

DEMOGRAPHIC DESTINIES

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

PAA Oral History Project

Volume 2—Secretary-Treasurers
Number 1--From 1953 through 1996

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 SECRETARY-TREASURERS

	Years	Secretary-Treasurer	Interview date, place, interviewer	Page
1	1931-32	Alfred J. Lotka	Also President 1938-39—No Interview	
2	1932-33	Clarence G. Dittmer	No interview	
3	1934-39	Frank Lorimer	Also President 1946-47—No interview	
4	1939-42	Conrad Taeuber	Also President 1948-49—see Presidents (Vol. 1, No. 1)	
5	1942-46	Philip M. Hauser	Also President 1950-51—see Presidents (Vol. 1, No. 1)	
6	1946-49	Harold F. Dorn	Also President 1957-58—No interview	
7	1950-53	Henry S. Shryock, Jr.	Also President 1955-56—see Presidents (Vol. 1, No. 1)	
8	1953-56	Hugh Carter	4/27/73, New Orleans, Lunde; 2/5/88, Washington, DC, VDT	<u>5</u>
9	1956-59	Daniel O. Price	4/6/88, Chapel Hill, VDT	<u>11</u>
10	1959-62	Kurt B. Mayer	4/90, Ascona, Switzerland, self interview with material provided by VDT	<u>30</u>
11	1962-65	Paul C. Glick	Also President 1966-67—see Presidents (Vol. 1, No. 2)	
12	1965-68	Anders S. Lunde	4/5/88, Chapel Hill, VDT	<u>35</u>
13	1968-71	Abbott L. Ferris	4/18/88, Atlanta, VDT	<u>63</u>
14	1971-75	James W. Brackett	3/27/88, Arlington, VA, VDT	<u>78</u>
15	1975-78	Mary Grace Kovar	12/5/89, Hyattsville, MD, VDT	<u>108</u>
16	1978-81	Thomas W. Merrick	2/11/89, Washington, DC, VDT	<u>137</u>
17	1981-84	John L. Goodman, Jr.	3/1/90, Washington, DC, VDT	<u>169</u>
18	1984-87	Robert J. Lapham	No interview	
19	1987-90	Suzanne M. Bianchi	11/8/89, Washington, DC, VDT—Also President in 2000	<u>188</u>
20	1990-93	Barbara Foley Wilson	8/4/93, Bethesda, MD, VDT	<u>222</u>
21	1993-96	V. Jeffrey Evans	11/20/96, Washington, DC, Weeks	<u>256</u>

HUGH S. CARTER

PAA Secretary in 1953-56 (No. 8). Interview with Anders Lunde at the Cosmos Club, Washington, D.C., November 20, 1974.

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS: Hugh Carter was born in 1895 and died in 1988. He received his Ph.D. in sociology from Columbia University. He taught sociology at the University of Pennsylvania, was a statistician with the Immigration and Naturalization Service from 1945 to 1952, and Chief of the Marriage and Divorce Statistics Branch in the National Office of Vital Statistics and its successor, the National Center for Health Statistics, from 1952 to 1965. Among his publications, he was coauthor with Paul Glick (PAA President 1966-67) of Marriage and Divorce: A Social and Economic Study, 1970; revised edition, 1976.

LUNDE: How did you first become interested in the study of population?

CARTER: My interest goes back a great many years. When I was a graduate student at Columbia University back in the early 1920s, I studied statistics with Robert Chaddock and E.A. Ross in the sociology department and they were both very much interested in the whole field of demography. So that was the beginning.

After I began teaching sociology at the University of Pennsylvania, I was very much interested in population questions and in demography. Later I did considerable research on the fringes of demography, you might say.

When the Population Association was first organized in the early 1930s, I was very much interested but I didn't join immediately. I saw its publications from time to time. After I was in the federal government, in the National Office of Vital Statistics, the suggestion was made that I should serve as secretary. My chief, Hal Dunn, said this would be okay for a period of three years. So I did serve for those three years [1953-56].

The first president that I served with was the distinguished demographer Irene Taeuber [PAA President 1953-54], who happened to be the first woman to be elected president of the Population Association. It was a very interesting year. Irene decided that she would like to have the meeting of the Population Association at the University of Virginia [Charlottesville, May 8-9, 1954]. Some members of the Board immediately raised the question of whether the issue of segregation would come up. Irene was determined that the meeting could be held without segregation being involved. To make sure of it, she and Con Taeuber and my wife Isabelle and I drove down to Charlottesville well in advance of the scheduled meeting and talked to the authorities there, including Lorin Thompson, who was the local man who was handling the meeting arrangements. [Conrad Taeuber says Lambert Molyneaux was chair of the local arrangements committee. Conrad Taeuber letter to Daniel Price, July 14, 1982.] An arrangement was made with the leading hotel in Charlottesville that a list of the persons to attend the meeting would be given to them and all of these people would be allowed to stay at this hotel, regardless of color.

This seemed to be absolutely waterproof. But there was a hitch. One black man from down in the Caribbean had said he would not come, so his name was not on the list [George Roberts]. But at the last moment he decided to come. He showed up at the hotel, his name was not on the list, and he was refused admittance. So he quietly went away to a small black hotel and registered. When Irene Taeuber learned of it, she was very much upset. She called him up and urged him to come over to the other hotel. He said he was very comfortable where he was and he preferred to stay there. Whereupon Irene went over to him and pleaded with him that if he didn't come over to the main hotel, it would put her in a very difficult situation with her Board. Whereupon he kindly agreed to come over to the main hotel. And the incident that threatened to blow up into something amounted to nothing at all. And it

was a successful meeting.

I might mention that when we met at the University of Virginia, the president of the university met with us at a little luncheon. This was simply a gesture to show that the university was very glad to have us there. In his remarks, he told us this story, which we could apply as we saw fit to this present situation. He said two men met in Penn station in New York City toward the end of the day; they had had a very exhausting day. While they were waiting to catch their trains a man came up and said, "Hello, Joe, I just saw your brother down in Miami." Joe said, "Is that so? Nice to see you." After he left, his friend turned to him and said, "I didn't know you had a brother in Miami." The man said, "Well, I don't, but I was in no condition to argue." So the University of Virginia gave us a warm welcome, although at that time Charlottesville was a very segregated town.

The year that I was with Irene Taeuber was unusual in another way, in that there was to be a meeting of the International Population Union [IUSSP] in Rome that year [Rome, September 6-12, 1953, jointly with the International Statistical Institute]. The question arose, how were we to get people over to Rome and who should go. So Irene appointed a committee to plan this out and funds were solicited from foundations and so on. I don't remember the total amount but it was a sizable sum. Then the question arose, who should go. Obviously those who were giving papers should go, but then there were a great many others; there were plenty of funds for others to go. Irene and I decided that we ourselves would not put in for a grant, since we were on the inside, as it were. Irene did get to Rome some way, but I didn't. I stuck to my guns, as though being on the inside I should not take a grant to go.

The next year that I served the Population Association as secretary, Marny Hagood [Margaret Jarman Hagood] was the president [1954-55]. She was a remarkable woman; it was a pleasure to work with her. She was in the Department of Agriculture. She was a very systematic person--a person who didn't know how to spare herself. As you will recall, she died rather young of a heart condition. I saw her many times during the year and there were many times when I was aware that she was just on the ragged edge; she didn't know how to spare herself. But she did a superb job.

That year we met at Princeton [May 21-22, 1955]. The Population Association was still small enough to meet at Princeton. But that was the last year we met there, because obviously it was pretty crowded. It was a good year.

The next year, they decided to combine the offices of secretary and treasurer. I had been more or less serving as treasurer anyway, as the previous secretaries had. They had a nominal treasurer, but the whole thing was handled more or less in my office, so they just decided to combine the two offices. Henry Shryock was the president that year [1955-56].

That was the year we got a small grant from the National Science Foundation so that we could get out a directory of the members. It wasn't a big grant, but it involved a good deal of consultation and talking to people and working out the plans and finally getting this small grant, under which the questionnaires went out to all PAA members and that meant the National Science Foundation had a directory of demographers, along with directories of many other professional groups.

LUNDE: Looking back, what issues do you recall as the concern of demographers in those years? Today we have the World Fertility Survey and we're concerned about issues having to do with population growth and hunger and so on.

CARTER: I think the concerns were rather similar. I remember one man who always had a lot to say, with which 99 percent of the people disagreed. He was a Jesuit priest from one of the Catholic universities who had things to say in the general meetings and special meetings [PAA sessions?] along the line that the population problem could be solved by migration to the areas of less dense population. Most people strongly disagreed.

There were discussions of various methods of contraception in the fertility meetings. At that

time, the rhythm method was being put forward by some people and there were discussions as to its unreliability.

In my field, rates of population growth, the nuptiality tables, and mortality trends that existed at that time were of interest. There were always interesting meetings on internal migration and some on international migration. I had formerly been in the Immigration and Naturalization Service, where I had done research in international migration, and I recall some meetings where we had some lively discussions of aspects of international migration. The pressure of population on food supplies and resources was a subject of great interest at that time. There were sessions on the teaching of demography and what was involved in adequate teaching of demography.

At that time, the feeling was rather strong in the top group in the Population Association that it should be kept small and that it should not become--there was some fear that it might become a propaganda organization rather than a scientific organization. So there was no push to get in members. The only push I made personally toward getting in members was with state officials, like state registrars of vital statistics. After consulting PAA officers, I sent invitations to them and quite a number of them joined the Population Association. I sat with some of them at some of the meetings of the Population Association. I don't think they stayed with it too long.

LUNDE: When I checked the record not so many years ago, I found only two of the persons on the National Center for Health Statistics roster of state registrars of vital statistics, for which I was responsible, in the [PAA membership] directory.

CARTER: Well, the directory of the Population Association that I got out for the National Science Foundation--it must have been about 1955 or 56--was a very small directory and had in it quite a number of state registrars and state statisticians. I have kept it. My secretary did 99 percent of the work on it.

LUNDE: Going back to your mention of the IUSSP. As I understand from the record, at one time, PAA elected members to serve on the American National Committee of the IUSSP. They had to be elected, as members of the PAA Board were.

CARTER: That may be, but I don't know for sure. When I became interested in the IUSSP, I had to be proposed for membership, as others are, by a certain number of people and then after a delay of six months or a year, I was elected to membership in it. When I went to a meeting of the International Union in Vienna in 1959, there was a good deal of discussion of what should be done about this, but nothing significant was done. There were national chapters of the IUSSP. There was a United States chapter and we used to hold meetings every year at the same time that the Population Association met. To my regret, the group decided to vote itself out of existence about three or four years ago. Clyde Kiser and I and others spoke out against that, but it was voted just to disband the organization. So that although there are chapters in other countries--in India, for example--we do not have one here.

The International Union, I think, serves a very useful purpose and the Population Association of America has always been closely tied with it. Frank Lorimer was one of the early people that got it going and also the late Stuart Rice had quite a bit to do with it in an indirect way, although he was not active in it.

LUNDE: From the earliest days of your association with the Population Association, who are the people you remember, besides Irene Taeuber and so on?

CARTER: I remember Warren Thompson; I always saw him at the annual meetings and had very pleasant chats with him. I also saw quite a bit of Pat Whelpton, whom I deeply admired as a scholar

and as a person. Pat was a very human and likable person. I saw quite a bit of Clyde Kiser and Frank Notestein. Kingsley Davis I saw from time to time. He was a regular attendant and served as president in one of those early years [1962-63]. And a great many others.

You mentioned Horace Hamilton earlier. He was president one year [1960-61] and I had very pleasant associations with Horace. I was active in trying to promote better statistics of marriage and divorce and I worked with others in setting up a committee on marriage and divorce statistics of the American Sociological Association. One year I persuaded Horace Hamilton to serve as the chairman and then he served another year. He was an extraordinarily useful and active chairman. He appointed sociologists in the universities in all the states that were not in the marriage and divorce registration areas to work in their states for improving registration, which in some cases was very successful. Horace was a great guy. He had a heart attack later. I'm not sure how active he is now; I haven't seen him for several years.

LUNDE: I saw him last summer and he was still racing around, although he had retired--I guess for the second or third time--this time from the Carolina Population Center of the University of North Carolina. He was still there doing some work. He is still at North Carolina State University in Raleigh, though he told me he isn't doing as much as he used to.

CARTER: Andy, since you were in Chapel Hill, you'll be interested in this story. We had a meeting there at the University of North Carolina in 1951 and our understanding was--I was not an officer at that time--that everyone would be allowed to attend the annual dinner at the Carolina Inn. But at the last moment, there was a hitch and blacks were not allowed to attend the dinner. Whereupon the officers did a very wise thing, I believe; they simply canceled the whole dinner. The Inn, I suppose, lost some money on that.

That was one year that we didn't have any dinner. The meeting that was to have been at the dinner was held in an auditorium in one of the university buildings and the invited speaker was William Ogburn, who made a very fine talk ["Population and Social Change." Philip Hauser, then PAA president, invited Ogburn to give this address in place of his presidential address. See Philip Hauser interview above]. That was just prior to his retirement as professor of sociology at the University of Chicago. I studied with Ogburn when he was at Columbia University, before he went to the University of Chicago.

LUNDE: There is some talk today about eliminating the dinner meeting--or the banquet meeting--and having the president's address simply in an open forum. What do you think about eliminating the dinner? I think part of that has to do with the cost of it.

CARTER: I would be very much opposed. I think it's an important and friendly feature of the get-together. As to cost, they've always made arrangements that students or others who didn't wish to attend the dinner could come in and sit down and hear the speaking, so they didn't have to pay the big price of the dinner. I would be very much opposed to doing away with the dinner.

The Population Association in its early meetings was able to avoid having two or three sessions going on at the same time. But now, of course, it's so big that they've got to have all these competing sessions--which is too bad, because frequently you want to go to two sessions that come at the same time.

LUNDE: You also mentioned that in the early days--and I remember this too--there was a group that wanted to keep the Population Association very small. This has carried into the modern day. There are some, I believe, like Ansley Coale and others who still feel that it's too bad the Population Association should get too big--for various reasons--let's say, non-scientists might join and then it might become a political arena and an activist group. Do you have any feeling about this? The

Population Association has probably more than quadrupled in size since you were secretary.

CARTER: I do have some feeling about it. You recall that in the earliest days, Margaret Sanger, the mother of birth control in this country, thought of joining the original Population Association and was persuaded that this was to be a scientific organization and that it shouldn't become a propaganda organization and they requested that she not join [not run for vice-president; see Kiser interview above]. So that was the feeling in the early days.

Now, the question of standards for people that join organizations. I think in general there ought to be some standards. In the American Sociological Association, a person must either have a Ph.D. in sociology or the equivalent to be a full member. And I think that to avoid an organization becoming a propaganda organization there should be some standards as to who comes in.

Now, I don't know quite how this would work. If you limited the Association to people who qualified as demographers, it would obviously be a very small group. Courses in demography at universities, so far as I've observed, are small classes. And this means that, like courses in astronomy, you don't have a mass audience. On the other hand, there are a great many people who are interested in population problems, take a serious interest in them, and who could profit from membership in the Population Association and therefore should be allowed to join.

Perhaps it should be done this way. There would be voting members of the Association who would satisfy certain minimum standards and then others who are members but who would not be eligible to be officers of the Association or voting members.

LUNDE: We looked into this once and it didn't get very far. There seems to be a tendency now to open the doors of all these associations to whomever wishes to come in. This is probably a situation that would be very hard to reverse at the present time.

Personally, I've always believed in some standards for professional organizations. Otherwise--let's face it--they lose their status as professional organizations in the true sense of that term.

CARTER: Exactly. The status of a professional man, as an adviser to government or an academic making pronouncements on any subject in his professional interest, if it's to have any standing, must come out of a background of specialized knowledge. Now, a demographer obviously must have some special qualified knowledge to make any pronouncement on any technical subject in this area that's worth a damn. And I would certainly favor having some standards for membership, though I'm not prepared to sit down and write out what those standards should be.

LUNDE: You were, or have been, associated for some time with Paul Glick [PAA President 1966-67], with respect to publications and research in marriage and the family. Would you tell us a bit about that association and what you've been doing?

CARTER: It's been a very interesting association. In 1952 I took the post of Chief of the Marriage and Divorce Statistics Branch in the old National Office of Vital Statistics. Paul Glick at that time had the post of family statistician in the Population Division of the Census Bureau. So one of the first people that I got in touch with after I took on my new post was Paul Glick. We immediately cooked up a plan to have a special sample survey made which would get certain data which would not otherwise have been available--in regard to marriage and divorce and marital status. We got out a joint publication that, incidentally, has some material in it that is still benchmark material.

Since that time, we have given joint papers at the Population Association and American Sociological Association meetings, been on programs of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and a number of other groups. Paul is now Senior Demographer in the Population Division of the Bureau of the Census and is one of the top people in the Bureau. Many of

them who were associated with him back in the early 1950s, like Henry Shryock and Con Taeuber, have now left the Census Bureau.

But the most comprehensive job that Paul Glick and I ever did together was to get out a monograph on marriage and divorce that came out in 1970 and was one of a series of monographs that the American Public Health Association sponsored. This we called Marriage and Divorce: A Social and Economic Study. I think we probably shied away from the word demography in the title, thinking it would scare some people away, but it was essentially a demographic study. That book, by the way, has pretty well sold out and the Harvard University Press has asked us to write a chapter updating the more important findings of the publication and we're now in the process of doing just that. So, perhaps in 1975, the book will be reissued with a new chapter [revised edition, 1976].

DANIEL O. PRICE

PAA Secretary-Treasurer in 1956-59 (No. 9). Interview with Jean van der Tak at the Carolina Inn, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, April 6, 1988. See also joint interview conducted later the same day with Daniel Price and Anders Lunde, following the Lunde interview, below.

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS: Daniel Price was born in northern Florida. He received the B.S. in mathematics in 1939 from Florida Southern College and the M.A. in 1942 and Ph.D. in 1948, both in sociology and both from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. From 1947 to 1966, he was with the Department of Sociology and the Carolina Population Center at Chapel Hill, where he was also Director of the Institute of Research in Social Science. For 12 years, from 1966 to 1978, he was with the Department of Sociology and the Population Research Center at the University of Texas in Austin. From 1978 to 1988, he was Director of the Department of Sociology at the University of North Carolina on the Greensboro campus. From 1990, he has been Adjunct Professor at the University of North Florida. He has specialized in internal migration and the demography of American blacks. Among his publications, he is author of the 1960 census monograph, Changing Characteristics of the Negro Population (1969), Demographic Aspects of the Black Community (1970), Blacks During the 1960s with Projections for 1980 (1977), Rural-Urban Migration Research in the United States (1975), and editor of The 99th Hour: The Population Crisis in the United States (1967).

VDT: How did you become interested in demography?

PRICE: I guess Dr. Rupert Vance was responsible for that. I came to Chapel Hill to do graduate work in sociology without any clear notion of what I wanted to do.

VDT: How did you jump from being a mathematics major as an undergraduate into sociology?

PRICE: I considered being a minister, interested in the social gospel, and was going to get a master's degree in sociology before going on with the ministry. Once in sociology, I never got out. With a background in math, I was interested in the more quantitative aspects of sociology, which was demography. So I worked with Rupert Vance and . . . well, he and Margaret Hagood were responsible for it. I took statistics with her and, of course, she too was in demography. They are the two who really got me interested in it.

VDT: Later I was going to ask who influenced you most. Now you've mentioned two. How about first your reflections on Rupert Vance?

PRICE: I always thought the world of Rupert and was fairly close to him even during graduate school. He got me started going to the Population Association meetings. We used to travel together. As you know, he was on crutches. He had polio at age two or three and spent the rest of his life on crutches.

I remember as a graduate student, he suggested I go to the meeting at Philadelphia and that was my first one. Then I went to the meetings at Princeton with him on several different occasions.

VDT: There was a meeting in Philadelphia in 1948.

VDT: Maybe that wasn't my first one, but I particularly remember that one, because they had the dinner in the museum.

My first meeting was bound to have been in Princeton [1946 and 1947 meetings were in

Princeton], because I was still a graduate student and that's where I met Don Bogue, who was there with Warren Thompson. Thompson and Vance were friends. We all were leaving on late trains, so after the meetings adjourned, on Saturday or Sunday afternoon, the four of us sat around and visited.

Don and I have remained close friends ever since. Our careers were fairly similar, same age, same navy duty, whatnot. We were friends but he wasn't one of the people who influenced me.

Vance directed my dissertation. That was on internal migration. I was taking a course from him--this was just after the 1940 census came out--and I remember he commented in class one day that the 1940 census for the first time collected all this data on migration and nobody was analyzing it. So I thought, here's a good dissertation, so that's what I did, worked on the data from the question: Where did you live five years ago? It had a lot of flaws, a lot of problems. I wrote this in 1946, 1947. I was in the navy and got back in the fall of 1945 and started to work.

We mentioned Rupert being on crutches. I never will forget his quick wit. Out here near the Carolina Inn, he was going home for lunch one day and the turn signal on his car didn't cancel out and a car coming thought he was going to turn left and they hit head on in the street. Rupert got out on his crutches and the fellow in the other car said, "Oh, are you hurt?" Vance said, "No, I just carry these crutches in case of an accident."

Then I stayed on the faculty here and he was a colleague and a close friend up until the time of his death. That was about 12 or 14 years ago.

VDT: He must have been an awesome figure because a number of demographers mention him as a leading influence.

PRICE: Yes. I remember just after finishing my degree going through the programs at two different PAA meetings and in both cases just about 10 percent of the people on the programs studied or worked with Vance at some point. And yet, except for Margaret Hagood, he was the only demographer here at Chapel Hill.

VDT: One of my questions was to be what explains the leading role of North Carolina in demography. Vance must have had a part in that.

PRICE: That's right. Another factor of minor importance was that Margaret Hagood did the book, Statistics for Sociologists, of which the first edition was published about 1941. In that first edition, she had a back section on population statistics. It went into standardized rates and life table construction--basic statistics that one needs in demography. That had an influence, because at that point there wasn't any other ready source of these things.

VDT: So people who might be attracted to demography flocked here where these two leading figures were?

PRICE: Right.

VDT: You've explained how you became interested in demography and in internal migration. How about the U.S. black population? So many of your publications have been on that.

PRICE: That's a fairly natural thing for anyone interested in migration, because back then was the beginning of the heavy black migration out of the South. But even then, in the early 1950s, I got one student who did a master's thesis using census data on black return migration to the South, which, so far as I know, was one of the first studies of that. That was Elizabeth Fink, whom I visited this morning. She got her master's degree here in the early 1950s. Then worked for the state department of

public welfare and came back as assistant director for the Institute of Research in Social Science while I was director there. She followed Catharine Jocher as assistant director.

VDT: So you continued to do research and teach courses in those two areas?

PRICE: Yes. In more recent years, I've gotten further away from those particular topics and have been trying to analyze data, cohort analysis, to do something with the age, cohort, period problem. I'm not happy with the highly mathematical solutions which Feinberg and others have developed because I think they've missed the point of what is the substantive meaning of age, period, cohort. Assuming that these things really are there and have reality rather than being just abstract concepts, we need to look at the concepts a little more clearly.

VDT: That leads to another question I was going to ask. In several of these interviews, people have brought up the fact that past figures of demography had over-arching theories--Notestein is often cited as a prime example--they looked at the broad picture. A number of PAA oldtimers have regretted the getting away from that and the fixation on very fine methodological points. Is that what you're saying here?

PRICE: I think it is. Not only in demography but even more so in the general field of sociology, I think, there's this getting away from broad topics and into more minute and really esoteric statistical procedures, which are good and it's important to analyze the data, but I think people frequently lose perspective. I know they lose an awful lot of audience.

VDT: Good point. In recent years, I pick up Demography very squeamishly. I barely open it to see if someone I know has an article and even then, I gulp when I see the formulas. Do you feel that way too?

PRICE: Oh yes.

VDT: You're a good friend of Don Bogue. He has a broad grasp of demography. There was the famous controversy when he wanted demography to be seen as including family planning and there were the purists who disagreed with that and Demography changed course rather radically when Bogue stepped down as editor in 1968.

PRICE: That discussion traces back to the very beginnings of the Association. The Board of Directors was set up to be self-perpetuating in order to maintain it in the control of, quote, the "scientific people," rather than the planned parenthood people, whom they were afraid would take control if they didn't maintain it as a fairly closed operation. I was one of the young Turks who worked at the business meetings to get it opened up so at least the members could elect the officers. Previous to that, the Board of Directors, who nominated their own replacements on the Board, did all the election of officers, and the membership had no say on this.

VDT: That controversy was resolved in the early 1950s when Irene Taeuber was president [1953-54]. That change in the constitution finally came about. It was a much more democratic approach.

PRICE: Yes. But I have some mixed feelings about the inclusion of family planning in the field of demography. I'm not sure it really belongs there, even though I was one of the ones that helped open it [PAA] up.

VDT: Would you call Don Bogue a family planner or a demographer?

PRICE: He's both. I have mixed feelings about family planning. I don't feel strongly that it's not a part of demography. But I think that too many people who came in purely from family planning see family planning as all of demography. That's the only thing they know and to them that is demography. I think it's important to have a broader view.

VDT: Do you feel that internal migration, for example, is shortchanged if one becomes fixated on fertility, as a lot of demography research has been in the past couple of decades?

PRICE: I think there has been some neglect of fields outside fertility and I think this is primarily the consequence of government funding. There's been much more funding available in fertility, family planning, than there has been in what I call the more basic aspects of demography.

VDT: Well, fertility is one of the basic aspects. We're all taught that they are fertility, mortality, and migration, though migration has tended to be shortchanged. Do you think in the U.S. there will be more awareness now of migration--obviously, international migration but internal too?

PRICE: I think so. The international migration implications are bound to bring a lot of renewed financing and study in this area. I've never really gotten into international migration because I see it as almost an entirely different phenomenon from internal migration. The characteristics of the streams and the people are determined by political reasons rather than by people involved in the streams themselves.

VDT: What about your association with Margaret Hagood?

PRICE: She was more of an influence than Rupert Vance when I was here before going off to the war. Having had a math background, I worked more closely with her in statistics. She got me to do my master's thesis on factor analysis. It became the first published paper in sociology using factor analysis.

But during the war, she felt she should be doing more for the war effort than being here at the university, so she joined what was then the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in the Department of Agriculture in Washington and never returned to academic life. She stayed in Washington. My contacts with her after the war were considerably less than they were before the war.

We kept up, of course. She asked me work with her on the revision of her volume on statistics [Margaret Jarman Hagood and Daniel O. Price, Statistics for Sociologists, second edition, 1952]. I used to go to Washington weekends. One of the decisions there, by the publishers as much as anything, was to omit the section on population statistics.

VDT: Why was that?

PRICE: At that point, Marny was working with Henry Shryock and Jay Siegel on a volume on population statistics, so they thought they would do that in a separate volume. Of course, that was many years in production and eventually it did come off as a rather different volume from what had been planned. [The Methods and Materials of Demography, 1971, by Henry Shryock and Jacob Siegel, based in part on the earlier work by Hagood, Shryock and Siegel, but interrupted when Hagood died in 1963. See Shryock interview above.]

She was teaching a graduate course at the Department of Agriculture while she was there. This was before the 1950 census data were out, because she mentioned that in her class, as an example, she

made up some illustrative data and one of her students took it for fact and reported it for the newspapers as if it were early 1950 census data. She was embarrassed and the Census Bureau was upset. She made it very clear from then on what was hypothetical and what was real.

VDT: What led you to shift from the University of North Carolina to Texas?

PRICE: Somebody used to ask me, "Are you open to other offers?" and my response always was, "I read my mail." They made a very attractive offer.

To back up a bit. The Carolina Population Center was developed in the late 1950s, early 1960s, and when I had the offer from the University of Texas, I was telling the university here what it would take to make me stay. The sociology department and the population center at that time didn't work together. I did everything I could to get people to work closely with and be a part of the population center, because I felt there was a lot to offer in the combination. But at that point, many people in the department were "purists" and couldn't see getting into the applied fields as much. The population center offered the department whatever money they needed for me to stay here, but the department would not utilize it. So I went to Texas.

VDT: That's interesting. In John and Pat Caldwell's book on the Ford Foundation infusion to the population field [Limiting Population Growth and the Ford Foundation Contribution, 1986], they point to the Carolina Population Center or University of North Carolina as one of Ford's pride and joys. The first really multi-disciplinary population program was established on this campus. But you say now . . .

PRICE: It was multi-disciplinary, but in general, if they needed a sociologist they would hire one; the department would not really cooperate in that. In the other disciplines, there was less resistance. The department here changed and in more recent years, soon after I left [in 1966], the two groups began working very closely together.

VDT: Were you in the department of sociology at Texas?

PRICE: Yes, and I also worked with the Population Research Center.

VDT: Texas has also been a leading center for training demographers in the U.S. How do you explain that?

PRICE: Harley Browning was the first director of the Population Research Center; that was before I got there. He went to direct the Center as a fairly new Ph.D.; he'd gotten his degree, I believe, at Berkeley with Kingsley Davis. The sociology department there gave a lot of support to the Center. Len Bloom, of the Bloom and Selznick Introductory Sociology volume, was head of the department and I think had much to do with pushing the development of the Center. Then Dudley Poston came in and brought in a group of young people who were active in research--simply made a go of it.

VDT: You would think of Texas as being oriented toward Latin America, but that hasn't necessarily been true.

PRICE: Not entirely. They do an awful lot in that area. Harley Browning and Frank Bean are both doing a good deal on Mexican American fertility.

VDT: And migration.

PRICE: Yes, making estimates. Omer Galle, making estimates of illegal migration.

VDT: But then there's Dudley Poston and his work on China.

PRICE: That's a fairly recent development of Dudley's. This summer he is leaving Texas and going to Cornell. They are apparently moving into Chinese demography, which is an area Dudley has gotten excited about. He learned Chinese and spent time over there collecting data on only children, comparing them with multiple children, to see if--as rumor has it--they're spoiled brats. His preliminary analysis does not show any evidence of it.

VDT: You wrote the 1960 census monograph on Changing Characteristics of the Negro Population, which came out in 1969.

PRICE: It actually was published in 1970. I told them I would not be the author of a 1960 census monograph published in 1970. The Census Bureau was to edit the manuscript, but they got behind in the planning for the next census and I could not get them to work on it. Finally, I planted the rumor that they were suppressing it because it dealt with blacks. But that still didn't bring it out.

VDT: So you were not to blame; you finished on schedule.

PRICE: That's right. I finished it, I think, in 1964.

VDT: And it took all those years to get it published! That's most unfair. Con Taeuber inspired the 1950 and 1960 census monographs. Now we have the 1980 monographs; they didn't try for 1970 monographs. What about those monographs? You've just put your finger on probably one of the problems--they take forever to get out.

PRICE: Right. And so many of them fall by the wayside. The one I most regretted was the one on the family in the 1960 series, which Alice Rivlin and Jack Beresford were doing. It had a sizable amount of money and they got a great many extra tabulations from the census data. In my monograph on the Negro population, I almost completely ignored the family; that was to be dealt with in their monograph. They just never got it finished. I guess that was because Alice left Brookings and went to the Census Budget Office [OMB?] and Jack Beresford left the Census Bureau and set up his own business.

VDT: I didn't know Alice Rivlin was a demographer; I think of her as an economist.

PRICE: Her degree was in economics, but most of her basic work was in demography. I first met her when she was a graduate student at Harvard. Harvard at that point had no demography and she was getting into demography. I remember visiting with her at one of the PAA meetings at Princeton and she'd had no guidance from demographers and was unaware of some of the work demographers were doing in the field she was working in--simply because there was nobody at Harvard who really was familiar with the areas. But she'd gotten to the PAA meetings and at that point the whole area opened up to her.

VDT: Who have been some of your leading students you're proudest of?

PRICE: Tad Blalock, I guess, was one of the leading. His book on statistics was a leader for a long time.

VDT: Yes, that was my manual when I started at Georgetown [Hubert M. Blalock, Social Statistics, 1960].

PRICE: He came to Chapel Hill as a graduate student, having a master's degree in math from Brown University, and was determined to work on race relations. I practically beat him on the head to go take statistics, at least for job security, "Well, take some over at the department of statistics." And, of course, he got on with it. But he still thought of race relations as one of his areas of interest, even though his reputation has been in statistics.

Another was Harriet Presser, who is the current president-elect of the Population Association. She did her master's thesis with me, and in fact one of the chapters in the 1960 census monograph on the Negro population was written largely by her; her master's thesis was the basis for it.

Ken Land was at Texas; he's now head of the sociology department at Duke. He is, to my way of thinking, one of the top mathematical sociologists.

Those are the top ones I can think of.

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

PRICE: That's a hard one. I never stop to think of it that way; I've enjoyed all of the work so much. Somebody asked me when I was going to retire and I said, "As long as I enjoy it and they pay me, I'll keep doing it." So that's what I've been doing. [Dr. Price retired as head of the department of sociology at the University of North Carolina, Greensboro, in early 1988, but at the time of this interview was continuing part-time, pending the appointment of his successor.]

To me, one of the most rewarding things in recent years is having Harriet Presser ask me to introduce her when she gives her presidential address at PAA next year [1989].

VDT: What do you see as some of the leading issues in U.S. demography over the years you've been involved? You have mentioned internal migration, but beyond that, the issues that have concerned demographers within the U.S. You haven't been much concerned with demographic issues outside the U.S. We're talking about U.S. population issues.

PRICE: Of course, the issues vary, depending on conditions and the projections, almost none of which have worked out. The fertility--whether we're going to have a declining population; whether we're going to have overpopulation; back to, maybe, a declining population. There's been a shift.

To me, one of the issues that's bound to catch fire--it's beginning to some extent now--is the migration from abroad. Clearly with a fourth to a third of U.S. population growth coming from immigration, the whole character of the American population is going to change. And it won't take many years for it to change. I think there hasn't been sufficient attention given to what the implications are.

VDT: What are the implications?

PRICE: Well, as I told somebody back in the 1960s, "I'm anxious to get these Civil Rights laws in place and working because they'll be needed for my descendants; they're likely to be a minority group." I think racial discrimination is still there under the surface and it is going to have implications for the integration of the population. The question of whether you maintain cultural differences and cultural pride or work toward a melting pot. I think at this point, we're pretty much dedicated to maintaining cultural differences. And an implication of that is that will of necessity maintain a certain amount of racial prejudice. Yet, I would not decry the importance of cultural differences and recognition of cultural pride.

VDT: You edited a popular book, The 99th Hour: The Population Crisis in the United States. That came out in 1967 at the time when there appeared to be a population crisis with respect to the baby boom, although by that time fertility was already falling. Could you comment on that?

PRICE: This was just as the Carolina Population Center was getting established at UNC. As one of the first activities, someone went out and got a grant for a series of lectures on the population problem in the U.S. I was to plan the series and edit the book that resulted from it. Rather than my planning and stimulation, that was largely a consequence of the early development of the Center. Although there are some good papers in it, it didn't turn out quite the way we anticipated. One article, by Rev. Joseph Fletcher, is really on ethical relativism--"situation ethics" was his term. We had asked him to discuss the problems of making contraceptives available to teenagers, because of people's fear that if they knew about these things it would affect their sexual behavior. We felt this was one of the problems of sex education and making contraceptives more generally available. Well, he didn't talk about that topic at all; he talked about situational ethics.

VDT: It's still a topic of concern.

PRICE: It certainly is.

VDT: Was the idea of the book your awareness of the baby boom?

PRICE: Oh, yes. I guess you know where the title "The 99th Hour" comes from? I got that from one of my sons having a problem in a math course, about if you have two germs in a bucket and they double every hour and it takes 100 hours to fill the bucket, when is the bucket half full? Of course, it's at the end of 99 hours. So, people could say, "There's still plenty of space; there's no crowding," and yet, it could be the 99th hour.

VDT: And you were concerned about it with respect to the U.S., let alone the rest of the world?

PRICE: Yes.

PRICE: And then things changed radically; we have the birth dearth.

PRICE: I'm a back-to-nature conservationist. I still think overpopulation is a problem. I think if we can handle the economics of it, we should probably not have a larger population than we have now in the U.S. That isn't an idea that sells well, except among many conservationists.

VDT: Just driving from the Durham airport over to Chapel Hill [through the woods], you say, "Well, let's try to keep it this way."

PRICE: That's right, but if you compare the Research Triangle area now to what it was 20 years ago, you'd say there are too many people. And yet the economics are important. Can we operate a solid economic system without an increase in population? I don't know.

VDT: There are those who claim that with an aging population, as we're going to have, especially when the baby boom generation gets up there to 65 and over, there is not only the problem of how we're going to support them, who's going to pay the social security, but also we'll have an aging labor force.

PRICE: I think this is a real problem. I've gotten interested in something related to that recently: the significantly greater emphasis in most institutions--universities, businesses, industries--on managers, rather than people who come up through the ranks and know the business from the ground up. We've tended to bring in managers who are trained just in management and don't really know the substantive nature of what it is they're managing. This may be part of why we're falling behind Japan, because my perception is that in Japan the people who run the plants came up through them, know what goes on. I think that in the U.S. it's increasingly true that they do not know this.

VDT: Are you teaching courses in something of that nature now?

PRICE: No, it's just a recent interest. I've been threatening to do a paper on faculty wimps and curmudgeons. I'm a curmudgeon. This is faculty reaction to this Administration by management, rather than by faculty administration. If you speak up and try to express ideas, you get known as a curmudgeon and are no longer listened to. If you don't speak up, you're a wimp. I don't know how you balance this.

VDT: That seems to be a trend in American business. They have to do something with all those business school graduates.

PRICE: That's right.

VDT: Turning now to your connections with the Population Association, in which you played the crucial role of secretary-treasurer, from 1956 to 1959. You think the first meeting you attended was at Princeton. Did you attend the last meeting before they knocked off for the war, in Atlantic City in 1942?

PRICE: No, I was in the navy at that point.

VDT: But when you came back to the University of North Carolina, you went with Rupert Vance to the meetings at Princeton. I'm sure you would reiterate what so many people have said about those wonderful, intimate, early meetings at Princeton. Everybody knew everybody else.

PRICE: Right, and there were no parallel sessions. Everybody went to all the sessions and there were breaks and time to sit around and drink beer and talk.

VDT: Do you think the changes over the years have been for the better or for the worse?

PRICE: I think it's mixed. Obviously, the field has gotten larger. There are more people involved and having parallel sessions is an inevitable development. And it makes the meetings much richer and of broader interest. But at the same time, you lose the intimacy of the early meetings. The Southern Regional Demographic Group, now the Southern Demographic Association, in some ways captures the feeling of those early PAA meetings at Princeton, because it is a smaller group. Again, its success is destroying what it is known for: it's gotten known for that closeness and now there are participants from all over the United States.

VDT: It certainly has a reputation for that. Lee Bouvier is always telling me, "You ought to go to those marvelous meetings." Have you been involved in the recently formed Triangle Population Group?

PRICE: I've not been involved in it because I'm a little out of the center, being in Greensboro, but I have come to the meetings. It's an interesting group.

VDT: I understand that it's more social; that's what Andy lunde, its first president, said yesterday. One certainly does have tradeoffs between intimacy and the size of groups.

When you were PAA secretary-treasurer, you handled the job from North Carolina. Later it seemed to be accepted that it should be in Washington; the Census Bureau offered Paul Glick time and help when he took over as secretary-treasurer [1962-65].

PRICE: As I recall, the Census Bureau began to feel they couldn't legitimately do this kind of thing and Paul began to feel some pressure, inability to use his office there to help carry the office of secretary-treasurer.

There was, of course, no central office of the Association then. When I got the records, these were the accumulated records and were the only archives and files of the Association. I remember getting a filing drawer of material. It must have come from Hugh Carter [secretary-treasurer before Price]. He was also in Washington. I think most of the Washington agencies were feeling some pressure to not support professional associations. I decided that it was foolish to keep mailing around what was archival material from one secretary to another. Seems to me it must have been Ansley Coale at Princeton who agreed that they would take the material and keep it. So when my term was up, I shipped the records--other than the current materials--up there.

VDT: So you, in a sense, were the start of what has now become the archives at the Georgetown University library. But not entirely, because there's still a lot of material in the PAA business office, some of which needs to be in the archives too. How did you get asked to be secretary-treasurer?

PRICE: I don't remember. I expect it was Rupert Vance's influence, or maybe Margaret Hagood. She was still in Washington at the time.

PRICE: Do you remember some particular PAA issues during those years?

PRICE: No, I really don't. I remember trying to figure out what the job of secretary-treasurer was, because there wasn't any central office. Joe Spengler [President 1956-57] was president when I started out. Fortunately, he was nearby [at Duke University, Durham NC]. He said he was trying to figure out what the job of president was. So he and I spent a fair amount of time together trying to get the act together.

VDT: Tell me about Joe Spengler. Unfortunately, it's not going to be possible for me to interview him. He took part in a joint interview for this project that Harry Rosenberg conducted in 1976 with him, Horace Hamilton, and Clyde Kiser, but it wasn't very useful.

PRICE: I knew him casually but always enjoyed him. He had a keen wit. I remember one of his statements: "Whenever I find myself voting with the majority, I decide it's time to reexamine my position." That was pretty much his attitude. I remember that when the issue of establishing a journal first came up in the Association, he took a position against it. Maybe it was ornerliness, curmudgeonliness, I don't know. I think he really felt it was better for demographic materials to be out in the other substantive journals, because demographers are an interdisciplinary group--economists, sociologists, statisticians, and public health--and he felt that the person, say, in public health does better publishing in a journal of public health, because his colleagues are more likely to read the article

and it's more meaningful for him. The economists should publish in the journals of economics, because if it's in some other journal, his colleagues may never see what he's publishing.

VDT: He felt one's primary loyalty should be to economics or whatever?

PRICE: Yes, I think he did, rather than to demography as a substantive field.

VDT: What do you feel about that?

PRICE: At the time I tended to agree with Joe, but since then I've felt that it makes sense to have a journal of demography. By now we're well established. What reminded me of Joe's attitude was that at that meeting [when the question of a journal first came up], Joe's comment was, "Well, I helped preserve the society another year." Because he felt getting into publication of a journal would be more than the Association could carry, organizationally and financially.

VDT: He might have been rather prescient in that, because there was such a to-do over Demography once it got started under Don Bogue in the 1960s. You already had Population Index.

PRICE: Yes, and this was Joe's point, that with Population Index people could find and locate the literature they needed, without the necessity of having a new journal.

VDT: What do you think of Demography as it evolved? We touched on Don Bogue's era and then it became a rather scholarly journal, which it has more or less remained. Have you seen the latest issue? At least it's got a new cover.

PRICE: I've only seen the cover so far. I think it's a good solid journal. My comment is the same as with the sociology journals: there's more and more of it I'm not able to read and understand. I don't know what the long-run effect of this will be--being technical and representing more technical advances, but as a consequence appealing to a smaller audience. This is happening in professional journals across the board.

VDT: Is that a consequence of Ph.D. students being practically required to get at least a part of their theses published somewhere?

PRICE: It's broader than that. I think there's a sizable group of people in practically every one of the substantive areas who are writing for a smaller and smaller audience. Take the Journal of the American Statistical Association; I've been subscribing to that 40 some years. It was very readable, at least from my point of view, and then it became increasingly technical and so they established the American Statistician. That had more readable articles and now it's becoming increasingly technical. I just wonder where this evolution will lead. A lot of it, I guess, is the fact that so many places in the academic world have no provision for helping faculty keep up with changes in their field; in other words, opportunities to take a sabbatical and study new developments. And I think that faculty, perhaps more than people in industry, tend to get out of date.

VDT: In demography we now have "demographics." In the olden days, PAA fought off the family planners. What about the applied demographers now--not just those in state and local government, but beyond that, in business?

PRICE: I think it's a good development. I think it will result in more attention being paid, more use

made, of demography and demographic materials. I get a little bothered at the government pushing off to commercial firms much of the publication and making available of demographic materials. The government should make this available to the general public as it used to.

VDT: You mean the data down to the block level?

PRICE: Right.

VDT: Which the data companies get hold of and make their living with proprietary data for which you pay through the nose.

PRICE: That's right, this trend bothers me. Yet I'm glad that businesses are making more use of demographic data.

VDT: We've said Demography has become very technical. What do you think of Population and Development Review? It has retained broader articles.

PRICE: Yes, but I guess it doesn't get the readership; probably it has a much smaller subscription than Demography.

VDT: Yes, it has. Then there's American Demographics; that's become slick and thick with advertisements.

PRICE: Right, and it's expensive.

VDT: Oh, very. I always resent my annual subscription, which is usually paid for by businesses you work for, but I always had my own, because someone would grab it first.

PRICE: Right. The universities are having trouble, serial costs have gone up so much. Now if you want the library to subscribe to a new journal, you have to give them one they can drop. It puts pressure on trying to get new journals. I don't believe our library at Greensboro, for instance, gets American Demographics. I'm sure they do here [at Chapel Hill]. When I want to see it, I go to members of the department that do subscribe.

VDT: What is the difference between Greensboro and Chapel Hill in the field of demography at North Carolina?

PRICE: There's a long story about that. In the 16 universities that are part of the University of North Carolina system, only three branches are Ph.D.-granting institutions. These are Chapel Hill, North Carolina State in Raleigh, and UNC, Greensboro. But of those, only Chapel Hill and NC State are really major research universities. At Greensboro, we grant Ph.D.s only in about five fields and are essentially what they call a Class Two university. That's apparently one of the government classifications. It's simply that we don't have the amount of research money and whatnot that Chapel Hill and NC State get.

VDT: You have a department of sociology, of which you've been head, and there's one also at Chapel Hill.

PRICE: Yes. Originally the three branches were combined. Then a decision was made that each one

should be a complete university.

VDT: But the Carolina Population Center was here at Chapel Hill?

PRICE: That's right. Historically, there's been more support here. Greensboro originally was the women's college and for many years everybody referred to it as the "WC." I think that a lot of the view of it as an institution still carries over from the days when it was a women's college. Yet many of its strengths come from that. When I was here at Chapel Hill, we felt--at least in sociology--that a student who was an undergraduate major in sociology from Greensboro had a much better background than they would if they'd gotten that undergraduate major from here. The department here was interested in graduate work; the undergraduates are stepchildren. Whereas in Greensboro, undergraduate education was their big thing. They did a much better job of it.

VDT: You mention, in a sense, prejudice--against women--which brings me to another question. You recall that Con Taeuber wrote you back in 1982 about a PAA history vignette he was trying to write for PAA Affairs about some of the incidents at early PAA meetings because of the prejudice against blacks, when blacks could not stay in the same hotels as whites. We think of it as ancient history now. He asked what you remembered of two incidents in particular. One was when the Association met at Chapel Hill in 1951. Rupert Vance was chair of the local arrangements committee and he was elected president at that meeting. Three years later, in 1954, PAA met at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville. Con asked if you recalled problems with housing of blacks who came to the meetings. Of course, the problem has long passed and actually, I guess PAA has not had the problem often, because we still don't have too many black members. Is that your impression?

PRICE: Yes, it is. I forget what my response to Con was, but I remember it was at the Chapel Hill meeting--I was involved in the local arrangements--that the Association passed the policy that we would not meet in places where all members didn't have access to all facilities. We put up the black members who came, as I recall, at the black college in Durham--the North Carolian College, now the North Carolina Central University. I remember Preston Valien was one of the blacks that did come and my wife and I had him for dinner one evening and our neighbors didn't speak to us for about a week.

VDT: You also mentioned that you had a black woman who helped you part-time and she came in and almost dropped the tray of potato chips when she saw your guest. [In his response to Conrad Taeuber's 1982 query, Dr. Price recalled the Preston Valien incident as occurring during some other, non-PAA meeting. He also wrote: "I believe it was at the PAA meeting that we served lunch in the Alumni Building (housing Sociology and the Institute for Research in Social Science) for the small number of black attendees and an equal number of invited whites." Clyde Kiser recalled, in his 1973 interview, above, that at the 1951 meeting, Howard Odum, then director of the sociology department at UNC, Chapel Hill, not wanting "to defy convention too much," advised that because there was one "well-known man there"--a black member of PAA--the dinner, which had been arranged by Dr. Price, should be canceled--"and they canceled the dinner."]

In 1954 in Charlottesville, Con Taeuber said there was still a problem, with George Roberts, the well-known West Indian demographer, who came.

PRICE: I was unaware of the problems in Charlottesville, because I wasn't involved in local arrangements. I took a carload of graduate students up to that meeting. That was after the Board of Directors had passed that resolution at the 1951 meeting. It was my assumption that Lambert Molyneaux [chair of the local arrangements committee] was sure there would be no problem. [See the

Hugh Carter 1974 interview, above, for a description of the 1954 Charlottesville incident.]

VDT: Was the 1951 meeting the only time it was here in Chapel Hill?

PRICE: Only time. [The 1940 meeting, when Leon Truesdell was president, was also in Chapel Hill.] They used the Carolina Inn here for housing and for the most part had the meetings in the alumni building on campus.

VDT: They were still small enough to be accommodated other than in the very large city hotels that we now have.

PRICE: It was stressful. We managed the accommodation, but we were taxing the facilities.

VDT: Well, it was better than these cavernous ballrooms with no outside windows, usually over-airconditioned. I would say meeting on a campus ought to be much pleasanter. Have you attended most of the meetings through the years?

PRICE: Most of them, yes.

VDT: Can you remember any outstanding meetings?

PRICE: No, they sort of run together. The ones I remember most distinctly were the early ones at Princeton, because of being with people. There seemed to be more opportunity for visiting, spending time talking.

VDT: You have a good sense of history. I recall back when we put out a call for early photographs that it was you who sent the photograph taken of all the people at the 1954 meeting. That's invaluable.

PRICE: I'm a packrat; I save all these things.

VDT: I hope you'll remember that when you're clearing out files--now that you're going to have a little more time, except that you're going to get married! I hope you'll keep an eye out for material that will be useful to PAA.

A final question I had was what do you see as the outlook for demography in the U.S.? You've answered that in a sense--the importance of international immigration.

PRICE: Yes, to me it's that and the increasing use of demographic data in business that are the two major things of importance.

VDT: Do you think that will imply a change in the training of demographers--more applied demographers?

PRICE: I think it would. I think perhaps most places where they do demographic training are much more likely to be interested in applications than other university fields. In sociology, for example, applied sociology is a fairly new area and for so many years we made an effort to be pure. We've tried to point out that after all, as Dr. Odum used to say, there's nothing more practical than sound theory. As an example, I used to say that if you had two graduate students, one very good, one sort of second rate, and there was a job in a university and another one open, say, in a government agency where you apply data, you'd recommend the better student for the university and the second-rate student for the

applied end, simply because this was the status level of the two things. I think this is a mistake, because clearly the applied end needs the best possible people. I think the academic world has failed to recognize this. There's too much effort to remain pure.

VDT: You mean training all their best people for hopefully going on at university and earning grants, doing theoretical research?

PRICE: Exactly. This is the case, and many of the less capable people have been pushed off into applied fields. If anything, it ought to be the reverse.

VDT: Because that's the way the public comes in touch with these disciplines?

PRICE: Exactly. A while back, a friend of mine, Ivan Belknap, was reading all this data information on hospital beds: you're supposed to have so many hospital beds per 1,000 population. He wondered where that standard came from. He went back into the history of it and it was some graduate student who'd stuck that into a report, facing a deadline, having pulled it out of thin air, and it got used as a standard for years! I think this tends to happen. Obviously, millions of dollars are wasted--or not enough are spent--simply because there wasn't a good sound job done in an applied field.

VDT: That relates to basic data. Many demographers working on developing countries have learned to manipulate deficient data. Philip Hauser, in the Milbank Memorial Fund volume of papers given when Clyde Kiser retired [*Forty Years of Research in Human Fertility*, 1971], remarked that after someone goes through all the fancy things one can do with deficient data, when it comes down to it, it's the basis data that we want to improve. Now, you have worked with U.S. census data on blacks and there's the continuing worry there about the missing data on, usually, black males.

PRICE: I published the first article on underenumeration in the census, about 1945 ["A Check on Underenumeration in the 1940 Census," *American Sociological Review*, 1947]. It was a comparison of draft registration figures with census data, and there were more black males registered for the draft, in World War II, than the census had counted in that age group just six months earlier. I looked at these by state.

VDT: How did they manage to capture them for the draft registration?

PRICE: There were pressures and penalties for not registering, and there were considerably more registered for the draft than the census had found just six months earlier. The largest underenumeration was in Northern urban areas rather than in the rural South.

VDT: Which continues to be a problem. Some cities have lost a lot of funds because of underenumerated blacks.

PRICE: That's right. I'm ambivalent. I don't know what I think about the current efforts to require the Census Bureau to produce adjusted figures. I'm just not sure we know enough to adjust them properly.

VDT: I recently heard Barbara Bailer, who resigned from the Census Bureau over this. She claims enough is known to make adjustments. But when you hear stories of enumerators who went out hunting people who did not return the questionnaires, it seems a little hairy.

PRICE: Yes. I think you can make adjustments at the state level, but trying to make adjustments with small areas, you're totally playing with thin air. As I say, I'm ambivalent. If you're dealing with it statistically, you want to know that data was correct; if it wasn't corrected correctly, that isn't the best data. I remember discussions with Margaret Hagood. She was using factor analysis for a variety of things and a lot of people were objecting to these high-powered statistical techniques. Her point was, if your data aren't very good, you have to use everything you can to squeeze what you can out of it. Therefore, you need some high-powered statistical techniques, so long as you don't go clear out in left field.

VDT: I heard a sad story about Margaret Hagood from Henry Shryock when I interviewed him, that she was sort of a secondary victim of the McCarthy era through her friend Hope Eldridge, who was hounded by the investigators.

PRICE: Hope was. I didn't realize that Marny was hounded, if she was. She was sympathetic. I remember a story she told. She was working at the Department of Agriculture and there was never much in the way of royalty checks on statistics texts, but she'd gotten one, and she'd gone out at lunchtime and bought some clothes or something and came back and said, "Well, it didn't take long to take care of that royalty check." And the people around thought she'd said loyalty check and for a couple of days there was a rumor that she was being investigated.

VDT: They must have been hyper to have heard that.

PRICE: Yes, everyone was very hyper. Someone we haven't mentioned is Horace Hamilton [PAA President 1960-61]. I used to enjoy him. As a graduate student, I took some courses from him over in Raleigh [North Carolina State University]. He and Rupert Vance and Clyde Kiser were all graduate students together at Chapel Hill. At PAA meetings, we all sat around and listened to them reminisce about Chapel Hill. Horace got up early and went around and waked up Rupert and Clyde. I got to know him real well. We were both early birds and at PAA meetings, we bumped into each other going out and trying to find some place for breakfast.

He was a very applied, practical sort of person. If he couldn't demonstrate it with a pencil and paper or some marbles or something, he didn't go far with it. He was a very good teacher; talked right down to earth. I had one course with him, I guess it was in population statistics. Actually, Horace taught whatever it was he was working on at the time.

VDT: Tell me more about Don Bogue, whom you say became a good friend after you met him at an early PAA meeting which he came to with Warren Thompson, who was at Scripps.

PRICE: Yes, and Don was there for a while. Don and I have always been just really good friends socially; we've never collaborated on anything professionally. We both finished a master's degree just before the war; were both in the navy; both had demobilization awards from the Social Science Research Council; we finished our degrees the same year.

VDT: What were those awards?

PRICE: The Social Science Research Council during World War II set up graduate fellowships for people who were in the service to make certain they came back into graduate work and finished their degrees.

VDT: Did you have to apply for them or they found you?

PRICE: Rupert Vance knew about them; got my name in the lot.

VDT: So you had that in addition to GI benefits? You must have been relatively better off than some.

PRICE: I had more disposable income then than ever again. The demobilization award was on the order of \$2000; that was in addition to tuition.

VDT: And that paid for everything, housing and all your incidentals? You could be a full-time student, didn't have to teach?

PRICE: That's right. That was the purpose of it, to help students finish up. Don went to the University of Michigan; I came back to North Carolina.

VDT: About Don, he seems to have a chip on his shoulder, or he perceives that some of the profession have been against him because of his optimistic population projections--that family planning programs were going to bring down fertility so rapidly.

PRICE: Yes. I think he's been over-optimistic about a lot of this. And yet, I admire his willingness to stick his neck out. But I think a part of it has to do with his greater concern for application rather than just pure demography. And I think there's a certain amount of down-the-noseish look at applied fields in the academic world.

VDT: That happened to Margaret Sanger, the founder of PAA, when other founders wanted to keep out the birth controllers, and it's continued ever since.

PRICE: Yes.

VDT: I was involved with Don on the Population Bulletin he and Amy Tsui did for the Population Reference Bureau on "Declining World Fertility" [October 1977]. It was very obvious that fertility was beginning to decline in developing countries. But we got into a press brouhaha. Unfortunately, I wrote a news release that was translated by many newspapers as "The population problem is over." And wow, we got on our backs the purists who said "You are misleading people." And rightly so; the problem is not over. So this put Don on the spot again, I'm afraid.

PRICE: Yes, he's always willing to stick his neck out. Before I left Chapel Hill in the 1960s, we tried to recruit Don to come to Chapel Hill. At the time, I guess he was working on his study of homeless men in south Chicago; he has a volume on that. One of the reasons he gave for not accepting our offer here was we just didn't have enough slums.

VDT: So you never got him down to the South. Are you a Southerner?

PRICE: Yes, I was born in North Florida. That's part of the South; South Florida is not part of the South.

VDT: Who makes that distinction?

PRICE: Southerners. Then I went to college in Florida and came to Chapel Hill and spent most of my life in the South.

VDT: And the South has risen again, in the course of your lifetime, so you never needed to worry that you were in a backstream--certainly not demographically. Any more tidbits you can remember about PAA?

PRICE: No, as I say, most of my recent efforts have been with the Southern Demographic Association, more so than with the PAA. I was president of that, three years ago, and I was one of the founding fathers, in the late 1960s. Some of the people at Oak Ridge National Laboratories were interested in demographic research and felt there should be a Southern association. There was a group called ORAU--I can't think what the acronym stands for--it's a consortium of Southern universities that used the research facilities at Oak Ridge, mainly in nuclear research, but some people were trying to expand it so it would also be used for demographic research for various universities across the South. They had a sizable demographic research center there for a while. Dick Taeuber directed that. They got all the census tapes early and would make data available to the universities. The Southern Regional Demographic Group was set up to work with that. Then it caught hold and went off on its own.

VDT: So it wasn't necessarily set up as an antidote to PAA's increasing size?

PRICE: No, it grew out of the effort at Oak Ridge to develop some sort of demographic center there.

VDT: You don't necessarily concentrate your papers at the meetings on the South?

PRICE: Oh, no.

VDT: What's the membership size now?

PRICE: Around 700.

VDT: About what PAA was just before Don Bogue started Demography and then his advertising efforts, which were much bemoaned at the time, doubled the membership. The Southern Regional Demographic Group has now changed its name to Southern Demographic Association.

PRICE: I appointed a committee to figure out how to change the name, the year I was president. It took three years to get the change. The question was the SDA. You remember SDA--Students for Democratic Action--a farout group? We decided that was far enough in the past that it would no longer carry negative connotations.

VIDT: The meetings are two, three days?

PRICE: Two days.

VDT: Just about what the PAA meetings were at Princeton. Leon Bouvier, with whom I worked at the Population Reference Bureau, is your archivist and he would point out your archives in his file drawer and I had a few PAA archives in mine.

What are your plans for "retirement," quote, unquote, other than to be married? When are you going to be married?

PRICE: Marion and I will be married in June; I'll be moving to Florida between now and then. So,

I'm retiring, sold the house yesterday, removing to another state, buying another house, getting married--all within 90 days. The only major events missing are the birth of a child and a death in the family! Those are the only stress sources missing.

VDT: Indeed! Where are you moving to in Florida?

PRICE: Jacksonville area. Marion and I spent a good deal of time deciding whether we should live in Greensboro or Jacksonville. She lives in Jacksonville, only 50 miles from where I grew up. So I've got a lot of friends in the area and what family I have. My brother and his family live in Winter Park, 50 miles away.

VDT: So you're going to be in the internal migration statistics.

PRICE: That's right. I found that the moving costs to Florida are much higher than other places, because it's almost a one-way stream--they have to come back with an empty van.

VDT: Are you going to keep any hand in demography?

PRICE: I'll probably fool around with this problem I've been working on of age, period, cohort effects, which is a statistical problem, but I don't think it's been looked at carefully enough from the substantive side.

KURT B. MAYER

PAA Secretary-Treasurer in 1959-62 (No. 10). In response to a "questionnaire" supplied by Jean van der Tak, Dr. Mayer kindly wrote and sent this "self-interview" from his home in Ascona, Switzerland, in April 1990.

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS: Kurt Mayer was born and grew up in Zurich, Switzerland. He studied economics and sociology at the University of Zurich, the London School of Economics, and at Columbia University, from which he received the Ph.D. in sociology in 1951. He taught sociology at Rutgers University from 1948 to 1950 and at the New School for Social Research from 1947 to 1950. From 1950 to 1966, he was with the Department of Sociology at Brown University, as Assistant Professor (1950-53), Associate Professor (1953-56), Professor (1956-66), and Chairman of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology (1957-63). From 1966 to 1971, he was Professor of Sociology and Director of the Institute of Sociology at the University of Berne, Switzerland, and since then has been Professor Emeritus. His population publications include works on Switzerland, Rhode Island, migration, ethnicity, and population theory, and his sociological publications include Class and Society (1955).

BACKGROUND AND CAREER

I was born in Zurich, Switzerland, on September 6, 1916, and grew up there. After attending the city's public schools, I graduated with the Matura certificate in 1935. I then studied economics at the University of Zurich in 1935-36 and in 1937-39. In 1936-37, I was at the London School of Economics.

By the summer of 1939, I had completed all the courses and the first draft of a dissertation for a Ph.D. in economics at the University of Zurich but did not stay for the final examinations and the defense of the dissertation because war was imminent. Fearing an invasion of Switzerland by Hitler, I got myself an immigration visa for the U.S., which was not difficult because the Swiss quota was not filled, and arrived in New York on August 15, 1939, two weeks before World War II began.

I first worked in the statistics department of a Wall Street firm and later became an executive in a fur-manufacturing business. (My father had been a partner in a wholesale fur business in Switzerland.) But I did not enjoy being a businessman, so in 1943 I decided to return to academia as a graduate student in the sociology department of Columbia University. I had first become interested in sociology when I took a couple of courses with Rene Konig at the University of Zurich in the 1930s. Later I was much impressed reading Erich Fromm's Escape from Freedom. So I decided to ditch economics, the "dismal science," and switched to sociology.

In 1951 I obtained the Ph.D. in sociology at Columbia University, with a dissertation supervised by Kingsley Davis and Abe Jaffe on The Population of Switzerland, which was published by Columbia University Press in 1952. Davis, who had recently published his monumental work on The Population of India and Pakistan [1951], at that time intended to stimulate a whole series of studies in dissertation form on the demography of various European countries, but actually only two of these dissertations materialized: Anders Lunde's on Norway and mine on Switzerland. I had first become interested in demography when I took a class on population statistics at the University of Zurich. I renewed this interest when I was asked to teach an undergraduate course in population problems at Rutgers University in 1948-50.

I began my teaching career as a lecturer in sociology on the graduate faculty of the New School for Social Research in New York in 1947-50. Simultaneously, I also taught at the Newark campus of Rutgers University in 1948-50, with the rank of instructor.

In 1949 my wife, who is a physician, accepted a position as chief pathologist at the Rhode Island State Hospital in Cranston, a suburb of Providence, and moved there with our two young children while I continued to teach for a year at Rutgers and the New School, commuting to Rhode Island every weekend. Of course, I soon became tired of that and began looking for a job in Rhode Island. I was delighted to accept an assistant professorship in sociology at Brown, offered by Vincent Whitney in 1950. My interests in demography were not the main reason I was offered the job. I was asked to teach courses and seminars in social stratification, sociological theory, and the family, while the population courses were taught by Whitney.

At Brown my career developed smoothly. I was promoted to associate professor in 1953, became a tenured full professor in 1956, and served as chairman of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology in 1957-63.

In 1963-64 I was awarded both a Guggenheim and a Social Science Research Council fellowship. I spent six months as a visiting professor at the Australian National University in Canberra, invited by Wilfred "Mick" Borrie, whom I had met at IUSSP meetings in New York [1961]. Borrie was chairman of the demography department at ANU, at that time the only independent demography department in the world. At the same time, he was serving as temporary chairman of ANU's recently-founded sociology department until a permanent chairman could be appointed. I offered a seminar in social stratification and did a comparative study of stratification in Australia and the United States, "Social Stratification in Two Equalitarian Societies: Australia and the United States," which was published in 1964 in both English and German and later included in several readers in the U.S. and Australia.

The second part of my sabbatical I spent in Switzerland, doing research on the immigration of foreign workers, which by then had become a major political issue in Switzerland. In subsequent years, I published several articles on this topic, e.g., "The Impact of Postwar Immigration on the Demographic and Social Structure of Switzerland," which appeared in Demography in 1966.

In the 1960s, sociology was still in its beginning stages in Swiss universities, so I considered it a challenge to make a real contribution to the development of the field when in 1966 I was offered the country's only chair in sociology, at the University of Berne. I had retained my Swiss citizenship and had always planned to return someday, sooner or later. It was entirely a matter of "pull"--the return of the native son. There was no "push," as I had been very happy at Brown. In fact, my 16 years there were the happiest and most productive years of my professional life. The atmosphere at Brown had been most cordial and harmonious, entirely free of the feuds so frequently encountered at other places.

Unfortunately, after a pleasant beginning, the move to Berne turned into a disaster. In 1968, the student unrest which had begun at Berkeley in 1965-66 swept like wildfire through many European universities, and everywhere, sociology students were in the vanguard. That is not surprising, because sociology in a sense is a "subversive" science, in that it teaches students to view society through critical eyes. It tends to attract political radicals and counter-culture types. The "1968 movement," as it is now called, very nearly led to a revolt against de Gaulle in France. It was strongly influenced by the anti-Vietnam protests, which in Europe meant anti-Americanism in general. Consequently, I found myself in a very vulnerable position in Berne. I had recently come from the U.S. and I was not a Marxist. I taught "mainstream American sociology," not the radical theories of Herbert Marcuse and the so-called Frankfurt school of Adorno and Horkheimer which my students wanted to hear. Fired on by the examples of radical firebrand student leaders like Daniel Cohn-Bendit, "Red Danny," at the Sorbonne and Rudi Dutschke in Berlin, my students started to disrupt and boycott my classes and in 1970 occupied the Institute of Sociology. Because this intolerable situation began to affect my health adversely, I decided to take early retirement in 1971.

A year later, I left Berne and moved to Ascona, a resort in the Italian part of Switzerland, near Locarno. My family had long owned property there and I had always planned to live there in retirement. I built myself a home right on the shore of Lago Maggiore and my wife and I have been

living there ever since. My wife had been working part-time in the pathology department of the University of Berne until we moved to Ascona. Two grownup children remained in the U.S. The youngest son, who had come with us to Switzerland, now lives in Zurich.

In Ascona, I have continued to do some research and writing in both population studies and social stratification; these two fields have always been the main focus of my academic work. My book Class and Society, first published in 1955 and later translated into Italian, Spanish, Portuguese and German, has been my most successful publication, selling well over 100,000 copies. In 1972 I published an introductory population text in German, Einführung in die Bevölkerungswissenschaft. I have also done a number of articles on international migration. But with neither academic nor clerical assistance, the scope of my work has necessarily been limited since I left Berne.

DEMOGRAPHY IN BROWN'S DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

When I joined in 1950, the department of sociology at Brown University consisted of four men. Vincent Whitney was chairman until 1957, when I succeeded him. Up until 1950 only undergraduate courses had been offered, but the university administration then authorized the founding of a graduate program. This began very modestly with two graduate students working for M.A. degrees, who held teaching assistantships. At this point, the incipient graduate program was not yet focused on demography. But when we decided to expand to the Ph.D. level a few years later, it was clear that with a small staff we could not spread ourselves thin but had to concentrate on one or two specialized fields in order to attract good graduate students. Since Whitney's main interests were in the field of population studies and I was also interested in that subject, we decided to emphasize population studies and social organization as the main areas in the Ph.D. program.

As the staff expanded slowly during the 1950s, appointees with strong interests in demography were systematically added: Sidney Goldstein, Leo Schnore, and Robert Potter. Robert Parke, Jr., and Jeanne Clare Ridley also came with one-year appointments as teaching interns. They all made important contributions to the development of the graduate program. The most outstanding addition proved to be Sidney Goldstein, who succeeded me as department chairman and became director of the newly-established Population Studies and Training Center in 1965. Sid combines unusual abilities as an excellent teacher, productive scholar, very able administrator, and most successful fundraiser.

Trained by Dorothy Thomas, Sid had done an innovative study on internal migration at the University of Pennsylvania, using city directories as data sources. At the same time, I had been working on a research project to analyze the basic processes of economic change and metropolitan development in the Rhode Island region and had published a first part, Economic Development and Population Growth in Rhode Island, in 1953. This study had shown the major role which migration had played, but its limited scope did not permit any detailed analysis of migration trends. So it made sense for Sid and myself to combine our forces and we began to collaborate. In 1958 we published the first of a series of studies, Migration and Economic Development in Rhode Island.

The reason for our focusing on Rhode Island was that with its highly urbanized and industrialized as well as ethnically very diverse population, it seemed well suited as a social research laboratory. The smallness of the state was also an advantage, since at the beginning of our studies we did not have any outside research funds at our disposal. In time, such funds became available through successive grants from various sources, particularly the Ford Foundation, the National Science Foundation, and the National Institutes of Health.

Sid and I were able to work very smoothly together, not only in gathering and analyzing the data but also in formulation of the reports. Altogether our collaboration resulted in the publication of 19 joint monographs and articles.

After returning to Switzerland, I switched my interest from internal to international migration. The vast and ever-increasing movement of people from the less developed countries of the South to the

industrialized countries of the North presents major problems, which will take on enormous dimensions in the future. In the past, both internal and international migration have been "stepchildren" of demographic research, as pointed out in their PAA presidential addresses by both Goldstein [in 1976] and Dudley Kirk [1960]. This is partly because reliable data on migration are harder to come by than data on fertility and mortality. Census bureaus the world over have been required by law to produce data on fertility and mortality for political reasons, and these data aroused more interest among the general public. But interest in migration may well increase in the future as these movements take on major proportions.

To return to Brown's graduate program. Shigemi Kono, our first Ph.D. and one of the very best, was recruited, supervised by Vincent Whitney, and entirely supported by fellowship funds made available by the university. But it was clear that the limited number of fellowships and assistantships available from this source needed to be supplemented by outside grants which would permit faculty members to pursue their research interests freely and train good graduate students. Sid and I together were instrumental in obtaining government grants. However, my role in the establishment of the Population Studies and Training Center in 1965 was minor, since I was already preparing my forthcoming move to Switzerland. Most of the credit for this very successful venture and other major grants goes to Sid.

Among the Ph.D. students with whose training I was involved during my years at Brown, there were several who have since "made their mark" in the field, most successfully, perhaps, Calvin Goldscheider, now himself a professor at Brown, and Peter Morrison at the Rand Corporation.

THE PAA

The first PAA annual meeting I attended was in Chapel Hill in 1951. I drove down with Vincent Whitney, who had attended the University of Carolina as both an undergraduate and graduate student and had received his three degrees there. He introduced me to his former teachers, Howard Odum and Rupert Vance, and to former fellow students, e.g., Daniel Price, Hope Eldridge, Margaret Hagood, and others. The campus there was enchanting, very similar to the Princeton campus where the 1952 meeting was held. I also very much liked the campus of the University of Virginia in Charlottesville, where the 1954 meeting was held.

The ambiance of these meetings in the early 1950s was very pleasant, almost intimate. The attendance of a few hundred people was still small enough so that most participants knew each other, and almost all faithfully attended the sessions. Unlike the annual meetings of large societies, e.g., the American Sociological Association, where many people were milling around the corridors, more interested in socializing and in the employment market, at these PAA meetings people wanted to hear the papers and the corridors were empty during the sessions.

There were always several clusters of "stars" who dominated the meetings. They represented the major centers of demographic research at the time. From the Census Bureau, there were Conrad Taeuber, Henry Shryock, Paul Glick, and Harold Dorn; from the Princeton Office of Population Research, Frank Notestein [who went to the Population Council in 1959], Ansley Coale, Irene Taeuber, and Charles Westoff; and from the Population Council, Dudley Kirk and Parker Mauldin. In addition, there were P.K. Whelpton from the Scripps Foundation, Philip Hauser and Donald Bogue from Chicago, Amos Hawley and Ronald Freedman from Michigan, and Dorothy Thomas and Everett Lee from Pennsylvania. These were the insiders, a sort of inner circle.

Vincent Whitney and I invited the 1959 meeting to the Brown campus, partly as a public relations exercise to draw attention to our growing population program. In this we had the active support of Dorothy Thomas, who was PAA president in 1958-59. She had just recruited Whitney to become chairman of the Pennsylvania sociology department in 1959 and she had retained close ties with Sid Goldstein, her former student. Some of the sessions were held on the campus, others at the

Biltmore Hotel in nearby downtown Providence, where the registration desk was and the banquet was held. Everything went smoothly and several people made a point of telling us that they had enjoyed the ambiance of the Brown campus. Generally, the atmosphere of university campuses and the relatively small number of participants resulted in a feeling of intimacy, which was lost in later meetings with their larger attendance and the impersonality of big city hotels.

As far as I can remember, it was in connection with the preparation of the 1959 meeting that Dorothy Thomas approached me about serving as secretary-treasurer and I accepted the proposal, partly because of the attention it would draw to the Brown program. The secretary-treasurer was elected on the annual ballot along with the other officers, but that was merely a pro forma election since only one candidate was listed for this position; thus nomination was tantamount to election. The reason for this procedure must have been the belief that because of the work load involved, suitable candidates would not vie for the position but had to be coaxed.

Actually, I did not find the work unduly burdensome. As department chairman, I had at my disposal the services of the department secretary, who handled the clerical work involved--recordkeeping, correspondence, and mailings to the membership--very efficiently, without complaining about the additional chores. I had previously served a few years as a member of the executive committee of the Eastern Sociological Society, so I had an idea of the administrative routine of a professional society. At each annual meeting, there were two meetings of the Board of Directors, the outgoing Board and the incoming Board, as well as the business meeting. The minutes of these meetings had to be prepared, of course, but I don't recall any problems in this connection. Dudley Kirk, the president during my first year in office [1959-60], was a very active and meticulous president and an experienced insider. I called on him a couple of times during the year when I happened to be in New York to discuss PAA affairs and he "showed me the ropes," so to speak. My relations with the two succeeding presidents with whom I served, Horace Hamilton [1960-61] and John Durand [1961-62], were more distant.

I tried to keep the PAA business on an even keel, but not being an insider I was not much involved in the politics of the "luminaries." Membership was growing slowly and there was debate among the Board members between those who wanted to make more efforts to recruit non-demographers and those who wanted to retain the character of a scientific community of professional demographers. I don't recall the details of this debate, but a large increase in membership would have strained the modest logistical capacities at Brown.

The last annual meeting I attended was in New York in 1974. PAA had received a grant to invite some speakers from abroad, whose travel expenses were paid by these funds. At the invitation of William Petersen, I presented a paper on "Intra-European Migration During the Past Twenty Years," which was published in the International Migration Review in 1975. This marked the end of my active involvement with the PAA.

ANDERS S. LUNDE

PAA Secretary-Treasurer in 1965-68 (No. 12). Also first Historian of PAA and initiator of the PAA Oral History Project. Interview with Jean van der Tak at Dr. and Mrs. Lunde's home, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, April 5, 1988, followed by an exchange of reminiscences between Dr. Lunde and Daniel Price, who joined us for lunch at the Lundes' home after his individual interview the next day.

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS: Anders Lunde grew up in Bridgeport, Connecticut. He received the B.A. in sociology from St. Lawrence University in 1938, became a Unitarian minister and served overseas as an army chaplain in World War II, and then went to Columbia University, where he received the M.A. in sociology in 1947 and the Ph.D. in sociology in 1955. He taught sociology and population at Rutgers University from 1948 to 1951, at St. Lawrence University from 1951 to 1955, and at Gallaudet College from 1955 to 1958. From 1962 to 1977, he was with the National Center for Health Statistics, as Chief of the Natality Statistics Branch and Associate Director of the Division of Vital Statistics in Rockville, Maryland, among other posts, as well as Director of NCHS's Office of State Services in Research Triangle Park, North Carolina. He has also been an adjunct professor at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He is an expert and has published extensively on methods of measuring vital events, both in the United States and in other countries. In his retirement, he has become a celebrated craftsman of intricate whirligigs, which are described as having "a sense of humor, directness, and a point of view . . . that separates [them] from the vernacular whirligig." He has lectured, appeared on TV and in many art shows, and published three books on this subject: Whirligigs: Design and Construction (1982), More Whirligigs: Large Scale and Animated Figures (1984), and Whirligigs in Silhouette (1990).

VDT [Following biographical introduction]: As first historian of the Population Association of America from the 1960s to 1981, Andy collected almost all the materials that exist about the formation and early days of PAA, compiled all the records about PAA meetings, officers, boards, membership numbers and so on through the years, and arranged for the deposit of PAA historical materials in the archives of the Georgetown University library. He inspired a session at the 50th anniversary meeting of PAA in Washington in 1981 on "The PAA at Age 50," which produced several valuable papers on early PAA history, including his own. He began the "Vignettes of PAA History" published occasionally in PAA Affairs since 1981 [19 through 1990]. And, most importantly, he began this series of interviews with past presidents and secretary-treasurers of PAA on their careers and reminiscences of PAA.

Andy, how did you first become interested in demography?

LUNDE: Well, it's a long story. I suppose the earliest indication I have that I was aimed in this direction goes back to my undergraduate days at St. Lawrence University.

VDT: Where is that?

LUNDE: Canton, New York, 90 miles north of Lake Placid. I had a professor of sociology there by the name of Herbert Bloch, who was a rather distinguished sociologist. At the end of his career, he was director of research at Brooklyn University. One of the first things that he had me do as--I guess it was as a senior student--was to do a survey on students' smoking habits.

VDT: Very up to date! This was in the 1930s?

LUNDE: Yes, 1937 or so. I developed a questionnaire, distributed it to the students, to the sororities and fraternities and so on, had a collection system, and got reports anonymously. This was written up locally. It never got much national attention, but, nevertheless, that was one of the early starts I had.

Later when I was at Columbia . . . I had gone back to school after the war; I'd been away for three-and-a-half years in the army. When I got out, I first went to Harvard. I was by then, strangely enough, not interested in demography as much as in history. I went to Harvard to be interviewed there and I was accepted in the history department. But the dean explained that since the war was coming to an end, hundreds of Harvard graduates of course were showing up for graduate school and that, while I was accepted, I would have to wait till the following semester. I'd hoped to get in in September but they said I've have to show up in January.

Well, I simply couldn't wait. I had a family; I couldn't figure out how to make ends meet. Among my letters, I had one recommending me to Columbia. So I went down there for an interview and I bounced around there. I went to the history department, but all the historians were in Europe, the first chance they'd had to get back to their haunts in Europe. So I went downstairs to the next office, where I also knew people. That was the sociology department.

Things at Columbia were strangely organized in those days. You were sort of immediately accepted once they knew who you were and you had the credentials; they weren't stopping any proposed students. So I remember going downstairs and meeting with people I was supposed to meet, like Dr. Abel and one or two others, including Paul Lazarsfeld; we had mutual friends, so I knew who he was. That was very interesting. Both these professors thought I should have a career in their department, so they signed the necessary chits. Then I met some fellows who were in the same boat. I think I was partly in an army uniform and another guy was in a navy uniform, another in a Seabee uniform, and we're still in touch with each other after all these years! They all went in various directions in the field.

I remember, to my surprise, going downstairs and standing in line and the first thing they gave me was a piece of paper which entitled me to receive my tuition and all books for whatever courses I took in the department of sociology. Then I stood in another line--we went from one line to another, all arranged in the open air on the campus or in these army huts. We got in another line and I got another chit that said there was an apartment waiting for me in Camp Shanks at the river, which had been turned into a veterans' housing project. So I had a home. There was another line I went to and it was announced that I would receive so many hundreds of dollars a month for the upkeep of myself and my family. I took all these pieces of paper and I remember getting on the train and going back to Vermont, where Eleanor was temporarily with her mother, and saying, "Listen, we've got two choices. We can wait six months and go to Harvard and then I don't know what will happen there, or we can go immediately down to New York and live and work at Columbia." And I said, "Considering the situation we're in, I think we should probably go to Columbia." That was the fall of 1946. I'd stayed over in Europe for a period after the war came to an end.

What happened then was, I was working for Lazarsfeld in an area that was not quite demography; it was an evaluation and appraisal of the role of art in America. It was a rather unusual interest he was developing, because I had got interested in studying the control of music in America by the American Federation of Musicians union. He hoped that by starting in this particular area, I could also increase my knowledge of the organized field of music and go on to art and architecture and so on, which also was an interest of mine. But this is way off the track. Are you really interested?

VDT: Yes, I want to know how you got into demography. Go on.

LUNDE: These things happen by strange coincidences and accidents. I never got to see Mr. Petrillo, the lord of music in America in those days. But I did see his vice-presidents and I wrote a paper which was published in Public Opinion Quarterly, in 1948, on this subject, which I think had some exposure

and I enlarged it and it became my master's dissertation. Why did I bother with it? Mainly because some of us felt we didn't know how long it would take us to get a Ph.D. under our circumstances. I was with other men who had been in the army and were older and also concerned about their families and we all knew we had to go to work as soon as possible. So we decided, most of us, to pick up an M.A. on our way through.

I started this other work and had picked up quite a bit of data on music and art and so on in the United States. In the area of music, it wasn't just the control of music. We found, for example, more symphony orchestras per capita, more bands and this and that, than in any country in the world. I had thought it was Germany where everyone played something!

VDT: But tell me how you got into demography.

LUNDE: I had all this stuff and it was stored in the old Columbia medical school downtown, way down Amsterdam Avenue somewhere. We had access to that for various purposes; we could have an office there or store our stuff there. Suddenly, Lazarsfeld announced that, unfortunately, he would have to decamp the area because he had been invited to go to Norway to establish a Scandinavian center for research, particularly radio and so; kind of thing he had done previously at Princeton and New York [University]. So we said a hurried goodbye and he told me to keep going and "I'll see you in a year," and he took off. I had to move all these cardboard boxes and junk to my home, which was in Plainfield, New Jersey.

VDT: By that time you'd moved out of the veteran's apartment?

LUNDE: Yes. I got the master's. Then an opening came at Rutgers almost immediately. They were looking for someone who could teach courses, strangely enough, in population studies and criminology. The demography I had been working on; I took courses. But what happened there was interesting: I was the only applicant who had ever studied criminology; I took it on the side at Columbia. So I got the job.

While I was at Rutgers, we got a house in Plainfield that had a big attic, where I stored all this stuff on the arts from Lazarsfeld. The house caught fire. The attic was the first thing to go. I think I found page 148 of a paper where I was summarizing some area of this study. Everything else was shot. My wife had to go back to Vermont to live with her mother, to take care of the kids. We were then taking care of my mother; she had to go into a nursing home. And there I was at Rutgers; I went into a rented room. That's how things went until the end of that year. I got a lot of help from the chairperson of the department, Jack Riley, and his wife Matilda; they were wonderful to us. But there I was; I had nothing.

Well, I didn't know what to do, but I kept taking my program. When Lazarsfeld came back and I told him the story, he was very sympathetic and told me a horrible story. He had finished writing his dissertation on Die Arbeitslosen in Marienthal [The Unemployed of Marienthal, Austria], a famous early sociological analysis. He had taken it to the railroad station, put his briefcase down, and went up to a window right there to get a ticket, and when he got back, the briefcase with his document was gone--the only whole copy he had. It took him a year to put it back together. So he clapped me on the shoulder and said, "What are you going to do?" I said, "My God, I don't know what I'm going to do." So he said, "Incidentally, I want you to know that we have another member coming into the department this year; his name is Kingsley Davis." "Oh yes," I said, "I've read his stuff."

I was continuing my work for the Ph.D. at Columbia, taking courses. Kingsley Davis showed up and I had an interview with him. Kingsley at that time, being brand new, was looking for graduate students who were interested in demography. A friend of mine who was in the program sooner or later was Arthur Campbell. Lincoln Day showed up during that period and three or four other persons; Sam

Baum was there. We weren't all together in one group at that time. When I met Kingsley, I didn't know these other fellows that well; we eventually merged around Kingsley. So we had quite a group there and it was different from my experience. I had been one of the persons who had been a protege of Lazarsfeld. We had a group nicknamed "The Young Turks"; we all had an office in the Bureau of Applied Social Research. This was a famous group. Stanley Bigman was in that group, but he stayed with surveys. I was one of those who moved into demography.

I remember that first session with Kingsley. He asked me what I was interested in in demography. At that time, I was sort of a generalist; I didn't knuckle down to fertility till later. I was interested in population change and in the population of various countries and what was happening around the world. Kingsley said, "Are you acquainted with any country in particular? Do you speak any language?" I said, "Yes, I know Norway quite well and can speak rudimentary Norwegian; I read Norwegian." Then he went on to tell me that Dorothy Thomas was working very hard on Sweden and had published. I said I knew of her work. He said, if he remembered correctly, Norway had data almost as old. I said, "Yes, it's not as old. Sweden goes back to the early 17th century; Norway doesn't pick up vital statistics from church registers and so on till the latter part of the 17th century." He said, "Would you be interested in pursuing a study related to Norway?" I said I hadn't given it that much thought, but I thought I might like to do it. He said, "Well, let's talk about it again."

I thought about it and thought, Gee, this is something I think I could really take hold of; it would be unique. So I saw Kingsley again and we laid down a pattern of work and off I went. I immediately sent to my cousins in Norway, who were closely connected with various publications, and I got together quite a collection of Norwegian data from scratch. Then I went to the various libraries. I didn't find anything in the New York universities but in the New York library downtown, I found a complete collection of Norwegian statistics going way, way back. These old volumes were so old they fell apart in my hands. There it was--in the New York library! I'll never forget the excitement of finding this wonderful shelf of basic data, really excellent stuff. So I worked on that for quite a while.

I stayed at Rutgers from 1948 to 1951. At the same time I was working on the Ph.D. at Columbia, I was teaching what in those days were called population problems. We had a semester of population and then another of population problems. Warren Thompson's book, Population Problems, was very popular in those days. At the same time, I was teaching a course in criminology. A strange thing happened there. I got so interested in the Kefauver trials, in front of the television. So I told the students in this criminology course that they could take this week off from class if they promised that they'd watch the trials on television. This got a lot of attention; it hit the New York Times.

VDT: The living criminology course!

LUNDE: Right--the laboratory and all that. It was very exciting. And I took the students to all the New Jersey institutions and agencies, in buses.

While I was doing this, Dr. Bloch, my original mentor with whom I had maintained very close connections, happened to have developed the New York State Institute on Crime and Delinquency. He called one day and asked me to join his staff. This was a summer institute and it was held at St. Lawrence University. It was supported by the state. It later became the Frederick A. Moran Institute, because he was the great social worker in New York City and president of the social workers' institution for years. I went off to St. Lawrence, with the understanding that the other basic course I would be teaching would be population, demography. I participated in the summer institute on crime and delinquency. We had all kinds of people coming from all over the state, at all levels, from prison guards at Sing Sing to judges of the criminal court. I again organized people so we'd take them to the Canadian institutions, which were just across the river [St. Lawrence], like Clinton, in your country [Canada].

I mention St. Lawrence because when I left there [1955], guess who came to take my place?--

we've laughed about it ever since--Joe Stycos. He came in when I left St. Lawrence because he was waiting for another assignment. Then he left and went to Cornell.

I finished my work on my Ph.D. at Columbia and got it in 1955 [with a dissertation on The Population of Norway]. It took quite a bit of time to get organized and Kingsley, by the way, was flitting around the country. For example, at one point when I was waiting for him to return my manuscript, I didn't get it back for the longest time because he was down in the Caribbean somewhere; lost track of it.

At that time, you have to remember I was getting older. I thought I'd like to leave St. Lawrence after I got my Ph.D., because I felt a little enclosed there; it's a small place. I wanted to be in New York City where things were happening. It was hard to get out of St. Lawrence. It took almost all day in these little puddle-jumping airplanes to get down to New York, if you were in a hurry. It took all night by train and then they cut out the train service. I went down to a meeting in New York and went to talk to various people about job opportunities in that general area. Well, there weren't that many and for many people with whom I had interviews, I appeared too old. They wanted to know how many books I'd published and that sort of thing. I felt very discouraged. It happened to be a year when some universities were retrenching; they were not expanding. Salaries, by the way, were very low in those years. "Well," I said, "I'll go back to St. Lawrence and spend another year looking around."

But I had an appointment with a man by the name of Dr. George Detmold, a very fine person who had been an assistant dean at Cornell but who had been called to Washington for a very unusual assignment. The board of trustees of Gallaudet College--which has been in the news lately--had decided that they didn't want to be a second-class college anymore. They wanted to be fully accredited by the Middle Atlantic States Association of Colleges and Universities. So they got hold of Detmold, who was a well-known educator, and asked him to assemble a staff of PhDs who could move into Gallaudet and work to establish it as an accredited institution. This was a job that appealed to me; it just had enough of a crazy challenge to make it different. I remember talking to Eleanor about this. We had certain problems with it, but the salary was good, maybe \$8,000. At St. Lawrence, I'd been getting about \$6,000, maybe less.

VDT: How many children did you have?

LUNDE: My daughter was born in Canton, New York, so that made four by the time we left St. Lawrence.

I came to Gallaudet and that was a very interesting job. I still taught population. We were given a highly intensified course in sign language. We were all hearing; there weren't that many non-hearing PhDs. We did have a marvelous statistician in the Census Bureau who was deaf, Wilson Grabill, very close colleague of Con Taeuber's. Robert Parke at the Census Bureau was his translator at meetings.

VDT: Jay Siegel learned sign language to communicate with him.

LUNDE: There's a story there too about when I first went to a committee meeting in Washington [at the Census Bureau] and I saw the struggle they had trying to understand this man. He could speak quite clearly, but he couldn't hear. You had to write everything down or use sign language. I said to Con, "From my experience at Gallaudet, let me tell you're missing the boat on this wonderful, highly intelligent person. You've got to get an interpreter so he can talk naturally and he can watch the signs of the interpreter instead of struggling for half an hour trying to get an idea across." Con said, "I don't know how to do it according to the government." I said, "Get somebody on your staff." Well, they did eventually. They had a spot for a secretary and they got a secretary whose mother and father were deaf. She used the sign language and from then on this guy sailed along.

VDT: Did you learn to lecture in sign language?

LUNDE: Oh, yes. Well, at Gallaudet lecturers speak because they want people to speech read, but you sign at the same time. After a while, it was as if I had two heads.

VDT: How long did you teach there?

LUNDE: Three years. That was a great experience. And we got accreditation for Gallaudet. We spent a lot of time organizing our programs; we published our first really great bulletin. Not only that--what was so interesting to me--the year Gallaudet was accredited by the Middle Atlantic States Association, the University of Maryland lost accreditation. That was the year it was discovered the president of the University of Maryland and a coach had given most if not all of the scholarships to athletes.

VDT: Then it was the National Center for Health Statistics after that?

LUNDE: Well, there was an interval of a few years which I haven't gone into with you before. When I started out, back in the beginning of college, I went to theological school and I was a Unitarian minister for some years. And in the army, I was a chaplain for three and a half years.

When I got out of the army, I wanted to study social problems, get back into the general field again, and I went back into sociology. But what happened was, when I was in Washington at that time [at Gallaudet], I used to speak at the Unitarian church on 16th Street. I knew everybody there and whenever the minister was sick or left town, he'd ask me to speak for him on Sunday, and I often did. One Sunday when I spoke they said, "There's a group of people who want to meet you, the First Unitarian Church of Philadelphia." They asked me if I'd come to Philadelphia. So I went for three years.

At the same time, I'd just finished a study on the employment of the deaf in the United States, which was published at Gallaudet. I brought Sam Bigman out of hiding to help me finish, prepare the schedule; this went to deaf people all over the country. I told Sam, "I'm going to have to leave the final product to you and you put your name on it." So it's Lundes and Bigman, Occupation of the Deaf in the United States.

I'd been in Philadelphia only a short time, when I realized I'd been geared to a different way of life already. So after three years--I'd made arrangements anyway to go--I went back to Washington. In Washington, the first job I was offered was in the Department of Education; they had projects related to social surveys and automated handling. But things were slow in getting that approval, because the education commissioner had some kind of brouhaha and he left just about when he was going to sign something for me. They even showed me my desk and gave me a telephone on a Friday and then called me on Monday and said, "Andy, don't come, because the commissioner hasn't signed you off yet; he's left and we don't know when he'll be back." At that point I said, "to heck with it."

I had gotten to know Con Taeuber during this interim, because I went to an international sociological meeting in Washington that Con was very active in organizing. He asked if there were people living in Washington who could take some people home for dinner after one of these sessions so these people from various countries could get acquainted with American homes. I put up my hand and Eleanor and I took home about a dozen people, from all over the world. Con never forgot that. Then I began to interview for other positions in Washington. When it came to the National Center for Health Statistics, they wanted a chief of natality statistics. When I was teaching, particularly at St. Lawrence, I had a lot of contact with NCHS, before it was NCHS. They had the health surveys, that was a separate unit, and they had the national vital statistics division. I had written a lot to Bob Grove

about data that I wanted and also Hugh Carter, who was then marriage and divorce statistics. I knew Hugh very well; always ran into him at meetings and we always had good times together. Somehow I didn't put anything together until I was asked to come in for an interview at NCHS. I'd come there from an interview at the National Science Foundation; they wanted me to consider taking a job doing a survey for them on social scientists in the United States. So I was very cheerful, thinking, this was the job; to heck with the education business. I arrived for an interview with Dr. Oswald [Ossie] Sagen, former Registrar of Illinois and then head of the Division of Vital Statistics, and there were Bob Grove and Hugh Carter. It was like meeting old friends! They took me over to meet Dr. Forrest Linder [then director of NCHS] and then I was asked if I'd put in my papers and let them have them.

The strangest thing happened. In order to get recognition as a demographer in those days--I don't know what they do these days--you had to have an examination. Your papers were passed on to an examining committee. I thought, if I'm lucky I'll get a Grade 12 at this point, although I had at least a Grade 12 or its equivalent at Gallaudet College. About two days later, I got a call from Jerry Combs. He'd been at Columbia with me and lived down the street at Shanks Village. Jerry said, "Con Taeuber has asked me to call to find out what the heck you want. We've got your papers here and Con says, 'Gee, is Andy looking for a job?'" I said, "What are you doing with my papers?" He said, "I'm secretary of the examinations committee for statisticians. Con wanted to know, do you want to be a supervisory statistician or a demographer or what?" I said, "Whatever it takes to get this job." In the end, they made me a supervisory statistician and demographer and one or two other survey kinds of statisticians. They approved me for four classes; I'd worked in all these areas. And a Grade 14. So I went home and said, "Eleanor, I've got to get the final papers together and it looks like we're finally in a job."

I went into NCHS in 1962 as Chief of the Natality Statistics Branch. The first thing that happened was they wanted a publication immediately, combining data on fertility and marriage, which had to do with the future of the American population. It was to be published in one of their HEW special publications. Besides, I now had to edit the Monthly Vital Statistics Report, but I'd already been receiving it so it wasn't strange to me. What was strange was to know how they did things with it, but it was pretty cut and dried, because they had the data; it was all checked out. Wonderful staff working there on that kind of thing. But I said, "Who the heck do I work with on this thing [special publication] upstairs?" They said, "He's coming down to see you," and in walked Earl Huyck, then the editor of these publications, whom I also knew. We talked about it and I wrote this up. Carl Ortmeier [coauthor of the publication], working on marriage and divorce then with Hugh Carter, provided some data. When we got it all done, it was accepted, but Earl said, "Wait, there really ought to be another element here; we want to get census data." So we did. That was the first [government] publication I had anything to do with. It was done within a month of my time there; it was published.

I loved the work in the National Center for Health Statistics from scratch. It seemed made for me. You know, now and then you hit a job where you say, "I've lived all my life doing all kinds of crazy things and now they've all come together in this job."

One of my first visitors was Don Bogue, who wanted some data and had some ideas about what we ought to be collecting. He expanded my horizons quite a good deal, because he had a broad view of things. I enjoyed talking to Don.

My second visitor was P.K. Whelpton, who was still going strong at Scripps [Foundation for Research in Population Problems]. This was about 1962; he died in 1964. Fortunately for me, I had read his books, so when he showed up I didn't sound like a dunce. He had already prepared one publication for the Division of Vital Statistics on cohort fertility, used our data, and was now in the process of preparing another volume. We simply made arrangements for him to have anything he wanted.

VDT: Were you working at this time with Art Campbell?

LUNDE: What happened with Art was this. I went out to see P.K. Whelpton at the University of Miami with Harry Rosenberg, who was in my office. We spent a morning with P.K. and his staff and there was Art Campbell and also John Patterson. We had a wonderful time and learned what P.K. Whelpton wanted. They were also discussing at that time other kinds of things, such as the [1960] Growth of American Families study that Art Campbell had just participated in.

Then we went to lunch and as we walked across the campus, we bumped into Warren Thompson. It was a thrill; I'd never met him before. When I was student at St. Lawrence, every year in the department of sociology they would hand out questionnaires about "What is your ideal family size?" The first of these studies.

VDT: They had been Warren Thompson's studies?

LUNDE: Yes, he started way back then, probably before that. I remember in the early 1930s, they came in once a year and we were all told to think a little about it but not too long; just put down what is the ideal family size as far as you are concerned.

VDT: This was the forerunner of all the fertility surveys?

LUNDE: Exactly. I didn't think much about it at the time; it came up later in my mind that I'd participated in these things. You answered these few questions and they were collected and returned to Warren Thompson. Years later when I'd been at the Center a couple of years, Art Campbell came down to be with us at a committee meeting, at the request of the Census Bureau. I represented the Division of Vital Statistics. Con Taeuber was there, Goldberg, professor from Wisconsin, and somebody else from Census. The question before the committee was should Census investigate expected family size in its Current Population Survey. We apparently were able to come up with a report that, yes, it was worthwhile for Census to go into this area. At that time, again, I thought of Warren Thompson and what he had done.

Art and I were at dinner that night. He had a new baby, a lovely little girl by the name of Julie; they were very happy with Julie. Art was sleepy; said he hadn't slept the night before; we were talking about that. I said, "Art, what are you going to do next?" He wasn't sure." I said, "Has anybody ever talked to you about coming to Washington and working at Census or NCHS? Would you like that?" He said, "Yes, I think I might, it's in my field." So I shot right back to Bob Grove and said, "You won't believe this but Art Campbell is sort of between jobs and we have a vacancy in the natality statistics branch. Could we offer it to him?" Not offer to him--the government doesn't work that way--couldn't he be a candidate and hopefully be brought on board. That's how Art Campbell first came to Washington, in the National Center for Health Statistics.

VDT: What explains your interest in fertility? That's a broad question, because by that time you were very much into fertility statistics and you and Bob Grove wrote a lot on measurement and collection of fertility data.

LUNDE: At that time, we were getting ready for the 1964 standard certificates of births, deaths, marriages and divorces. I had to spend a lot of time on various committees and working with Bob Grove and others on what we should ask in the 1964 standard form which had never been asked before. I immediately threw in my oar--this was my demographic background; nobody was thinking along these lines--I thought that education of mother and father should be added. I had an awful time arguing on this point. It was added. We weren't quite satisfied with the data, but it was added. It's been there ever since, for births.

There were other kinds of problems with respect to the data, after we collected it from the states. For example, I went through the natality statistics publication very carefully every year and one year, I found the final age of mothers was something like 55 and over and we had about 100 births there! This looked a little strange. I'd just read a report in Lancet, I think, that the oldest woman in England who'd had a child in all their years of records was something like 52 years, 7 months, and 3 days. So I said, "How come we've got so many over 55?" I asked the computer generator to provide copies of all the certificates of women of the previous year for which this was reported. I went through them and said, "This is ridiculous," because it looked as if some women were 77--or 93.

VDT: Did they fill in a hole for age?

LUNDE: These were typed, sometimes printed by hand. I sent copies to the state registrars and said, "Please explain."

I was fascinated. There were a lot of women from Mexico who walked across the border, had their babies, and went back. Whoever filled in these certificates took whatever the woman said, so we didn't know how old the woman was. Then we got a large number of mistakes. For example, the woman was 39 and it was typed 93 and our computer people punched in 93; it never entered their head that it could be 39. There were plenty of errors like that. The strangest one was Massachusetts, who, without notifying the Center as it should have, were changing their format. Used to have an area, I think, for address and they were typing in a zip code like 91 where age used to be; that sort of nonsense. They identified these things.

The only people we couldn't trace, aside from the Mexican women, were a group of American Indians who lived near the Mexican border and they were all given strange ages, well, over 50. I called the Census Bureau about these Indians. They put me onto their southwestern area experts and they said, "Oh, yes--the so-and-so Indians. They're famous because they don't shave and they still act as if they were back in the Spanish days, sort of an isolated group, not quite accepted by other Indians. I'll tell you how they get that particular age. When we did the census the last time, we had to send in special people and they had no knowledge of dates. An Indian would say, 'I was born in the year of the great snow,' so these people put down 75 or something. You understand?"

VDT: That's what they're trying to do in developing countries to trigger people's memories of when they were born.

LUNDE: I found that we would have to assume that none of those women in that [55 and over] category belonged there. I wrote a report on this. Then we decided that we would change the category to 45 and over and we would flag to see that we'd take a second look at everyone in that category. But then we'd wonder about all the rest of them too. I asked when I went back to the Center a few years ago, "Are you still flagging that 45 and over?" and, no, they're not.

VDT: I remember the first time I met you, Andy. I was at Georgetown or the Population Reference Bureau and you were tracking down what the Swedish mean by stillborn. There's that gray area where some countries will categorize a newborn infant as stillborn and some will call it an infant death, perinatal mortality. There's tremendous competition now to have the lowest infant mortality. And they thought the Swedes were leaving some out that the U.S. counted as infant deaths.

LUNDE: Yes, there's always that problem. It's sometimes a matter of definition, or interpretation.

The other category was age at death. That's something else that came up when I got into vital statistics in a broader sense, when I was Associate Chief or Assistant Chief [of the Division of Vital Statistics]. We had a lot of people who were dying at over 100.

VDT: Well . . .

LUNDE: I'm talking about a big group. Dr. Sagen said, "We have to look at these people," so we pulled out all the persons who were supposed to be 100 or more when they died and, again, we found a lot of people weren't sure how old they were, and many were not 100.

A wonderful thing about the vital statistics system is you can always go back and check with the states. They have the original certificates and the state registrar knows the local registrars and they can send out public health nurses and actually talk to people. So you can get right down to the bone, unless you're talking about 50 years ago.

VDT: Who have been the leading influences in your career? You've already mentioned Herbert Bloch, who steered you in the first place, and you've mentioned Kingsley Davis.

LUNDE: In the course of my experience in Washington, I'd say that Bob Grove certainly had an influence. He taught me the mechanics of what goes on in the background of producing vital statistics data.

VDT: What was Kingsley Davis like as a young professor from whom you took courses? You mentioned that he was all over the map already then.

LUNDE: Kingsley was very scholarly when he was at Columbia. He had published The Population of India and Pakistan just about then [1951]. He was full of that kind of information. He was writing another book on the American family and he was full of that. In our classes and seminars, his approach was intellectual, highly scholarly. Not so philosophic in general, you might say, not too theoretical as such, but very much concerned, not with the kind of measurement that we got into at the National Center--we're very much concerned there about the details of measurement--rather, with the interpretation of data, such as there was. He was very much concerned about the populations of the world and their shifting gears, population growth and change. At that time in my class, there was a young woman, whose name now escapes me, who was working on illiteracy in the world and how one measures it and how one gets the information. Kingsley was fascinated by this. He worked himself in this area when he went to California. I think he relied heavily on this young woman's work, because she knew more about illiteracy around the world than anyone I've ever heard of, before or since. Kingsley spent a lot of time with this kind of thing; how does one measure it. He tied his demography into social problems. And he made it a living force. I never knew anyone who gave you so much the feeling that if you could understand demography, you could understand what was happening in the world of politics, social events, and so on. He provided a very strong background for understanding population and its consequences.

VDT: Tell me about Don Bogue.

LUNDE: We had a lot of interesting experiences. I remember Don was very interested at the time I met him in developing a journal for the field. He talked to me about his plans and I'll never forget when the first issue of Demography appeared [1964]. He was interested in getting an article from me about the 1964 standard certificates and I couldn't talk much about it; we'd have to say just what we were hoping to get from it. I was then secretary-treasurer of PAA.

VDT: You were secretary-treasurer from 1965 to 1968. Let's start on PAA. Do you remember when you went to your first meeting?

LUNDE: I think I went to a meeting at Princeton, one of the early ones. I was only there for a day; I didn't spend the night. It was a very small, happy, intimate group. Ansley Coale always wished it would stay that way. When the Association grew to be quite a large group, I think there were people who wished it would remain the small comfortable group that it was when it met at Princeton. They could be put up at the Princeton Inn, go to the tavern, have a lot of fun. Everybody seemed to know everybody else. It was just a wonderful meeting; I'll never forget that. So were the early meetings of PAA that I went to later.

Now, how did I become secretary? This is something you should talk to--well, Kurt Mayer [secretary-treasurer, 1959-62]; he's in Switzerland. He'd written a book on the population of Switzerland at Columbia at the time I was working on Norway. Before Kurt Mayer, there was Dan Price [secretary-treasurer, 1956-59] and you should ask Dan about why he was secretary. When I became active in the Population Association, Paul Glick was secretary [1962-65] and he was secretary because of an arrangement with the federal government. It was understood that things were happening in Washington and the Association couldn't afford a secretary, provide an office. So where's the office going to be? The solution seemed to be to get somebody connected with the Census Bureau to have as part of his job--not that he'd be paid for it, but he'd be doing it--he'd be allowed an extra person to help now and then, carry on as secretary of the Association, and be in Washington and the office would be where he happened to be. As Paul's time came to an end in 1964, 1965, there was a discussion between the Census Bureau and the Division of Vital Statistics, which now was the National Center for Health Statistics with a division of vital statistics within it. The idea was, the Census had given us three years, provided an office for the Association, maybe this time it was the job of the National Center for Health Statistics to provide office space and a secretary. It wasn't that he wouldn't be elected from the PAA but, rather, some solution had to be found for the fact that there wasn't such a thing as a Population Association office. So there was a meeting that Forrest Linder chaired--that came later--and the prime subject was that if the office is not to be connected with the Center or with the Census, where should it be and how should it be handled?

I remember Con and Linder and others talking back and forth and, one day, I went to lunch in the old HEW building and Dr. Moriyama was sitting there with Forrest, waved me over, and shortly told me that there had been a discussion about what to do and Dr. Linder had said he'd provide an office for the next secretary. Linder was director of the NCHS. He had been head of the UN Statistical Office. He'd been in Japan with MacArthur and set up the Japanese vital statistics office after the war. Then he came back to Washington; then went to the United Nations for ten years to set up their Statistical Office and was the first editor of the Demographic Yearbook. He came back at the invitation of HEW to pull various statistical elements of the health offices into one unit and gave it the name, National Center for Health Statistics. After which, everybody else borrowed the name, National Center for this and that. Then he tied together the health surveys which were floating around in Hyattsville and the national Division of Vital Statistics. That was [my] unit. Later they added these other things, like the nutrition surveys. That all came about in about four or five years.

VDT: And he was willing to give PAA office space?

LUNDE: Right. So there was the question that if this could be done, whose name could be proposed to be elected secretary. So they asked me. I thought about it a while, talked to Paul Glick and he said it would be easy; he'd just hand the stuff over and if I had any questions, I could ask him. So that's how we worked it out. I said all right. I was duly elected only because I think I was the only name on the ballot.

VDT: I think there always has been only the one for secretary-treasurer.

LUNDE: I took over Paul's sequence of work: so many meetings, so many letters going out, and that

kind of thing. I might say here that Paul was very helpful. After which, I think I was a member of the Board of Directors twice around.

VDT: We were talking about Don Bogue and the first issue of Demography.

LUNDE: What about the second issue? Was that the one that had the . . .

VDT: Indian family planning inverted triangle on the cover, which caused all the trouble. That was the fifth volume ["Progress and Problems of Fertility Control Around the World," special issue of Demography, Vol. 5, No. 2, 1968]. They thought he was advertising family planning and suddenly Demography had gotten very thick. There was a rising up in wrath.

LUNDE: I remember those days! Every time there was a Board meeting, Don Bogue and his Demography were part of the problem. I didn't consider it a problem. I thought it was wonderful; he had done so much for the field. And yet some members of the board--I don't know whether they were jealous or had other reasons--were opposed to his activities, perhaps mainly because he didn't clear everything with the Board before proceeding. But whenever that came up, there was a big hassle.

VDT: They felt he was scientifically impure, bringing in the family planners?

LUNDE: That's true; there was a lot of talk about that. I'll never forget, for example, Kingsley Davis when he heard that somebody had been made professor of family planning at some university, he blew his top. One of the problems was, I remember, they felt that Don had not returned to them the investment that they had originally given him.

VDT: He didn't have enough subscriptions?

LUNDE: No, I'm talking about money. He got support from various groups to start the publication [through the Ford Foundation support of Bogue's Community and Family Study Center and a three-year grant of \$30,000 from the National Science Foundation] and he also got some money from the Population Association, and they felt he should have returned it by, I don't know which edition. Nothing had ever been returned. There was a particularly hot meeting, I think in Cincinnati [1967], where this came up and it was very embarrassing. I didn't like to hear him castigated, to be honest with you. It's one thing to look at a colleague and say this or that should be done. But it's another thing to really take off, which they did on this occasion. It just so happened that I went to the men's room and there was Don Bogue, all alone. I said, "Don, I'm not reporting anything that you won't be hearing, but I think you could take a lot of steam out of the situation if you could find it possible to return to PAA some of the funds they advanced you for Demography as soon as possible." And whether I had anything to do with it or not I don't know, but it wasn't long after that that Don sent them a check, which did take some of the steam out, because it looked as though their investment was going to be returned to them. I don't remember that it was a lot of money, but it was enough to answer questions.

VDT: This was before the last, family planning issue? In the end, his Center paid for the whole last issue, or paid PAA back for it.

LUNDE: Yes, but this was in the days when apparently he was having trouble getting financing, getting the money back. It was a big venture; it took a lot of effort to get that out. Not just to publish it, but to distribute it. There were many times that Don talked about that; I could see it was a real problem. But, you know, a Board member comes in cold and sees these things and wonders about it. I

had the feeling that some of them were unfair to Don.

VDT: Did it go only to members of PAA or were there also subscriptions to Demography alone?

LUNDE: Yes.

VDT: Because membership ballooned about that time from about 800 to over 1,400.

LUNDE: Yes. I kept a record of that and I think I put it in the archives.

VDT: Yes, you did [from 802 members in 1963 to 1,142 in 1964; 1,283 in 1965; 1,375 in 1966; 1,435 in 1967; 1,495 in 1968; 1,552 in 1969].

LUNDE: Membership did balloon with Demography. I felt it. I was collecting the money and all of a sudden the membership got out of control. I believe I reported this. I said, "I don't believe we can handle this anymore."

VDT: That's when PAA went with Ed Bisgyer and the American Statistical Association.

LUNDE: It was a part of this meeting of a committee with Con Taeuber and Forrest Linder [Committee on Organizational Management]. Other members were Parker Mauldin, Judith Blake, and Joe Stycos. This [first] meeting [June 1966] had to do with where the office ought to be. We thought we ought to get together and discuss how other small organizations in the United States handled these problems. At the next meeting [August 1966], Forrest Linder had constitutions and by-laws of just about everything in the country; he always did his homework. They finally said to me, "Andy, would you be interested in visiting the organizations in Washington to see how they handle things?" I didn't have a chance to visit all of them but I did talk to some small organizations, not the big ones like economics and history. Some of them were rather small and operated in some guy's cellar, that kind of thing. I was fascinated by this: loyal dedicated secretaries, who kept publishing things and doing everything else for their various societies in their attic rooms or in the cellar. That's how it goes even today.

But I got great help from the American Sociological Association; I've known them for years. It was the office manager of ASA who sent me to the American Statistical Association to talk to Ed Bisgyer about handling our business affairs. And it was Ed who came up with the suggestion that they had room for one more group and ours seemed to fit the bill, as I reported to you in that letter I wrote Ed when he retired [in 1984. The letter appeared as a PAA history vignette, "How Ed Bisgyer and ASA Rescued PAA from Its Business Morass," PAA Affairs, Spring 1985.]

I told Ed, among other things, "Things are burgeoning and we ought to have some kind of flyer that we can stick in the mail, send to universities." It so happened that at NCHS, I had prepared a small flyer--I think they printed a million of them--"What to do when you have a baby." It was to be in doctors' offices; it was handed out free. We were interested in getting mothers to give their doctors or the hospitals, registrars, accurate, complete information on their part of the birth certificates: names, addresses, that sort of thing. So I made a brochure about this size.

VDT: Andy is holding up a brochure: "An invitation to join PAA."

LUNDE: It looked just like this. I wrote out a statement: What is PAA, purpose, publications and so on. Of course, it was different then, but this was essentially it. I typed it out, folded it up, and showed it to Ed Bisgyer. He said, "Yeah, we can publish them." That came out, I'd say, the year Ed took over,

1967.

There was something else. We didn't have very good meeting programs and when I was secretary I said, "Come on, we've got to have decent programs." So we made a program with a hard cover. Also we decided to have pictures on the cover or some design to make it look interesting. They did a great job in San Francisco; they had pictures of the city. [The program cover for the 1964 meeting in San Francisco was a glossy montage, front and back, of colored photos of the city--unique among PAA meeting programs. The program covers for meetings during Andy Lunde's tenure as secretary-treasurer were adorned with sketches of the Statue of Liberty for New York in 1966, a paddle-wheel river boat for Cincinnati in 1967, and a four-masted schooner for Boston in 1968.]

Then something else came up. I said, "Nobody knows what anybody looks like; we don't even know who we are." I don't remember when this first happened, whether Chicago or Boston or somewhere else [Cincinnati meeting, 1967]. But I organized a photographer to come take pictures of the Board.

VDT: First time, and now it's been done every year since. You gave me the photos for the first five or six years, which are not yet in the archives but will go there. Jean Smith has copies of all the others in her PAA files at the American Statistical Association, which recently moved to Alexandria. Someday, I'm going to have copies made of all of those to be sure we have them in the archives. In the last few years, they've been published each year in PAA Affairs. [Jen Suter, PAA Administrator since PAA's business management was transferred to the American Sociological Association in spring 1990, had all the annual Board photos framed. After a showing with other PAA memorabilia at the 1991 60th anniversary meeting in Washington, these photos are displayed along the staircase leading to the PAA office--the first actual office space PAA has ever had--on the top floor of the ASA headquarters on N Street N.W. in Washington, D.C.]

LUNDE: Jean Smith was with us also almost from the beginning, handling the details. But I must say, without Bisgyer, I don't know what we would have done. And they questioned this guy's handling of the operations, about ten or eleven years ago. They had a committee look into it, because they thought he was getting too much or something. I told them, "Frankly, I just don't believe you can get it done any other way or as cheap as this." And sure enough, they decided it was worth that much money. You get more than your dollar's worth with that organization, I can tell you.

VDT: There was another big flap during your time as secretary-treasurer, when the Committee on Organizational Management also recommended that the membership should be broadened to people who weren't pure demographers, there should be two classes of members, small grants for research, and so on. Paul Glick wrote that up well [History vignette, "PAA Committee on Organizational Management: 1966-67," PAA Affairs, Summer 1982]. Ansley Coale, who was to become president [for 1967-68], rose up in wrath and said he would not go along with this.

LUNDE: Yes, there was a big brouhaha about that. I remember the meeting; I don't remember what town it was in [Cincinnati, 1967], where this was proposed as a report from that committee. Ansley Coale threw it right out [wrote an eight-page letter of objection to then president, Paul Glick, before the Cincinnati meeting]. And that was the end of that.

I have another point to make. At the time they were discussing what to do about the PAA business affairs, Forrest Linder had close connections with the University of North Carolina and particularly the School of Public Health and was planning to come here. So at that point, a formal invitation to move the PAA office to the Carolina Population Center came from Moye Freymann. I looked into it carefully, what it would cost, how we would do this and that. But as an alternative to staying in Washington, it didn't seem to be quite the thing, although Moye did offer full office space

and a secretary.

VDT:L Paid for by the university?

LUNDE: Yes. Well, he ran the Carolina Population Center at that time and it was assumed that if we agreed to do it, it would be done that way. But it seemed that the office should be in Washington.

VDT: That seemed more the center of gravity of demographers?

LUNDE: Right.

VDT: How did you become so interested in capturing the early history of PAA? You mentioned that you were interested in history as a student; that might explain in part your historian's perspective. You started the whole project of getting the archives, getting early members to recall . . .

LUNDE: When I became secretary, I met many of the oldtimers.

BREAK HERE

VDT: Andy has a date with Forrest Linder, who is here visiting, and there's a cocktail party shortly, but he's agreed to go on talking a bit about why he became interested in capturing the early history, or any history, of PAA. You've just explained that some of the oldtimers would come by the office when you were secretary-treasurer, including Henry Pratt Fairchild.

LUNDE: Yes, and I met Warren Thompson at Miami, as I told you. I don't remember when Alfred J. Lotka died. I met him and, of course, P.K. Whelpton, and Frank Lorimer and Frank Notestein.

VDT: Tell me about Frank Lorimer. He's the one we don't have much on, although he was such a well-known person and there was his connection with IUSSP. You never got to interview him. He died in New Zealand a few years ago.

LUNDE: How about corresponding with Lincoln Day? He worked with him. I don't have that much to say.

VDT: I don't have to correspond with Linc. His wife Alice lives and works in Washington, so he's frequently there from Australia. [See interview of October 1988 with Lincoln Day, below.]

LUNDE: Frank Notestein, of course, I saw from time to time and he had friends here in Chapel Hill.

VDT: By the way, you moved to Chapel Hill not long after you joined NCHS? You moved down here in 1968?

LUNDE: NCHS at that time, when I was in the Division of Vital Statistics, was interested in developing a program that would improve statistical output by the state offices. President Johnson had signed the comprehensive health bill. It called for a lot of data production by the states and it was felt that the states didn't know sufficiently how to produce or analyze this. Forrest Linder had a committee in Washington to determine how we could give our knowhow to the states. It was decided to establish an in-house training program to which the states could send people. Where would this be? We weren't sure, but Forrest thought it might go into the new office that he was planning down here in Research

Triangle Park. It would house the computer and also this training program.

Well, I worked with this committee quite a bit and we had a number of ideas of how it should run and what it would focus on. But it was a blurred thing. I was invited to represent the Center and Con Taeuber represented the Census Bureau at a big meeting in Washington conducted for government officials and big-business officials on statistics: What government statistics could provide for business; what businesses could do for government statistical offices, that kind of thing. One of the papers had to do with the difference between theoretical and applied statistics. It bounced around in my head and I said, "By George, that's what we've been struggling with; we haven't separated the two in our discussions. We're not interested in theoretical statistics in training, we're interested in applied statistics." So I went back to Linder and said, "Forrest, I have the name of your teaching group, the Applied Statistics Training Institute." Forrest thought that was okay. Of course the acronym was ASTI and Dr. Sagen, who was then his assistant, said, "Just don't call it the National because then you'd get NASTI."

Forrest asked me to come to North Carolina to run this program and that's how I came down here. I came all alone with Eleanor and, I'll be honest with you, for several months I was in a stew trying to figure out how to run this thing. Finally, we developed a bulletin. The first course we taught was on computers and their applications, but the course was demography. These were persons in state statistical offices that had anything to do with demographic statistics, mostly in the health field and mostly in state vital statistics offices, where they were all grouped.

When this started, Dr. Sagen said, "When you train the first 50 chief health statisticians of the states, that will be the end of the program." And I thought when I was developing this program, "We'll have 50 people and we'll be through." But this darn program grew and grew.

I had organized it in the first several months to be very simple so we could teach a two-week, highly intensified course. We'd be able to say to the states, "When they take this course, this is what your people will know." In the morning, we had lectures and demonstrations and, in the afternoon, laboratories where they actually did the work. We didn't have too much money, but we could spend money and get the best kinds of people in the country. We started with Berny Greenberg and his staff here and we got teachers from all over the country. After a course, our staff would discuss what was wrong, did we handle it right, how could we improve it. So the first few months went by and it became a smashing success.

In the next period, we had the courses closer, so when one class would go, another would come. We had deals with the motels around to provide cheap housing for our groups. After three or four years of this, the World Health Organization got interested and asked me to come to Geneva to explain how we did it. Immediately they said, "We can do this kind of thing in developing countries." So they sent a commission over here to live with us for a week as we taught our classes, see how we did it. They wrote a most favorable report. Then it got so big, the states said, "We can't send all the people that we want to send. Is there any chance you can save us airplane tickets from Hawaii, by coming out here to teach?" So we restructured the program. Since we were a federal organization, we could ask the seven regional offices to provide us with space in their federal office buildings. So that's what we did. We moved the classes into the regions and moved the teachers to the classes. It was much cheaper.

VDT: You were running all this?

LUNDE: Yes, I was the director of what's called Office of State Services, NCHS. My assistant was Junior Knee. I left him in Washington to run the public health conference. I was chairperson of the Public Health Conference on Records and Statistics for five years. It's where the registrars of all the states and visitors, mostly officers, from Canada and Mexico and other countries would come to see how things were handled. This is what keeps the vital statistics system going.

VDT: Very interesting. Well, you were saying you met some PAA oldtimers and you were looking at the list of presidents.

LUNDE: Con Taeuber [president 1948-49] is still a very good friend.

VDT: What is Con like as a person to work with? You were never in the same office, but obviously had much professional contact.

LUNDE: We worked on several committees together. Con is a very quiet person, but of course highly intelligent and very knowledgeable. You get used to listening very carefully to what Con has to say, because he usually hits it right on the nose. Con, in addition to being highly knowledgeable, very professional, is a very fine individual--very kind and thoughtful, a very warm person, lovely man. And lots of fun to be with. One time, we were on a trip to Russia from Poland and somehow, after all these strange experiences with the Russian army and God knows what--half the time we expected to be arrested--we wound up in a train car; everybody got together. I don't know whether vodka was involved, but Con started it all, because some friends came to see Con and other people came to see friends. We were in this funny little European compartment on a Russian train and pretty soon it seemed to me there were about 40 people in that thing. Eleanor and I were in it. Somebody took a picture and it looks like those crazy stunts that college students did years ago to see how many people could fit into a telephone booth.

VDT: Do you have a copy of that?

LUNDE: Somebody's got a copy. I think Con sent me a copy.

VDT: You were going to a professional meeting?

LUNDE: Yes, and after the professional meeting, we left Warsaw and went on a big trip to Russia. We went to Lithuania, to St. Petersburg or Leningrad, and to Moscow and back home.

VDT: It's a remarkable family. Con has written a few notes about the "demographic dynasty" of the Taeubers, how the children became involved. He mentioned that they had to stuff envelopes when he was the PAA secretary, around the dining-room table, and that was one way they were weaned early to demography.

LUNDE: Yes, and how Irene worked. I loved talking to Irene [president 1953-54]. I often saw her at meetings and if she was alone, I would saunter over and have dinner with her or something, chat. The last time I talked extensively to her, she was working on a book on the population of China. This was before we could get into China. I said, "Irene, how in the world do you get your information?" She said, "When I go to international conferences, I run into Chinese colleagues and they provide me with information." She used to work in the living-room of their home on cardtables. According to Con, it was very hard; the rule was the kids weren't supposed to touch any of that stuff.

I didn't know Margaret Hagood [president 1954-55] very well. Henry Shryock [1955-56] I still write to; we write to each other at Christmastime, keep in touch. Henry is another very fine fellow. And then Joe Spengler [1956-57]. It's hard for me to remember, but when we talked about demographic subjects, his focus, as you know, was on economics and that was a little apart from my particular kind of interest, but Joe was very broad in his demographic insights. He had a kind of world view of demographic activity, which I find very penetrating. His economic analysis was for many

demographers--outside of those we know now--I guess early on.

VDT: That's right. Even though Notestein had a Ph.D. in economics [social statistics], you could never accuse him of being an economist. And John Durand [president 1961-62].

LUNDE: Then we come to Harold Dorn [1957-58], whom I knew very slightly and then he died early. It was such a blow for many of his friends in the field; they didn't expect it. Dorothy Thomas [1958-59] I met quite a few times. The first time I had a long talk with her, Eleanor and I were invited to a cocktail party at an American Sociological Society meeting in Atlantic City; big excitement, because Marilyn Monroe was queen of the ball that year. She was in a big arcade right in front of our hotel. One other thing that happened. It was reported to the group that a noted sociologist had died, Znanietzki, author of The Polish Peasant in Europe and America. I remember there were several people from Columbia there and they had known this man intimately and were shocked by this news. We were standing on the beach talking about this and Znanietzki walked by!

Dudley Kirk [1959-60] is another great one. Dudley was very good at meetings, always a cool head. When everybody else was losing their mind over Bogue or other problems, Dudley was very sensible, came up with, shall we say, a medium position and set everybody straight. He's a very fine person.

Horace Hamilton [1960-61] was great. I got to know him quite well when he was here. Horace was the greatest demographer for detail; used to write reports for the states you wouldn't believe, had to do with the population expansion along certain city streets. He had the measurement of the macadam on the roads; he'd have the pipes that were running under the road; he had the houses along the road; everything in great detail. He wasn't an economist, but when he wrote a report that had to do with population changes in the city of Raleigh in the state of North Carolina, he threw everything into the report which had to do with what happened when more people appeared on the scene. He was a professor at North Carolina State University in Raleigh. He was very, very good. When he retired, he became a consultant to the Carolina Population Center [at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill] and was there quite a bit. I went to his funeral in Raleigh. I knew Mrs. Hamilton, but I haven't seen her for many years.

One of the things that concerned me about the presidents that I remember was that many of them were interested primarily in their own subject matter and not in the field of demography as a whole. You look at some of the presidential addresses and again and again you will see that what they did was they took their own particular subject, almost as if they took a Ph.D. dissertation.

VDT: They took their own life work. Frankly, I find that rather convenient when I want to get a quick overview of a president's life work before interviewing for this series. I read his/her PAA address. What's the matter with that?

LUNDE: That's all right, except on many occasions there was an opportunity to publicize the field of demography. Maybe somebody would disagree with me . . .

VDT: But he is speaking to other demographers.

LUNDE: But he is also speaking to the nation. You'd be surprised how when you have somebody speaking about a demographic subject, it's picked up by the press and you get a little something. They can talk about their own interests, but broaden it a little bit and talk about the implications for the country as a whole. For years, for example, I wrote the presidents . . . I saw the baby boom happening, first it went up and then down. I said, "What a marvelous thing for a PAA president to talk about the implications of this baby boom." It was in the press all the time. I said, "Gee, why don't they talk

about things like that, that would have a national interest? You'd get on the front page of the New York Times and the Washington Post."

VDT: PAA has never been very good about media coverage except in 1981, our 50th anniversary meeting in Washington, when Cynthia Green and I manned a press office.

LUNDE: That's what you've got to do. But you could get people excited about it, what's happening in demography. And now we've got "demographics," a word that we never heard of in the old days.

All I'm saying is, I don't want to mention any names, but there was one president not so long ago who spoke very narrowly on the subject matter that he or she was involved with at the time.

VDT: I'm glad you're pointing this out, but I thought that was only accepted practice.

LUNDE: That may be, but I thought, "Come on, we're here in the nation's capital, or wherever we are, and there are reporters around and let's talk about something that's happening in the world of demography that will have some kind of special interest that demographers particularly would like to control or problem in the world at large."

VDT: That's fine if you can get a reporter there. There are a few reporters that come on their own. In San Francisco [1986] we had good coverage.

LUNDE: Ron Freedman [1964-65], another scholar and very fine man. Very solid, great. I liked Ron very much.

Then Cal Schmid, 1965-66; I was secretary-treasurer then. I found a problem--had nothing to do with Cal, who was a man in a million, and, by the way, another president who spoke on his particular interest. ["Some Remarks Concerning Contemporary American Demographers and Demography," Population Index, October 1966. The first part of Schmid's presidential address described the PAA membership in text and several graphs, as revealed by responses to questionnaires sent out by Paul Glick, secretary-treasurer in 1962-65, in preparation for the 1965 directory of members. The second part was a general discussion of the current state of demography.] Remember that textbook of his [Handbook of Graphic Presentation, 1954]? He was fascinated by graphic presentations--little figures, histograms. Instead of straight lines, he'd have little pictures, pies. Cal was in the state of Washington and I'm the secretary and want to find out what's going on. We burned the phone lines, but it wasn't the same thing. I found it very hard to organize things with Cal when he was never coming to Washington. I think he showed up at the annual meeting in New York [1966, when he was president]. I realized then it was unfortunate that we didn't have some kind of consistent office and some kind of national presence that would tie people in more frequently. We didn't have enough meetings that the president would attend. At that time, the president was practically an honorary person. I'm sure today, as I've seen it, he's more involved in running things. But in those days it was honorary. Whatever else was done was done by the secretary, who happened to be me and anybody else I could grab for this purpose.

Then Paul Glick was president [1966-67]. Now Paul showed me how things ought to be done. When it was announced after the election that Paul would be president, he set to work and the first day in office, he provided me with a complete list of the chairpersons of all the PAA committees and then some new ones. He had everything lined up. We started to work under some of our presidents maybe by the third month. We started to work under Paul the first day he was president; he had it all organized. It was a great year for the Association.

I wasn't associated with Ansley Coale [1967-68] so much, but Ansley was very good at operating his meetings. With Ansley and Dudley Duncan [1968-69] I was on several committees, but I

was then a member of the Board of Directors.

Under Everett Lee [1969-70], we had a great membership drive and I think that shows up in the records somewhere [1,552 members in 1969; 1,862 in 1970; 2,075 in 1971; 2,377 in 1973]. Everett asked me to be the master of ceremonies at the annual meeting that year [introduce Lee at the presidential address dinner session at the 1970 meeting] and I told the usual jokes; we had a lot of fun. That meeting was in Atlanta.

Then Nathan Keyfitz came on [1970-71]. Nathan and I wrote a paper in those days. Nathan was abroad a lot. I remember that the Women's Caucus was getting very strong. Joan Lingner, who was here at UNC, was one of the leaders. She and I were going to write a book on vital statistics together and she went to Southeast Asia and on the way back through the Philippines, she was there to pick up information for our office of international statistics, and she died there of a heart attack. She was in bed reading at night and in the morning, she didn't show up at this meeting and they went to get her and there she was. Brilliant young woman. I was broken-hearted, because I knew that was the end of that particular project. We had already collaborated on a couple of other publications for the international laboratories here.

VDT: What did Nathan have to do with the Women's Caucus?

LUNDE: It all happened when he was president, at the meeting in Toronto [1972] in that hotel [King Edward] in the bar there, where women were not permitted.

VDT: Keyfitz's meeting was in Washington in 1971.

LUNDE: Okay, it was there. [The Women's Caucus, formed at the Atlanta meeting in 1970, presented several proposals for discussion at the business meeting in 1971.] I'll never forget that Nathan asked me to bone up Robert's Rules of Order for the meeting and there was some big brouhaha and somebody got up and I kept saying to Nathan, sitting beside him on the platform, "Nathan, this man's out of order. Just say he's out of order; get off the subject." Nathan said, "Oh no, this is a democracy, Andy, we have to let everybody talk." I said, "Nathan, he'll talk till midnight." And Nathan let him talk. It went on and on.

Then Art Campbell [1973-74] asked me to be the master of ceremonies at his dinner in 1974 in New York. That period or soon thereafter was when I left the active workplace, although I knew Charlie Nam [1979] and Jay Siegel [1980]. I went down to the University of Florida to give a lecture for Charlie once and Jay, of course, I knew when we were working together at the Census Bureau. But the other presidents I knew only really by name.

VDT: What about Amos Hawley [1971-72]? I'm interviewing him tomorrow.

LUNDE: There's something you should ask Amos, because I'm a little bewildered about it. We had a constitutional committee and Amos and I were on it and we met here. I think this was a significant change in the constitutional by-laws and you should ask Amos about it.

VDT: I think it was that individual members could propose candidates for election. Up to that time, the nominating committee had proposed all candidates.

LUNDE: Well, we had a lot of talk about that and Amos was involved. When I first knew Amos, he was involved in human ecology; had written a textbook on it. Then I met him several times here at meetings, but I haven't seen him for several years, even though we're in the same town.

VDT: It's wonderful to have your recollections of the earlier presidents that you knew. But, as I said, how did you get the feeling that you had to capture some of PAA's history and get started on the archives?

LUNDE: I was talking to some of these older people and I asked around to find out if there were records. When I became secretary I said, "Where are the records?" And there were no records. Some of them were in a funny old file that was being held at the Census Bureau. Then we picked it up--a funny old green metal file about that high, heavy as lead. It was moved over to Ed Bisgyer's office. I looked through it and found page after page of letters from the treasurers to various members, going way back, saying "You haven't paid your dues for 1951," or something. That kind of stuff. I said, "Good grief, where is the documentation for our past?" Very little. There were the constitutional by-laws, one or two things like that. But 80 percent of that file was junk. It was the old carbon paper stuff, pink sheets, onion skins. I said, "We won't throw it away, but we've got nothing."

The first thing I thought of was to write the old presidents and ask if they would tell me what the PAA was like in those days. Then I talked about this to friends in the PAA and they said they'd look through their records to find if they had anything. I found these presidents would write and say, "Gee, I don't have anything, or any records." Out of the blue one day, I got a letter from Ansley Coale saying they had found some stuff at Princeton in the library, did I want it? I said, "Of course." So I got that eventually, but that was a little later.

I thought that maybe the thing to do, since I couldn't seem to get the information by writing, perhaps I ought to snag those that are still around and put it on tape. So I asked Ed Bisgyer if there was any money lying around so I could go out and buy a tape recorder and some spools of tape and do a history by recording voices. So that's how I started. Because when I got the files of PAA which I'd thought would go back to 1932, I found it absolutely empty of information. I couldn't believe it. Most of those files were worthless and had nothing to do with the development of the organization. So I began to collect things. Henry Shryock provided me with something. Con Taeuber provided me with something when Dorothy Thomas died; there wasn't much. Then I put a notice in PAA Affairs. You know how PAA Affairs started.

VDT: Yes, with Abbott Ferriss [secretary-treasurer in 1968-71] writing to members. Then it became a regular newsletter in Jim Brackett's time [secretary-treasurer 1971-75], with Ellen Jamison as editor. She wrote about that [History vignette, "The Story of PAA Affairs," PAA Affairs, Summer 1986].

LUNDE: She did a marvelous job.

VDT: How did you make that list of all the meetings and the number who were there, right from the beginning?

LUNDE: As I got into this, I tried to find out if there was an overall directory of the meetings and people and there wasn't. So I thought what would be the sources: they would be the programs, some of the secretary's records, I could go back through my own and then after that? But before that, we had only a few dates and names. The beginnings were vague. I believe the material I got from Princeton had to do with the early days, so right away I had some important material. Frank Notestein had that.

Then when I came down here, the second time, and retired in 1977, I said, "This is a real project, involves going to Washington, costs money, checking this and that." They said, "Andy, we'll pay your expenses if you'll do it." So I did. I went back to the old files; by that time we'd moved them to Georgetown. That was mostly Con Taeuber's intervention. He was at Georgetown at that time and it was he who introduced me to the archivist.

You asked me what I thought about Con. I'll have to add that Con was very innovative, full of

ideas, very helpful to young demographers, very helpful to his colleagues. If a book were to be written about Con's influence on the field--his work and support of his colleagues--boy, you'd have a big book. He did an awful lot for me through the years in little ways.

VDT: He's doing a lot right now for the historian's role.

LUNDE: He instigated the archives at the Georgetown library. I went over there, found out how they handled things, what they wanted, found out how an archivist thinks. They love every shred of paper. They don't want you to do anything with it; they want to handle it. So I shouldn't throw anything out. So we arranged to deliver everything; first what was left from the old green box, then everything else that came my way. More stuff came as we advertised. I took all my records and you know the rest, how things got in there. I tried to help them sort them out so I knew where things were. And sure enough, within months, Georgetown had a list of how they had filed them. So we had a key immediately.

VDT: I'm afraid not much has been added since then, but you got the basics there. Then all this fed into the wonderful session you had on "The PAA at Age 50" at the 50th anniversary meeting in Washington in 1981. Judith Blake was president that year. Con Taeuber was moderator of the session and you read your paper on "The Beginning of the Population Association of America." Frank Notestein spoke on "Memories of the Early Years of the Association," Frank Lorimer on "How the Demographers Saved the Association," and Clyde Kiser's paper ["The Role of the Milbank Memorial Fund in the Early History of the Association"] was read by Dudley Kirk. [These papers were published in Population Index, Fall 1981].

LUNDE: It's too bad you didn't get the old boys together in a picture.

VDT: I so regret that! At least Con Taeuber got them on tape. It's just terrible to think a photo wasn't done at that time

One last thing. Although you're concentrated on whirligigs, you're obviously still interested in demography because you're involved in the Triangle Population Association, which began a couple of years ago.

LUNDE: Yes, I helped organize that group. They made me its first president.

VDT: Why does North Carolina have so many demographers?

LUNDE: It's mainly the Research Triangle Park and the fact that the universities here all have either statistical offices that are involved in demography or have departments of demography, such as they have at Duke under George Myers. He's now the president of the Triangle population group. And they have a very strong demographic group here at Chapel Hill, the School of Public Health, the Department of Biostatistics has a very strong interest in vital statistics particularly. So there's that element. In the old days, there was Horace Hamilton over at the state university at Raleigh and others, particularly like George now at Duke. Then you have the sociologists and health statisticians here at Chapel Hill.

When we advertised about our meeting, we were surprised to find a number of people who are in these important offices at Research Triangle Park, people connected with IBM, with the various health organizations, environmental health sciences, and now we're getting people interested in so-called demographics who are in the big corporations over there. We are getting people whom we might not have called demographers in the old Princeton days. So that is why you have great interest here in this organization. We don't meet often, because it's just a social organization; we exchange

ideas. We have speakers from the various agencies tell us what they are doing.

ANDERS LUNDE (PAA Secretary-Treasurer 1965-68) and DANIEL PRICE (Secretary-Treasurer 1956-59)

This exchange of reminiscences occurred after lunch at the Lundes' home in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, following individual interviews with Dr. Lunde (April 5, 1988) and Dr. Price (April 6, 1988).

VDT: We're at the Lundes' lovely lunch table and Eleanor is making her excuses and retreating. Andy has reminded me of something he thought Dan Price should talk about. During your term of office, Andy, there was the Linder Committee on Organizational Management of PAA.

LUNDE: Among the participants in this committee were Dr. Linder, representing the National Center for Health Statistics, and Dr. Taeuber, representing the Census Bureau. One day they were talking about the office of the secretary-treasurer and they both agreed that for various reasons--I don't know what reasons were uppermost; perhaps it was the secretary or perhaps simply organizational, or perhaps it wasn't legal to carry on this way--they both agreed that the Census Bureau, which had supported the office of secretary for some time, and the National Center for Health Statistics, which had done the same for me, could not continue in this way. So it was at that point that Linder asked me to investigate how other societies operated and how they maintained an office, even though they may have been small groups. Eventually I wound up with the American Statistical Association and Ed Bisgyer. My question to you was to be sure to ask Dan what the arrangement was when he was secretary. I was secretary and had my office in the National Center for Health Statistics. Glick was secretary and had his office in the Census Bureau. What I wanted to ask Dan was, Where were you?

PRICE: Jean asked me how I came to be secretary, because I was one of the first ones out of Washington. Hugh Carter had been ahead of me [1953-56. Carter was Chief of the Marriage and Divorce Statistics Branch of the Division of Vital Statistics, then a part of the Census Bureau and later transferred to the National Center for Health Statistics when it was formed about 1962.] I told her that I vaguely recalled that there had been pressure in the government that they could no longer support these sorts of professional offices.

LUNDE: Even during Carter's period?

PRICE: I recall that was the reason and they got me to take it. Actually, the Institute for Research in Social Science [at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill] helped support it with me. Of course, it was a much smaller operation then. They provided secretarial help and, eventually, bookkeeping service. There's a story on the bookkeeping service. When I was finishing up, Horace Hamilton was appointed auditor to audit the books. I had everything all balanced out and Horace went through them and said, "Dan, where'd you get this figure?" It turned out there was an error. I finally entered an amount, I think it was \$43, "for purpose of balancing the books."

LUNDE: The pressure became rather intense when I was secretary because of these added numbers of members. Then there was the year Rockefeller [Foundation] gave us--was it several hundred thousand

dollars?--to send members to the IUSSP World Population Conference in Belgrade [1965]. As secretary-treasurer, I had the responsibility of doling this out. I had the applications from members on my desk and I had to go through them and determine whether or not they would be receiving the Rockefeller money or the Public Health Service money, because it had also put in money for these trips. Actually I was able to fill all of the applications, but it took an awfully long time and, of course, I had reports in triplicate to the Public Health Service. There was trouble with that, because if you moved them by the Public Health Service, you had to send them by American flag carrier. I put that news out as quickly as I got it straight. I remember getting an excited telephone call from Georges Sabagh. He was in California and had his family already on a Greek tramp steamer, taking the long way round. He was always one for squeezing the most mileage out of the travel dollar. He said, "What am I going to do, I've got this Public Health Service money?" I said, "Oh, my gosh, but go, Georges, and we'll cover you some way." This kind of thing was enough to tear you apart. At the end, before I left for Belgrade myself, I had all the figures laid out and had a report for the Public Health Service and I sent a report to New York to Rockefeller and, I must say, I was very happy to receive a wonderful letter from Rockefeller, saying they had checked my information and found it to be completely correct. I hated to spend that kind of money; I had a feeling of responsibility for public funds. It worked out all right, but Linder had to provide me with extra assistance then.

PRICE: The real chore during my term [1956-59] was when the Population Association got one of its first outside grants for the Committee on Population Statistics. I remember when Con and Irene Taeuber came down and met with Rupert Vance and me and we had lunch out here at the Pines and were kicking around the idea of establishing that committee, which Con wanted to establish.

VDT: He wrote a vignette on that committee for PAA Affairs ["PAA Committee on Population Statistics," PAA Affairs, Winter 1982]. It started with that lunch.

PRICE: We got a chunk of money for the use of COPS. I was handling it and I was insisting to the Association that the secretary-treasurer should be bonded. They were unwilling to do it. Have they ever?

LUNDE: Yes, I did it once.

VDT: What does bonding mean?

PRICE: It means if you abscond with the money, the Association doesn't lose it.

LUNDE: In my second year as secretary-treasurer, I also had an audit. They had three members of the Association come over and I'll never forget that they found \$300 missing. I didn't know why I had overlooked it myself. I checked it out and it was true, there was \$300 missing. I couldn't believe it. I sat around with my head in my hands trying to think. And my little secretary came in, very sheepish, and said, "I forgot to give you this last month," and she put down a deposit slip for \$300. We had memberships coming in the windows on some days. I would ask for extra assistance and never got it. I'd make a record of these incoming checks and ask my secretary to deposit them at Riggs Bank during her lunch hour. I didn't get a receipt for that one. It was all right in the end.

PRICE: I was keeping the books and when I became director of the Institute, I transferred the bookkeeping to the secretary and she just fouled them up.

VDT: It must have been particularly difficult there. You couldn't trade in on the government.

LUNDE: All of that disappeared when we were able to get the Statistical Association to take over the work. Then the secretary could think a bit about what else he ought to be doing. We'd never been free to add a heck of a lot to the organization itself. We were just record-keepers.

PRICE: You were supposed to remind the president to do something.

VDT: Jim Brackett [secretary-treasurer 1971-75], whom I interviewed a few weeks ago, feels the secretary-treasurer is the most powerful post in the Association because it continues three [four, in Brackett's case] years. The president changes every year.

LUNDE: Dan, didn't you feel in those early days that for many presidents the job was simply an honorary job?

PRICE: Yes.

LUNDE: They were given the job and they didn't do anything. I found that to be true at first. It wasn't expected that the president do anything special, have a leadership role. That's changed.

VDT: How has that changed? Do you think recent presidents really do influence policy?

LUNDE: I have that impression. I think that even during the period I was secretary, the Board meetings became more meaningful and had more significance--especially as the problems of an increased membership grew, what should the policy be?--and Demography, the journal. More committees.

PRICE: The president does influence these committees and what they take up.

LUNDE: And the president is the one in the end who nominates the chairpersons of these committees. That is a role of long-standing influence. That's their important role.

Some presidents like Paul Glick, as I mentioned yesterday, would start to work the day after they were elected. Glick had a complete roster of chairpersons and members of major committees ready. Some presidents never got around to that, took time to get organized. And some presidents never did anything, in those days. Dan is right about committees and especially committees connected with finance and with publications. All of this takes a lot of time. It's a great responsibility.

PRICE: I think that grant to COPS was the first outside money that the Association had had. This was 25 or 30 thousand dollars; the first large money. [Taeuber, in the vignette on COPS cited above, states: "The official year of birth is 1962, for it was in that year that the Population Council made a grant of \$8,000 for a period of three years to support the work of a PAA Committee on Population Statistics.] I guess some of the foundations put money in at times for special needs. Of course, they've always supported Population Index. [Richard Hankinson, editor of Population Index, stated in a history vignette on "Fifty Years of Population Index," published in PAA Affairs, Winter 1983, that "NICHD has supported much of the cost of preparing the bibliographic records for the Index for many years." Also, "some additional financial support" had been received from USAID to help the Index contribute "to the computerized information data base POPLINE, available through the National Library of Medicine." No non-governmental sources of outside funding were mentioned, beyond the first few years of Index.]

LUNDE: COPS is one of the most significant committees that was ever developed by the Population

Association.

VDT: There's now concern about data to come from the 1990 census. PAA members have always had a part in the census. Then there was the more political stance they took with the development of the Public Affairs Committee. That's now one of the strongest committees. Al Hermalin wrote a PAA Affairs vignette on the beginnings of the Public Affairs Committee ["Formation of the Public Affairs Committee, PAA Affairs, Winter 1984].

LUNDE: Dan, do you know why it went back to Washington; why the Census Bureau undertook to support Paul Glick when he became secretary-treasurer?

PRICE: My guess is simply a change in policy or change in personnel in Washington.

VDT: Did you go on the Board of Directors, Dan, after you were secretary-treasurer?

PRICE: I think I did. I was on the Board of Directors before then. I remember I was on the Board of Directors when they counted the ballots when Irene Taeuber was elected president. That was in 1953. That was the first female president.

VDT: Exciting! Then she was followed immediately by Margaret Hagood.

PRICE: In fact, they were both candidates at that point. It was a question which one would be elected.

VDT: There were three strong women presidents almost in a row: Irene Taeuber [1953-54], Margaret Hagood [1954-55], and Dorothy Thomas [1958-59]. Then there was a huge gap until women came in again: Evelyn Kitagawa [1977], Judith Blake [1981], and Jane Menken [1985]. Of course, we're going to have Dan's prize student, Harriet Presser, next year [1989]. What explains the big gap in between? Andy, you were always great on women, because you encouraged the Women's Caucus.

LUNDE: At one point I wasn't doing too well. Dan, do you remember Joan Lingner who worked here for a while with Linder?

PRICE: I knew her name.

LUNDE: At some meeting I was addressing an issue and I looked at Joan and two or three of the other ladies there and said, "Now, you girls know that this is how it ought to be." Well, immediately these three ladies surrounded me and said, "Andy, look, your ideas are great but please, we are not to be called girls." This was in the early 1970s.

PRICE: I remember when I was a candidate for president, I got a letter from the Women's Caucus saying they could not support my candidacy. And I never knew why!

VDT: That's unfair. That must have been in the 1970s. The Women's Caucus was formed after the Toronto meeting in 1972. [No. It was formed at the Atlanta meeting in 1970, "in response to feminist concern within the organization about the status of women in the profession and the status of women's issues in the population field," according to Harriet Presser in a vignette on the "Women's Caucus of PAA," PAA Affairs, Winter 1981.]

LUNDE: It was at the Toronto meeting that I happened to make that statement to the ladies.

VDT: Women were particularly hyper in 1972. Dan, do you suppose the Women's Caucus not supporting you had something to do with your being a man from out of the South--they didn't trust Southern men?

PRICE: I don't know.

VDT: Of course, women are still in the minority in PAA and in demography.

PRICE: PAA has had more female presidents than any national professional association I know of.

VDT: Harriet Presser will be the seventh. That's not far along in nearly 60 years.

PRICE: That's more than most. I guess the Statistical Association has had half a dozen.

VDT: Andy's going to make a last remark.

LUNDE: I wanted to tell you after you left yesterday that you're doing a wonderful job as the historian. You'll know more about the history of PAA than anyone.

VDT: Thank you, but that wasn't it. I wanted to ask you something that I'm not privy to; you two can tell me secretly. Does anything go on at Board meetings that I ought to know about?

LUNDE: I started to tell you yesterday and I thought, no sense leaving bad feelings, so I skipped over some of those things.

VDT: At times there are acrimonious Board of Directors meetings?

LUNDE: Oh yes.

PRICE: One of the interesting things to me about Board meetings--I wasn't on the Board then--was when PAA met here [Chapel Hill, 1951] under Rupert Vance [local arrangements chairperson that year]. That was when the directors elected the officers. I've forgotten who the two candidates were that the nominating committee had nominated, but when they were presented, somebody on the Board nominated Rupert Vance from the floor and he was elected president. He'd never been nominated!

LUNDE: That reminds me of something. Remember I told you about Dr. Herbert Bloch of St. Lawrence who wound up as research director of Brooklyn University? I went to a sociological meeting in Washington with Dr. Bloch many years ago and there was Rupert Vance, in a wheelchair. Herb ran over and they hugged. They had been to college together. Somehow I had never known this.

VDT: It's a pretty intertwined profession--sociologists, and demographers even more so. In this very select sample of those of you have been in key positions in PAA, it's bound to be that you intertwine, influence each other in one way or another.

LUNDE: Yes, it was fun to meet these people and get to know them a bit. It's a unique experience to be a secretary-treasurer, which Dan points out, is for a three-year period. So they come and go and you get to know these wonderful people.

VDT: My first experience at meeting the demographic VIPs was as rapporteur for the planning meetings at Georgetown University for the National Survey of Family Growth, which brought in demographic "greats." Andy, I didn't ask you this question, though it's on the record. You were one of the first to have the idea of the National Survey of Family Growth, weren't you--in the mid-1960s?

LUNDE: Well, since there was no activity in this area [demise of Growth of American Family studies after 1960], we were talking about having the federal government take it on, which it eventually did. Yes, I was chairperson of a committee of the National Center for Health Statistics. This committee had the support of the Surgeon-General. Art Campbell and Monroe Sirken were on it, plus three or four others and a couple of visitors from the Census Bureau. We actually laid out a program, mostly with Arthur Campbell's help, of how we should schedule this. Because the federal government gives you a budget and assumes that it's going to be spent over a certain period of time and here with this survey, we had a lengthy continuous activity. We had to be careful how we spaced this according to the money we would get. And we worked it out and made a brief report.

Then the Center was suddenly without a nickel and nothing could be budgeted. That was the end of that; that was a big disappointment. But the idea was still there and continued to be mentioned off and on and, eventually, when the Center did have funds, the office was created [in 1971], under Bill Pratt. I tried to hire him years ago to be in Marriage and Divorce [branch of NCHS]. I think we even went out to Los Angeles or someplace to have an interview with him. I'm talking years ago. The only job we had was in Marriage and Divorce. He didn't want that.

VDT: Now he's in an interesting position, with the NSFG all these years, even though it's not been repeated every other year, as originally planned. And Marriage and Divorce has been under Barbara Wilson all these years and now they're threatening to cut it out!

LUNDE: Yes, I wrote a letter. Well, first I called the Center to find out what was going on and I got the impression they may get from CDC [Centers for Disease Control]. The problem is . . . For many years this has happened, when the Center is under pressure and something has to give, everybody looks at Marriage and Divorce, to get rid of that. I got really upset, because that office only costs about \$500,000 a year for everything: paying the states to receive the information, follow-up, and then getting it published. It occurred to me that again we would be the only country in the Western world not to have this kind of information.

So I sat down and wrote a hot letter to my local representative, David Price, and I got a very nice letter back from him saying his associates had called the Center to get the story straight and he was happy to let me know that they were going to be funded the next year. David Price--no relation to Dan--was professor of political science at Duke, head of the Democratic state organization. Really knows his stuff. His specialty is congressional committees, so he's a good congressman.

ABBOTT L. FERRISS

PAA Secretary-Treasurer in 1968-71 (No. 13). Interview with Jean van der Tak on April 18, 1988, at the airport of Atlanta, Georgia. (Jean was en route to the 1988 PAA meeting in New Orleans).

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS: Abbott Ferris was born in Jamestown, Missouri. He received a bachelor's degree in journalism from the University of Missouri in 1937 and the M.A. and Ph.D. in sociology from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1943 and 1950, respectively. In 1949-51, he was an assistant professor of sociology at Vanderbilt University and from 1951 to 1957, he was a sociologist with the Air Force, at the Human Resources Research Institute in Montgomery, Alabama, and later at Randolph Field in San Antonio, Texas. In 1957 he joined the Census Bureau in Washington, D.C., where he was Chief of the Health Statistics Division in 1957-59 and then detailed to work on the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission under Laurence Rockefeller. He was with the National Science Foundation from 1962 to 1964, the U.S. Office of Economic and Manpower Studies from 1964 to 1967, and the Russell Sage Foundation from 1967 to 1970, all in Washington. In 1970 he went to Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, where he was Chairman of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology until 1976 and also Professor of Sociology until his retirement in 1982. His publications relevant to demography include articles on U.S. internal migration and marriage and the monographs Indicators of Trends in the Status of American Women (1971), Indicators of Change in the American Family (date), Indicators of Trends in American Education (date), and Research and the 1970 Census (editor, 1971).

VDT: How did you first become interested in demography, or sociology? I see you have marvelous notes with you.

FERRISS: I became first interested in sociology upon touring Mississippi, in 1939, collecting folksongs for the Library of Congress. I became interested in the cultural differences and folkways in the state and particularly the poverty of the people. I became motivated to try to find a way to bring about change to improve the lot of the Negro and the welfare of the people of the state. The Southern Regions of the United States by Howard Odum of the University of North Carolina had recently been published and I was impressed by the data he had in there. This led me eventually to go up to North Carolina, where I plunged into analyzing statistics, though I didn't have an adequate background to do it at that time. But Eleanor Bernert [Sheldon] was there and she showed me a few tricks with a Monroe calculator.

I began working on a level-of-living index for rural Mississippi and rural North Carolina. This followed the steps that Monty [Margaret] Hagood had laid out for developing these indexes; it involved factor analysis.

VDT: Was Margaret Hagood still at the University of North Carolina at that time?

FERRISS: She left shortly after I arrived and went to the Department of Agriculture in Washington; that was about 1942. I finished my thesis and then went into the service.

VDT: What was your [master's] thesis about?

FERRISS: My thesis was on part-time farming in North Carolina. This factor analysis that I mentioned became part of it. The part-time farming was an interview survey I did in rural areas out in Alamance County, not too far from Chapel Hill. That study was published [May 1948] in Social

Forces. It was rather primitive; the data were gathered with little faculty guidance because there were not an awful lot of faculty around during this early wartime year.

VDT: Who did you do your work with?

FERRISS: Odum was my designated adviser but I did my work with Miss Herring. She was an expert in the cotton industry in North Carolina, mills and things like that. My thesis tied into that mills culture.

When I returned to Chapel Hill in 1946 after serving in China with the Army Air Corps, I plunged into the study of statistics and population. At Chapel Hill they had recently organized a theoretical statistical program under Harold Hotelling, a very well-known statistician, and Dorothy Cox over at North Carolina State [Raleigh] had a new applied statistics program. So I took a minor for the Ph.D. in statistics. In population I worked with Rupert Vance and Horace Hamilton; Hamilton was at North Carolina State. Still interested in hard data, I saw an opportunity to examine the effect of regional differences on the distribution of trade centers in North Carolina through use of Dun and Bradstreet data on the location of businesses over time. The sociology department gave me the opportunity to learn to teach by handling one class of the swarm of students then on the campus, and I used the income from this to engage a lady to code data from Dun and Bradstreet volumes onto work sheets. I developed a dissertation on the basis of these data and finished writing it during my first year at Vanderbilt as a full-time teacher.

The Agricultural Experiment Station in Raleigh published a little bulletin called "How Far to Town?" based on my dissertation. The idea was that these were small trade centers ecologically distributed around in rural areas; they weren't right in town. Honey Hobbs of the faculty of the sociology department at Chapel Hill published extracts from my M.A. thesis in his North Carolina Economic and Social Newsletter. With these publications and census and ecological data, which the Dun and Bradstreet data were, I thought I was on my way.

VDT: Sounds like you were!

FERRISS: I didn't stay very long at Vanderbilt, because \$2,800 a year didn't go far enough to take care of my growing family. I'd been married before the war. So I doubled my salary by moving to a research position with the Human Resources Research Institute of the Air Force in Montgomery, Alabama.

However, my devotion to hard data was to remain with me and eventually, some seven years later, I found myself in Washington as Chief of the Health Statistics Branch at the Bureau of the Census and through contacts with Paul Glick and others I eventually was spotted to be secretary-treasurer of PAA.

This came about because Paul Glick [PAA president 1966-67] observed my work as secretary-treasurer of the District of Columbia Sociological Society. He and Anders Lunde [PAA secretary-treasurer 1965-68] had arranged with the American Statistical Association to look after the membership and financial records of the PAA. So I was the first PAA secretary-treasurer who did not have to spend endless hours keeping records of dues paid and bills paid and the burdensome detail of the annual meetings. Ed Bisgyer did this. I sent him the bills that came to my attention and he returned checks for my signature. Later, even check-signing was delegated to Bisgyer.

VDT: At the time you were secretary-treasurer, weren't you in New York with the Russell Sage Foundation?

FERRISS: I was working for the Russell Sage Foundation, but they had an office in Washington at

the Brookings Institution and that's where I worked. The work I was doing with them involved assembling data for social indicators, which required contact with a lot of government agencies, particularly the Census Bureau and other agencies that processed census data. So that was the reason Russell Sage had the office in Washington, which was in connection with the Social Science Research Council office and the Brookings Institution.

VDT: I want to go back to your work on social indicators, but let's go on with PAA.

FERRISS: With the troublesome details of the PAA secretary-treasurer's office out of the way, I could devote attention to scheduling events which led up to the annual meeting, to distributing news about population developments or about committee meetings, and spend some time prompting officers and committee chairs that it was time to submit a report or make an appointment or whatever.

As secretary-treasurer of DCSS [D.C. Sociological Society], I had initiated a newsletter, The Sociologist, which was named after the first regularly published sociological journal, which was begun by Albert Chavannes in Knoxville, Tennessee, about 1882. I used the original masthead that Chavannes used for the DCSS newsletter.

VDT: I was editor of the DCSS Sociologist at one time, so I know about the origin of the name; it's still The Sociologist. It was Paul Glick who put the finger on me to become the editor of that newsletter.

FERRISS: Did you change the masthead?

VDT: It got changed before my time. Now, of course, the newsletter is all computerized and looks very different.

FERRISS: That experience helped me to understand the function that an active newsletter could perform for an organization. So it was logical to institutionalize the distribution of information on meetings, elections, programs, committee activities, etc., into a newsletter, which I dubbed PAA Affairs. Incidentally, Ed Bisgyer, seeing what PAA Affairs did for the Population Association, initiated AMSTAT News, the newsletter of the American Statistical Association. That newsletter has become quite successful in making money for ASA, because of ASA's large membership and the interest that booksellers and computer distributors have in getting business with statisticians. I think that PAA could get some of that now too.

VDT: You recall that a couple of years ago Ellen Jamison wrote on "The Story of PAA Affairs" [PAA Affairs, Summer 1986]. She was the first official editor. You started the whole thing with your communications to members called, "PAA Affairs." Then when Jim Brackett came in as secretary-treasurer [1971-75], he was not about to do as much work as you had done and realized this should become a regular newsletter, published four times a year, with Ellen as the first official editor. Sometimes you had seven communications a year that were called "PAA Affairs."

FERRISS: I don't think that's right; I think it was quarterly. Andy Lunde gave me a schedule of events and communications that we needed to send to the members and it was a quarterly arrangement. I don't recall extra communications.

Another fact that made my tenure as secretary-treasurer possible was the flexibility of my employment with the Russell Sage Foundation in Washington. That was a research position and it was possible to pause at any time of the day to tend to whatever PAA matter might arise.

VDT: Did you have a secretary at Sage who was as long-suffering and obliging as secretaries of other PAA secretary-treasurers have been?

FERRISS: Yes, she helped out, of course. To set me off on my duties, as I mentioned, Andy Lunde gave me a schedule of mailings, which was July, November, January, and March; this schedule was dated November 17, 1967. These mailings were in the form of letters or notices. "Cover letter contains brief highlights of the annual meeting, business meeting, and meetings of the Board, etc." This was supposed to be in the July letter. I also had a list of the secretary-treasurer's duties.

My first PAA Affairs came out in July 1968. It included a list of officers, instruction on the direction of PAA correspondence to the ASA, a statement of the membership criteria for PAA, a report of the April 1968 annual business meeting in Boston, where Ansley Coale had presided as president, an announcement of the 1969 and 1970 annual meetings, announcement of the 1968 PAA Directory, a report of Charles Nam's Committee on Population Statistics 1967-68, a "Proposal for the Advancement of Demography" by Ansley Coale, an announcement of a meeting of the publications committee where Clyde Kiser was chair, an announcement of the transition in submitting manuscripts to Demography from Donald Bogue to Beverly Duncan, the new Demography editor, a list of publications received, and a report on research opportunities at the National Archives and Records Service from a meeting which I had attended with Everett Lee.

As time provided additional experience in assembling PAA Affairs, these types of news items persisted and others were added. One important addition was to announce federal sources of funds for demographic research, which I got together with considerable telephoning and consulting with agencies in Washington. COPS, the PAA Committee on Population Statistics, was an important committee and its activities were frequently reported. The employment exchange was added when applicants or vacancies were announced; constitutional revisions and proposals for such were carried; announcements of meetings of other societies, such the International Statistical Institute, were included; messages from the PAA president and committee chairs; balloting and biographies of candidates. But the original content of PAA Affairs continued in later editions with little variation and few additions.

I began as secretary-treasurer at Ansley Coale's final meeting as president [PAA annual meeting in Boston, April 1968]. Actually, Andy Lunde was secretary-treasurer at that time, but I was being initiated. Then I served under Dudley Duncan [president 1968-69], Everett Lee [1969-70], and Nathan Keyfitz [1970-71].

The most trying activity of the office was recording the minutes of the Board meetings. I attempted to write as fast as I could, in a kind of abbreviation of words, which sometimes led me to wonder later what I had written. In trying to record everything in its actual detail, I overburdened myself during these annual meetings. I understand that now there's a shorthand secretary present to record the necessary detail of motions and actions of the Board, which should be a great relief to the secretary-treasurer. Following a meeting of the Board, I would retire to my hotel room and go over the notes, drawing up minutes of the meeting for later typing. Andy Lunde had suggested this as the best procedure.

I was rather brash and forward in my duties and I began to initiate suggestions to the presidents and others as to what they should do or prompt them that it was time to make appointments or whatever. I do not know how each of the presidents took this. My relations with Everett Lee were perhaps more open and direct than with the others, probably because of his personality, I suppose. He and I went to New York on one occasion, seeking support for various PAA activities from the Ford Foundation and the Population Council. I believe we submitted one proposal and received funds, \$75,460, from the Population Council in support of various PAA activities: support for COPS activities and for the Committee on Recruitment and Training of Demographers for a careers pamphlet and a directory of training centers. These funds were granted during my last year as secretary-treasurer and the only project I actually worked on was the careers pamphlet, which I helped develop and eventually

saw to publication in 1971.

VDT: That was the first of the careers pamphlets?

FERRISS: Yes. Later on they revised it and put out others, but I had a committee of which I was chairman that helped write the text of it.

PAA had previously received funds from the National Science Foundation to help with the journal Demography and later, I believe, from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Center for Population Research. But Everett and I were proud of having helped develop the proposal for the Population Council grant.

Another example of my brashness as secretary-treasurer was a letter I wrote to Christopher Tietze when he was [first] vice-president and thus responsible for the program of the upcoming meeting in 1971 [Washington, D.C.]. I wrote him that Dan Price was preparing a "Guide to the Chairman of the Program Committee," which he might avail himself of, and I outlined to him the dates he should schedule as deadlines for developing the program.

VDT: Did he stick to them?

FERRISS: Oh yes, he came out with a very nice program. My later experience with other organizations, especially the Southern Sociological Society, verifies the importance, however, of keeping officers informed of what their duties are and of deadlines, for often the office may be the first and only occasion for many of them doing that sort of thing and the experience of the secretary-treasurer's office is very important, I think, in prodding them to get these things done. Nathan Keyfitz, in fact, would telephone me from California and ask, "What am I supposed to do now?" He asked me this question partly because I had developed, I suppose, a small reputation of trying to run things. At any rate, it was very good working with him.

Another activity which was given to me in the spring of 1970 was membership on a committee to select a PAA member to receive the Winston Churchill Training Fellowship from the English-Speaking Union. They wanted to send a demographer to England to give him some experience there and they asked PAA to select such a person. The president designated Rupert Vance to chair the committee to make the selection and I was helping Rupert do this. We received several applications, some of which proposed activities which were not in keeping with the guidelines laid down by the English-Speaking Union. We finally settled upon William Pendleton from Emory University. He was to visit Cambridge University, the London School of Economics, the British Museum, and the University of Edinburgh. The appointment by the English-Speaking Union worked out quite satisfactorily for their purposes, because Pendleton has continued to visit England and Scotland almost every summer since then and has developed research projects there. By a peculiar turn of fate, Pendleton left in September 1970 for his venture in England and I was able to rent his house for the first three months of my tenure in my new job as Chairman of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Emory University.

Another enterprise in which I was engaged was to assist the committee making selections of applicants to attend the London meeting [September 1969] of the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population. John Durand was chair of this task force and we had funds to support transportation from the Population Council. John came to Washington for the final selection step and we reviewed the accounts. It was no simple task because some applicants were receiving some travel support from their universities and wanted only partial support, so it was a matter of juggling funds around. At the end, there was a small amount left over. John proposed that, owing to my services to the committee, I apply for transportation to the meeting. At the time, I was attempting to complete a book on the status of women [Indicators of Trends in the Status of American Women, 1971] and I was

facing a deadline and could not spare the time. So I was disappointed to have to decline John's kind offer.

Another task that required considerable administrative work was assembling an agenda for the Board of Directors meetings at the annual PAA meetings and distributing them in time for them to make their plans. This required obtaining directions from the president and getting financial statements from ASA, making certain that reports from committees would be available to the Board, and--most important of all--making certain that no person who needed to make a report to the Board would be overlooked.

At the annual meeting, the problem always arose as to how much to relate at the membership business meeting of the actions of the Board and how many committee chairs to have present their reports to the business meeting, which ones should be called upon to make these reports, and making certain that everyone was informed and was present. The secretary's job was to see that the business meeting came off with dispatch. My recollection is that all of them went fairly well except the final one, which was chaired by Nathan Keyfitz [as PAA president]. This was on April 23rd, 1971. The record, I suppose, will show the nature of the difficulty, but as I recall, resolutions were being considered which had been offered by various activist groups. The procedure was that the resolutions should be offered first to the Board, which reviewed them and might modify them or make other recommendations if the Board so desired. My job was to present these alternatives for the vote, at the instance of the president. Some of the audience objected to some of the procedures which we were following on this occasion. Andy Lunde later said that the problem arose because of Nathan's weak eyes, which made it difficult for him to see and recognize people in the audience. But I think part of the difficulty arose from my presentation of the alternative resolutions.

VDT: What do you mean by that?

FERRISS: Well, the alternative resolutions had to be read and presented to them and then they were supposed to vote on them. Some confusion arose. In any event, all parties survived and PAA moved on to more significant considerations.

When I decided to go to Atlanta beginning in August 1970, the question arose as to whether I should resign the secretary-treasureship after being in that office only two years, rather than serve the usual three years, owing to my being removed from Washington. I decided to retain the office and demonstrated, I think, that the secretary-treasurer could function just as effectively away from Washington as living there and being in close proximity to the ASA office.

VDT: You had had predecessors who had lived away from Washington at the time there wasn't so much business. I interviewed Dan Price [secretary-treasurer 1956-59] a couple of weeks ago and he had been in North Carolina and functioned okay then, but there wasn't so much business.

FERRISS: Well, the point was that the ASA office could communicate with the secretary-treasurer by mail and telephone and could work just as effectively as when the secretary-treasurer was there in Washington.

Another function of ASA was to preserve the PAA records. As secretary-treasurer, I made certain that committee reports and minutes were all bound properly and deposited with the ASA for the archives, which at that time were kept by the ASA. Now, I understand, the archives are at Georgetown University. This practice of binding all the reports in a single annual volume is a very important function, I think.

VDT: I wonder if it's still done. Frankly, I don't remember such bound volumes in the Georgetown archives, but I'll look into that.

FERRISS: During my close contact with the affairs of PAA, the question seemed to be a continuous one of maintaining the membership. There were those who thought membership should not expand numerically, but should merely depend upon the acquisition of those persons whose devotion to demography was engendered through their academic teaching and research interests in demography. And there were others who were not quite so pure about it, who wanted to see the membership expand, irrespective of commitment to the demographic method and so forth. I was interested in seeing the membership expand without too much thought about what type of members we would be acquiring. But I thought some people thought that people in family planning and people who were activists, population control and that sort of thing, if we got too many of those they might take control over the organization and the old-line demographers didn't want to see this happen.

VDT: There has been battle with the family planners since the beginning. As you know, Margaret Sanger was asked not to run for vice-president at the very beginning, though she had helped call together the first meeting.

FERRISS: Well then, there's a long history of that. I did what I could to try to increase the membership.

VDT: What were your tactics?

FERRISS: We worked out a little brochure on the advantages of membership, setting forth the aims, inviting people to join. Then we had membership committees and I tried to stimulate them to promote membership.

VDT: Did you have any mailings of that brochure?

FERRISS: Yes, we would do that. I suppose that family planners and other activists in the population control area are members of PAA, but they don't seem to have dominated the organization. They have other outlets for their programs, in any case.

As I look back on my experience as secretary-treasurer, I feel that it was a completely satisfying and beneficial experience for me personally. While I devoted considerable effort to the job, particularly at the time of the annual meetings and in preparing issues of PAA Affairs, the benefit to me personally was in association with the officers and committee chairpersons of PAA, who proved to be wonderful, stimulating colleagues.

My own contribution to demography has not amounted to very much. I've made a few studies of migration, especially migration of graduate students and faculty in connection with my work at the National Science Foundation [e.g., "Predicting Graduate Student Migration," Social Forces, 1965]. My study of outdoor recreation [with the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, 1959-62] would not be judged to be demography, although Everett Lee has always claimed that his definition of demography is whatever he might be engaged in at the time. I edited a volume of papers on Research and the 1970 Census [1971].

VDT: What was that about?

FERRISS: It was assembled by a group of people at the Oak Ridge Laboratory, Tennessee, to talk about research plans for different areas of the 1970 census.

VDT: Was this before or after the census?

FERRISS: I think it was the summer of 1970. The idea was to see what research could be done with the data collected; Everett Lee invited the people to come and I edited the volume of proceedings. I doubt that the volume had much influence on demographic research, but it was an interesting exercise and I enjoyed doing it.

I've already mentioned the little pamphlet on "Careers in Demography," published by PAA.

VDT: You did such a good job with the first one that it was years before it was updated. They finally got a new one out a couple of years ago.

FERRISS: Well, it was probably because they printed a lot of them and had to get rid of them.

If it could be considered demographic, my work on U.S. social indicators was probably my most substantial contribution.

VDT: Yes, it certainly is.

FERRISS: The Indicators of Trends in the Status of American Women [1971], Indicators of Change in the American Family [date?], and Indicators of Trends in American Education [date?]-those were the volumes. I also edited an issue of Social Indicators Research on "The Federal Effort in the Development of Social Indicators" [date?]. In addition to these publications, I've done some studies of demographic data relative to education, which have not been published.

My present commitment to social indicators, however, touches continuously on demographic data. And I do not consider that I have retired from the field, even though I retired from teaching five years ago.

VDT: Well, that's marvelous. You have covered practically everything I had on my list. I did indeed want to ask you about your work on social indicators. When did you do your work on the three volumes you just mentioned?

FERRISS: They were done while I was working with the Russell Sage Foundation in Washington and published by Russell Sage; one was published after I got to Emory.

I now publish a quarterly newsletter called SINET, the "Social Indicators Network News." It is distributed to 25 foreign countries and has a fair circulation in the United States and Canada.

VDT: That's important; I know about that. I think you are a particularly good editor. You were also editor of the D.C. Sociological Society newsletter, as you mentioned. You started PAA Affairs. I know you also as the editor of another "Sociologist," The Southern Sociologist, which was an inspiration to me as also editor for the D.C. Sociological Society and also in my job as PAA historian. I happen to have this issue with me [The Southern Sociologist, Spring 1984] and you have a good nose for history, because there was an article in here about the second Southern Sociological Society president, Wilson Gee, in a series called "SSS Historymakers." Also you had in there something about how to make a history of a sociology department. There was one issue with an article on how to go about making a history of the profession, and that, of course, is important to PAA too.

FERRISS: "Themes in Southern Sociological Society History" is what you're thinking of, I believe. It was a little editorial in one of these.

VDT: How long were you editor of The Southern Sociologist?

FERRISS: Three years.

VDT: It's a lot of work. We currently have two editors of PAA Affairs [David and Marilyn McMillen].

FERRISS: The thing is getting people to write things--well-written. You really have to knock on a lot of doors.

VDT: The Southern Sociologist has how many pages--16?

FERRISS: Usually 36 or a little less [40 in issue cited above]; four times a year. Much the same pattern as PAA Affairs.

VDT: Oh, not at all, because it's much bigger. How many members does the Southern Sociological Society have?

FERRISS: Fifteen or sixteen hundred. It went up to 1,800, but now it's around 1,600.

VDT: How did you persuade them to have an up-to-36-pages newsletter with a rather small membership?

FERRISS: They gave me \$6,000 a year to put it out. I could do anything I wanted to do with it and if I wanted to increase the pages, I had to cut corners somewhere else. I didn't have any secretarial help to do it, so you know where the hide came from.

VDT: Well, it's a beautifully computerized job. Is it desktop publishing? It was rather early on with that [circa 1984].

FERRISS: It wasn't computerized at all. I did it on a word processor.

VDT: But it was camera-ready copy.

FERRISS: Yes, 13 by 10 inches, reduced to this size [eight and a half by 11 inches].

VDT: I think you have both a good sense of the history of a discipline and of editing, getting the word out--record-keeping.

Your educational work, you mentioned modestly, hasn't been published. Was this working with census data?

FERRISS: Yes. One study I did was read in Arkansas in a governance conference on the uses of demography in state planning. I got together some data on the school population of Arkansas in relation to the birth rate 17 or 18 years earlier and showed them how they might project the school population more accurately. I did that about 1981.

VDT: So you've continued to do quite a bit of demographic work, because that was long after you came to Emory as chairman of the department of sociology in 1970. You did come as chairman?

FERRISS: Yes, I came as chairman in 1970 and was chairman for six years and then I retired in 1982.

VDT: Looking back, who among your professors and colleagues do you feel were most influential in your career in general? You mentioned Professor Odum very early.

FERRISS: I worked under Rupert Vance as well as Odum.

VDT: Tell me about Rupert Vance at North Carolina.

FERRISS: He was a crippled fellow, a little, small man. Had a twinkle in his eye and was continually encouraging students to do more than many of them, including me, were capable of doing--spurred us on. He was a wonderful influence to students as well as colleagues on the faculty at the University of North Carolina. He got his master's degree at Vanderbilt and then went over to North Carolina at Chapel Hill, where he roomed with Clyde Kiser as a first-year graduate student in one of the old dormitories close to the sociology department. Then Clyde Kiser left after about a year to go to Columbia and Rupert stayed on at Chapel Hill and spent his entire career there.

VDT: Were there some others of your professors at North Carolina that you can recall or was Vance the outstanding one?

FERRISS: Vance and Odum were the outstanding influences, particularly Vance.

VDT: Everett Lee is obviously a good friend. You did a wonderful interview with Everett in this series of PAA oral histories, in 1979. Tell me about Everett and Anne, his wife.

FERRISS: They have a large rambling house overlooking a lake in Athens, Georgia, and most of their children--I think all but one--have left. We visit with them from time to time, but they're both busy and we don't often get over there now. Everett is a charming little fellow. The last time I was there, he took me back to show me his new IBM computer and--lo and behold--he couldn't make it work! He had to wait till his daughter came in, who knew how to operate it for him. I'm sure that's because it was quite new and he manages it all right now.

VDT: Can you remember the first PAA meeting you attended?

FERRISS: I expect the Philadelphia meeting in 1948 was the first one I went to. I never attended one at Princeton.

VDT: Can you remember some outstanding meetings?

FERRISS: No, I don't have any special recollections about meetings.

VDT: Can you tell me about Otis Dudley Duncan? He was PAA president during your time. Did you ever work with him in any way?

FERRISS: I think he came to Washington once or twice and we talked about things, but my work with him was purely by correspondence. I had met him about 1951 when he came from Chicago to Montgomery, Alabama, to do a little consulting with the Air Force program of research. And I kept in contact with him ever since; see him from time to time. I know his work, keep up with that.

VDT: Do you have some observations on that?

FERRISS: He's done a variety of things. In one book he assembled some papers of William Fielding Ogburn. A book of his I've seen most recently deals with regression analysis; it's a simple, straightforward presentation of regression analysis. He's done a wide variety of things. If he gets interested in something, he pursues it to the end. I also had some contacts with him in connection with social indicators--meetings that were held in the Russell Sage Foundation offices in New York City when he and Beverly were developing papers for the book that Eleanor Sheldon and Wilbert Moore published on Indicators of Social Change [1968]. He's a fine scholar and a real good gentleman. I met his father too, long ago before he died.

VDT: His father was also a sociologist?

FERRISS: Yes, he was a sociologist out at Oklahoma State. I think he was called O.D. Duncan and that's the reason Dudley calls himself Dudley.

VDT: Did you ever work with Nathan Keyfitz, other than telling him what to do as PAA president?

FERRISS: No, I never worked with him, except when he was president. I corresponded with him recently; he'd been in Vienna, but he also went to Indonesia, but he's gone back to Vienna. He's working on estimating population characteristics beyond the span of the data, using age distributions.

VDT: Have you specialized in the demography of the South in any way?

FERRISS: No.

VDT: Your interests in sociology have been very broad?

FERRISS: I've splashed around in different areas--social psychology for a while, regionalism for a while, sociology of education, evaluation research. So I've messed around with a lot of interesting areas. I haven't specialized extremely in any of them.

VDT: What are you doing now, besides editing SINET?

FERRISS: I've just published an article called "The Uses of Social Indicators" in Social Forces. And I'm now working on a time series on health--I just got a computer lined up to start working on it--illness measures, social indicators of illness.

VDT: Using what kind of data?

FERRISS: This comes from the Current Population Survey. They ask if you worked last week and, if you were not at work, what was the reason: Were you on strike, ill, on vacation, or some other reason. This illness data goes back to 1946 or 1947 and provides a monthly index of illness. The illness rate is increasing.

VDT: It's increasing? Or do you think perhaps people are more conscious of illness or more willing to report or stay away from work?

FERRISS: Well, anyway, it's increasing, and the seasonal pattern continues.

VDT: What's that--more days off during the winter?

FERRISS: More illness in January and February. It decreases down to the middle of the summer, then begins to increase in August and September, and reaches a peak usually in February.

VDT: That's very interesting. Nobody ever before analyzed those data?

FERRISS: I've never seen any analysis of it. Of course, we have a National Health Survey now; it started in 1957. That is much more refined data, because you can relate the characteristics of the people to that and have much more refined measures of illness. But I've been playing with this for several years and I'm beginning to get some results which are interesting. I hope to finish this as soon as I can.

VDT: This will be an article?

FERRISS: Yes, I think so.

VDT: Are you associated with the Southern Regional Demographic Group, now called the Southern Demographic Association?

FERRISS: Yes, I've belonged to that since the beginning of it.

VDT: Do you find, as so many people tell me, that that has the advantages of PAA in the olden days, smaller numbers at the meetings, single sessions?

FERRISS: That's what they say; you know a lot of people there.

VDT: Do you go to those meetings?

FERRISS: The last one was here in Atlanta, but I had a conflict and couldn't attend. The one before that was in Texas and that was a little far for me to go. But I still go from time to time to those meetings.

VDT: Let me ask you another broad question. What accomplishments in your career have given you the most satisfaction?

FERRISS: Well, publication, I think, has given me more satisfaction than teaching.

VDT: Any one in particular or publication in general?

FERRISS: Just in general. What did Dan Price say he enjoyed most?

VDT: Well, that was all of two weeks ago and I haven't transcribed that interview yet. Did you know that Dan Price is going to be remarried?

FERRISS: Yes, he told me not to mention that.

VDT: You say that you preferred your own research and writing to teaching. Have you always taught both undergraduates and graduates?

FERRISS: Yes, I taught both levels. I've had some satisfaction in teaching graduate students.

VDT: Any outstanding graduate students?

FERRISS: No, I don't think so.

VDT: And of your publications, are there any you particularly like--the social indicators volumes perhaps?

FERRISS: Yes, I think those volumes. The one on women, I think, was rather remarkable [Indicators of Trends in the Status of American Women]. It was published about 1970 [1971].

VDT: Have you read the 1980 census monograph on women by Suzanne Bianchi and Daphne Spain [American Women in Transition, 1986]? How did you like that?

FERRISS: It was very good.

VDT: There's going to be a whole session on that at the PAA meeting in New Orleans.

You say you haven't been so closely associated with demography, though many of your publications have touched on it and demography is certainly multi-disciplinary, but what do you see as the outlook for demography or demographers in the U.S.? I have been peripherally involved with sociology and, until recently, the job market for sociologists was rather depressed; I think it's recovering now. What do you think about demography and demographers, which in a sense can be looked at as a branch of sociology?

FERRISS: Well, it's a branch of economics and a branch of geography now also. I wouldn't expect it to develop into a separate profession.

VDT: Demography? Why not?

FERRISS: There are a few places where it's separated out, but not very many.

VDT: Are you talking now about university departments?

FERRISS: Right. The federal government doesn't even have a special demographic category, does it?

VDT: I think that's finally resolved, but you're right, it's been controversial as to whether or not they should have demographers as a job category.

FERRISS: I think it would be much better if it was identified as a separate occupational category for state and federal government. It would be a spur for identifying high-quality personnel for those positions.

VDT: Now, of course, they do have many state demographers; they're called that.

FERRISS: Yes, right. I worked on a committee for the PAA trying to get the federal government interested in establishing a demographic roster--a category or job title with demography in it, with specific classes of demographers. Then if a demographer wanted a job, he would get his name on the roster, like other job categories in the federal government. I don't think that was ever done.

VDT: You are aware of the tremendous controversy over the American Sociological Association having set up a category of demographers and declaring their credentials, and the PAA has objected?

FERRISS: Yes, that's a certificate that they're trying to develop. What I'm talking about is a job category for federal and state government employment, that would be called "demographer" and would have particular entrance requirements. It would be specified and demographers would have to meet them in terms of experience and training. The ASA effort is to certify people who are already employed in universities. People who are already employed in universities would make application to be certified as demographers, having certain qualifications. People in universities object to this because it's an unknown. They don't know whether if they apply they'll be certified or not; a little shaky on it. A great deal of controversy has arisen because ASA is trying to do this.

VDT: Is that the only occupation?

FERRISS: No, there are four or five categories. There are different fields of sociology involved, demography being one of them.

VDT: What do you feel about that?

FERRISS: What it will mean is that if a faculty has all of its members certified in one field or another, it will look good for graduate students to attend and look good to the university administration. It has a long way to go before it would reach that stage. I'm not sure it can be reached in one leap; it will take a long time before that kind of credential will be accepted. Until that does happen, people who resist submitting their qualifications for review will continue to work, and I guess that's the way it should be. I don't know.

VDT: Some people have objected, for instance, that if you don't have that certification and you testify in court, as demographers are called upon to do more and more, then the court won't take you so seriously.

FERRISS: Well, it's an added credential, just like a psychologist who has passed all the tests and can testify in court that a person is insane or whatnot. But courts will accept people's testimony whether or not they have those credentials. I've testified in a good number of cases.

VDT: Can you give me an example?

FERRISS: In the cases where I've testified, my testimony had to do with attitudes in relation to age. This has to do with selection of a jury. Age is not a qualification for jury selection; color and sex are qualifications. That is, it's required that the jury panels from which a jury is selected be representative of the population of a locality, county, according to color and sex, but not according to age. Many people have tried to make the courts recognize age as a criterion because of the variation in attitudes toward many aspects of criminal justice. Young people under 30, for example, have attitudes that are significantly different from those of people over 50 along a lot of dimensions that have to do with criminal justice, the administration of laws--smoking marijuana, for example, the death penalty. Surveys from the Gallup Poll and Harris Poll have shown variations by age in these characteristics.

In one case that I testified in, the judge said he would not accept my testimony, he threw it out, and on appeal, the higher courts ordered that he consider it. This is the nearest any of the cases I've had to do with have come to having age as a criterion. He threw out the testimony because he didn't think it relevant, I suppose. So the lawyer appealed the case and the higher court directed the judge to

hear the testimony, so I had to go back and testify again. These are all cases where the penalty is death; these are mostly murder cases. And the lawyers are attempting to keep the case alive and not allow it to be decided, so they perpetuate the case as long as they can.

This matter of age being a criterion for jury selection is a genuine issue. Some articles have been written on it and a good many sociologists have testified on it, besides myself. They are usually poverty cases, where the death penalty is at stake.

VDT: That's very interesting. I think we've fairly well covered what I wanted to ask you. Did you sit right down yesterday after I'd phoned you [to confirm interview time] to write out your recollections at your word processor?

FERRISS: I'd already written it down.

VDT: Have you ever done anything on the history of sociology or of another organization? [Dr. Ferriss later suggested to the Southern Sociological Society that they undertake interviews for an oral history project, similar to PAA's, and at the request of SSS president Joel Smith, prepared a "set of conditions for the organization" of such a project, sent to Jean van der Tak--among others--for comment on September 17, 1990.] What is that you have?

FERRISS: This is my personal file of each issue of PAA Affairs that I put out.

VDT: And here's another file that looks familiar, of the D.C. Sociological Society newsletter. Thank you very much, Abbott.

JAMES W. BRACKETT

PAA Secretary-Treasurer in 1971-75 (No. 14). Interview with Jean van der Tak at Jim Brackett's home in Arlington, Virginia, March 29, 1988. Jim Brackett edited the interview transcript in May 1990 and added some new material.

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS: Jim Brackett was born and grew up in Gastonia, North Carolina. He received the B.A. in mathematics and sociology in 1953 from the University of North Carolina and did graduate work there in mathematical statistics and sociology, with a focus on demography. From 1955 to 1967, he was with the Foreign Demographic Analysis Division of the U.S. Bureau of the Census, where he specialized in the demography of the Soviet Union and Marxist population theories. He was with the Office of Population of the U.S. Agency for International Development from its establishment in 1967 until 1987, with four years (1982-86) spent on detail to the Population Institute. Since 1987 he has been a consultant for the Indonesian family planning program and the Africa Bureau of AID, among other projects, and he is currently writing a book on the U.S. response to the international population problem. Besides the demography of the Soviet Union, his work and publications have focused on the use of computers for demographic analysis, in which he was an early expert, and on family planning in less developed countries, especially as documented by the World Fertility Survey and the Contraceptive Prevalence Surveys, with which he was closely involved while at AID.

VDT: Jim, you'll have to tell us later what you're doing now as a consultant in Indonesia with their family planning program. I've just caught you between trips to Indonesia.

But I'd like to start at the beginning and ask you: How did you become interested in demography?

BRACKETT: I became interested in demography as an undergraduate at the University of North Carolina. UNC had a multi-disciplinary statistics program with a focus on demography and statistics in the departments of sociology and public health. There was also a topnotch mathematical statistics department, one of the three or four top schools in the world.

I was a student of Dan Price, combining mathematics and sociology as undergraduate majors and mathematical statistics and sociology as graduate majors. As an undergraduate, I took the courses required for a master's degree in sociology and still managed to finish my bachelor's in three years.

I left North Carolina in January 1955 for a job in the Census Bureau's international program. I never worked in any of the Census Bureau's domestic activities. I spent a few days in 1960 with a census-taker as an observer only.

I worked much of my dozen years at the Census Bureau on the demography of the Soviet Union and on Marxist population theories. I became quite fascinated with the way complex theories and ideologies can be invented to justify about anything a government wants to do or wants to avoid doing. I also learned how governments could do things that were in sharp conflict with ideology while pretending to be working within the ideology. That applies to our own as well as foreign governments. It also applies to other organizations and to individuals.

I also became interested in computers, probably because of my mathematics background, and wrote the first computer software for making population projections.

VDT: Really! For the whole United States?

BRACKETT: My program was later used by Donald Akers to make population projections for the United States. I was responsible for producing projections for foreign countries.

Before I wrote the program, we made projections for five-year age groups at five-year intervals of time. We spent several days on each country. Then someone, usually me, had to eyeball the

worksheets by following each cohort from period to period to determine if the changes were reasonable. Two or three statistical clerks and often a second statistician worked with me a good part of the year making projections.

Users of our population projections were interested in functional age groups--school age, military age, etc.--not standard five-year age groups. Moreover, they were not satisfied with data at five-year time intervals, 1955-1960, etc. They wanted the school-age population in 1957, for example. We were frequently called upon to produce data for different age groups and calendar years, usually on an emergency basis.

The countries we were working with had quite irregular age-sex structures, an effect of many wars, purges, etc. To generate estimates of non-standard age groups for non-standard calendar years, we used quick and dirty methods which might have been acceptable had we only responded to one request or had the age structures been regular. But we had numerous requests, almost all on short notice. Either we or the users sometimes discovered inconsistencies in the estimates.

So I learned to program and wrote a computer program to do population projections by single years of age and single years of time. That way, we could provide data for any age group and any calendar year the users wanted, and the numbers were consistent.

VDT: You devised that program?

BRACKETT: I developed the program, actually wrote the coding myself. I wrote two versions, the first, about 1957, in machine language for the UNIVAC 1105 and later, about 1962, in FORTRAN. The FORTRAN program was used by the Census Bureau for probably 25 years; I don't think it is used any longer. It was written for a computer that had 8,000 words of core storage, or the equivalent of about 36k bytes of RAM. A typical PC today has 640k bytes, nearly 18 times as much. I tried to run the program on a PC several years ago, but without success.

I don't know of any other program that does projections by single years of age. Some programs do five-year projections and then interpolate to single ages, but that approach doesn't work very well for countries with highly irregular age structures. By my third year on the job, the projections work could be handled by one statistical assistant working about two weeks a year with a little supervision by me.

Freed from this drudgery, I spent more and more time on the demography of the Soviet Union, which was much more interesting.

VDT: I interviewed Jack Kantner a week ago and he mentioned that in 1958, 1959, the Soviets finally came out with computations and you discovered that some of your projections were pretty wide of the mark, because of war losses.

BRACKETT: The Soviet Union did not publish any demographic data from 1939 until 1957. We used population estimates projected from prewar censuses--1926 and 1939. Soviet leaders sometimes mentioned ratios in political speeches, from which we derived crude estimates of total population, usually around 220 million in 1950 and 240 to 250 million by 1955.

In 1957 the Soviets published a statistical yearbook on the national economy which placed the population in 1956 at 200.2 million. This figure, we learned later, was derived from the system of household books or population registers after the system was revamped and it was undated, but we didn't know that at first. The Soviets later published data from the 1959 census which provided the first detailed look at postwar age structure and sex ratios.

The new data were received with shock and disbelief in our office, particularly by the emigres. They were suspicious of anything the Soviets said. The American-born employees had no personal experience with the Soviet system. While we were also skeptical, we were more detached. We wanted

to look at the evidence. No one in the office had any love for the Soviet system. We knew very well the tragic history of that country, and we had heard personal horror stories from colleagues who had lived through them. Our charge was to search out as much information as we could about the true nature of the Soviet Union, void of personal biases. The new data were potentially very valuable, and they had to be scrutinized carefully to determine their reliability.

VDT: The emigres believed the Census Bureau numbers or the Soviet numbers?

BRACKETT: They doubted the Soviet numbers because they implied an incredible level of war losses. The Soviet Union had a population of about 200 million in its postwar territory on June 22, 1941, the day Hitler attacked the Soviet Union. That the population could still be 200 million 15 years later was hard to believe.

I don't know whether the Soviets have released any new data relating to the 1940s since I left the Census Bureau in 1967. At that time, we believed the population declined substantially, to a level of 170 to 175 million, by 1946 or 1947.

VDT: The war losses were about 30 million?

BRACKETT: That's our estimate of the net population decline, not war losses. The net decline was a typical demographic balance among births, deaths, and migration. There were births during the war, although at a much depressed level. For example, I estimated that only a third as many babies were born in 1943 as in 1940, the last full year of peace for the Soviets. The Germans forced millions of people to work in Germany or other parts of occupied Europe and millions left voluntarily. I think the number of war dead, counting civilians as well as military, was close to 50 million.

The 1959 Soviet census revealed that the cohorts from which military personnel were drawn had sex ratios as low as 50 to 60 males per 100 females and that the cohorts born during and immediately after the war were sharply depressed.

VDT: Soviet demography is a fascinating game. I worked with Murray Feshbach on a Population Bulletin on the Soviet population ["The Soviet Union: Population Trends and Dilemmas," August 1982]. I'm sure those were interesting years for you.

Is it true that the U. S. Census Bureau can be credited with really getting demography and population work computerized? You must have contributed to that.

BRACKETT: The Census Bureau has a long history of technological developments to process censuses. In 1888 Hollerith walked through the halls of the Census Bureau where clerks were busily hand-tallying the 1880 census, eight years after the enumeration. He concluded that there had to be a better way. He was familiar with the punched cards used to control weave patterns, so he opted for punched cards as his tool. He used the greenback to fix the size of the punch card. The U.S. changed the size of the dollar bill, but the punch card remained the same size. The Hollerith machines were used to process the 1890 U.S. census and the 1898 Cuban census. They are now at the Smithsonian.

The Bureau was involved in the evolution of data processing over the years and by 1950 they had what came to be called UNIVAC I. It was used to process a small part of the 1950 census. The first full census to be processed by computer was 1960.

I think the people involved in the Bureau's domestic programs viewed the computer as a fast way to process punch cards. I don't think they realized its potential as a demographic tool. That comes through in the Shryock-Siegel book, The Methods and Materials of Demography [1971]. They mention the computer several places, but they did not deal with computers meaningfully. I think the references were added as an afterthought in response to comments they received from me and others.

Several years after I wrote the population projections program, I got a call from Don Akers. He had the task of preparing a new set of projections for the United States and he asked whether he might use my program. Of course, I agreed. He wanted to use a cohort approach to fertility assumptions, which I had not built into the program.

VDT: Wasn't that normal, ever since Whelpton?

BRACKETT: We didn't have data required for cohort analysis for the countries I worked with, so I had not provided for it. Don Akers wrote a patch program for cohort analysis and successfully ran projections for the United States. Whereas before, the Population Division spent months or years preparing projections for the U.S., Akers completed the task in a matter of weeks.

That created problems. Jay Siegel was away during that period; I think he was at CELADE. When he returned, the projections report was published. He was not happy.

VDT: Now, of course, there are 30 different projections for the U.S., with all kinds of assumptions. That's very interesting. I hadn't realized what a contribution you had made. Now let's turn to what made you leave the Census Bureau and go to what was then the newly forming Office of Population at AID.

BRACKETT: In 1964 AID asked the Census Bureau for the services of two senior demographers to work on a project leading to a re-examination of U.S. policy on population in the Third World. At that time, virtually no Americans were being trained in demography. Available fellowships were largely used to train Asians, particularly Indians.

VDT: You mean the Ford Foundation . . . ?

BRACKETT: The Ford Foundation, the Population Council, and so on. The last thing the Census Bureau wanted was to lose two senior demographers to another agency, even for a short time. In any case, I was interested in the new activity, so I prevailed upon my boss to let me do the project.

VDT: Who was your boss?

BRACKETT: Paul Myers. Don Akers worked with me. We used Pakistan as our model. Les Corsa wrote a report on family planning operations; Perlman and Hoover did the economic model. Akers and I used my computer program to model Pakistan's family planning strategy.

Stephen Enke did a separate report. He concluded that one dollar spent on family planning would have the same impact as one hundred dollars spent on development aid. When the World Population Conference met in 1965 in Belgrade, the State Department sent a telegram in the name of President Johnson. The telegram changed the ratio from 1 to 100 to 5 to 100. The theory didn't go over very well at the conference.

Some years later, we were still trying to combat the furor Enke generated. The interpretation put on the telegram and Enke's paper at Belgrade was that the United States would put its entire foreign aid budget into family planning. That was never even a remote possibility, but many people used the argument to bash us.

After I moved to AID, we hired a graduate student one summer to unravel Enke's model and explain it. Enke used methodologies designed to assess the feasibility of capital projects--dams, factories, etc. It discounted future benefits of an investment to the day the investment is made.

For humans, Enke discounted all future production and all future consumption to the date of the person's birth. The child's discounted lifetime production is always less than his discounted lifetime

consumption. That's because consumption begins immediately after birth and is thus discounted less than production which begins only when the child starts work. When a person gets a Ph.D. or M.D., he remains in school until age 25 or later, greatly increasing his consumption costs and delaying his production. His discounted consumption may exceed production by an even larger factor than for a person who receives less education and enters the labor force earlier.

Thus, according to the theory, no child has ever been born at any time in human history who had a positive value to the society into which he was born. Society would be better off if there were no births at all! Moreover, the richer the society, the more worthless its children!

The graduate student tried to find a situation when a baby would have a positive value, but he didn't find one. Perhaps a person born in the proverbial log cabin who doesn't spend much time in school and earns a great deal of money early in life may prove the exception. I don't think we considered that case. Of course, one needs to assess the real value of that person's contribution to the society. The fact that he amassed a great fortune through investments and speculation may not qualify as a benefit to society.

VDT: If the child had not been born, you would lack all these contributions to society, but the costs, which would be higher, would also be saved. But I don't see the connection between that and five dollars in family planning to avert a birth is worth a hundred dollars in economic development, the country would be that much better off . . .

BRACKETT: By manipulating the discount rate, you can make the ratio come out about anywhere you want.

Obviously, there are aspects to childbearing that Enke didn't include in his model. Although many unwanted children are born, most of us want some children. Yet we also want to see society progress.

VDT: But that was a very great equation and it certainly touched off the U.S. entry into family planning aid, although it was already happening.

BRACKETT: The development was already under way, and I think the evolution of population policies might have gone more smoothly had the theoretical underpinnings been sounder.

You may be interested in another event during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

Kennedy appointed Richard Scammon as director of the Census Bureau. Scammon thought each new baby born had two hands to produce; wouldn't it be great that his daughter would grow up in a world of x billion more people than the world he grew up in. He employed Ben Wattenberg as a writer.

VDT: That was already in the early 1960s?

BRACKETT: Scammon came to the Census Bureau in 1961 or 1962. He sent papers, I think mostly written by Wattenberg, to the senior demographers--usually John Aird and me--for review. We were to check the arithmetic but not express any views on the reasonableness of the statements or the soundness of the conclusions.

One of the statements was that if all the people in the world were placed in the state of West Virginia, the density of population would be no greater than that in the District of Columbia, never mind that West Virginia cannot support the 2 plus million people already living there. Wattenberg later substituted Texas for West Virginia to compensate for the growth in world population. Some of us expect Alaska to be next.

VDT: This was the era leading up to Paul Ehrlich and The Population Bomb [1968] and yet here was the director of the Census Bureau saying that this could be a good thing!

BRACKETT: While I was working on the AID project, a magazine publisher asked Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges to write an article on population. Hodges quite naturally turned to the Census Bureau, the Commerce Department agency with the expertise. Scammon produced his typical "more the merrier" paper, which John Aird and I were asked to check.

Aird and I shared an office at the time. We were struggling with the article one day when Bruce Jessup, my contact at AID, came by. We showed the article to him and he became very agitated. The paper ran counter to what the White House and the State Department were trying to do, and, of course, what Akers and I were doing at the Census Bureau. Within hours the White House called Hodges, who didn't know anything about the paper's content. I don't think he knew about the efforts in the administration to develop a population policy either.

I finished the report and delivered it to AID. I was offered a job in the newly established Population Office. I had been at Census for 12 years and was ready for a change. I moved to AID in the summer of 1967.

I met Julian Simon not long after I arrived at AID.

VDT: Julian Simon already then!

BRACKETT: He was professor of economics at the University of Illinois. He had a theory that if women were paid three quarters of the per capita GNP to remain in a non-pregnant state for a year, one could have a great impact on fertility. He was leaving shortly for India and wanted a grant from AID to test his theory. Congress did not pass a foreign aid bill that year until halfway through the fiscal year, so we couldn't give him a contract at that time no matter how sound his proposal was, but I dealt with his theory on a substantive basis.

At that time, India had a population of 500 million and a GNP of \$50 billion. The per capita GNP was \$100. Three quarters of \$100, or \$75, times 100 million reproductive-age females amounted to \$7.5 billion, 15 percent of the GNP, just for the bonuses. Administrative and policing costs would be additional, and they were likely to be high.

I told Julian that I was not an economist but that I had a practical knowledge of economics. It was clear to me that the kind of money he was talking about was not going to come from the donor community.

VDT: Oh, Simon was suggesting that the U.S. . . .

BRACKETT: He wanted AID money to test his theory. He didn't say where the funds would come from to implement the program.

One of the techniques I used over the years to test the feasibility of the many schemes we were presented with was to ask proposers to tell me what they would do with the information if their research proved their theories to be 100 percent correct. Could the findings actually be used in the design of practical programs? If not, I didn't see why American taxpayers ought to pay for the research.

I told Simon that in India there were two potential internal sources of funding, couples who have children and people that have investment capital. Poor Indian couples already spent 80 percent of their meager incomes on rice. Taxing them would literally take food from the mouths of babes. Using investment capital for consumption would play havoc with India's development program. Moreover, it was unlikely that these two sources would yield enough money.

Simon told me that I didn't understand economics. It was just a transfer of payments within the

economy, he said. If only I were an economist, I might understand.

He didn't get the money. He went over to the "more the merrier" side. He cites that meeting as the turning point in his thinking. Evidently, the grass was greener on that side. His convictions weren't very strong.

VDT: Was Ray Ravenholt already there when you started at AID?

BRACKETT: He was one of four or five people in the Population Office when I arrived.

No one had ever run a big international family planning effort before. There were no cookbooks to consult.

VDT: That was the theme, wasn't it? From the beginning the idea was to encourage family planning programs? Of course, the Office of Population has branched off in many other fields.

BRACKETT: We explored many avenues, but we concluded that there was a substantial unmet demand for fertility control and that by satisfying that demand, we could impact fertility substantially. If after the demand was satisfied fertility was still too high, there was time to try other approaches.

Several people pushed incentives. Others pushed demographic transition theory; they said that until developing countries raised living standards, fertility would not decline. The Draper Commission [1959, during the Eisenhower administration] pointed out that high rates of population growth hampered development; Third World nations were in a catch 22 situation. We were not prepared to give up so easily, so we pressed ahead with an emphasis on family planning services.

AID was in many ways a prudish organization. Early on we tried to collect information from AID missions on family planning activities, contraceptive availability, etc., by sending questionnaires via State Department cable to AID missions. An old AID bureaucrat in the office was quite upset with the cable. The Secretary of State's name appears at the bottom of all official cables. The bureaucrat didn't think the Secretary wanted his name associated with the subject matter; if we were going to ask such questions, we had to be more delicate.

In 1972 we obtained data tapes from a number of KAP (Knowledge, Attitude and Practice) surveys dating back as far as the 1950s. We tried to standardize them so they could be analyzed systematically, but we found that they were not comparable; they used quite different concepts. Further, none of them collected data on family planning availability. That fitted into the biases at the time. If couples really wanted to use contraceptives, they would find them, whether or not they were available. Demand would create availability without official action, not the reverse. Therefore, information on availability was not needed.

When we started the two big survey programs--the World Fertility Survey and the Contraceptive Prevalence Survey--we ran into similar opposition to including questions on availability.

VDT: That's ridiculous, because that was why AID got into the whole business.

Did the idea of the World Fertility Survey originate with AID?

BRACKETT: Like many other important developments, the surveys had many parents. ISI [International Statistical Institute] approached AID about 1971 with several ideas they thought AID might be interested in. Ray Ravenholt was a major factor in coming up with the concept of a survey program.

VDT: The WFS was called the "largest social science survey ever mounted"; 350,000 women were interviewed by the time they finished with surveys in 41 developing countries.

BRACKETT: The International Statistical Institute was the executing agency for WFS.

The combined World Fertility Survey and Contraceptive Prevalence Survey interviewed about 500,000 people, mostly women, but in some cases subsamples of their husbands, in 61 developing nations. In some of these countries, of course, we did more than one survey.

VDT: That was certainly a magnificent achievement. And that was one of your main activities during the 1970s?

BRACKETT: The survey data changed the way people looked at fertility and family planning. We found that half the respondents did not want a future birth and another 25 to 30 percent did not want to be pregnant for at least two years. That means 75 to 80 percent made a positive statement that they did not want to become pregnant, at least for now. Another 10 percent were unsure whether or when they wanted a future pregnancy. Fewer than 10 percent said they wanted a pregnancy within two years.

But only about 40 percent knew where to obtain modern contraceptives, and many of these did not have easy access to them. The family planning outlet might be too far away, or the cost too high, or the hours of service too limited, or the outlet might not have contraceptives or personnel trained in family planning. Many factors contribute to accessibility.

I was in a village in the Kenya highlands about three years ago where a woman could receive free oral contraceptives from a distributor in her village if she first got medical clearance from a government health clinic. To get clearance, she had to take off from work for a day, walk several miles to a paved road where she waited for an itinerant taxi to take her to town. The round trip fare was about one and a half day's pay. When she reached the clinic, she had to wait along with many sick people for her turn. Medical staff quite naturally and understandably give priority to the sick and injured; I have never seen a Third World clinic that had a shortage of sick and injured. This lady isn't in pain; she may sit there until the clinic closes without ever getting clearance to use the pill. The cost to her: half a week's pay--1.5 day's pay for transportation plus one day of lost wages.

Her wage for hoeing weeds on a coffee farm from early morning to late afternoon was the equivalent of 60 U.S. cents. She may have to support several children and an unemployed husband on her meager wages. Clearly, this lady does not have a great deal of discretionary income. She may determine that investing half a week's pay in an uncertain attempt to get official permission to use the pill is not something she wishes to do.

We delayed doing surveys in Africa because many African countries were engaged in the Africa Census project. That was in the mid-1970s. The idea for the Africa Census project came from General William Draper. He saw it as a way to get contributions to the UN Fund for Population Activities, particularly from the French.

VDT: Why the French?

BRACKETT: There were several reasons. If France became a donor to UNFPA, other countries would likely follow. France also had considerable influence with her former African colonies. Draper hoped France would encourage them to start population programs.

Draper believed that if reliable data were available, African nations would assess their demographic situation. He felt many would conclude they had a problem and would take action to slow population growth. Many African countries had never had a census.

I remember one amusing story about the Africa Census Project. I arranged for a U.S. Census Bureau employee to attend a conference in Bangui, Central African Republic. After the two-week conference, he wrote a long upbeat report. At the end he stated that he was prepared to do anything to further the goals of the Africa Census Project, short of returning to Bangui!

The widely-held assessment was that many African countries had limited statistical

infrastructures and were not able to handle both a census and a major survey at the same time. In addition, the surveys needed the census as a sampling frame.

The first survey data from Africa showed very low percentages who did not want a future birth. Rather than the 50 percent in Asia and Latin America, African countries reported 15 to 25 percent, so we thought we had something different.

Somewhat later we received data on the percent of African women who wanted a future birth only after two years. These percentages ranged widely, but several countries reported 40 to 45 percent--considerably higher than in Asia and Latin America. The combined figures for those who did not want a future birth and those who wanted to wait before having a baby for some countries equaled 75 percent, the same as in Asia and Latin America. Also, the later surveys in Africa tended to show a shift toward more women wanting to stop childbearing.

[Added in May 1990

The following data were taken from a report I did in 1989 for AID's Africa Bureau.

Percent of Women Who Do Not Want a Future Birth at All
or Who Want to Wait Before Becoming Pregnant

Country	Year	Percent	Change
Botswana	1984	74%	-7%
	1988	67%	
Ghana	1979/80	26%	42%
	1988	68%	
Kenya	1984	69%	9%
	1989	78%	
Zimbabwe	1984	68%	0%
	1988	68%	

end of 1990 insert]

VDT: The later surveys in Africa being what--Nigeria? It came right at the end.

BRACKETT: Well, not so much Nigeria.

VDT: We're talking about the World Fertility Survey?

BRACKETT: World Fertility Survey and Contraceptive Survey. The WFS was repeated in only one country, the Dominican Republic, I think. The Contraceptive Prevalence Surveys were to some extent a follow-on to the WFS, but also CPS was repeated in several countries to get trend data. For the countries surveyed earlier, say in the late 1970s, and then repeated in the 1980s, we found that the percent who said they did not want a future birth had increased.

In Nigeria, WFS found high proportions of women who stated that they wanted a future birth, including old and high parity women who were physically incapable of giving birth. When respondents in Nigeria and other African countries were asked the number of children they wanted,

common responses were, "It's God will," or "It depends on my husband"--in effect, "It's out of my control."

The surveys also documented that very few Africans had access to family planning and knowledge of even one modern family planning method was often quite low. People who don't have any means to control their fertility may not spend a great deal of time thinking about the number of children they want or when they want them.

Some demographers took the "desired" or "ideal" number of children reported in surveys as firm decisions on fertility intentions. They did not accept the possibility that Third World fertility could fall significantly.

As contraceptives became more widely available and people realized they could exercise a measure of control, responses to fertility preference questions became more rational. Fewer people gave non-numeric responses and the desired number of children dropped.

Take Thailand as an example; I probably have the numbers wrong, but the magnitude is right. In 1970 women said they wanted 5 children when they were having 6; they were having one child more than they said they wanted. By the middle of the decade, they said they wanted 3.5 to 4 but were having 4 to 4.5. By the early 1980s, they said they wanted 2.5 to 3 but were having 3.5. Thus, in a bit more than a decade during which family planning services were expanded to virtually every village, family size preference dropped from 5 to 2.5 and fertility declined from 6 to 3.5. I think you will find the same pattern in other countries.

Other factors may influence fertility preferences, but they cannot come into play unless contraceptives are accessible. I think the availability of family planning services plays a central role in decisions about fertility preferences and, of course, in implementing them.

VDT: You are well known for your excellent writings on the importance of contraceptive availability, as shown in the WFS.

I'd just like to talk a bit about why AID's Office of Population, and Ray Ravenholt, became controversial. At the Bucharest Conference of 1974 . . . You were there?

BRACKETT: No, I wasn't.

VDT: At that time, of course, the U.S. was leading the field among those who said that family planning services were important. Many developing countries, following the demographic transition theory, thought socioeconomic development was a prerequisite for fertility decline and that contraceptive supplies were almost irrelevant. Then there was the turnaround ten years later at the Mexico population conference and it was America that came with the revisionist view of population and the developing countries that were asking for family planning. Somewhere along in that period the approach of "getting the family planning supplies out" as most important became a bit controversial. What happened?

BRACKETT: Bucharest was 1974. A year earlier at the IUSSP meeting, Ansley Coale presented a paper; I think he called it "Transition Theory Re-examined" ["The Demographic Transition Reconsidered," in IUSSP, International Population Conference, Liege, 1973, Vol. 1, pp. 53-71]. He found that in Europe there were many exceptions to the assumed pattern of mortality declines always preceding fertility declines. It's too bad Rockefeller didn't have Coale's paper. We might not have had the theme "development is the best contraceptive."

The Catholic Church and some Protestant groups opposed family planning on religious and moral grounds all along, although the opposition heated up with the abortion controversy. Christianity has a deep-seated belief that anything to do with sex is evil.

Some academics pushed transition theory long after work by Coale, Knodel, Van de Walle, and

others punched holes in it. I think some of them didn't want to admit their earlier positions were wrong. Some thought that offering family planning services before doing something to alleviate poverty was evil. I never understood why.

VDT: Transition theory was Notestein's theory.

BRACKETT: I recently criticized a speech written for one of the population publicists because it contained strong overtones of transition theory that defeated the message he was trying to get across. His response was, "This is Notestein's contribution and you don't question that." Notestein's been dead for a number of years now. He must have known about Coale's re-examination of transition theory. In any case, I don't understand why a population publicist would cite a theory that runs counter to the message he should be getting across, particularly when considerable evidence exists that the theory is wrong.

Notestein and I were at a conference in Kiev about 1969. I headed the American delegation; Notestein was an observer. We heard a lot of ideology from Peter Podyachikh, a die-hard Marxist who represented the Soviet Union at the UN Population Commission for many years. If the U.S. would only stop spending whatever number of billions on armaments and put the money into development we wouldn't need family planning, Podyachikh said; development would take care of high fertility. I had to respond or else allow the meeting to become a political circus. Podyachikh was in effect subscribing to transition theory, although his statements had solid foundation in Marxist ideology.

VDT: What about Notestein?

BRACKETT: Notestein was very pleased with the way I handled the situation and told me so at the time. And even more, he wrote a letter to the State Department praising me.

The following week I went with him to Moscow University where he lectured to several classes of Soviet students on the work of the Rockefeller Foundation and Population Council and the international concern about rapid population growth. I had a good association with him and appreciated what he said about me to my bosses.

VDT: Have you ever had association with Kingsley Davis? He is one of the ones who said that because ideal or wanted family size is so high, they're not going to use contraceptives; you have to work on changing that motivation.

BRACKETT: I haven't worked with him directly. I remember Davis's testimony before the Select Committee on Population in the mid-1970s. He was very critical of the AID mission in Nepal for having a seven-year supply of condoms. That was a gross waste of government funds, he said. The condoms will never be used; they'll rot. He wanted to put a stop to the emphasis on family planning services and turn the focus to motivation.

At that time, the use rate for condoms in Nepal was less than one half of one percent. The government was building contraceptive supplies for a major expansion of family planning. Department stores build Christmas inventory in July and August to have supplies on hand in November and December when sales shoot up. Davis apparently didn't understand that family planning programs must also build logistics if they are going to expand.

John D. Rockefeller III told the Committee that a Bangladesh woman's main purpose in life was childbearing and that she wouldn't use family planning unless and until she had some alternative. My thought at the time was, "How the hell does this billionaire, descended from generations of billionaires, possibly know how I get along on my income, let alone a Bangladesh woman who may have less than \$100 a year to live on. He probably spent that much on lunch that day."

We had a lot of armchair theorizing in clean, air-conditioned offices in Washington, New York, Boston, and Berkeley, as well as from the Third World universities. These theoreticians should spend time in the barrios so they can find out how the majority of human beings live.

Guadeloupe de la Vega was the only female witness and the only witness from a developing country at those hearings. She was the last witness called. All the congressmen had left; the staff director ran the hearing. She runs a large private family planning program in northern Mexico and knows first hand that demand for family planning is high.

VDT: Besides beginning to get the results of the WFS in those years, you were doing a lot of traveling, actually seeing what was going on in the field. Can you tell me about some of your outstanding experiences in developing countries?

BRACKETT: I did considerable travel in connection with management information systems. Take Indonesia, where I've been working recently. I went there in early 1970 to work on the design of a management information system for the family planning program which was largely still on paper. The information system that grew out of that visit was implemented and worked very well for well over a decade. It is still operating after 18 years. It was designed for a clinic-based program and Indonesia's program is no longer primarily clinic-based. It is heavily community-based, with field workers and village distribution points dispensing contraceptives. The program has about 15 million active users. The information system was not designed for that level of activity nor for non-clinical service delivery, so there is a need for a new system or a redesign of the old system to meet the new demands.

VDT: You're talking about contraceptive users among women of reproductive age, who are about what percent of that age group?

BRACKETT: About 65 percent of reproductive-age women in Indonesia have ever used contraception. Their current use rate according to a survey in November 1987 is around 48 percent. It's much higher in East Java and Bali, which have been out front since the program began in the early 1970s.

VDT: That's what took you originally to Indonesia?

BRACKETT: Yes. We were trying similar management information systems in a number of countries. Pakistan was a different story. They tried various approaches to family planning without much success. Only about 3 percent of reproductive-age women were using modern contraceptives.

In the early 1970s, Pakistan set up a community-based distribution system. Male-female teams were supposed to visit every reproductive-age couple in a prescribed territory at least four times a year to motivate them to use family planning and to deliver contraceptives to them. Female workers were essential to contact prospective female family planning users in this predominantly Muslim society where most women are in purdah. However, females could not travel freely around the countryside alone. The male worker accompanied her to lend respectability. He also worked with the men in the village.

The male and female workers kept separate ledgers containing information on every reproductive-age couple in their territory. The records contained the names and ages of the husband and wife, the number, age, and sex of each child, an entry for each contact the family planning worker had with the couple, contraceptives sold to the couple, complaints, and whether the couple was using contraceptives.

The record also contained a long ID number that uniquely identified each couple and also

indicated their address. Two digits were used for the province, two for the district, etc., down to the village, house, and couple within the house. To the extent that these ID numbers were accurately recorded, records of contacts could be linked to create a record of program activity for each couple. However, if the numbers were incorrectly recorded, contacts would be mismatched, producing garbage.

To prevent mismatching, we decided to use check digits. By doing a series of calculations on the digits in an ID number, it is possible to arrive at a check digit that can be appended to the ID number. Anytime the ID number is used on a record, the series of computations can be repeated. If the check digit generated by the computations is different from the check digit in the ID number, the ID number is not valid. The computer tosses out the record for correction.

The Joint Secretary for Family Planning could not understand the concept of check digits. He complained to Ravenholt, who didn't understand either. I had a three-day set-to with Ravenholt over that. I prevailed and the system was implemented in 11 districts.

As information accumulated, we learned that the median age of women contacted by the field workers was 35 years and the median parity was four. Contacts with younger and lower parity women were few and far between. Moreover, the workers were averaging about two contacts per year, rather than the prescribed four.

VDT: Why was that?

BRACKETT: The early programs in Asia viewed family planning as a means of terminating childbearing once couples had the children they wanted or the number program administrators deemed they should have. Some programs denied contraceptives to women with fewer than the prescribed number of children.

The impact of such policies shows up in patterns of fertility change. In the 1970s, AID funded a project for nearly a million dollars to find out what caused the unusual pattern of fertility declines in Taiwan. The Population Office refused to fund it, so another part of AID made the contract. In Taiwan, fertility declines were at first confined to women 35 years and older who had three or more children; fertility for younger and lower parity women remained high. Somewhat later there was a slight decline for those under 35, and later a substantial decline.

The contractor ran regressions for every conceivable relationship. Nothing worked. The declines were not related to changes in income, infant and child mortality, education, etc. He then ran lagged regressions, under the assumption that conditions not only had to change but the change had to be in force for a period of time before they would trigger a change in fertility. Still nothing. Several hundred thousand dollars were spent on computer time alone.

The explanation for the pattern of decline was no mystery. Had the contractor visited the Taiwan family planning headquarters in Taichung, he could have learned that in the early days of the program the policymakers decided that the only contraceptive they would allow women to use was the IUD, which is more suited to women who have already had a child. Further, they decided that to be eligible for family planning, the women had to have at least three children of which at least one must be a son. Fertility for high parity women dropped. Somewhat later, the program administrators permitted the pill, but only for women who had trouble with the IUD. Some slight decline in fertility of somewhat younger women followed. Later all restrictions were removed. Fertility for younger women declined. This information was available without ever turning on the computer.

One of Ravenholt's pet projects was what he called "inundation." It was supposed to provide contraceptives at a virtual give-away price through 35,000 outlets in Pakistan. These outlets were supposed to sell contraceptives at the equivalent of 2.5 U.S. cents for a month's supply--one cycle of pills or a dozen condoms. The retail shops paid the government 1.5 cents for the supplies, keeping a penny for their troubles. But a penny wasn't sufficient motivation to cause them to promote

contraceptive sales.

VDT: Did they actually have the 35,000 outlets?

BRACKETT: No. They didn't have anything near 35,000, and those that existed rarely had contraceptives they were willing to sell at the official price.

The free market rate for oral contraceptives was 45 to 50 cents a cycle, so not many shops would sell a commodity for 2.5 cents they could sell for 20 times as much. If someone tried to buy contraceptives at the official rate, the merchant might be able to scrape together one or two cycles or half a dozen condoms. However, if you were willing to pay the free market rate, his supply "shortage" would be quickly remedied. He could have a semi filled with contraceptives in front of his shop within an hour.

VDT: And they were, of course, government pills?

BRACKETT: Yes, some were. Government pills usually came from AID, packaged under the "blue lady" label, a package personally designed by Ray Ravenholt. They were readily identifiable. The pharmacies also had supplies obtained legitimately from commercial channels, packaged under manufacturers' brand names. There were reports that contraceptives were smuggled to Afghanistan and re-exported to international markets in Europe and Hong Kong, but I don't know whether these stories were true. I heard that AID-supplied contraceptives were available in the market in Kabul, although AID did not have a population program there.

VDT: Then there was the story of all the condoms that rotted in the warehouses and never got out into the country.

BRACKETT: Or dumped. One of the rumored schemes was simply dumping "surplus" contraceptives to limit the supply and maintain the price.

Another factor that influenced the program in Pakistan and other parts of South Asia was the belief that oral contraceptives posed health problems. I remember one lady field worker in Pakistan who reported putting a total of seven women on the pill and taking two of them off because of generalized pains in the thighs--in other words, thromboembolism. The rate of thromboembolism in North America at that time was two cases per 100,000, in a society in which women ate high cholesterol diets, lived in a cold climate, and followed sedentary life styles, factors that should increase the risk of blood clot. Pakistan women had a very different life style that should result in a lower incidence of blood clot; they engaged in hard physical labor, ate diets dominated by rice and wheat rather than red meat, and lived in a warm climate. The statistical probability that this field worker had two cases in seven was extremely small.

Most field workers had limited education. Although they had some family planning training, a CDC physician traveling with me indicated that it was extremely unlikely the field worker could recognize true signs of thromboembolism. He indicated that physicians not specifically trained to recognize symptoms might miss them.

VDT: You're talking about Bangladesh?

BRACKETT: This particular case was in West Pakistan; Bangladesh at that time was part of Pakistan. It could have been India. Indian family planning workers also had strong anti-pill biases. I think there is somewhat more contraceptive use in the subcontinent than in the 1970s, but they have a long way to go.

VDT: Yes, Pakistan and Bangladesh are stubborn cases, like some of the African countries.

We were talking about the controversy between the development side and the family planners, which has now changed around again. Can you tell me a bit about working with Ray Ravenholt, and in doing that, I'd like to know if you think there has been something of a controversy between the family planners, the population people out on the front lines, like yourself, and the academic demographers sitting back with their articles on family planning, or, as we mentioned, Kingsley Davis and his assumption that ideal family size is so high that you won't get down to replacement level unless you change motivation.

BRACKETT: Many academic demographers understand the urgency of doing something about the population problem. Some are involved in action programs and make vital contributions. They understand and support the necessity of solving the problem sooner rather than later.

Some other academic demographers want to study the problem for ten years, with no guarantee they will ever find a solution. Of course, while they are contemplating their theories, world population is not standing still. In ten years the world will add almost a billion more people.

I'm sure you know about the controversy between the birth controllers who were thought to be interested in eugenics rather than pure scientific demography and the demographers in the early days of PAA.

VDT: Right. That's why Margaret Sanger was asked not to run for vice-president at the very beginning.

BRACKETT: I think that controversy had a great impact on the Association over the years. When I became secretary-treasurer in 1971, some members wanted PAA to support things like a woman's right to abortion. Some members of the Board were strongly against getting involved. They received a delegation from the women's rights group reluctantly and coolly, if not coldly.

PAA members who had business before the Board waited outside until the Board was ready to meet with them. They came in, said their piece, and left. Some Board members believed that they should report only those actions that directly affected PAA members, such as a dues increase. These attitudes and actions fed the distrust many PAA members felt.

I initiated several actions to change the way PAA did business. I opened the Board meetings to any members who wanted to attend. We had occasional observers, but they usually learned quickly that the meetings were not very exciting. Still, the fact that they were not excluded reduced suspicions.

The Board met all day Wednesday, the day before the general meeting, sometimes until late in the evening, then at breakfast the next morning, and again on Saturday. My predecessor [Abbott Ferriss, secretary-treasurer 1968-71] would stay up half the night transcribing the Wednesday minutes for distribution to the Board at breakfast on Thursday. The minutes of the Thursday meeting were transcribed before the Saturday meeting. I had to do both AID and PAA business at the annual meetings. I didn't see the need to produce transcripts so quickly since, the Board rarely referred to them.

I asked Jean Smith of the PAA/ASA business office to take near verbatim minutes, which she transcribed after we returned to Washington. I published them in PAA Affairs. If any question arose at the Thursday or Saturday meetings about what happened earlier, Jean was there with shorthand notes. Later, when I arranged for Ellen Jamison to edit PAA Affairs, Ellen attended the Board meetings so she could report what went on. These actions further reduced suspicions.

VDT: Back in the early 1970s people were urging that PAA become much more politically involved?

BRACKETT: Some members thought PAA should be more politically involved on population issues.

VDT: Of course, right then there was the controversy over abortion, which resulted in the Supreme Court decision of 1973. There were also the Concerned Demographers, young people concerned about Vietnam.

BRACKETT: Vietnam was an issue, but I don't recall it as overwhelming. Family planning was much more of an issue. Some members wanted PAA to take a stand in support of family planning programs both overseas and in the United States.

VDT: So that became a more acceptable topic in PAA; even the academic demographers might be interested?

BRACKETT: Right. PAA did not become an advocacy group, and I didn't think it should. I think it should retain its essentially scientific nature, but at the same time be more open to suggestions from members and more active in getting sound demographics integrated into government policies and programs. A scientist doesn't give up his integrity by applying his scientific knowledge to improve the lives of human beings. If scientific knowledge never gets applied, it is of little value to society.

We also did some specific activities with women's issues. We had a grant to support work by Harriet Presser, Joan Lingner, and other women to conduct a survey of PAA members, for example.

PAA also made changes in the way officers and Board members were selected. Previously, the Board selected a nominating committee who proposed candidates for each office. There was no provision for other nominations. The Board was self-perpetuating. About the time I came on the Board, the nominating committee became elective and procedures were made for members to make nominations. The nominating committee proposes at least two candidates for each office, except the secretary-treasurer. The names are then published in PAA Affairs. Additional nominations may be made within 60 days of the publication of the nominating committee report by petition from at least ten PAA members.

VDT: The most important time that happened was some years ago when there were no women proposed for the Board by the nominating committee, but by the time we voted, there were four women on the slate, and I think we voted in three of them.

BRACKETT: There were a few exceptions, like Irene Taeuber, but in general women did not serve on the Board.

VDT: In the early days, there were Irene Taeuber, Margaret Hagood, and Dorothy Thomas who served on the Board and were presidents in the 1950s. Then there was a long gap to Evelyn Kitagawa in 1977 until there was another woman as president.

I'd like to go back a bit in your career and your move from AID to the Population Institute, working with the "controversial" Werner Fornos. What led you to go from AID to the Population Institute?

BRACKETT: As you probably know, the Carter administration was the worst of any, including the Reagan administration, in handling population activities.

VDT: I never realized that!

BRACKETT: Jimmy Carter appointed Sander Levin, now a congressman from Michigan, as assistant

administrator for the AID bureau that contained the central Population Office. He became Ravenholt's boss in the spring of 1977. I think Levin clearly had a charge to dismantle the population program. The Carter people cultivated the right-to-life group, just as Reagan did. According to some reports, Levin parleyed his services to family planning foes into a seat in the Congress.

In 1982, two years after Levin left AID, a young Democratic congressman from Michigan announced at the last minute that he would not seek re-election. He was believed to be in good health. He was in a safe district with a substantial Democratic majority. There was every reason for him to continue in the Congress. There was a great mystery about why he quit. Up to this point, the story is covered in political analysis of the period and I don't have much doubt that it is true. The rest of the report is harder to check. It alleges that the Catholic bishops prevailed upon the young congressman, who was Catholic, to step aside to make room for Sander Levin. There was not much time between the congressman's announcement that he would not run and the filing date for the Democratic primary. Levin and several others filed. Levin won. I don't think the Republicans have run anyone against him.

Back to AID and 1977. Levin allegedly told Ray Ravenholt very early that he wanted his resignation. Ravenholt was in a career, not a political, position and could not be removed legally at the whim of a political appointee.

Levin attended the PAA meeting in St. Louis that spring, where he managed to super-charge the atmosphere. He held a meeting with heads of population organizations, apparently to determine whether they were loyal to Ravenholt or whether they could be "won over" to his camp. Of course, neither Ravenholt nor any of the Population Office staff were allowed to attend the meeting.

A reporter who interviewed Ray in St. Louis claimed that Ray wanted to sterilize millions of Third World women. What Ray actually said is unclear, but I personally doubt he said what was attributed to him. I suspect what he said was that according to the WFS, half the women interviewed did not want a future birth and that this translated into potential demand for voluntary sterilization by some millions of women. Voluntary sterilization is a very popular method, with millions of couples around the world opting for it.

I recall telling someone at the time that the "interview" was probably written in Washington by family planning foes. I don't know if that happened, but the news story seemed awfully convenient.

In August 1977, Levin's associate, Pat Baldi, went to a population meeting in Mexico City, where she allegedly told some people that the Carter administration had a hit list of AID employees they were going to get rid of. All but two of the names on the list were career people and the two who were then political had been career employees for many years. They were given political appointments to raise their status and as a reward for good works. I was in Mexico that August and I know Baldi had a series of meetings with heads of population organizations. An AID official not in Levin's camp reportedly asked him about the list. Levin reportedly first denied the existence of any list, but then inquired about the names Baldi gave.

That summer we had to go to Levin hat in hand to plead for one more month's funding to keep our contracts going. He was still trying to determine the loyalties of the contractors and was unwilling to provide long-term funding to those whose loyalties were unclear.

Levin knew nothing about foreign affairs, family planning, public health, demography, or statistics, so he was uniquely unqualified to assume responsibility for the U.S. international population program.

I got into trouble with him over data. For several years before his arrival, I wrote short reports on interesting data from surveys, journal articles, etc. I distributed these to people in AID, State, and elsewhere. They were well received by most people, but Levin didn't like them. I didn't understand why at first, but it soon became apparent that he did not want data disseminated that put the population program or Ray Ravenholt in a favorable light. If half the women in the world didn't want a future birth, as the surveys revealed, it was hard for him to argue that there was no demand for family

planning and that Ravenholt was wrong when he pressed for distribution of contraceptives. Levin never told me outright not to publicize data from the surveys, but he did tell me never to send anything to the AID administrator's office. He became upset a few times because somebody else sent copies of my reports to the administrator. He also told me that he didn't want WFS data to get to the Congress.

Levin managed to get several of his loyalists installed in key career positions and they continued his policies into the Reagan administration. Someday the full story of what happened to the U.S. international population program during the Carter and Reagan administrations will be told.

In any case, by 1982 I wanted to leave AID, so I arranged a detail, still an AID employee but assigned to work at the Population Institute. I moved there in 1982 and came back to AID in 1986 for about a year before I retired.

VDT: You stuck it out through the Carter administration.

BRACKETT: I stuck it out; it was difficult. Levin also burned thousands of copies of Population Reports.

VDT: I never heard of that! Population Reports of Johns Hopkins?

BRACKETT: That was before Population Reports moved to Hopkins; the Population Information Program was still at George Washington University. The report contained information on the side effects of the pill. It defused some of the allegations against the pill and pointed out some health benefits. It was written by well qualified medical authorities. Levin didn't want to put the pill in a favorable light, so he burned the reports. He also shut the project down. He dispatched trucks to the university, loaded desks, files, everything. The items were locked in a government warehouse. The Washington Star published pictures of the move the following day.

VDT: There were some problems anyway, weren't there, with the head of that program at GW?

BRACKETT: Phyllis Piotrow was head of the program for a time, but she left to get her Ph.D. at Hopkins. Werner Fornos was running the program during the book-burning and shutdown occurrences. You may be thinking of Murdoch Head, who was dean of health affairs at GW as well as head of the Airlie Foundation. I'm not aware of any role Head played in the Population Information Program.

There were allegations that Head and Joe Beasley were involved with Otto Passman, a Louisiana congressman and long-time chairman of the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, in misuse of government funds. Beasley, Head, and Passman were all tried. Beasley went to prison. As I recall Head was convicted, but I don't think he went to jail. Passman got his trial moved to his congressional district, where he was acquitted.

I moved to the Population Institute to get away from the mess at AID and to see how the private side functioned. I did a study of the cost of expanding family planning services to essentially all couples in the Third World. That report was published just before the 1984 International Population Conference in Mexico. I did some further work along the same lines, including the project I am currently working on in Indonesia.

VDT: I've been reading Gaining People: Losing Ground [Population Institute, 1987]. You did an essential part of that book too.

BRACKETT: Yes, I did those calculations after I left the Population Institute. I think the methodology we developed is quite useful for looking at family planning costs. We are using it in

Indonesia.

One of the problems we faced in the past was to convince people, particularly demographers, that family planning would work even to get fertility from 6 to 5 children per woman. A lot of people thought we were insane for even dreaming about replacement fertility in a Third World country. But we now have Singapore with a total fertility rate of 1.6. Fertility rates have declined sharply in Thailand, Indonesia, South Korea, and most of the Latin America.

Only two or three developed countries have fertility rates as high as replacement, so it's clear that there is nothing magic about the two child family.

VDT: Then you have Ben Wattenberg cropping up again.

BRACKETT: Yes, Ben worries about the birth dearth. I debated him on channel 4 about three years ago. He belongs to the "more the merrier" crowd. One of the comments he made on television was that we live in a country that has had one of the fastest growing populations in history. Two hundred years ago when we gained our independence, we had a population of four million. We now have 240 million, 60 times as many people.

Of course, what he did was take the results of the 1790 census, which covered the original 13 states along the Atlantic coast, and compare that to the population of a country that stretches across the entire continent and extends well out into the Pacific and to the Arctic circle. In 1790 there were Spanish settlements in Florida and in the territory stretching from Texas to California. The French were in New Orleans and the Great Lakes area, the Russians in Alaska and to some extent further south. There were also Indians, Hawaiians, Eskimos, and others. I haven't been able to find an estimate of the population in the present territory of the United States in 1790, but it had to be considerably more than the four million counted in the first census.

That aside, we did experience substantial growth during the past 200 years, but the nature of that growth was very different from that experienced by developing nations. Millions of adults, educated and/or trained by their countries of origin, came to North America where they could apply their skills to exploiting the rich natural resources of the continent or find ready employment in an expanding economy.

Population growth in today's developing nations is a consequence of high birth rates. These poor countries must bear the expense of feeding, housing, clothing, and educating these babies before they are ready to enter the labor force, which, of course, already has a huge reserve waiting for their turn at gainful employment.

Finally, the rates of population growth were very different. Wattenberg claims the U.S. population grew 60 times since 1790. If Kenya's population were to continue to grow for the next 200 years at the rate it has grown since it gained independence, it would increase 3,500 times--to a level of 70 billion!

VDT: That's interesting; I never thought of that. But the 3.9 million of the 1790 census excluded Indians; it didn't count blacks.

BRACKETT: It did count blacks, both free and slave, but, of course, it did not count people outside the boundaries of the 13 states of the day. Since states like Virginia and North Carolina stretched beyond the mountains into the current states of Kentucky, Tennessee, and West Virginia and Maine was part of Massachusetts, the territory was actually somewhat larger than the current territory of the original 13 states, but still, three quarters of the current U.S. territory was not covered in the 1790 census.

VDT: I don't think Ben Wattenberg is so much "the more the merrier" now. In the The Birth Dearth

[1987], of course, he deplores below-replacement fertility in the developed world, the "free" countries--he leaves out Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union--but he also says we should bring down the high rates in developing countries; that both sides should aim for replacement level, one goes up and the other down. He's changed his tune a little.

BRACKETT: I saw a pre-publication copy of Birth Dearth; I haven't read it since it was published.

VDT: There were some problems there. I did a review based on galley proofs and there were some changes after that.

BRACKETT: I don't know whether he changed it, but in the pre-publication version he said he went to a high school in Michigan where he asked a class of 17-year-olds for their fertility preferences. Did he change that?

VDT: No. It started off the whole book.

BRACKETT: Okay. He asked the 17-year-olds how many wanted four kids. Nobody did. He then asked those who wanted three to raise their hands; one or two did. Some of their classmates said, "Gross!" On the basis of this public vote of 25 17-year-olds in one high school in Michigan, he concluded that the country is going to have even lower fertility than we have now. I don't know what he was doing when he was 17, but I certainly didn't spend very much of my time thinking about the number of children I wanted. I was more interested in whether I would get a date for Saturday or whether I had prepared adequately for the Latin test next period. I don't think teenagers in the mid-1980s were any different.

The total fertility rate in the United States is now 1.8. Last year we had 3.5 million births and 1.9 million deaths, so we are not running out of people.

VDT: Well, of course, when you get the baby boomers through the bulge of childbearing . . .

BRACKETT: Sure, it's an age structure phenomenon now. But in the 1930s we had a fertility level almost as low as it is now and we had demographers predicting that by 1960 the U.S. population would peak at 150 or 160 million and then go into a tailspin. Of course, it didn't happen quite that way; we now have 240 million people. The population is still growing, even from natural increase. I don't know what's going to happen to the birth rate in the future. I suspect whatever happens the opinions of high schoolers in Michigan will not have much bearing on it.

Remember that the baby boom raised the TFR in this country from 2.5 in 1945 to 3.8 in 1957. During the next 15 years, the TFR fell by half to a level below replacement. Who knows what will happen in the next 15 years.

VDT: You're being a bit critical of Ben Wattenberg and I'm inclined to agree with you. You've been an interesting person in many respects and one way is that you've been someone who has bridged the gap between the academically trained demographer and the publicist, or the people who have been on the forefront of the battle--the Werner Fornoses and Ray Ravenholts. Tell me a bit about how you've felt being in that position between, say, Ravenholt and the academics and between Fornos and the people who think he's an alarmist.

BRACKETT: You keep asking me about Ravenholt and Fornos and I keep drifting into other topics. Let me try to answer.

Ravenholt and Fornos have a number of common characteristics. Both are hard-driving and

confrontational, even when the circumstances call for a more reasoned approach. Both have many good ideas, but sometimes present them in outrageous ways. Ravenholt was accused of wanting to throw contraceptives from helicopters.

VDT: That was a famous thing. Did he ever do it?

BRACKETT: I don't know whether he even said that, but it's possible. Both Ravenholt and Fornos were tough bosses. They had many ideas and wanted the staff to follow up on them. Sometimes they would listen, Ravenholt more than Fornos, but other times they wouldn't. I think they would have been better served had they listened more to other people's opinions before jumping.

We accomplished a lot. The work schedule in the Population Office was extremely difficult. Ravenholt worked 12 to 15 hours virtually every day. I averaged 10 to 12 hours. I used to work all day in Washington, work on the overnight flight to London, go to WFS as soon as I arrived in London, and then take a night flight to Africa or Asia.

We were doing novel, interesting, and challenging things. Many of us felt that the population problem was serious and urgent. We were dedicated to doing something about it.

Some people say that had Ravenholt approached his activities in AID on a more camaraderie basis, working with other people in the agency, we might not have had the problems we had. Perhaps. But starting a new program in AID that by its very nature was controversial could not be done by people who have a Milquetoast approach to things.

Many people in AID have negative authority. They can stop or at least delay actions. On the other hand, only a few people have positive authority. If they sign off on something, you can go forward.

Positive authority is usually vested in political appointees. Some were capable and dedicated, but others had political and/or personal agendas that superseded the goals of the agency, the interests of the American people, the people in the Third World, and the signals from the Congress.

Those with only negative authority were sometimes political, but most were career bureaucrats. Some were dedicated development experts who helped us get our program through the system, but, regrettably, many others used their negative authority to curry favor for their own ends. They had little or no interest in the program.

Had Ravenholt played the bureaucratic and political game when he started the program, we would have had a much easier time. But we wouldn't have accomplished very much.

The first year of the program was FY1968. Congress earmarked \$35 million for population that year by putting language in the authorizing legislation to the effect that not less than \$35 million of any monies the Congress appropriated for foreign aid must be spent for population. To limit the bureaucratic tendency to label whatever they wanted to spend money on as coming under programs the Congress liked, Congress spelled out a list of activities the money could be used for.

The AID administrator went to the appropriations committees to upset the earmarking. He succeeded in getting language passed that "up to" \$20 million could be programmed for population. He didn't really want \$20 million, but that was better than \$35 million.

Both bills passed. So according to one bill, AID must spend not less than \$35 million for population and according to another, AID could spend no more than \$20 million. Our friends in Congress managed to make the language in the authorizing legislation operative, so we got \$35 million.

I remember a conversation I had with a person in the Program Office. He stated that we would be permitted to "waste" only \$4 million. "It is better that the money be returned to the Treasury than to be wasted on this dirty business." On another occasion, the White House sent over a document on population signed by President Nixon. This same individual said in a loud voice, "He can't do that!" I suggested he call the President and tell him.

In any case, the first year we programmed \$34.6 million, almost literally over the dead bodies of the Program Office, and most of that was in the last couple of months of the fiscal year. I think that was a real accomplishment, since most of us were not well versed in the bureaucratic maze one had to transit to obligate money.

I think the view of family planning in the Third World is now 180 degrees from what it was 20 years ago.

VDT: You mean the change in population policy?

BRACKETT: Well, the view that fertility is amenable to change. I think the view some people had--and some still have--was rather elitist. In essence, they said women were too dumb to know what's good for them, so the social engineers had to manipulate their fertility behavior to conform to some prescribed pattern. While Third World women may not have a great deal of formal education, I think they have a great deal more practical education--we used to call it "horse sense"--than the social engineers. These women must make their way in a society and economy where life is hard. I wonder how many academics could do as well.

The early WFS results which revealed that half the women we interviewed didn't want a future birth was rejected by many academics and many in AID, including Sander Levin, who told me that he didn't care what these women said, they don't make decisions on their own fertility. I told him that we had at that time a survey of husbands in Thailand and that when the responses of husbands and wives were matched, 80 percent agreed on whether they wanted a future birth--50 percent agreed they did not want a future birth and 30 percent agreed they did. Twenty percent of the couples didn't agree. Levin rejected those data as well. We now have husband surveys for several countries and they show substantial husband-wife agreement.

I think the element that did not exist prior to the international family planning program was the access to safe and effective means of fertility control.

VDT: Do you think that's true in Africa? Everyone thinks Africa is different from Asia and Latin America.

BRACKETT: People said fertility could not decline in the Third World, period. You may remember the various attempts to "explain" the fertility declines that occurred over the years. The first countries to experience declines were island nations, so we heard how inhabitants of islands could sense the finiteness of their world since they could see the ocean on four sides, but they were an exception. No other Third World nations would follow suit.

The next countries to experience fertility declines were peninsulas. Well, aren't they were really islands attached at one end to the mainland? Inhabitants can see the ocean on three sides, so they still sensed the finiteness of their world and thus reduced fertility.

Well, then came the isthmuses. They were really like islands attached at both ends to larger land masses, but inhabitants could see the ocean on two sides.

Guess what happened next! Well, there must be something wrong with the data, because there surely is no flaw in the ideology.

There were also ethnic explanations. Chinese people would limit their fertility because of the particular social structure, but others would not.

Africa is the latest, sort of the last frontier. When I visit Africa and talk to people engaged in family planning, they say there is big demand. For example, when I was in Kenya in 1985, appointments for sterilizations had to be made weeks in advance. The condom uptake in Africa is increasing dramatically, partly related to AIDS. Zimbabwe clearly demonstrates that an African nation can have effective family planning program that serves a large percentage of the population. Africa

has a long way to go, but I see some progress.

When we first started, we were told that only a few highly motivated couples would use family planning, at most 2 percent. When use rates hit 10 percent, these same people predicted that we had scooped off the cream, the going would be tough in the future. Then we reached 15 percent, 20 percent, then 30 percent.

VDT: It's 38 percent in Zimbabwe. I've been there and seen contraceptive distribution in the field.

BRACKETT: Botswana and Kenya are also distributing contraceptives in increasing numbers.

[Note added in May 1990:

In 1989 I did a report for AID's Africa Bureau. I found the following use rates for modern contraceptives in five African countries:

Zimbabwe	1988	36%
Botswana	1988	32%
Kenya	1989	18%
Liberia	1986	6%
Ghana	1988	5%

The 38 percent rate for Zimbabwe was for all methods in 1984. The use rate that year for modern methods was 27 percent. Use rates in the French-speaking countries of West Africa are all single digits, and usually in the 1 to 2 percent level. End 1990 insert.]

AIDS is likely to have a profound affect on the population problem, particularly in Africa, but possibly in other regions. As you know, in Africa AIDS is not a disease limited to the so-called "high risk" groups--homosexuals, druggies. The sex ratio of AIDS cases is about one to one. AIDS spreads via heterosexual contacts but also through other means, such as scarification, circumcision, both male and female, blood transfusions, and the re-use of hypodermic needles in health centers. The severe shortage of medical supplies leads to re-use of supplies whenever possible, including pre-sterilized needles packaged for one-time use.

VDT: Tell me about Werner Fornos and the Population Institute, which has certainly been in the forefront of getting governments involved in family planning and keeping the population problem before the American public eye.

BRACKETT: Werner Fornos and the Population Institute have done more to make the American people aware of the population issue than anyone else. I did some public speaking while I worked at the Institute. I can tell you about one trip I made to give you a view of the way things happened at the Institute.

I met up with Werner at a conference we held in Mexico. I came from Washington; he came from California. After the Mexico meeting, he was scheduled to continue on a speaking trip to Oregon and Alaska but he had to return to Washington to handle an urgent problem, so he handed me his air tickets with his name on them. I was Werner Fornos as far as the airlines were concerned for a couple of weeks.

Since I didn't have winter clothes, Maura arranged to send an overcoat and other things to Eugene, my first Oregon stop. I spent two nights sleeping in the attic of one of my contacts there. After several speeches, TV and radio appearances, meetings with newspaper editors, etc., I rented a car and headed south to several places in central and southern Oregon. I returned the car and flew from

southern Oregon to Portland and on to Anchorage. I ended up on Good Friday in Fairbanks, where the temperature was well below zero. My hosts were concerned that I might fall on the snow because my shoes were smooth-bottomed; theirs had snow treads.

I made several trips, some that were set up for me from the start and some set up for Werner. It was interesting getting out to meet people. I found most people like to have visitors, particularly when they can meet a person face to face who can speak with authority on an important topic.

One of the problems the population organizations have is that they use too many numbers. People don't relate well to numbers. For example, how much is 5 billion? Is that really too many people?

One technique used is to move the discussion to growth. The world population reached 1 billion in 1830, 2 billion in 1930, 3 billion in 1960, etc. I went a step further and talked about the population growth in one human lifetime--mine. When I was born in 1931, world population was 2 billion. By the time my second son was born, 1960, world population had added a third billion. That son was in high school when world population reached 4 billion. Up to that point population had doubled during my lifetime.

About the time this same son completed his master's degree, we had a fifth billion. The sixth billion will be here about the time I reach 65 years. At that point, world population will have tripled during my lifetime. World population may well reach seven billion before I die. Prior to my generation, no human being had ever experienced even a doubling of world population.

But even that didn't always get across, because my audiences were often high school and college age. The Vietnam war ended while they were in preschool. World War II was a long time ago, and 1930--well, that's ancient history.

You were involved in the fourth billion.

VDT: Yes, we decided that on March 28th, 1976, the world would have the fourth billion. Paul Myers did the calculations for us [the Population Reference Bureau].

BRACKETT: As you know, the Population Institute decided that July 1986 was the date when the fifth billion arrived on earth. We did get a lot of publicity.

VDT: July 7, 1986. You certainly did. Of course, the UN weighed in with a year later.

BRACKETT: Yes, it would have been better if we'd all been together.

VDT: I think both times got a lot of publicity.

BRACKETT: Yes, but I'm not sure what the ultimate consequences of the publicity are. I think there is a need to relate on a more human level.

I was doing a lot of public speaking in the United States when the evening television news reported the horrors of the Ethiopian famine. Everybody knew the Ethiopian story. They saw the emaciated children on television. They readily associated Ethiopia with the population problem, but the immediate solution was not planeloads of condoms, but shiploads of corn.

What should the people in the American heartland do about the population problem? All too often the answer was to call your congressman and tell him to vote for some obscure amendment, such as the Kemp-Inouye amendment.

Here were two men whose ideas on population were as different as any two people you can name. Senator Inouye thought the amendment would force the President or the Secretary of State to publicly state that they did not believe China's population planning program had engaged in human rights violations. That would release money to the UN Population Fund. Inouye and the population

lobby believed that neither the White House nor the Secretary of State would brand China as a violator of human rights because they wanted to keep good relations with the leaders of China. I'm not sure exactly what Kemp thought the amendment would do. He was opposed to family planning, period. Try explaining that to people in the heartland in sufficient detail so they can speak intelligently to their congressman.

The amendment did pass, but it did not accomplish the purpose Inouye had in mind. The White House went lawyer-shopping. They found that while the lawyers at State ruled that the authority to decide whether China was violating human rights could not be delegated below the Secretary of State, the lawyers at AID said the authority could be delegated to the administrator of AID, which is exactly what the White House did. On the basis of a report prepared by the Census Bureau, the AID administrator determined that China's population planning program did violate human rights. The UN did not get the money.

I think the international population community has been too timid. They retreat in the face of inroads by family planning foes when they should attack. I sometimes told audiences that the family planning foes, masquerading as anti-abortionists, were really out to remove safe and effective contraceptives from the shelves for Americans as well as people in the Third World and that unless they fought back, the family planning foes would win. That is exactly what the foes did. American couples have access to fewer family planning methods than couples in many developing countries.

VDT: Who have been some of the leading influences in your career?

BRACKETT: Norman Lawrence was probably the most important influence. He became my mentor. I went to work for him in 1955, as soon as I left the University of North Carolina. He was working in an international program at the Census Bureau headed by Parker Mauldin, who also had considerable influence on me. Parker left the Census Bureau about two years after I got there for the Population Council. Norman Lawrence worked in the international program exclusively from at least the mid-1950s on. He spent a tour in Caracas working on the 1960 Venezuela census, then came back to the Census Bureau's international program. He was later detailed to AID's Latin America bureau. Unfortunately, he died a number of years ago.

VDT: How did he become your mentor?

BRACKETT: I don't know how someone becomes a mentor. But I worked very closely with him during the period just after I came to the Census Bureau. We hit it off and remained close until he died. He encouraged me to computerize the work we were doing. He went to work at AID several years before I did. When he retired, he worked for me as a consultant.

VDT: I've never heard of him before. Why wasn't he active in PAA, for instance?

BRACKETT: He was. He was responsible for my becoming secretary-treasurer. He was on the nominating committee that year.

VDT: I was going to ask you about that--how one becomes secretary-treasurer. It's a non-elective office and it would seem to be a rather thankless task.

BRACKETT: I remember when Norman asked me if I were willing to serve, he said that the secretary-treasurer was, in many ways, the most powerful job in PAA. I hadn't thought much about it before, but his assessment was correct. The secretary-treasurer is the only officer who serves more than one year. The Board members serve longer terms, but they normally meet only once or twice a

year. In fact, as I recall, PAA didn't start holding fall Board meetings until I became secretary. The Board members are not really involved in the day-to-day operations of the organization.

The secretary-treasurer works with the business manager; the American Statistical Association business manager was also PAA's. The two basically take care of the day-to-day business. When something required action by the president, I would call him and we usually worked it out on the phone.

[Phone interruption]

VDT: We were talking about Norman Lawrence getting you to be secretary-treasurer of PAA and he said that it was the most powerful position of the PAA and you were saying that was true.

BRACKETT: I think that's true because the secretary-treasurer is the person who must deal with the business matters of the Association on a day-to-day basis. The president serves one year. The role of the president is somewhat more executive and in some respects honorary.

VDT: Except he's very busy planning the program for that year [since 1976. Before that, the first vice-president was responsible for the annual meeting program.]

BRACKETT: That's true, but the logistics of the meeting are usually left to the secretary and business manager. The city and hotel to meet in are scouted out years ahead by the business manager and/or the secretary. We visited places that were potential meeting sites if we didn't know them already. We reported to the Board on the sites we scouted and they voted on the sites PAA would meet at.

VDT: Do you remember the first meeting you attended and also outstanding meetings through the years?

BRACKETT: The first one was Princeton; I think it was 1956 or 1957. I went to one the next year in Ann Arbor.

VDT: 1955 was at Princeton and the next one at Ann Arbor.

BRACKETT: The meetings at that time were very small. PAA could meet at university halls. I remember we had a banquet in a museum with stuffed animals.

VDT: That was 1957 at the University of Pennsylvania.

BRACKETT: One of the somewhat amusing but regrettable developments was at a meeting in Toronto [1972]. PAA had agreed a long time before that it would not meet any place where any form of segregation was practiced. But we missed the fact that the hotel had a men's bar.

VDT: No, they called it the ladies bar. That means that you had to go in there with a man, but women were not allowed in the main bar.

BRACKETT: Dorothy Thomas was kept out. The hotel allegedly suspected her of soliciting!

VDT: Toronto is my hometown and it was embarrassing to me that you even went to the King Edward Hotel because it was rather run down then. Now it's jacked up.

BRACKETT: One of the meetings I had a hand in organizing that went very well was Seattle [1975].

That was the West coast and we didn't have a lot of experience with West coast meeting. The number of people that came was small, relative to East coast cities.

VDT: In 1975 there were 595. Well, there were 590 in Atlanta just five years prior to that.

BRACKETT: In New York in 1974, we went over a thousand [1,110]. PAA was growing rapidly at that time, so we expected attendance at the annual meetings to grow also. I scouted out Tucson and Phoenix as possible future meeting sites, but the Board was afraid to schedule another meeting away from the East coast.

One of the events we had in Seattle was a boat trip to an island where we had a salmon bake. That went over extremely well.

VDT: It did; I remember that well.

BRACKETT: The next year [1976], the meeting was in Montreal. There was a wine and cheese party on the Expo 1967 grounds and that was a disaster.

VDT: Right. They didn't feed us enough.

BRACKETT: I think people remembered the tremendous success of the salmon bake the year before and signed up in much larger numbers than expected. They weren't prepared for the numbers. Ed Bisgyer negotiated a refund of some of the money.

VDT: He did. And on the basis of that PAA gave up on having dinners.

BRACKETT: In St. Louis in 1977 we had a show on a boat on the Mississippi. The skit wasn't really appropriate for . . .

VDT: A serious academic gathering.

BRACKETT: It was slapstick comedy.

But that meeting was the beginning of the downfall of AID's Population Office.

VDT: That was one of the few times when PAA meetings got into the press, with the Ravenholt interview. I've regretted that lack over the years. In San Francisco [1986], we had our friend Tim Shriner of the San Francisco Chronicle; he wrote a little. In 1981, the 50th anniversary meeting in Washington, Cynthia Green and I ran a press office and we did get quite a bit of coverage. But, otherwise, people have regretted the fact that they didn't get into the papers more. Here [St. Louis] was an example when they did and it was a disaster.

BRACKETT: Well, PAA could have gotten into the paper in a little more favorable light. This was very unfortunate.

VDT: Family planning, as we've said again and again, is a very controversial field. Of course, it's a fascinating field and it affects everybody. There's bound to be problems.

Just before we finish, I want to get on to a couple of other things. You studied at North Carolina; there's been more than one demographer from there.

BRACKETT: I was born in Gastonia, North Carolina, which is just next to Charlotte. Clyde Kaiser

happens to be from a town called Bessemer City, which is five or six miles from Gastonia.

VDT: Where he now lives.

BRACKETT: His sister was my algebra teacher in high school. She was a first-rate teacher and probably accounted for some of my interest in mathematics. I never thought about demography then. I don't think I even knew the word.

VDT: Wonderful connection!

BRACKETT: We also had Dorothy Glenn, an ob/gyn. She had a substantial medical practice in town. Her father was an ear, nose, and throat specialist; her husband and father-in-law were surgeons. She worked as population/health officer in Saigon for seven or eight years and then spent several years in Korea. She worked in the Population Office [of AID] on and off over the years.

Then there was Harry Rosenberg.

VDT: Rosenberg also--same town!

BRACKETT: Same town. Rosenberg married a girl who grew up across the road from me.

VDT: You mean his present wife? He's remarried.

BRACKETT: It was probably his first wife.

VDT: His first wife died.

BRACKETT: Oh, I didn't know that. I haven't seen him in years.

Then we had Marshall Turner, who is at the Census Bureau.

VDT: All of you people come from that one little town! There must be something in the soil there that breeds population people.

Then there's another population person whom I presume was a very important influence in your life--Maura--Maura Brackett, who is chief of the Population Division in AID's Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, and, of course, you are a very well-known couple in the field, carrying on the lead of some other famous demography couples.

BRACKETT: We met at AID. Maura worked for John Kennedy . . .

VDT: I see the pictures around the walls here of the Kennedys.

BRACKETT: She worked at the White House from inauguration day through the Kennedy administration and for about a year under Johnson.

VDT: What was she doing at the White House?

BRACKETT: She worked in congressional relations with Larry O'Brien. Her immediate boss was Henry Hall Wilson, who was responsible for the House of Representatives. I didn't know her at the time, but I've gotten to know some of the people she worked with.

About a year after Kennedy's death, she got a Fulbright scholarship and spent a year in Caracas.

She came back and started work at AID, where we met. We started at AID at about the same time. I met her not long thereafter. In fact, I think Norman Lawrence introduced us. I had no thought at the time of romantic involvement; I was married to someone else. I was divorced in the early 1970s and Maura and I started going out, got married, and have been quite happy ever since.

VDT: You have certainly strong similar interests.

BRACKETT: I think so, and I think we influence each other in a very positive way. She is very interested in computers. She formed a PC users group for population activities. It's called POPLAC, LAC for Latin America and the Caribbean. She may change the name because many people who attend the meetings are from other regions.

VDT: They are coming to the Census Bureau? Is that where the meetings are?

BRACKETT: No, the meetings are at the State Department. The Census Bureau has played virtually no role. She invites software and hardware manufacturers and other people who have interesting applications to make presentations.

VDT: Obviously, you had a lot to do with her getting into computers.

BRACKETT: I probably contributed to it. She might have gotten into them anyway. She just attended a meeting in Boca Raton on the planning for the 1990 round of censuses--hardware, software.

VDT: A final question: What do you see as the outlook for, well, I say demography in the U.S., but I really mean population in LDCs. I'm sure you see demographers becoming more crucial than ever.

BRACKETT: I think the outcome of the next election [1988] will have a lot to do with what happens in the future. George Bush has a previous history of strongly supporting family planning. He wrote the preface to Phyllis Piotrow's book [World Population Crisis: The United States Response, 1973] while he was ambassador to the United Nations. His actions may depend upon his assessment of the political situation. In the preface, he states that his first exposure to birth control as a public policy issue was in 1950 when his father ran for the Senate from Connecticut. The Sunday before the election, Drew Pearson reported that Mr. Bush was associated with Planned Parenthood. The elder Bush lost by a few hundred votes out of nearly a million. The Vice President states that he always attributed his father's loss to the association with Planned Parenthood.

Pat Shroeder, the congresswoman from Colorado, asked Bush recently on a TV program about family planning. Bush reaffirmed his support. It is possible that he will move away from the Reagan administration opposition.

I don't know who is likely to be Bush's running mate. There's talk of Jack Kemp.

VDT: Likely to have the opposite effect.

BRACKETT: In terms of the Democrats, I don't know what the views are; there's hope, at least, that something can change from what we had under Carter.

VDT: Any final remarks? You're a great raconteur, as I knew; I certainly have enjoyed this. Well, I'll throw out a huge question: Is world population growth coming down?

BRACKETT: I think the growth rates of individual countries will decline additionally; they have

already declined in Asia and Latin America, less or not at all in Africa. I think the demand for family planning is very high in the Third World. I think we're going to see more countries with very substantial declines in fertility and, in fact, fertility at or below replacement.

Of course, future declines in fertility are heavily dependent on the availability of family planning services. Fertility declines are slowing in many areas because resources to support family planning have declined and because much of the money that is available is not used effectively. Unless that changes, we may see further slowing of fertility declines. A majority of Third World couples now know that the means exist for them to control their fertility and I think they will demand family planning services.

VDT: This has been a great interview. You're a fund of stories and you've certainly been in the thick of the battle to tackle rapid world population growth and I hope you will go on being a key player for many years. What are your plans?

BRACKETT: I'm going back to Indonesia this weekend and complete the long-range strategy project I've been working on since October; in effect, to take the Indonesian family planning program to the final stage where contraceptive use is universal, where Indonesian couples have substantially universal control over their fertility.

VDT: Perhaps to Pakistan?

BRACKETT: I haven't been in Pakistan in a few years. I would like to go back to see if things have changed. I was in Bangladesh about three years ago and there are signs of progress with family planning, despite the abject poverty of that country. One wonders what a country like Bangladesh can do to get out of the poverty; I don't know that there is much.

VDT: Except to see that the poverty is not aggravated by adding so many millions a year.

BRACKETT: They can reduce the aggravation, but they don't have a large supply of resources. The population is largely illiterate, so it's not another Japan, where a highly educated population makes a good living processing natural resources imported from elsewhere.

VDT: Do you see yourself working in different developing countries?

BRACKETT: I certainly hope so.

VDT: Here's an afterthought. Jim says that the PAA president he found easiest to work with was Amos Hawley. Tell us a bit about him.

BRACKETT: I found him easy to get hold of; that wasn't true for some of the other presidents. We could discuss issues we had to deal with, come to a decision, and then follow through with required actions. If he was supposed to do something, he did it. I didn't have to worry about it.

VDT: Obviously, he could relate well with people.

BRACKETT: One of the other presidents was extremely hard to get hold of. I could rarely call and get him on the phone and he rarely returned my calls. Months went by between contacts. I received several angry letters from PAA members who tried unsuccessfully to reach him. I couldn't do anything to help them. [JRW note: Brackett was Sec/Treas during terms of Hawley, Ryder, Campbell, and Westoff]

MARY GRACE KOVAR

PAA Secretary-Treasurer in 1975-78 (No. 15). Interview with Jean van der Tak at the National Center for Health Statistics, Hyattsville, Maryland, December 5, 1989.

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS: Mary Grace Kovar was born Texas and grew up near Pittsburgh. She received a B.S. in biology in 1951 and the M.S. in biology in 1956, both from the University of Pittsburgh. She obtained the Dr.P.H. (Doctor in Public Health) from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1983. In 1959-60, she worked as a statistician with the National Health Survey in the Division of Public Health Methods of the then Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a division that evolved into the National Center for Health Statistics, which Dr. Kovar joined as a statistician in the 1960s. During her career with NCHS, where she is Special Assistant, Office of Vital and Health Statistics Systems, she has been closely involved with the agency's national health surveys and she is project director of the Longitudinal Study of Aging. She was director of the first three editions of NCHS's Health, United States and is the author or coauthor of numerous other publications dealing with health, mortality, and other issues among infants, adolescents, the elderly, and other age groups in the U.S.

VDT: Mary Grace was the first woman to be secretary-treasurer of PAA and one of only two women among PAA's 19 secretaries or secretary-treasurers [through 1989] since the Association's founding in 1931. Currently, Suzanne Bianchi is secretary-treasurer [followed by Barbara Foley Wilson for 1990-93].

[From biographical introduction]: Where were you born?

KOVAR: I was born in Burnet County, Texas, on land that had been a Spanish land grant to my great-grandfather. When he went to Texas as a very early migrant, from North Carolina, it was still part of Spain.

VDT: Did you grow up there?

KOVAR: No, I grew up outside of Pittsburgh.

VDT: Among Mary Grace's publications, she has just mentioned that she's done a chapter in the 150th anniversary volume for the American Statistical Association on the gathering of social statistics.

KOVAR: Right. I did that with Bob Israel, deputy director of NCHS, and Fred Bohme, who is historian for the Census Bureau. The title is "Collecting Social Statistics for a Nation." It's been published in the Sesquicentennial Invited Paper Sessions, American Statistical Association, Washington, D.C., 1989. So it might add to some of your historical documentation.

VDT: We'll hear more about your work and publications at NCHS. But, to begin at the beginning, when and how did you first become interested in demography? You appear to have carried on a tradition that was more common in the early days of demography in the U.S. of biologists drawn to demography, like Raymond Pearl; that was back in the 1920s and 1930s. I think it's been much rarer in recent decades, hasn't it?

KOVAR: I think it probably has been. But, remember, I was at Pittsburgh at the School of Public Health and the chair of the department of biostatistics was Tony Ciocco. Tony had trained under

Raymond Pearl and so I was exposed to the Raymond Pearl discipline. And my master's thesis, although supposedly on genetics, was truly a demographic thesis on survival.

VDT: You'd been an undergraduate in biology at Pittsburgh and went straight on. This was your mentor for your master's degree?

KOVAR: No, the mentor for my master's degree was actually a biologist. But Paul Denson, who was at that time in the School of Public Health, was interested in the change of the expectation of life that came along with the Industrial Revolution. His thesis was that people subjected to great stress in early life who survived it then had a tendency to have a longer expectation of life than the average person who had not been subjected to that early stress.

And so, very much in the tradition of Pearl, I designed an experiment using fruit flies to test this. And indeed, the longest-lived fruit flies were those who were exposed to adverse conditions very early, during the first 24 hours of their lives. But the other interesting thing about that thesis was that it demonstrated the crossover effect.

VDT: That we now talk about between blacks and whites at older ages, right.

KOVAR: And that crossover effect, between those with adverse conditions early in life . . . sorry, I'm using both hands and I know this doesn't turn up on a taperecorder.

VDT: It's fun for me to watch; go on.

KOVAR: Their expectation of life did indeed cross over those who had not been subjected to that early stress.

VDT: It's still an issue.

KOVAR: It's still an issue. It's an issue that long ago could be demonstrated in the laboratory.

VDT: Was your thesis published?

KOVAR: Unfortunately, no. It should have been. At that time and place, nobody suggested that it be submitted and that was that.

VDT: What did you do after Pittsburgh?

KOVAR: That year I had been nominated for a Public Health Service scholarship and was told, "We're not going to award you the scholarship, because you'll get married and there's no point in your having it."

VDT: The Public Health scholarship would have been here in Washington?

KOVAR: No, it would have been for graduate study at the School of Public Health at Pittsburgh. "But we're not going to waste them on a woman who's going to get married." So that next spring there was an opening at Iowa State in the department of statistics and I decided that I would just leave Pittsburgh if that's the way they felt about me, and I wasn't going to go anywhere there anyhow.

I went to Iowa State and did the next year there in applied statistics in the statistical laboratory. At that time, George Snedecor was still there. He went to Brazil for one semester, so I lived in his

house.

Then at the end of that year, I married and went to Vietnam. My husband was in the State Department.

VDT: When was that, about 1958?

KOVAR: I'm one of the worst persons on dates, but around then.

VDT: We coincided; I lived in Bangkok in those years. We visited in Vietnam.

KOVAR: Well, I visited in Bangkok.

VDT: You were there while Saigon was traditionally Vietnamese.

KOVAR: I actually saw the French Foreign Legion leave and the wars beginning. We were there two years.

VDT: That was an interesting period.

KOVAR: It was a very interesting period. It was a great time to be young and living in Southeast Asia. I taught English to Vietnamese at an American-Vietnamese school called Hoi Vietnam. I would teach for three months and then take all the money I had earned for three months and go off to Laos or Cambodia.

VDT: In the days when we could get into those places. Angkor Wat--you were able to go there?

KOVAR: Three times.

VDT: I went once and, of course, for years after that it was forbidden territory. Wonderful! And then what happened?

KOVAR: We finished by taking three months coming home around the world. And it took me a very few months to decide that keeping house in a Washington apartment wasn't enough to do. I had seen an article when I was in Saigon about the National Health Survey and thought this was a place I would like to work. So I did something I suppose you couldn't do anymore. I found out where the man who had written the article was, walked into his office, told his secretary that I would like to talk with him. She asked me why and I told her. She said, "Let me see if he's here," and he was. I told him that I had read this article in Saigon and I really wanted to work there and he said, "Fine."

VDT: Who was that?

KOVAR: Forrest Linder.

VDT: How great!

KOVAR: So, obviously, there was a demographic connection.

VDT: Absolutely! So, that was in 1964, when you began at . . .

KOVAR: Actually, it was 1959.

VDT: You are down in the Petersens' Biographies of Demographers as having started here at NCHS [National Center for Health Statistics] in 1964. But this was 1959?

KOVAR: The reason for that is technically my federal entry-on-duty date is 1964. Because I was here and then I went away for several years and then I came back and they adjust what we call your "entry-on-duty date." They don't want that empty space in the middle, so they move the beginning to a date that removes it.

VDT: So you began to work for Forrest Linder in 1959?

KOVAR: He said, "Fine, I want you to come to work." So then I had to find out how to do this officially, because obviously there has to be a piece of paper. At that time it was Form 57, so I filled it out. At that time, all statisticians--and many demographers in the federal government are still classified as statisticians--had to go out to the Census Bureau to be classified. The Census Bureau apparently thought, "Here is a hot candidate," and didn't send my papers back.

VDT: They wanted to steal you first!

KOVAR: I got phonecalls: They would work out a carpool for me. Well, I was not at that time going to go to Suitland. And I didn't know what to do about it.

VDT: Where was Forrest Linder's office?

KOVAR: Down in what is now the DHHS North building, right at Fourth and Independence. And, of course, if you're young and living in downtown Washington, you want to work in downtown Washington. So why go to Suitland, when you can work within walking distance of the National Gallery and things like that?

Finally, I found somebody and said, "What should I do?" "Well," she said, "you call Linder's office and tell him." So I did and the papers came back very promptly.

VDT: Was it the Division of Vital Statistics of NCHS?

KOVAR: No, NCHS didn't exist at that time. It was the Division of Public Health Methods [of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare]. Bill Stewart, who, I believe, is now at LSU or went there, was Surgeon General at that time. What is now the National Center for Health Statistics was just a group of people within the division. Forrest Linder was head of the division; Ted Woolsey was deputy; Phil Lawrence was head of the National Health Survey; and Oswald Sagen, who did a great deal of international work, particularly in Yugoslavia, was head of, I think they called it Special Studies. The only survey we had at that time was what we now call the National Health Interview Survey. It was the national health survey.

It was a marvelous place to be. There were bright people doing something that was new.

VDT: When had that survey started?

KOVAR: Eisenhower signed the legislation in July 1956. It went into the field July 1, 1957.

VDT: And it was the Health Interview Survey, every other year?

KOVAR: It was a continuing survey. It's still a continuing survey, interviewing every single week, and designed around the same sample frame that was used for the Current Population Survey.

VDT: Which was starting about that time?

KOVAR: No, it's much older; that goes back to the late 1930s. I think the Current Population Survey is the oldest continuing survey in the world.

VDT: And the health survey used the same sampling frame?

KOVAR: It was a different sample but the same sampling frame, which is one of the reasons that after Eisenhower had signed the legislation, the survey was literally in the field as a national survey one year later.

VDT: Things moved faster in those days.

KOVAR: They not only moved faster getting started. I have over on the bottom bookcase an original of the first press release from that survey and the data were released three weeks after they were collected.

VDT: And they didn't even go into the field with microcomputers!

KOVAR: No microcomputers. The only mainframe at that time, as a matter of fact, was the Univac I, which I think is now in the Smithsonian.

VDT: What did you do with the Health Survey?

KOVAR: The first thing I did was to design all of the tables that we would be doing from that year's survey, which, while a deadly job, was probably one of the best things that any beginner could be forced to do. Because at that time, you couldn't do what I do now; if I want a table, I sit down and type in six lines and I get it back. They all had to be programmed for Univac I. Therefore, everything you were going to get for the entire year had to be all written out in advance, and the group had to agree that these were the tables we were going to get that year. And I had to do them.

There's no better way to learn how to design tables efficiently. Now, of course, when you sit down and do anything, you can throw it out if you make a mistake. Or if you don't like the looks of it, you can just change a few variables and run it again. That was going to be it for the entire year. All the publications that were going to be written that year were going to be written from that group of tables.

VDT: Was that designed before the data were collected?

KOVAR: It was during the time the data were being collected, but certainly before we had seen any of the data.

VDT: So you knew what data you would have to work with?

KOVCAR: I knew what the questionnaire looked like.

VDT: You didn't influence the questionnaire in advance?

KOVAR: We didn't influence that year's questionnaire. Of course, the data would have an influence in a later year, but we're talking about 30 years ago.

VDT: How long were you involved with the health survey?

KOVAR: At that point, I was involved with it for about two-and-a-half years. Then my husband was sent to Nigeria, so I went to Nigeria, and lived in Kaduna. That's the capital of northern Nigeria, an old British military base, and still laid out like a military base, which with Independence had become the capital of northern Nigeria.

We built four houses. There was a new office being established there, so we had to build places for us to live. I didn't actually get out and bake the clay bricks.

VDT: But they were being built while you were there?

KOVAR: Yes, we helped design them; they were built while we were there. In the meantime, we lived in a flat up over the main street, and, of course, it was the kind of flat where if you pulled the plug in the bathtub, the water ran out the hole in the wall.

VDT: That must have been really off the beaten track.

KOVAR: At that time, it was.

VDT: Could you teach English? . . . Oh, of course, they speak English. So what did you do there?

KOVAR: Other than building houses and going off to strange parts of Africa that I would never have gotten to see otherwise, we played some very good bridge. They were starting to do a census in Nigeria at that time . . .

VDT: The famous one of 1963. That's been the last [published] one, until the one they've called for 1991. They're finally going to have another one.

KOVAR: So I thought, of course, that would be an interesting thing to do. And I went down to Lagos to talk to the people in charge of it and was told, "Well, we use British women to run the calculators, to add up the numbers." Actually, they were adding machines. Being somewhat of an arrogant type, I thought that was beneath me. If they didn't want to use my volunteer skills any better than that, I'd let them run their own census.

VDT: Is that the one that caused so much trouble because of the tribal numbers?

KOVAR: Yes. [The 1973 census was suppressed supposedly for this reason.] And, of course, it was a classic example of how if you use a census for an ulterior motive, the data are distorted. One of the things they were planning to do with that census was to set up conscription. What happens when you want to use a census for conscription? You're missing great chunks of young men.

Anyhow, it was about time I had children, and I became pregnant with my son David. And instead of gaining weight while pregnant, I kept losing weight. So I had a choice of either going up to Germany to the military base or coming back to the United States. Since I didn't know anyone in Germany and I didn't see any point in spending two months there all by myself, I came back and he was born in the U.S. That was 1962.

VDT: Then did you go back to NCHS at that time?

KOVAR: No. I liked my children; I actually stayed home with them. Elspeth is two years younger. She was born here, at Georgetown Hospital in D.C. I stayed home with them, and I enjoyed staying home with them.

VDT: I think we all do if we have a choice. Our generation still had that luxury, to stay home with them when they're young.

KOVAR: Well, it was a luxury and a requirement. But you're right, it was a luxury. I was sitting in the precinct one day, stuffing envelopes . . .

VDT: Precinct?

KOVAR: Voters--stuffing envelopes, flyers, the kinds of things that go out to voters. And I thought, "Mary Grace, this is a ridiculous occupation. Why should you be doing something like this when you have a profession that you like that you could be paid for doing." So that Christmas I called Forrest Linder and asked if I could come in and talk with him. I told him that I would like to go back to work, but only part-time. He started suggesting various things that I could do and I said, "I've done that." He finally said, "Mary Grace, I am not running this organization as an educational institution for your benefit." [Laughter]. "No sir, but what could I do that would be more fun?" He told his senior staff that he thought I would be able to work, that he would like me to come back. In general, the whole idea that anybody worked part-time was strange and new.

VDT: And in the federal government!

KOVAR: The federal government, in the late 1960s. But Monroe Sirken decided he would take a chance on me, so I came back for two days a week.

VDT: Monroe Sirken was in what part of NCHS then?

KOVAR: He was pretty much director of research at that time and did special studies. He originated what we now call the followback surveys--a sample of birth certificates or a sample of death certificates is the basis for going back and finding out information that is not reported on the legal documents. He instigated a lot of that kind of thing.

Interestingly, a couple of years later a demographer who was working at the Center became pregnant and wanted to work part-time. And one of the men--I don't think I'll use his name at this point--who had said, "I will never have a part-time person," then said, "Oh, it worked fine for Mary Grace. Sure."

VDT: Ah, you were a splendid leader.

KOVAR: And one of the nice things about this organization over the years since then is that it's been very accommodating to women working part-time--men, too, if they ask--but usually women with small children, who want to keep a career but don't want to work full-time. There have been quite a few over the years and the Center has been very, very good about that.

VDT: I see you're setting up a child care center. There was a naming contest announced downstairs.

Is that the first in-house accommodation?

VDT: That will be the first in-house child care center.

KOVAR: Will it be right on-site in one of these buildings?

KOVAR: There are three buildings in this complex and we're moving across the parking lot to a different one in May. That building has room for a child care center, so there will be one.

VDT: How long did you keep up part-time work?

KOVAR: Until 1974, until Elspeth was in about fourth or fifth grade.

VDT: Then you came back to work full-time?

KOVAR: When she started school full-time, I switched over and worked a six-hour day. So it was three-quarters time.

VDT: You were still downtown?

KOVAR: No, by that time we were up in the Parklawn building. So I could take her to school in the morning and go to work. She took the school bus home and I could get home about the time she did.

VDT: That's great. I think of you--and me, too--as the bridge generation. We were raised to think we were not going to do anything but stay home and look after kids, but that was not enough; we were educated.

What other surveys and work have you been associated with at NCHS over the years?

KOVAR: I started with what is now known as the National Health Interview Survey, which is a big continuing interview survey. Then, as I said, the followback surveys. I have spent part of my time in survey planning, the Office of Research and Methodology, because the planning and design of surveys and data collection really does fascinate me. Briefly with the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, which is the one where we choose a probability sample of people and go out and give them physical exams so that we not only learn what they tell us about their health, we learn what they can't tell us; establish norms for the U.S. population.

In 1983, I developed the . . .

VDT: The Longitudinal Study of Aging.

KOVAR: In 1983 developed a special supplement, a supplement on aging to the National Health Interview Survey, as the basis for a longitudinal survey, and that is the Longitudinal Study of Aging.

VDT: Is it continuing?

KOVAR: The thing I just took off my computer and saved, before we started this interview, is the OMB clearance package for next year's interview, 1990.

VDT: It began in 1984. You picked up the group and then followed them in 1986 . . .

KOVAR: 1988, and now 1990.

VDT: The same group, which was about 5,000 in 1986, wasn't it?

KOVAR: Yes, but 7,000 in 1988. Actually, there were 16,148 people in the original study, but those were people of age 55 and over. There were 11,497 who were age 65 and over. This is somebody who cannot remember her date of birth! [Laughter] But because of budget constraints and because of the tremendous need to know about the oldest old people about which so little has been known in the past, we are following only those people who were 70 and over at the time they were first interviewed, who were about 7,000.

VDT: I think the number that sticks in my mind--about 1,900--were those who were living alone at the time the survey began.

KOVAR: Yes.

VDT: That was an interesting article ["Aging in the Eighties, People Living Alone--Two Years Later: Data from the 1984 and 1986 Longitudinal Study of Aging Interviews," Advance Data from Vital and Health Statistics, April 4, 1988], because they presumably care for themselves less well than if they're living with partners.

What do you think of as your leading publications while you've been at NCHS? What are you proudest of?

KOVAR: I think the one I'm best known for probably is the book on children, which was done in the early 1980s.

VDT: Better Health for Our Children: A National Strategy, Report of the Select Panel for the Promotion of Child Health. How was this set up? It's an HHS [Department of Health and Human Services] publication.

KOVAR: It was a special panel on children's health that the Congress said the Department was to do. It had a special staff and I wrote volume 3 of the report, which you have in your hand, which is a statistical profile of children.

VDT: Material collected in the Health Interview Survey?

KOVAR: A lot of it is Health Interview Survey; a lot of it is other Center data--mortality, natality, of course, population projections--how many children are there going to be?--and census data and data from other statistical studies. It even has my name on it someplace.

VDT: I hope so.

KOVAR: It's a compilation of demographic and health data about children.

VDT: And this was even before Sam Preston's famous 1984 PAA presidential address ["Children and the Elderly: Divergent Paths for America's Dependents"] pointed out that we're shortchanging our children. And since then, there's been more attention paid to them. Was this in a sense something that helped set the pace for the 1980s concern with children?

KOVAR: That was the intent of the panel, yes. The report was presented, of course, just as administrations changed.

VDT: You got the Reagan administration and less money--for everything.

KOVAR: I think some of the people who were on the panel were disappointed that some of their recommendations were not heeded, at least not immediately. But I think over the course of the decade they have been listened to. A lot of their work has reappeared now.

VDT: Give me an example of something that might have been a direct spinoff.

KOVAR: My volume is not the book of recommendations, of course; it's the backup book. The need for better coverage. At that time, a woman who was pregnant with her first child could not have Medicaid coverage because she was not yet a mother; you had to have children.

VDT: How dumb. There was no possibility for prenatal care for poor women.

KOVAR: That's right, if that was the first child. If they had one, of course, they could get it for another child, but she was not a mother until this child was born. Therefore there was no way of paying for her prenatal care. And that was one of the things that was pointed out, that this does not make sense if you're trying to provide children with a good start in life. And that's been changed since. There are a lot of these small things, even though there was no immediate large change. I think some of those changes happened because of the work that was done for the panel's report and partly because of the interest of the people who were on the panel. They fought for more care for our children. Some of those changes have been made and they continue to be made.

I suppose the funniest story, though, is that I wrote an article on premarital childbearing, based on the National Natality Followback Survey, in which I took premarital births plus births within nine months of marriage and developed a measure of premarital conceptions.

VDT: Were you the one who developed that? That's since become standard.

KOVAR: At that time we didn't get authorship credit, so my name isn't on it. It was published as a supplement to the Monthly Vital Statistics Report. It said--this was me, of course--that one third of all first births in the United States were conceived out of wedlock.

VDT: That hit like a bombshell! I remember that--late 1970s?

KOVAR: Oh, no, it was March 1970. There was the standard Department press release on it and a very enterprising reporter from one of the New York state newspapers saw it, called me, talked about it, interviewed me, and it was in his newspaper chain the next day. The New York Times called me and I went downtown and they interviewed me, and it was on the front page of the New York Times the next day--that one third of all first births in the U.S. were conceived out of wedlock.

The next day, the New York state legislature voted on the abortion bill and it passed by one vote.

VDT: Phew! Of course, New York was one of the first states to legalize abortion; they were ahead of *Roe v. Wade* by about two years. Interesting--history, indeed!

KOVAR: That, of course, was why the New York Times was interested in the story and why they put it on the front page. At the time, there were people who thought that story made the difference.

VDT: That one vote. Well, it sounds very plausible.

KOVAR: That's a good demography sotry.

VDT: Indeed. You, a demographer within government, influencing policy. Does NCHS have a lot of clout in that way, do you feel?

KOVAR: Let me see if I can say this right. I think that our job is to put out the best possible data information to inform policy. It's a political process to make the policy.

VDT: But you mentioned press releases. NCHS has obviously had them for some time?

KOVAR: Oh, yes.

VDT: And that's how your findings got out? You'd written this article, supplement to the Monthly Vital Statistics Report, and there was a press release.

KOVAR: I think there was a press release that went with it. You know, we publish a lot of . . .

VDT: Advance data, of course, but there are enterprising press people. You have felt it's important to keep in touch with these press people, that your names then get on the media circuit?

KOVAR: Oh yes, my name was definitely on the media circuit. My name was on the front page of the New York Times and all the wire service stories.

VDT: Did they keep you on the string, keep phoning you up for further information through the years when something like that came up again?

KOVAR: They do it for a while and then, you know, your name fades from the rolodex. Then you do something else and your name comes up on the rolodex again.

The followback survey actually has been the basis for a lot of interesting stuff, particularly during that time period when there was such a tremendous change in what women were doing.

Incidentally, you mentioned at the beginning some of my interests. People ask me what I'm interested in. I usually say: women, children, and old people. And since women are involved in all of them . . .

VDT: Right, particularly now.

KOVAR: I think it's been rather consistent. When I was very young, I did more writing about children and then--I've always done a lot about women--and now I'm running a survey on aging.

VDT: You are running the Longitudinal Study of Aging?

KOVAR: Yes, I'm project director of it.

But another example from that time. Another paper from this same survey [National Natality Followback Survey] was on women working during pregnancy. The data showed that those women who worked during pregnancy had heavier babies, babies with higher birth weights, than those who did not work. That was especially true of the lower educational levels. That also stimulated a trmendous amount of media interest and hundreds of letter. Particularly because there was a lot of

belief at that point that women had to quit work during pregnancy.

VDT: And here was proof that they were better off continuing to work?

KOVAR: Well, not better off; certainly there was a lot of proof that on the average the infants were not suffering. Andre Hellegers, who at that time was at the Kennedy Institute of Bioethics at Georgetown, had been doing testimony for a case against the Bell Telephone Company, which was doing pregnancy testing of women and refusing to hire a woman if she was pregnant, said, "Can we believe this?" So I did some further analysis of these data for Andre and he used them in testimony and, of course, won the case and Bell was no longer allowed to get rid of pregnant women.

VDT: That must have established another precedent.

KOVAR: It did.

VDT: You have been in on some key issues!

KOVAR: It was not doing the policy, but trying to provide the background on which policy can be made. And those are very satisfying things to do.

VDT: It must be, indeed. Sometimes one thinks of federal employees as faceless statistics themselves. But you're not; you're important.

Why did you decide you needed a doctorate?

KOVAR: I didn't decide I needed a doctorate; I decided I needed to go back to school. When I was a graduate student, the mainframe computer was locked up in the room down the hall and you couldn't get close to it and a lot of the things you learned, you learned only on paper--this was how you would do it if you could actually do it. In the meantime, computers had become more accessible and statistics and data had changed tremendously as result. I decided it was time for me to go back and update myself.

VDT: You went to North Carolina to do your doctorate. You had been at Pittsburgh and Iowa State before. And you felt it was time to update yourself.

KOVAR: I thought it was time to learn all the things that had happened when I had been, first, away, then only part-time. So just to complicate life, I remarried in April and went back to school in August, with two children.

VDT: Took them with you to Chapel Hill?

KOVAR: Sure. They were nine and eleven, and they loved it. They adored Chapel Hill; it had a good local bus system and they could go everywhere by themselves.

VDT: This was the mid-1970s?

KOVAR: Yes, 1974. I worked very hard.

VDT: Your new husband came along too?

KOVAR: No, he stayed in Washington.

VDT: Why did you choose North Carolina?

KOVAR: Because it has the best department of biostatistics in the United States. My degree is actually in biostatistics, not demography. But North Carolina also had the demography program; it's one of those schools where you can do both. Demography is taught, of course, in the department of sociology of the university, but it was also taught in the School of Public Health in the department of biostatistics.

VDT: North Carolina had a university-wide infiltration of population studies.

KOVAR: It had population studies all over the place. The Carolina Population Center and then Research Triangle had a good group. And Forrest Linder turned up in my life again; he was there at the time, head of Dualab. So it was a perfect combination of demography, statistics, and health--or was for me at that time. Also, it's not that far from Washington, so I could get home for a weekend or a husband could come down for a weekend. So that had an influence too. It was a great year.

VDT: Only one year?

KOVAR: Actually, only nine months in residence. I came back here for the summer intending to go back in the fall, but at that time Congress had just said that the Department had to do an annual publication reporting on the health of the people in the United States.

VDT: Oh yes, "Health: USA."

KOVAR: No, Health, United States. I know, because I named it.

So I came up that summer and started getting the report done, and then it looked to me as if it wasn't going to get done if I didn't stay. So I asked, "Do you want me to stay here?" And they answered, "It certainly would help."

VDT: To get the first publication out?

KOVAR: I think I was responsible for the first three.

VDT: The editor or the overall manager?

KOVAR: Sometimes the typist. As a matter of fact, the first one we'd never intended to print, just put together as a report, and there were tables on big sheets of paper and little sheets of paper. I entrusted my then 12-year-old son to take batches of these up to the copying machine and he would reduce or expand them to make sure all these sheets of paper were the same size, to put that book together. David did that that summer. Ted Cooper, who was at that time Secretary of the Department, the Under-Secretary for Health, actually wrote David a letter thanking him for his work; I thought that was terribly nice. The report was not supposed to be published, but it seemed foolish to have only the three copies that were required. So I happily sent it downstairs and had it iteked, a process used for reproduction.

Just at that time, Dorothy Rice came in as the new director of the Center. Dorothy had--and has--a great flair for public relations and pleasing people and letting people know, and she was just enchanted with this and distributed it widely to everybody she could.

VDT: Was the first issue as readable as they have been?

KOVAR: Of course not.

VDT: But you developed that; it's one of the most readable of government publications.

KOVAR: Well, we weren't doing everything.

VDT: But Dorothy Rice was enchanted with it, probably because of the interesting information.

KOVAR: I also think the title helped. The intent was to name it "Report on health status, health services, health utilization, and health finance"--something like that. And I said, "Heavens, no. It's going to be called Health, United States."

VDT: That grabs your attention.

KOVAR: I really do think that has had something to do with its popularity. It's far more readable now. The first copy is sitting over there on the shelf; it looks tacky in comparison with the current one.

Another funny story--about that first one. Con Taeuber at a party said, "The most fascinating thing about that publication is it doesn't have a GPO number. How did you do that without the Government Printing Office?" And, of course, it wasn't deliberate. I wasn't even thinking about it; I just wanted 200 copies.

VDT: So you had it iteked and that wasn't the official publication channel at that time?

KOVAR: It wasn't an official publication.

VDT: But it was by the second year?

KOVAR: Yes, the second year has a proper GPO number.

VDT: And you were responsible for the thirist three?

KOVAR: First three.

VDT: And you didn't get back physically to North Carolina?

KOVAR: That's true. I had the opportunity, however, to spend a year at the Kennedy Institute of Bioethics.

VDT: That's where you were when you went to Georgetown. This was just after your tenure as PAA secretary-treasurer [1975-78].

KOVAR: Yes. There I did several things, one of which was to get involved with the World Health Organization, so I spent part of that time in Geneva. I also took a couples of classes in economics at Georgetown and two tutorials and a couple of other things and pretty much managed to finish up the coursework.

VDT: This was the required coursework you needed for the doctorate at North Carolina. And then the dissertation, what was that?

KOVAR: The dissertation uses data from the National Health Interview Survey. It started out as a dissertation on the health of children; this was the same period that I was doing that book on child health. But as I became more and more interested, it really turned into a methodological dissertation. It's one of the first examples of using the data files--not tables--and using the procedures for the analysis of data from surveys with complex sample designs on the national survey.

VDT: Say that again; I didn't quite get that.

KOVAR: Your traditional assumptions, which assume a random sample, do not hold for our big national surveys, which are designed to be cost-efficient, as best we can, with clustered geographic areas and then clusters within clusters within clusters. Those clusters have the effect of making our variance estimates bigger than they would be for a simple random sample. The theoretical work on how to deal with this developed--starting at the Census Bureau and then on with Leslie Kish at Michigan, people like that, but no one had actually carried through an analysis of a large national data set using these procedures. So I did that in my dissertation.

VDT: That must have had an impact.

KOVAR: Well, it certainly influenced the way the Center--and through the Center, people using our data and using data from the other big national surveys--started doing the data analysis.

VDT: Great. Was that published?

KOVAR: The dissertation was never published per se. Of course, it's on file at the University of Michigan; Michigan files dissertations. A lot of the sample part is in that publication.

VDT: The National Vital Health Statistics series, Series one, "The National Health Interview Survey Design: 1973-1984; and Procedures: 1975-1983." Your name is down here.

KOVAR: Yes. The Center has gotten much better at this over the years.

VDT: Giving more credit to authors. "Sample design and estimates by Mary Grace Kovar, Doctor P.H., Special Assistant for Data Policy and Analysis, Interview and Examination Statistics Program." Is that still your title?

KOVAR: I think so. No, it's Special Assistant, Office of Vital and Health Statistics System.

VDT: That must be the ideal kind of dissertation to have. You distill the wisdom to be used in a very practical way.

KOVAR: Let me show you something; the world does change. There's a suggested citation in the front of that one. Right on the front cover we do a suggested citation. You see how it goes? "National Center for Health Statistics . . .

VDT: The authors' names are next: "M.G. Kovar and G.S. Poe." That was 1985.

KOVAR: This one is 1989.

VDT: It's Kovar, right at the beginning--"Kovar, M.G., 1989"--then the title of the article and, finally, National Center for Health Statistics. Isn't that amazing! Now, who brought that change about? This is from March 1989.

KOVAR: The Center has changed over the years. You go back to the very beginning and there's nothing except at the bottom of the first column of text, in tiny print, "Prepared by [author's name], to moving toward that kind of suggested citation, with National Center for Health Statistics first and the authors afterward, to 1989--the author comes first.

VDT: The actual human person comes first.

KOVAR: Just as in a journal article.

VDT: That must be a major change that you've seen at NCHS over the years.

Who have been some of the outstanding influences in your career, at NCHS and before? You mentioned your first biology professor.

KOVAR: Forrest Linder certainly was an influence, no question about that. Bernard G. Greenberg, who was Dean of the School of Public Health at North Carolina for ten years, was certainly a great influence. He was Dean and I was a student at North Carolina, but actually I had known him before and continued until his death. I suppose from Pittsburgh the greatest influence was Paul Denson.

VDT: Others at NCHS?

KOVAR: In various ways, but I think probably those three are the most important.

Dorothy Rice had to be an influence, of course, because she's the first woman I ever worked for. I still remember going home one night and sitting there eating dinner, we had dinner guests, and in the course of a conversation, I said, "I saw Dorothy Rice in the women's room and she said--whatever it was." And somebody said, "Where else would you see her; she's a woman." And Earl, my husband, started laughing and said, "I don't think you understand what Mary Grace is actually saying to you. Men meet other men with influence in the men's room all the time. Women don't meet women with influence in the women's room." [Laughter]

VDT: Right. I think you must have influenced other women--and men, of course--in the course of your career. As you mentioned, you were a leader, in a sense, in being a woman having a job, part-time at first, while raising a family, and using her education and expertise.

KOVAR: But we did that.

VDT: There had to be a leading generation.

What do you see as leading issues in U.S. demography over the years that you have been involved? Now, you mentioned that your interests have been focused on children, women, and older people--your own life story, in part. Leading issues among U.S. population issues?

KOVAR: I think a leading issue has to be the aging of the population.

VDT: Now?

KOVAR: Now. I don't think there's any question. I think it's going to continue to be, because that baby boom generation is going to get old, and that's going to take a lot of preparation, a lot of planning, a lot of thought. Although there are people doing it, I think there are very few people who are talking about what it's going to cost if we have an enormous population of people in their late seventies and into their eighties and don't do something to prevent the disability, or postpone the disability, that so frequently comes with aging.

KOVAR: You're talking about preventive measures, so people are healthier in their late seventies and eighties?

KOVAR: And more functional.

VDT: Are you writing about that?

KOVAR: Some, yes. I think that's something in this country we have to pay a lot of attention to.

I think we fail to pay enough attention to our own migration patterns, which are really patterns of migration from Central America.

VDT: Why do you say "not pay enough attention to"?

KOVAR: Well, we're essentially opposed to migration. We are also having, and I think will continue to have, relatively low birth rates. And as the population becomes older and older, who are going to be the truly productive workers in this country and who's going to take care of the older people? That's where I think we need to think far more seriously about what migrants can contribute--not thinking so much that this is illegal immigration and we've got to do something about it.

VDT: You're suggesting that they should not be discouraged--legal migrants?

KOVAR: I'm thinking we should think hard about the needs for the country.

VDT: And our workers may have to come from migrants?

KOVAR: I think that is entirely possible. So those are major demographic issues, I think. The world issues? I don't think there's any point in my getting into .. The world population does indeed keep growing.

VDT: Let's now talk about PAA. Can you remember the first meeting you attended? Here's a list of the meetings.

KOVAR: I went to Boston in 1968. That was probably the first meeting I attended.

VDT: What do you remember about that meeting? Ansley Coale was president and gave his address on "Should the United States Start a Campaign for Fewer Births?" His conclusion was no, because the birth rate was already going down. That was an unusual presidential speech in that he did not talk about his own research. Do you remember that?

KOVAR: I remember Ansley talking; I don't remember that specifically. What I remember primarily about that meeting is that we were there at the time they ran the marathon; it was April. And Monroe Sirken developing his idea for network sampling, which he has continued to write about.

1969 was Atlantic City; yes, I went to Atlantic City. 1970 was Atlanta--garbage strike.
[Laughter]

VDT: I bet you'd remember that--oderiferous.

KOVAR: It wasn't that, but there were people at the meeting who wanted to get out and march with the strikers. I also remember that, because the paper I told you about, that had been in the newspapers, was also my PAA paper.

VDT: That a third of first births were premaritally conceived?

KOVAR: I think that was the first PAA paper I ever presented. And it was certainly an odd way to begin: You'd had your name in every newspaper in the country and you gave your paper . . .

VDT: Fantastic way to begin. PAA through the years has been criticized for not getting itself into the news more often.

KOVAR: So there was a certain amount of laughter about that. I remember walking into the room and--"Well, now, you've been in every newspaper in the country and you're going to come and talk to us" . . .

VDT: Were you involved in the Women's Caucus issues?

KOVAR: Yes, I really was. Was it in New Orleans [1973] when we sat out the restaurant in the Monteleone Hotel?

VDT: That's right. The year before in Toronto, the hotel had turned women away at the bar and they then decided they were going to meet only in hotels that would accept women in the bar and the Monteleone promised that they would.

KOVAR: They had a men's bar, which was the only place you could really get lunch between meetings, so we sat in the bar. They didn't serve us, but we didn't leave either. I suppose there were 20 of us or more. Actually, it was very peaceful, no stridency or anything, but, "This is a public restaurant and we are guests of this hotel; we expect to be served." New Orleans [Monteleone Hotel] changed its policy after that and the PAA realized that the women meant business; we were not going to meet in a hotel that was not open. [See also Harriet Presser's description of this incident in her interview, below.]

As a matter of fact, at that meeting a black demographer left the meeting because people in New Orleans had also discriminated against him; he left very quietly.

By that time, we had organized a Women's Caucus. There was a first survey to find out the number of women who actually were members of the Association. When did I become secretary-treasurer--1975?

VDT: 1975-78 was your tenure.

KOVAR: So it would have been the 1973 elections. When the nominations for Board members went in in 1972, they were all men. And a group of women decided to take advantage of a provision in the constitution for write-in nominations--20 members can submit a name. It had never been done. But they decided they were going to submit the names of two women. Among the people who made this decision were Ruth Dixon and Harriet Presser, who decided on two names whom they thought had

sufficient name recognition to attract at least some votes. They submitted my name and Shirley Hartley's name. It caused great consternation because nobody had ever done this before. It says that in the constitution, but . . . These names were added to the ballots when they went out to the PAA members and both Shirley and I were elected to the Board of Directors.

VDT: Great! Of course, there had been plenty of women directors before then.

KOVAR: There hadn't been a whole lot, as a matter of fact. There had been some outstanding women presidents. I don't think it was really so much deliberate as it was . . . You know, you get a group of people and they keep nominating more people like themselves. All people do that: We choose more people like ourselves.

VDT: You think the women had been left out because they didn't have that network going for them?

KOVAR: If you don't have anybody in the in-group to nominate more people like themselves, you don't get more people like yourself nominated. You've got to get on the inside.

Anyhow, that's how I went onto the Board of Directors, in 1973. I'm tremendously proud of that, that women in the Association decided that they wanted me to be on the Board to represent them. I think that's a tremendous honor.

Then in 1975, I was chosen to be secretary-treasurer.

VDT: You followed Jim Brackett [1971-75]. How do you think a secretary-treasurer is chosen? Often because they have been on the Board? In your case, do you think you were perhaps chosen because you were a woman?

KOVAR: No, I don't think so. I know I was chosen to be on the Board because I am a woman. But it was the women who chose me, so I think that's great. The secretary-treasurer of the PAA, of course, is a working office. The mail doesn't go out; the ballots don't get prepared; the nominating committee doesn't get done--all those things don't get done if the secretary-treasurer doesn't do them. That's why it's a three-year term rather than a one-year term.

VDT: Meaning you have to learn the process?

KOVAR: And there are a lot of deadlines to be met. If the ballots aren't on schedule, the elections aren't held on schedule. The president has to be reminded to do such-and-such. Now, not all presidents have to be reminded. PAA has had some marvelous presidents, but PAA has also had presidents who recognize it as an honor and don't recognize it quite so much as a responsibility.

So it's a working job. You really do want somebody who knows the organization, who has the experience of office in the organization so he or she knows how the system works. And you really need somebody that works in an organization--whether it be a foundation or federal office or whatever--who can get some secretarial support.

VDT: That's a crucial part of it, everyone has said. And NCHS agreed?

KOVAR: And NCHS agreed.

VDT: Agreed to the actual office time that your secretary would spend on this outside professional commitment of yours?

KOVAR: We're permitted to do that. And don't forget that Andy Lunde [PAA secretary-treasurer in

1965-68] was at NCHS. So we had a great precedent for it, because Andy had been here for many years.

VDT: Of course, it was during Andy's term that it was realized that PAA had to have a business office management and the arrangement was made with the American Statistical Association, which took a lot of the burden off the secretary-treasurer.

KOVAR: It had to be done before Andy could give up the job. There had to be a business office someplace before anybody would take over from Andy, because nobody was going to take over all that much work. During my term, there was a lot of discussion about splitting from the ASA office.

VDT: Already then? That was about ten years after we'd gone with them [1966].

KOVAR: That was about 1976-77. We had a major review of the functions that ASA provided and a series of interviews with other professional associations in town to get cost estimates, to see if there were others that would work better. And the decision was to remain with ASA.

VDT: Was there dissatisfaction with ASA?

KOVAR: The Board had questions--their charges to PAA were going up. And I just smiled, because I'm sure the charges to PAA are going up again--they're never still. They probably were half then what they are now, and the Board felt that they were overcharging: "Obviously, it could be done more cheaply than this." So the Board authorized the secretary-treasurer and a committee to get out there and find out. So we did, and found that it was going to cost as much or more to house our office with any other professional association. And PAA was really not big enough to support its own office; not when you think of all the different functions that have to be performed. So after all that, the decision was to remain with ASA.

VDT: PAA is now leaving ASA.

KOVAR: But for a different reason.

VDT: Yes, this time it's being asked to leave. That's a big issue right now.
What other issues do you remember in your time?

KOVAR: There was a period when we were going to meet only in states where the ERA [Equal Rights Amendment] had been ratified. And, again, it took a while before some people realized that we were serious. So it was a period of change.

VDT: Did that mean some places that had been booked for a future years were unbooked?

KOVAR: I think one was unbooked, and I have some recollection that it was in the Midwest. Could it have been Chicago?

VDT: I think it was; someone else has mentioned that in an interview. And they hastily had to find Denver, I think it was, for a meeting after your time.

KOVAR: Yes, it was for a later meeting.

VDT: I think Denver was brought in for 1980 in place of some city that was not acceptable because of ERA. [Denver replaced Chicago, which had been booked for 1980.]

KOVAR: PAA planned three years and then the next three years, so you're running five or six years ahead, so it might very well have been that. It was also that the women on the Board said, "Is it an ERA state? Why didn't you look? Well, you'd better look." Somebody said, "Does it really matter that much?" "Yes, that's what we have said we're going to do and that's what we're going to do." So it was educational, "we are serious"--it was that kind of change.

Also, it was a period when AID funding for family planning was--what?--at its peak? There were various tensions. For one thing, the papers on family planning and fertility control sort of took over the whole meeting program for a couple of years. If you look at the programs in there, you'll find that the rest of demography sort of got submerged under fertility/family planning. It had that kind of impact; there was so much funding at that point [mid- to late 1970s].

VDT: You were secretary-treasurer when we met in St. Louis in 1977; that was where Evelyn Kitagawa was president. That's where Ray Ravenholt [director of the Office of Population of AID] got into the local papers.

KOVAR: That's what I was going to say. There was a certain tension between the more traditionally trained demographers and the views of some of the AID people--the view that demographers present research and somebody else makes the policy. Of course, Ravenholt didn't hold that point of view at all and he did indeed get into the paper. [See Jim Brackett's version of this incident, above.] It didn't slow him down. He went off on the riverboat party with everybody else and had a great time. Things like that didn't bother Ray.

VDT: Maybe some of his colleagues felt he had to hang his head.

KOVAR: He didn't feel in the least he had to hang his head. But there was that kind of tension, with AID having this tremendous funding power and also determined to show that family planning was having an enormous effect. And also, I suppose, a certain lack of concern for the views of the Catholic Church.

So, yes, there was definitely tension there. There were a few occasions when a member would tell me that he really didn't think that some of those people should be on the program of a professional organization. I would write back and say, "I am not chair of the program committee, but I have passed your letter on to the chair of the program committee." And there were a few people who thought they should quit [leave PAA] over this issue, but they were really very few people. At the time, you kind of feel inundated by this controversy. Yet, looking back on it, it was really only about three or four people on each side. The Association either didn't care or looked on with great amusement.

But those were the years--the Montreal, St. Louis, and the Atlanta meetings--that I was secretary-treasurer.

VDT: I remember Montreal [1976]. That was the embarrassing one where they didn't feed us enough at the dinner [wine and cheese] reception and it was so bad that you refunded the money to people who had paid for it.

KOVAR: We told them we weren't going to pay them. I had forgotten about that; that was atrocious.

VDT: It was embarrassing. I'm Canadian, so I was chagrined at that.

KOVAR: They came out with one little tray and that was it. Then 15 minutes later, there was another little tray. There were 200, 250 people there and each of the little trays had maybe 20 tidbits on it.

VDT: We were underfed.

KOVAR: But the Association also got the money back for us.

VDT: Was that your doing?

KOVAR: As treasurer, of course, I had to be involved, but I had help.

VDT: Was that the last time we attempted a dinner-like event? No, next year was St. Louis and there was the riverboat . . .

KOVAR: We had a riverboat party. The idea was that there should be some sort of gala event one evening of each meeting. In earlier years, there had been a presidential banquet and the presidential speech was given there. That's where the famous "Here we are, broken down by age, race, and sex" speech was given.

VDT: Wasn't that Rupert Vance? He's given credit for that. [This appeared in Rupert Vance's introduction of Joseph Spengler at the presidential banquet of the 1957 meeting in Philadelphia. According to Horace Hamilton, "[Vance] gazed out over the audience and said, 'I know this audience is a typical demographic table--all broken down by age and sex.'" See interview with Hamilton, Clyde Kiser, and Joseph Spengler, above.]

KOVAR: The dinner became less popular; hotel prices keep going up. One of the great things about PAA is its real insistence on helping younger people go to the meetings, and they couldn't afford the banquet and so couldn't hear the president.

VDT: That's an interesting point.

KOVAR: The dues structure made it possible for students to belong [lower dues for students]. And we tried to keep the meeting fee down for students so they could go. And we very frequently would find two hotels--the meeting hotel and a cheaper hotel somewhere nearby where the students could go, or we went to the Y to find out whether students could stay there.

Certainly students couldn't go to that kind of a presidential banquet and it came to feel more and more elitist. So we were trying to find another form of entertainment so that people could get together. Well, you know what it finally ended up being--the famous beer party.

VDT: Did that start in your time?

KOVAR: I think the first one was my last year, yes.

VDT: That would have been 1978, in Atlanta. Is that where it began?

KOVAR: I can't remember too well, because I'm a member of the American Statistical Association as well and they also have a beer party to open the meetings. It was an idea imported from AmStat, so I can't really remember when the first PAA one was. I wouldn't say I brought it in. Both organizations were being run out of the same office, so the office people knew about it, and I knew about it, and

other PAA members knew about it. It worked well for AmStat, and we were searching for something for PAA that would get people together. So let's try the beer party and see if that won't get people together, the first night of the meeting, so you know who's there.

The presidential dinners really were not quite something anybody wanted to do anymore. We tried the Montreal experiment, which was a great idea but it didn't work out.

VDT: Going out to that island in the St. Lawrence.

KOVAR: Because the world's fair had just been there.

VDT: That was Canada's Centennial in 1967. This was nine years later.

KOVAR: Anyhow, they had all those lovely buildings on the island and a metro [subway] that went out, and it looked like a marvelous idea, but they didn't feed us. Then in St. Louis, we had the riverboat and I think that was fun, but you cannot have a riverboat in every place that PAA meets.

VDT: In Seattle [1975] we had that wonderful trip out across the harbor to an island.

KOVAR: Yes, remember that! I have never seen so many tipsy demographers in my life.

VDT: Drunken demographers! It was a great party.

KOVAR: It was a marvelous party; we had salmon.

VDT: Yes, oh boy!

KOVAR: That had been a good one, a really superlative evening, and we thought we'd try to find something like that in every city. Well, it didn't work out that way.

VDT: I can't even remember the riverboat in St. Louis. I mainly remember going up the archway over the river--with Earl Huyck.

Did you work with Charlie Westoff? He would have given his presidential address in 1975 at Seattle. That was one of the last years in which the presidential tenure went from mid-year to mid-year.

KOVAR: No, I came in with Sidney Goldstein.

VDT: Tell me about working with Sidney. I'm going to interview him next week.

KOVAR: Oh, he's a pleasure. I said that some presidents really were marvelous presidents and some took it as an honor but not as a responsibility. Sidney took it as an honor and a great responsibility. He knows the field; he knew the organization; he knew what needed to be done. A new secretary could not have come in under a better president.

And the reason I can remember--when you said that was the Seattle meeting--I didn't become secretary until after that. I got to Seattle--that was the year I was a graduate student at North Carolina, so I was coming directly from school--and they had lost my hotel reservation and the hotel was full up and they were not going to let me in the hotel. Sidney was standing there in the lobby and walked across to the hotel clerk and said, "Miss Kovar is going to be secretary of this organization next year. I think you should find her a room." And, bumf . . . ! I looked at Sidney and said, "I would never have

thought of doing that." He said, "I know you wouldn't; that's why I did it for you."

VDT: Wonderful, what a gracious person!

KOVAR: Isn't that a nice man!

VDT: Sidney Goldstein has such a reputation for caring about people--his students, his famous admiring coterie, whom he cares for and they return it. You say he combined both the honor and the responsibility of the office.

What about Evelyn Kitagawa? She was the first woman president we'd had after a long gap since Dorothy Thomas, in the late 1950s. From 1959 to 1977, there was no woman. Evelyn was the fourth woman president.

KOVAR: Her presidency, I thought, was long overdue for Evelyn. I think she had done outstanding work and had been doing it for years. I did not realize that there had been that long an interval between women. This is my personal opinion, obviously, but I thought she not only deserved to be president but she deserved to be president for several years before she was actually nominated and elected.

She is--you're asking my opinion of her as president--Evelyn is a conscientious, good, hard worker. If you asked Evelyn to do something and she said she'd do it, she did.

VDT: Evelyn came in the first year the president supposedly was going to be responsible for the meeting program, but the switch had come just the year before and she had done it as first vice-president. Ren Farley reminded me that she asked him to do the program. So you must have worked with Ren also that year, as program chairman. [This switch also affected Sidney Goldstein, president just before Kitagawa. He asked Charles Nam to do the program.]

KOVAR: Ren is another one of those people who, if he says he will do something, he gets it done--I don't quite know how, but you can count on him. Organizations count on people like that.

VDT: Dick Easterlin, too, came in your time [1978]. He gave a famous presidential address, "What Will 1984 be Like?"

KOVAR: Yes. He had all those economic curves in that speech.

VDT: He said that the birth rate would be going up by 1984. Well, it's only beginning to inch up now [1988-89]. In his interview, done last May, he claimed it's still going to happen. He's standing by his hypothesis.

KOVAR: It was very much an economic address, and he was using economic curves to describe demographic changes--which, of course, is what he does.

VDT: What are the biggest crunches for a secretary-treasurer? The two Board meetings a year?

KOVAR: The annual meeting, probably.

VDT: You mentioned that you have to remind presidents, or the program chairman, that things have to be done.

KOVAR: Sometimes you have to and sometimes you don't have to, but it's your responsibility to

make sure that they know. And if something is not working out the way it should, for the most part you're the person who gets called. But if you were talking about the presidential addresses and various papers and what went on during the meetings, during those three years I don't think I ever went to a scientific session.

VDT: Just no time.

KOVAR: Because your job is seeing that the organization is functioning right.

VDT: And that goes on during the meetings.

KOVAR: Very much so during the meetings, because there are all these Board meetings and then the meetings with the president on this and a meeting of this committee or that committee. In St. Louis, one of our more eminent demographers thought it was my fault that they had turned the air conditioning off. So I did indeed try to deal with the hotel, because the weather had turned unseasonably warm again, and asked if they would turn the air conditioning back on. You are at that meeting to serve the organization, not yourself. So you don't get to hear the papers. I think I did get to the presidential address every time.

VDT: Everybody goes to that; that's the one thing that draws them all. Since the presidential address was divorced from the banquet, it's now the hot number.

KOVAR: Yes.

VDT: And the business meeting is no longer attended by people. Is that because there are not exciting enough issues, that there were with the Women's Caucus?

KOVAR: I remember the year a member came to me, very concerned, because California was going to cut back so much on the information collected on their birth certificate. All they were going to put on their birth certificate was that this person was born on such-and-such a date. This was in response to some feeling that they were asking for too much information and they were introducing this new legislation that this was all the California birth certificates would have. So this member came to me and we talked about it and I said, "You have to stand up in the business meeting and tell the membership." "Oh, I can't do that." "Yes, you can do that, because if people don't know, they can't do anything. So you do it."

VDT: Was that Beth Berkov or June Sklar?

KOVAR: Beth. And she did. And the members were definitely interested. I was sitting up on the platform next to Wendy Baldwin and all of a sudden Wendy said, "That's 10 percent of all the births in the United States!" And, of course, the law never passed in California. So the business meeting was serving an important function.

VDT: Important, indeed. That issue came up there?

KOVAR: It came up in a business meeting, and the Association moved.

VDT: That doesn't seem to happen so much now. What do you feel it is--the younger members don't feel a part of the workings of the Association? [Prior to 1974, PAA policy could be decided by vote of

members present at the business meeting. With the controversial issues of the early 1970s--abortion, women's rights, U.S. involvement in family planning in the Third World--the business meetings consequently could be "exciting" or, as Larry Bumpass describes it at the end of his interview below, "were often free-for-alls." Bumpass explains: "We worried about packing the galleries, about the way in which PAA policy could be decided on a particular issue by organizing to have a lot of people there and vote and that would then determine what would be the course of the PAA." In the revised constitution of 1974, the "business" meeting--still the popular term--became "a general membership meeting" which is "a forum for open discussion of the affairs of the Association" only and "any decisions are made either by the Board or by referendum of the Association."]

KOVAR: Oh, I don't know what it is, Jean.

I tremendously enjoyed my three years as secretary of the Association. I loved doing it. I felt as if every single member was my friend. I didn't discover until I was out of office that there were a lot of people in this association who thought my last name was Grace, because I signed all the letters to the members "Mary Grace."

VDT: Very nice; you were just on a first-name basis.

KOVAR: I felt on a first-name basis with everybody. I had fun; I really enjoyed it.

I don't know about the business meetings. Maybe some of the demographic issues aren't the same, certainly the social and cultural issues. The 1980s have not been a time of social activism.

When I was in Minneapolis a couple of weeks ago, I was sitting having a drink in the lounge of my hotel and the man who served my wine asked me where I was from and I told him. He had just gone from Minneapolis to Washington to march in the march against homelessness--25 hours on the bus from Minneapolis for that one march and 25 hours back. There was a whole busload of them. He said to me, "People are beginning to care again."

VDT: Care again, yes. Some young friends of mine came down specially from Philadelphia for the April abortion rights march; they had suddenly wakened up.

KOVAR: I don't know whether he's right or not, but people are beginning to care again.

VDT: And you think that's been missing in the 1980s, so issues like that did not come up in the business meeting?

KOVAR: Homelessness, why aren't our members out doing something? We don't even know how many homeless people there are in this country.

VDT: That's right. Well, of course, there's always been contention within PAA about whether we should provide the data on which reasonable policy could be made, as you do in your job, and whether one should go out and lead the policy.

KOVAR: But are PAA members providing the data on homelessness? Are they trying to get programs organized to get those data collected? Are they even saying, "Look, we have to have a session on the number of homeless people there are in this country and if there's nobody who knows, we've got to stand up and spend that session talking about what we're going to do about it." So the tension is there, but there's also an activism within the profession that I don't think has been as noticeable during the 1980s. It is not a PAA fault as much as a social phenomenon. And also saying, "Look, this is information we need to have. Now we've got to go out and fight for it."

VDT: And that was lacking in the 1980s?

KOVAR: It is my perception that it has not been so strong. Now, certainly with issues such as trying to get the badly-named sex survey off the ground, I think maybe there is a little more push for trying to get information that we need.

VDT: Are you involved in any way in that badly-named sex survey, that will provide information needed to combat AIDS?

KOVAR: I'm an interested observer and if given an opportunity to talk about why we need those data, I certainly do talk about why we need those data. It's a shame that the survey was given that name.

VDT: It's still in the Kinsey shadow too many years later.
Have you attended all the PAA meetings since you left office?

KOVAR: No, I have not. I have attended most of them.

VDT: Not more than "most"? I have the impression that sometimes officers, once they've left office, tend to lose some interest.

KOVAR: Yes, you don't have the same total involvement. And, of course, federal employees don't have their way paid to meetings unless they have a paper, unless they're on the program. So it sort of depends on that as well. I did not go to Denver [1980] or San Diego [1982].

VDT: Which were expensive to get to.

KOVAR: And I did not go to San Francisco [1986]. I think I have been to the rest of them.

VDT: What do you think of the current meetings, which are now 84 sessions [90 in 1990 and 1991], eight overlapping, many spinoff workshops?

KOVAR: You know what I think of them. I think of them the same way everybody else does: There are too many sessions at the same time, particularly because it's a small organization.

VDT: You mean the small number of attendees? There were 1,200 [1,193] at Baltimore [1989], which was the most PAA ever had. That must be very small compared to the American Statistical Association meetings.

KOVAR: Which have, what?--6,000 attendees--or the American Public Health Association which has 12,000.

VDT: And you think that eight overlapping sessions [nine in 1990 and 1991] is too many?

KOVAR: Yes, I do, particularly when we also have other things, such as workshops. The program is too big.

VDT: How could it be done differently?

KOVAR: At the same time, I understand why it's done: You want to give people a chance to

participate. Again, PAA has tried to encourage young people and new researchers. You want to give them a chance to present. I think that one of the good things about PAA now compared to when I was an officer, when, as I told you, everybody was so focused on fertility, is that the program is far better balanced. I think the topics are more interesting and there's a chance for a diversity of views.

Sure, I think there are too many sessions at the same time. If you're asking me for a solution, I can't give you one. But I bet no one else can either.

VDT: You still enjoy the PAA meetings, obviously.

KOVAR: Oh, sure.

VDT: Are you still rather unique--a biostatistician in PAA?

KOVAR: I hadn't thought about that. I don't think so--am I?

VDT: You do belong to the American Statistical Association and the American Public Health Association?

KOVAR: Yes, I'm a fellow in both of them. Those are the three associations in which I have been most active, with which I'm most closely identified, and I have been an officer in all three. One major office is all I can cope with at a given time. So, since being PAA secretary-treasurer, I have been president of the Washington Statistical Society and chair of the social statistics section of AmStat and have long been on the Governing Council for the American Public Health Association and am on the editorial board for the journal there.

So my association involvement changes, but my interests are still as a demographic, epidemiologic, health statistician, wherever those three circles intersect.

VDT: Well, you have had a very interesting career and are continuing to have. Involved in many things. Tell me what your children are doing--David and Elspeth.

KOVAR: David is head of the computer facility for the Harvard School of Public Health--at the age of 26.

VDT: Fantastic! Did he go to Harvard?

KOVAR: No, he went to Dartmouth. He did computer sciences. His mother, of course, thinks that no kid that age should be paid that much money.

VDT: Obviously he inherited your genes unadulterated.

KOVAR: But I think he's going to quit at the end of this year and become an entrepreneur. Which I think is all right, because he's always wanted to. He really wants to try to find out what it would be like to be on his own. And he's the right age; he's not married and he has no dependents. And if he wants to try it, it's far better that he go try it now than still have that ache when he's 40.

And Elspeth was working for Mead Data Corporation, the people who do LEXIS and NEXUS. She said it was a great job for anybody who liked computers, but she doesn't like computers. So just about a month ago now, she quit, and at the moment is working for Olsson's Books.

VDT: They sound like typical young people, but they obviously have had your interest in numbers.

KOVAR: Well, when David said he was going to quit and go out on his own, I worried. He said, "Mom, don't worry." I said, "David, I'll make a deal with you. You live your life the way you want to live your life and I'll live my life the way I want to live my life. You're going to quit a job at Harvard, I'm going to worry."

VDT: I think you have a right to.

KOVAR: He said, "Yeah, I guess it's the generation gap; some people can't forget the Depression."
[Laughter]

VDT: Oh, dear. But you obviously have had a great life and career and raising your kids. I think, after all, we were in an interesting generation, a bridge generation.

KOVAR: I think so. Sometimes it was rough going through it, but . . .

VDT: We didn't have to worry too much about child care for the six-month-olds. Thank you very much, Mary Grace.

ADDENDUM

VDT: I just mentioned that Jane Menken said that she combined raising children and working part-time in the federal government.

KOVAR: She did. Jane and my husband, Earl Pollack, shared an office at Harvard, when he went back to school to get his doctoral degree.

VDT: Is that your first or second husband?

KOVAR: The current husband, second husband. He'd gone back to Harvard to get his degree, 20 years ago. So they had known each other and he knew her at NIH when she was working there and having children. Jane and I had talked on the telephone a lot, particularly about women's issues in PAA, the Family Growth Survey, but we had never met until we shared a room together in Atlantic City [1969 PAA meeting].

VDT: It's a small world. That's another thing about demography; a lot of it is like that.

THOMAS W. MERRICK

PAA Secretary-Treasurer in 1978-81 (No. 16). Interview with Jean van der Tak at Jean's home in Washington, D.C., February 11, 1989.

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS: Tom Merrick was born and grew up in Omaha, Nebraska. He received his B.A. in philosophy in 1963 and M.A. in economics in 1964 from St. Louis University and the Ph.D. in economics in 1967 from the University of Pennsylvania. From 1968 to 1971, he was an international economist with the population program of the U.S. Agency for International Development in Washington, D.C. From 1971 to 1974, he taught and did research in demography at the University of Minas Gerais in Belo Horizonte, Brazil, as a Ford Foundation population adviser for its programs in Brazil, and also Peru and Mexico. He returned to the Population Studies Center at the University of Pennsylvania from 1974 to 1976, where he taught and was a senior research scholar. From 1976 to 1984, he was at Georgetown University as Director of the Center for Population Research and the succeeding Department of Demography, which he established. Since 1984, he has been President of the Population Reference Bureau in Washington, D.C. He is a frequent population consultant for the World Bank, AID, the United Nations Population Fund, and other institutions in Latin America, Africa, and China, in particular. He has published extensively on the population of Brazil, including the monographs, Population and Economic Development in Brazil: 1800 to the Present (with Douglas Graham, 1979) and Determinants of Brazil's Recent Rapid Decline in Fertility (with Elza Berquo, 1983), and on Latin American and world population trends, and more recently, on applied demography, including Demographics: People and Markets (with Stephen Tordella, Population Bulletin, February 1988).

MERRICK [elaborating on biographical introduction]: I went to St. Louis in 1957 when I joined the Jesuits. You know I was in the Jesuit seminary for some years, so the St. Louis University years were actually part of the seminary experience. The seminary was affiliated with St. Louis University. We studied philosophy and Greek and Latin literature at the School of Philosophy and Letters, a very classical education.

VDT: But you made a leap in one year from philosophy [B.A. 1963] to economics [M.A. 1964]?

MERRICK: That's true. I read Ten Great Economists by Robert Heilbroner, one of the great popularizers of economics. That was one of his first books and, actually, I read it in a philosophy course. It had vignettes of Adam Smith, David Ricardo, John Stuart Mill, Malthus and Marx, and it all absolutely fascinated me. So I took one economics course, then another, and eventually decided to take a master's degree. The Jesuits encouraged you to pursue degrees in fields other than your philosophy so that you could eventually teach in an outside field. So that's how I got started in economics.

VDT: How did you get interested in demography? In the Petersens' Biographies of Demographers you are classified in the small group called population economists, along with Richard Easterlin, Joseph Spengler, and as Sam Preston said when I put this to him, "The first population economist could have been Malthus."

MERRICK: It was at Penn, where I went because they offered courses in population and economics. I was interested in economics, but also in population--again, going back to Heilbroner's book, reading about Malthus and Mill and Marx. I wrote my master's thesis on Marx's theory of surplus value.

When I was looking around for graduate school, one of the things that fascinated me about Penn's economics department was they they had an option for development and population study. And, of course, they had such luminaries there as Dorothy Thomas and Dick Easterlin. So I applied in economics at Penn and started the regular economics curriculum.

In my second year, Dick Easterlin was my adviser. I walked into his office one day and he said he'd noticed on my application form that one of the reasons I wanted to come to Penn was because of its population program but I hadn't yet taken any courses in population. He told me about a fellowship from the Population Council for students in the economics program who would study population: Would I be interested in it? Being a graduate student in need of financial support, I said yes. So that's how I got started.

Then I took courses with Vince Whitney, his general introduction to population, and Dick's course on economic development, which covered a lot of population. When I got into my dissertation work, I took the famous Dorothy Thomas two-semester population research seminar.

VDT: What was your dissertation topic?

MERRICK: My dissertation was on the topic that almost everybody at Penn at that time worked on--population redistribution. I worked on international comparisons of population redistribution between regions of different countries and how they were related to the rate of growth of their economies and shifts in the structure of those economies. Very interesting--one of those broad-vision kind of Kuznetsian topics.

VDT: You worked with Easterlin?

MERRICK: With Easterlin and Hope Eldgridge and, later, John Durand, who had come to Penn from the United Nations. I had them on my dissertation committee.

I spent a lot of time among the dusty basement shelves of Princeton's library, which had all the European censuses, digging out early 19th century materials. I remember coming across a census volume for Austria that was actually handwritten and bound with ribbons. A wonderful experience! After World War II, Princeton got a lot of the German statistical archives, so it was a real find. The only problem was that I was allergic to dust.

VDT: Was this at the Office of Population Research?

MERRICK: No, the main Princeton library. Some of the volumes were at OPR, but the best finds were in the main library. I would take the train up; at that time you could still get the train in North Philadelphia. I would go up in the morning, get off at Princeton Junction, take the little Toonerville train across to Princeton and hike up to the library, and then come home at night.

That's how I got into population. At that time, the Penn Population Studies Center was located in a house, 3935 Locust Street, in Philadelphia. Now it's Locust Walk.

VDT: They still had the traffic then?

MERRICK: It was still a regular street; there were even streetcar tracks close by. All of that, of course, is now built over with highrises and the university apartments. The economics department at that time was in Dietrich Hall, back down on the main campus. So there was a regular stream of students who would hike up to the Population Studies Center. It was a real sub-culture at the Center, strongly influenced by Dorothy Thomas, who would insist that the coffee break, for example, be absolutely sacred.

VDT: Morning or afternoon?

MERRICK: Both. You could not continue to work. The students would all be working at these big clunkers of calculators that had all the buttons on them--rows and columns of buttons. And if anybody would dare to punch one of those things and make it go clickety-clack, clickety-clack during coffee break . . . big trouble!

VDT: You were all in one big room at carrels or something?

MERRICK: Well, it was an old house with nooks and crannies everywhere where students were tucked in with their research. It was a real status symbol to get a desk or have a spot in front of one of the calculators. But I remember that if you kept calculating during the coffee break, the wrath of God descended on you!

The other thing I remember about those seminars with Hope Eldridge and Dorothy Thomas--it was an attic room in the top of the building--was that the place would be blue with cigarette smoke. These were the research seminars. They would meet once or twice a week and the students would present progress reports on their dissertations. It was exciting and it was ahead of its time in terms of what many programs do now, having these ongoing seminars just to talk about research very openly.

VDT: Who were some of your fellow students at that time?

MERRICK: There was Shirley Smith, who's now at the Bureau of Labor Statistics, doing working life tables, and Fran Goldscheider, who's at Brown.

VDT: Did you stimulate each other? Norman Ryder, for instance, said he learned more from his fellow students at OPR than he did from Notestein.

MERRICK: The other students were very interesting. I learned a lot from them. This was a period when the majority of foreign students at Penn were Asian, rather than Latin American . . .

VDT: Or African, as they are now at Penn, under Etienne van de Walle.

MERRICK: Yes. And a few American students, sometimes people like me from the economics department who studied population, for example, Karen Holden, who is now at Wisconsin working on social security and retirement, and Ghazi Farooq, who's now with ILO in Geneva.

VDT: Why were there comparatively few American students?

MERRICK: It was recruiting, in part. Vince Whitney was the Asia adviser to the Population Council at that time and played a key role in steering many Population Council fellowship students to Penn.

VDT: That's interesting, because the Caldwells in their book on the Ford Foundation contribution to population [Limiting Population Growth and the Ford Foundation Contribution, 1986] talk about Penn not being so Third-World-oriented in the 1960s. But Penn did have a good healthy group of Third World students when you were there?

MERRICK: Oh, yes. I never throw away any files, so I've got lists of all the students of that time. I'm sure I would be embarrassed by forgetting some.

VDT: I wanted to ask how you got into your interest in Third World demography. But first, tell me a bit more about Dorothy Thomas. She's been described often in these interviews, but I'd like to hear from you.

MERRICK: Dorothy is a wonderful person to have had in one's life experience.

VDT: You had long experience with her, because you were also at Georgetown together?

MERRICK: We didn't overlap at Georgetown. Dorothy passed away in 1977, and when I came to Georgetown in 1976 she'd already left. I think she left Penn in 1973 or 74, came to Georgetown, so her two years at Georgetown were actually the two years that I was at Penn. I inherited her office when she left Georgetown. I have a vivid memory of that, because when I moved into the office, there was the wastebasket with a fire extinguisher right next to it. I said, "What's this?", and they told me Dorothy had set the wastebasket on fire about three times by throwing her cigarettes in it.

VDT: She was a heavy smoker?

MERRICK: Very heavy.

VDT: You mentioned her seminar room at Penn.

MERRICK: Yes. And, of course, when Irene Taeuber would come up for a seminar, it was a regular volcano of smoke.

VDT: Did Dorothy mother you like she seemed to have done with others?

MERRICK: No, she was more motherly with the foreign students; she would really take the foreign students under her wing. She had been a visiting professor at the UN population center in Bombay, so there was K.C. Zachariah, who was a kind of son to her. I think Zachariah was finishing his dissertation at Penn about the time I came. Dorothy also looked after other Indians.

She was tough on the American students. She expected them to set an example and help make up for some of the language difficulties that foreign students experienced. Some of the Koreans and Taiwanese initially had language problems.

It was very much a family affair. I remember a time when one of the students fell victim to an ordinance in Philadelphia about leaving trash out. His trash had somehow fallen out of the trash container and they'd opened it up and found a letter addressed to him and arrested him for littering. The poor fellow was in absolute consternation and, indeed, the Philadelphia court system was not exactly what you would call honorable--this was the time of Rizzo. So Dorothy got us all out. At that time, I was still in the seminary and had my Roman collar. I hardly ever wore it, but she knew I had it, so she said, "I want you to wear your Roman collar when we go to court." So we all trot down to this justice of the peace in South Philadelphia, supporting our fellow student, and got him acquitted. I'm sure the justice of the peace was much more intimidated by Dorothy than by my collar. [Laughter]

It was that sort of thing. There was none of the anonymity of graduate school that you have today. I had left Penn by the time they moved out of 3935 Locust, but I remember there was real fear on the part of the faculty and students that they would lose the closeness and family spirit by moving into an ordinary building--which, is fact, a great facility.

VDT: They still have a great spirit.

MERRICK: Indeed, they do.

VDT: I went up there to interview Sam Preston and Jane Menken. It's great.

MERRICK: Both Dorothy and Hope Eldridge were great inspirations. Of course, Dick Easterlin was my mentor.

VDT: Tell me a bit about Hope Eldridge. That was after she'd been shoved out of the United Nations, with the dreadful harrassment she got during the McCarthy era. This was ten years or so later. She taught at Penn?

MERRICK: She was teaching at Penn. Her field was migration and population distribution. Of the members of my dissertation committee, she was the most exacting reader. She had me rewriting chapters for very fine methodological points that nobody else even noticed; points about weighting. I remember that one problem I had was dealing with the intervals between censuses which were uneven and I had to find some way to standardize the redistribution rates. I used the redistribution measure they had used in the classic study, in several volumes, of population redistribution and economic growth in the United States [Population Redistribution and Economic Growth in the United States: 1870-1950, and later to 1960, in three volumes, 1968, 1960, and 1964, by Dorothy Thomas et al, including Eldridge and Easterlin]. Other faculty members were Ann Miller and Everett and Anne Lee, who had worked on the study. Another student there at the time was Ed Cahill, who's now at the University of Tennessee. The Cahills were close friends of the Lees.

Going back to Hope, she was very exacting and a very good teacher. She was a kind of Eudora-Welty-type character. I've lost track of Hope since she and her spouse, DeWitt, moved back to Alabama. I don't know even whether Hope is alive. DeWitt was a delightful fellow--a tall, lean, almost white-haired, professor at Temple.

VDT: They managed to arrange that after the UN episode in the early 1950s?

MERRICK: I don't know when they came to Philadelphia; I imagine in the late 1950s. I was at Penn from 1964 to 67, and really didn't get into the population center until late 1965 or 1966.

VDT: Tell me about Richard Easterlin.

MERRICK: Dick and I were, of course, professor and student. Over the years, he has remained a very interested, supportive friend. I had lunch with him just a week ago out at USC [University of Southern California]. He and Eileen Crimmins were married in 1980 and they have two kids, the youngest of whom, I think, is three.

VDT: Was she a student of his?

MERRICK: She was his student, yes.

VDT: Following the tradition of a fellow Californian.

MERRICK: Yes, indeed. Anyway, they have two beautiful children. I didn't see Eileen during my visit; she had the proverbial flu that everybody else has had.

VDT: You'd gone out for the Kingsley Davis meeting [on population, resources, and environment] in Stanford and stopped in Los Angeles?

MERRICK: Stopped in Los Angeles to visit the Bixby Foundation and then went over and talked to the people at USC, Don Van Arsdol and David Heer, who have been sending graduate students to our fellows program at the Population Reference Bureau every summer, interviewed a couple of students who might be candidates for the program, and had lunch with Dick.

He's working right now on the combined effects of family structure and life-cycle changes on income distribution. He and Eileen are also working on a joint project, looking at aspirations of high school students.

Dick is very interested in population and economic interrelations. I worked with him on a paper he wrote, looking at the relationship between per capita income growth and population. Of course, we didn't find a very strong relationship.

VDT: He was one of the early ones to point that out?

MERRICK: Dick published papers in the late 1960s on this issue. At that time, he was very interested in what are called long cycles, long swings, and one of the hypotheses I looked at in my dissertation was whether these long swings in economic development were in any way related to population redistribution. And, of course, they were. It was difficult to tell which was cause and which was effect, because it was really association rather than a causal relationship. Restructuring of the economy--particularly with the expansion of manufacturing--required shifts from rural to urban areas and such shifts spurred the demand for manufactured goods--one of those symbiotic linkages.

VDT: You were mainly looking at population redistribution within countries, not the international migration which Easterlin said had such an effect on fertility cycles in this country?

MERRICK: That's right. No, this was on redistribution within countries.

VDT: Which, of course, is something that Dorothy Thomas was always interested in.

MERRICK: That's right. Dick was coauthor on what we always referred to as the Pennsylvania study [cited above], along with Dorothy Thomas, Hope Eldridge, Ann Miller, Simon Kuznets, Everett Lee--they all worked on different pieces. There are three large volumes; I've still got them at home. The first volumes covered 1870 to 1950; later they updated it to 1960. They looked at interregional population distribution in the United States. First they measured it and then connected it with economic development. Part of Dick's early work was in the measurement of income for regions and states. He was working on the economic side, under Kuznets. Kuznets was at Penn before he went to Harvard.

VDT: I noticed in your 1979 Brazil book [Population and Economic Development in Brazil, 1800 to the Present, with Douglas Graham], you gave credit to Easterlin and Kuznets as being inspirations.

MERRICK: That's right. The book was very much in that spirit of taking the long historical view. Doug Graham's mentor was Simon Kuznets.

VDT: Obviously, it was at Penn that you became interested in Third World demography, and you made the leap into AID, the practical side.

MERRICK: By that time, I was out of the Jesuits. There were three phases in a Jesuit's education. The regular college, and then two years of philosophy. So in addition to getting my master's degree in economics at St. Louis University, I got what was called a licentiate in philosophy, which was a license to teach philosophy; it was a European type of degree.

VDT: Simultaneously with doing your M.A. in economics?

MERRICK: Yes, doing them at the same time. Then I went to Penn and got the Ph.D. in economics and was supposed to go back and study in the third phase of the Jesuit training, which was theology. I decided I didn't want to become a priest, so I kind of changed my career goals; I was really interested in economics. I elected to leave the Jesuits in 1967.

Then I was looking for a job, and actually came back and spent another semester at Penn as a senior research scholar, continuing to work on some of these population and economic development topics. At the American Economic Association meetings, which were in Washington that year, I went to a recruiting booth and met somebody from AID. The next day, I got a phone call saying, "We're looking for a population economist; would you be interested in the job at AID?" So, in August of 1968 I moved from Philadelphia to Washington and went to work for AID. At that time I was hired as an international economist and worked in the Program and Policy Coordination Office on a number of different population projects. This was just after the earmarking of funds for population.

One of the projects I remember was the adaptation of the Coale-Hoover-type model to demonstrate how population and development were related. I learned all about that very quickly. That was not the kind of thing that Dick or other Penn people thought very much of; they were much more conservative about the adverse effects of population on development. I met Steve Enke, who was working with G.E. Tempco, whose offices, by the way, were at 777 14th Street, right where PRB is located today.

VDT: Enke by then had made his mark with his famous . . .

MERRICK: That's right.

VDT: Johnson had made his speech in 1965, that \$5 put into . . . \$100 . . . What was it?

MERRICK: It was originally \$5 worth of family planning was worth \$100 of ordinary development; that was Enke's calculation. Later--it's still controversial whether Johnson or Enke moved it down to \$1 of family planning. It's something that most people who dealt with it afterwards want to forget. It really backfired. But working with Enke was quite an experience.

The other major contract was the Rand contract. Paul Schultz was doing a population project, so I got to know Paul back in those years. Paul had studied at MIT and was just starting at Rand.

Then Ray Ravenholt came along and succeeded in consolidating all the AID population projects in the Office of Population. It was one of eight hundred reorganizations at AID, and I eventually moved to a division called the Technical Assistance Bureau and became part of the Office of the Population for about a year and a half, from late 1969 through the summer of 1971.

While I was with the Program and Policy Coordination Office, each economist was assigned a country to work with in terms of the cable traffic going back and forth with AID people in the field. There was a constant stream of communication and one was supposed to keep an eye out for things that related to economics or whatever, a kind of program coordination. And there were TDY's--temporary duty assignments--going out to work on different projects. So as the luck of the draw had it, I got Brazil.

VDT: Did you know any Portuguese?

MERRICK: None at all. I'd had some Spanish. The Jesuits were very big on languages, so in the course of my Jesuit education, in addition to Latin and Greek, I had studied French and German. I passed the French and German exams; I don't think I can remember a word of German today.

VDT: And Spanish too?

MERRICK: Spanish I learned more informally. Going from Latin to Spanish was fairly easy. But then I started taking Portuguese lessons at the Brazilian-American Cultural Institute at Connecticut and Van Ness.

I traveled to Brazil for the PPC office on some project or other, got very interested in doing things on Brazil, but also was doing a lot of other traveling. I remember trips to Kenya and Ghana. I think I met Fred Sai in Ghana way back in 1969. Spent a miserable six weeks in Addis Ababa in Ethiopia, doing an AID-related project, trying to get a population project going at the Economic Commission for Africa; their headquarters are in Addis Ababa.

VDT: Why miserable? Because it was so hot, or . . .

MERRICK: Oh, it was just dusty and dirty and there was not much to do. Potentially very interesting, but one of those places that for a young whippersnapper from Washington was not exactly the ideal setting to work.

I became interested at that time in getting overseas experience. Out of the blue, I got a telephone call from the Ford Foundation. I think it was the result of a paper I had written for an AID spring review of the population program. I remember getting a comment on my paper from Bud [Oscar] Harkavy at Ford, just a little note saying, "Nice job; nice to see that people at AID can write." That might have been a year earlier. Anyway, a call comes in out of the blue: "We hear you're a population economist with an interest in Brazil. Would you consider a position that the Ford Foundation has on a Brazil population project?" And I said, "Yes!"

So I was off to Brazil again in 1971, to take on what the Foundation called a DAP--delegated authority project--which meant that you worked for the Foundation but were assigned to a university. Of course, I liked that idea because it meant I could get back to teaching. I had actually taught at Georgetown while I was at AID. Andre Hellegers and Murray Gendell and John Macisco invited me to come over and teach in the evenings; I believe I taught a couple of courses. This was about 1970.

VDT: I just missed you. I got my degree in May of 1970; did my course work in 1968 and 69.

MERRICK: It couldn't have been 1971, because I was already on my way to Brazil. I remember Sergio Diaz was in that course. I taught him both at Georgetown and then at Penn. Sergio was a student at Penn in the mid-1970s.

I interviewed with the University of Sao Paulo and the University of Minas Gerais in Belo Horizonte. Both had economics departments that Ford was supporting, and the idea was to introduce demography into the economics programs. I ended up selecting Belo Horizonte, partly because there was already someone--Doug Graham--at Sao Paulo, under the Vanderbilt program, which was AID-funded. So Doug and I were in Brazil at roughly the same time, except at different universities.

VDT: Where is Belo Horizonte?

MERRICK: North and west of Rio; northeast of Sao Paulo. It makes a triangle, with Rio and Sao Paulo as the base and Belo at the tip, halfway between Rio and Brasilia. It's up in the mountains. The state is Minas Gerais, which means "general mines." It was the big gold and diamond mining area in the 18th century.

So I taught and worked as professor at the university there, helping to get the demography program started, which is now flourishing. There is a Ph.D. program in economic demography; they have about ten Ph.D.-level professors there.

VDT: You started it?

MERRICK: With others. There had been professors who went off to graduate studies, like Jose Alberto de Carvalho, who is now a famous Brazilian demographer and IUSSP Council member. We never coincided.

The Ford program managed two programs. It was kind of a triple strategy. When Ford decided to start in Brazil, they invited Ansley Coale, Joe Stycos, Harley Browning, Carmen Miro, and others to advise them how to go about it. There were several models. One was to push a single institution and work through institutional development, providing faculty support, training, research support for that institution and so on. They elected not to do that for a variety of reasons. I think one was that it was difficult to decide which institution. The other was the political climate of Brazil; it was difficult at that time--under the military--to deal with the major universities, which were all government universities. The government was strongly rightwing and it was just difficult to have any leverage. In fact, many social scientists had been forcibly retired from the universities. So Ford did not want to collaborate with the government.

So they elected to follow a modified strategy. I went to one of the universities, but the Foundation started investing heavily in fellowships for graduate studies in England, France, and the U.S. In the course of that program, nearly a hundred Brazilian students went abroad; I may be exaggerating but quite a large number. The program started in 1970 and went on almost ten years, eight or nine students going each year. Not all of them finished and not all of them stayed in population, but the core group of Brazilian demographers was trained during that period. They were sent to schools in the U.S.--Berkeley, Penn, Harvard--not so many at Michigan, too cold. A lot of them went to Texas. Some went to London; London was very popular because of Bill Brass. A few of them went to France. Brazilians are inclined to study in France because they study French in school, so there was a fair number who went to France or Belgium. This was an exclusively Brazilian program, run out of the Rio office of the Ford Foundation. There was also a program in Mexico, but I don't think it was as large.

From Brazil, I also assisted the Ford office in Lima with their Peruvian program, and to a lesser extent, the program in Mexico. At that time, the Ford Foundation had offices in Mexico, Bogota, Lima, and Rio, and were about to close their Santiago, Chile, office after the Pinochet regime came in. None were as large as the Rio office. The fellowship program in Brazil was by far the biggest.

As a second phase, after students started to return to Brazil, a concern we had was that they would lose the momentum in research that they gained as graduate students. What was so typical of many graduate students in the Third World was that they'd come back and not find support in their universities that they had as graduate students in the U.S. and Europe. So we instituted a research competition. We got the idea for that from the Ford-Rockefeller population research competition of the 1970s; \$20,000 to \$30,000 was the typical award.

VDT: Of the 1970s? I thought that was still on.

MERRICK: Ford is out of it; Rockefeller still has a program. I don't think they have it in population

anymore. Now it's women's studies and other thematic areas.

One of the things that occurred was that we would hear from the New York office, "Why aren't more Third World people, or Brazilians in particular, applying for or succeeding in the [worldwide] competition?" We would write back, one, the language issue--the proposals had to be submitted in English--and, two, they were always at a disadvantage in an international competition. We became reluctant to encourage people to submit proposals, knowing that their chance of being turned down was virtually 100 percent. We would put a lot of work into translating their proposals, and then they'd get turned down for a variety of reasons, not the least of which was that the review committee consisted of North Americans with a different concept of the role of research and who judged proposals only on grounds of research and really didn't look at the combination of research and institutional development.

Our response to that was that we'd set up our own program. We'd have a Brazilian competition and gear it to these returning professionals and their colleagues, to give them some research money. So we started a program of financial support for small projects, which is still going on.

VDT: With Ford money?

MERRICK: Initially, it was Ford money. In fact, it still is Ford money. I was in Brazil again last October for the Brazilian Population Association meeting and also as a Ford consultant to evaluate that program, 13 or 14 years after it was initiated.

A third phase in the overall strategy was that Ford wanted to step back and turn the programs over to Brazilians. So in 1974 or 75, Ford and the Brazilians moved to create a Brazilian Population Association that would pick up the fellowship program and the small research grants program and be the guiding force in Brazilian population studies. Earlier, the fellowship or research awards decisions were made by a committee of distinguished Brazilian population studies authorities, people like Isaac Kerstenetzky, director of the Brazilian Census Bureau at that time, Paul Haddad, who was director of CEDEPLAR in Belo Horizonte, Elza Berquo, my coauthor of the National Academy of Sciences book on Brazilian fertility [The Determinants of Brazil's Recent Rapid Decline in Fertility, 1983], Padre Beltrao, a Jesuit priest from the south of Brazil, and others.

I remember also at the Liege IUSSP meeting in 1973, we held a Brazilian dinner; drank a lot of wine. There were about 20 Brazilians there. Ford had sent many of our Brazilian fellows, either the ones in Europe or in the United States, to this IUSSP meeting, so the dinner included the fellows and the Brazilian demographers who were there. Lira Madeira, who was the grandfather of Brazilian demography, got up and announced, "We ought to start a Brazilian Population Association." And, of course, we went back to the Ford office and said, "That's a terrific idea. Let's see what we can do to get it going."

Over the next couple of years, Bob McLaughlan, also a Ford population officer in Brazil at that time, and later Axel Mundigo, who took Bob's place as the population officer, and Chuck Wood, who took my place at CEDEPLAR when I left--the four of us worked together to keep stirring the waters on the Brazilian Population Association. Ford again invited in an outside advisory group. There was a big meeting at the Sheraton hotel in Rio in 1976. There were the then-retired fellows, leading Brazilian demographers, and this committee that included Ansley Coale, Harley Browning, Carmen Miro--at least those three; there may have been others--to talk about the experiences of professional associations; Ansley as an ex PAA president; Carmen as IUSSP president; Harley with his vast knowledge of Latin America. And at that meeting in 1976, the Brazilian Population Association, ABEP, was founded.

ABEP has held meetings every two years since. The 1988 meeting was the sixth or seventh of their biannual meetings.

VDT: Have you attended them all?

MERRICK: All but one.

VDT: You really were largely the father of Brazilian demography!

MERRICK: More a co-conspirator. Many very distinguished Brazilian scholars took the lead. Lira Madeira had been working in demography in Brazil since the 1940s. He was a protege of Giorgio Mortara. Mortara came to Brazil during the 1930s and really gave Brazil its first modern demographic censuses. Brazil's censuses in 1940 and 1950, the two Mortara censuses, are wonderful, rich in data. Then Mortara's writings on the censuses are a gold mine. We used them a lot in our book. So if you ask about the fathers of Brazilian demography, I'd say they were Mortara and Madeira, although much of their work was on the biostatistical and statistical side.

There was a hiatus during the 1960s. The Brazilian 1960 census was never fully completed. It came just before the collapse of the Brazilian government. The military came in and didn't complete the tabulation of the census. It was Isaac Kerstenetzky who got the Brazilian statistical system going again, with the 1970 census. Isaac continued through the mid-1970s until he was fired by the military, because he refused to "adjust" the price indices to push the inflation rate downward. He refused to do it and was asked for his resignation. It was a terrible thing and demoralized the Brazilian Census Bureau. They still haven't recovered the kind of professionalism and leadership that Isaac gave them. It all occurred around the time of the 1980 census, which he had set up--maybe in 1979.

VDT: Well, the Brazilians have a strong demographic community now.

MERRICK: They do.

VDT: Do they need to continue to send students to the U.S.?

MERRICK: They still occasionally send students.

VDT: Not only Brazil but in Latin America generally, can you say that they have strong enough centers of training themselves and don't need outside demographic support from the U.S.?

MERRICK: Financial support is, in fact, one of the issues I was dealing with in Brazil in October. There is not the tradition of private philanthropy in Latin America that there is in North America, so Brazilian institutions are very dependent still on outside donors. Because Brazilian universities are also government institutions, the economic crisis of Brazil over the last several years has really undone a lot of the growth in autonomy that they developed during the early 1980s.

The Ford Foundation's hope was that it could make a tie-off endowment grant to the Brazilian Population Association. Ford had been giving annual grants to ABEP and hoped by the early 1980s that it could set up an endowment which would cover basic core costs for running the association, with ABEP raising the money for programs from Brazilian sources. There's a Brazilian national science foundation and state-level science foundations. ABEP was successful in the mid-1980s in getting funding for the research awards program, for annual meetings, and so on. They don't charge for their annual meeting like PAA does. But with the economic crisis, the bottom fell out of these sources of support. They came back to Ford and Ford has made two more grants to the Brazilian Population Association.

VDT: Those must be their remaining population grants, because Ford has moved out of the population field.

MERRICK: Mostly. One of the points I made in the evaluation was to ask where Ford was going with its population program in Brazil. So we made some recommendations about how ABEP might reorganize its budget. They really hadn't questioned some of the basic assumptions of their programs, which we encouraged them to do.

It's an interesting experience to go back over that history. It's a good example of the kind of long-term investment you have to make if you really want to lay the foundations in a field. It was a challenging setting because of the military regime. Social scientists were very suspect. Many sociologists and political scientists had been forcibly retired from the universities, "retired" being a euphemism for being sacked. I'm referring to the early through late 1970s. During the so-called abertura of the early 1980s, the Geisel and Figueiredo regimes, many professors were allowed to come back to their university positions.

But demography was then a field where many could find a safe haven, because demography was more quantitative. I don't think the military quite knew what to do with demography. So it became a common ground on which many social scientists could communicate with each other. It was very attractive to them, and it was also less political, surprisingly.

VDT: Less political? You would think that by extrapolation it would go to, "We need family planning," and Brazil was notorious in the 1970s for resisting family planning.

MERRICK: It's a curious thing. I've often reflected about the investments that outside agencies make in population study in the hope of promoting research that will lead to policy decisions such as the decision to have a family planning program. With the Ford Foundation, I think the expectation was that this investment would lead to a better understanding of links between population and development in Brazil and a more open attitude toward family planning programs.

It really never happened. The field certainly grew and became very sophisticated, probably too sophisticated from a scholarly and scientific point of view ever to go for the simplistic arguments about population growth and its adverse effect on development. Brazilians were always right on top of the field. They were ahead of the National Academy of Sciences [Population Growth and Economic Development: Policy Questions, 1986], if anything, in their skepticism about these arguments--unfortunately, because Ford was also investing heavily in family planning.

Ford was a major supporter, with a three-pronged population program in Brazil. It supported BEMFAM, the Brazilian IPPF affiliate. It also supported a lot of biomedical research. Ford has three population advisers at one time in Brazil when I was there. Bob McLaughlan was the family planning program officer, Gordon Perkin was the biomedical research adviser, and I was in population studies, although not in the Ford office. It was a large program.

The decision at that time was to keep them separate, because the feeling was that population was so sensitive that they didn't want to link family planning and population study, as they had done in Colombia, for example. In Colombia, Ford supported groups like ASCOFAME, which included a population study program that laid the groundwork for Colombia's population policy and was eventually turned over to Profamilia, which is the family planning program. In Colombia, Profamilia has played a major role in the delivery of family planning services.

In Brazil, the tracks were really separate. The decision to keep family planning separate from population study was based on the hope that people would see the light. They never did. Even to the point that when a World Fertility Survey was proposed for Brazil, the Brazilian Population Association went on record against it. They didn't want it because they felt it wasn't necessary and also because, obviously, it had AID funding. Always this antipathy to family planning and outside donors--which is a topic in itself. That history--a fascinating history.

VDT: I didn't realize you were that involved in the development of demography in Brazil. You mentioned that you've continued to return to Brazil for the Brazilian Population Association meetings.

You've gone back for the World Bank too?

MERRICK: I've done all sorts of consultancies. I go Brazil probably once a year. I've traveled to Brazil as a consultant for the ILO, on a mission to study migration and population distribution policies. I go for AID, on the PRB project. I've gone any number of times for the World Bank. The last was an ill-fated social sector adjustment mission that nothing has ever resulted from. Earlier, I went on an urbanization mission for the urban office of the World Bank.

VDT: My final question on Brazil. Can we stop worrying about Brazil, about Colombia, Mexico, because their fertility rates are headed down at last?

MERRICK: The population issue in Brazil now, in terms of policy, is a twofold one. One is family planning access for people who aren't getting services as a result of the way in which the Brazilian model has developed. This is fundamentally a model where the drugstore is the source of supply for pills and the organized health system is the source of sterilization. Half the sterilizations are provided through private physicians, working in private hospitals, and the other half by the Brazilian social security system, which is their equivalent of Blue Cross. For anybody who works for what is now called the formal sector, social security taxes cover both retirement and health insurance. So the third party provider is the social security institute, which is like the Social Security Administration here. People have access to social security hospitals through the system, so people who are in the system, if they want medical services, including sterilization, can get it. The problem is the people who don't have access to that, who are too poor even to buy pills from the drugstore. They are still a substantial part of the population; my guess is about 30 percent of women at risk don't have that kind of access.

The DHS [Demographic and Health Survey, 1986] showed contraceptive prevalence at 66 percent. They now think the Northeast may be overestimated; it showed up at 53 percent, but it may actually be lower. The prevalence rate [66 percent] is inconsistent with the total fertility rate. The total fertility rate [3.5] is too high for the contraceptive prevalence level.

VDT: Still, it's headed down.

MERRICK: Yes, it is. But the problem is the women who don't have access through either the social security system or private commercial sales.

The other issue is the quality of service. When you go to the drugstore in Brazil to buy anything, you may get a pharmacist, you may get somebody who was hired yesterday, and many poor people go to the drugstore to get their medical advice. So someone goes to the drugstore and asks for a pillula, the birth control pill, and they get whatever the counter person sees on the shelf. Brazilians are notorious smokers; you may have a woman over 35, a smoker with high blood pressure getting high estrogen birth control pills and doing damage to her health. That whole issue of the health impact and the quality of family planning services has been neglected in the way in which Brazilian family planning has evolved, which is basically that the government has looked the other way in terms of everything. There's been very little quality control. It's a mind of make-money, commercialized approach, even through the health system. The Brazilian health system is a real mess, and it hasn't gotten any better with all of the chaos.

These two issues have emerged now in Brazil. At the World Bank, Nancy Birdsall, the Brazil officer, is actually leading a study of reproductive health issues. One of the main recommendations I made in my report to the Bank last year was that if the Bank wanted to do anything on population through the health window in Brazil, it ought to work with this quality issue. The Brazilian women's health movement has also picked up on the issue. I think it's an issue that's going to spread to other countries: the quality of services, both in terms of health impact and in terms of the effectiveness of

family planning.

One reason, I think, for the inconsistency between the total fertility rate and prevalence rates is that the prevalence rate is measuring very poor use, particularly of the pill.

VDT: That's already been pointed out in Zimbabwe, which is very suspect with its relatively high prevalence rate and its total fertility rate still over six.

MERRICK: Yes, so I think it's an issue that has relevance to countries other than Brazil.

VDT: After Brazil, you went back to Penn for two years. Were you married by then?

MERRICK: I was married before Brazil. I taught at Penn for two years and also had a Rockefeller Foundation research award where I basically wrote that book on population and economic development in Brazil.

VDT: You and Douglas Graham got data from Brazil and you also went back for a while?

MERRICK: Yes, I went back. Of course, I brought a lot of data back. I had actually started writing the book in Brazil and had enormous amounts of data.

VDT: Is this the comprehensive book on Brazil's population?

MERRICK: At least through 1970. It's dated now.

VDT: But no one else had collected the whole long history?

MERRICK: Not really. If you look at the historical perspective of the century since the first Brazilian census in 1872, we were able to mine the census data for several years.

VDT: And you were inspired by Richard Easterlin's historical view?

MERRICK: Oh, very much so. There've since been a number of important books, including a very recent one that I just reviewed in Population and Development Review by Carvalho and Wood [The Demography of Inequality in Brazil, PDR review, September 1988], using 1980 census data. Our story stops with the 1970 census. And, of course, there's been an explosion of demographic research. I have bookshelves of material now. I think back on the difficulty of finding material for our book, and now there's such a wealth of material available for Brazil. In a way, I shudder at the thought of bringing it up to date, because there's so much to sift through that was produced during the 1980s.

VDT: Do you think you might?

MERRICK: Someday I'll probably go back and bring it up to date, yes. We missed spotting the onset of the fertility decline; I was very skeptical about the data. I had read the Dudley Kirk threshold paper. In fact, I just saw Dudley out at Stanford; sat next to him during the conference, reminded him again how wise he was. Dudley Kirk wrote a paper in Economic Development and Cultural Change way back in the late 1960s on the threshold hypothesis. The UN picked it up in one of their reviews. Dudley and his colleagues wrote that they thought the fertility decline in Latin America was delayed, and it was. If you look at fertility rates in the 1960s in Latin America, they were much too high by comparison with their levels of urbanization, education, and so on. But what was happening was there

was a pent-up demand for family planning. Then during the 1970s, the birth rates of Colombia, Peru, Brazil, and to a lesser extent Peru, Venezuela, were coming down. So that I'd like to go back and patch up.

My appointment at Penn lasted two years--1974 to 76. I remember I was going up to New York to talk to Bud Harkavy about rejoining Ford when I got a call from Andre Hellegers, who had been talking to Bud. Andre said, "You don't want to go work for the Ford Foundation, you want to come to Georgetown. Before you make any decision about Ford, come down and visit us at Georgetown." I did go up and talk to Bud. I said, "You know, I've talked to Georgetown as well." Then I went down and talked to Andre and Georgetown.

I ended up going to Georgetown and the Center for Population Research in the fall of 1976. Con Taeuber was the director at that time, but they were looking for someone to come in and succeed him. So six months later, something like that, I became director.

VDT: I'd forgotten that Con Taeuber was fairly briefly the director of the Center for Population Research at Georgetown.

MERRICK: Con was director for at least a couple of years there in the mid-1970s.

VDT: Did you choose Georgetown because, well, you enjoyed research and you had been teaching--that theme had always been there? You like teaching?

MERRICK: I like teaching. I like Washington. I'd lived in Washington before; I was attracted to the idea of coming back to Washington. I had taught earlier at Georgetown, so had had some experience with that program. And it was an interesting program also because it was in the Kennedy Institute of Ethics and I had the philosophy and ethics background and was kind of fascinated by the opportunity to be a part of the Kennedy Institute of Ethics as well as the Population Center.

VDT: Did Andre Hellegers [director of the Kennedy Institute] die shortly after you came?

MERRICK: Both Hellegers and Don Herzburg passed away suddenly. Herzburg was the dean of the graduate school. Many of the understandings with which I came to Georgetown about a tenured position and some of the hope for establishment of a department of demography at Georgetown were worked out, as they typically did, informally between Herzburg and Hellegers. Hellegers died in May of 1979; had a heart attack while he was in Europe. I remember I was on my way to Brazil at the time for one of the Brazilian Population Association workshops, just outside Rio. And a year later, Herzburg, who was working on the Democratic campaign during the summer of 1980, dropped dead of a heart attack.

So I devoted much of my time at Georgetown to administration. We had a crazy situation where two faculty members, Jeanne Clare Ridley and Murray Gendell, had tenured positions in the sociology department. The rest of us--by that time Beth Soldo had come and I was there and we, along with Con Taeuber, Henry Shryock, and Jay Siegel were full-time faculty but did not have regular faculty appointments. We were kind of lost sheep. We were negotiating institutional arrangements, and finally after much struggle did get the graduate department of demography established with regular faculty positions. At that time, we got tenured track positions. I think I'd been there five years; my expectation had been I was going to get tenure after a year or two. That was an enormously difficult period.

But I continued at Georgetown the work that I'd been doing on Brazil.

VDT: Which led to the National Research Council book [Brazil's Recent Rapid Decline in Fertility, 1983].

MERRICK: Yes, and contributed to another, the National Research Council review of Brazilian demographic trends, which was a committee product. I also produced a number of articles for different journals about Brazil. I completed a lot of the research that I was doing on Brazil during that period. And taught.

I was giving a lot of thought to the nature of the demography program at Georgetown. When I came, many people were urging us to consider a Ph.D. program in demography. I was always against that idea for a number of reasons. One of them was the comparative advantage of Georgetown. I'd been involved in the Ph.D. program at Penn and saw what a tremendous investment it took in faculty and other resources to make it work. I'm convinced that few of the Ph.D. programs in demography today could really function without NIH center grants, and Georgetown did not have a center grant. It's very difficult. I know a number of the programs well enough to appreciate the vital role that those center grants play. While Georgetown was aspiring to get a center grant, it was just unrealistic to expect that the NIH center grant program was going to expand. So the resources would have to come from elsewhere.

VDT: There are about 15 centers with NIH grants?

MERRICK: I think there are eleven.

So where to get the money to support the students? At Georgetown, unlike other universities, demography did not have a broad undergraduate base of either a sociology department or economics department to pay for the overhead. So the whole question of reliability of funding was fundamental.

The other problem is that the model was unclear. Some people were calling for a small program, four or five Ph.D. students. And there was a lot of pressure from former Georgetown M.A. students, who had jobs in Washington and wanted to come back and get Ph.D. degrees while they were still working. We were dead set against part-time Ph.D.s. I'm a firm believer that if people are going to get a Ph.D., they have to really live the research experience; you can't do that on a part-time basis. It's got to be total immersion for at least a year to understand the nature of the research enterprise. Again, the resources were simply not there to do it. So my feeling was that the direction in which Georgetown should be looking if it wanted to innovate was to the future of the field of demography. And I felt that the future lay in applied demography.

So during the last two years I was there, we had a lot of discussions about redirecting Georgetown's M.A. program toward applied demography. And, indeed, in 1984-85, Georgetown switched and now has an applied demography program, which is doing quite well.

VDT: How did your interest in applied demography arise? Just because you could see the future, or . . .

MERRICK: In part that, and in part through PAA. We'll eventually get to the fact that I became PAA secretary-treasurer, during Dick Easterlin's time as president.

VDT: I had that down here, "Who proposed you for secretary-treasurer? Easterlin?"

MERRICK: Dick Easterlin. He was president of PAA in 1978.

VDT: How did that fit in with your applied demography?

MERRICK: The secretary-treasurer effort is a long story, but one of the dimensions of the job was keeping track of PAA's different committees, including state and local demography and business

demography, which was just getting started during my tenure as secretary-treasurer [1978-81]. So I got to know the people who were involved in those committees, started going to their meetings, just out of support and interest. I thought they had important things to say about the need for demographers to communicate effectively to nontechnical audiences; to be thinking about applications of demography in fields other than the traditional research areas.

From about 1981, when I left the PAA secretary-treasurer's job, to 1984 when I came to PRB, I was thinking more and more about teaching needs. In 1982 or 83, John Weeks asked me to write a paper on the teaching of applied demography. I forget how I expressed that interest; anyway, he found out about it. So I started to think about it a bit more systematically. It may have been that I had written to several departments asking for advice when we were contemplating Georgetown's applied program. A couple of California schools had programs in applied economics and applied sociology; Michigan had a program in applied statistics. So I was collecting information on applied programs. Then I wrote up what I'd found about applied programs in other fields and how that could be used in the teaching of applied demography. That piece was eventually published in the journal, Teaching Sociology.

We took all that information and put it into the design of the applied program at Georgetown. For example, there's a strong emphasis on internships in other applied programs, responding to the need to establish continuity between the classroom experience and later careers.

VDT: Internships in companies?

MERRICK: In companies or organizations where people would get experience. In fact, we're now collaborating with Georgetown on an internship for applied demographers who will work with Decision Demographics [at PRB] and PRB people.

One thing I found in my assessment of career tracks of young demographers was that completing the degree and going into the job market is not the whole story. Through your mentors and through your professors there is role modeling that goes on while you're studying. This is another reason why I felt that total immersion is really necessary for a Ph.D. program, because a dissertation is more than just writing a monograph. It's really a socialization experience of seeing how research professionals work, rubbing elbows with them on a day-to-day basis in a kind of apprenticeship experience. People who go into what I would call academic mainstream demography were getting this in their degree program, but applied demographers don't. If anything, the applied demographer is getting negative reinforcement during the graduate school experience because, by and large, the established people of the field of demography may look down--even though they don't perceive it--they look down on people who work in business, who work in state and local government, or in the federal government. Somehow you haven't delivered in demography unless you become a major figure at a U.S. university.

Economics may have influenced me in this way because in the economics profession there isn't that kind of stigma. There are lots of non-academic organizations where economists thrive.

VDT: And the academics do not look down on them?

MERRICK: Well, there's always that mystique about academia. But what I've discovered is that there's life after tenure and there are some very interesting and challenging things to do outside of academia. In fact, some of it is more interesting and challenging.

VDT: That leads into my next question. Why did you leap out of academia into the Population Reference Bureau particularly--the real world? Because you and I both know--you're my former boss; I dearly love PRB--but it had a suspect reputation in the population world. It was never quite

acceptable, even though Henry Pratt Fairchild was the first president of both PAA and PRB; Kingsley Davis was a vice-president of PRB.

MERRICK: You're quite right on that. I was reading with some embarrassment some of the writings of my predecessors at PRB, who were not what I would call enlightened souls on some social issues.

VDT: You were the first demographer to be president, the first acceptable . . .

MERRICK: I have to say that Con Taeuber is the person who convinced me of the value of PRB's work. I hardly knew about PRB when I was a graduate student in the mid-1960s; those were the Robert Cook days. I knew less than some of my colleagues who in later days would say, "Oh yes, I used to enjoy PRB materials when I was a graduate student." I was not even aware of them as a graduate student. I'd seen some of the blue-cover Population Bulletins of that period, but it had really not registered. It wasn't until I came to Georgetown that I really got to know PRB. I joined PRB's advisory committee. I remember that we met out at Belmont, up in Maryland, and really got to know PRB and the staff.

VDT: I was at that meeting.

MERRICK: Then along came AID's Compilation and Analysis of Population Data Project and an invitation for Georgetown to bid with PRB on the AID RFP [Request for Proposals]. At that time, 1978, I'd just become director of the Georgetown center and was desperately looking for ways to finance students. Here was an opportunity to provide the likes of Cary Davis, Rich Kirchberger, Mary Kent, and Lisa Olson--I think 13 or 14 students eventually benefited from opportunities for part-time jobs on that project. That gave me an opportunity to work with PRB on a day-to-day basis and to strengthen the ties between Georgetown and PRB. So I got to know the organization quite well through that project.

Eventually, in 1980, they invited me to join the Board of Trustees. Eventually I got on the Executive Committee. I came on the Board just as Bob Worrall was becoming president, which I think was early 1979. That was when they were going through that big battle with Bob Avedon over funding. Through the executive committee, I got involved in the personnel committee at PRB and got to know many of the staff. Many of the people who were involved in this, of course, were also former Georgetown students.

VDT: There's always been a close PRB-Georgetown connection.

MERRICK: It was especially strong at that time. It still is. The staff has expanded; many of the same people are there, but there are many other non-Georgetowners as well. Now we're getting a Wisconsin mafia, with Stephen Tordella and Sarah Besadny. Another Wisconsin graduate, Tom Godfrey, came on staff about two weeks ago.

Then Bob Worrall announced at a December 1983 executive committee meeting that he was going to resign as PRB president sometime during 1984. A search committee was set up and eventually I got a call from somebody on that committee, saying, "You really ought to consider becoming president of PRB." And I said, "No, I just received tenure at Georgetown"--I'd had tenure for about two or three years--"I don't want to leave Georgetown." But a lot of people said, "Well, take a leave of absence from Georgetown; at least help us during this transition period." Eventually I got talked into that. I took a two-year leave of absence from Georgetown, fully intending to return after two years.

VDT: And you kept teaching.

MERRICK: Kept teaching at Georgetown. But I was getting more and more involved in PRB--and liking it. And finding it fascinating, partly because of the applied demography connection.

VDT: You came up with the idea of what is now Decision Demographics [for-profit subsidiary of PRB]?

MERRICK: Well, yes and no. DISC [Demographic Information Service Center] had been there as a window for small business set-aside contract bidding. What was happening was that PRB had been doing consulting work for businesses--Carl Haub had done work for Pulte Homes--but it was a passive approach. Firms would turn to PRB for information and often end up taking up two or three days of staff time, when they could have been buying it at somebody else's commercial rate. The feeling both on the part of the staff and on the part of the Board was that if a commercial client were to buy time from PRB, they ought to be buying it at commercial rates. So PRB started using DISC as a window for that sort of thing.

When we got the AID-funded IMPACT project [producing materials on population issues for policymakers in less developed countries] and looked back over our history, one of the concerns of the Board was that we not become so dependent on AID again that the loss of an AID contract would put us in the kind of financial bind that PRB was in in 1982 when we lost the Compilation and Analysis of Data project to Westinghouse and PRB had to swallow about \$150,000-worth of staff time liability. So when we sold the 2213 M Street building and made a profit on that real estate, the Board said that we ought to invest the profit in our future. "Let's use that money to launch ourselves aggressively into the application of demography in business."

John Beyer suggested we do a business plan: "Recognize that you're going to have to spend some money to make some money. Hire somebody to do a marketing plan; position yourself in the market; and make an investment in your own future, anticipating the day when federal government support will be more difficult to get." We needed support for our core activities: Population Bulletin, Population Today, the Data Sheets, and the information services, which I view as the heart of the matter. Other things are frosting in the sense that they draw from and contribute to the core activities of PRB. So we've been doing that over the last year and a half through what is now Decision Demographics.

It's not been an easy pull. It's a very hard market to break into. Depending on how you count it, we'll probably end up having invested about \$100,000 in 1988 in the enterprise. I'm confident that it will pay off.

VDT: When you look at the full-page glossy ads in American Demographics of your very large competitors, you wonder if there is room for more in the field.

MERRICK: True. But now about my remaining with PRB. Georgetown called me in 1986 and said, "Your two-year leave of absence is up. Come back or resign." Of course, I first tried to negotiate for another year and they wouldn't have any of that. So I eventually resigned from Georgetown. I'm still an adjunct faculty member.

VDT: Are you teaching?

MERRICK: Last semester I didn't teach, for a variety of reasons, the main one being that I was traveling in the fall. And also I taught a course in Mozambique last May-June and then in China again in the summer, so I was kind of "taught out."

VDT: Was the course in China for UNFPA?

MERRICK: It was a UNFPA project. Both of those courses were under UNDP auspices.

VDT: They were on microcomputers?

MERRICK: The one in Mozambique was, using microcomputers to apply demography in planning.

VDT: I wanted to ask you about that. You are a computer nut, obviously, from way back and very adept at it. How did that come about? Were you sort of ahead of the game, as well as seeing the value of microcomputers?

MERRICK: I'd been a mainframe computer buff way back at Penn.

VDT: Already in the 1960s?

MERRICK: Actually back at St. Louis University, I did some work with computers. I was always fascinated by computers. Of course, my dissertation was very computer-intensive, because there was a lot of computation involved. I had an enormous data file of population-by-region for many countries.

VDT: You took these dusty census volumes and entered all the data . . .

MERRICK: I transferred all the data to computer cards. I've still got the data. Someday I'll go back and work on them. They're all on IBM cards. I'm not sure I could even find a card reader today. I should transfer them to diskette someday.

On the Compilation and Analysis of Data Project, one of the persons we hired was Richard Collins, who persuaded me to buy one of the very first Apple microcomputers. We had a dickens of a time convincing AID and PRB to let us buy this microcomputer; they thought it was all a waste of time. In fact, when we first bid that project, we were using remote terminals to manage the AID database. Richard convinced me that we could do that and much more with microcomputers, which at that time were miniscule in terms of their capacity compared to the computer you have sitting over on that table.

But we got an Apple II at Georgetown--that was in 1979--and I think PRB then got an Apple II, or perhaps they borrowed one from the Futures Group. Futures was using Apples on the RAPID I project to do demonstrations of the RAPID I model.

When I came to PRB in 1984, I was shocked by the lack of computers. PRB had received one Hewlett-Packard microcomputer as a gift from the Hewlett-Packard Company foundation. They were using that down in a room on the first floor. There was one other microcomputer in the place. Well, of course, at that time I had my own microcomputer at home and one at the office at Georgetown; I was not about to give up that capacity. So I set up a task force to get PRB "microcomputerized" and immediately went out and bought one for myself.

VDT: And you've spread that around the population world.

MERRICK: Now we've got more microcomputers than we have people at PRB. In fact, when the new IBM model came to us about a year ago, Art Haupt sent me a message to ask whether we should put our old machines out in the hall for Nada [cleaning lady] to throw in the trash.

VDT: Great! Now I'd like to ask you a couple of broad questions before we get onto PAA. Which of all your roles have you enjoyed most? You have been a teacher, a consultant in Brazil and continuing to be so in many other parts of the world, a teacher-researcher, and now you're an administrator-entrepreneur, I think you might call it. You're rather unusual in the population world, because you have had these many different types of careers.

MERRICK: They're different types of activities, but what I have felt is a common thread in all of them is working with people--a combination of nurturing, in the case of the students I've worked with and other staff members, helping people get interested in demography, grow in demography and population studies, and learning from them.

You asked about applied demography. I'm fascinated by demography, on the one hand, but have always been a little bit uncomfortable with the narrowness of the mainstream of the field. I've been the kind of person who always wants to reach out, often through other people, either as collaborators on research projects or collaborators with consultant teams.

VDT: You mentioned some of those people, but who have been some of the outstanding influences for you, both the professors you mentioned and your students?

MERRICK: The opportunity to work with people like Con Taeuber, who is certainly known as a demographer. But Con has a remarkable contact with people all around the world in population and related fields. Working with you, for example; you're a person who is a much broader demographer in terms of your interests and contacts. Both you and Con have made me a letter writer.

VDT: Huh! That's interesting.

MERRICK: I really have learned the value of correspondence with people, and follow up on correspondence. I hated it when I was a bureaucrat with AID; it was one of the biggest bothers. I'd much rather have spent my time reading and writing, doing the real things. But now I really enjoy and value correspondence.

VDT: You can bat it out so fast on your computer.

MERRICK: Oh, yes.

VDT: Con continues . . . I've just come to a place in transcribing my interview with Lincoln Day where he mentions, in his relationship with Con, that Con continues to send little tidbits to him. And to me--an article that he's come across of interest to me and he continues to send me things for the PAA archives, and so on. Yes, Con is well known for those little notes.

MERRICK: Yes. Outside of the mainstream, I've enjoyed working with people in the business demography field, getting a chance to meet and work with Cheryl Russell of American Demographics, with Lou Pol, and Hallie Kintner at GM, and Joan Finch--people whom I probably would not have gotten to know had I stayed in an academic department. Working with academics, working with people like Beth Soldo, learning about aging, and the colleagues in Brazil, the vast array of colleagues there--Elza Berquo and Jose Alberto Carvalho, Paulo Paiva. I remember interviewing Paul Paiva, now the past president of the Brazilian Population Association, when he was at the Catholic University in Belo Horizonte, interested in demography. I suggested that he and his wife go to Penn, because she was interested in historical demography; he was interested in the labor force, which John Durand and Ann Miller were covering.

The opportunity to meet and work with people and see those people develop in their careers. All my professors at Penn certainly had an enormous influence. John Durand was a wonderful man.

VDT: You also took courses from him?

MEKRRICK: I can't remember whether I audited or took courses, but I got to know John very briefly when I was a student, and then worked with him as a colleague from 1974 to 76. When John retired--I think in 1977/78 [1979]--he moved down to North Carolina. I went down and visited him, went hiking with him in the mountains.

VDT: Did you find him aloof, as people have said he was?

MERRICK: John was almost a recluse in a way, very shy--very warm person once you got to know him, full of a kind of mountain wisdom. John was very spare with words. If you could get John to read your paper, you got his incisive insight into what you were saying. A very careful, dedicated mentor, very caring about students. Yes, many people found John very spare with words. John and Ann Miller were close friends. Ann just retired a couple of years ago.

I enjoyed working with those people. It was very rewarding to go back to Penn as a faculty member, to get to know as colleagues people whom I'd known as a student--others were Ed Hutchinson, who worked on international migration, Vince Whitney I mentioned earlier--and to keep up with Everett and Anne Lee, now down at the University of Georgia at Athens.

Being in Washington also and, of course, being at PRB gives you an opportunity to interact with lots of people.

So you asked of all these wide experiences what I enjoyed most, I think it has been the opportunity to work with and to get to know so many people. You mentioned the PAA secretary-treasurer's job. One of the most exciting things about that was to get to know people and work with the PAA presidents.

VDT: We'll get to PAA which, of course, is most important. But one last question about your career: Which of all your accomplishments have given you the most satisfaction? This is a standard question in these interviews.

MERRICK: That's a tough one. I'm sure getting a book out is always a great satisfaction. But the feeling that you've contributed to the creation of something that's going to last is also important. So, I was one of many who contributed to the creation of the Brazilian Population Association; others certainly gave a lot. Axel Mundigo, for example, gave a tremendous amount of time to the actual launching and probably spent more of his time and energy than I did. The opportunity that I had to get that whole Brazilian enterprise going is certainly something that I feel very good about.

Helping Georgetown's program get through some tough times. I'm still convinced that it will last. To leave a lasting mark on an institution--to leave it better in terms of people who are there, in terms of the structure of the program--is what I value. And that's the way I feel about PRB too. The opportunity to come to an institution, to shape it, to leave it stronger in terms of program and people and financially than when you came.

I'm not sure I can assign a ranking, one, two, three, four, to those.

VDT: Well, you've certainly done some outstanding things.

Now, PAA. Also a standard beginning in connection with PAA: Can you remember the first meeting you attended? You have that list there.

MERRICK: It may well have been Cincinnati, which was 1967. The Population Council, as it still does--I was on the Pop Council fellowship committee from 1984 to 87--brings its fellows to the PAA meeting. I was a Pop Council fellow in 1966-67. I think that year I was actually an honorary fellow, because I'd had a Pop Council fellowship in 1965-66, and then in 1966-67 I got a Ford Foundation fellowship.

VDT: I once had a Ford Foundation fellowship, in my second semester at Georgetown. They didn't know who else to give it to.

MERRICK: Being a fellow, they brought me to the PAA meeting, and I think that [1967] was the first one. It may have been that I also went to the New York meeting the year before, in 1966. But I distinctly remember the Cincinnati meeting.

VDT: What do you remember about it?

MERRICK: I remember one thing. The hotel was an old Sheraton hotel and the hotel detectives . . . Students at that time had a tendency not to register, and there was some policy where they were trying to police us and capture students who were not registered.

VDT: You were doubling up in your rooms?

MERRICK: That's right.

VDT: Can you remember some of the outstanding personalities at the early meetings you attended, not necessarily just that one?

MERRICK: I was always impressed with the presidential addresses. At the 1967 meeting, it was Paul Glick [on "Permanence of Marriage"]--former PRB Bulletin author [Paul Glick and Arthur Norton, "Marrying, Divorcing, and Living Together in the U.S. Today," Population Bulletin, October 1977].

VDT: PAA issues about that time [late 1960s] were--Donald Bogue came up with his family planning issue of Demography [special, thick issue on "Progress and Problems of Fertility Control Around the World," with Indian family planning inverted red triangle on the cover and the slogan, "Two or three--that's enough," Vol. 5, No. 2, 1968].

MERRICK: I do indeed remember that.

VDT: And there was a committee to decide whether PAA should try to expand membership out into fields peripheral to demography. You might not have been aware of that.

MERRICK: As a mere student at that time . . .

VDT: No, you were not involved in that.

MERRICK: I was struck in great wonder at all the marvelous papers [at meetings].

The thing that always impressed me about PAA . . . At this time, I was essentially in the economics program at Penn. They were encouraging us to go also to the American Economic Association meeting, which was a huge meeting, impersonal, mammoth sessions. So to go to the PAA

and to find that it was kind of an extension of this family experience that you had at Penn is one of the strongest things I remember. The faculty actually noticed you at PAA meetings. They kind of showed off their students. They wanted their students to go.

I remember in 1968 a whole bunch of us drove to the PAA meeting in Boston. There was an Atlantic City meeting--yes, that was in 1969. And I remember driving down to the Atlanta meeting in 1970.

VDT: When Everett Lee was president, gave his address.

MERRICK: I think that was one of the most interesting and well-written presidential addresses that I remember ["Migration in Relation to Education, Intellect, and Social Structure"]. That was when he gave his migration theory paper. [The latter probably refers to Lee's famous article, "A Theory of Migration," Demography, 1966.]

VDT: And he was introduced by Andy Lunde. Apparently, that was a memorable introduction.

MERRICK: Yes. 1971 was in Washington, D.C.--a big meeting; I remember that. In 1972, 1974, 74 I didn't go because I was in Brazil and could never get back at the time of the PAA meeting.

VDT: In the early 1970s, before you went to Brazil, were you aware of the issues on women's rights? That came up about that time. And Concerned Demographers, who were concerned to get PAA into more policy issues. Business meetings were heavily attended and exciting, which is not true now.

MERRICK: Only to the extent that I followed them in PAA Affairs. I was so involved during the early 1970s in Brazil with kind of a parallel political development that anything going on here paled by comparison with the ferocity of Latin American politics.

VDT: Let's leap ahead. I have here, "Who asked you to be secretary-treasurer?," [for 1978-81] and I have "Easterlin" [president in 1978] question mark; you've answered that. And, "How did they get chosen?"

MERRICK: They get chosen, I think, on the basis of who's willing to do it and whose institution is willing to pay the overhead part of it. The PAA secretary-treasurer's job is one that, if it's going to be manageable, has to have institutional support, including secretarial support. You need an organization that is willing, in effect, to absorb some overhead. It's a non-paid job. It's a job that people do in addition to everything else they're doing. It's a job that has peak-load efforts; there's a lot to do around the times of the Board meetings in the fall and just before the annual meeting. Then there are other ongoing affairs that you have to pay attention to, such as the organization of a PAA membership directory. I was involved in the 1979 directory, and have been very involved in the current [1989, forthcoming] directory. I got into that because I'm the chair of the membership committee, so I volunteered to coordinate the committee to put together the questionnaire [preceding the directory].

VDT: I finally got that; I was wondering about it. The 1985 directory is so out of date.

MERRICK: Yes. Well, it [1989 directory] has been delayed for a variety of reasons, including a computer problem at ASA [American Statistical Association, then still managing PAA business affairs]. I hoped they would do it last summer, but there was no way.

VDT: May I make a small objection? That questionnaire does not ask for the fields of your degrees,

and if I hadn't had that in past PAA directories, my job in getting some background on my interviewees would have been much more difficult. It simply asks for the years of your degrees.

MERRICK: There's a long story to that, going back to the 1979 directory when we did do it [and in 1985]. The information turned out to be totally impossible to code. It raised the price enormously, and it was information that very few people were using.

VDT: Well, I have been using it.

MERRICK: It was an open question, and people would have very long explanations of what their degree was about. The coders would try to abbreviate the information and inevitably wouldn't abbreviate it the way the person who submitted it wanted it, and you got all sorts of controversy.

VDT: So that was deliberate. Naturally, I put mine in anyway. I'm very proud that I have an M.A. in demography. Not too many--though maybe there are more now--diplomas actually say, "demography." Mine does.

MERRICK: It was a decision meant to reduce the cost of producing the directory.

Going back to the job of secretary-treasurer. Dick Easterlin and Mary Grace Kovar [secretary-treasurer 1975-78] called me. When secretary-treasurers finish their terms, they are very anxious to find a successor, so in 1978 Mary Grace was looking around for somebody. She was then, and still is, at the National Center for Health Statistics.

What typically has happened with the PAA secretary-treasurer's job is that they seek a person in Washington, because the business office is here and there's so much to be done jointly with the business office. So it had been at the Census Bureau [Paul Glick, 1962-65], at AID [Jim Brackett, 1971-75], at the National Center for Health Statistics [Anders Lunde, 1965-68 and Mary Grace Kovar], and then they were looking to Georgetown. I think also Con Taeuber may have suggested that Georgetown would be willing. Anyway, Dick and Mary Grace called and finally I said, "Yes, I'll do it." That was in 1978.

I was a bit reluctant, because I'd just been made director of the Center at Georgetown and was concerned about the workload. The advantage, of course, was that being the director of the Center I had access to overhead support.

As secretary-treasurer, you work with four presidents. I worked with Dick in the final months of his presidency, then Charlie Nam [1979], Jay Siegel [1980], and Judith Blake [1981].

VDT: And was it easy to work with all of them?

MERRICK: Dick I knew, of course, and it was toward the end of his term [secretary-treasurer's term begins July 1]. He and Mary Grace were very helpful. Mary Grace came to Georgetown as a visiting scholar in September of 1978, which was immensely helpful. She walked me through the first Board meetings, which was terrific. Getting through a Board meeting is a major task: working up the agenda, working with the business office to make sure everybody gets there, getting all the materials and reports out to Board members. It's a major logistics job, so it was very helpful to have her.

Charlie was an excellent president to work with, I remember, very easy-going.

VDT: Very thorough.

MERRICK: Yes. At that time, 1979, there was a lot of discussion about the Public Affairs Committee. I'm trying to remember exactly when the Public Affairs Committee was started [spring

1979]. You have that story from Al Hermalin ["Formation of the Public Affairs Committee," PAA history vignette in PAA Affairs, Winter 1984]. He was chair of the Committee on the Monitoring of Federal Activities Affecting Demography [ad hoc, set up in 1978]. At the 1979 meeting of PAA in Philadelphia, this committee met and agreed to move ahead with a new Public Affairs Committee. I remember some heavy horse-trading going on, negotiating, right before and actually during the business meeting in Philadelphia, leading up to a motion to form the Public Affairs Committee. [Hermalin, in his "vignette," says his committee presented a report, recommending the Public Affairs Committee, to the Board meeting prior to the main Philadelphia meeting, and it was the Board who discussed it and voted to establish the PAC. He does not mention any "negotiating" or motion on the PAC taking place during the general membership business meeting.]

VDT: It seemed then more and more important that PAA should get involved?

MERRICK: Yes. That was right after Rep. Jim Scheuer's committee in the late 1970s [House Select Committee on Population] and Michael Teitelbaum [staff director of the Scheuer committee] was very convinced--he and Al, Mike seeing it from the inside and Al seeing it from the University of Michigan--that demographers were missing the boat in terms of what other professional associations were doing to protect their interests in some of the key congressional committees that were allocating research funds. This was toward the end of the Carter administration, and research money and institutional support money was really at risk. So they were pushing it strongly.

There was some mild, but valid, concern about whether PAA should do this, going back to the mid-1960s controversy about involvement in family planning, which I only heard about in retrospect. There had been a bandwagon push on the part of the international field to co-opt PAA. If Ray Ravenholt had had his way, PAA would have joined the bandwagon for international family planning. Remember the famous issue of Demography with the red Indian family planning triangle on it [mentioned above]?

VDT: That was 1968. Ray Ravenholt had an article in that issue.

MERRICK: Exactly. So the membership, especially the old guard, was very wary of anything like that ever happening again. They were suspect of this "public affairs thing." So the people involved in it were very careful to point out that it was not lobbying. It was meant to monitor federal activities to make sure that nothing was happening that was adverse to the interests of demographers in terms of population studies.

The question was how to institutionalize that and how to create a presence in Washington. Michael knew Anne Harrison Clark through an earlier job that Anne had held with one of the women's advocacy groups in Washington. Anne was just joining the Population Resource Center. So they worked out an arrangement for the Population Resource Center to be the organization that represented PAA in Washington.

I was always curious, seeing this then as a PRB Board member and as PAA secretary-treasurer, why PRB didn't play more of a role in this.

VDT: PRB came up with the materials for these hearings [for Congress members and their aides, arranged by the PRC on behalf of PAA].

MERRICK: Yes, but that was later. A very interesting story; I'll tell it to you sometime when we have more time.

VDT: The Population Resource Center has always been a connection that I think some PAA members

are still uncomfortable with.

MERRICK: Yes. Over the last couple of years, Julian Simon has actually made motions to have the relationship severed.

VDT: Some people might not follow Julian Simon's lead on principle!

MERRICK: At any rate, Charlie Nam played a key role in carefully, but thoroughly, getting that process launched. I remember meeting with Charlie on several occasions here in Washington as we were organizing the Public Affairs Committee. Of course, one of the other issues was funding. A grant from the Hewlett Foundation to the Population Association helped PAA cover some of the Population Resource Center's costs for this activity. I think we got a grant of something like \$25,000 from Hewlett for this public affairs activity. A lot of time and energy went into writing the grant proposal, getting it circulated, making sure the language in the grant proposal did not commit PAA to doing something the membership didn't want to do. A lot of the secretary-treasurer's effort, particularly in 1979, was thus involved in the establishment of the Public Affairs Committee.

VDT: Do you think the PAC has paid its way--all the hearings that have been held over the years with Congressmen and businesses and so on?

MERRICK: It's made a major contribution to the outreach of the Association. The difficulty is that it's a low-cost operation. It's all voluntary on the part of the PAA membership [members who make presentations at the hearings]. It's difficult to get as broad a participation, perhaps, as there should be of PAA membership. And, of course, not everybody is as interested in doing it as some of the members are. But it's a needed outreach activity.

VDT: At the few hearings I've attended, there was perhaps one Congress member there if you were lucky; usually just aides.

MERRICK: Well, that's par for the course. It always happen that you deal with congressional aides, but that's effective. We met yesterday--it had nothing to do with PAA--with two of Albert Gore's legislative assistants. Senator Gore is preparing a new bill on the environment and wants to include population.

VDT: Who's "we"?

MERRICK: "We" in this case were Pat Baldi, Sharon Camp, a representative of ZPG, and I.

On that kind of visit you never meet with the Senator; you meet with legislative assistants, the people who are doing the work. That's where the real influence is. So I don't worry when the Senator or Congressman doesn't come. Everybody's delighted when they do, but in reality, most of the time they're too busy to attend.

I think it's an effective program. My regret is that the PAA membership is not more appreciative of how important this kind of outreach is. You're hearing this from someone who has a Washington perspective and a policy perspective. The thought that people will support demography just because they see its inherent value is a naive impression of the way the world is run.

VDT: Another interesting event during your time, from my point of view [as PAA historian], was the setting up of the PAA archives. And Andy Lunde's efforts on that PAA session of 1981 on "The PAA at Age 50" for the 50th anniversary meeting, when Judith Blake was president. What was your part in

arranging for the Georgetown library to take the archives?

MERRICK: A lot of work. The question was what to do with PAA's files, which had been floating around, a box here, a box there. Andy had a couple of boxes down in North Carolina and there were two or three boxes in a closet over at ASA [American Statistical Association]. A lot of people had different documents. There was duplication of much material. Finding a place that would agree to give them archival treatment, which meant putting them in acid-free boxes and cataloguing them, and guaranteeing access--all of that took a fair amount of negotiation. Everybody hoped that we'd find some place in Washington. I spent quite a bit of time negotiating with the University librarian, Joe Jeffs, and people in the archives department.

VDT: It was sort of obvious that it should be Georgetown?

MERRICK: The hope was that it would be Georgetown. I don't remember exactly how the decision came that way, but the decision was made to approach Georgetown.

Then creating a catalogue was a major effort, along with the right categories for cataloguing it.

VDT: You set that up? I know that Ana Zakarija [then with the Special Collections staff of the Georgetown library] did the actual physical work.

MERRICK: Yes.

VDT: I last went to see the archives a year ago last October and I found them behind the papers of Harry Hopkins, so it is hard to get at them. Some material keeps getting sent there. I myself haven't sent anything now for a year. They get PAA Affairs and Demography regularly and they dump them into a final box. So there's a lot of physical work to be done there and there's nobody over there anymore to do it. I'll have to do it myself, and I will, when it's warmer--it's cold there--and when I can persuade them to move the Harry Hopkins papers so I can get at them. And they've run out of space. There's no more room to put extra boxes, which we'll need.

But your setting up the archives was a tremendous contribution to PAA, and any organization of our size and long history needs it.

MERRICK: Well, I do remember that was a major event and one of the more time-consuming ones. Was that 1980?

VDT: 1980-81, leading up to the 50th anniversary meeting. It was during that meeting that Andy Lunde asked me if I would take over as historian, that he had done his work, and one of the main things was to get the papers physically there.

MERRICK: I remember Andy coming to Georgetown a couple of times. We went over and talked to the librarian. Andy brought boxes up and handcarted them over to the library.

Other events of that period. I remember the Women's Caucus was active and we made the decision at one of the meetings to move the 1980 PAA meeting, which had originally been scheduled to be in Chicago, to Pittsburgh.

VDT: It had not to be in a state that hadn't passed the ERA [Equal Rights Amendment].

MERRICK: Right. We had originally scheduled the 1980 meeting in Chicago. Then the decision was made at the Board meeting in the spring of 1978 not to have it in Chicago, so one of my very first challenges was to figure out what to do.

VDT: Now we've had one in Chicago [1987], so we no longer care about states that have or have not passed the ERA. At that time ERA was on everyone's mind, of course.

MERRICK: For PAA to get hotels, you have to be three, four, five years in advance to get space for April, a prime time for meetings. So we really had to hustle. Finally what transpired was that they were thinking about Denver in 1982; we moved Denver up to 1980 [replaced for 1982 by San Diego] and took Pittsburgh for 1983. There was a major shiffle in the cities at that time to accommodate to the decision not to have the PAA meeting in Chicago. And the problem was fundamentally finding a hotel in one of these cities. Ed Bisgyer [PAA Business Manager at ASA] had a dickens of a time coming up with a hotel to accommodate PAA in 1980 on such short notice--two years was unheard-of. We finally worked it out, but I remember that was a major effort.

VDT: And you must have been very involved in the 1981 meeting, the 50th anniversary, big event in Washington.

MERRICK: Yes, trying to set up that session on "PAA at 50," trying to come up with documents and getting people who would come and talk. The panel included Frank Notestein, Con Taeuber . . .

VDT: And Frank Lorimer. Con Taeuber didn't actually give a paper, but he organized the session. There were Frank Notestein, Frank Lorimer, Clyde Kiser's paper was delivered by Dudley Kirk, and Andy Lunde gave a background paper to begin with.

MERRICK: Yes, that was quite a session. I remember you were there with your tape recorder.

VDT: I was. The tape recorder was gotten at the last minute, but, alas, no one had a camera. I've regretted that ever since; I should have raced home and gotten mine. It was a historic occasion.

MERRICK: You wrote that up, didn't you?

VDT: Well, I wrote it up for PRB [Intercom], but all the papers appeared in Population Index that fall, so they are recorded for posterity. And we do have the tape; it's somewhere in the archives. Con Taeuber looked after that. I've never heard it myself; I don't know if it's audible. But it was a tremendous occasion, especially because Frank Notestein and Frank Lorimer soon after passed from the scene.

Talk about big hotels, what do you think of PAA meetings now? The last one [1988] in that vast hotel in New Orleans. There were over 1,100 there and my guess is that at Baltimore [1989] there'll be more.

MERRICK: I see there were 1,115 in New Orleans. The Washington meeting of 1981 is still the largest--1,167.

VDT: That's the record so far, and then last year's was second largest [exceeded by Washington 1991: 1,399; Baltimore 1989: 1,193; and Toronto 1990: 1,175].

MERRICK: I still think PAA meetings are great meetings. Of course, the question of having more concurrent sessions has always been an issue that the Board will never resolve.

VDT: There are eight overlapping sessions now [nine at 1990 and 1991 meetings].

MERRICK: Now they go after lunch on Saturday?

VDT: Yes, they went to 3:30 last year; this year too.

MERRICK: I've had the good fortune, the last two or three years, of having the 8:30 Saturday morning session.

VDT: Ugh!

MERRICK: I'm on again at 8:30 on Saturday morning this year. But I think it's important to have an open type of format, to give as many people as possible the opportunity to present papers.

VDT: They get their way paid, for one thing.

MERRICK: Yes. My ongoing disappointment is that people don't think more about presentation style and use of graphics. We've had various discussions in committees about encouraging people to use graphics more. I was pleased to see that this year they actually have a note to speakers--there's a sheet in the packet that went out to paper-givers about getting coached on how to make a presentation. There's a room where you can go at the PAA meeting for this.

VDT: Really! That's the first time for that.

MERRICK: Yes. I would like some alternative formats for applied demography sessions. The applied demographers are still struggling with how to get themselves onto the PAA program. And there was some disappointment this year on the part of the state and local demographers that they didn't get more representation.

VDT: They have one session.

MERRICK: They have one session, but two in previous years; they're quite unhappy with that. Part of the problem is that people working in an applied setting don't have the opportunity to write the kind of paper that passes muster for a PAA session. There's not the same reinforcement; there's not the infrastructure to support it. The audience is a different audience. And yet there's a need for the kind of professional interchange, of professional development, that you get out of a professional meeting, so the Association ought to be offering and creating this for applied demographers.

Now I'm in a session that Peter Morrison is organizing on case studies ["Developing Case Studies in Applying Demography," 1989 meeting], which I think is very good. Perhaps that may be a way to do it, to focus on cases, and provide a bit more guidance to the applied people on how to develop and present a case.

VDT: Do you think the applied people will stay in the Association?

MERRICK: I think it's up to both the Association and the applied demographers to make it work. I think there's a real risk that they'll pull away; some of them are quite disenchanted.

VDT: We have the Thursday evening sessions that the applied people have and, of course, the breakfast on Friday morning. But I suppose not so many mainstream demographers go to the Thursday evening session. Now I notice there will be a session on Wednesday afternoon [only

"Chinese Student Meeting" in 1989].

MERRICK: There's good will. Certainly Ren Farley [president and meeting program chair in 1988] was really sincerely interested in getting the applied demographers onto the program. But it's tough, because what will work for the mainstream does not work as well for the applied group. And some of the papers that the applied demographers submit are just poor papers. I've been involved in one way or another in applied sessions for the last five years. There are people who don't know how to write a paper and who don't usually communicate in the professional-meeting paper format.

VDT: Why do these applied demographers stay on as members of PAA? Because they've been trained by the old-line demographers?

MERRICK: It's that, and because PAA is a good meeting for professional contacts; many go to the PAA meetings for professional contact. It's a good place to keep up with the new developments in the field. And it's a lot of fun.

But thought has to be given to the kind of professional nurturing that the PAA does for the mainstream. For anyone working on the big topics, domestic or international--migration, fertility, family research--PAA offers a lot of new ideas. There are other meetings, smaller workshops, where you'll be communicating on specialized topics. But PAA is a kind of supermarket.

VDT: A smallish supermarket; there are still just 2,600 members [2,679 at end 1989; 2,752 at end 1990].

MERRICK: Yes, but nonetheless the meetings are an excellent way to sample. You know, PRB always assigns people to cover different sessions for Population Today. I've always resisted being assigned, because I like to shop around; go to one paper in one session; hear somebody else in another session. Reporting for PT inhibits that a bit. Even though I may go to a session that's of no immediate interest to me in terms of what I'm writing, whether that is Latin America, Brazil, fertility, or applied demography, I'm curious to hear about the topic if it sounds interesting.

VDT: And you find the set papers interesting? The oldtimers, of course, miss the give-and-take between the audience and the paper presenters. Now there cannot be the same.

MERRICK: I agree.

But getting back to the applied demographers, we don't do as much for the applied demographers. I think it's time to consider their needs more systematically. I know Harriet Presser has worked very hard on the program for 1989, but I think there's even some discontent on the part of the applied demographers about that program. I'm not on the Business Demography Committee any more--I served for four or five years--so I don't know their reaction to this. But I got a letter from Dave Swanson, who is very disappointed in the program.

Some applied demographers do want to leave the Association, which would really be too bad. There has to be room in the Association for applied demographers and for mutual give-and-take. Some creative effort on the part of people who live in both worlds is needed.

VDT: Do you think in the future of U.S. demography the jobs are going to be mainly in applied demography or is there still room for the formal, mainline demographer?

MERRICK: Oh, I think the majority of demographers will be the mainstream: academic demography, the Census Bureau, the federal agencies, who are the data creators, the UN organizations, who are the

compilers of international data, the research community. But there's going to be an increasingly important role for applied demography.

The problem is that applied demography is by its very nature much more into other fields. You can't succeed in applied demography unless in a sense you become part of the field in which you're applying it. You aren't credible in the business field unless you're also pretty good in the realm of business. So you have to go to business meetings and demography meetings; you keep a foot in both camps. That's more difficult. More difficult just in terms of time and effort, but also because you're not quite at home in either one. You don't quite fit into the standard PAA format or the standard format of whatever your other field is. You're not quite there either because you're not a full-fledged member there either.

Still I think it's healthy for applied demography to be a part of PAA because there's a lot that the field as a whole--the mainstream of the field--can offer to applied demography. A lot of the methodology that could be used in applied demography is based on innovative approaches derived from the mainstream.

VDT: Or maybe some of the older methods. I've just re-read Dianne Schmidley's case history in your "Demographics" Bulletin [Merrick and Stephen Tordella, "Demographics: People and Markets, Population Bulletin, February 1988] on using the system of reapportionment of congressional districts after each census to distribute telephone payment agents.

MERRICK: That's right.

VDT: That's a good place to end up. You've had your foot in many worlds and I think you've enjoyed it.

MERRICK: I have indeed. Thank you for the opportunity to talk about it.

JOHN L. GOODMAN, Jr.

PAA Secretary-Treasurer in 1981-84 (No. 17). Interview with Jean van der Tak at the Federal Reserve Board, Washington, D.C., March 1, 1991.

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS: John Goodman was born and grew up in Evanston, Illinois. He received his bachelor's degree in economics from Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, in 1969 and his Ph.D. in economics from the University of Michigan in 1974. From 1974 to 1983, he was with the Urban Institute in Washington, D.C., where his research and publications focused on the demography and economics of housing in the U.S. He was a visiting professor of economics at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville in 1980-81. Since 1983, he has been with the Federal Reserve Board in Washington as a specialist in housing finance. In late 1989 and early 1990, he served on the initial staff of the Oversight Board of the Resolution Trust Corporation, set up by Congress to deal with the savings and loan debacle.

VDT: Jack recently was lent by the Federal Reserve Board to work on the savings and loan debacle and during that time I kept trying to pin him down for an interview and he was so busy that he had to postpone it. Now he's back at the Federal Reserve and life is easier, he says. I gather his career has gotten away from demography and he's going to explain how that has evolved. But to begin, Jack, tell us how and when you became interested in demography.

GOODMAN: It was in college. At some point in my college career at Miami, I decided that economics really excited me and that's what I wanted to do for a profession. And I wanted to be in a field of economics where I thought there was some particular social value to the specialization I would be entering into. I was shopping around for graduate programs in economics during my final year at Miami and one of the brochures I received was about the program in economic demography at the University of Michigan and that looked very attractive to me. One thing led to another and, lo and behold, I ended up in Ann Arbor in the graduate program in economics, with specialization in economic demography.

VDT: Going back to Miami University, was the Scripps Foundation [for Research in Population Problems] still there during your undergraduate years?

GOODMAN: It was there. I had no contact with them. They had an office in the same building where the sociology and political science departments were housed and I remember going by the office door from time to time, but I never really ventured inside and became acquainted with the staff.

VDT: So that didn't enter into your knowing about the existence of demography?

GOODMAN: No, it didn't; it was more a coincidence.

VDT: At the University of Michigan, Suzanne Bianchi has told me, you had one of the economic demography training grants. Did you have that right from the beginning?

GOODMAN: I did.

VDT: And what was that?

GOODMAN: This was a program sponsored by the Ford Foundation and it was to the Population Studies Center at the University of Michigan to help underwrite graduates' education in both economic demography and social demography. The university was offering fellowships in both the economics and sociology departments for people who were interested in pursuing specialization in demography.

It was a wonderful program for me personally. It allowed me to work with some very good people, both through the Ford program, through another program, and the Center for Population Planning that I participated in during part of my graduate career. That program was sponsored by the National Institutes of Health. Between the two centers and the two programs, I had an opportunity to work with such people as Paul Demeny, Ronald Lee, and George Simmons, who was my dissertation adviser and my supervisor for some of my research assistant work as well. And I became very good friends with other people on the staff at Michigan at that time--Ron Freedman, Dave Goldberg, Al Hermalin, Ren Farley--and a number of those friendships have continued through the years. It was all in all a wonderful experience for me, both professionally and personally. I have very fond memories of the years there.

VDT: Let's talk about some of the people you've just mentioned. Paul Demeny--where was it he had just been?

GOODMAN: He was at Michigan between Princeton and the University of Hawaii.

VDT: Did you study with him?

GOODMAN: My first summer at Michigan, I worked as research assistant to Paul. After that, I began working for one of these other people I mentioned; I can't remember exactly the order in which it all occurred. I worked with Paul for just that first summer.

VDT: Paul was an economic demographer too. You are a growing breed within the field, but fairly rare then too.

GOODMAN: We were. There sure weren't a whole lot of us out there. There were certainly some leaders, people such as Dick Easterlin, for example, but the role models were not all that numerous at that point.

VDT: Dave Goldberg is no longer in the PAA member directory. Is he still at Michigan?

GOODMAN: Yes. I think David is still on the faculty. I don't think he's retired; he may be close to that age. I saw him a couple of years ago down in New Orleans. A featured attraction at the PAA meetings that year [1988] for Dave and for many of us was Ren Farley's presidential address.

VDT: Of course. And you worked with Ren?

GOODMAN: It's funny. I took a course from Ren and we've become--as Ren and several of the other professors have--they evolve into becoming good friends with their former students. Ren and his wife Gail are dear friends. I never worked as a research assistant on a project that Ren was supervising, but the environment at the Population Studies Center was such that there was a lot of interaction among the faculty and the staff. So even if you were not assigned to one of the faculty members, there was a lot of opportunity to interact.

VDT: They have those morning coffee hours. I interviewed both Freedmans there last June and we had to interrupt the interviews. It was sacrosanct to go to that morning coffee hour, to see the visitors

who were there, the students, and whoever was there.

GOODMAN: It was a wonderful tradition. It was, as you say, sacrosanct. At 10 am--I don't know what the technology is now--but back in the early 1970s, they had a little intercom system and throughout the office network at the Population Studies Center at 10 am, you would hear a little tone over the intercom--beep, "Coffee's ready." And it had almost a Pavlovian response.

VDT: It was similar last year. That would include even the new graduate students, say, the very first year you were there?

GOODMAN: Yes, in 1969, 1970, the first years I was there.

VDT: Already then, it was customary for people at all levels to meet there in the morning, every day?

GOODMAN: Yes, it was wonderful. You could never tell what the topic of discussion would be at the table. This was a time when the Detroit Tigers happened to be playing good baseball and so every once in a while the discussion would be on the Detroit Tigers. Other times, it would be on the most recent fertility data out of Taiwan. Other times, the discussion would be on recent trends in racial residential segregation in major U.S. metropolitan areas. It was a very nice environment. You didn't feel obligated to talk on certain topics or to avoid other topics. It was very much a mixed bag.

VDT: What was your dissertation topic?

GOODMAN: I could give you a copy of that. It's one of those cases where the title is actually fairly descriptive of the dissertation. The title was Local Residential Mobility and Family Housing Adjustments.

What I tried to do was develop a model, based on consumer economic theory, that would allow one to predict when a household would move within a metropolitan area, not moving from one area to another for labor market reasons but to move locally--try to predict when that move would occur. And then also to try to predict the type of housing adjustment that would occur as a result, to forecast additionally. I wanted to tell what housing had been like before the move and what their economic condition was, what their life-cycle stage was, to try to predict the type of housing that they would move to, and to try to develop this model within a fairly rigorous economic framework. And then to test the hypotheses that were generated by the model using data from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, which when I was doing my dissertation was only in year four; 1972 when I started my dissertation was year four of the panel study. It had started in 1968 and, I think, it continues today as an annual survey. It was a real nice opportunity for me, because it was a new data base and it provided research opportunities that weren't previously available and allowed me a fairly clean method for testing hypotheses that I developed in my dissertation.

VDT: Was your dissertation published?

GOODMAN: There were a couple of journal articles that were generated either directly or indirectly from the dissertation and I was pleased that the core of the dissertation had gotten to see the light of day.

VDT: From those articles has it been used since that time or put into practice?

GOODMAN: Well, I'm still marketing the motion picture rights for it. [Laughter]

VDT: It sounds to me like it's something the realtors would be thrilled to put their hands on--if they could predict who's going to move where.

GOODMAN: Yes. I wrote up more non-technical versions for more general audiences. One was in American Demographics. I did an article loosely based on my dissertation for that. That gets you into a somewhat broader network of readers for your research. And there were a few newspaper stories that were being done on the topic of urban population changes generally and someone would put them onto me for background information, so some of the work got out into the public domain through that channel as well.

VDT: You said you did your dissertation under George Simmons. Tell me a bit about him.

GOODMAN: George came to the University of Michigan as a fresh new assistant professor the same fall that I was entering my first full academic year. I'd started at the beginning of the summer in 1969 after finishing off at college, but as things go on a summer schedule, it was sort of slow. But come fall, the tempo of activity picks up and George was the new economic demographer on campus. He had a joint appointment with the economics department and the department of population planning in the School of Public Health. He was my graduate student adviser from those early days on. I started out as research assistant to Paul Demeny but with George's arrival, I began working with George. He was a wonderful guy; he still is a wonderful guy. [George Simmons died July 15, 1990, at age 50.]

VDT: He did that study for the National Academy of Sciences, along with Bob Lapham. What were they looking at, in family planning programs [family planning effectiveness]?

GOODMAN: George had done his dissertation with a cost-benefit analysis of the Indian family planning program.

VDT: So he got to be known as evaluating family planning programs?

GOODMAN: Right. His dissertation was published and fairly widely distributed, so that became one of George's specialties, as dissertations tend to do.

George was very helpful to me, just in dealing with the frustrations and anxieties and challenges of graduate school--very nice personal things--he and his wife Ruth. When my graduate education was interrupted by basic training for the army reserve, in 1971 . . .

VDT: You had to leave for a while?

GOODMAN: Half a year, basic training for the army reserve.

VDT: Was that a way of escaping the draft?

GOODMAN: Sure was.

VDT: But you still had to do something; it was still the Vietnam era.

GOODMAN: Oh, very much. I was in the first lottery. December 1st, 1969, is a night that I will long remember. I was studying for exams--this was the end of the first full term of graduate school, the fall term of 1969--and December 1st was the drawing for the draft lottery. I had been studying at the library and I came back to my apartment, not knowing the results of the lottery, and called up the

student newspaper and said I wanted to check on the results of the lottery and the person answering the phone said, "What's your birth date?" So I told her and she said, "Hold on just a second," and she went to her records and shuffled and she said, "You came out 14th." "From the top or the bottom?" And she said, "Sorry!"

So the next day I interrupted my studying for final exams by studying the phone books of all cities within a 200-mile radius of Ann Arbor, Michigan, and getting phone numbers for every reserve and national guard unit in hopes of getting into one of those units before my draft board caught up with me. So it worked.

VDT: If you were in the army reserve, you didn't have to be drafted?

GOODMAN: You didn't have to be drafted.

VDT: But you were in university. I thought people went to university to escape the draft, but that wasn't going to protect you?

GOODMAN: No, it wasn't.

VDT: But for the army reserve, you had to fulfill this time obligation?

GOODMAN: Yes, that was the better part of a half year. After that I came back to Ann Arbor and resumed my graduate studies.

VDT: Did many people do it that way? I know of the people who went to Canada, of course, and I had assumed that people went to university to avoid the draft, but that was another gimmick I hadn't heard about.

GOODMAN: I think a lot of people did that--joined the reserve or the national guard. It was a very popular alternative to either Canada or the war.

VDT: George Simmons was at the Center for Population Planning?

GOODMAN: Right.

VDT: Was Leslie Corsa head of it at that time?

GOODMAN: Yes, he was.

VDT: And wasn't there some question about its survival?

GOODMAN: I have some vague recollection of that--to be a center or to be a department in the School of Public Health--but I'm not sure that all that was going on at the time I was there. These university bureaucracies all evolve over time and I think that the status of the population program at the university was under some review, but I don't recall exactly what happened. [The Center for Population Planning was established in the School of Public Health in 1965, followed in 1971 by the Department of Population Planning, which in 1977 was dissolved and the Center for Population Planning reconstituted. See John and Pat Caldwell, Limiting Population Growth and the Ford Foundation Contribution, 1986, pp. 91-94.]

VDT: Did you have anything to do with the Detroit Area Study?

GOODMAN: I did not. That was really in the domain of the sociology department. At that time--I don't know if it's changed--economists in training at the university really weren't involved in the Detroit Area Study. In a way, it could have made some sense for me to get involved in it, given my dissertation topic, but I already had the data base that was very well suited for my topic, so for that purpose, anyway, I didn't have to get involved in the Detroit Area Study.

VDT: You were concentrated on the U.S. but, of course, must have rubbed shoulders with many of the Third World students at Michigan.

GOODMAN: Oh, yes. There was a wonderful event several years ago when the Population Studies Center had what must have been its 20th anniversary reunion seminar and a number of those classmates from graduate school days who had gone back to their home countries came back for this reunion. There were a number of the students from Taiwan, one from Turkey, and a Japanese fellow. It was great to see those people, to get caught up on what they had been doing since they had left the University of Michigan.

VDT: It obviously was a great place, and it still is. Everybody raves about it, and I could just feel it, even on that gloomy June day that I happened to be there.

Then what did you do after Michigan?

GOODMAN: My first job and then my home for the better part of a decade was the Urban Institute, right here in Washington. When I was on the job market, the Urban Institute was looking for an economist with an urban or demographic background or specialization to help on some housing research programs they had under way at the time. It was a wonderful match of their needs and my interests, so I came to Washington to accept the job, and stayed at the Urban Institute for the better part of a decade, working on housing research programs--basic research programs with foundation support of one sort or another and also some program evaluation work for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, primarily. A bit of international work as well: I went to Bahrain under the auspices of the World Bank as a consultant on a project that was under way there. So it was a very nice mix of activity.

VDT: Did you have some publications on housing at that time? The Urban Institute is always coming out with important reports.

GOODMAN: I did--a number of publications in both demography and housing, basic journal-type research as well as more programmatic analyses of various programs, housing assistance programs--the most efficient use of monies available to try to achieve the stated objectives of the program, that sort of stuff. Those involved the housing allowance experiments that were being sponsored on a fairly large scale that were under way for much of the 1970s.

VDT: Is that Title 8?

GOODMAN: No. Section 8--the Section 8 program, housing assistance program, evolved indirectly from these experiments, and some aspects of the Section 8 housing assistance programs are similar to some of the designs that were being tested in these experiments, but the Section 8 program is quite different.

But it was a good experience for me, because it allowed one the opportunity to apply sound analytical reasoning to some fairly significant public policy issues--to try to bring the best information

to bear on the essentially political decisions that had to be made about some of these programs.

VDT: Why did you leave the Urban Institute?

GOODMAN: I had been there for some time and had gotten a little antsy to try something a bit different. I guess a first manifestation of that itch was when I took leave from the Urban Institute for the academic year 1980-81 to teach economics as a visitor at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville. I taught economic theory and urban economics down there and very much enjoyed that experience, but decided all in all that I would rather pursue a more research or public policy type of career than a teaching career. Teaching was okay, but unlike some people, I didn't feel it was something I just couldn't live without. But it was a wonderful opportunity for me to sample a different career path.

At the end of that, I came back to the Urban Institute. And when I did--this was now in the early 1980s--there were a couple of things going on simultaneously. One, there were funding cutbacks for all sorts of research.

VDT: Out of the U.S. government?

GOODMAN: Right. There were fairly significant funding cutbacks that were affecting most places, the Urban Institute included.

VDT: Did that have something to do with the fact that the Reagan administration was coming in and the Urban Institute is known as being fairly liberal?

GOODMAN: The Urban Institute wasn't viewed by the Reagan administration as being supportive of the Reagan administration. The Urban Institute continued to do a bit of work for the U.S. government, but certainly not the amount they had done previously. The pie was a lot smaller and the Urban Institute's share of that pie declined as well. And the way that affected me personally was more the flexibility to work on exactly the type of projects that I wanted to. There was less of a menu of things that you personally could work on; there was more of a need for people to work on whatever work was available.

So that was going on at the same time that my appetite for research in housing finance was being whetted by both some work that I was doing at the Urban Institute and also just current events. In the early 1980s, as you know, the country was in a serious recession. Interest rates were at record levels; mortgage interest rates were 17 percent, if you could find money even at 17 percent. And there were just a lot of things going on in the financial area, many of them related to housing, which was what I had been working on, although not so much housing finance. So I was getting really interested; there were a lot of issues in that area that fascinated me.

And it was in that context that the opportunity to come here to the Fed [Federal Reserve Board]--where they were looking for someone to work on housing and housing demands--became available. It just looked too darn attractive to pass up. This was where things were happening; it was just the right move for me at that time. So I came.

VDT: In 1984?

GOODMAN: It was the very end of 1983, the last week of 1983. And I've been here since.

It's interesting, up to the point where I came to the Fed, when people talked about doing time series analysis, comparisons over time, I would think of comparing, say, the 1970s with the 1960s. Well, at the Federal Reserve when you're doing time series analysis, you're comparing February to

January, so it's a little bit different.

Then also the geographic scope of the way you do housing research at the Federal Reserve is different than at the Urban Institute. Housing markets are so localized that it makes a lot of sense to look at housing conditions in Chicago, in Houston, and in San Francisco and those are all three very different settings and the markets operate somewhat differently. And if you're working on some government assistance program, or just trying to monitor what's going on in the urban area, you want to recognize that those three areas are very different. That's what one would do at the Urban Institute.

Here at the Federal Reserve when you're analyzing housing market development, the context is one where your boss is the chairman of the Board and the Board members have to set monetary policy and we're going to have the same monetary policy for Houston, Chicago, and San Francisco. There's no alternative available; we've got one central bank and we're going to have essentially the same interest rates in all market areas of the country. So since coming here, my focus has been the national aggregates--what's happening to construction for the country and how does it relate to interest rates. It's been less a focus on what's happening to the housing market in Houston and how does that depend on the price of oil or economic conditions in the local area or in general.

So making the shift from the Urban Institute to the Federal Reserve, I stayed in the area of housing economics, broadly defined, but I shifted from looking at housing from sort of a demographic perspective to more of a financial perspective and also taking more of this macro economic view and less of a regional view.

VDT: And recently you were lent to the RTC, which I now know means Resolution Trust Corporation--Oversight Board--the savings and loan debacle. I think you were an oversight of an oversight board, weren't you? It's difficult for the lay person to follow, except it's going to cost us billions and billions of dollars. Why were you chosen to do that?

GOODMAN: The legislation that was signed into law on August 9th of last year, 1989, established a number of new agencies, entities, to deal with the resolution of all these insolvent thrifts and to take care of that situation at the minimal possible cost to the taxpayers. When these new agencies were established, some of them had staff they could draw on because the new agencies were established out of existing agencies. Other groups, such as the Oversight Board to the Resolution Trust Corporation, had no logical source for staff. What the Oversight Board had was an immediate set of responsibilities and tasks that had to be done and they had no staff to do them. So a number of individuals, maybe 30 of us in total, were drafted from various U.S. government agencies, mostly in Washington--a couple of people came down from New York, but mostly from Washington--to staff this Oversight Board for its first few months and to get it up and running, get the things done that had to be done immediately, and to pave the way for the permanent employees that were to be hired by the Oversight Board, who would be replacing us and allowing us to go back to our permanent homes, wherever they would be.

I was one of the people who went over from the Federal Reserve. There were maybe half a dozen of us. I was the only economist; the others were attorneys or bank supervision and regulation specialists of one sort or another.

It was a fascinating experience. I was involved in a number of things. I worked in a four-person policy group and one of our tasks and the main project that I had during the fall was to develop a strategic plan for the Resolution Trust Corporation. This was essentially, like for a business, a strategic plan of where you want to get to, what are your objectives, and how do you plan on achieving them. This strategic plan was required by the legislation of the summer and it was a task that was directed to the Oversight Board. So there were four of us, essentially, who had to come up with this document that laid out a strategy for resolving, liquidating, or otherwise disposing of several hundred insolvent savings and loan associations and to do so in such a way that would minimize the cost to the taxpayers and achieve certain other objectives that the legislation had set out as well.

So it was a very strenuous time. Deadlines always seemed to be staring you in the face; they never seemed to be more than two hours away. And it forced all of us to really broaden the scope of what we were looking at. I got involved in areas of financial institution operations and regulations that I had never been involved in before and probably will never be involved in again, but had to jump into these areas, do something reasonable in terms of contributions to the strategic plan, and then hop onto the next task. So it was a very stimulating time.

VDT: It must have been a nerve-wracking time; you were in the eye of the storm. It makes the front page every now and then, but I guess it will be a continuing story.

Did you lose interest in demography per se? Obviously, your career has evolved.

GOODMAN: No, is the answer. But I guess I was just feeling the need to get involved in a different field of specialization.

VDT: You mean when you left Michigan for the Urban Institute?

GOODMAN: No, when I shifted from doing demographic housing economic research to working more on financial issues.

VDT: Which you did when you shifted from the Urban Institute to the Federal Reserve?

GOODMAN: Right. I was still very much involved in demography while I was at the Urban Institute. In fact, just a year or two before I left there I had been fortunate enough to win a nice NIH grant which allowed me to continue work on urban population change from an economic perspective. So I had maintained my demographic interest and research throughout my stay. It was always mixed in with other activities under way, but I kept my demographer hat on throughout my time there. But, again, I became very excited about other types of housing economics, the more financial aspects of housing situations and problems, in the early 1980s. It wasn't so much that I lost interest in demography. It was more that I found myself attracted to another field of specialization. And I suspect it will happen again to me sometime in my professional future; I'll make another significant redirection of career path.

I try to keep up to date on at least the basis of what's going on in demography, especially with regard to housing demography. I'm glad other people still call on me to review things in the field from time to time and I'll be going up to the PAA meetings in Toronto this spring [1990] as a discussant in a session on housing and demography ["Demography of Housing"].

VDT: Who's chair of that?

GOODMAN: Dowell Myers is organizing that. He's at the University of Southern California. I'll be the discussant to his session.

VDT: Have you ever worked with George Sternlieb?

GOODMAN: I never worked with him; I'm certainly aware of his work. He's quite a character. Someone referred to him as the Howard Cosell of housing. [Laughter]

VDT: He was one of my Population Bulletin authors, he and James Hughes who works with him at Rutgers ["Demographics and Housing in America," January 1986]. Very glib--although the manuscript required a lot of editing--it pours out.

Let me throw out this question that I ask everybody: Who have been the greatest influences on your career as it evolved? You mentioned George Simmons. Who else?

GOODMAN: I don't know if I'd want to single out any particular--all of these names I've mentioned, the whole Michigan crowd, they've been very influential. My professor as an undergraduate in principles of economics--he was perhaps the individual who was most influential of all. His name is Andrew Gold.

VDT: At Miami University?

GOODMAN: He was there at the time; I think he's now at Trinity University in Connecticut. I have not spoken to Andy since maybe a year after I graduated from Miami and I suspect he would not have the slightest recollection of me, but he was instrumental in my deciding that economics was what I really wanted to do.

VDT: In what way--his lectures, or . . . ?

GOODMAN: He was just an outstanding teacher and he really excited me as well as other students--the attraction to the economic approach to studying problems, economic problems as well as problems that aren't normally considered to be economic problems. He was very instrumental in my deciding that economics was what I wanted to do.

VDT: And the demography, you mentioned, was just happenstance? You got a brochure about this program at Michigan.

GOODMAN: It was an applied field. I knew I wanted to work in an applied field rather than, say, economic theory or econometrics per se. So I was shopping for an applied field and economic demography was the most attractive among the applied fields that I was aware of because of the social importance of the subject matter.

VDT: And I always ask everyone: What accomplishments in your career so far have given you the most satisfaction?

GOODMAN: That would take some thinking.

VDT: You must have felt--although the savings and loan debacle is only beginning to be resolved--you must have felt pretty good about meeting the deadlines in setting up this important plan.

GOODMAN: It was fun to be involved and to contribute in some small way to the team effort, a number of people chipping in. You were never sure where one person's efforts stopped and the other person's efforts began to show up, but it was fun to get a feeling of accomplishment from that.

VDT: And you must have, too, from your dissertation. It sounds to me like you did.

GOODMAN: Yes. It was wonderful to get it done. I didn't do this deliberately, but somehow my final defense was scheduled for April Fool's Day, 1974. But despite that date, everything seemed to go okay and they let me out anyway.

VDT: Now let's get onto PAA.

GOODMAN: Good. This is what I thought we were going to talk about.

VDT: Do you remember the first meeting you attended? Here's a list of the meetings. Do you remember, for instance, the 1970 meeting, in Atlanta, Georgia?

GOODMAN: I did not go to that one. I think the first one must have been Toronto in 1972. That's the first one of which I have a real memory.

VDT: And you're going to Toronto again this year. That's my hometown. It was my first PAA meeting too, and Amos Hawley was the president that year and gave his address. Can you remember anything about that meeting, other than that it was in Toronto?

GOODMAN: Yes, I remember a Portuguese restaurant where a number of us graduate students had much too much wine to drink. I must say in those early days, PAA was perhaps more of a social occasion than an intellectual event, speaking for myself. Over time I developed more of an interest in the sessions themselves, but early on I would say they were useful for giving one more of a feel for the profession than they were for being a source of specific and hard knowledge. I have found that demographic research is more effectively conveyed in print than in verbal presentation.

VDT: That's an interesting point. Many people would agree. Can you remember . . . well, the meetings then were already fairly large.

GOODMAN: In the early meetings I attended, the record shows that the sizes of the meetings were up to about where they have been since. It's a little bit larger now.

VDT: The New York meeting in 1974 was a record turnout--over 1,100 [1,110]. That record stood for several years and was toppled in Washington in 1981 [1,167].

GOODMAN: All these years were about the same order of magnitude in terms of attendance.

I guess my first real clear professional memory from some of these meetings was in 1976 in Montreal, where I presented work that was based on my dissertation in one of the sessions, and I was very flattered by a number of very nice things that Peter Morrison, who was the organizer and discussant for the session, had to say about my work. I felt good about that, because Peter is someone whose work I have always admired, because he can do sound demographic research in a way that makes it accessible to people who aren't as steeped in all the jargon and technique as we are, and he has a good sense for what the important issues are, and he's, I think, a very effective communicator. So then--and now--I thought well of Peter and I was flattered by his comments about my work.

VDT: You said you went to New Orleans in 1988. Did you go to Baltimore last year [1989]?

GOODMAN: I was very busy and I must say the only event in Baltimore that I went up for--and I just drove up for the evening--was the Wednesday evening mixer. I wanted to see some friends that I hadn't seen for a while and probably wouldn't see again for some time, so I just drove up and spent a couple of hours and renewed some acquaintances. We were under a crunch here, so I came back.

VDT: But you have tried to keep in touch in that way, attending meetings?

GOODMAN: Oh, yes. I have gone to most--well, certainly the years immediately before I was secretary-treasurer and during that time [1981-84], of course. Then most of the years since, I have

gotten to--the Chicago meeting in 1987, New Orleans in 1988.

VDT: What stands out in your memory of the changes there have been over time? You are correct in pointing out that already in the early 1970s, attendance was approaching 1,000; it was almost 1,200 in Baltimore [1,193]. There are now eight sessions simultaneously and many spinoff workshops.

GOODMAN: I guess what strikes me is how they haven't changed. There are more sessions, as you point out, but the format--and this isn't just for the PAA meetings but for other professional associations as well--the format hasn't really changed much. You have two two-hour slots for sessions in the morning and one or two two-hour slots in the afternoon and each session consists of two to five people getting up and presenting their research. All too often there are too many numbers presented much too quickly. As a profession, I don't think we do a good job in conveying research verbally. I think there's an inherent difficulty to doing so.

VDT: In both demography and economics?

GOODMAN: Yes. I would say perhaps even more in demography than in economics, if only because demography is more number-intensive.

VDT: Is it?

GOODMAN: Yes.

VDT: Do you feel the papers now have become more numerate, more number-crunchy?

GOODMAN: I'm not sure that I think they are more number-intensive. I mean, the computers allow us to look at a lot more numbers, but maybe we have the same number of tables in the typical paper now as we did 15 years ago, but that typical table now may be based on a sample of one million that you've analyzed, whereas 15 or 20 years ago that table may have been based on a sample of 25. We're a very number-intensive profession, obviously. I don't know if I perceive any trend.

VDT: And the papers now are presented as poorly or . . . as they were 15 years ago?

GOODMAN: I haven't noticed any trend. And this is despite what I think is an increased effort on the part of the profession, PAA leadership, to try to get people to pay attention to how they present their research. One innovation of the last 10 or 15 years in the program organization is that the PAA did send out--certainly it doesn't happen every year but oftentimes, I think, presenters get sent out little reminders by our program committee on how a good research paper does not necessarily a good presentation make and you shouldn't just get up there and read this thing from start to finish. That's not the most effective way to convey your information in this medium. I think there's an awareness that we can do better, but I think all of us could probably work a bit harder on it than we have.

VDT: Good point. Let's talk about your term as secretary-treasurer [1981-84]. How did you come to be appointed secretary-treasurer?

GOODMAN: Well, I was looking for a way that I could contribute to the profession. I was looking for a way to do something a little bit different than what I had done in the past. I've always had a very fond feeling about the PAA, the profession.

VDT: Why is that?

GOODMAN: I like the way it operates. I like its scale. Despite problems with how we present our research, I think the topics that are discussed and the topics for the sessions at the meetings are interesting ones; I think they're usually the right choices.

I have benefited a lot from participation in the PAA and I was looking for some new way to contribute and to assist. And I was no longer a novice in the profession in the early 1980s. I had some years of professional experience under my belt, and I had contributed some to the body of knowledge--as we ponderously put it. So I felt that, well, maybe there's something additional I could do here. I knew that the Association was looking for a secretary-treasurer; Tom Merrick's term [1978-81] was coming to an end. And I had a sense that, other things equal, having a secretary-treasurer that was located in Washington was a convenience to the Association. So I made discreet inquiries, as people say, and expressed my interest.

VDT: You made the overture! That's interesting. It's usually the other way round; they have to whiplash someone into it.

GOODMAN: Yes. I guess someone must have been flabbergasted that someone was actually interested.

VDT: Volunteering--indeed!

GOODMAN: But my self-nomination was accepted and I became secretary-treasurer.

VDT: I think Tom Merrick claims he went after you, but obviously his memory is a little hazy on that.

GOODMAN: What might have happened is that I mentioned to someone that I was interested in finding out more about the job if they were looking for someone and Tom, as the incumbent, of course had the most vested interest in getting himself replaced and so he discussed it with me.

VDT: There has to be some institutional backup.

GOODMAN: Yes. I can't remember at what point in the process I'd broached that topic with the Urban Institute, but at some point I did and the Urban Institute agreed to provide the institutional support. Which pleased me, and I thought it to be consistent with the character of the institution. They didn't have to do it and it cost them money out of pocket.

VDT: For secretarial time?

GOODMAN: Secretarial time, or even my time. If I'm working on PAA things, I'm not working on one of these other projects. All of our projects at the Urban Institute had budgets associated with them and just as a law firm or an accounting time has time sheets, we had time sheets. So if I were on some given day spending three hours on PAA affairs, I needed to have some budget or some account that I would charge that time to. So the Urban Institute with their discretionary funds provided the necessary financing to do that.

VDT: Tell me about the issues during your tenure that stand out.

GOODMAN: Well, there were several. One that always seemed to take up time--and I think it always has and always will--was where the Association was going to hold their annual meeting.

VDT: You decided at least the first two or three for after you came in? You came in after the 50th anniversary meeting in Washington, in 1981. You took up office in the summer after that meeting?

GOODMAN: July 1981 was where I took over. The planning horizon extends some distance for the meetings but, still, every year or two you have to add additional cities to the end of the queue--six or seven years from now is the time you're planning for. So it seemed we'd always have these discussions of where are we going to meet. And we'd have the people who would want to go to small places, because only the PAA could go to these places; the American Sociological Association or the Economic Association can't get into small-size places.

VDT: Meaning the cities, smaller cities?

GOODMAN: Yes. Other people would say, "No, I want to go to Chicago, New York, or Los Angeles because it's easy to get in and out." So it's not a professional concern, but . . .

VDT: Do you remember one of the cities you actually had a hand in choosing? Your first meeting was San Diego, 1982, then Pittsburgh [1983], then Minneapolis [1984]. Those places must have been set before you came in.

GOODMAN: I think San Francisco [1986], Chicago [1987], New Orleans [1988] were the ones that I was involved in.

VDT: Rather large cities--it ended up that way.

GOODMAN: Then you have the decision, well, if we've been in the Midwest this year, where are we going to go next year? So the meeting place was something we spent time on.

Another thing that was going on that I spent some time on was seeking of financial support for the Association from the Hewlett Foundation. I was actively involved in drafting a first renewal application. Tom Merrick and Michael Teitelbaum had really engineered the first Hewlett support to the Association, very effective in doing that, so I had the easier task of having to keep this ball rolling once the initial contact and favorable response had occurred. I can't remember exactly when it was during my term of office, but I had the responsibility of preparing our request for a renewal.

VDT: Was it Anne . . .?

GOODMAN: Anne Murray.

VDT: Anne Firth Murray [then with the Hewlett Foundation], who's always been such a supporter of population. No longer, unfortunately; she's moved on to something else. Did you work with her?

GOODMAN: I did, some, as did the presidents of the Association during my term. Those were Judith Blake [1981], Jack Kantner [1982], George Stolnitz [1983], and Sam Preston [1984].

VDT: Tell me about working with those presidents.

GOODMAN: Oh, they were wonderful--all in their different ways. They were all interested in the inner workings of the Association. The secretary-treasurer and the head of our business affairs at the business office are really the chief operating officers of the Association and the presidents are the chief

executive officers and don't get involved in a lot of the nitty-gritty, and that's the way it should be. But I got a sense that all four of those presidents became comfortable with how I was doing things and had a fair amount of confidence in me. So when we would consult on matters, they were all great to work with.

This was also a period where the Association was trying to better recognize the diversity of the profession, particularly the growth of business demography as a profession and a field of specialization within the Association. And I think the overwhelming consensus view was that, "We want to make sure that the Association has a place for people in business who are demographers, either by training or by practicing." The Association was trying to adjust itself.

VDT: In what way did you think that the business demographers should be more recognized, or whatever, in the Association?

GOODMAN: The Association wanted to make sure that they had something to offer this group, be it in terms of a new newsletter that would allow them a channel for communicating with each other; the business demographers would have more in common with each other than they would with, say, a demographer at Princeton who was doing studies of fertility in sub-Saharan Africa. They wanted to make sure there was some vehicle for these people, as we have formal or informal vehicles through the Association for other specialties to communicate with each other.

We wanted to make sure that there was also adequate input to the PAA leadership as to what the concerns and interests of this growing field of specialization were, be it a special committee on business demography, which there was.

VDT: Now called "interest group." As you know, a number of these committees have been shifted to being called interest groups.

GOODMAN: Or making sure that the nominating committee in presenting a slate of candidates for the various PAA offices be aware of the availability and interest of demographers working in a business setting.

That was a concern and topic of discussion at Board meetings at the time: What are we doing to adjust the program, the Association's activities, in order to recognize the fact that our profession is changing in certain ways from the traditional hold of the PAA? The traditional hold being most of the members--academia and the federal government.

VDT: Things probably ran smoothly in your time with the American Statistical Association. Was Ed Bisgyer [PAA business manager at ASA] about to retire then?

GOODMAN: Yes. I continued to work with Ed and then also with Jean Smith [at ASA].

VDT: You know that now PAA is leaving the American Statistical Association and going to the American Sociological Association. A new office is being built on the fourth floor of the American Sociological Association building on N Street to accommodate PAA.

GOODMAN: One of the things in the early 1980s I had to do was consider and propose to the Board alternatives at the time that our contract with the American Statistical Association was up for renewal. The American Statistical Association was requesting an increase in level of support to continue our activities. My recollection is that the PAA had no reason to think that this requested increase was inappropriate, but nonetheless, we thought, "Well, we need to know what the market is; we need to know what our options are." So I took responsibility for figuring out what the market was and what

our options were. I had conversations with the people at the American Sociological Association, going over to those offices on N Street and having various discussions with them about whether something might be worked out there. I also had conversations with professional association management firms, firms that ran small and mid-sized associations such as the PAA as a business.

We--we being the Board--weighed all available options and decided to stay with the American Statistical Association, both because it was the best thing available to us and also because my sense was that the Board was generally pleased with the support that were were getting at that time from the ASA office--Bisgyer and Jean Smith and their colleagues there.

VDT: There's now going to be a big story about the whole history of that relationship and the shift in the next issue of PAA Affairs, which will be the first issue that Signe Wetrogan will be editor of ["American Sociological Association to Manage PAA Business Office"]. It's very much delayed, but PAA Affairs is going to get back on track. I talked to Signe this morning.

What do you remember about the three meetings when you were secretary-treasurer? That would have been San Diego in 1982, which was Jack Kantner's year, George Stolnitz was in 1983, in Pittsburgh, and then there was the Minneapolis meeting in 1984 when Sam Preston gave his famous children-being-shortchanged-by-the-elderly address ["Children and the Elderly: Divergent Paths for America's Dependents"].

GOODMAN: I'm glad you mentioned Sam's address. A number of PAA presidential addresses have been excellent, but that may be the single best professional address by a demographer I've ever heard, in terms of pulling everything together and presenting it. That was effective communication--truly memorable. So that--now that you mention it--is one clear memory that I have.

More on operational grounds, my recollection from the San Diego meeting was that I worried about things a lot more than I should have. There's very little for the secretary-treasurer to do by the time the meetings actually occur. If everything is in order, things will go well. If they're not in order, they're not going to go well and it's too late to do anything about it. So I was running around . . .

VDT: That meeting I remember myself. Everybody has said the setup was poor. We were in a peculiar hotel/motel isolated from any other place and there was no big central building, as I recall; it was scattered around.

GOODMAN: We were in some convention center and all the sleeping accommodations were in other buildings. Of course, that's not a big problem in San Diego, since the climate is quite nice for getting around.

VDT: And it wasn't even a very good week; the sun never shone.

GOODMAN: That's right.

VDT: Was that what you were worrying about when you were there?

GOODMAN: No, because I hadn't picked the hotel and the time of year for the meeting, so there wasn't anything I could do about it. But, you know, just five million little details to worry about. I worried about them less with every passing year. The business office, I think, does a good job of organizing and running these things. So that's memory one, that as secretary-treasurer I worried about these things less with every passing year.

Memory two about my years of going to meetings as secretary-treasurer is that the hotel rooms I had were certainly the best I've ever had and ever will have. [Laughter] That was the attraction. The

disadvantage, of course, is that you have to hold a lot of committee meetings in your room.

VDT: Do secretary-treasurers get somewhat larger rooms for that very purpose?

GOODMAN: It's a combination of the fact that you are hosting these committee meetings and also it's perhaps the only perk of the office, as secretary-treasurer. They were wonderful. In Pittsburgh at the Pittsburgh Hilton I had a corner room overlooking where the rivers come together and the Hilton is right out there. It's the last building before the point and so you have an unobstructed view and I spent some time sitting in a chair just gazing out the window. Minneapolis was a very nice place too.

VDT: The Monday night I arrived it was snowing--in early May! But they have that great indoor walkway that goes around the first story of the whole city.

Anything else you remember about your term? He is consulting a two-by-four-inch piece of paper on which he's written his voluminous pre-interview notes.

GOODMAN: We've hit them all: Hewlett Foundation, business demography initiative, dealing with the presidents and helping them get up to speed at the beginning of each of their terms of office.

VDT: Did anyone need particular getting-up-to-speed? Of course, Judith Blake was already in full swing when you came in. Then there was Jack Kantner, George Stolnitz, and Sam.

GOODMAN: No, they were all very nice to work with; things worked very smoothly. Liaison with the business office, we talked about that. Selection of the meeting sites. So we've hit all my topics.

VDT: What about Bob Lapham, your successor [1984-87]? Did you have a hand in choosing him?

GOODMAN: Bob was a volunteer.

VDT: Also!--he who was always over-committed, I would think. He always was handling several balls.

GOODMAN: He expressed interest in the job, again through discreet inquiries, I guess. I had inquiries referred to me, so I guess at some point I called Bob and said, "I hear you might be interested in the job. I'd be happy to sit down with you and talk about what's involved." I can't remember, but we must have had that conversation and so he ended up taking the position. He was not drafted.

VDT: He at that time was at the National Academy of Sciences, running those two big studies [study director for the NAS Committee on Population and Demography; later, head of the Demographic and Health Surveys program at the Westinghouse Institute for Resource Development].

Each secretary-treasurer must work with the previous one somewhat.

GOODMAN: Yes.

VDT: Suzanne Bianchi [secretary-treasurer, 1987-91] has said that she relied on you a lot when she did not have Bob to rely on, because he died [February 20, 1988, age 58] just a few months after she took office.

GOODMAN: Yes, she got a few things [from Lapham] in the first half year of office, but has been on automatic pilot ever since. Yes, I would say that every secretary-treasurer, especially in the first year

of office, you push a lot of phone calls to your predecessor, because there's just a lot of history there that you need to know that's not written down.

VDT: Do you think some of this history should be written down?

GOODMAN: One thing I think that's very useful are the minutes of each of the Board meetings. Jean Smith of the business office always did a very conscientious job of taking notes during the meetings; getting them typed up and distributed to at least the president and secretary-treasurer sometime after the semi-annual Board meeting occurred. I relied on those minutes, going back by ten years in some instances, to develop an historical record of issues that had come up in the past and how the Board had decided on them and what the reasoning had been at that time for the Board's decision, whatever it had been. So that sort of written record of what the Board had been doing over time was a very valuable resource.

I think the files of the secretary-treasurer--there's a file for the Hewlett Foundation grant and, of course, there'll be historical records of correspondence back and forth on that, and the IUSSP travel grants and that award process, there'll be an historical record there for the secretary-treasurers to draw on as they're dealing with the issue. So I didn't feel that I was disadvantaged as secretary-treasurer by not having available to me enough historical information. A lot of it was written, or if not written, there were enough people around that I could call to get information.

VDT: Do you think that perhaps every post in the organization should have it written down? Somebody will record: "These are the jobs that will come up with the secretary-treasurer."

GOODMAN: I'm not real keen on paperwork and that to me gets close to something that sounds good, but it's going to take someone's time to do that and is there some problem that's current now because we're not doing it? I guess my view is: If it's not broke don't fix it, and my sense is it's not broke.

VDT: That's an interesting observation. Anything you'd like to add?

GOODMAN: No, I think that's about it. It's been a while, six years, since I was in that office and I hadn't thought a whole lot about a lot of these things in the years since, so this gives me a nice opportunity to jog my own memory.

VDT: Well, you've come up very well. I liked your observation that you liked PAA--and you still do?

GOODMAN: I do, I do. I like it as an association. I like the way it operates and I like the personalities that have been involved in leadership positions in the past.

VDT: And you've kept in touch and I hope you will continue to, even though your day-to-day work is rather far removed from demography.

GOODMAN: It is, but not completely. Every once in a while my colleagues in the group--I head a group of 15 here and we deal with everything from consumer use of credit cards to developments in mortgage securities--but every once in a while we will delve into demographics as we're trying to do long-term housing forecasts.

VDT: Of course, demographers like to feel that demography enters into just about everything.

GOODMAN: Well, it does.

VDT: Thank you very much. We'd better go to lunch.

CONTINUED

VDT: I asked Jack why his outside cap was sitting here and he said . . .

GOODMAN: I bicycle to work. I live in Arlington [Virginia], about three miles away, and biking in is wonderful, especially in the morning, because it's downhill. I come down through Arlington Cemetery and it's very nice biking to work. It's cut down on both my coffee consumption in the morning, because biking in helps me wake up, and it's also cut down on my beer consumption at night, because biking home helps me unwind after the day at the office.

VDT: Don't you go home through the dark at this time of year?

GOODMAN: Yes, but I've got a good light.

VDT: Were you ever inspired by Ren Farley, who's the greatest jogger, and you say you and Ren are good friends?

GOODMAN: Well, I've never been as avid a jogger as Ren is, but one year when he was out here to run in the Marine Corps marathon, as he oftentimes has done, I rode my bicycle around one part of the route to cheer Ren on. Ren and Gail have always been very good about--when they are in Washington--getting together with a number of their former students and Ann Arbor friends. Whenever they came to town for the marathon, they would host a party before the marathon; it came to be a real highlight.

VDT: You must have enjoyed it last year when Ren was at the Census Bureau for six months and they were here.

GOODMAN: Nice to see him.

SUZANNE M. BIANCHI

PAA Secretary-Treasurer in 1987-90 (No. 19). Interview with Jean van der Tak at Jean's home in Washington, D.C., November 8, 1989.

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS: Suzanne Bianchi was born and grew up in Fort Dodge, Iowa. She received all her degrees in sociology: the B.A. from Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska, in 1973; the M.A. from Notre Dame in 1974; and the Ph.D. from the University of Michigan in 1978. She joined the Bureau of the Census in 1978; worked for two years in the Population Division; took leave of absence in 1980-81 to be a visiting assistant professor of sociology at the University of Illinois; and since 1981 has been with the Census Bureau's Center for Demographic Studies. Her research has focused on the occupational structure of the U.S. labor force, racial inequalities in income, housing, and family structure, and particularly women and children. Her publications include Household Composition and Racial Inequality (1981), American Women in Transition (with Daphne Spain, 1986), which was the first volume to appear in the 1980 census monograph series, America's Children: Mixed Prospects (Population Bulletin of the Population Reference Bureau, June 1990), and Family Disruption and Economic Hardship: The Short-Run Picture for Children (with Edith McArthur, Currents Population Reports of the Census Bureau, Household Economic Studies, Series P-70, No. 23, January 1991).

VDT: Suzanne is the current secretary-treasurer of PAA. She has been in office since July 1, 1987, and will complete her three-year term at the end of June next year, 1990. We're speaking in my home in northwest Washington, D.C. Suzanne has come by here on her way from her office at the Census Bureau to her home, which is a few blocks north of here.

Suzanne, how and when did you first become interested in demography?

BIANCHI: I've been thinking about that. I've never said this to Omer Galle, but I think I first became aware of the sort of work that demographers do when I was reading things as an undergraduate and he and Walter Gove had an article, something on the effects of population density on behavior; it may have been in an urban course that I took. Of course, I've since met Omer. He must have written that fairly early in his career.

But I didn't really have a good demography course until I went to Michigan, and then the first course I took was with Ron Freedman. I liked that course very much and went on to take a sequences of courses.

VDT: You didn't do demography for your master's at Notre Dame?

BIANCHI: No. There I was more into survey research--methods and that kind of thing. I saw that Notre Dame wasn't really that good a place to be a graduate student. I didn't even do a master's thesis there. I had already applied to Michigan and been accepted and was going on. But I completed the coursework to get what was at Notre Dame a terminal degree in sociology--hedging my bets in case I never finished my Ph.D.; I'd have this master's in sociology.

VDT: What took you to Michigan?

BIANCHI: It wasn't so much demography, it was the Institute for Social Research, or so I thought at the time. It was a place where you could get good survey research training and the department itself had a practicum in survey research--the Detroit Area Study. I had this interest and took the

coursework for demography, but at the time my main interest, probably, was in social stratification, social inequality, that sort of thing.

But Ren [Reynolds] Farley turned out to be the principal investigator on the Detroit Area Study for which I served as a teaching assistant. I was a teaching assistant for 1976 and this was the Detroit Area Study of the academic year 1975-76. It was Ren's investigation of racial residential segregation in Detroit. Howard Schumann was the director of DAS that year, Ren was the principal investigator, and there were three teaching assistants. The team of five of us worked fairly closely on the whole survey and eventually did a publication that may be our best titled one: Chocolate City, Vanilla Suburbs: Will the Trend Toward Racially Segregated Cities Continue?

From that interaction with the Detroit Area Study, although I didn't end up doing my own dissertation with those data on racial segregation, I formed a mentor-student relationship with Ren Farley and moved over to the Population Studies Center and proceeded to do a dissertation using census and Current Population Survey data, looking at the economic well-being of black and white households and what family compositional changes had to do with the trend in the economic status of whites and blacks.

VDT: That led to a publication that you and Ren wrote on . . .

BIANCHI: Yes, we've done things off and on on that topic, and Ren's done something on the whole range of topics of black-white relations.

My dissertation was subsequently revised and published by Rutgers University Press. The title is Household Composition and Racial Inequality.

VDT: You finished your dissertation in 1978?

BIANCHI: Yes. I worked on revising it in the next year and the book came out in 1981. Our book on women [American Women in Transition] came out in 1986. Daphne Spain and I have joked that we need to come out with a book every five years; I don't think I'm going to make 1991.

VDT: What was that first demographic course you took at Michigan with Ron Freedman?

BIANCHI: It was a general population course for graduate students. It was a very good course and made me very interested in population. The second course I took was with Al Hermalin and that was the methods course--population estimation, projections, methodology. I think I also had a third course, probably from Paul Siegel, who was on the faculty then.

And Deborah Freedman was on my dissertation committee; one of the most valuable members of my committee. Every committee was made up of three persons from your department and an outside person; she was the person from economics. She put an incredible time into editing and making this piece a readable work. She taught me a lot, not only about the substance but about how to write in an interesting fashion. I'll always be grateful to her for the time she put in as an outside member, but a very active member of my dissertation committee.

VDT: I was going to ask what your connections were with the Freedmans, whose interests really were more in the Third World.

BIANCHI: Right, except for Deborah. Deborah has had a fair amount of interesting work with the Detroit Area Study, where she and Arland Thornton went back to respondents interviewed in the DAS in the early 1960s. There's been a set of work that they have done on things related to U.S. families and changing family structure and attitudes about family and fertility that has been close to my own

interests. She was very involved in the DAS at the time I was starting my dissertation research.

VDT: 1977 was when they did the reinterviews.

BIANCHI: Okay, they had just gone back into Detroit and Deborah was starting to get the data to look at.

VDT: Interesting what you say about Deborah. I interviewed her after I interviewed Ron Freedman this past June, in Ann Arbor. I'm so glad you're saying this about Deborah's care and interest in students. When I asked her a question that I always ask professors, "Who have been some of your leading students?", she sort of thought that she didn't have any students. But you're telling me that though she was an outsider on your committee, she took this special interest. Do you think that was in part because of the topic you were doing, or because you were a woman and she's a woman, or what?

BIANCHI: Actually, I think Deborah took an interest in a lot of the women, both economists and sociologists, who passed through the Population Studies Center. It was--at least in those days--a wonderful place to be, because faculty and students got together every morning for ten o'clock coffee.

VDT: They still do; I was invited to join them.

BIANCHI: Your schedule is very different when you come to a real job like the Census Bureau, but I remember while working on my dissertation always trying to get in in the morning by coffee time, because it was a very important part of the informal socializing.

Deborah probably had more to do substantively with the women who were economic demographers going through the program at the same time as I was--people like Barbara Devaney, who's now at Mathematica [Policy Research], and Roberta Barnes, who's at the Urban Institute. But there were a set of us in sociology. She took an interest not just in what we were doing--she was always interested in what people were doing professionally, academically, what they were writing and working on--but she also took an interest in how you were doing personally. There was a very motherly aspect to her that I think a lot of us appreciated greatly. So maybe she didn't have any students that directly worked with her, but there were a lot of people who felt very fondly, I think, about Deborah and Deborah was a presence in their life at the Population Studies Center.

VDT: That's interesting to know. I had the impression that both Ron and Deborah were sort of paternalistic influences at the Center.

Tell me a bit more about Ren Farley.

BIANCHI: One of your questions in the letter you sent was: Who in your career have been leading influences? I remember Harriet Presser getting up at the PAA meeting last year [1989] and talking about why she had chosen Dan Price to introduce her [her presidential address]. He had been an important mentor in her life and it extended beyond how he influenced her academically. He realized that here was a good student and "I need to find a way to fund her."

Well, I would say that Ren has clearly been, if I think about it, my most important mentor in terms of initially supervising the dissertation and working jointly with me and others on the papers that came out of the Detroit Area Study. But over time, we've also become very good friends. He's very appreciative, I think, of people who work hard. He was appreciative, I think, of the hard work the teaching assistants did on the Detroit Area Study, and has given back to us many times over for his appreciation for that.

I've worked again closely with him in the last couple of years as secretary-treasurer and he as

president of PAA [for 1988], and he just continues to be for me somebody whose friendship I value greatly, but also whose opinion about professional decisions or matters I also value greatly. I think those kinds of people are very unique and you don't run into them often in the course of a career. There are many people who are surprised that my dissertation chairman and I have continued to work together and be good friends. For many, a dissertation is something you do and you may never have much contact with the chair again. But in my case, he's been a very influential person.

He has this deep concern for the status of black Americans and he's devoted his career to that. That's been very important. I think he also has a concern for the status of women, an appreciation for the obstacles that can stand in the way of achievement on the part of minorities and women.

VDT: Well, it was fortunate for you that Deborah and Ren were at Michigan. But do you think there is something about Michigan that fosters these very special relations between professors and students? For instance, you mentioned the morning coffees, and I understand that the DAS has a different topic each year and it's specially set up to give training to students. Do you think that is rather unique in the field?

BIANCHI: I think the DAS is very unique. And I think the Pop Center itself is very unique.

VDT: How is it unique from other population centers?

BIANCHI: Well, actually, I don't know. The experience of students at Michigan in the Pop Center was probably more cohesive in terms of faculty and students interacting with each other than, say, students at Michigan within the sociology department in other areas. Being involved at the Pop Center was a unique and positive experience for a subset of sociology students at Michigan and a subset of economics students.

A place like Wisconsin, obviously, is a great place right now to be doing family. I think it's a bigger program, but I assume there also students have a lot of interaction with faculty, and I assume at North Carolina there may be that as well. But there are not that many places with a big population center where graduate students interact with faculty on a daily basis, informally and formally.

Most graduate students wrote something with a professor along the way, at Michigan.

VDT: You mean joint publications?

BIANCHI: A joint publication. And that's a very important part of training--having a center where students were assigned to faculty and worked with them, but also ran into them informally. I think that was a very good setting. You've been there; it's located in a building off by itself.

The other thing about Michigan is that graduate students themselves hung out there a lot at night.

VDT: You mean you came back to the Center?

BIANCHI: Right, and tended to work in their offices there at night. There is now a set of--they're still relatively young demographers, out maybe ten years of so--but a set of people that I see emerging as perhaps the people who'll be running the PAA in ten or 15 years, who were fellow students then. Michigan got a good set of students, I think, who had a lot of interaction with each other and those bonds extended over time and place. That seems to be true for the group coming out of Wisconsin also.

VDT: Who are some of those in that network, for you, from Michigan?

BIANCHI: For me--well, I think of people like Rob Mare and Judy Seltzer who are at Wisconsin, on the faculty there. The other thing that happened too is there's a whole set of Washington Michigan people. You may not have been there at the same time, but the fact that you are from Michigan put you into this network when you came to Washington. So people like Jack Goodman, a prior PAA secretary-treasurer who had already left the Pop Center when I came there, I met after coming here. People like Kris Moore; she and I overlapped for one year at Michigan. I've since heard her do presentations here on teenage childbearing; some of the work she does is really good. There was a set of people I knew as students there who have emerged as very good people in their field. Linda Waite had left Michigan before I came, but there is also this Michigan connection to her, and she's just been elected first vice-president of PAA.

VDT: She's on her way. Of course, Larry Bumpass [at Wisconsin since 1970], who's to be PAA president next year [1990], came out of Michigan.

BIANCHI: Right. There is a set of people that were at Michigan long enough before me that I am not as aware of their Michigan connection. But, yes, there's certainly a strong Michigan-Wisconsin connection.

VDT: That's come up several times in these interviews. Norm Ryder, in particular, said that when he was setting up the Center [for Demography and Ecology] at Wisconsin, they naturally drew upon the Michigan graduates because they were the best.

BIANCHI: And there's a big set of Wisconsin people here in Washington too, that I don't know as well as the Michigan set, but there's a lot of interaction. A fairly strong sort of Michigan-Wisconsin demography crew here in Washington. There are others I haven't mentioned who are PAA members--Jennifer Madans, who's at the National Center for Health Statistics. Stan Smith is actually down in Florida, but he does a lot on population projections.

The thing, too, about the Pop Center at Michigan was that it was a place where, at least when we were there, economists and sociologists mingled. So you had a set of economists, like Jack Goodman, with whom you became friends. In fact, I met my husband there. He was an economic demographer going through the economics program at the same time I was getting my degree in sociology.

VDT: What does your husband do?

BIANCHI: My husband, his name is Mark Browning, is an economist.

VDT: Oh, him! I didn't know he was your husband.

BIANCHI: He's at Pepco. He's a PAA member who has sort of moved more toward the business demography interest and his work has become a bit more peripheral to what PAA does.

VDT: I want to get into that later--how the business demographers fit in.

BIANCHI: I guess because Washington is such a big employer of social scientists, there is a set of us who came out of Michigan, both in economics and sociology, who have ended up here.

VDT: That leads to my next question: How did you come to Washington? You mentioned that you spent a year at the University of Illinois.

BIANCHI: Right, that was after I had come.

I was looking for a job--actually, Ren was the connection; Ren has always had a fondness for the Census Bureau. I was interested in nonacademic jobs as much as or more than academic jobs. Ren had a connection--perhaps from his Duke days; he was at Duke before he went to Michigan--with Larry Suter, who at that time was chief of the Education and Social Stratification Branch within the Population Division at Census. So Larry came to give a presentation at the Pop Center at Michigan and also talk to students who might be interested. He had an opening at that point. A year or two prior to that, he'd lost someone who'd moved onto another job--Linda Waite.

VDT: Great!

BIANCHI: People have joked because I ended up coming to take Linda's old job and started out in the education branch. Linda went from the Census Bureau to Illinois and when she and Rafe left, when Linda went to Rand, she didn't resign immediately and Illinois had a visiting position. And Mark Browning--not my husband then--had taken a job in the economics department at Illinois, so I was very interested in spending a year there. So I took Linda's job, as a visitor, for a year at Illinois. I remember Jack Goodman saying at the time, "Oh, you're going to Illinois. How do you feel about Santa Monica?"

VDT: That would be the logical progression! [The Rand Corporation is in Santa Monica, California.]

BIANCHI: But I never made it. I'm not sure I was quite ready to follow in Linda's footsteps at that point.

When I first came out of graduate school, I had other job offers, but once I visited Washington I really wanted to move here. The Census Bureau seemed like it would be a good place. I had been analyzing census and Current Population Survey for my dissertation anyway and I would be continuing some of that work. And while there were certainly those on my committee at Michigan who, I think, frowned upon Michigan graduates taking a job at the Census Bureau--it was in status, at least, a lesser job than if you got a good academic job--Ren was not that sort of person. As I say, he always seemed to have a fondness for the Census Bureau. And he was encouraging; it could be a good job. And for me, it has turned out to be a good place.

VDT: I'm interested that you say that Michigan--perhaps it's not just confined to Michigan--somewhat looked down on nonacademic jobs. Do you think that may be true of many of these population centers, graduate departments?

BIANCHI: I think in general it is. Clearly, the stars--those whom they consider their best students--will go to the top-tier universities; you only get one or so of those a year.

VDT: You mean one or so job openings in demography at a top university?

BIANCHI: People actually getting offers. The year before I was there, Rob Mare had gone from the Population Studies Center at Michigan to Wisconsin. The year I was there, Diane Colisanto--now with Gallup--had gone from the Pop Center to be an assistant professor at Wisconsin. Those were clearly the kinds of jobs that all of us looked up to. You're socialized to think that even if you don't personally want to do that exactly, that's what you should want to do and aspire to.

I think it takes a long while to come to grips with the fact that maybe for you--first of all, you may not have that option--but maybe it's not the kind of life style for you anyway. I think all of us at a

place like Michigan were socialized to aspire, at least, to an appointment at a place like Berkeley or Wisconsin, maybe now North Carolina, Chicago--those kinds of places. And obviously not all the people that come out of Michigan are going to have those kinds of appointments, nor are they necessarily the best ones for some of us, I think.

VDT: Do you think the Census Bureau was perhaps regarded just a little bit below some of those top-echelon things, and certainly above business--say, your husband in Pepco, for example?

BIANCHI: Certainly above business, because the Census Bureau does have a tradition of research. And at any point in time, it has at least a handful of recognized people doing demographic research. And it's clearly a big place for doing demographic research, at least if you're interested in the U.S., and there's an international group as well. I think it was clearly considered better than business.

It's always true, probably, that within the field of population and demography, there's somewhat less stigma attached to taking a nonacademic job than, say, within sociology. Now I was getting a degree in sociology with an area concentration both in population and in social stratification. But for the graduates of the other part, those who had nothing to do with demography, I think clearly there the idea was that you would take an academic job somewhere. I think more of us who are in demography are in nonacademic settings and there's somewhat less of a stigma than within sociology more generally.

VDT: I had the impression that since the sociology jobs were perhaps drying up in the academic world . . . Certainly, sociologists traditionally came to Washington, working in the government--perhaps not in business. Another interesting observation!

You have obviously in your Census Bureau career done mostly research. You've been removed from the hurly-burly of hands-on dealing with, say, the 1980 census?

BIANCHI: Right, I have. It has its pros and cons. For me, the Census Bureau has been an incredibly good place, because I've gotten to do a lot of what I would want to do no matter where I was, whether I was an academic somewhere or in a think tank kind of place. I've had an unusual inexperience in that most of my time there, since 1981, I've been in this small Center for Demographic Studies. When I was in the branch under Larry Suter, you're more in the line of producing reports. The Population Division is somewhat more production-oriented; they have a set of Current Population Reports and census review and reports that they have responsibility for.

The downside of being off in the Center for Demographic Studies is you're not really in line. Larry Long is also there with me. And I think for the two of us, given our personalities and what we want to do, it's been a very comfortable place. There's always been some uncertainty about whether it will continue to exist.

VDT: Really?

BIANCHI: Yes--money. But it muddles along. Bill Butz [Census Bureau Associate Director for Demographic Programs] has been supportive of the idea of it, even if there hasn't been a lot of funds redirected toward it, and so it's continued to exist.

My feeling about the Census is that its main mission, its reason to exist, is to collect data and to get that out--the decennial census, but also the Current Population Survey, our oldest and most important survey. When push comes to shove, that has to be the activity that gets done, where the concentration is. But the Census Bureau is tolerant of researchers like Larry Long and myself, because the Bureau also from time to time is criticized for not doing enough research.

VDT: By whom?

BIANCHI: Well, sometimes by other agencies, who want information and don't want to go through a bunch of reports but want it in a readable publication. Certainly by the academics, and the media to a certain extent, I suppose. The Census Bureau can point to work by Larry Long or myself or some others and say, "Ah, but we do do research."

So the cost to us of not being central to the mission is that we aren't central to a lot of the key decisions that are made. But the benefit is that I think we are valued by the agency and we have a lot of autonomy--we've been given a lot of autonomy to do work that shows the usefulness of Census Bureau data.

There does come a question in the justification for continued collection or new data collection efforts of: Why should the American public cooperate with the 1990 census; what does the census do for them? And it's the research that's done by some of the people there as well as others that allows us to tell people: "Here's what we can tell you about yourself or here's how we can help you because we've collected these data and we've analyzed them and this is what it shows." So there's always been a great emphasis at the Bureau on doing research that shows the usefulness of the data that's understandable, that's written in prose that's not so sophisticated methodologically that the intelligent lay reader won't be able to follow it. There's that sort of thrust: What is newsworthy; what is something that people care about reading? And there's probably a lot more attention given to being cited correctly--hopefully--in the New York Times or the Wall Street Journal than having a publication in American Demographics or the American Sociological Review or whatever.

VDT: That leads right into what I wanted to ask about American Women in Transition, which is certainly readable and comes across to the public.

But first I'd like to ask, do you have any influence on questions, changing questions or whatever, in the CPS, for example? You can show what can be done with the data, but can you also influence the data to some extent?

BIANCHI: It's tough with the CPS, because it's primarily a labor force survey. But there are certainly people more within the branches of the Population Division, people like Martin O'Connell, who works in the area of fertility, who do have a fair amount of input, within limits, to the questions that are asked. NICHD has in the past sponsored some of the fertility supplements. Certainly, the demographers in the branches responsible for subject areas have influence on questionnaire context. Of course, it's not like doing a Detroit Area Study where we came up with a questionnaire and tested it. It's a much bigger operation, with OMB review of questionnaire content and that sort of thing. And obviously with the decennial, there's virtually no ability to add questions. What can be asked is so limited and there are so many competing demands, that people at the Census Bureau have very little power to influence questionnaire content.

VDT: When did the Center for Demographic Studies get started?

BIANCHI: I think around 1980.

VDT: You were one of the first staff members?

BIANCHI: Yes. I left the Census Bureau after two years, from 1978 till the fall of 1980, and was on leave for an academic year at Illinois. There is the Intergovernmental Personnel Act, where the federal government can exchange personnel with state and local government. Joan Huber was head of the department of sociology at Illinois and I went there as a visitor for a year, on leave from the Census

Bureau under this Intergovernmental Personnel Act. So I don't know quite if the Center was formed right before I left or after I left, but I returned to it when I came back in May of 1981, technically, I guess, assigned to Larry Long.

Daphne Spain was there at that time too. Ren was there as a visitor and told us that the committee for the 1980 census monographs wanted a volume on women and we submitted a proposal. I'm sure Ren was helpful. Jim Wetzel was the head of the Center at that time and he was also on the committee for the 1980 monographs, sort of the Census Bureau liaison to the committee.

VDT: I was going to ask how you got chosen to do that. You and Daphne submitted your proposal.

BIANCHI: Well, there were a couple of other proposals; I don't recall offhand who they were submitted by. I'm sure it helped tremendously that Ren was supportive of our proposal. We were not very well known. I had done some work in the area of women. Daphne's work had been in the area of urban studies, so she had done much less on women. But I'm sure that the friends we had on the committee, Ren Farley and Jim Wetzel, argued for our ability to do it. We had each published a book by that time.

VDT: Yours was your dissertation.

BIANCHI: Right. Daphne's was an edited volume on gentrification of neighborhoods; there wasn't much written on that yet. We were young and unknown to some extent, but we clearly had already established that we got things done. And I think we proved to them that we did.

VDT: Absolutely, you came out first [American Women in Transition, 1986].

BIANCHI: I always said I'd feel terrible about being so late with this monograph, except even being this late, it was done before the rest of the series. But to some extent we had an easier job too, because some of the monographs which were on small-area analysis really required census data that was late coming out. We often preferred the Current Population Survey data to census data for, say, labor force trends, so we weren't quite so reliant on having that 1980 census data that some of the other monographs were.

VDT: Did you work on it right from the time you came back to the Center?

BIANCHI: No. We wrote the proposal and then there was some lag before we knew we were going to be selected to do it. The data were late coming out. I think the authors had their first meeting in June of 1982. I didn't go to it; Daphne did. I was on my honeymoon. And Daphne ended up leaving the Census Bureau for the University of Virginia, so we collaborated over distance. The actual doing of it took place more in 1983 and 1984.

The other thing that I attribute our being first to was that Daphne and I ended up with a very hard and fast external deadline--an advantage to us that others may not have had--and that was that I became pregnant with my first child and the baby was due in September of 1984. When this became known, Daphne and I said we've got to get the draft completed by then. A perfect time to have our review committee going over it and reviewing it--each monograph had a review committee of four--would be while I was on maternity leave. We just buckled down and pushed to get it done. And I think we would have made it--much to the surprise, I think, of my Center team--except that my daughter was three weeks early. So there were a few things to tie up afterwards, but basically we did get a draft out to review, which was reviewed while I was on maternity leave. So I always attribute Jennie's arrival as sort of the real motivator to get the work done.

VDT: That's another question I was going to ask: How do you get it all done? I think a young working mother, professional mother, has to be more organized.

But I want to go on a bit first about the book itself. It's been very influential. It's marvelously written. As you said, the aim of publications from the Center is that they should be written for the general public. It's interesting that you mentioned that there's more interest in getting cited in the New York Times. Was some conscious effort made to get it out to the media?

BIANCHI: There was some effort in that regard. Daphne and I, Ren, and others who were authors of monographs, Frank Levy, were not particularly pleased with the promotion of our books. We felt Russell Sage should have an interest in getting these books publicized widely. In some ways, it was nice that Daphne and I got our monograph done early, but there was also a problem in that it was done so much earlier than the next one--it was almost a year before the next monograph.

VDT: Frank Levy's Dollars and Dreams was the next one.

BIANCHI: I think that's right. Ren's was also one of the early ones [Reynolds Farley and Walter Allen, The Color Line and the Quality of Life in America, 1987]. But Russell Sage claimed it really wanted to promote things as a series and it wasn't geared up to really promote the book at the time it came out.

I can't remember how it happened, but a copy was sent to Jack Rosenthal, who was the New York Times person on the demographic beat; now it's Felicity Berringer here in Washington. And he did take a look and there was a short thing in the New York Times Book Review. The Census Bureau made some effort too. We have a prime list of persons who are notified when we put something on the press table from the Bureau and those people were alerted that the book was coming out.

But, interestingly, what received more media attention was a short 40-page pamphlet called, "American Women: Three Decades of Change," that was published by the Census Bureau. When Daphne and I set out to do the monograph, we said, "Well, what if we had to describe the status of women and what the trends have been and we only had six weeks to do it?" So we sat down and put together "Three Decades of Change." That was the thing that got a lot of attention. It was short. A lot of media people don't want to sift through a whole book, but 40 pages they can handle. And for us it provided an overview of the topics we were going to cover, showed us what places we needed to develop further or we didn't know much about, or where we had unanswered questions.

VDT: Was American Women four decades?

BIANCHI: It was three decades--1950 to 1980, roughly. In that short piece from the Census Bureau, there may have been a page and a half apiece on what was ultimately a chapter in the book, but we laid out the topics that we then developed in the book itself.

That publication received much attention. We got a request from the Joint Economic Committee of Congress to give testimony on the situation of women. And, like the PRB [Population Reference Bureau] Bulletins which are so useful in the classroom, our Bureau publication was more the size of thing you could assign to somebody in a classroom.

VDT: I was very pleased you quoted a number of Population Bulletins in your book. You covered a lot of material; it wasn't just Census Bureau material.

BIANCHI: Many of the census monographs have joint authors. I think Daphne and I were especially fortunate that our collaboration worked well. I would say it truly was a collaboration. We split up the areas, because you couldn't read everything, or one of us couldn't. And one would take the first pass at

a chapter and then the other one would get it to go over or revise. Daphne writes very well. Of the two of us, she's probably the stronger writer in terms of writing prose that's readable.

VDT: She had been on the American Demographics staff at one point.

BIANCHI: That's right. When she left the Census Bureau, she started freelancing for American Demographics, as well as working on the monograph. She's now in the school of architecture at Virginia. She had been jointly with the urban planning department there, which is within architecture and sociology, but this year she's moved full-time into urban planning in the school of architecture.

VDT: It's very obvious that they would choose a woman for such a monograph. It was the first census monograph ever on women?

BIANCHI: Right. There are problems with the monograph. Clearly, given our age, we were more interested in the issues surrounding the combination of work and family, issues of younger women. It's short on issues of older women. There's some attention paid to widowhood and economic differences at different stages of life. One of, I think, the legitimate criticisms of the book is that it is focused more on the life cycle stage that we were in.

On the other hand, in our defense, I would say that I think clearly for women that balancing of work and family is the important story in a large part of the last 20 years. So in some sense, it makes most sense to focus on that.

VDT: I agree. I like the way you ended up. I've got the book right here, a copy from the PRB library. And the way you laid it out--again, this shows your organization--you ask the question, then you answer it, and then you sum up at the end of each chapter.

BIANCHI: I'm thrilled to hear that from you, Jean, because I know you are an expert.

VDT: Well, if I had been confronted with manuscripts like this, wouldn't life as a demographic editor have been a joy!

I like two particular quotes at the end; I'll just put them in the record: "Will it always be that women, more so than men, put the needs of children ahead of their own labor force advancement?" Now, you have pointed out that your generation, the baby boomers--and you were a leading baby boomer--have been the ones who have stayed in the work force through childbearing, but you still have the disadvantage that wives do not command a salary equal to their husbands' and certainly bear an unequal share of housework and child care.

Then this final thing: "One might view the 1970s as the decade in which individual women made personal adjustments in order to establish themselves in the labor market and achieve wage parity with men. They delayed marriage and children. They attended college in record numbers, began to major in non-traditional fields, and entered male-dominated professional and managerial ranks. And the 1980s and 1990s may hold the answer to how effective these individual acts by the baby boom cohort of women were." Whether or not they will, "having made some sacrifice . . . in an attempt to combine raising children with the responsibilities of mid-level positions in organizations, they will have the opportunity to see if they emerge from their childbearing years with earnings and labor force attachments that are more equal to those of men than have been true for past generations of women." [American Women in Transition, p. 243.]

I believe this is the story. Have you seen the current issue of Newsweek? It's on "Family and the Future" and much of it is centered around just what you have treated there. Its treatment of the elderly is not so much of the current elderly, but the baby boomers when they get old. And certainly the problems of working women now, the day care problems. Nothing on equal sharing of household

tasks, so that was a good point you made.

BIANCHI: Well, you know, reporters still call me fairly frequently, or they're directed to me about, "What's the story with women; what's the story for the 1990s?" And it really seems to me that increasingly the story may not be what's happening with women, but what's happening with the men in terms of housework and children. There's a certain amount of change that women will continue to make in terms of increased labor force participation, but those changes have been so dramatic that at some point you start to reach a ceiling. It's still only something like 70 percent of mothers of children are in the labor force and it may go a little higher, but we don't expect everybody to be in. So at some point, what's happening to women is not going to be changing rapidly, is not going to be as interesting. And what's happening for women, at least on the wage front, is going to rely on what's going to happen with men. The question is will there be an interesting story in the next decade on men in terms of the way they organize their family life or the attention they pay to their family life.

VDT: Good story. What about you? Do you have flexitime, for instance, at the Census Bureau?

BIANCHI: Yes, we do. Another thing I've seen happen with government agencies that I wouldn't have foreseen even five years ago when we were working on this is there's been a tremendous push on the part of agencies to set up on-site child care centers. At the Census Bureau, for example, within the last two or three years, we have started a day care center. And I see it happening over and over at many of the agencies.

We have had such rapid changes in female labor force participation, particularly for married women with children, younger women, that there has been a period when things were out of sync. Those changes occurred before there were the institutional supports for the family. The optimistic view would be to hope that ten or 20 years down the line, those things will be more in balance again. So when my daughter looks for her job, how she's going to arrange the care for children won't be quite such a big issue as it certainly has been for me and for other women of my generation.

VDT: Well, you certainly have been a leading generation. You've covered a lot of things I wanted to ask about the book, which was really a seminal book. An awful lot has been written about American women, the problems of working women, but I think you summed it all up here. What about your present research; what are you doing now?

BIANCHI: Well, you know Jean, to some extent your interests do follow biography, I think, and my life now is consumed by the needs of small children. But I have also become very interested in .. . Sam Preston had that wonderful address where he turned a lot of people's attention to the situation of U.S. children ["Children and the Elderly: Divergent Paths for America's Dependents," PAA presidential address, May 1984, published in Demography, November 1984]. You can't be interested in working women and what's happening with them and how they're balancing their lives without also becoming aware of children as actors too and what's happening with their lives. So I've moved more now into work on the well-being of children.

There's been an added push at the Census Bureau; we have a new Survey of Income and Program Participation [SIPP] that collects longitudinal data for two and a half years. A lot of areas other people are covering, but nobody was looking particularly at the estimates we were getting for how much children's economic status declines following separation. So I began to look at SIPP data, comparing the estimates we were getting of the decline in children's well-being with other data, like that from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, to try to see if our estimates were reasonable. I'm working very hard on this now. And the Population Reference Bureau is giving me the opportunity to take a step back and look at the whole literature in the area. I'm doing a Bulletin on the well-being of

children.

VDT: Great! I didn't know that.

BIANCHI: Which should be done very soon ["America's Children: Mixed Prospects," Population Bulletin, June 1990]. I wish I were a bit more on top of it, but I'm working very hard on it at the moment.

VDT: You're working on that in your office hours?

BIANCHI: Yes, that's my main . . .

VDT: I must say I'm glad you're coming out with a Bulletin, because you know Larry Long let us down. Larry Long's Bulletin on metropolitan America was supposed to be my last Bulletin [in June 1987] and it never materialized.

BIANCHI: This fall was when I was going to do the bulk of the work and I must say that PAA and its current situation, which we'll probably get to, has taken more hours away from my research than I had quite envisioned or intended. But I'm certainly at the moment really concentrating on what I want put in that Bulletin.

VDT: And that will be the central publication out of that work you're doing now?

BIANCHI: Right. Hopefully, the Census Bureau will issue in its SIPP series, P-70, a report on the economic well-being of children following parental separation. My target is to get this done the first quarter of next year [1990]. My co-author on that is Edith McArthur, now at the National Center for Education Statistics, but who was on the SIPP staff at Census. We gave a PAA paper last spring ["Family Disruption and Economic Hardship: The Short-Run Picture for Children," PAA Baltimore meeting, March 31, 1989] and are in the process of revising that for publication by the Census Bureau as a SIPP report [published January 1991, same title, Current Population Reports, Household Economic Studies, Series P-70, No. 23.]

VDT: Well, you are into issues that are of hot interest in this country now.

BIANCHI: I haven't done much lately on race or minorities, that sort of thing. Yet I still have a very keen interest, particularly how blacks are faring vis-a-vis whites. My dream, or hope--Ren and I have talked a bit about this--would be that perhaps within the next couple of years, he and I might--he at Michigan could certainly be director of DAS again--might possibly go back into Detroit again and do a second round on residential segregation and maybe some family structure. And then analyze the 1976 data we collected, which we never . . . What happened was we collected the data and as students working on it, we were all trying to get our dissertations done and get out of there. Ren analyzed it somewhat, but maybe not as fully as he would have liked, but if we can go back and assess change over time.

VDT: Go back to the same people, as Arland Thornton and Deborah did?

BIANCHI: No, we probably would not go back to the same people; we would probably do another cross-section of Detroit. This is all at the moment just in our discussing, "Wouldn't it be nice to do?" But I really am hopeful that after 1990, particularly when the decennial census comes out, that I will

get back to looking at racial differences.

VDT: It might be particularly interesting at this time in U.S. history when we have just voted in a black governor [Wilder in Virginia], a black New York mayor--and what happened in Detroit?

BIANCHI: Coleman Young will continue. He's black. He's the one who's the fifth-term mayor of Detroit.

It's also interesting--I'm looking at children right now--the family structure differences of blacks and whites have diverged. The trends are in the same direction, but they have diverged and the question arises of the well-being of this generation of black children as compared with the well-being of this generation of white children.

VDT: You and Ren did write on that in a paper that came out in the American Statistical Association ["Growing Racial Differences in Marriage and Family Patterns," American Statistical Association 1986 proceedings].

BIANCHI: Right. There was a paper that he was certainly the lead author on but that we put together.

Even when I was doing my dissertation, it was pretty clear that what black women do, the choices they make or the constraints they face about marriage and children and the family, are very different than white women. People point to black male unemployment, that sort of thing, but I haven't seen a totally convincing explanation of, first of all, just why the differences, but why the trends should be diverging for black and white women over time.

VDT: Do you think it's been an advantage being a woman in your demographic research, because you're more sensitive to the problems there certainly would be for women but also other women, with blacks?

BIANCHI: I was trying to think about why I was interested in racial differences. One of the questions you had was: Why are you interested in women and minorities? I don't know for sure, except that I think that . . . While I was at Michigan, particularly in working on the Detroit Area Study, one of the other teaching assistants was a black woman, now a Ph.D. from Michigan. There was a set of my fellow graduate students who were black, whom I was fairly close friends with, and in our discussions of things, I began to have some appreciation for the differences in our background and how we perceived things.

I think also . . . I'm from a working class background. I remember getting to Michigan and starting to realize that here I was, with a working class background, but someone who'd always done well in school. I got to Michigan and I remember this feeling of being very average and starting to realize that a lot of these people who were graduate students with me were maybe second-generation academics. When I went to college, my parents knew nothing about how to direct a child to go to school, because this was the first child who'd ever gone to college.

Also when I got to college, I had a black roommate, and I grew up in a small town in Iowa and I could see that my parents were very disturbed just by the fact that she was black. I was disturbed by the fact that there I was at Creighton and they were leaving.

VDT: You were disturbed by their being disturbed?

BIANCHI: I noticed it. It's clear that people had different reactions. Julie, my roommate, and I may not have chosen each other, but to me it was very beneficial to share a room for this first year when you're away at college. She was from the Omaha [Nebraska] area. So there was a set of people that

we had in our room and that I became acquainted with that I would never, probably, have selected to fraternize with.

VDT: Other blacks?

BIANCHI: Yes, other black women.

VDT: They must have been fairly unusual there.

BIANCHI: Yes, a fairly small subset of them at Creighton, this small Catholic college. In Omaha there was a section, a ghetto, blacks were segregated there as everywhere and the few blacks there were at Creighton tended to come from the Omaha area. And it was a small private school, so there was some recruitment too.

VDT: Only women?

BIANCHI: No, there were men as well. So more than now, and I miss that, I had at Michigan good friends who were black, women friends, and at Creighton certainly acquaintances who were black.

You know, sometimes coming from a working class background into a setting like Michigan, you can feel sort of marginal. It gives you an appreciation for perhaps other groups, like blacks, who might feel also marginal in those kinds of settings. So maybe part of it is that.

VDT: What does your father, your mother, do?

BIANCHI: My mother was a housewife. There are six of us. I'm the oldest of six children, a good Catholic baby boom family. My father worked for a meatpacking plant on the assembly line. He was a union member, so he made reasonably good wages and it was one of those baby boom families where they could support a large family on one person's income.

VDT: Did you work your way through college?

BIANCHI: I was a National Merit semi-finalist and then my father's company provided scholarships, so I got one of those; that covered a lot of the expenses. I had other grants, work-study, that sort of thing. And I had a wonderful mentor who materialized there. After my second year I wasn't sure I could continue to afford to stay at Creighton and I was thinking about going to the University of Iowa. I had declared a major in sociology and there was a professor in the department and he and his wife--they didn't have children at the time--took me in and sort of like these au pair girls that are around Washington, in exchange for room and board, I cleaned house. That helped me financially to get through. And he was very instrumental in helping a group of us apply to graduate school, take the Graduate Record Exam, think about going beyond our undergraduate degree.

VDT: What's his name?

BIANCHI: His name is Jim Ault. In fact, I've just been asked to write a letter of recommendation for him for an award in support of women students that Creighton University gives out, which I hope he gets. It is pleasant to finally be able to repay in a small way someone I considered a really important mentor.

VDT: I was going to ask who have been some of the leading influences in your career and you said

you'd thought about it and you gave a lovely accolade to Ren Farley and now to Jim Ault and you praised Deborah Freedman. Are there others you would add?

BIANCHI: They are clearly the more important and they are both men, Jim Ault and Ren Farley. I've been trying to think: Are there women who are important to me? Certainly, it's been a pleasure this year to work with Harriet Presser [PAA president 1989] and get to know and appreciate her better. One of the things I've realized, too, is that a lot of my coauthorships have been with other women. There it's more collegial, but those relationships, the support of those relationships in doing research, I would say have been for me extremely important.

VDT: That would include Daphne.

BIANCHI: I include Daphne. I would include Nancy Rytina, who actually is the daughter of Joan Huber out at Illinois. They don't have the same last name; Nancy is from Joan's first marriage. Nancy and I continue to be friends even though she has moved away from doing demographic research. She went back to Michigan and got an MBA.

VDT: Is she the one who was at Blue Cross/Blue Shield?

BIANCHI: She was for a while, and also at the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

VDT: Do you think there's something special about women that makes them able to work together on a professional job with perhaps more success than men?

BIANCHI: I don't know. For me, I guess, it was easier to be on an equal footing with other women. I'm trying to think, why don't I work with men at the Census Bureau? I don't write anything with men. Partly, it's interest. It's more likely that other women will be interested in the things I'm interested in--family, children, household composition.

In some ways, Larry Long has been a person who's influenced me--not somebody I work directly with, but influenced me as a sort of role model for doing research in a place like the Census Bureau. He's very good at figuring out what's newsworthy, what is important to do in terms of research so far as the Bureau is concerned. He writes well. He's perceptive about the importance of writing about things that are important and writing in a way that other people can understand. So watching that has given me some clues as to how to operate within the Bureau itself. But I don't have the same relationship with him, obviously, as with, say, someone like Ren, who is far more important in terms of being interested in the same areas that I am. And probably more interested in it from a social-worker aspect too, as well as the researcher on it. Not that we're social workers, but we have a true interest, I think, in the well-being of the groups that we're looking at.

One thing I'm always keenly interested in, of course, is the other women in PAA and how they're managing their careers and combining all the things they do.

VDT: That was a leading question; I'll ask it now. You're a woman balancing family and professional responsibilities, but also extra professional responsibilities, like being the PAA secretary-treasurer, in addition to your full-time office job. Do you think that's important?

BIANCHI: I do, although with PAA I joke that Ron Lee [1987 president] caught me at a vulnerable moment. I was coming back from maternity leave with my second child and you're a little at loose ends then: What are you going to do; how are you going to get back in again? He asked if I would do this and it seemed like a good thing to do.

It was also . . . Ron Lee was my husband's dissertation adviser. At Michigan when I was there, Ron was around. He was somebody I knew a little bit--he was an economist and I didn't know him well--but came to appreciate greatly. He's an incredibly intelligent person and a very nice individual as well. And I appreciated his skill in handling some of the affairs of PAA, the half year he was president which coincided with the beginning of my term [mid- to end 1987]. He was the one who asked if I would serve. Ren didn't put pressure on me, but he certainly let it be known that he thought if I wanted to do it, it would be a good thing for me and for the PAA. Ren was president-elect and how can you turn down your husband's dissertation chair and your dissertation chair?

VDT: Let's just finish up on your general career and then we get into PAA, which is part of your career. A question I asked ahead of time, so you know about it: What accomplishments in your career have given you the most satisfaction?--to date, because, of course, you're only mid-way.

BIANCHI: When I thought of that, I thought, I just don't feel . . . I mean, considering the people you are interviewing, I'm relatively young and inexperienced. But I would say that Daphne and I were both very pleased to get the monograph done and to feel, like, we could always have done a better job, but we felt we'd done a good job with it. That was certainly something.

Obviously, completing your dissertation, but going on to revise it and get it published was also something that pleased me.

VDT: Did Rutgers Press come to you?

BIANCHI: I'm trying to think how that worked. I know Fran Kobrin was a reviewer. Rutgers, I think, came to me and said let us consider this and they sent it to Fran Kobrin--Goldscheider now. Anyway, they sent it out for a couple of reviews and the reviews were sufficiently encouraging that they came back and said, "We'll publish it."

VDT: Those are the two books--accomplishments.

BIANCHI: I guess those would be sort of the highlights to date.

Also, I was pleased in some ways to be asked to serve the PAA as secretary-treasurer and most of the interaction I've had with the people in the PAA, the presidents, I think I'm going to look back on as a very positive and important experience, although at the moment that's a little hard to say. I'm so mired in that.

VDT: One last thing before PAA. I noticed that you were elected a member of IUSSP last year and I wonder if you see IUSSP as important.

BIANCHI: You know I don't do very much in the international area, but it seemed important to me in my role as a secretary-treasurer of the PAA that I become more knowledgeable about what was going on in IUSSP. So that was my primary motivation for joining, just becoming more aware of what's going on, of the publications that come out of IUSSP. I've never attended a meeting of the IUSSP.

VDT: Well, of course, the first one since you were elected, being in New Delhi [September 1989], wasn't practical for most people.

BIANCHI: The interesting one may be the 1992 conference on "Peopling the Americas," where I would think there will be more U.S. involvement.

VDT: And they hope the next general IUSSP meeting will be in my native land, in Montreal.

You've pointed out that your interests have been focused on the U.S., but you have explained one reason you were attracted to IUSSP.

BIANCHI: For instance, right now I feel a real need, especially doing this Bulletin on children, I'm really curious about what's happening with fertility in the developed countries of Europe, because of what's happening with fertility at the moment in the U.S. The rate in the last year or two is up.

VDT: Inched up. It rounds off still to 1.9, but it's really above that.

BIANCHI: Yes, and the number of births is pushing toward 4 million. We also think it's a timing thing. Clearly, the baby boom generation didn't start having babies when everyone thought they would and they're not stopping quite on time. People tell me that in Sweden the rate is now 2 or something.

VDT: Yes. Carl Haub keeps close tabs on Sweden for the PRB Data sheet. He rounded it down to 1.9 in this year's 1989 Data Sheet, but he said, "You know, it's really 2.0." Amazing.

BIANCHI: And it's something like 1.5 down in Italy.

VDT: Italy is lowest at 1.3.

BIANCHI: Okay. That makes me wonder about--back to the thing we discussed about whether there are times when what's happening with women, their labor force participation and their fertility decisions, are very much out of sync with the institutional supports that there are to help them combine both. I don't know what's going to happen to U.S. fertility in the future, but the fact that Sweden is back up makes me wonder. There I have the impression that more of the family supports are in place for working women and this has allowed fertility to go back up slightly. I don't expect it to go way above replacement or anything. I have this feeling about U.S. women that there will be some of us--not all, but some--whose fertility will be pushed toward age 40, when maybe ideally, under other circumstances, we wouldn't have had our babies at age 20, but we might have preferred to have them more around age 30. And how much of that delay is related to what's in place in terms of supporting families? I think if I had a more full understanding of what's going on in Europe right now, that might help. In our monograph, we didn't do much on international comparisons, though we were always interested. Maybe it will be the project for five or ten years from now.

VDT: I was going to ask what do you think is the outlook for women and fertility in the U.S., and you've said, well, keep an eye on Europe; maybe they're just a bit ahead of us. And perhaps Europe's attitudes also toward the elderly, which will become such an issue in the U.S. when your generation gets there.

BIANCHI: Yes, obviously as more of the baby boom generation becomes older, there's going to be a lot more attention even than now on issues of aging.

VDT: How about the outlook for demography per se? It's interesting that you say that Michigan--perhaps they've changed their attitudes now, ten years down the road from when you were there--slightly looked down on nonacademic jobs. But what about applied demography, that seems to be taking more and more of a role in demography? Is that where the jobs are and will applied demography become more important simply because there will be more jobs there than in the academic world?

BIANCHI: I did say, too, that what I liked about demography was that it was a more applied field than, say, sociology in general or maybe economics--well, economics I think is more applied; there are more practitioners. But it's certainly a place where PAA could grow. There's a great demand out there, I think, and more and more people who don't have the same kind of Michigan training that I do but end up doing demographic work or being employed by businesses and state and local government, that sort of thing. I think there's a real tension within PAA about that.

VDT: I was going to ask about that.

BIANCHI: Yes. I think Bob Lapham, my predecessor, certainly, and Jack Goodman to some extent before him, wanted to see applied demographers more involved in PAA and help try to make that possible. But I think there's also a fairly strong part of PAA that still is more academic and more large population center. If we expand more in the direction of applied demographers, I think as an association, we're going to have to pay more attention to the issues they raise, the concerns they have, which can be very different from those of the sort of core academic demographer or large-population-center demographer.

For example, there was an issue on this past Board agenda. The business and state and local demographers are very concerned about the American Sociological Association certifying demographers at the master's level.

VDT: Which they are requiring now?

BIANCHI: It's something you can do. And the PAA Board spent a lot of time on this two or three years ago and basically, I think, the Board's position is that PAA doesn't believe any certification is necessary or desirable, but we can't tell another association that they can't certify sociologists as demographers; you can't tell them what to do.

I had a sense that the Board thinks this is not a big issue; it's going to die its own death and not much is going to come of it. Whereas, I was on the phone this morning with Hallie Kintner, who's chair of the Business Demography Interest Group, and it's clear it still is a very big issue for that interest group and they're very concerned about it.

I think there is a tension there and a feeling always on the part of the state and local and business demography groups, particularly with this last move to call them interest groups, that they're not represented, they're not in the mainstream.

VDT: Interest groups rather than . . .

BIANCHI: Committees. They were formerly called committees.

VDT: What's the difference between those two?

BIANCHI: Well, Ron Lee toward the end of his term was asked by Chris Taylor in Canada to form a committee on international migration. No one could see any particular reason not to have a committee and within the constitution and bylaws, it said it was a president's prerogative to form committees. Ron consulted with the other officers and said, "Sure, go ahead and form this committee, but you realize that you won't necessarily have call on the resources of the Association; any requests would have to come from the Board."

Well, some of the Board members became concerned with the informal way this committee had sprung up. The concern was on this international migration committee and why this person was chair

and why this composition. So an ad hoc committee was formed to come up with rules. And they basically made what they saw as a distinction between operational committees of the PAA--Finance Committee, Nominating Committee, Public Affairs Committee--and those groups that were more organized around substantive issues--China Study and Exchange or demographers in the business world or state and local government issues--and suggested that they be called interest groups as distinct from committees and that they in the future have to go through a process of submitting to PAA a request to form an interest group and organize it.

That was adopted by the Board and I think many of the persons within the business group and state and locals saw it as a demotion in stature. They had been committees and now they were interest groups, when, I think, from the Board's perspective, it was to formalize how groups form within PAA. There's always this question of sections and it usually comes around to saying, "We're not really big enough to have sections, so people should be able to get together around subject matter interests." That's the purpose of the interest groups.

VDT: Do you think there's a threat that the business and state and local people will break off?

BIANCHI: Well, there has been some concern, particularly of the state and locals, and they may have another opportunity with this new government statistics section formed in the American Statistical Association and they could go there.

Paul Voss--who I must say was a wonderful Board member and truly a useful committee person in PAA--was trying to be an intermediary, I think; be attuned to their concerns but tell them that this wasn't a demotion, to make them interest groups. I get mixed signals about how dissatisfied they are. The current chair of the state and local group, David Swanson, has been less likely than his predecessors to communicate with the Board and to file reports. Hallie Kintner is the chair of business. She's been, on the other hand, very good about collaborating with the Board, keeping the Board informed, very organized. Business demographers in general are a very organized group. They know what they want. When they make a request, they've costed it out; they have their rationale for why it would be good for the PAA to give them whatever it is that they want.

I would be very upset to see either one of those groups leave the PAA. And I am concerned about their level of satisfaction. I have heard that the state and locals were more dissatisfied than the business demographers. I've heard that they were very dissatisfied and then I've heard that only a small subset of them were dissatisfied. I personally think that, more so even than the business demographers, state and locals benefit greatly from their attachment to PAA in terms of methodology, projections, estimations--the expertise of demographers. I think it would be a loss for both sides if they would decide to split from the PAA. And I don't think they would find in the American Statistical Association the substantive knowledge that they need to do their job. They wouldn't get as much input from the annual meeting, for instance, as they get from the PAA. So I would hope they would realize that. And that the PAA Board would continue to be aware of their concerns and make strides to see that the tension doesn't grow so high that they split.

One of the things we've done that is a positive step, I think, is in the selection of the new editor of PAA Affairs to give weight to having somebody who might represent the interests or be well connected to the interests of the state and local community. Signe Wetrogan--who I think will be a good editor anyway--brings an added liaison role with the state and locals [through her estimates and projections work in the Population Division of the Census Bureau]. That was why she was proposed as a person who would be a really good selection for the editorship of PAA Affairs.

BREAK

VDT: We've just had lunch and Suzanne had such interesting observations about combining a career

with raising small children--her daughter, age five, in kindergarten at a local public school, and her son, who's three and goes to a day care center. [Suzanne Bianchi had a third child, a boy, in spring 1990.] You said right now you weren't sure you were doing the best possible job in all areas of your life.

BIANCHI: I was saying that I think that's probably fairly typical of working mothers, to feel like they're not doing a particularly good job some days--most days--when they're at the office and feel guilty about the time they're not giving to their children. You can't focus on one or the other solely. You have to be always juggling. There are times when you leave the office or you're not in because your children are sick and you're not getting work done, you're missing deadlines. There are times when you're missing the school's Halloween party because you're supposed to be at work or at a meeting.

And the child care costs are tremendously expensive. Even women who are paid fairly well, if they look at child care costs as a proportion of their income, they feel like they're working for very little money.

But for me, anyway, I think it's important to take a longer-term perspective. Sometimes right now, I think, "Do I really have a career?" I'm torn between the needs of children and feeling that I'm not doing such a stellar job of what I do professionally. But really we do have careers. Many of the women I know feel like we're staying in--some of us have cut back to part-time--we're holding still; we're not making great strides. But for the time being, that allows us to balance family and career. I guess my perspective is, I'm going to have a lot of years in the labor force and my children are going to grow up relatively quickly and I won't have this. Then it's going to be very important to have other things like my work that are interesting to me, that can consume my energy and time when I have more energy and time. So it's important, at least for me, to hold on right now, try to balance the two, as difficult as that may seem, and hope that in the future when my children don't need me as much, I might still have a fairly good foothold in a career.

VDT: It's a great generation--the first in America--well, in almost any country--that has done it all, managed to handle family responsibilities and continue on with a career.

BIANCHI: Well, some people probably do feel that they're doing it all. But most of us who hear that think. . . Well, on a given day, your child's school just called and you're supposed to go get the child immediately. You have a 2 o'clock appointment that's been set up for three weeks that you're going to have to cancel. You get home and your house is in terrible disarray. And you think, "I'm doing it all? Huh!"

VDT: And it's not your husband that gets called to go pick up the child.

BIANCHI: True. I had an interesting example last week. On the Murch school form, the D.C. public school form, they ask specifically which parent is closer to the school so that if the child gets sick the one who can get there more quickly would be the one called. We filled the forms out; it was clear my husband was the person to be called. But the school nurse called Mother. Actually, then I called Father, who went to pick the sick child up. My husband said, "I'm going to get our son at day care too, because I don't think he's feeling very well." But 20 minutes after the school nurse called me about the older child, the day care center called me and said, "I think you should really come and pick up your son." Again, it was me they called. It's not just the men, it's the caregivers.

I realized this in having a household caregiver. I had an in-home sitter for two years when my children were very young, and typically in Washington, those are immigrant women. Actually, there's a group I'd like to study sometime. I had a friend who was more of a participant observer and I

thought, "Gee, with my demographic approach and her participation, it would be fun." We were into the Jamaican community at that point. Those women want to deal with their female employers, the mother in the family. They shy away from bringing any concerns about raises in salary or job conditions or anything--never would she bring anything up with my husband; always to me. So you end up being the manager of the home, partly because women just do that, take it over, maybe not always trust their husbands to do it well anyway, partially because their husbands are unwilling, but partly also because the kinds of people providing the services or the people at schools tend to come to the mother--have these expectations that the parent to contact is the mother.

VDT: Just as you said, society has not caught up with the reality of mothers in the labor force. They'll have to change that.

Let's go back to PAA. Can you remember the first meeting you attended?

BIANCHI: The first meeting I was aware of but did not attend was the 1976 meeting in Montreal, because I was a teaching assistant with the Detroit Area Study, we were in Detroit interviewing, and the demography students at Michigan wanted to go to the PAA, including the ones who were in Detroit interviewing. So we had to stay in the field an extra week to allow them to take a break to go to the PAA meeting. But the first one I actually attended was Atlanta in 1978 and I don't think I have missed one since then.

VDT: Can you remember Atlanta?

BIANCHI: Very well. I was getting ready to leave Michigan at that point and looking for a job, so part of my reason for attending was to talk to people like Hal Winsborough at Wisconsin, who had the 1940-50 census project--they made the public-use tapes from the 1940 and 1950 censuses--and he was looking for someone. And I remember talking to Linda Waite at that meeting, who was very pregnant with her first child and had left the job I was considering at the Census Bureau, and wanting to find out what it was like to be an employee at the Census Bureau.

I believe Richard Easterlin may have been the president who gave that . . .

VDT: Yes, 1978, that's when he gave his famous address: "What Will 1984 Be Like?" All the young women were going to stay home and have babies when the baby bust generation got to working ages, because there would be more jobs, higher salaries, for younger husbands. Here we're long past 1984 and it hasn't happened. He's changed his views on that--not too much, not entirely; he's still hanging onto them. I interviewed him last May in Los Angeles. What else can you remember about that meeting?

BIANCHI: I remember that the group of us who were graduate students at Michigan felt we couldn't afford to stay in that main hotel; we stayed in a rather divey hotel nearby. I've learned since that it's very important to sell the room block, to stay in the convention hotel. It's important to an association that they guarantee a certain number of rooms to the hotel; you need to have at least that many participants using rooms in the hotel. PAA does that. But in our case, we were looking for an off-site place that was cheaper and I remember walking over to the hotel for the meeting and Atlanta was wonderful; it was spring.

VDT: I just have to tell my hotel-room story from Atlanta. I always go to the Psychosocial Workshop before the PAA meeting and arrive after 9 o'clock or so on the Monday night. So I had marked my reservation that I would arrive at that time and they're supposed to hold it. But they had nothing left but a two-story penthouse suite on the top of that skyscraper hotel, which is where I lived for a week.

The crazy thing was there was this enormous round bed and I sprawled out on it and phoned my husband and said, "Guess where I am?"--and it was our wedding anniversary! [Laughter] I brought all my fellow participants, certainly from the workshop, up to view these magnificent surroundings.

BIANCHI: You probably had a suite better than the president.

VDT: Oh, indeed. What about changes in the meetings over the years, the flavor of the meetings?

BIANCHI: My participation has certainly changed. When I first went, I was much less serious. You went to a few sessions and you met up with old friends and there was much more of the social element. It's still important in that respect, but now as secretary-treasurer, I spend those days working. I'm in meetings pretty much from morning to night and actually attend fewer of the sessions than I did a few years ago. Someone says, "Can you come to the Public Affairs Committee meeting; it's at such-and-such a time?" and you say, "Okay," and don't get a flavor of what's going on in the sessions.

At Pittsburgh in 1983, even though people didn't like Pittsburgh, it was the time that Daphne and I were really starting to think a lot about the monograph. That's probably the meeting where I went to the most sessions. And Pittsburgh was less of a diversion, too, as a city. So for me that was a meeting where I got a lot out of going to sessions, amazingly, partly because we knew what we were looking for and between us we tried to attend all those sessions that related to chapters of the monograph. So that one, surprisingly, was a good meeting.

I enjoyed very much New Orleans [1988]. For one thing, it was very pleasing to me to see Ren Farley finally ascend to the presidency. And it was my first complete year as secretary-treasurer too--I'd come in in the middle of 1987--so I'd worked closely with Ren getting ready for that. That was my first time going through it with the eyes of a secretary-treasurer, seeing all that was involved and observing what Jean Smith at ASA [American Statistical Association] did for the meetings, what was involved in pulling the meeting off. I also thought New Orleans was a wonderful city--a playful city, anyway.

I also enjoyed Baltimore [1989] a lot for the same reason: being very involved as secretary-treasurer and wanting to hear the presidential address, being very interested in what Harriet was going to talk about ["Can We Make Time for Children? The Economy, Work Schedules, and Child Care"].

VDT: Because it was your issue.

BIANCHI: Right. It was an issue that I was keenly aware of, both personally and professionally. And because I'd had by then an opportunity to work with her and begin to appreciate her as a person, as well as someone whose work I've read.

VDT: Let's talk about women in PAA. You, of course, came in after the early 1970s when there was the women's movement in general and the Women's Caucus push for equal rights for women in the profession. Some people felt that women in demography had always done very well.

BIANCHI: Right. People keep pointing out, for instance, that several of our awards are named after women.

VDT: Right. We finally got a Robert Lapham award, the first one named for a man, after the Irene Taeuber, Dorothy Thomas, and Mindel Sheps awards.

So what is your feeling about women in the PAA? Harriet is just completing her tenure as president. She's actually just the seventh woman president in the long history of PAA. There was the long hiatus between the women presidents in the 1950s, Irene Taeuber, Margaret Hagood, and Dorothy

Thomas, and Evelyn Kitagawa in 1977. Evelyn Kitagawa, though I haven't interviewed her yet, I hear explains that as, well, the women had dropped out of higher education and were home raising the baby boomers; she was an exception. Then the next generation were those who were in the wave of increasing enrollment in higher education, which you pointed out so well in your book. What do you think explains the women coming on again, perhaps after a hiatus--in PAA, as an example of a professional organization?

BIANCHI: I don't know. I'm trying to think what the trends were. I assume there are more of us, but I don't know if that's changed so much as a percentage of the membership. I think there are more women that are good scholars and those are the kinds of people likely to be president of PAA and get elected to the Board. To some extent, it's name recognition and name recognition in terms of publications.

It was always interesting to me--not so much lately, but before Jane Menken was elected president and even the year she was president [1985]--that women at a fairly senior level, like Jane, would show up at the Women's Caucus meeting. That suggested that even they felt the need to have a Women's Caucus and be concerned about it. But it's very different with the Women's Caucus and the Sociologists for Women in Society, say. The Women's Caucus of the PAA was always very focused on professional things. When they would get together at the meetings it would be to push for a session on the program, but a session that always turned out to be rigorous in terms of the papers presented. I think the Women in Sociology are more political and more concerned about taking feminist stances on things. The Women in PAA seem like--it's not that they're not feminists, but they're more concerned about being good scholars, and that they also happen to be women and that women are good scholars. More the idea that you prove the worth of women by being very good at what you do.

VDT: Do you think that might be back in the early tradition, the fact that some of the leaders in PAA were women? Of course, there was Margaret Sanger who started PAA, who was not a scholar and she was pushed aside because she was an activist, would muddy the role of scientific research.

BIANCHI: Some would think of that as very conservative. You might describe women in PAA as buying very much into the male tradition of scholarship and what it takes. Personally, I think we're aware that we're women but I think there is a feeling that we have to do good work. It will be interesting to see what perspective you get from Harriet, because she's very much watching whether women are getting elected. For instance, of next year's [1990] slate, many of them are women. Our first vice-president is Linda Waite; our second vice-president is Karen Mason. Several of the new Board members, perhaps three out of four, are women. [For 1990-92: Mary Kritz, Margaret Marini, Beth Soldo--and Robert Willis.]

I served on the Board for a three-year term, 1984 to 1986, prior to becoming secretary-treasurer. Actually, now that I'm remembering this, I probably wouldn't have been there but in part for the fact that I was a woman. When that slate came out of the nominating committee, there was not one woman's name on the Board of Directors slate.

VDT: I remember that. Go on.

BIANCHI: Subsequently, petitions were circulated at the meeting and someone asked if I would be willing to run. I really at the time didn't have a very high expectation that I would win, but I agreed to run, and my name, Nancy Williamson's, and perhaps Susan Watkins--several were added to the slate. Of the four persons elected to the Board that year, I believe three were women. [Bianchi, Watkins, and Williamson. John Bongaarts was the fourth person elected.]

VDT: Women were making a definite statement then. And I think some people think that's still happening. For instance, Harriet Presser ran against Joe Stycos and he's an oldtimer whom everyone thought should have the chance to be president--Harriet would have a chance later--but Harriet won. Well, who's to say? She's a woman; she's popular; more name recognition, I suppose. How can you ballot name recognition?

BIANCHI: Right. There are certainly some very good women who've been on the Board over the six years or so now that I've been on the Board. There are some women I expect to see in the slot for future candidates for president. I would not be surprised to see, for instance, Linda Waite, next year's first vice-president, at some point in the future, or Julie DaVanzo, who's currently [1989] the first vice-president. But we're not the majority of the profession by a long shot.

The thing for me that's always interesting about women is to look at them--especially the ones elected to the presidency or whatever--look at their careers and how did they get to where they are and how did they balance that. Harriet was a single parent of a small child when she went back to graduate school and somehow she . . . I mean, what are their fertility decisions: Do they limit their family size to one, or two? I joke about tenure babies and full-professor babies--the distance between their first child and the second--but frequently it is the case. After you get to be tenured, you have the first child, and five or six years later when you make full professor, you have a second.

I'm also intrigued by examples such as Fran Kobrin Goldscheider or Sara McLanahan, who are women who are very well known and are people who had their children early on and then went back to graduate school and did the professional thing when their children were a bit older and obviously have gotten to the point in their careers where women of the same cohort had gotten. Sara, I would think, compares favorably with anyone in her age cohort, even though others did their careers in a more linear fashion like I did, where you go to school and get your degree and then you go get your job and if you have children, you delay them.

VDT: You think that perhaps they didn't lose anything by taking that time out?

BIANCHI: Yes. On average, I think that women who have their children early don't do as well economically, professionally, whatever, as people who have their children later and have their education earlier, and statistics bear that out. The people like Fran Goldscheider and Sara McLanahan may have been great researchers no matter how they did things. The fact that they're where they are is perhaps because they were much more activated to overcome what for many would have stopped a career, that is, relatively early childbearing.

It's interesting to me to see the many different ways in which women who are likely to play a leadership role in the profession have combined family and careers. I don't think I look at men that way so much, because it doesn't seem like it has to be quite such an issue for men. Although I do pay attention--for younger men, I often ask: "How many children do they have? Are they married? What does their spouse do?"

VDT: That's interesting, how people are coping. That's what I hoped you would talk about, because you are of the younger, leading forces in PAA.

Let's talk about your being secretary-treasurer. I'd like to ask, for instance, about Bob Lapham [secretary-treasurer, 1984-87], whom you followed at the time he was ill. He was ill when in took over in July 1987?

BIANCHI: Yes, he was [died February 20, 1988]. It was incredible, I thought. Bob had been diagnosed as having his brain tumor a year prior, I think. He missed the San Francisco meeting; that spring of 1986 he had started to have seizures. But by that fall of 1986, the November Board meeting,

he was back, fully operational as secretary-treasurer, looking like perhaps he'd beat it. Bob said when he was first diagnosed they said he had at most three years, but it did go into remission. He was still active and energetic and looked great the next spring [1987] when we were in Chicago.

VDT: I remember. He was there with his camera taking pictures.

BIANCHI: Right. I had been asked if I would take over early in that year, 1987, so he had started filling me in on everything so I would see at least the paperwork that came through him and what he did. He was incredibly active. I remember my impression was, "This man is running around, is this what secretary-treasurers have to do?" But he said part of it was the DHS work he was doing. [Lapham was director of the Demographic and Health Surveys at the time of his death.] He was incredibly involved and active.

But we were supposed to have a transfer of the actual files and there was a period when it became a little difficult to get hold of Bob. Then his secretary told me he was back up in New York for another round of surgery; the tumor had started to grow again. He had a period of recovery and then he was clearly going to die. He had hopes of getting into an experimental program at Johns Hopkins, but didn't meet the protocol and was disappointed that summer not to get into that.

After his second round of surgery, he still looked great. In fact, he brought all the files out to me at the Census Bureau in that summer of 1987. He, a man who was at this time dying of cancer, went to great detail to lay out with me a whole list of, "Okay, in January this is what you have to do; in February this is what you have to do." Left me a very detailed list of what were the certain things you had to make sure you tried to attend to in each month of the year, Which is wonderful; I'll probably pass it on with not many changes to my successor. Organized the files; transferred them; did what he could.

It was very sad to meet with him, because he looked fine and yet he clearly had this cancer eating away inside him that was killing him. But he was very devoted to PAA and it seemed very important to him to do an orderly transition.

Then it became--actually, I've since worked fairly closely with his daughter Susan over the establishment of the [Robert Lapham] award--but he had a stroke later that year and was unable to communicate. He'd managed to transfer everything, but was not in good enough health to do anything after that.

I was very impressed by that, given the circumstances that he was in, the way he left things and how much help he gave me in trying to do the transfer. Although, of course, there have been many times when if I could only have called him to ask a question--losing somebody who's that much on top of what's going on in the Association is very difficult. On a couple of things, I've gone back to Jack Goodman [secretary-treasurer, 1981-84], but it's so far removed for Jack that sometimes it's hard for him to be able to guide me as to what was done before.

VDT: Let's talk about what the secretary-treasurer does. Are secretary-treasurers chosen in part because they can get office backup, not just the PAA office, but your own at the Census Bureau?

BIANCHI: Definitely that's a consideration. The institution at which the secretary-treasurer is must contribute, does subsidize the PAA. In my case, it was negotiated with the Census Bureau that this would be a legitimate use of some of my time. I realized that with two small children I wasn't going to be able to do all this PAA work on nights and weekends--in fact, might be able to do a fairly limited amount on nights and weekends. Bill Butz had indicated to the Board that he was willing to have someone at the Census Bureau give time to this, and that's partly why I think they looked to the Census Bureau for someone.

Then also the institution has to provide--you have to have a secretary for certain things, so you

have to have access to somebody else's time. And there are lots of mailings that I would do from the Census Bureau, and Bob and Jack did before me, so that it's not billed directly to the PAA.

So you're definitely looking for someone who can give of their own time but also have some access to support staff and resources to be able to do the work.

VDT: And that's what you have had at the Census Bureau?

BIANCHI: Right, I have had.

VDT: Well, what do you do? Don't go through every month!

BIANCHI: Probably the most important things you do have to do with the two Board meetings [day before the spring annual meeting and in the fall]. You work out with the president the agenda for those meetings. You work with the finance committee chairman to set up an agenda for the finance committee meeting.

VDT: The finance meeting is at the PAA meeting?

BIANCHI: Usually the finance committee meets before and then makes a report at the actual Board meeting. They meet at the same time; same day usually.

You nag everybody to get their reports in; you call; people call you if they have things they want to add to the agenda--that sort of thing. So there are two crunch times of activity before Board meetings, when there may be weeks when you do nothing but PAA, trying to pull all this together.

You are also trying to get the financial statements. Well, we have contracted with the American Statistical Association. They are supposed to provide us with quarterly financial statements, but our accounts have been far behind there. So I have, for instance, this fall spent a lot of time with an outside auditor who was computerizing the accounts and getting everything up to date and providing a ledger for keeping up accounts. So there's a fair amount of time being put into those financial matters and being on top of those.

Then at the beginning of each year, it's important that you make sure that the committees are all in order and that the president knows who to thank because they're leaving and who to appoint, where there are holes, that the award committees are on track--that sort of thing. And typically you're dealing with a new president who has a lot on their mind. They're trying to get a final meeting program together and they're preparing an address. So really the secretary-treasurer is the officer that needs to be on top of what in terms of committee structure and that sort of thing needs to be done and consults with the president, to the extent you can, in making the appointments.

Another important thing is that you handle the counting of the election ballots. The nominating committee gets the candidates and the business office gets the ballots out and serves as the address for receiving them. But the secretary-treasurer has to find . . . My first job as secretary-treasurer--you take over in July--was to get a chair for the ballot counting committee and say, "Call on your friends in the Washington area and get together a group of people who are going to count the ballots."

VDT: The only time I ever worked with Bob Lapham I was on the ballot committee. PRB's office then was close to GW; I counted at GW [George Washington University]. I remember driving home with Bob afterward.

BIANCHI: Well, you know about ballot counting. The secretary-treasurer's job after that is to do the follow-up on that. To call the current president and tell them who won and call the winners and losers of the officers, so that they hear it first from you. And then to send out the notices of who's won.

VDT: Do you know who won for next year?

BIANCHI: It should have been in PAA Affairs, which is not out. Ron Rindfuss is to be president [for 1991].

VDT: That means Paul Schultz has lost a second time, I'm sorry to hear.

BIANCHI: You hate to make those calls. It's pleasant to call the winners. I don't like calling the losers, but it's important, I think, that they hear it first from those who counted the ballots.

Things come up with the business office. Many of the routine things are handled by the American Statistical Association office, through Jean Smith. But things come up and correspondence gets referred to the secretary-treasurer and you have to handle that.

VDT: What have been some of the leading issues while you have been secretary-treasurer?

BIANCHI: Currently, the most important issue is our future governance.

VDT: What does governance mean?

BIANCHI: Our organizational structure, I guess. The American Statistical Association no longer wishes to provide the management of the business affairs of the PAA. I would say that prior to their indicating that, one of the issues for the PAA had already become--actually, we had an ad hoc committee looking into that--how we were organized and whether that was satisfactory for getting done all the things we want to get done.

There is, I think, growing concern--on my part, certainly, after having been secretary-treasurer now for almost three years--but on the part of many others about operating an association that is still relatively small in size but does a lot of things with an all-volunteer set of officers and Board members and committee members. There's only so much that people can do on a volunteer basis, even if they have some agreement with their main employer to use some of their time to do PAA work. So there had been a committee looking into whether we needed some sort of staff person, at least on a part-time basis.

There's a feeling that there's a lot of things that we can't do. For example, it's been pointed out to us that there may be money in foundations for an outreach effort to minorities in the U.S. There are very few black, in particular, and Hispanic minorities. But with the current organizational setup, there's really no way to easily manage some sort of outreach to minorities program. And you certainly don't want to go to foundations for money unless you know how you can spend it. It's been a continuing problem with the money we do get from the Hewlett Foundation, the lack of a person who has the time to really coordinate the outreach efforts that we have. We do have some money from Hewlett for outreach to LDCs.

VDT: How do you use that?

BIANCHI: It's not a lot of money. It was supposedly to provide subsidized subscriptions to Demography--which we do. This year we've also subsidized membership renewals for members that are in LDCs. Managing that money, which is a fairly small amount, has been one of the most time-consuming parts of my job. It hasn't been done very well and it's because you don't have the time to really get on top of it. So there was the feeling that if we had somebody who was at least a part-time staff person, who could begin to network with other associations, find out what they're doing on certain

issues, we might be able to get grant money and manage some of these extra programs that would be desirable.

Now all that has been thrown up in the air with the need of PAA to just get a transfer to some other association or to hire paid staff, whatever, to manage its business affairs.

VDT: The business affairs consist of reminding people to renew, making arrangements with hotels for the meetings, that kind of thing?

BIANCHI: Yes that, and serving as a general contractor for handling of publications, copyediting, and seeing that they get printed and mailed and keeping the financial accounts. And with AStatA no longer wanting to do that and wanting to be rid of us fairly quickly . . . They say they would be just as pleased to be done with us by the end of the year, but I think Barbara Bailar will carry us through the end of the year.

VDT: Barbara Bailar is now the head [executive-director] of ASA and she's sort of cleaning things up. Do you think she was instrumental in this move to push out extraneous work?

BIANCHI: We're trying to figure out what's going on. As she put it to us, ASA was not doing a very good job of managing their own affairs and they want to concentrate on their own affairs. If it were just a matter of money, that we weren't paying them enough for the services they were providing, they could ask for money. But they have made the decision to phase us out of their operations. I have the feeling there may be some inter-personal things going on, political things within the ASA, and we may just be part of the fallout. Yes, but consequently we are in this position of having to find, or decide on, another way of managing the affairs of the Association.

VDT: Well, it will be interesting to see how that works out. It's obviously another watershed, as was the time when Ed Bisgyer [former manager of PAA business affairs at ASA] and Andy Lunde got together back in the late 1960s [1966] and PAA finally had one paid outlet to do its work. [See, Anders Lunde, "How Ed Bisgyer and ASA Rescued PAA from its Business Morass," Vignettes of PAA History, PAA Affairs, Spring 1985.]

BIANCHI: That's right--from a totally all-volunteer effort that was doing everything. There the paid thing was to contract to another association. But we may be moving to the point where we have to decide whether we want somebody on the order of an executive officer or secretary or someone to pay attention to our affairs.

VDT: More like the big professional associations--American Statistical Association itself or the American Sociological Association?

BIANCHI: Right.

VDT: PAA is still rather small compared to these other professional associations.

BIANCHI: That's the problem, I think; we are rather small. At least until now, we've had inexpensive dues, relative to some organization like the American Sociological Association.

VDT: How much are they--much more than PAA?

BIANCHI: Oh, yes. They're graduated, but you fairly quickly get to the highest income category and

that's \$150 [per year].

If we went on our own, we could only afford a person or a person and a half, or something; I've talked about this to some of the associations. Then when that person leaves, you've lost the person who's doing everything for the association. So we are on the small side to go it alone, although there are some who feel we need to begin to have that. I think that's why we stayed with AStatA so long, even when sometimes some of the services they were providing left something to be desired--for example, the latest [1989] membership directory, which has all the mistakes in it.

VDT: I understand 30 percent of the phone numbers are wrong.

BIANCHI: Right, and trying to hassle with who's going to pay to reprint that directory.

VDT: Oh, you might do that?

BIANCHI: Yes, the intention is to re-issue.

VDT: Everybody would get a second issue--it's that bad?

BIANCHI: It's dreadful.

VDT: And it was very late to begin with, wasn't it?

BIANCHI: Right. So there've been a lot of things about the service that we're getting from the American Statistical Association that has been, I'd say, sub-optimal. But we're a conservative organization; PAA is risk-averse to making changes, I think. Perhaps we needed them to kick us out to move us in a direction . . .

We may have a rough couple of years, trying to get something else in place, getting that worked out. And I'm concerned at this point that we're going to have a substantial dues increase [\$45 to \$70] and that we'll lose members [which did not happen]. And we certainly have to make the membership aware of why we're taking the steps we are, and that takes time to do that. So these things consume me. But my hope would be that after a couple of years that perhaps we would have an association that is better run than it seems to have been in the past couple of years. Then we might be in a position to think about the things that we're not doing.

VDT: What would you like to change about PAA? You have to change the governance. You say there are more things PAA should get into. You mentioned the Hewlett money that's supposed to go to LDCs and that there could be more outreach to get more black and Hispanic demographers. Just to encourage more Hispanics and blacks to go into demography in the first place?

BIANCHI: Right. I think it's necessary to start at the undergraduate level. I see several sets of ideas about outreach either to developing countries or to U.S. minorities and the Board says those would be really desirable things to do as a profession and as an association. But I don't see us being in a position to be able to do those things without some sort of paid part-time staff person.

On the other hand, I'm not totally sure what the majority of the membership wants. I also think that more attention needs to be given, or it would be desirable to give more attention, to the interest groups we have, what we were discussing earlier, the business and state and local demography groups. Right now their main point of contact is through the secretary-treasurer and the reports they file with the Board twice a year.

VDT: You mean the main connection with all the committees is simply these reports?

BIANCHI: Yes. And I guess if someone had more time and energy, there could probably be better use made of the expertise within these committees and interest groups and certainly more effort made to liaison with them and keep the pulse on them.

I'm feeling a little bit overwhelmed by the amount of things there are to do that now tend to reside primarily in the secretary-treasurer, who is not paid by the PAA to do those things.

VDT: Give me an example of one of those.

BIANCHI: Well, an example is that I have spent every day since the beginning of October with the majority, or at least an hour or two, of my time consumed by matters having to do with PAA. Now this is unusual, in that we're going through this crisis. In October before the Board meeting, I did virtually no Census Bureau work. Part of it has been intensified this fall by AStatA saying they weren't going to continue with us. Right now there are a set of things. I need to find a lockbox for our accounts, for instance, which requires calling around to banks and seeing what the services are and what the relative costs are. There are a set of administrative things as well as more substantive things that it's almost impossible, I think, for an all-volunteer set of officers to do, other than what's the most critical. You can't do all of them. You start to make decisions.

One of the things Bob Lapham wanted to do and then he became too sick--there's been this continuing problem that there's a small amount of money in the Hewlett grant for outreach to LDCs which we have a hard time spending. Bob was going to devise, based on his experience of three years, guidelines for what he thought was most needed and how we might best spend that money, and then he was never able to get to it. Another thing the secretary-treasurer does once a term is we apply to Hewlett for money because that money helps support part of our work with the Population Resource Center. It provides the money for the travel grants for members to go to the IUSSP meetings. I have found that although there are lots of good ideas for how to spend the Hewlett outreach funds, it's not as easy as it might seem and I have to worry about that. What I may suggest, actually, is that I continue to worry about that after leaving as secretary-treasurer. You almost need some time in the role to learn what the Hewlett money is spent for and what the application procedure is. That's an example of something that's not getting enough attention and even raises the question of whether we should be asking Hewlett for money for that activity. It's not that we lack ideas of how to spend the money, it's that we lack the time and structure to get a program off the ground and get it operational.

VDT: It's good to have that on record. We'll see what the future holds, how things will change. Is the membership still just around 2,600?

BIANCHI: Around 2,700 [2,679 at end 1989]. It hasn't really grown.

VDT: No, it's fluctuated about there since the mid-1970s. Why do you suppose that is?

BIANCHI: I don't think we've made a tremendous effort. I think if we wanted to grow, we could do a lot more in the way of membership recruitment and marketing. Those are a couple of other areas where, if we had a paid staff attention, we might pay more attention to what we do in terms of membership recruitment. We might pay more attention to liaison with the media and promoting articles in Demography or the annual meeting papers.

VDT: That hasn't been done since the 1981 meeting. Cynthia Green and I manned a press office and we got some coverage, as you know.

BIANCHI: That's typical, I think. Occasionally, when there are individuals who are willing to put in the time and energy, we do something. But there wasn't something that kept that going.

VDT: No, that was the 50th anniversary meeting and we were in Washington, so we wanted to do that. I thought Gordon De Jong was going to issue more press releases for Demography.

BIANCHI: Gordon is. One possibility is to go to Hewlett, which is a foundation that funds outreach and education, and ask them to help support someone to help with the four issues of Demography and the annual meeting, presenting in a readable fashion what some of the highlights are. But that remains to be seen.

VDT: You're going to have to go pick up your daughter. A couple of final questions. Do you have your successor as secretary-treasurer lined up?

BIANCHI: No, we don't; we're working on it. Because this ad hoc committee was coming in with a recommendation, I was waiting to see what the secretary-treasurer's job might look like in the future.

VDT: Ad hoc committee?

BIANCHI: There was an ad hoc committee, chaired by Jeff Evans, to look into the organizational structure of PAA. It was formed last spring and they came with a report to the Board. Actually, they had moved in the direction of recommending that we keep our business arrangement with the AStatA--this was before AStatA said they wouldn't do it--but that the next secretary-treasurer might be sort of an executive officer where at least 20 percent of their time was paid. We may enlarge it so it wasn't just the Washington area. Right now, the secretary-treasurer tends to get selected from those willing to do it in the Washington area, because of the business office. Start to move slowly in the direction of having a paid staff person, but with the understanding that there would be areas in which we weren't doing what we wanted to do and that person would begin to move in that direction.

VDT: But that's been on hold, since there's this practical matter of who's going to do the business management?

BIANCHI: Right. So I wanted to see what happened. It's hard to approach somebody and say, "Would you be secretary-treasurer?," when you weren't quite sure what you were approaching them with. I'm still not quite sure, but Harriet and I are starting to pinpoint people in the Washington area that might be receptive to being considered. And I'll probably approach them with, "Look, this is what my job consists of. I think you have to assume that we'll replace AStatA with something and your job will look the same, but you won't be dealing with the American Statistical Association."

VDT: One last thing. Why is it that the business [annual membership] meetings are so poorly attended now? Aren't people interested in the workings of PAA? Now, you obviously are and there is a core group of you who are.

BIANCHI: Is your impression that they were much better attended in the past?

VDT: Oh, yes. But . . . I've asked this question of several and they point out that in the early 1970s, just before you came in, there were some hot issues--the women's issue, resolutions on abortion. I've just been transcribing Dudley Duncan's interview. He said he and Beverly walked out of PAA about

that time because those meetings were getting too political, but at least it meant there was a terrific turnout at the business meetings.

BIANCHI: Perhaps if there was a big issue on our organizational structure and management to be decided there might be a big turnout. [Prior to the constitutional revision of 1974, PAA policy could be decided by vote by members present at the business meeting during the annual meeting. "Hot" issues of the late 1960s and early 1970s--abortion, women's rights, U.S. family planning aid--raised by members, e.g., the "Concerned Demographers," at the business meetings led to some "free-for-alls," as Larry Bumpass described it in his interview. Concern about "packing of the galleries" for votes that could then determine PAA policy led to changes instituted in 1974. The "business" meeting, now formally "a general membership meeting," is designated as "a forum for open discussion of the affairs of the Association," but policy--including policy on strictly PAA affairs, such as the Association's structure and management--is decided by the Board or mail referendum of the members.]

VDT: Why are there not more people who are interested in the workings of PAA?

BIANCHI: I don't know. I don't know if they're more diverse or more loosely attached. If they're more loosely attached, we may lose more of them because of the dues increase.

VDT: Maybe they're loosely attached to the profession too.

BIANCHI: That could be. In some sense, what goes on in the business meeting could, I guess, be considered fairly dull. Or maybe people feel they sort of know it anyway. I must confess I tended not to attend business meetings until fairly recently.

I think for a lot of the membership, they feel like they're basically getting what they want out of PAA. They're getting the journal, the newsletter, a decent annual meeting, and things are running well. That's fine with them. That's the involvement they care to have with the Association. That's understandable. They came to the meeting to see their friends, talk to their colleagues, not to attend business meetings. As long as they can be sure that the business is basically being taken care of . . .

VDT: And thank goodness, it is--as it has been, very well, in the last three years. I think that's a good place to end, Suzanne.

Thank you very much. Now you have to go to your family home.

[Continued] I've just asked Suzanne what her working day now is.

BIANCHI: I was working full-time until recently. With children, I've switched to part-time.

VDT: You were working full-time?

BIANCHI: I went in early. I went in at 7, 7:30, to 3:30.

VDT: Phew! Your husband looked after the children in the morning?

BIANCHI: My husband gets the children where they have to be in the morning. He's better able to deal with little people in the morning than I am. I basically get dressed and get out of the house and get to work.

VDT: What time do you leave for work?

BIANCHI: I try to leave by 6:30; it's 6:30, a quarter to seven.

VDT: That means you're getting up at . . .

BIANCHI: I don't spend a lot of time getting ready these days. I'm getting up 5:30, quarter to six.

VDT: Oh boy!

BIANCHI: Now since this need to pick up Jennie in kindergarten, I have been leaving the office instead of--a normal workday would be leaving at 3:30 or 4--but I've been leaving more like 2, around 2 o'clock or a little after, to pick her up.

VDT: You come in at 7 and leave at 2.

BARBARA FOLEY WILSON

PAA Secretary-Treasurer in 1990-93 (No. 20). Interview with Jean van der Tak at Barbara's home in Bethesda, Maryland, August 4, 1993.

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS: Barbara Foley Wilson was born and grew up in Yonkers, New York. She obtained the A.B. in psychology from Barnard College in 1956. After working to put her psychiatrist husband Paul through medical school, producing three baby boomers (born in 1961, 1963, and 1964), and years of voluntary work, she returned to university and received the M.A. in demography from Georgetown University in 1974. In the same year, she was employed as a demographer in the Marriage and Divorce Statistics Branch of the Division of Vital Statistics of the National Center for Health Statistics. Remaining in that role ever since, she has become a well-known authority on marriage and divorce statistics, frequently quoted in the press. Her publications on marriage and divorce include many annual and special reports for NCHS and articles in such journals as *American Demographics* and the *Journal of Family Issues*.

VDT [Excerpts from interview introduction]: Barbara completed her three-year term as PAA Secretary-Treasurer at the end of June [1993]. She has been a strong supporter of my work and that of my predecessor as PAA historian, Anders Lunde, on the PAA oral history project. However, she missed out on being included in *Demographic Destinies*, the collection of interviews from that project, with PAA presidents and secretary-treasurers, which came out in June 1991, when she was just completing her first year as Secretary-Treasurer. So I'm very pleased that you have agreed to this interview, Barbara, which will be a supplement to *Demographic Destinies*.

For my introductory background on Barbara, I was lucky to have a "Spotlight" profile on her which appeared in a recent issue of the in-house staff publication of the National Center for Health Statistics, where Barbara has been the expert on marriage and divorce since 1974.

Barbara was born and grew up in Yonkers, north of New York City on the Hudson River. A lovely tidbit I picked up from your profile is that in the summers, your family lived on a boat moored in Long Island Sound, so that meant that your dates in high school years had to be willing to row you home at midnight!

In her junior year at Barnard College, she married Paul Wilson, a Columbia graduate, and when he was drafted into the army, she commuted to Barnard from their post in Fort Monmouth, New Jersey. I gather there was no break in your college career; you got married and went right on?

WILSON: I got married on Saturday and got to my 9 a.m. class on Monday. It was in economics.

VDT: Wonderful! After Paul's army stint, she worked while Paul attended medical school, first teaching English and science at a private school in Yonkers and then as secretary to a biochemist at Rockefeller University. They moved to Chicago, where Paul did his internship, and their first child, Patricia, was born there in 1961. Paul did his residency in psychiatry in Ann Arbor, Michigan, and their other two baby boomers, Andrea and James, were born there in 1963 and 1964. You certainly did have perfect baby boomers--1961, 63, and 64, the last official year.

WILSON: It's easy for me to remember the dates of the baby boom.

VDT: In 1965 Paul joined the American Psychiatric Association and they moved to Bethesda, Maryland, where they have lived ever since.

After several years as a homemaker and community volunteer, Barbara decided to return to university and enrolled in the master's program in demography at Georgetown University in 1972--and

she'll tell us why she chose demography--completing her degree in 1974. In the same year, she was hired by John Patterson, head of the Division of Vital Statistics of the National Center for Health Statistics, as a statistician in the Marriage and Divorce Statistics Branch of NCHS, and she has remained there ever since.

Barbara has become known nationwide, I'd say, as "Mrs. Marriage and Divorce Statistics" for the U.S. She is frequently quoted in the media on marriage and divorce statistics. She has been the author of NCHS's annual reports on marriage statistics, the *Advance Report of Final Marriage Statistics*, for 15 years. The last one I could find covered 1988. Is that the last one; are you working on the next?

WILSON: [Laughter] I will tell you, if you want to know.

VDT: Okay. That is dated 1991, although the PRB [Population Reference Bureau] copy is stamped 1992.

And you did the comparable divorce report for 1987. Presumably others are responsible for divorce?

WILSON: Well, alternatively. We do one and then the other. At least right now.

VDT: We can get onto that too. She has done a number of special reports on marriage and divorce for NCHS's publication series Number 21. She has given papers at meetings of PAA, the American Statistical Association, the American Public Health Association, the Gerontological Society, and the Southern Regional Demographic Group, now the Southern Demographic Association. And she is author or coauthor of some five lively articles on marriage and divorce appearing in *American Demographics* since 1984 and one in the *Journal of Family Issues*.

Now, Barbara, after all that, what led to your interest in demography and your decision to enter the master's program at Georgetown? I've always been interested in your career because we were very similar. With small children, three baby boomers apiece, we decided to go back to university. I think we were sort of the leading generation of baby boom mothers who decided that mothering was not enough, or staying at home and volunteering was not enough. You entered the Georgetown program two years after I finished it.

WILSON: Actually, you are part of the reason that I was accepted there.

VDT: I am! Meaning, the old ladies--the old mothers--could do it?

WILSON: That was it; I'm sure that was in their minds.

When the women's movement took hold, it became really apparent that things were changing. I had always vaguely anticipated going back to work. I didn't know precisely what I wanted to do; I thought it would be psychology.

I went to the Widening Horizons for Women and took a whole battery of tests, heard a whole lot of people. The counselor looked at my battery of tests and said, "Oh, my dear, you can do anything." Which, of course, was nonsense, absolute nonsense! I was a mother and I had no intention of not being here--not putting that role first.

VDT: You mean not being back home every night?

WILSON: I mean I couldn't do things that took me away from coming home at night. As far as I was concerned, I couldn't do *anything*. I couldn't be a ballet dancer; I couldn't travel every day; there were

a lot of things I couldn't do.

Dr. Gordon gave a talk about geography and I decided I wanted to be a geographer.

VDT: Dr. Gordon?

WILSON: One of the chaps who talked to the Widening Horizons for Women. I went there with another housewife. She was a sociologist and we said we wanted to be geographers and he said, "No, don't do that; we're only 7000 people, we don't need you." And he said, "Be a demographer. John Macisco says there are jobs for demographers."

VDT: This is the Dr. Gordon who spoke on geography?

WILSON: Yes, and he just said flat out, "Don't be a geographer; be a demographer." And I said, "What's demographer?" My friend said, "Oh, pooh, I don't want to do that. That's boring." The last time I saw her, she was still a housewife.

I followed up. Right after that discussion, there on the classroom door was a notice about a seminar on how to get into graduate school and next to it was a notice about Georgetown's demography program, and things fell into place. I went and saw *the* John Macisco, who was just very warm--a lovely man. He accepted me into the program, and then promptly went away to Fordham, leaving the rest of the staff to cope with me. I think they might have been a little nonplused, because there were a few of the little hurdles that I hadn't quite leaped through in the right order. But that did mean that I moved immediately into the program, the following fall.

VDT: The fall of 1972?

WILSON: Yes. It was a two-year program at that time, so I graduated in 1974.

I know that the reason that John Macisco and the others felt confident was that you really had aced that program. They were so pleased at your success that they just felt, "So she's a housewife now, but she can be anything later." [Laughter]

VDT: You went back full time? You took four courses a semester?

WILSON: I don't remember.

VDT: Did you do a thesis?

WILSON: I didn't have to because I took an extra course. And enjoyed that course a lot; that was migration with Henry Shryock. I had to do a paper.

VDT: A long paper.

WILSON: A long paper. And that paper, in fact, was finished in no time, because I can remember the paper was due and the school closed because of the snow. It was a snow holiday, so my children were home. They would go out and sled and then get wet and cold and come home in a half hour and need to be dried off and fed and dressed in dry clothes and sent out the door again. So I did this about three times with my son, who was eight. I can remember pulling off his boots and pulling down the red socks, which of course put me nose to nose with him because he was standing there in front of me, and he said, "Mrs. Coupard is at the top of the hill, giving out hot chocolate, and Mrs. Davis is at the bottom of the hill handing out home-baked bread, and all you do is type that paper!"

VDT: That sounds very familiar. What was that long paper on?

WILSON: That was return migration to the South by Negroes, in the 1970 census. I worked hard, did all the calculations by hand on shelf paper, and wrote in different colors. Well, Henry Shryock liked the paper and wrote in the margin, "This is very interesting. I think you should publish it." And I felt immensely pleased.

VDT: And did you?

WILSON: I got home and the rabbit had eaten the calculations for all of North Carolina and half of South Carolina. [Laughter]

VDT: Your only copy!

WILSON: My only copy, all handwritten notes with colored pencils. It wasn't on the floor but it was on the shelf at knee height and the rabbit got up there--my daughter's rabbit named Fido--and Fido ate North Carolina and South Carolina. And I never had the heart to go back and do all that work again.

VDT: Of course, now it would have been on the computer; this was before computers.

Well, you've answered one question I had: Did you feel any discrimination against you as an "older" woman. But you have just complimented me and said there was this older woman ahead of you.

WILSON: The people in the class were wonderful. I still am so fond of those people. I certainly was the oldest, and I thought if I just didn't talk about it nobody would know. I bought a pair of jeans and a jean jacket. So I would go down to Georgetown in my jeans and my jean jacket and nobody said anything, until the second year and Gary Lewis--wonderful, warm person--would talk to the class about distributions, skewed distributions. Of course, by that time we were all very familiar with the normal distribution and what a graph would look like. And he was on the left side of the room and he gesticulated with a big sweeping arm over to the right side of the room--I always sat in that last seat by the door on the righthand side--and he swept over and said, "And the distribution skewed by age," and ended up pointing at me. That was the first time I realized I didn't really fool anyone about my age.

VDT: Great! This is Gary Lewis who was in Kenya for a while and is now working on his own?

WILSON: Yes.

VDT: I was going to ask about some of the other students. Gary Lewis was there.

WILSON: Chris Bachrach, Bill Mosher, Lynne Heltman, Bill Deutermann, Juan Shoemaker, Mary Healy, and then Father Francis Abel. I remember after migration class, we used to go down to the Georgetown bar called The Tombs, which was just across the street, and buy ourselves a pitcher and we would talk about demography and the meaning of life and philosophy--and had the best time. Really enjoying talking about migration and fertility and all these subjects. It was wonderful fun! It was a good gang.

VDT: Who were your special professors, besides John Macisco, who left?

WILSON: John wasn't there, but Murray Gendell in fertility, of course. Naturally to a housewife and a mother, fertility was extremely interesting. Dorothy Thomas was there and had seminars at her house; it was wonderful. She'd have incredible people come and visit and talk to us.

VDT: She was still doing that? Everyone who was at Penn in Dorothy's time has raved about her mothering and her interest in her students. And though she was technically retired, she came to Georgetown, and she did the same with you?

WILSON: She was terrific. That was when I got to know Everett Lee. He came as a guest speaker--such a nice person, as is his wife Anne. And then Irene Taeuber was there and, of course, really intimidated me because she was so fierce about what she knew. And Con Taeuber had a seminar that I took and then he brought in everybody. Every week there would be some other incredibly famous person talking to us--famous if you know demography. It was fascinating!

VDT: Do you think that Georgetown, that program, was good preparation for your later work at NCHS?

WILSON: For me it was. I moved right into Vital Statistics, Marriage and Divorce. Everything that we did in that branch was something that Jay Siegel had taught me to do on Saturday mornings.

VDT: *Methods and Materials of Demography* had just come out?

WILSON: That was our textbook, if you can imagine, those two humongous volumes, and Jay taught from that. I have wonderful margin notes from that. He talked a great deal and I have his comments on every different little test. I still have my books; you can bet I'll never part with them. So I read them every now and then and get a smile.

In fact, I have one of the copies that was finally withdrawn because there's an illegal table in there that Paul Jacobson had never given permission for. Shryock and Siegel had written him repeatedly and he never answered. After they went ahead and published it, Jacobson took umbrage and made them withdraw the table. Then two people, Alex Plateris and Bob Armstrong, made a substitute table that was put in subsequent editions of the book. The earlier edition had to be called back.

VDT: I never heard that story!

It's good to hear you sounding so excited about Georgetown because there was a period in there, a bit later, when they thought it should be turned into a Ph.D. program, interdisciplinary, and that never happened. Yet I always thought Georgetown was a good program in itself for what most of us who came out of it did. Many going into government, in my case a nonprofit organization [Population Reference Bureau]. What do you think about that?

WILSON: You mean, should Georgetown have a Ph.D. program?

VDT: Well, yes.

WILSON: I think the master's degree program served us very well. I realize the world has changed a lot and that master's degree program has also had to change. I think it has adapted. My colleague is now in that program.

VDT: Who?

WILSON: I work with Sally Cunningham Clark, and she is now working her way through that program. She works very full time, but she's also taking courses at Georgetown. She had a bachelor's degree; worked for the Census Bureau; they trained her in surveys, and then she took a job at NCHS. She didn't have any demography at all and is now gradually picking that up.

VDT: What does she think of the program now?

WILSON: She finds it extremely interesting. She's had a couple of courses with Maxine Weinstein. I can see that she's learned a lot. She's also taking a couple of courses at the University of Maryland and had Joan Kahn there. That was a good course for her too.

Do I think Georgetown should have a Ph.D. program? I suppose yes, if they want it. But this other program serves a lot of people very well.

VDT: And do you feel, as I do, that one of its great benefits is the networking? It's here in Washington, many people work for the government, and there's a tremendous camaraderie among Georgetown graduates. We seem to be everywhere.

WILSON: Yes. And, of course, a lot of them--Bill Mosher, Chris Bachrach--went on to get their Ph.D.

VDT: Betsy Stephen, who has gone back to Georgetown and is on the faculty.

WILSON: That's right. Did she take her degree at Georgetown?

VDT: Yes, her master's there, then she went to Duke.

Now let's move on to NCHS. In the profile, you mentioned that just before graduating, you went to a PAA meeting. Could that have been New York, in 1974?

WILSON: Yes.

VDT: Okay. And you met Mary Grace Kovar and she filled you in on NCHS and that's where you went. Is that it?

WILSON: That's right. Mary Grace was at the meeting and I think she may have even been Secretary-Treasurer at that time.

VDT: No, she was Secretary-Treasurer from 1975 to 78.

WILSON: Okay. Well, everybody told me I had to talk to Mary Grace. And certainly Anders Lunde, who was at NCHS--a wonderful man, so supportive.

VDT: You met him at that first PAA meeting, you think?

WILSON: Oh, yes. And at NCHS. And he told me, "You absolutely must talk to Mary Grace." And, of course, Mary Grace gave me an analysis of NCHS, how it operated, where the opportunities were, who were the important people involved, and just laid it out for me. The two of us were in a little side room in the hotel, and she did her usual thorough job of describing for me.

I know that I actually took one of the jobs that she thought wasn't the best one. But it was right for me. It wouldn't have been her choice.

VDT: Which job are you talking about now?

WILSON: The marriage and divorce one.

VDT: When did you go and interview with John Patterson?

WILSON: At the same meeting. It was whenever the PAA meeting was--the spring.

VDT: It happened in April that year.

WILSON: Okay. I wanted to work for NCHS. It was close to home.

VDT: It was on Parklawn Drive in Rockville at that time.

WILSON: Yes, and Rockville is really close to Bethesda, so that was obviously a good place to go to work for.

John Patterson was in a session [at the PAA meeting] and I tapped on his shoulder and said, "I'm interested in a job." And he said, "Make an appointment." And that was really it. I made an appointment. He talked to me very briefly and it was all lined up. Of course, the wheels of the government grind slowly, so it took a while. But that was okay because I was still finishing up at Georgetown.

VDT: There *was* a job in Marriage and Divorce?

WILSON: There was a job, and it's been exactly the right job for me.

VDT: Why has it been? You've stayed ever since.

WILSON: I have stayed ever since; it's 19 years today.

VDT: Today!

WILSON: And, incidentally, today John Patterson announced his retirement.

VDT: Oh, only now. I hadn't heard of John for some years, so I wasn't sure if he was still there.

WILSON: Forty years in the government.

VDT: He goes way back in demography to the Growth of American Families Studies [1955 and 1960].

WILSON: Right.

VDT: Why *have* you stayed? You said in your Spotlight profile it [marriage and divorce] is "intrinsically interesting."

WILSON: I think it is, absolutely. Even when I'm just looking at the numbers, they always represent all of the drama of couples trying to make a marriage work and starting out life together. And, of

course, I talk to reporters and students all day long. And I very often talk to men who want to write books about divorce, because they're going through a divorce and they're going to write a definitive description of how to do it, how not to do it, what it means, how to get through it, how to pay for it.

I finally decided that that's what men do. If they have a problem, they attack it with their thinking powers and to think you need data, so they call me up for data. Typically, they sound very demanding at first and very authoritative. Then when I listen to the questions, after I get over being intimidated, I realize they don't know what they're talking about; they're asking for things that aren't logical. Then I can relax and start to explore what they're really trying to do; they're trying to understand what's happened to themselves. Some of them then turn the information into very good books, and I think one man made a very large amount of money on one of these books.

Certainly a lot of people I talk to are writing books. And they usually write books--and this is men *and* women--about their own experiences: older women loving younger men; couple therapy; adult children of divorce.

It's not just our own data that I'm giving people. It's other people's information, often. I've referred them to Larry Bumpass so often he wants to change his phone number, sometimes! People who call are very often not just asking for our data; they're asking much broader questions that our data do not address. So then I just put them into the network.

VDT: Great. Incidentally, you said the men who are writing books on divorce. Don't women write them?

WILSON: There's one woman who has a couple of books; she has a handbook of divorce. But typically these are men. What women tend to do is write books on how to deal with the emotional aspects of divorce. The men are much more practical about it, so it is different.

VDT: And you are the practical, statistical person to begin with.

WILSON: That's where people start. And sometimes they just need to talk to someone.

VDT: Do you think, being a woman, you have a special interest in statistics on marriage and divorce?

WILSON: Absolutely. But we all do in DVS, in Vital Statistics. I work closely with Stephanie Ventura, who does the birth statistics, and Selma Taffel.

VDT: Who?

WILSON: Selma Taffel. She has lowered the Caesarean section rate in the United States, by just looking at the numbers and saying again and again, "How can we explain this, except for the wrong reasons?" She has made this persistent observation that forced people to evaluate what they were doing. And she's doing the same thing about weight gain. That's because she, as a woman, when she was having her children was dealt with badly about gaining weight in pregnancy--as we all were.

I don't talk to people in mortality as much because they are physically separated. I talk to people in [National Survey of] Family Growth.

Sure, we're all interested; it's not far from our lives to our statistics.

VDT: Very good way to put it.

And you have shown that in your writings. For instance, I have here the article you had in *American Demographics* [October 1991], "The Marry-Go-Round." You had this fascinating chart. I had of course seen the article before; I went back to it. I'm a bit confused on it; how life evolves

through the different stages until we end up with death. Did you think up this chart yourself?

WILSON: I think so. I have to say that that's the most creative thing I've done. The little drawings on it are precious; I didn't do those. I had it as a much more basic flow chart. What I was trying to do was to reconcile vital statistics with census data. They don't balance; they never add up. You always come up with large differences between the two data sets that need to be explained.

VDT: The differences between the number of marriages that take place in a year and the number of people in the marriage status, or something?

WILSON: Yes. The change in the number of married people never equals the addition of marriages, the subtraction of divorces, and the subtraction of deaths.

VDT: You're talking about the decennial census or also the Current Population Survey?

WILSON: The Current Population Survey in general, but the decennial census does the same thing.

You can't make the numbers work but, of course, they should at some level. You have to explain the number of married couples by the number of people who get married and who get divorced and who don't.

This circular pattern was something I worked on for a year or so, refining and refining it. First to establish that the numbers are just not going to add up. The number of married women does not equal the number of married men, to begin with.

VDT: True, although you have women age 42, in this case, and men age 45.

WILSON: Those are the median ages of wives and husbands. But if you check, the number of married women does not equal the number of married men.

VDT: Some women say they're married when they are not?

WILSON: Or some men are married to more than one woman. It's probably true for both sexes, but more bigamy for men than for women.

Then when people are separated, they'll say they're married but separated. The Census Bureau doesn't try to make those numbers agree--the "married but separated" category--and they never do agree. Perhaps the married-but-separated men are dying more rapidly than the women realize and they think their husband is still alive. I mean, there are all sorts of explanations.

The earlier suspicion was that women were lying; they were embarrassed about being unwed mothers so they lie to cover up and say they're married. That was always the assumption by the early demographers. But the more I look at these data the more I'm convinced that you just have men getting married more than once, without having been divorced.

VDT: Interesting--in the U.S.! I can see your enthusiasm; it's just oozing out of you!

I have a question here on do you enjoy working with the media. You said that in passing.

WILSON: They're very good to me. When I first got there, certainly I had been warned that the media misquote you and like to make you look foolish. I haven't found that to be the case. I've been *extremely* well treated by the media. If I say things like, "Please, when you're finished, clean up my syntax. If you're going to quote me, at least make sure that I sound grammatically correct." Then they do that. I hate to see a direct quote that ends up with "sic." [Laughter]

VDT: Good point.

And there was never any question at NCHS that you should be guarded with the media?

WILSON: Initially there was, yes.

VDT: How long did that last? When did they allow government employees to be more open with the media?

WILSON: I think I just stopped paying very much attention to that restriction, the parts of the restriction that struck me as unfounded. I think there are certain parts of it that make sense. We are public servants; taxpayers certainly are not going to want to hear certain kinds of things from us.

VDT: Give me an example.

WILSON: Well, if they're just matters of our opinion. It's very tempting to think of oneself as an expert, and as an expert about everything; that just because you happen to have the data in front of your nose that suddenly your opinion is valuable on anything. I think that's an attitude that we were encouraged to guard against, initially, and I think that's a valid thing to be worried about. It is very easy to be seduced into thinking that you just know everything--when somebody's there, taking down information.

That's really the one concern that I still think is very valid. And then there are just some things that we don't have the data for and it's our job to say, "We don't have that. One of my colleagues probably does, but we don't."

VDT: Perhaps it's people outside the government who can give an opinion. I often notice that a story on Census or NCHS data will review the report, it's by such-and-such author, but the first opinion, the first outside quote, will come from PRB [Population Reference Bureau], who are nonprofit, non-taxpayer's-money. Do you find that--or do you even suggest someone they might phone, outside the government? You say you pass people onto Larry Bumpass, but the media also?

WILSON: That has more than one side. One side that I find very irritating is that I may have worked for a year on a report. I resent it if the reporter covering the release of the data then calls up somebody else and asks them what it means. That annoys me. And it has happened a couple of times. It has also happened to everybody else I know, so I'm not taking this personally. In fact, when people call me up because Steve Rawlings' report has just come out, *Families and Households*, and ask me to comment, I will comment but I will also say, "You have to talk to Steve about this. It is his report; he worked a great deal of time on this; talk to him about it."

Sometimes what happens is that--not necessarily Steve--but some people are muzzled about interpreting their report.

VDT: Muzzled?

WILSON: They are not supposed to go beyond their data. They're not supposed to say, "It's the economy that [caused] that." Somebody else can say that. There are times when you *can* make a comment about somebody else's report but I don't think it's fair to just take over.

I think that reporters that are covering demography now are very good about working with us. Where before they would typically always run to Paul Glick to explain anything in my field, they give us all a crack at it now. He will be in there and, of course, so will Andy Cherlin and, of course, Frank Furstenberg, and of course . . . You can name the seven people. It's kind of fun to ask the reporter,

after I've named a handful of people, "Did you already have those names?" And they'll say, "Well, I had three of the five."

I think the reporters are working with us in a very nice way. There are a couple of women reporters who do an excellent job; they do a synthesis. They use a new report as a springboard for an essay on something demographic.

VDT: Give me an example of one of those people.

WILSON: Barbara Vobjeda [The Washington Post] is one. Margaret Usdansky [*USA Today*] is another.

VDT: She [Usdansky] was at the PAA meeting this year.

WILSON: She's at Georgetown now, taking courses.

VDT: Wow! I never heard of a *media* person going into demography.

WILSON: She got very interested in demography. She's got a wonderful way of putting ideas together.

What they do, really, is to make a synthesis. I love reading those articles. I hate it to be my report.

To give you an idea--recently a pair of reports came out from the Census Bureau and were published simultaneously. One was the Marital Status and the other was Families and Households. I was called up about this for, quote/unquote, background information. And that was fine. There's lots you can say about what is happening with the American family. So I gave my background data.

Well, the woman who wrote the article did a great job of weaving people's comments, weaving data from the report, weaving NCHS data, weaving Census Bureau data, weaving all of these things together. We got a lot of calls; nobody could figure out what the source of the data was. It was a good article in the sense that it held people's interest, it taught them a lot. It was all accurate, but it certainly didn't preserve the turf around which data set you were dealing with, and for that reason it was confusing to anyone who wanted more information. So I was sending people back to Arthur Norton and Louisa Miller at the Census Bureau, and people at the Census Bureau were sending people to me. Of course, Arlene Saluter and I have always talked to the same people.

VDT: Arlene Saluter?

WILSON: She works in marriage and family statistics, and she just does a great job.

VDT: Why are your NCHS statistics so out of date? I mean the published [final] statistics. The 1988 statistics seem to be the last ones; you're so behind.

WILSON: Our statistics are behind because it has the lowest priority of certainly any data set in the Division of Vital Statistics.

VDT: You mean marriage and divorce.

WILSON: Marriage and divorce statistics have the lowest priority in Vital Statistics and maybe at the National Center for Health Statistics.

The natality certificate was revised in 1988 and a lot of items were added: health items on the mother's condition and whether she smoked and whether she drank and when she started seeing a

doctor--a lot of data. It was very expensive; it was hard to code; it was a very rich data source. We share all the same people who code the data, tabulate the data, clean up the data, sort it--everything. Until every bit of natality was done, our data wasn't approached. And by the time they finished the 1988 natality data then they were ready to do the 1989 natality data, because that was already late. So then they did the 89 data and the 90 data were ready.

VDT: You have your 1989 data?

WILSON: No, it's not tabulated even.

VDT: Well, that leads into this next question--the threat from time to time to eliminate your branch entirely.

WILSON: The branch *is* eliminated. We're part of Natality [Natality, Marriage and Divorce Statistics, DVS].

VDT: Oh, it is. I interviewed Paul Glick in 1989 and he had just written a letter trying to stop the elimination, or possible elimination, of marriage and divorce [at NCHS]. It seemed to be the umpteenth threat. So it literally *was* eliminated?

WILSON: The branch was folded in. Now, the advantage of that was that our budget was no longer separate and therefore attackable in the internecine warfare that goes on for pieces of the pie. I don't know if that's why it was done but certainly that was one of the effects.

We've had three or four directors of NCHS while I've been there. The early ones automatically supported marriage and divorce; they thought it was important. Then we got a medical doctor as director and he could just not see any point in having marriage and divorce statistics, and he said so, and he tried to get rid of the program.

He told me this recently. There's a management book discussion club. We're all reading total quality management and reinventing government. I commented after we read a section one day that if one were to take these ideas seriously and also given the mission that he had described for NCHS, then he probably wanted to get rid of marriage and divorce statistics. And he said, "I tried, but Congress didn't let me." It is written into our legislation that NCHS will collect marriage and divorce statistics." So he has to. But nobody in Congress said you had to do it well, so nobody has tried to complete the registration areas.

VDT: It's gone on so long. Just 42 states [in the marriage registration area], eight missing, including Arkansas and Texas. California?

WILSON: They don't have California in divorces; we don't have Florida or Texas.

VDT: How many in divorces?

WILSON: Thirty-one.

VDT: And this is solely because it's not given any kind of priority?

WILSON: Very low priority.

VDT: By NCHS itself?

WILSON: And at the local level, there's a lot of resistance to spending the money to set up this.

I think we have finally gotten to the point with electronic capability that it doesn't have to be done in the old-fashioned way. It could be done very swiftly and efficiently if anybody were to pay any attention to this. Michigan has just recently upgraded its divorce collection system. It went from being a disaster to being very complete and very accurate. That's because the people in Michigan gave it a little attention. And their lawyers decided they wanted this. If you don't have the lawyers committed to this, then they sabotage it at every step. It's their bread and butter and they don't want people mucking with it. It seems.

VDT: We could go on and on about this, but it seems you're going to get it done before you leave NCHS. I hope you do.

Back to you personally. How did you balance home and your job? The children were quite young still, when you took this full-time job?

WILSON: I did take a full-time job, because I talked to the women who had part-time jobs and they were always working almost full-time but got paid half-time and didn't get the benefits. And I thought I might just as well say I'm going to work full-time and then err on the other side.

I will say, though, that both Stephanie and Selma have been working part-time for years.

VDT: They have been?

WILSON: They still are. They do a great job; they're incredibly productive. You know a smart housewife can get a lot done!

VDT: Now I'd like to ask about your great sense of history--history of demography. You initiated and carried out the project of the videotaped interviews with the directors of fertility surveys. Everybody from Clyde Kiser of the Indianapolis Study up to Bill Pratt of the National Survey of Family Growth, in 1985. [Clyde Kiser on the 1941 Indianapolis Study of Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility, interviewed by Arthur Campbell; Ronald Freedman on the 1955 Growth of American Families (GAF) Study, interviewed by William Pratt; Arthur Campbell on the 1960 GAF, interviewed by John Patterson; Charles Westoff on the 1965, 1970 and 1975 National Fertility Studies (NFS), interviewed by Christine Bachrach; Norman Ryder on the NFS, interviewed by Barbara Wilson; William Pratt on the 1973, 1976 and 1982 National Survey of Family Growth, interviewed by Wendy Baldwin. See, Barbara Foley Wilson, "Videotaped Interviews about American Fertility Surveys," *PAA Affairs*, Winter 1985.]

That was a great thing. You thought that up?

WILSON: I did. Fools rush in where angels fear to tread. I didn't know that it was impossible. I met Dr. Feinleib; he is the director of NCHS. He didn't know that I was Marriage and Divorce at the time or he probably would have said no. I just said there was this really neat thing I wanted to do and would it be all right if we used the television equipment. And he said, "Oh, yeah. That's the sort of thing I like my people to do." Well, neither of us had any idea what was involved. He just said, "Let it be done." And then I could run around in NCHS and say, "Oh, Dr. Feinleib says it's okay."

I didn't know very much at that point about all of the background work that goes into preparing a good piece for television. I have taken some courses since then. As a matter of fact, it badly needs editing and I didn't dare do that, because what I told everybody was, "You've got 20 minutes. I want you to use your judgment about what those 20 minutes should consist of."

VDT: You told the interviewers?

WILSON: The interviewees. I told Clyde Kiser and Charlie Westoff and Norman Ryder and they then were responsible for being sure that their 20 minutes did the best job of representing what they wanted to say. We gave them questions ahead of time and told them that they could answer these questions or other questions, but 20 minutes was the length.

It was a fascinating thing to do. I don't want to give up on that.

VDT: You ended up the vignette you wrote for *PAA Affairs* [cited above] saying, "Hopefully, [these] will be the start of a collection of videotaped interviews documenting important chapters in the history of U.S. demography." Have you got plans for more?

WILSON: I would really love to. I don't think that NCHS will do it for free anymore, which they did then. We had an incredible lot of time from the staff. There's much more control over how they spend their time now. There's a lot of money involved if you pay people for all the work that goes into video. And even if I were contributing my time entirely free, there's just the sheer mechanics of having a quiet, well-lit place, the proper equipment functioning, good quality tape, good machine.

If you remember, there are a lot of things wrong with the fertility tapes, where there would be a vacuum cleaner in the background because some cleaning person at NIH decided to clean the room nextdoor. There's another place where there's a thunderstorm that goes on right back of Ron Freedman's head. Tom Merrick offered his office at PRB. The men [Freedman and William Pratt] were sitting against a window and a humongous thunderstorm came over Washington. It got dark; there were flashes of lightning; then it got light. All of this went on while they were engaged in conversation. Of course, if you're watching the thing, you . . .

VDT: Spent a lot of time watching the storm! [Laughter]

Let me also ask about this. Apparently you were involved in an NCHS oral history?

WILSON: Yes. We did that first for the 25th reunion, and that got me started thinking about what an advantage it is.

VDT: Was that before or after [the fertility videotapes]?

WILSON: That was before. I was the interviewer for Ted Woolsey. He was a demographer and he was one of the directors of NCHS and he always championed marriage and divorce statistics. A wonderfully nice man. He died just this past year. He was a great help. I can remember sitting and watching that interview, thinking as bad as the television aspects of this were, it was fascinating to hear Ted Woolsey talk about his life, in his own language, and it's so real and immediate. I became convinced at that moment that the most important thing was to capture that on tape; get these people while they're there.

VDT: And get them live. Now I'm getting the [edited] transcripts [of taped interviews], but it's not the same as seeing the expressions on their faces. Seeing yours; I'm sorry we can't have a video of you while we're talking.

WILSON: That's exactly the point. It's important to have the words, and the words will last. Your contribution is incredible, this set of *Demographic Destinies*, but it's so real to see the difference between Charlie Westoff and Norm Ryder, for example.

The editing of people was so funny, because I was trying to read the transcript and edit the transcript, and Charlie starts a sentence, stops in the middle, thinks, and then continues. It's extremely

hard to decide whether you're going to cut that or edit it. Norm Ryder thinks and then talks in a complete sentence and stops dead and it's extremely easy to edit.

VDT: I remember you told me about that and when I interviewed Norm, I said that [to him], and that's exactly what he does. I didn't have to edit his written transcript at all.

But, yes, just to see how different they look.

WILSON: Yes. What's funny was to consider how they worked together--that these two men managed to be so productive together [on the National Fertility Studies] and have such different styles.

And then their two different viewpoints. Consider their two different presidential addresses, where Norm Ryder was talking about all the inadequacies of the fertility survey ["A critique of the National Fertility Study," 1973]. Then Westoff responded, I think it was the next year.

VDT: Two years later [1975].

WILSON: And said it's "The Yield of the Imperfect" [: The National Fertility Study of 1970"].

VDT: That's right! [Laughter]

WILSON: It wasn't perfect, but we got a lot out of it. I really enjoy the presidential addresses!

VDT: Have you got another topic or subject area you would like to do the same thing with? You say it's expensive, etc., etc. But . . .

WILSON: I don't know whether it's possible to get some foundation money. I've started asking people. So far nobody has known of any group that supports this kind of thing.

But clearly, if you're a demographer you want to do natality and mortality and migration.

VDT: You mean the people who've been involved in those subject areas?

WILSON: Yes. And I like the model of having--I want to say a Grand Old Man, but that's because, with few exceptions, the original people were men--but to have the giant on whose shoulders we stand, have him interviewed by his student. That's fun; that was so great. Bill Pratt interviewed Ron Freedman, for example; he wanted to very much.

VDT: Right, he was his student, of course.

WILSON: Yes, and that's such fun. That way, of course, ten years down the road, you have the man who is currently the student--or the woman--who is now somebody else's mentor. It's just a wonderful kind of continuity. I like that model. It's not the only one to use, but I like that system of having two generations of people. And I think we need to cover all the topics. We certainly haven't exhausted fertility by doing the handful of surveys. There's all the economic modeling.

VDT: I think you've got a lot of things there.

You know, of course, of Sylvia Wargon in Canada working on the history of Canadian demography--full time as a pre-retirement project at Statistics Canada. She's been at it four years and it still isn't finished; she's had two or three articles out of it. There's an immense story in the U.S. and it should be done. Do you think that's a good idea? Of course, Dennis Hodgson is working on parts of it, but that's not the history of demography.

WILSON: I wonder if we couldn't get an archives started, certainly while the people are alive. We've missed a couple of very important people and I feel so bad about that.

But, again, it's a matter of time and money and somebody to get it done.

VDT: I'm glad I got the people I did while I did.

WILSON: Oh, yes.

VDT: There are a few of those whom I interviewed, as you know very well, who couldn't be interviewed now, even two or three years later. So, yes, I hope you'll do that. You've been a great supporter of what I have done, which would contribute something to that.

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

WILSON: I'm still waiting for the big one, which would be completing the registration areas.

[Laughter]

This article that you pointed out, I enjoy that.

VDT: "The Marry-Go-Round."

WILSON: Actually having played around with these numbers to the point where I felt I understood something about this. I knew I really understood the way the Census Bureau information fit or didn't fit--or to what extent it did--in with the steps and all these different marital statuses. It really took me a long time. Of course, part of it was I was playing around on PCs, computers, and just the sheer mechanics of trying to draw that on a computer. It was a freehand drawing initially. It did take a long time.

VDT: Good. Any other accomplishments in your career?

WILSON: Well, there are several topics that I'm very interested in. Age difference between spouses is one that I'm fascinated with and have given at least one or two papers on and if I ever get it all written down, hope to get an article published.

And then, there's such gratification if I really get into the numbers long enough to feel that I do finally understand something. Relative stability of first marriages and remarriages. Things like that I like a lot.

VDT: That includes the reports that you still plan to do, you said in your profile?

WILSON: Yes.

VDT: Before the far-off day when you retire [in 2000].

WILSON: Yes. And talking about history, I also want to do a series on historical trends by state, probably really by geographical divisions. We have all that data and nobody has just kind of sorted it, lined it up, for 20-year trends. To make it relevant to myself, I would have to understand the religious composition of the community and the national mix. You see such differences when you move from the northeast to the southwest in the country.

VDT: In both marriage and divorce?

WILSON: In both marriage and divorce; one feeds on the other. So I have to understand the composition of the population, sociological composition, before I could possibly enjoy the statistics. That's what I hope to get to in the next year, maybe, or the year after.

VDT: Good. Who have been the leading influences on your career? Starting with John Macisco, perhaps.

WILSON: I admire the work of people and perhaps that would be the influence. Richard Easterlin, when he gave his presidential talk . . .

VDT: "What Will 1984 Be Like?" [1978].

WILSON: Just got me so excited I was bouncing in my seat, literally. You probably don't remember but down in the lower righthand corner of this illustration about all the effects of what happens with these cycles was this little plus sign for the fact that men will marry at younger ages, under certain conditions, and of course conversely, they marry later. And that explained what I was trying to deal with when I was writing the differences by state in marriage and divorce.

VDT: He was saying then that the baby bust generation, being a smaller generation, would have good jobs and be able to marry earlier, and the women would all go back home again. It never turned out that way. He still thinks he's fairly right, however; it's just been delayed.

WILSON: Yes, but of course the reverse things were true too. And the economy has made a tremendous difference in what I've seen in the marriage and divorce statistics.

Then it's been intriguing for me that both my first child and my last are in the marriage squeeze. My daughter [born 1961] is in the squeeze on women and then my son [born 1964] is on the reverse side. It's really easy for me to follow the flow of the baby boom.

VDT: It sounds like you were a little influenced by Paul Glick, who first came out with the concept of the marriage squeeze. Any other particular influences?

WILSON: Con Taeuber was tremendously important in introducing us to all of those people he brought to his seminar. And then Murray Gendell's fertility class, which brought all of these notions together. That was why it was so interesting to do the fertility videotapes, which was an exercise from Murray's class.

But actually there wasn't anybody to work with in my field. I mean literally I wasn't working with anybody. Alex Plateris was doing divorce when I first came. He was a very shy and extremely nice man, but his health was already deteriorating at that point.

VDT: So really you've worked more on your own.

WILSON: I worked more with colleagues than with mentors, really, because Alex was not in good health. Jim Weed was there for a while, but he left.

There are just two people now. At times I've been the only person working on that pair of files. Kathy London worked with me for a couple of years. It's great having one of these wonderful people to work with; I love it. But it's not as if there was somebody there guiding my steps. I would have benefited a lot if there had been. I really regret that there wasn't.

VDT: But you've been marvelously distinguished in what you have done.

A final question on your career. What do you see as the leading issues in U.S. demography over the years you've been involved? Now, you have just said Easterlin pointed out things having to do with the baby boom and bust cycles. There was the recession.

WILSON: I think you have said it. And the economy has made such a tremendous difference on everything I deal with, certainly on whether people *can* get married.

VDT: You mean the recession now and the recession in the 1970s and the boom, more or less, of the 1980s?

WILSON: Yes. Actually, the gas crunch was the first time that I could see *so* clearly the impact of the faltering economy.

VDT: You mean in the early 1970s and the tremendous hike in the prices?

WILSON: Gasoline got expensive, industry slowed down, people lost jobs, and marriages absolutely plummeted--1974, 75. And that was right after our peak years. In 1972 the marriages reached an incredible high.

That happened for a couple of reasons. One was that the Supreme Court said you couldn't write laws that discriminated by sex. That meant that the minimum age at marriage for young men, 21, couldn't be different for women, which had been 18. So all the states had to fall in line with this and set the same minimum age at marriage. That meant an incredible bubble of young men who got married at 18 and 19 who wouldn't otherwise have been able to.

VDT: When was this?

WILSON: 1972. And that being immediately followed by the recession, when they probably all lost their jobs, I frankly think had a lot to do with the high divorce rate that we saw during the 1970s. All of these things were kind of going on simultaneously, but certainly right after that the marriage rate plummeted. Except in Alaska, where the pipe line was being put in.

VDT: Interesting.

WILSON: The drop in the marriages started with the auto industry states and it spread around the country.

You probably remember during the Second World War the illustrations of Nazi Germany taking over the world like a black octopus reaching out from Europe. Well, I had the same feeling when I started doing maps and putting colors in for marriage rates. It was flowing like an octopus. It was the weirdest thing. I suddenly had this childhood memory evoked.

The economy has done that a couple of times in my data and I'm fascinated to see it happen.

Now, of course, all these different sociological changes have taken over. The whole business of what effect cohabitation is going to play is very interesting. I have kind of a running battle with a couple of demographers about the meaning of cohabitation. A lot of people think that cohabitation has meant that marriage statistics are unimportant and I argue that that is not the case.

It really has meant--and I've been shocked to hear it--that there are demographers who feel as if there is no point in trying to keep track of who gets married and who doesn't.

I don't think cohabitation and marriage are equivalent at all. Certainly there is a lot of cohabitation that is not the same thing as people really getting married. They mean something different by it.

For one thing, when you've got two people cohabitating, very often one is more committed than the other. And one may never intend to get married or be around for years from now or pay those bills or support those children. So it's quite different.

VDT: Although you have written that most people who cohabit do marry.

WILSON: Yes.

VDT: It's still the majority, is it?

WILSON: Yes. Again, we don't keep the records so I have to be citing somebody else's work at this point. Yes, people who cohabit do go on to get married, though a substantial number of them don't marry that first person they cohabit with. And I guess very often they never intended to. They're students and cohabitation is convenient.

What did Ron Rindfuss say? I heard his paper on what is the meaning of cohabitation at the Urban Institute. Sally Clark and I went down, and he said, "Well, people seem to move in together when someone's lease runs out." They move in together because they're paying two rents and they know that somebody is always over at the other person's house and you might just as well pay only one rent.

VDT: I guess that's one reason for it.

Well, it's a fascinating topic and I'd love to go on talking about it, but we better move on to PAA.

What do you remember of the first meeting you attended, that you confirmed was 1974 in New York, where you talked to both Mary Grace Kovar and John Patterson? Other than running around looking for a job, what do you remember of that meeting and your early meetings of PAA?

WILSON: It was very exciting.

VDT: Why didn't you go in 1973? Of course, that was in New Orleans; that was pretty far for a mother to go.

WILSON: That was just my first year at Georgetown. So I went in 1974, at New York, and if I'm not mistaken, Art Campbell was the president.

VDT: Yes, he was.

WILSON: And we had a dinner.

VDT: A dinner speech. One of the last ones when they were combined. [The last one. Charles Westoff, president in 1975, abolished this in favor of a presidential address given on its own as the final session on Friday afternoon.] You remember Art Campbell speaking.

WILSON: I remember Art Campbell speaking and, again, it was just reinforcing. The part of it that impressed me was his saying that you can have truths for the population at large that are more important than individual differences. It reinforced my feeling for what a great field I was in. This was the right thing to be doing.

The other things I remember are going there early in the morning, a gang of friends. I drove up and drove a bunch of Georgetown students who couldn't all afford to go separately. When we got there, we went for a walk and I can remember a couple of people in our group were complaining about

New York and how unattractive and crowded and dirty it was. They went on and on about what a bad place New York was. We walked up Fifth Avenue to Central Park South and then went back.

Then I went in and heard Everett Lee talk about cities and why people go to cities. He said, "They go to cities because people think people are interesting." And I went out after that and went up Fifth Avenue again and I was just so pleased to be with all those people who liked being in cities. I must have had a wide grin on my face, because at one traffic light some man even commented, "Lady, what are you grinning about?" I felt very pleased with being a professional in this exciting field. It was just a confirmation of the choice.

VDT: That's a great way to put it.

What else do you remember about those early meetings? In the early 1970s, that was the time of the start of the Women's Caucus and the concern about women in the profession. It really had begun a couple of years earlier than that, in Atlanta [1970 PAA meeting, formation of the Women's Caucus]. The 1972 meeting was in Toronto; that was the infamous time when the women were shut out of the bar in the hotel where the meeting was held, and they vowed never again to meet in a hotel that discriminated. That happened to them again in New Orleans, the year before New York. Anyway, the women's movement was affecting PAA too. Were you aware of that or involved in any way?

WILSON: The women had been fighting the battle for me and I really just benefited. As I did from you.

I certainly had my hands full just trying to be a mother and a housewife and . . . I didn't have any household help and I was working 40 hours a weeks. So I wasn't doing anything . . .

Well, I was doing something. I was getting in a lot of trouble with my friends, because they thought I was--how shall we say?--a defector. We all had been housewives, and I went back to school, to get ready to go to work. I did not need to do that *at* anybody; I was doing it because I thought it was important.

And it was also in response to what was going on in the lives of the women around me. A lot of very nice 40-year-old women that I knew were being dumped by their husbands at that point, and it seemed as if a woman had to learn to stand on her own feet. So I was reacting to the women's movement at large, really.

My reason for choosing demography--aside from the fact that John Macisco said there were jobs in it--was that the first couple of things I was interested in, when I went for interviews there, I met a lot of sexual discrimination.

VDT: Interviews at Georgetown?

WILSON: No, in other lines of work. I thought it would be interesting to be an architect and I went to talk to an architect I knew and I got propositioned. I thought, "Well, I don't need this line of work."

The thing about sociologists that I felt immediately was that they could take me seriously as somebody who wanted to work. I wasn't going to have the same battle to be accepted with the sociologists.

VDT: You're talking now about sociologists you met before you narrowed in on demography?

WILSON: I went and talked to a whole bunch of people; it was part of this Widening Horizons program. We had the battery of tests; I was told, "The world is your oyster." I realized it wasn't. Another part of it was to interview people in the field, and this geographer was one of the people. Some were in broadcasting. I went and talked to a friend who was in broadcasting and, in that case,

one thing he said was, "There's a lot of competition. People are not needed in broadcasting." But the other thing that happened was that the women who worked around him came over literally to find out if I was a threat to them in their jobs. So I could see there was going to be a lot of competition; I wasn't welcome in that line. So all of these things were going on.

VDT: You say your friends thought you had defected from being a housewife?

WILSON: Yes, because *they* were feeling very threatened.

As a matter of fact, I can remember going to the dentist with a book--it was one of the early feminist books--it was on my lap. I said not one word; he had the drill in my mouth, I couldn't have said anything. He saw the book and started shaking with rage, because his wife wanted to go to work and he didn't want her to. The man terrified me! He had this drill going in my mouth! I never went back to that dentist.

There really were a lot of strong feelings and it's very easy now to forget that it was a different time. I don't know about you but I wasn't really socialized to . . .

VDT: To think that you would work?

WILSON: No.

VDT: We were the bridge generation, I like to call us, those raised to assume we would get married, be housewives, and quit our jobs at that point--maybe go back when the kids went to college. But we were suddenly in a different era.

WILSON: That's right.

VDT: I think we were pioneers in our field.

What do remember of other outstanding PAA meetings over the years, and some of these issues that came up? You can run your eye down the list [of meetings]. Did you go to Montreal [1976], for instance?

WILSON: Didn't go to Montreal. I remember the incredibly beautiful cathedral in St. Louis [1977] and the rather difficult review my paper got in St. Louis. I gave a paper on Hispanic marriages. That was my first.

VDT: Who gave you the difficult review?

WILSON: A Hispanic man. The speaker before me was a Hispanic man and in reviewing that paper, the discussant called him, in Spanish, something that meant "You and I are buddies," and was lavish in his praise about the importance of his paper. The reviewer's comments to me were very terse. So it took a little courage to go back.

VDT: Did you go all the way to San Diego in 1982? Jack Kantner was the president that year.

WILSON: I did go, yes. In Denver [1980] was that not Jay Siegel?

VDT: Right. "Bump the women when older men go for medical appointments. There are too many [older] women."

WILSON: He made so many points in that presidential address! Of course, I know Jay so well that it

was great fun to hear him.

It was interesting for me to compare, because we've just been to Denver again [1992].

VDT: Yes. In 1980 in Denver, there was a big drop in numbers [750 attendees; after 1,045 in Philadelphia in 1979]. Although in San Diego, a couple of years later [1982], there were just 694. And then at the latest Denver meeting it was over a thousand [1,085]. We were amazed at that. That was a recession year, too, in 1992.

WILSON: That leads into that part of things, which is the incredible amount of effort we've been putting into choosing a city that's attractive and also is a great drawing card for people to get to.

It comes down to two factors that we can isolate, right now. One is that the airlines just have incredibly good prices--and this is no minor matter; lots of difference in the cost. And the other was having incredible numbers of people on the program.

VDT: Yes, a record number of sessions there [in Denver]; that was up over 90. And the latest one, in Cincinnati, was 101. That was deliberate?

WILSON: Oh, absolutely! For bringing people in? Putting a lot of people on the program--yes, indeed.

It was a great challenge for Jen Suter to find space for all those people, because the arrangements had been made for a much smaller meeting. You know, we work years and years ahead on this, so the arrangements were made for a meeting of 700 and we suddenly had all these other folks coming and all of these people on the program and you needed to have spots and time.

VDT: Of course, being on the program means that your institution will pay for your going.

WILSON: If people are on the program, generally their institution will pay. And their egos are also involved in this too. It's no minor matter to be accepted to give a paper on the program.

All of those factors are exceedingly important, and it's better fun to be there if a lot of people are there, too. Good old friends.

VDT: Well, now that we're onto the meetings under your aegis, let's get on to how you became Secretary-Treasurer, in 1990, following Suzanne Bianchi. Did you actively seek the job?

WILSON: No, I didn't. Suzanne called one afternoon. I don't know why she called me. It was 3 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

It just happened to come at the right time, in terms of my own career. For one thing, the data was not going to come through; the natality data was taking such precedence. So that it was at a time that, in terms of my work, there was an emotional and an intellectual lull.

VDT: When did Suzanne call you? In the spring of 1990 or earlier?

WILSON: Oh, February or March.

VDT: Larry Bumpass was President.

WILSON: Larry wasn't around that spring. The first things I remember were the organizing meetings with Jeff Evans and Tom Merrick and Jen Suter. First there was a committee on organization [Committee on Organizational Management] and then there was the transition committee. [Between

these two, the work of a Negotiating Committee led to the agreement to establish a PAA business office in the headquarters of the American Sociological Association. To oversee the transition from the American Statistical Association, Larry Bumpass appointed a one-year Transition Committee, chaired by Jeff Evans and including Suzanne Bianchi, Tom Merrick and Larry Suter. See, "American Sociological Association to Manage PAA Business Office," *PAA Affairs*, Winter/Spring 1990.] I was in on a couple of meetings of the Transition Committee. I was brought in on them [early in 1990]. That was really the beginning of finding out what the issues were, in terms of the transition.

VDT: Do you think Suzanne thought of you in part because--you were the fourth PAA Secretary-Treasurer from NCHS, following Hugh Carter, who was way back in the 1950s [1953-56], Andy Lunde was in the late 1960s [1965-68], and Mary Grace Kovar, who was in the late 1970s [1975-78], and then here you were.

Of course, I understand that it's very important that your institution be willing to give you time and help to work on the job of being Secretary-Treasurer. What would NCHS guarantee you in terms of help and time to work on this professional activity?

WILSON: There were no guarantees. I can tell you that Suzanne had more institutional support.

VDT: In the Census Bureau where she worked?

WILSON: In the Census Bureau. Bill Butz [Census Bureau Associate Director for Demographic Fields] had stood up at the meeting and said that the Census Bureau would support PAA in this fashion. Nobody at NCHS ever made that kind of an offer. I was permitted to do it. It was a different spirit.

I thought it was important. For one thing, PAA had just spoken up for my program, Marriage and Divorce.

VDT: That was part of the reason that you felt it was a good idea?

WILSON: I personally felt grateful. "People still think it's an important program. So I can be altruistic about this, as well as being personally happy about it." There are other jobs in the government; I'm sure I wouldn't have been without a job. I just think it's an important program. So, I did want to say thank you. And that was one aspect.

VDT: Jim Brackett, in his interview, said the Secretary-Treasurer, who is in for three years--actually he was in for four [1971-75], though I don't know why--has more influence than Presidents who are in for only one, except they also work in the year they are President-elect. Do you agree?

WILSON: No. We're there longer, but I don't feel as if I've had a lot of influence. I feel that I've been part of a lot of things that have been going on, but we work collaboratively.

VDT: You and the President?

WILSON: Yes--and all the officers and the committees. What I learnt from Ron Rindfuss [President, 1991] I think is relevant here. Some committee had done a bang-up job. And since I had been in on the early stages of it, saw the whole thing through, I could see what an incredible contribution this particular committee had made. And I said to Ron, "Gee, we ought to do something--plaques or awards. You just have to recognize what they've done." And Ron said, "No. When you've been here a while, you'll see how many people contribute. And as soon as you single out somebody's contribution,

it means you're not recognizing somebody else's. You begin to see how much people contribute all across the board."

And, of course, by this time, three years later, I can see what he means. There have been so many people who have spent a couple of months, or maybe a couple of years. They just pitch in, ad hoc, and then they go back to their lives. It's the way the PAA works, and it's really so effective; it's impressive. When you're close you can see it done.

VDT: You think that PAA is pretty unique in that respect--the amount of volunteer effort that goes into it?

WILSON: I think the unique part of it, probably, is that so many people will step in in such a competent way and then step out again. There may have been some people who've been doing it for 20 or 30 years, but it strikes me that in fact everybody stands ready to do it for a while. And you've got so much talent to draw on. I can't think of one person who's always been there, for 20 or 30 years--meeting after meeting and committee after committee. It's not dominated by one or two people. It's a very broad base of support.

VDT: That's interesting; I haven't heard that comment from anybody before. It seems obvious, too. Yes, it hasn't been necessarily one person who's pulled it all the way through.

You came at the time that we had Jen Suter [as Executive Administrator]--it turned out to be full time--backed up by Jennifer Kilroy, and our own business office. And not so much put on volunteer effort or, I gather, the rather inadequate effort of AStatA, at least toward the end. Do you think that made a *lot* of difference?

WILSON: It just made it possible for me to get along without secretarial help. Otherwise, I would have had to call on people. I've worked as a secretary so I can do all those things. It's just that there's too much to do in the amount of time available.

Having the office has just been tremendously economically sensible. Things are so well organized now.

VDT: What were the most important, time-consuming issues during your time? Well, give me an example of the most important job of a Secretary-Treasurer, in your term? Of course, Suzanne had to deal with the transition and a lot of extra issues. But when you came, the office was in place.

WILSON: This is not a big issue, but a minor aspect is the election. Seeing that it runs smoothly and then letting the people know immediately what the results are.

And that I found extremely hard to do; call up people and tell them that they didn't win.

VDT: You did that the very night that the ballot-counting was finished--or the next morning, if it was quite late?

WILSON: Immediately, yes. I changed the way the ballot was getting counted. I've been part of ballot-counting and went through this cycle early on, that in the evening I think there were six or seven of us. For the first hour, it was great. And for the second hour, it was a little tiring, and by the fourth hour--this, of course, was after work--I thought we weren't doing it well. We didn't really care if that last count was exactly right, we were so tired and punchy.

So, when I got to be responsible for this, I thought maybe there's a better way to count the ballots than the free labor of a handful of people whoever is in charge this year can pull together on a hot August night.

VDT: I did it once and I loved it.

WILSON: You loved the whole four hours of it?

VDT: Well, I remember I drove home with Bob Lapham [then Secretary-Treasurer] thereafter and it had historic meaning for me.

WILSON: Okay. Well, that's the thing; it's fun to be with those people. But I was impressed with the fact that I don't think we were counting ballots very well toward the end. [Laughter]

Anyway, we changed it. As an experiment, I suggested that the ballots be counted on a flow basis as they came into the office. I set up a Lotus program for--the first person who worked on that job [now held by Jennifer Kilroy], you may remember, was Susan Francelli--so I set it up for Susan and Susan and Jen would enter the ballots each day, so that meant doing 50 ballots at a time, perhaps, rather than being faced with one thousand.

Now, the only problem with this Harriet [Presser] pointed out. Before I did that, I got the approval of anybody who wanted to voice an opinion, and Harriet said she didn't want the total count run, because that might influence the outcome, if people knew at the end of the month that it was a close race, or something like that. So we don't do that. And, as a matter of fact, the office has been so strict that they wouldn't tell me as the count was coming in, and they will not tell Jeff Evans [succeeding Secretary-Treasurer] what the results are as they're developing.

VDT: When did you institute that?

WILSON: I did that the first year.

VDT: I understand from Kathy London [co-editor of *PAA Affairs*] that the results will be out on August 15th this year--which is a Sunday, but still.

WILSON: But the votes are being tallied continuously. Of course, I had to go in and verify whether or not it was being done correctly. I would go in and take a sample and re-code and compare my results with Susan's or Jennifer's. I said, "Well, we'll change it if this system doesn't work." So far, it's working. I guess Jeff is going in now, periodically.

VDT: I was going to ask you if you happened to know who's the new President-elect, after Richard Udry [President for 1994], but, no, you don't. Nobody knows, really.

WILSON: Right. [It was Linda Waite.]

VDT: Well, that was an important thing.

You mentioned in your NCHS profile having to deal with the budget. Your first year spanned the time of the dues increase, from \$45 to \$70, and there were the expenses of the transition and I think we were all a little nervous that it could weather that financially. But apparently it did quite well.

WILSON: It did. You're right; we were exceedingly worried whether people . . . and I do know people who dropped out because of the dues increase. I despair that there are a lot of demographers at NCHS who *have* dropped their membership.

VDT: But that first year, 1990--at the end of 1990 the membership was up to 2700; it rose *up* in that

year [from 2,679 at end of 1989 to 2,752, end of 1990].

WILSON: Yes.

VDT: How do you account for that?

WILSON: Well, what I'm despairing about is that we are producing demographers and losing them. We haven't methodically tried to keep track of who gets graduated as a demographer and hang onto them for their entire working career.

VDT: I think that's right. I have a niece who graduated from Paul Voss's program at Wisconsin. I sent her the money to join PAA. She's been working for a year and she has not. It makes me so mad!

WILSON: You should have joined her up yourself! Not given her the choice about it.

I nag and tease people at work if they come to borrow my *PAA Affairs*. I'm certainly happy to give them the information and to let them copy it, but I say, "You know, you really ought to be a member. Then you'd have all this wonderful information too, and you'd be getting *Demography*."

The fact is we do lose members; all associations do.

VDT: Why do you think it's happening with demographers in particular, though you say all associations do?

WILSON: I think people begin to identify with other fields. It's easy to see in the federal government. We can go to one or two meetings a year and we have to choose between the Public Health conference, ASocA, AStatA. So you make that choice and that may determine which of these associations you join.

I think membership is one area that we really need to look into more.

VDT: I was going to ask you about that, because it's dropped by 200 since the end of 1990; it was just over 2500 [2,525] at the end of 1992.

WILSON: Yes. We *are* looking to what the factors are. Jen Suter has contacted some people [whose membership had lapsed] and they've had some very good, practical reasons. So it's always a case of what is the association doing for people and do they need it and are we the best source of this.

The other side of it is what about all the other people who do demography in some way that don't necessarily *ever* belong. In the paper the other day, for example, somebody was identified in Virginia as having done a demographic analysis of the people who live in Northern Virginia, where the voters are--he was identified as a demographer. Naturally, I looked him up in the directory and he's not there. He's not one of our members but he calls himself a demographer. So my temptation is--ah, hah, quickly send him out an application.

VDT: That's right.

WILSON: I think there are a lot of people practicing demography and have picked it up through business school or by buying PC programs who are selling their services as demographers. They are not part of our organization and perhaps we want to encourage them to be, so we'll have their membership too.

It all goes back to what sort of an organization we are. Are we mostly for university types or are we more broadly based? Where do we want the balance to be; where do we want the power to lie;

people who make the decisions; do we want to dilute the influence of the university types by having a lot of business demographers?

VDT: Do you think the university types now are the dominant voices in PAA?

WILSON: I think if you look at who gets elected to President; who gets on the Board--and I suppose it's a natural thing--whose papers are published; which names do you recognize when you look at a slate of candidates. What can people do but vote for the name they recognize, someone who has stature?

VDT: That brings us to another question I was going to ask, about the applied demographers. That was one of the issues in your time. The Business and State and Local Demography Committees were made into interest groups, along with the China Study and Exchange and International Migration Committees. I understand they felt that was a loss of stature and there were a lot of complaints. Now that they've been made back into an Applied Demography Committee, with two subcommittees for business and state and local government, do you think we'll hang onto the applied demographers?

This is a continuing issue in PAA. It has been since Margaret Sanger was shunted aside in the very beginning as being an activist and not a pure demographer. What do you think about the applied demographers?

WILSON: I think they'll stay part of PAA. For one thing, the ones that are there now certainly belong there. They're a very vital element, and they do have their own publication [*Applied Demography* newsletter].

I was even in the minority of people who thought that the interest groups should be allowed to continue.

VDT: What *has* happened? The interest groups have been done away with?

WILSON: Right.

VDT: And that happened when?

WILSON: Oh, the Board usually takes one or two Board meetings--the Board of Directors, acting as a group, usually returns to a question two or three times before the final decision is made. That's my observation after three years of watching six Board meetings. It takes revisiting, it takes the committee going back, it takes the plucky volunteers to really look at the question and talk to an awful lot of people.

That decision was made over the course of maybe two or three Board meetings. Larry Bumpass headed up that committee. People made a very strong, convincing argument that having interest groups in ASocA had been divisive and they didn't want PAA to be subjected to that splintering. So, the interest groups are welcome to go ahead and sponsor and have sessions, but they aren't to separate themselves; they're to be part of the ongoing organization.

VDT: But these two . . . ?

WILSON: Except for the two--there are two committees now, grandfathered in as separate entities.

VDT: There are the two subcommittees of business and state and local demography in the Applied Demography Committee. But there are still China Study and Exchange and International Migration.

WILSON: Yes, but they're operating under a different kind of system. It's not the same thing as, for one thing, having your own line item in the budget.

VDT: Which they did have before?

WILSON: Yes. But that was one of the issues.

VDT: Other interest groups: International Migration, China Study and Exchange, and The Demography of Aging Groups. Those are called *groups*?

WILSON: Yes. Those are the interest groups; the others are committees.

VDT: Confusing!

But you were among those that said that the interest groups should be allowed to continue. Why did you think so?

WILSON: There's a lot of energy that's created in these situations where people are terribly interested in one topic. You go into the China meeting, you certainly can feel it. They had a wonderful session at one of the meetings that took over one whole Thursday night, you remember.

VDT: Right.

WILSON: I just like to see that kind of enthusiasm. But the argument is that those people can do that anyway. They can have their sessions and they can arrange particular things. It's just that they're interest groups and they're not committees. I don't want to rehash this whole issue.

VDT: Okay, but it *was* one of the issues in your time.

But you don't think that applied demographers will split off from PAA. That's a good thing to hear.

WILSON: And I think it's important that we keep them actively part of PAA. They have some terrific people and we need that energy.

VDT: The Public Affairs Office in your time. That has been set up as a formal office, in PRB, with Anne Harrison-Clark half-time and Sarah Birtwistle full-time, and the expense is shared with the Association of Population Centers. Do you think that's a good idea?

WILSON: It's been incredibly important right now, if you could hear all that a couple of people are doing in terms of the budget-cutting for the census. Congress was saying that we're not going to do all of the review of the Year 2000 Census, and the Public Affairs Office got demographers to come to Washington and plead the case for the importance of supporting this research on the Year 2000 Census. As of today, it looks as if they've been very effective in getting the funds restored.

VDT: It happened today?

WILSON: Well, I just got the newsletter today. Of course, the budget has not yet been passed; as you and I speak it may be getting voted on. The House and Senate still have to get together on it. But the House restored funds that had been cut and then the Senate restored some other funds that had been cut. So, the work of this group this year has really been impressive.

VDT: You mean not just Michael Teitelbaum [chair of PAA Public Affairs Committee], but specifically Anne Harrison-Clark?

WILSON: I mean Anne Harrison-Clark.

VDT: Who worked for us before, at the Population Resource Center.

WILSON: Anne has been coordinating these efforts. And, of course, the APC group [Association of Population Centers] has an incredibly good network that goes out. When you're in the government, you can't pull for your own program. But demographers who are in other places, universities and so forth, can make very good and well-reasoned sales pitches for these programs to be supported. And they do that when they hear that something is endangered. Electronically, the word goes out and you get a whole lot of people bringing well-reasoned arguments and lots of data to support that program.

VDT: That really is important to have that lobbyist--then she's a lobbyist for that.

WILSON: Public educator.

VDT: [Laughter] That's what you call her.

WILSON: Because she's got a finger on the pulse of what's going on.

Of course, when Anne was brought on, there was no way of knowing that the Republicans were going to be replaced by an entirely different administration, with a different set of values and a different mandate.

VDT: Far more favorable, of course.

WILSON: Yes, but budget-cutting too. So it's a fine line to walk. It's been good that she's been in place and is so knowledgeable and was all cranked up to go to work when the new administration came on.

VDT: But can PAA afford it?

WILSON: I don't know. This so far was done on a three-year basis. We're not committed past this December, I think. We *are* committed up to this point, and as I remember, it's this December that the current contract runs out, and then it will have to be evaluated. Is it cost-effective and can be afford it, which are two slightly different things.

VDT: Okay. What do you remember best about the annual meetings while you were in office? Washington 1991, 60th anniversary meeting; had the largest attendance--1,399--we missed that last one to make it 1400. That was your first as Secretary-Treasurer.

WILSON: I remember Ron's [Rindfuss's] presidential address--demographically dense years. I loved that, particularly because he included marriage and divorce data.

VDT: Did you find the meetings a bit overwhelming as Secretary-Treasurer? Suzanne, your predecessor, said she didn't get into many sessions because there were so many committee meetings she had to attend.

WILSON: I don't think I got to any sessions at that one. Maybe more at this last [Cincinnati, 1993], but not very many, no. There are just a lot of committee meetings, and they take place in the Secretary-Treasurer's suite. I always had the feeling that I should be hostess.

VDT: I didn't realize that--they do? You have a larger suite, for those meetings?

WILSON: Yes. And the committee meetings are done back to back. There's one from 8 to 10 and one from 10 to 12; they go on all the time. They *are* doing the business. And the reason that so much is done at the meetings is that it doesn't cost the PAA anything to bring people in and work on these committees, so all the committees are to do their business, if possible, while they're there anyway at the annual meeting, and then it doesn't cost us anything--not even the room, because the room is there, provided by the hotel. That's the way PAA does its business.

But it's exhausting. We go on all day long and into the night.

VDT: This year's meeting in Cincinnati was the second largest attendance--amazing; people thought Cincinnati?--1,216. But we had 101 sessions. What do you think about that? Up to 12 overlapping.

WILSON: Ah, to live is to choose! [Laughter] It's very hard. In the early days, everybody went to one meeting [single session] and discussed the papers one at a time. And it's hard because sometimes even the same topic is back to back with something else, and you do have to choose. That's the other side of having all these people on the program.

It's a fine line to walk, but I think economically, there's no question about it making sense. Yes, it's very good, because the annual meeting provides most of the income. The biggest chunk of our income--registration fees for the annual meeting.

VDT: Which will more than cover the costs?

WILSON: Of the meeting, yes. And the registration fees for the PAA, I will say, are lower than registration fees for any other organization *I* go to. I don't know if you've found that to be the case.

VDT: It's the only one I go to.

WILSON: I'm stunned at the registration fees at the other places. SDA [Southern Demographic Association] may be lower, but they're special anyway. But in general, any other of these major association meetings I go to have astronomical registration fees.

Anyway, we charge enough, and we make a lot of money at the annual meetings--between that and the fees for tables and demonstrations that people put on. They bring in a major part of the income. So it makes sense to have a lot of people coming and a lot of presentations. And it has drawbacks, no question.

VDT: I'm so glad you're forthright about that. Jen Suter, whom I interviewed too, implied that--that you had to have a good turnout in order to make money.

The time of preparing for your twice-yearly Board meetings--that was a lot of work?

WILSON: Not as much for me as it probably was before Jen Suter was in place.

Those meetings are held either at the annual meeting or across the street from the PAA office [in the fall]. And the meeting itself is exhausting. Those Board meetings are *so* intense. All of the emotion, all of the arguing, all the discussion, all the brainstorming has to go on in that one day, and by the late afternoon we are punchy.

To come full circle, I wanted to have the Board approve some money to do some videotaped interviews. I wanted even to have them say they were in favor of doing it. But I didn't think of bringing it up until the end of the day, and I got more glassy-eyed stares and more "I can't believe you're asking anything more of us." And then somebody on the Board just said, "Look this is the kind of thing that if you want to do, you just gotta do it yourself." That was the last word on this project. I realized later that people were tired. Nobody wanted to think anymore; they had thought very hard about a lot of these really knotty issues. I don't know if the response earlier would have been better, but I know I'm never going to ask them late in the afternoon again. That's for sure!

VDT: Interesting point.

We discussed the point should PAA actively recruit more members and you think, yes--such as following up on people who graduate from demography programs.

Do you think we need more members? There were 2,525 at the end of 1992, and that's really about where it's fluctuated since the mid-1970s, except for a few little bumpties, like 2,752 at the end of 1990.

WILSON: I think nobody has stopped to say how many there should be. Now, I'm not saying that I think there ought to be more, necessarily. But I think we ought to think whether there ought to be more. And maybe we're exactly the right size, and we don't want to get any bigger because then there are fewer cities that we can meet at; if you get too big you can't meet everywhere. Maybe if it's too big you can't get all the people to be on the program, or as many people to be on the program. Maybe if it's too big nobody ever gets a chance to publish in *Demography*--although it's not as if we only let members publish there.

I just think nobody's ever talked about size. Maybe somebody ought to sit down and say what is a good size. What have other organizations found out? Does a group have to split beyond a certain size, where you really do have warring factions? I don't think anybody has really even tried to answer that question.

VDT: Good point. Nobody else has put it quite that way.

Why are so few PAA people interested in PAA as an organization? The very few people who attend the business meeting, as we keep insisting on calling it--the annual membership meeting. They flock in--and you do, too--for the presidential address; everybody goes to that. But there is a very scattered audience for the meeting the day before.

WILSON: I think there are probably many reasons. Among them would be the fact that the business meeting doesn't have the empowerment to make anything really happen there.

VDT: No longer, since the constitutional change of 1974.

WILSON: Right. And I think that was a good constitutional change, because a small group could have an entirely too powerful effect on what went on in the association. If you allowed the business meeting to pass motions that determined what the PAA was going to have to do, it really wouldn't be democratic, in terms of the expression of the total membership. I didn't cast that vote, although I probably was in the audience at that one, because I go to business meetings.

So people know that it's a place for discussion; it's not necessarily going to matter whether they are there or not.

And they're tired, and they really want to go and meet their buddies and bend an elbow and find out what's going on.

Maybe not enough gets brought up at these business meetings. I don't think it's necessarily bad

that they're small.

VDT: There's a core group of people who are, or will eventually be, on the Board or committees. They're the interested ones and they come.

WILSON: I think the other thing is that members in general are content with the way the PAA is going. It's a well-run organization.

VDT: And will continue to be? In the office, you had to deal with the issue of replacing Jen Suter--sadly, Jen had to quit after three years, although she will be there a bit, as much as she's able. And you brought in Ina Young.

WILSON: Yes. You asked about what were the issues. The issues that were terribly important [in my time] were the Public Affairs Office and whether we were going to have that and how it was going to be paid for. That really took up most of the second year of my tenure.

And then, yes, this year--certainly starting for me in November [1992] when Jen said that she was just stepping down. That's the way she put it at first; she wasn't going to work *any* more after the annual meeting, period. So it was from November on and on till the annual meeting that we were worrying and thinking and planning and so forth. What was the question?

VDT: I just said that was an issue--replacing Jen. And then you brought in Ina Young. I notice she was a Barnard graduate; that was in the piece on her in *PAA Affairs* [Spring 1993]. Did you know her there?

WILSON: No, I didn't; she's younger than I am.

All of us were going around trying to find the right person. It had to be somebody who was going to fit into this situation of a two-person office, cramped quarters, and lots of work to do. Trying to find the right person for this job and somebody willing to do it who didn't need a lot of money--who was going to be Mary Poppins. So we were recruiting in all directions.

Several other people were interviewed and they all wanted a lot more money. As soon as people were good enough to do all of this, they wanted more money.

I had gotten to the point where *everywhere* I went I was sounding out whether or not anybody knew somebody for this job, and I assumed that the others were doing that too--the others being all the other officers. Of course, the fact that I was here in Washington meant that I tapped into more people. So when I said at some Barnard meeting, "Does anybody know somebody who would have the following qualifications?", Ina was there--we were there to hear the president of Barnard talk--Ina just chirped up. She really does that; she's just so positive and bubbly. And she said, "Yes, I can do that." [Laughter]

And she's been like that all along. She'll look at a job and say, "I can do that," and sure enough, she can. And to begin with, I just have a *lot* of confidence in any person that Barnard accepts and graduates. If you have a Barnard graduate, as far as I'm concerned I already know a lot about what the woman is made of. So that was the beginning.

But I also worked with Ina back in the days before I went back to work and back to school. We were in "Barnard-in-Washington." It was the year I was sort of up to be president of every volunteer organization but I figured out how many hours I was going to put in and said, "Forty hours a week is going to be child's play compared to all of these other things." So that was when I stepped out of all those volunteer organizations and took seriously getting educated and getting a job.

So, Ina just has all of the skills. And her Dad was a bookkeeper, so she's comfortable with numbers, and she likes demography, and she's interested in sociology. I think she was a sociology

major at Barnard.

VDT: Yes, that was in the article.

WILSON: So, I just think we lucked out: the fact that I went to that meeting, that I opened my mouth, and that she was under my elbow at the time. It was just ideal.

VDT: She *does* get a good deal more than Jen got, I understand.

WILSON: She does. And Jen is getting more than Jen got too. We've had to face the economic realities--the fact that people who are extremely good can earn a lot more money than we were paying before.

Jen, of course, grew into her job. She came from another position. She was wonderfully ready and terrifically talented. I don't know the details here. I suspect that PAA pays her more than ASocA did, or at least as much. She was moving up the ladder. Of course, she started working for each organization half time and I think at that point, maybe we were matching her salary.

VDT: Can you think of any other issues with the Secretary-Treasurer? For instance, why isn't the new directory out? As I understand it, with the new system of membership renewal forms, the data are being put right into the computer and from that the new directory can be printed.

WILSON: The plan was to have that done. I don't know for sure, but I think Jen's having to step down has placed a much bigger burden on Jennifer [Kilroy] and the transition to somebody else means they've spent more time in the routine running of the office than maybe they had originally planned to. But I think the intention always was to start doing the directory immediately after this past annual meeting, so we may not be that far behind that intention.

VDT: Did you enjoy being Secretary-Treasurer?

WILSON: Very much.

VDT: A small question. Did you get Kathy London and Felicia LeClere to take over *PAA Affairs*? You'd worked with Kathy.

WILSON: I knew how good and capable Kathy is. So when the question came up . . . Again, it's always a network. Who has ideas for this position, this opening, you know, who's got an idea for the next Secretary-Treasurer? And people throw all sorts of suggestions out.

I certainly suggested Kathy London because I have the highest regard for her that I could have for anybody. She's a wonderfully intelligent and effective person. She's quiet, so it doesn't always become obvious to people how *exceedingly* effective she is, and just plain smart. And Kathy was the one who said, to do the job right, she was going to need somebody else and Kathy knows Felicia even better than I do at work. So that's a team of really sterling people. We are very lucky to have them. The newest issue of the newsletter, I think, demonstrates their skills.

VDT: I understand they're doing all the desktop publishing--the preparation of camera-ready copy. Those two are doing it; it's not now going back down to the PAA office.

WILSON: That's right.

VDT: One thing I like; it's finally gotten a table of contents on the cover, "Inside." Maybe I mentioned that to Kathy. I said in my Cleveland Park Historical Society newsletter I had this.

WILSON: You probably did.

VDT: I said you should have something like this, like Ellen Jamison, the first editor of *PAA Affairs*, from the Census Bureau; she had an excellent table of contents on the front. We needed that, so that's good.

WILSON: Well, it *is* good. Everybody contributes ideas for these things. Again, it's this whole business, that a lot of people feel identified with that, and ideas are welcome.

INTERRUPTION AND INTERVIEW CONTINUES

VDT: This is about women. I was commenting about Barbara having done all her work as Secretary-Treasurer without clerical assistance, which all the other Secretary-Treasurers seem to have had. And she mentioned that Chris Bachrach, in her interview with Charlie Westoff on the National Fertility Study, asked him where all the women had been in this.

WILSON: Chris asked Charlie, just observing that this was a fertility survey and all the people who seemed to be working on it--and you looked at the publications--were always men. And Charlie got reflective and thought back to the situation and immediately named off woman after woman after woman, saying, "She was there, and she was there." Apparently there had been a lot of women working on the surveys in one or another role, but their names never got on the publications in terms of being authors. Whatever role they were playing, it wasn't author.

VDT: That's the way things were. But things have changed now.

WILSON: Things have changed in every field.

VDT: Including demography. Tom Merrick tells me that women are in the majority in graduate programs in demography. And in many graduate programs, I think.

So, although PAA still has a minority of women--you think that's true? Probably.

WILSON: It's researchable. I think it's a majority of men and minority of women. [Women constituted about 39 percent of the membership in 1993. See, Susan Cotts Watkins, "If All We Knew About Women Was What We Read in *Demography*, What Would We Know?," *Demography*, November 1993.]

VDT: Right. But, still, the women are *very* visible in PAA.

WILSON: Yes. And that's why I went into demography, because we have a chance there. Even back 20 years ago, it was so.

VDT: You had that feeling then--that women had a chance in demography?

WILSON: Right.

V. JEFFREY EVANS

PAA Secretary-Treasurer in 1993-96 (No. 21). Interview with John Weeks in the dining room of the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, DC., on November 20, 1996.

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS: V. Jeffrey (Jeff) Evans grew up in the suburbs of Baltimore and obtained his undergraduate degree in Economics from Loyola College in Baltimore. From there he went to Duke University where he received his Ph.D. in Economics with an emphasis in Demography. He taught briefly at Greensboro College in Greensboro, NC while completing his dissertation, then went on to obtain his J.D. degree at the University of Maryland. In the early 1970s he began working at the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and has been there since, where he is employed as a Health Science Administrator within the Center for Population Research.

WEEKS: The Secretary-Treasurer is not on a calendar year as are other Board members. Why is that?

EVANS: It increases continuity. The Secretary-Treasurer in this organization has a lot of intimate day-to-day contact with operations, so with the officers turning over pretty quickly, it is pretty good to have the Secretary-Treasurer have a 3-year term and then have a slightly overlapping term, so that everyone is not new all at once. The Secretary-Treasurer is still in office when the new Board members come on, and the Board members are already established when the Secretary-Treasurer leaves.

WEEKS: Now, who has taken your place on the Board?

EVANS: Actually, we've had two. Jim Weed, from NCHS was originally elected, and he served informally until just last week, but new rules that are being promulgated in the government essentially make it impossible for a federal employee to be a top officer of a scientific association.

WEEKS: Who is promulgating these rules?

EVANS: The Department of Health and Human Services, of which NIH is a part, and NCHS is also a part. So, he got a very restrictive ruling about what he could and could not do, so he just didn't think he could do the job.

WEEKS: That seems absurd.

EVANS: I know.

WEEKS: Why would someone want to lower the ability of federal employees to be professional active in this way?

EVANS: The theory is that you want to distance the civil servant from participation in all kinds of special interest groups, and scientific associations are viewed as a special interest group. So, that doesn't bode well, because the Washington DC area is where almost every association has its office, and the talent pool is pretty well bottled up in the federal government.

WEEKS: Yes, and position of the PAA seems to require that the person be local, given the things that you have to do. Has there ever been a "long-distance" secretary-treasurer?

EVANS: No. Fortunately, we do have a couple of institutions around, that are either universities or non-profit organizations, but it puts a big burden on them. So, Betsy Stevens from Georgetown is now the new Secretary-Treasurer, and she's good. I've known Betsy a long time and I think she'll do a superb job. But it makes it difficult if we have to restrict our search to the couple of universities around or to non-profit organizations.

WEEKS: Can this new rule be challenged?

EVANS: It can be challenged. I'm a little annoyed at the department, because they took this action with regard to Jim on the basis of draft regulations. They are almost here, but not quite. They have to do with the ethical conduct of civil service employees. Anyway, Jim served in sort of an unofficial capacity, and I served in an interim capacity, all of which had questionable stature, because there are no provisions for this sort of thing in the by-laws. But, I think we're in pretty good shape because just this week our new executive administrator started, and so I helped Jim pick that person.

WEEKS: Yes, I talked to Jen Suter on the phone last week and she indicated that the new person was not named Jennifer!

EVANS: Right, Stephanie is her name. She started Monday, and Betsy started as new Secretary-Treasurer on Friday. Friday I went over to PAA for a transition meeting with them. So, that's the end of my term—I sort of faded away, after six months more than I thought I would have.

WEEKS: So, were you at this most recent Board meeting?

EVANS: No, Jim was, but I wasn't. And, that's where the bad news about Jim was discussed, and Betsy was elected. She'll serve 2 ½ years, to complete the term.

WEEKS: OK, let's talk about you for a little while. Now, my recollection is that you're a local boy.

EVANS: Right, Maryland.

WEEKS: In fact, you got your law degree at Maryland.

EVANS: I went to undergraduate college at Loyola College in Baltimore and got my legal degree at Maryland, so I'm a double-Marylander.

WEEKS: You grew up in Baltimore?

EVANS: Baltimore County—the suburbs. And, except for the time that I lived in North Carolina while I was going to Duke University, I've lived in Maryland.

WEEKS: I guess then that we can classify you as a "southerner."

EVANS: Yes, although it's a border state. I had a relative who fought for the north, and a relative who fought for the south. That's typical of families in Maryland.

WEEKS: Not what you would expect to find of people living in Durham.

EVANS: No, as a matter of fact, they didn't consider me a southerner, either, which sort of hurt my feelings. But, I've always considered myself a southerner.

WEEKS: You don't have that drawl.

EVANS: No, but if you notice here in DC there are some native Washingtonians and they have a deep southern accent, whereas Baltimoreans don't. We have more of a northern accent.

WEEKS: Now, how did you decide to go to Duke? Did you have an inkling that you were interested in population? Had you taken courses like that as an undergraduate?

EVANS: No, I never had. I was an Econ major, so I was interested in studying with someone who was really good in the kind of economics I was interested in and so I applied to a number of places, and I got this telegram from Joe Spengler and he said, "Hey, we have a nice NIH fellowship for you. You get 5 years guarantee of then a handsome stipend and the only requirement was that you had to study something called demography." So, I went to my advisor and I said is this a good deal? And he said, sure, Spengler is former president of AEA and also former president of the Population Association. He's the only guy ever to do that! It's a source of frustration for economists, because to be a mainline economist, you often get divorced from demography.

WEEKS: True, we see economists coming out of Princeton who wind up teaching in Sociology departments.

EVANS: Yes, Ansley Coale is a good example. He started his career as a mainline economist and his work in development is still taught, but he got really interested in the dynamics of population and he drifted off from economics proper, and most of his students now are not mainline economists. Many of them are in Sociology departments, and even chair Sociology departments. Anyway, it turned out that Joe was a pretty good guy. He didn't know it at the time, but he was probably the founder of the economics of aging. The Center at Duke has a heavy aging emphasis, due largely to his influence.

WEEKS: True, when I think of Duke in population terms, I immediately think of aging. So, you went off to Duke...As you arrived at Duke, knowing that your fellowship had to do with population, did you know what that meant?

EVANS: No. During the summer I went to the campus bookstore and purchased a number of books and read them over the summer to figure out what demography was about and then part of the program required interdisciplinary training, so the first year at Duke there was sort of a transition into the sociology part of the program. Ren Farley and Hal Winsborough had departed for Michigan and Wisconsin, respectively, and so Nathan Keyfitz, who was then in-between Chicago and Berkeley, stopped off for the year. He only spent a short time at Duke. He was polishing up his famous monograph on the introduction to the mathematics of demography. The big question was, could you take demographic models and put them in a discrete form so that they could be programmed on the computer, and that was what this book was all about. So, I spent an inordinate amount of time working with Nathan, actually writing FORTRAN programs to see if, in fact, this stuff would work.

WEEKS: He "exploited" a lot of students at Berkeley on this, after he finished with you.

EVANS: Yes, he did. I like to think that we got it ready for the Berkeley students. If you look at that book, you'll see that he thanks a lot of Chicago students, and some Duke students, and of course he was the mentor of a lot of people at Berkeley. I compressed all of my formal demography under Nathan. I took as many courses as I could from him. Really, my first year I don't remember much else except for Nathan!

WEEKS: You can't do better in terms of what to remember.

EVANS: He was a real neat guy to work with, so I think I got cross-trained in the demographic part of my studies pretty well and so I consider myself a demographer as well as an economist.

WEEKS: Did you see Joe Spengler as more of an economist than a demographer?

EVANS: Right. He was not very interested in the technical aspects of demography, but he was very, very interested in the substantive issues, especially as they involved population dynamics and, of course, his major contribution was asking the question: What happens to the economy when the population starts to slow down--when the age structure gets older, and the fertility falls below replacement? Those were the earliest questions that I got interested in.

WEEKS: What did you do for your dissertation?

EVANS: I asked the question of what will happen to school systems when the population starts to stabilize? I asked that question of higher education, basically, and it was easy to use to use the kind of technology I had learned about under Nathan to get the computer to crank out simulations. Then I started reading a lot of work from the Chicago school, because Gary Becker had opened up the question of human capital, and that had a heavy education component to it. Sort I sort of combined elements of that and that has influenced everything I have done since. Most of what I have done at NIH resonates with some aspect of what I learned from Nathan Keyfitz and Joe Spengler, or through reading Gary Becker.

WEEKS: Did you go to NIH directly from Duke, or was there anything in between?

EVANS: I was very interested in the institutional aspects of economics and Joe Spengler was one of the last great institutional economists. He lectured regularly in the Law School and History Department and I resonated with that sort of orientation, so I went to Law School right after I got my degree. Well, while I was working on my dissertation, I taught at one of the local little colleges near Duke—Greensboro College in Greensboro, North Carolina. That's how I got involved in local politics as well. I met my wife working on the campaigns in 1972 in and around Greensboro. That was the year that the Republicans cracked "the Solid South" in North Carolina. So, we elected a Republican governor. We elected a number of people to the legislature, and we also elected Richard Nixon as President—a California Republican and ex-Duke student, even though that was rather controversial. And also Jesse Helms, who still is around! Kind of the arch enemy of population. But Diane and I were both members of the Greensboro Young Republicans. And now she's a local politician up here in Maryland. She's the President of our County Council. So, I decided that I would also like to get a law degree, because there is a real strong cross-over between economics and law, especially in the institutional aspect of it. So, I came up and went to the University of Maryland.

WEEKS: So, that had nothing to do with your work NIH? I had always assumed, not knowing otherwise, that your law degree had something to do with your working in government.

EVANS: No, although NIH was nice enough to pay for some of it. No, it was an intellectual interest of mine. As I said, Joe lectured regularly in the Law School and another one of my teachers, Frank DeViver, was a well-known labor arbitrator—very enmeshed in labor law—so it was very natural for me to continue that way. I was interested in a lot of different things that were at the fringe of mainstream economics—the institutional stuff, the demographic stuff. I thought, wouldn't it be nice to find a place where I could be rewarded for being interested in all of these things, and NIH was such a place. I had NIH on my mind, and kept my contacts with Sid Newman at NIH and at the first opening, I applied. At that time it was thought that it was a good idea to have an economist, so I joined and actually I think that I am now the only economist to have "grown up" inside the NIH system.

WEEKS: Was the Center for Population Studies already going at that point?

EVANS: Right. I joined in the early 70s and the Institute was actually founded in the middle 60s. At the time that I joined, it was realized that economics had something to offer population research. I was brought along to figure out how to do that.

WEEKS: How do you feel you've accomplished that goal, compared to other kinds of things that NIH wanted you do? Have you had a free hand to do what you've wanted to do?

EVANS: I've had pretty much of a free hand. At NIH there are only rules: (1) you can anything you want, subject to the second rule, which is (2) almost anything you want to do is difficult! Within your limits of energy, that's what you do. I remember long discussions with Nathan, actually, because he had just left Chicago and he was still musing over the intense personal struggles that go on at Chicago. That great department [of Economics] had literally torn itself to pieces because of internal politics. That seems to be almost the natural course for academic departments. If you reach greatness, pretty soon you will develop real pain.

I realized that if we were going to do economics in a mainstream way, we had to ground economics not in people like myself, who were at the fringes of the discipline, but in people who were at the center of economics. The choices were either to make overtures either to the MIT crowd or to the Chicago School. In the early days we supported both, but the relationship with Chicago proved to be a bit more rewarding. So that was a way of getting mainstream economists involved in the population question. And that meant developing a pretty close relationship with people like Bob Mullins, Gary Becker, and Bob Michael, Jim Hepman and people like that who were going to become household names now in population. One of my early things was to do that, and I think it paid off.

WEEKS: Well, certainly, if you're fostering that kind of interest on their part, it will make a difference in incorporating them into the field.

EVANS: It's really something that I've tried to push. Before I joined NIH, I served briefly as a research consultant to a Maryland agency that did housing programs and things like that and so I tried my hand at making housing projections.

WEEKS: And how did that go?

EVANS: It was terrible. Very frustrating. The mathematics was simple, but they never were right. It became quickly apparent that they were never right. So, I kept wondering, why is that? Why can't I make a decent housing projection? And why can no demographer that I knew of do that either? And the first answer that was apparent was that people move around and migration really screws up housing

projections. The second thing is that the unit of analysis is what counts, and it's not really people—which is really the basic unit of accounting in mainstream demography—but rather it's households, which is a much more complicated thing. You remember right in the early 70s things started to happen to household structure in a very dramatic way. And it was because the underlying family unit was changing so much, so I came to NIH trying to figure out how to answer those two questions. How to get a better handle on why people are moving around, and why is the family changing so rapidly? And, how do you create a demography based on a complex unit like the household, rather than just people. The net product of that was what we now call "family demography," which didn't exist a few years ago, and now exists pretty much.

WEEKS: Yes, it's pretty well established now.

EVANS: Remember that in the early days, we had some real questions. For example, can you calculate a life table that shows family transition. That was an unknown. Then people started developing other techniques, where we could actually get regression models of life-table type things—so-called hazard models and they took off like topsy. So, there were a lot of really interesting substantive questions dealing with movement and change within the family, and I've been involved with them now for well over twenty years and in the interim NIH has invested a lot in family demography. That's grown to be the second biggest item in our portfolio, and it's a pretty well established sub-field. So, I'm pleased with that.

WEEKS: Now, what is your exact title at NIH?

EVANS: I'm something called a Health Sciences Administrator.

WEEKS: In that role, are you in a position to influence the direction of research? Either by decisions you make yourself, or by ways in which you encourage your advisory committees to operate?

EVANS: Yes, that's what always intrigues me about NIH, is that you always have that ability to influence the course of the discipline. You can't do it as a dictator, but you have to work as a consensus builder within a group and spend a lot of time building consensus within a steadily growing group of scholars—and now there's a whole bunch of them. In fact, I've run into a second generation of "youngsters" now who've gotten their PhDs, but don't remember the role of Center for Population Research support for family demography. I guess they assume that it has always been there.

WEEKS: Not unlike you and I growing up in an era when the role of family planning and fertility planning in demography was taken for granted. It didn't start that way either. Now, my recollection is that you were hired at NIH at a time when that was becoming the single most important source of funding for population research.

EVANS: Right. And our program, combined with the National Institute on Aging, now provides about 75 million dollars a year in support. Divide that through by about 2,000 active members in the field, and that's a fair investment for our discipline [\$37,500 per year per each active member in the field]. So, it's been good. And one of the things that I worked hard to do was to make sure that we didn't develop a rift within NIH with regard to the new National Institute on Aging. Because you know that was a branch within my Institute that kind of broke off and formed its own Institute. It just didn't seem to me to be a good idea to compartmentalize population research into "young people research" and "old people research." So, we've tried to find ways of working together, and that's always delicate.

WEEKS: True, although aging lends itself to that better than some things, since younger people will grow old and that naturally increases their interest in the subject of aging.

EVANS: I guess that I've always been in the topic of aging, but I'm in the part that focuses on young people. But, I think we've done a good job of working together to make sure that the field is well-served. And bureaucracies often don't work that way. Sometimes I have to shake my head, as some of the people that I really count on as the hard core of our support, like Ron Lee, Al Hermalin, and Sam Preston, have all gotten picked off by the Aging Institute, which is good for them and for good for the field, but it means that bureaucrats like myself have to bite my tongue and overcome the urge to be territorial. We have had a nice record of working together, and we've gotten some pretty big projects supported that way, for example, the National Survey of Families and Households.

WEEKS: How about working with private foundations. Do you try to interact with them?

EVANS: We do. At one time or another we've done business with almost all of them. Right now, there's such an emphasis on children and families, subject to public policy, and we're working with the Hewlett Foundation, Kaiser, and a number of others who are very, very eager to help government get its act together. I've been involved in a lot of that stuff, and it's been very helpful to have private foundations to work with. Government can do some things very well, but it limps when trying to cross-over, so it's been helpful to have private foundation support.

WEEKS: Do you get pressured in any way by members of Congress to spend your money in a particular way. Now, we know the negative side when Wendy Baldwin was battling Congress for funding, and I know that you were wrapped up in all of that, too. But, on the more positive side, do people call you to see if you will do this or that with your funding?

EVANS: That does happen, and we have always been successful in ignoring that. We have had some pretty heavy-handed attempts to influence our funding decisions. NIH has always said we don't want to do that. We want to set a scientific agenda and let the chips fall where they may. So, we especially have Senators from very small states who want to grab money to build large resource institutions in very small places. But we resist that. What has been helpful has been to show Congress that demographic research has a big public policy meaning. We can through almost all of these questions that you can think of by showing that the work is useful to both sides of the aisle, and that it is in their best interest to bring the thing off. I've been very active in trying to show Congress, and even the White House, how to do that.

WEEKS: Active in terms of personal presentations, or reports that you wind up writing for their benefit?

EVANS: Both. Over time, I've been identified as the person in government dealing with public policy issues dealing with families and kids. Any kind of family value thing or children's issues that have a demographic perspective, sooner or later I'll get drawn in to some kind of conversation. So I act as a bridge between those people who have the questions and the scientific community who find the answers. And, when we fund the best stuff, it's not hard to get the best people to cooperate. So, it's a natural kind of process. During this last Presidential election there were five different White House initiatives that involved stuff that I was doing. So, I got involved in going down to the Domestic Policy Council pretty often, and I got roped into the campaign. The Presidential campaign featured families and children. The welfare reform issues are essentially issues of families and children, so I've

spent an inordinate amount of time over the last year trying to work with political appointees at the White House to show them what can be done with demographic data and I think that as a result there will be more support to do good research and I think we have people who are in very responsible policy positions who are inclined to want to listen to what our best people have to say. So, that's useful. It helps frame science in a way that is useful to public policy.

WEEKS: Do you think that politicians listen to you more because they think you're a lawyer or because they think you have an academic background? Or is it the combination they're looking for.

EVANS: Well, I think it helps that I can put things in their frame of reference. A lot of them are lawyers, of course, and if you want to do anything around here it involves manipulating the law in some way. So, it does help to be able to communicate with them on the basis that they can understand and find useful. And we try to be helpful to everybody. I don't care whether you're a communist or a capitalist, if you have an interest in population research, I'll do my level best to explain what the ramifications of it might be. So, we often tell people things that they don't exactly want to hear, but some parts are useful enough that they want to continue the debate.

WEEKS: That gets back to a point that you alluded to earlier, which was that you fund the very best stuff. Over the years my sense is that the NIH Study Sections are among the most prestigious activities in the discipline, and you sit in the catbird seat with respect to that. Does it take a lot of time on your part to manage those activities and to keep track of what those people are doing?

EVANS: Oh, sure. That's the bread-and-better. To make sure that the best people are invited to be part of the Study Section, and then to pay attention to what they're doing. We instruct our review groups to be more than just one-shot advisors. We do have a continuity and a coherence, and an ability to form an opinion about what is good for the discipline. And they keep changing that incrementally over time. So, understanding what they think is good science is naturally instrumental in helping people understand will be pleasing to a Study Section and what won't.

WEEKS: What about the Center grants? Had those already been created when you arrived at NIH?

EVANS: That was one of the first things that I worked with. I did a lot of institutional development work, and I even wrote the first set of guidelines. The trick there was to get away from open-ended training grants—I'd been trained on one...

WEEKS: Yes, I was too.

EVANS: I think a good number of people at NIH were, too. They involved a good-sized slush fund, and so that was popular with the universities, but difficult to defend to Congress. And we wanted, as the field started to develop, to focus more of our energy on supporting really first-rate research. Research first; training as a much-subordinate objective. So, we were looking for ways to use the money to get the most out of research.

WEEKS: On the assumption that the good research by its nature draws in the graduate students who wind up being trained to do that research.

EVANS: Right. And, I think that if you take a look at the 10 academic centers that we have—actually 11, because RAND has a post-doc program. And that post-doc program has supported a number of people who have won the Dorothy Thomas Award. I don't know if you've been keeping tabs on that.

WEEKS: I admit that I have not.

EVANS: You go back, and you'll see that a number of those kids got their polishing in that training program. Our top eleven research centers are also pretty close to our top eleven training centers.

WEEKS: It would bound to be a self-fulfilling prophecy to a certain extent. That's not a bad thing, of course, given limited resources.

EVANS: I think it's defensible to the field, in general.

WEEKS: Given the limitation on the number of potential jobs, it doesn't make sense for every University that could run a PhD program in that area and could run a big research program in that area, to actually do it.

EVANS: Right. It's very good for the field, I think. I know that there's a lot of jealousy on the part of smaller institutions in regard to the larger institutions.

WEEKS: That's always going to be the case.

EVANS: I'm absolutely certain that if we didn't have our eleven centers—research universities making high-profile investments in the building of faculty capability in population research and getting rewarded for it—our field in general would be a lot poorer. Even in the smaller institutions, you would demography in much less appreciated role. Now, everybody understands that demography is a pretty valuable specialty.

WEEKS: Over time, the word "demographics" has entered the mainstream. Everybody understands the term, even if they don't understand what it really means. I was just reading on the plane in the Economist a list of "what the world is reading," and the top seller in Canada right now is a book on the demographics of Canada.

EVANS: It seems to me that since we don't have Departments of Demography, usually, we would be relegated to fairly exotics, poorly rewarded subspecialty, within a number of different departments, and we wouldn't have the visibility to the outside world, were it not for the Centers.

WEEKS: When you were at Duke, did you spend any time at the Carolina Population Center at UNC, Chapel Hill? Were there much of a connection there at the time.

EVANS: I did. I got to know Vaida Thompson at the Carolina Population Center, and she was involved in a lot of the outreach activities that Moye Freymann had put together, so she got me involved in that, so especially as I was working on my dissertation, I found myself involved in the Carolina Population Center more and more, and at Duke less and less.

Duke has a center, but it has been sort of taken over by the aging center, which has grown to be probably the best known center of aging in the country. When I was there the aging center was growing and Joe and some of the other people were brought into it and as time has gone on, the aging center really eclipsed the population center.

WEEKS: Now, was Joe Spengler a dynamic type of speaker? You said that he lectured all over campus.

EVANS: No, he lectured in different departments because he was kind of quirky. He wasn't your typical economic theorist. He wasn't actually a great speaker—he tended to ramble, but if you paid attention to him, you realized that he was generating a lot of really insightful ideas. Especially, in wondering how the institutional arrangements affected society and its separate components. He had a lot of little empirical insights which generated a lot of empirical studies. So a lot of his students got interested in various aspects of these ideas. It was not that he had a "school of thought"—almost all of his students are different. It's not like Ansley Coale who can churn out all these formulas. Joe turned out a variety of different sorts of people.

WEEKS: Who were some of his other students?

EVANS: In my cohort, we had Bill Serow, who is now doing aging work, Monica Boyd, who does immigration, Bill Reeves, who now does small area demography, and has almost totally gone into the business world, and there's Larry Suter—Jen Suter's husband—and Larry does the demography of education; Frank Bean, who does a lot of different things, especially research on Hispanics. That was pretty much my class at Duke, and if you'll notice, we're all different. Joe was a pretty good guy.

WEEKS: He must have been, to have turned you all out.

EVANS: Yes, but he wasn't dynamic, in the sense that you mean charismatic. He more or less let you do your own thing, and he would throw an occasional idea in your ear here and there. And he was very encouraging to aging people. He was very instrumental in bringing a lot of economists over to the aging center, so a lot of Duke economists are now aging economists. Aging and aging, as well! So, it was an institutional approach that he took, and he cared a lot about his students and about the program. He was a Dean, and Chair of the Department of Economics and he held a lot of administrative positions as well as being a good teacher. He wasn't a down-home lecturer, or a brilliant theorist, nor a tremendous econometrician. He was more of an old-school generalist and he had a good grip on the real world, so I appreciated that.

WEEKS: Now, getting to the business of the association, when you mentioned Larry and Jen Suter, it reminds me that the one story I need to get out of you for the record, is the story of the PAA's first independent office, and how that came about. I don't remember now how many years it had been that the PAA had been associated with the American Sociological Association.

EVANS: Well, I'll tell you. I was involved in most of that, because I kind of got interested in associations and so I was active first in PAA, and also in the Southern Demographic Association.

WEEKS: Which people often describe as how the PAA "used to be." At least until recently, because of course it has grown as well.

EVANS: Actually, as President of the SDA I managed to get it from an informal group to get it incorporated and made it into an actual association. It was big deal, changing the way we did business, and we had to change our name, even—from the SRGA to the SDA and that was painful.

WEEKS: Painful because there were traditionalists who didn't want a change?

EVANS: Right, and we would talk forever about various names, and whether we wanted to do it, and we were wrapped up in styles, and we were really changing the nature of the organization—from a

group of scholars who were actually doing collaborative research to a larger, more general organization.

WEEKS: Was it the Oak Ridge Laboratories that had originally organized the group?

EVANS: It was actually a very good idea; just a little bit before its time. The idea was that you needed a big national laboratory for demography, much like physics. It turned out that we didn't need that.

WEEKS: But you didn't know it until you tried it.

EVANS: Right. Although we may be entering an age when we do need it, because datasets are getting so complex and confidentiality issues are getting so meticulous, that we may have to create big national laboratories to access these things.

WEEKS: I remember things coming out from there regarding the 1970 census, but I don't remember other things coming out of that group.

EVANS: Well, that's about the time that they realized that they didn't have to go to Oak Ridge, Tennessee—and it's not easy to get to—to do the work.

So, I got interested in working with associations mainly because I was active in putting together the Centers program at NICHD. I got very attuned to the institutional needs of our field. We needed a superstructure of academic-like organizations—Centers—and we needed a better professional presence to represent us in the world of science. Having a solid regional association and having a solid national association is absolutely essential. After all, we have billions of dollars of public investment, and we have a relatively small number of people spread all over the country, so we needed to be very organized to defend ourselves. I've spent a lot of time, then, doing institutional-building and working on the sorts of issues we just talked about.

WEEKS: As you then looked at the Population Association from a professional perspective, what did you discover and what kinds of steps were you able to take?

EVANS: It's funny, I first got aware of PAA by being editor of PAA Affairs. So, I would show up at Board meetings and that sort of thing, and I did a couple of terms of that. I had had about six years to observe board meetings and the way the association did business, and it was not impressive. It was not impressive at all. We really didn't have a person in charge. We were associated with the American Statistical Association and Ed Bisgyer. We paid them, I think, \$50,000 per year to administer things, but we were always a stepchild, and if you called the office, you would never get anyone who would say "Hello, PAA." We didn't even have a sign on the board that said PAA. We had no assets, we had no employees, and in fact we weren't even sure that we could make it as a free-standing association in terms of generating enough dues to hire a staff, and getting a place to live, and that kind of stuff. And we probably still would be in that spot if we hadn't been evicted from the American Statistical Association. They decided they didn't want to do business with us anymore, and that was the real catalyst.

WEEKS: Did they think this was a money-losing proposition?

EVANS: What happened was that the American Statistical Association grew to be very large and it got to be a very unwieldy organization. And I believe Barbara Baylor was hired to be the Executive

Administrator and she just concluded that it had to be totally restructured; refocused, slimmed down, and remade as an association. So, she couldn't afford to engage in the side fields that were distracting her, that the PAA represented. She said, look, we're changing the whole nature of this organization and you're going to have to make your own arrangements.

OK! This was the mid-80s, and about that time Harriet Presser asked me to head up an ad hoc committee to examine the question: What steps could the PAA take to become a more effective organization. I've forgotten what we called the committee, but a group of us met on this, and we examined the question of whether we could become a free-standing association, and the answer was, yes, we could. We essentially gave them a blue-print of what we would have to do conceptually, even laid out some of the options, and it just so happened that this was going on at the time that the American Statistical Association decided that they couldn't carry us any more, so they cut the script. All of a sudden we had to implement these abstract plans.

WEEKS: So, there was already a plan in place.

EVANS: We had some ideas about what we wanted to do, and we realized that we wanted to have a much more aggressive public outreach operation than most social scientific associations have. So, we realized that we had to do some things differently than the normal scientific associations.

WEEKS: And the need for the public outreach stemmed from what?

EVANS: The fact that the we were a relatively small number of researchers who depended upon billions upon billions of dollars of public investment to do our work. We were a small profession with an enormous amount of public investment to protect. So, we simply couldn't afford not to be highly visible. Most social scientific associations treated relations with Congress as more of an academic affair, holding seminars and engaging in courtesy visits.

WEEKS: Unlike the medical model of going after Congress with everything.

EVANS: Plus, I'd been doing a lot of work with our Centers, and the social science centers were in league with the biomedical centers and, as you said, the biomedical professions are extremely aggressive in representing their science. That's not politics, per se, but rather defending the notion that the federal government ought to support science. So, we have a statistical and a research operation to defend, so we needed to do a medical mode, not a social science model, and that's where I was kind of focusing our efforts. We were actually beginning to encourage our Centers to form an Association, which has now been formed and it's called the Association of Population Centers, and that's the medical model. Most medical centers are very sophisticated in the way they organize and represent themselves. So, that was my primary thrust and all of a sudden we were evicted and had only a few months to find a new place.

We had no employees and no equipment. We did have a bank account and some investments, but that was it. We need help, fast. So, we struck a deal with the American Sociological Association and I actually negotiated the lease and the arrangements with the ASA. The plan was to spend five years there and in that time to find a way to grow into an independent organization. So, we signed a five-year lease and locked in things, and part of what we wanted was to find a way to get real PAA employees and so we hired Jen Suter, the wife of my old classmate from Duke. She was working for the American Sociological Association and we said, gee, we know Jen, she's one of us, she's the wife of a demographer, in fact a demographer in her right, and she knows how to run an association. So, she started first as a half-time employee. We kind of bought pieces of her, and then increased it eventually to full-time. Now, I don't know if you ever saw the physical arrangement up there.

WEEKS: Yes, I was up there once, and it was tight, to say the least.

EVANS: Yes, to say the least.

WEEKS: Dangerous for anyone over five feet tall, as I recall.

EVANS: Yes, but it gave us some breathing room and over that period of time we actually collected assets, and Jen managed to pioneer all of the aspects of how to do the business operations. We maintained for awhile a contractual relationship with Ed Bisgyer from the American Statistical Association.

WEEKS: He had been doing all of the annual meetings.

EVANS: Yes, he negotiated the contracts with the hotels and go out and site visit them, and he had spent a career doing this, so we hired him on contract to continue finding hotels and negotiating deals, which is a big aspect. But, actually Jen figured out how to do that too, so we terminated our contract to Ed and turned over the whole job that Ed had been doing to Jen. So, Jen wound up doing the total job of the association. She had hired several other people to help her, but basically it was a one person operation. Towards the end of that arrangement with the ASA—actually with two years left on the contract—I took over as Secretary-Treasurer. Unfortunately, Jen had gotten sick and she had to retire. If I had known that, I might not have accepted!

It took me by surprise that she was so sick. She had breast cancer, and has gone through all of the things associated with that, and she's been fighting back and is doing pretty well. But, she went through a period where she just couldn't stand the pressures of being a one-person show. That really threw us for a loop, because the one thing that we had experienced with Jen was that we were a little bit ahead of our plan, because she was very capable and was willing to work for a lot less than she could have earned elsewhere, simply because she loved what she was doing. We didn't appreciate the deal we had with her, until we looked around to find a replacement. We delegated everything to her, and she did it. And we needed that because we were trying to develop new procedures and develop an awareness that we were an independent association. We needed to be able to trust somebody, so we were way ahead of our schedule. After three years we were at the point where we could break off, but then she got sick.

That threw us into a real problem, because we hired other people and the decisions were not good.

WEEKS: Was it a local committee that was put together to do that?

EVANS: Yes, the committee that hired her was, I think, the President and the President-Elect plus the Secretary-Treasurer. Al Hermalin was the President, and Dick Udry was the President-Elect, and Barbara Wilson was the Secretary-Treasurer. So those three frankly had to make a decision quickly. They had only a few months to act. So, by the time that I took over in July, Ina Young had been on the job for two or three weeks.

WEEKS: So, Jen was out of the picture by this point?

EVANS: Jen was going through chemotherapy. We had her as a consultant, since someone needed to show Ina what to do, but Jen was really knocked out by the chemotherapy and she was wasn't able to do much. And it just turned out that Ina was not Jen. We learned a lesson along the way: that is,

that we were unusually fortunate with Jen, and we simply couldn't afford that model. We needed at least two full-time people to keep a handle on things, and we probably needed a lot more supervision of the staff by the officers than we did before. I guess that sounds as though we should have anticipated these things, but we had grown quite comfortable and trusting with Jen and it was a rude awakening for us. So, I spent my time putting out fires, realizing that things had gone wrong, and trying to invent procedures so they wouldn't go wrong again.

So, my term as Secretary-Treasurer was really up and down. It wasn't going at all according to plan, but we kind of had a parting of the ways with Ina, and it happened at such a time that the annual meeting [1995] was just weeks away, and that's our big affair. So, the only possible replacement was to promote the second-in-command, who's actually handling the meeting, to be the leader. She had already taken another job, and we had to go bid her out from that job.

WEEKS: Had she taken another job out of frustration working with Ina?

EVANS: Yes. So, in rapid succession the whole thing crumbled, and we had to scramble to get Jennifer Kilroy to come back. We tried to get Jen to do it, but she was too sick. So, Jennifer did it, and we managed to get the meeting OK, and then Jennifer, a very young woman, got married and then two terrible things happened. She got very sick and was out for a long time—encephalitis, which she caught on her honeymoon and almost killed her.

WEEKS: Where did she go for her honeymoon?

EVANS: She went to Spain, but she spent some time in Africa and that's undoubtedly where she picked up the bug. Then she came back and her new husband's father died suddenly, leaving a business that the son had to take over in California. Unfortunately, Jennifer was sick, preoccupied, and getting ready to move. And right along with that, probably something that contributed to her sickness, was that the American Sociological Association decided that it wanted to move. Now, they still have their building up for sale, as far as I know.

WEEKS: They've been talking about this move for some time.

EVANS: Yes, they had a plan that they wanted to sell their building for a huge profit, and move into a better place, and bank the rest. That is still the plan. They essentially said, we want you to come with us, but we want you to make a commitment to come with us. So, we were stuck with having to decide whether we wanted to follow our plan and break off and form our own association, or sign another five-year deal with Sociology and since they were facing a very uncertain future, and still are, and we had really outgrown the physical office, we decided that we had better find our own place. So, the Board gave me a mandate to find a new place that was better and cheaper than what we had with the ASA.

WEEKS: Better was easier, but cheaper was the hard part?

EVANS: That really meant that we couldn't go to locations like Bethesda. We'd have loved to have gone to Bethesda, we'd have loved to move into one of the really high-tech places in DC, but we couldn't afford it. We couldn't even come close to affording it. So, we found a corridor in Virginia and a corridor in Maryland that had a plethora of office space, and we settled in the Silver Spring area, and we looked at about 20 or 30 different offices. We were able to find the offices that we have now, which essentially enabled us to lock in a five-year lease, get two and a half times as much space, and

where every year in lease we are spending less than we were spending at ASA. So we accomplished our objective.

WEEKS: Jennifer introduced me to a friend of hers in the building who helped to locate that space.

EVANS: That's right. Nicky, who has actually helped at some of our meetings works for an association just down the hall. Yes, I was very proud of Jennifer. You know, she's just a young kid, and she handled a good part of the leg work and some of the negotiations.

WEEKS: Did you have to go out to all those sites.

EVANS: Well, there were a couple of us, and it was easy to eliminate most of them. There were actually three sites under serious consideration. Each one would be superb. We chose this one because it was the cheapest and also the largest. It gave us a little room to grow. The building is not glamorous, I'm sure you realize, by any stretch of the imagination. But, it is functional and it is within reasonable hopping distance of the Metro and has a big parking lot right across the street.

WEEKS: You're not expecting walk-in traffic at the office, so you need the space just to work.

EVANS: That's right, and the way we've conceived the association to work now, is that you need a business operation and a place for that work to be done. That's a service operation and that's all they do. We've built a firewall between that operation and the public affairs outreach. That has a different location.

WEEKS: I've blocked on that person's name.

EVANS: Anne Harrison-Clark.

WEEKS: Right. Now, she's hired on a consulting basis? She does similar work for other organizations?

EVANS: Yes. The model that we'd had previously was that the Public Affairs people were employees of PAA. And, frankly, one of our challenges, and another disagreeable thing that I had to deal with, was that costs were just going out of sight. And, we simply couldn't afford it. So, we had to build that firewall in there and ease the employees away so that they all worked for Anne as contractors, and that's still not complete. It will be complete within two or three months. Basically, Anne will do everything as a contractual operation, but she has other companies and she does an effective job of representing the profession and working with the big coalitions of scientific associations.

WEEKS: Is she responsible then only to the Board? There's no real interface between PAA staff and her? Both answer separately to the Board?

EVANS: Right. I kind of structured the deal that way. I think it's a good one, because they're really two very different types of operations. In fact, in those associations where they try to get their executive administrator to be also the chief representation of the Board, they don't do a very effective job of representing the field. You need a specialist. The activities are so different. It means that you need a specialist that does the business part, a specialist that does the public affairs part. I don't think that the social science associations, that I'm familiar with, do the outreach very well. They're more

concerned with the business of the association, and they don't get wrapped up in scientific issues. And, frankly, Congress doesn't care about the business issues. They care about other things.

So, building a firewall between the two parts of the organization contains costs, and we are also forging a partnership with the Association of Population Centers. We've been able to support it with dues, all with "private" money, from the Universities, outside of the grant from NIH. I must say that that organization has developed to be quite influential. I mean that's the hard core of this field.

WEEKS: The people with the real interest in "volunteering" their time.

EVANS: Right. If you're the President of a top research university, you're going to very definitely see it in your interest to be sure that your investment in research is well defended. That's not a controversial idea. And that's the way the medical field works, as well.

So, anyway, that's a problem that we solved. We had a lot of procedural things that we had to work out. We essentially learned by trial and error. What doesn't work? I've spent a lot of time writing things down, to make sure that we did things right, the next time we did them.

WEEKS: And safely stored in the archives.

EVANS: And, I guarantee, a copy delivered into the hands of Betsy Stephens, as well. So, at least she will take over with a lot of these things being experienced, the growing pains having been endured, and the attempt having been made to write formal policy to get this organization into "adult" status. And, I think that we decided that instead of rushing around like mad, as we did when Jen was sick, we would have a long drawn-out, exhaustive search for an executive administrator [Stephanie]. So, it took us six months to find the right person. But, I think we are on much better footing than in the last transition.

As I've explained to Betsy, and I think alarmed her to a certain extent, the thing I've learned is that the association needs a much more intimate relationship between the Secretary-Treasurer and the Executive Administrator. So, we can't just trust people the way we trusted Jen Suter. So, I've written a set of procedures, and it was an enormous amount of work. I'm not sure how that's going to work out. That may prove to be really burdensome. In other organizations, what they've had to do is to hire people like Betsy full-time to be a Secretary-Treasurer.

So, what will likely happen is that you'll have a highly involved Secretary-Treasurer and I just don't know how long a person can sustain the level of activity I've created in that role, on a volunteer basis.

WEEKS: Presumably, Stephanie will be able to move in a direction closer to where Jen was with the organization.

EVANS: Basically, what we were looking for was someone who knew the steps already, and someone who had worked for a larger organization as a junior person and who wanted to be the top dog in a smaller association. And that's exactly Stephanie's story. She has a real track record, but we can never go back to the days when we just turn it over to one person.

So, my legacy has been to create this web of responsibilities that are much more intensive than what I did.

WEEKS: I think that's a good idea. If you look back at the interviews that Andy Lunde and Jean van de Tak did with earlier Board members, you find that often Board members had no sense of what they were supposed to do. And, there wasn't that real sense of continuity. That may not matter in a small organization, but as you say when the organization is trying to become an adult, it matters a lot.

EVANS: It matters a whole lot. I mean there are real growing pains. So, I feel pretty good about it. I think we're over that. I have a lot of confidence that Stephanie is going to be pretty good, and also Jennifer Huber is a bright young person and my recommendation is that we nurture her so that we have a two-person show, rather than a one-person show. We never want to be in a position where the only person who knows what's going on is the executive administrator. Then, you're absolutely stuck if something happens. And, you need a much closer monitoring of day-to-day operations by the Secretary-Treasurer. I wasn't satisfied that I had enough information to do that, so we fixed that.

WEEKS: The lawyer in you struck!

EVANS: That's right. And now, Betsy has to pay the price of looking at a lot more stuff than she probably understands that she'll have to. I've alerted her to the fact that I've done that, and she's reading over the pages of stuff that I've written down. But, I think she's in pretty good shape, because the major issues of growing to adulthood are behind us. Now, it's a matter of functioning like an adult.

WEEKS: Now, she could be stuck if the government doesn't let people be on the Boards of Directors of scientific organizations. Is there any reason why someone couldn't be reappointed to that position?

EVANS: No, except for the burnout factor. And the reason why the federal government won't allow people like me to be intimately intertwined with scientific associations, is because they do precisely the jobs that I did. However, I don't think that's a crime. I'm proud of what I've done—that government has been able to form a partnership with non-profit Centers. We pay attention to what's good for science and that's a legitimate concern.