in any case. So I really didn't go to meetings on a regular basis until probably about 1966.

VDT: That New York meeting?

GOLDSTEIN: I went to that New York meeting and I've been going ever since, pretty much regularly.

VDT: Were you involved with the women's issues in the early 1970s?

GOLDSTEIN: No, not very much. It took a while for my consciousness to be raised, I guess.

VDT: Now it's been aroused.

GOLDSTEIN: There's no question about now, but at that point, no.

VDT: Do any of the meetings stand out in your memory--leading up to Sid's year as president in Montreal in 1976?

GOLDSTEIN: Not especially. I think the business meetings used to be much more interesting than they are now, because issues were dealt with there and there was much more interaction from the floor. It's gotten much more mechanical now, I think, so it's gotten kind of boring.

VDT: Besides the business meetings, the ambiance in general, the places?

GOLDSTEIN: Part of the thing that's happened to PAA is that it's been successful and it's gotten bigger. And I think in the process, one loses the kind of personal interaction within the sessions themselves that one had in the past. I think the best proof of that is that the Social Science History meetings are now at the stage that the PAA was at in the 1950s. Although there are several sessions per time slot, people within the sessions generally know each other and it's structured so that there's a real discussion of issues. They almost always run out of time.

VDT: Sid and everyone who attended the early PAA meetings has commented on the fact that everybody attended that one session.

GOLDSTEIN: There they all were.

VDT: All there in one room. Anne Lee said it was at the Philadelphia meeting in 1957 that they switched to double sessions [this actually occurred at the 1956 meeting in Ann Arbor], so it was beginning in the 1950s. The Social Science History meeting has what, about two or three sessions simultaneously?

GOLDSTEIN: No, they have four or even five. But they're small, most of them, and generally they're very area-specific, so that people who're interested in migration, for example, go always to the same sessions and people who're interested in police work in the 19th century, sort of law and order issues. It's a very eclectic group, in the sense that it covers a lot of different topics, but because of that people within the same topic tend to be together a lot, so we get to know each other and the kind of discussion one can have is much more interesting because there's a lot more other interaction going on as well.

VDT: Do you think it has something to do with actual physical size and setting of the rooms? PAA often gets us into very large rooms.

GOLDSTEIN: That's part of it. I think the other part of it is the nature of the papers--that demography tends to be very heavily statistical. Which is fine, except that it's very hard to either assimilate the statistics when they're presented orally or to have much of a discussion about them afterwards. I think if you're talking about ideas and issues, it's much easier to have discussions.

VDT: Some people in this series of interviews have said that's one thing that encouraged more discussion in the early days--the papers were not so statistical.

GOLDSTEIN: I really think that's true. I think there's been too much number-crunching going on. And I think we get much more hung up on our computer output than we probably ought to be. I think they're wonderful tools and I think they're absolutely essential. But I don't think they should be the end in themselves and they too often overwhelm other issues.

VDT: I think yours and Sid's publications are not so overwhelmed with numbers.

GOLDSTEIN: I like to think I have something to do with that. I very consciously deal with that.

VDT: You mean to keep them free from too much statistics?

GOLDSTEIN: Yes, I really try to do that. Well, Sid himself has written a series of articles that haven't had any tables in them at all.

VDT: And you take credit for that?

GOLDSTEIN: No, these are ones that we haven't even coauthored; he's done it himself. I do

tend to take out a lot of table descriptions; take out a lot of the statistics. And just try to emphasize the patterns and the trends, and then speculate about what that means, put it within some kind of context or some kind of historical framework.

VDT: Well, that makes you even more rare in demography, which seems to be becoming more and more number-crunching, as you say.

GOLDSTEIN: I like to think that a lot of our students really do get training in being more issue- and theory-oriented. Partly because they have to take a lot of sociological theory, and that really does become much more a way of thinking for them.

VDT: Here at Brown, you are more sociological perhaps than any center? You have the department of sociology, of course. Do you have any economists?

GOLDSTEIN: Oh, yes. We have economists, anthropologists, community health people--all are involved in the center. And one of the things that we try to do, and it's been one of my responsibilities, is in terms of the speakers we have coming in, either colloquia or summer workshops that we run every year, is to get people from other disciplines, so that we expose our students to as many different related disciplines as possible.

VDT: But not number-crunchers--historians, anthropologists?

GOLDSTEIN: Economists, geographers . . .

VDT: That's a very interesting perspective. I think demography needs more of that.

GOLDSTEIN: I do, too. I'm always very pleased when we have people coming in who can give a different social science perspective--or even the health perspective. We have close ties with the community health and the gerontology departments here and I think their perspective has been very valuable for us.

VDT: I would love to ask you about your children. I hear your daughter Beth is an anthropologist and a professor at the University of Kentucky and she studied in Hong Kong.

GOLDSTEIN: She's a perfect example of what can happen when Sid's on sabbatical. She developed a very strong interest in Southeast Asia because of the time she spent in Bangkok with us.

VDT: She was there only about one year?

GOLDSTEIN: She was only there one year; she was there in eighth grade. She went to the international school there, but she studied Thai. Well, we learned a little bit of it, but it somehow sparked something. And when she got to Yale, she started to major in anthropology because of that background of having been exposed to other societies, and with a strong minor in Southeast Asia, and she became fluent and literate in Thai.

VDT: At Yale?

GOLDSTEIN: At Yale, without going back to Thailand. Her sophomore year she was with the University Field Services, took a course in Malaysia, did her fieldwork in Thailand, with an exceedingly successful study; she had it published--as a sophomore. It was a very wonderful experience for her. Then that prompted her to go to Hong Kong as a "Chinese Bachelor." That was part of the China-Yale exchange program. China had this long-standing exchange with Yale and when China was closed to Westerners, and especially Americans, they moved the operation from the Mainland to Hong Kong. So that's how she got to Hong Kong, and there she learned Chinese. So she's fluent in Thai and in Chinese.

Then she decided to go back and do her Ph.D., but by then had gotten interested in problems of education for minority groups--in Hong Kong already--and did that using the Southeast Asian minority, the Hmongs, in Wisconsin; there was a large group in Wisconsin. So she did her Ph.D. at Wisconsin using them as her study group.

And now in Kentucky, she's looking at the Appalachian minority and trying to be helpful there. She's very action-oriented within the academic community.

VDT: She's in the department of anthropology?

GOLDSTEIN: No. Well, she has a joint appointment, primarily in the school of education, educational policy, but a joint appointment with anthropology, with responsibility for Southeast Asia and women's studies as well.

David's our biologist, at Wright State University in Dayton; it's part of the Ohio State system. He got a Ph.D. at the University of California, UCLA. He did a post-doc in Arizona. He's interested in metabolism of birds under extreme climatic conditions--California and Arizona desert conditions. He's since broadened that. I can't understand his research basically, but I do understand that he's really on the cutting edge of developing this whole area of research.

VDT: With birds?

GOLDSTEIN: I think he's also using now some warm-blooded animals, mice--metabolism, particularly kidney function, in extreme conditions. That has a lot of relevance for the whole environmental impact studies, including impact on human beings. So this is beginning, I think, to be a very large area.

VDT: And then the third one?

GOLDSTEIN: That is Brenda, who was also influenced by her time overseas. She went into public health; she got her M.P.H. at Berkeley. And because of her background of having lived in Thailand and traveled in Asia, she got a job with a county public health unit in Oakland, California, and she does maternal and family health training of refugee populations.

VDT: Interesting! It all tied in.

GOLDSTEIN: It all tied in. And we have 5.9 grandchildren. All the children are married and they all have at least one child.

VDT: That's marvelous. You've obviously had a wonderful life and career, and it's far from over.

GOLDSTEIN: We're very fortunate.

Addendum:

VDT: Now, an addition. The first one . . .

GOLDSTEIN: The main addition is that I always think of myself as an historian by training and a demographer by marriage. [Laughter]

VDT: And she also wants to be sure there's no misunderstanding about influences on her career. I had phrased the question as: Who have been the leading influences in your career besides Sid and Dorothy Thomas? She's now come down to put on record that Sid is really the most important influence.

GOLDSTEIN: Because if I hadn't met him, I would never have thought of going into demography.