

DEMOGRAPHIC DESTINIES

Interviews with Presidents of the Population Association of America

Interviews Referencing Frank Lorimer PAA President in 1946-47



This series of interviews with Past PAA Presidents was initiated by Anders Lunde
(PAA Historian, 1973 to 1982)

And continued by Jean van der Tak (PAA Historian, 1982 to 1994)

And then by John R. Weeks (PAA Historian, 1994 to present)

With the collaboration of the following members of the PAA History Committee:
David Heer (2004 to 2007), Paul Demeny (2004 to 2012), Dennis Hodgson (2004 to
present), Deborah McFarlane (2004 to 2018), Karen Hardee (2010 to present), Emily
Merchant (2016 to present), and Win Brown (2018 to present)

FRANK LORIMER

We do not have an interview with Frank Lorimer, who was the tenth PAA President (1946-47). However, as Andy Lunde and Jean van der Tak (VDT) were interviewing other past presidents, they regularly asked questions about those early presidents whom they had been unable to interview. Below are the excerpted comments about Frank Lorimer.

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS

Frank Lorimer was born in 1894 in Bradley, Maine. He graduated from Yale University in 1916 and then served in the military during World War I. He received his M.A. from the University of Chicago in 1921, and a divinity degree from the Union Theological Seminary in 1923. After serving as a minister at the New York City Baptist Mission Society for three years, he earned his Ph.D. at Columbia University in 1926. He taught briefly at Wellesley College and then moved to Washington, D.C. where his first wife, Faith Williams, was a high-level government official. He was professor of sociology at American University in Washington, D.C. from 1938 to 1964. During this time, he also served as administrative director of the International Population Union (IUSPP) from 1948 to 1956, and as a research associate with the Office of Population Research at Princeton University from 1961 to 1964. He was subsequently a visiting professor of demography at the University of the Philippines from 1964 to 1966. His first wife, Faith, died in 1958. His second wife, whom he met while in Africa, was from New Zealand, and Dr. Lorimer died in Wakatane, New Zealand, in 1985. He was the author of a number of books, including "The Population of the Soviet Union," "The Demography of Tropical Africa" and "Demographic Information on Tropical Africa." He was a founding member of the Population Association of America, and was also president of the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population.

From Andy Lunde's interview with Frank Notestein in 1973:

LUNDE: Frank, would you please tell us a few things about the early days of the PAA.

NOTESTEIN: I remember the organizing meeting [May 7, 1931] fairly vividly. Hank [Henry Pratt] Fairchild was the moving spirit and through the good offices of Margaret Sanger, he had gotten some funds from the Milbank Memorial Fund to finance the meeting. I think there were some 35 of us there, including Frank Lorimer [PAA President 1946-47], who is now in New Zealand, and Frederick Osborn [President 1949-50], among those now surviving. It was intended by Professor Fairchild that a nominating committee put in his name as president and Mrs. Sanger as first vice-president. But difficulties arose immediately. Frederick Osborn was a very great admirer of Mrs. Sanger but he felt rather keenly that there was a great need for a professional society which was not an action group and that it would be a great mistake if the association became an adjunct of her birth control movement, which he always supported and in which he was a strong believer. I think he even convinced Mrs. Sanger of this. I don't think she was at the meeting but in any event, he spoke of this and her name was withdrawn.

LUNDE: Back through the years were there areas where the Association had some particular impact?

NOTESTEIN: Well, in the Depression we had a situation not at all unlike that of England where the unemployed were overrunning the relief systems and people were saying--it was almost another Malthusianism--that it was no good having cheap corn if these people were going to have more children. There was a great deal of talk about people on relief having babies. I think the Association did well having meetings and publicizing what was actually going on. Sam Stouffer did quite a few

studies that got into the papers, showing that people on relief had lots of babies and that's why they got on relief. The need was there; people who had lots of kids were likely to be on relief. Then the birth rate went up a bit in 1934 and 1935 and there was a great hullabaloo about whether relief was lifting the number of births. I was able to take this by region in New York City and show that in areas where the unemployed were prevalent birth rates tended to drop rapidly and it was the well-to-do areas that were producing the children.

Then the Association was useful at the time that the [Committee on Population Problems of the] National Resources Committee was active. You remember that Frank Lorimer was [director of the technical staff]. After the Association got started, Frank raised some money from a Mrs. Robinson, a Quaker, to start a thing called Population Literature. He got Irene Taeuber [PAA President 1953-54] to do the bibliography on this and that led to two volumes. At the time, the Milbank [Memorial] Fund was paying something to the Association for a Permanent Secretary, wanting to get the Association launched, and Frank was the secretary. Then the Resources Committee came along and offered him the directorship of this big population study and he decided it was the thing to do. In the meantime, Milbank had given Princeton enough money to hire me to set up the Office of Population Research, in 1936. Princeton was pretty keen about our having a publication and the arrangement that Lorimer had [for funding] dropped out, so it was agreed that Irene Taeuber would join the Office of Population Research and we would put out the successor to Population Literature--Population Index. The Milbank Fund encouraged that. It was thought a public health foundation would have some trouble justifying the continued support of the Association journal, but since the Fund had decided to support my work at Princeton, it could be put into the budget there pretty easily without raising any question. Of course, this was most fortunate because by this channel, Irene Taeuber was working for the organization. She started in 1936 and retired this year [1973]. And if there's a more productive demographic scholar in the world, I don't know [him/her].

Now, the National Resources Committee--this was the cast. Lorimer was on it; that was one of the Association's contributions. P.K. Whelpton [PAA President 1941-42] and Warren Thompson [President 1936-38] were doing population projections; Thompson was on the governing committee [Committee on Population Problems]. E.B. Wilson was chairman of that committee. And I guess this is the only case of explicit censorship that I've ever run into. Is that in your records?

From Andy Lunde's interview with Conrad Taeuber in 1973:

LUNDE: What were the principal concerns of members of PAA in the late 1930s when you first joined?

TAEUBER: The National Resources Planning Board set up a Committee to review the population situation. This was done in the report, The Problems of a Changing Population [1938]. Frank Lorimer directed the technical staff. With the trend toward replacement fertility, there was much concern over the prospect of a cessation of population growth and possible population decline if then current trends continued. The U.S. situation was paralleled in northern and western Europe. The Committee recommended no action by the government of the United States. In the Association, as in public discussions, there was concern over the prospects and a good deal of skepticism about the ability of governments to affect such trends, as well as questioning of the desirability of having governments make such attempts.

There was a strong element of eugenics at that time. The differentials in fertility, with poorer families having more children than economically favored groups, were noted with a good deal of concern over the possibility that there would be a dysgenic effect and a lowering of the level of intellectual ability. The development of new measures of the underlying trends and the possibility of eventual population decline led to much discussion of population quality.

LUNDE: Going back to the years when you were Secretary (1939-42) and President (1948-49) of PAA, what were some of the activities and issues that would be of interest today?

TAEUBER: From the very beginning, there was a continuing concern with the possibility that the organization might become not a scientific organization but be taken over by family planning and other activist groups. This concern was parallel to the concern in the International Union which brought into its title "for the Scientific Study of Population." There was concern in the drafting of a constitution for PAA and setting qualifications for membership. Though it was recognized that both the national and the international organizations owed a major debt to Margaret Sanger for providing the impetus that got them started, she recognized the validity of the desire to have an organization that would objectively review data and policies and trends.

The early group did have a variety of backgrounds and interests. Henry Pratt Fairchild [first PAA President, 1931-35] had been especially concerned with immigration and had written one of the early texts on that subject. Osborn had a strong interest in human genetics. Frank Lorimer [President, 1946-47] first came into the field through his collaboration with Osborn in the preparation of their book, Dynamics of Population [1934]. Lorimer might be considered one of the first full-time professionals in the population field. Irene and I met Frank and Faith (Williams) Lorimer soon after we were established in the Washington area. Faith held a high position in the Department of Labor. Frank did some teaching at American University. He was elected Secretary of PAA early on and decided that PAA could serve its members with a current bibliographic service. Research reports of interest to demographers were then scattered among many journals, including foreign-language journals which were not readily available to most research workers in the U.S. He began this service to the field with the modest Population Literature, asking Irene to help him. This was taken over by the newly established Office of Population Research at Princeton and Irene became editor of the renamed Population Index, with an appointment on the staff of OPR, although she could do most of her work in Washington in the Library of Congress, which has a long policy of providing space to outside scholars.

From Jean van der Tak's interview with Philip Hauser in 1988:

VDT: I think you must have been the peacemaker on other occasions. Lincoln Day told me a story of a session with you in the chair and Kingsley Davis was reading a paper with an early version of intermediate variables and Frank Lorimer--they were always sparring with each other in fertility sessions--got up and intimated that Kingsley had borrowed his ideas from some of his, Lorimer's, articles. And Kingsley said, "I read some of your papers, Frank, and I thought they were all hogwash." Lorimer got up and pulled off his coat, and you said, "Gentlemen, repair to the alley."

HAUSER: I remember that.

VDT: I also forgot to ask you if you can tell me a bit more about Fred Osborn, who was PAA president just before you, among many others things. He was a good research entrepreneur too, I gather. [See comment about Lorimer]

HAUSER: There are two things about Fred that come to mind immediately. He's the only man I've ever seen able to put his foot on top of a desk this high and put his elbow on his knee. Try that sometime. He was six feet, seven inches tall. Also, at the old Cosmos Club in Washington, he was able to reach over the gate, which otherwise was closed to everybody else, and lift the latch.

Fred was not a demographer, never was, never would be. But he became very much interested in demography, largely through association with Frank Lorimer. They wrote this book together

[Dynamics of Population, 1934], which was Frank's book, not Fred's, and Fred became so interested that he became a philanthropist of demography. Fred made his first half million dollars in selling a railroad to Henry Ford and he amassed quite a bit of wealth. He was a very intelligent man; extremely motivated, particularly on the social engineering side. He was not a scientist but he appreciated what science could do and supported it. That was his major contribution.

From Andy Lunde's interview with Irene Taeuber in 1973:

LUNDE: How did you first get interested in this whole business?

TAEUBER: From a multi-disciplinary background; being interested as undergraduate and graduate in a rather wide area of the field. I have my degrees with majors in sociology and economics. My major electives and activities moved from a zoology department and human biology to an M.A. thesis using [anthropological data]. I did a thesis, in the sociology department, on "The Inheritance of Pigmentation in the American Negro," which Raymond Pearl published in the first or second issue of Human Biology [Volume 2, September 1929, pp. 321-381]. So I became a discovery and protege of Raymond Pearl.

Then my interests broadened in Washington in the 1930s, when Frank Lorimer and I started Population Literature. We were both among the disenfranchised who had spouses in the federal service. We would get a little grant to pay ourselves retrospectively and get out another issue. We did that for two years. Then when the Office of Population Research at Princeton was established, this became an obvious thing they could do, so they enlisted me in Population Index.

From Jean van der Tak's interview with Henry Shryock in 1988:

VDT: You got an early start at hands-on experience in collecting data, which I think some of today's demographers might lack. Going back to OPR. I interviewed George Stolnitz a couple of weeks ago; he was there in the 1950s. But you were one of the earliest ones.

SHRYOCK: I remember meeting George Stolnitz; that was when I'd finished at OPR and gone back to the Census Bureau in 1939. At OPR we were working on several things. One was that we had to edit Population Index, which we'd taken over in its third year. Irene Taeuber and Frank Lorimer had been handling it on their own [in Washington]. Frank Lorimer sort of bowed out [to become Technical Director for the Committee on Population Problems of the National Resources Board]. The name was changed from Population Literature to Population Index. By the way, I think it was De Witt Clinton Pool, the man that interviewed me, who came up with that name.

From Harry Rosenberg's interview (substituting for Andy Lunde) with Clyde Kiser in 1976:

ROSENBERG: Clyde, what are some of the books and materials you think might be useful in this project? For example, the history of the Milbank Fund, Forty Years of Fertility Research [Proceedings of a Conference Honoring Clyde V. Kiser, New York City, May 5-6, 1971, edited by Clyde Kiser, Milbank Memorial Fund, 1971]. Obviously, it's a central kind of thing.

KISER: That's right. There are three historical articles in here. My own is, "The Work of the Milbank Memorial Fund in Population since 1928." Then Notestein's piece, "Reminiscences: The Role of Foundations, the Population Association of America, Princeton University and the United Nations in Fostering American Interest in Population Problems." And then Frank Lorimer, "The Role of the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population."

Then this other little red book of which I've given each of you a copy. It's called, The Milbank Memorial Fund: Its Leaders and Its Work [by Clyde Kiser, Milbank Memorial Fund, 1975]. There's a little history of population here but not too much. I devoted this mainly to public health work.

There is another good book, the proceedings of the World Population Conference in 1927, edited by Margaret Sanger and published in London by Arnold. Another book is the proceedings of the 1931 IUSSP conference in London; that was the first annual meeting. It's edited by G.H.L.F. Pitt-Rivers. He was an erratic guy but he was pretty bright. He was the one who really caused a ruckus in that Paris meeting in 1937. He was something of a Nazi and he wanted to kick the Czechoslovakians and several of the other Communist countries--or those he thought were on the verge of Communism--out of the Union. There was a lot of argument. The Germans and Nazis there wanted to give papers in which they talked about the master race and all of that. In planning the congress, according to Lorimer, they put all those papers in the same session and let Frederick Osborn be the chairman. At the end of the session, Osborn quoted Voltaire: "I disagree with everything you say, but I would give my life for your right to say it."

From Jean van der Tak's interview with Dudley Kirk in 1989:

VDT: She [referring to Irene Taeuber's editing of Population Index] was writing those lead articles on the population of different countries anonymously, didn't get a credit line on them.

KIRK: Well, she did a tremendous amount anonymously and a tremendous amount over her name too. She'd come to Princeton to consult. Irene was always a bit eccentric in her manner of things. If you said something, she'd say "No, and . . ." but then she'd agree with you. If it began with no, it would end up with yes. Of course, she was a remarkable woman.

Also, Frank Lorimer stood out. He was another person I always admired very much. He was in Washington at the American University but he came up to Princeton to consult on his book on the Soviet Union [The Population of the Soviet Union, 1946], because it was published by OPR.

VDT: You mentioned some leading influences on your career--Fred Osborn, Frank Notestein . . .

KIRK: And Frank Lorimer.

VDT: Tell me about Frank Lorimer. I've heard what a wonderful character he was; how he married again, that New Zealand nurse he met in Africa. They went to live on a commune in New England, had a child when he was 79, and went out to New Zealand.

KIRK: They adopted another daughter, Petra's illegitimate niece. He also had adopted children by Faith, his first wife.

Frank Lorimer illustrated what I see as a great difference from those presently in demography. He had very broad interests, a broad background; he'd been a minister. At that first meeting of PAA I attended in 1939, 50 years ago, there were 17 participants, who gave papers, wrote joint papers, discussed papers and so on. Only 17, and 14 of them were then in Who's Who or a subsequent edition. And I doubt very much whether the 529 participants that I counted in the 1988 meeting program--think of it, 529 as opposed to 17!--I doubt very much whether they're going to have as high a proportion in Who's Who.

VDT: What do you think accounts for that, that population then drew such eminent people?

KIRK: That was before it was very firmly located in sociology. Several disciplines would be

represented in these meetings, broad-scale people. Frank Lorimer, besides the ministry, studied anthropology. He and Fred Osborn wrote this book at the Museum of Natural History in New York, Dynamics of Population [1934].

VDT: There's a funny expression used about you in that Dennis Hodgson article ["Orthodoxy and Revisionism in American Demography," *Population and Development Review*, December 1988] that looks at the shift from orthodoxy to revisionism. He says that in the 1970s, you, Kingsley Davis, Clyde Kiser and Frank Lorimer were labeled "eugenic demographers" by the feminists, because they felt you were supporting family planning programs to bring down the birth rate at whatever cost in developing countries and they felt that perhaps had eugenic, racist overtones.

KIRK: I've been called that because of long association with Frederick Osborn, and I was president of . . .

VDT: The Eugenics Society?

KIRK: Yes, though the name was changed to the American Society for the Study of Social Biology. I was president of that for three years [1969-72]. And I've always felt there really is a eugenic aspect of this.

VDT: I forgot to bring up a very important occasion--Paul Demeny and his thrill at how you picked him out, in Geneva, when you heard from Frank Lorimer in 1957 that here was this Hungarian who had gotten out of Hungary after the Communist takeover--officially, because he was at official meetings in Geneva and he decided not to go back to Hungary. His professor in Hungary got in touch with Frank Lorimer who got in touch with you and within a month there you were in Geneva, interviewing him at the Beau Rivage, a hotel that still exists. You had lunch there and within a month or so, here he was, a Population Council Fellow, arriving in the United States to go to Princeton and you had him met at the airport in New York.

KIRK: I did a detective job to find him. He had a sort of mail drop with a professor at the university. I went to the apartment where this man lived and the concierge didn't know anything about Paul Demeny and I didn't know the professor's name, so he said, "Well, go around and try each apartment." I knocked on each door and several of these nice Genevois invited me in to have coffee! They hadn't heard of Paul Demeny either; I was just a strange American who had knocked on their door. I finally did find the door of the professor but there was no one there. So I went down to the police station. You know, everybody has to register in Geneva.

From Abbott Ferriss' interview (substituting for Andy Lunde) with John Durand in 1979:

FERRISS: [Referring to early PAA meetings] Do you recall any incidents in the discussion; any arguments that ensued?

DURAND: Not much. I can only think of two arguments at a Population Association meeting. One was at a meeting in New York City, around the mid-1950s. [Most likely the New York meeting of 1961.] What I recall has to do with Frank Lorimer and Kingsley Davis. Kingsley was talking about Ireland and he hadn't exactly put Ireland in the most favorable light. He said some things about the nature of the Irish, the character of that country, that seemed to impel Frank Lorimer to come to the defense of Ireland. He got up and said, "The Irish are not all that bad," and went on to point out their attractions--a certain amount of poetry, certain amount of music, and so on--the qualities of Ireland and

the Irish.

That night, Frank came up to supper at our house, in Scarsdale, and sat in our kitchen. And he was full of remorse, because he felt that he had misbehaved in the meeting and allowed himself to get drawn into an argument that was not a substantive demographic argument and therefore was out of place at the meeting. He was very contrite. And I assured him, "Oh, Frank, you're a good fellow; your heart is of gold. Because you felt that Ireland was being mis-viewed, it's all right that you should have said what you did; you didn't overdo it." So, I remember this argument and that's one of the primary ones that I recall.

From Jean van der Tak's interview with Kingsley Davis in 1989:

VDT: What other highlights and people do you remember from the early meetings? I want to mention that a number of people have mentioned the wonderful debates there were between you and Frank Lorimer in the 1950s and early 1960s, in every fertility session. Apparently, you two sort of lit into each other; it almost came to a physical fight at one point, I'm told. [See Philip Hauser interview, above; Lincoln Day, below.] You took the socioeconomic approach to understanding fertility decline and his approach was cultural. I've never understood why those two should be different.

DAVIS: Essentially there aren't any differences.

VDT: Yes, but somehow you seemed to approach it differently enough to cause interesting fireworks in those meetings.

DAVIS: I guess it would be a long story to go into. I never thought of Lorimer as a rival, but he evidently thought of me as being one for him.

VDT: You never thought of him as important?

DAVIS: In my career, no. His material was too unsystematic to be worth serious consideration. I didn't think much about it.

VDT: I see. Well, you had some lively debates in those meetings. Charlie Nam, in particular, said everybody looked forward to the fertility session every year, because invariably you two would have lively discussions.

DAVIS: I guess that's an exaggeration.

From Jean van der Tak's interview with Ansley Coale in 1988:

VDT: I'd like to ask you to repeat a story you told in your 1979 interview about Frank Lorimer [PAA president 1934-39], who wanted you to come back when you were on your honeymoon, so you must have known Frank quite well. Tell me about him. I regret I didn't get to New Zealand in time to interview him before his death.

COALE: Frank was a free spirit. Here is that story. Frank was working on The Population of the Soviet Union [1946], part of the OPR work on Europe for the League of Nations. I had worked out a way of correcting the understated mortality rates at older ages in Eastern Europe. The rates were clearly understated in Russia as well. He wanted to adapt the system that I had used for the Balkan countries and apply it to Russia. I had corresponded with him about it. He asked me to come down to

Washington and speak before his graduate seminar at American University on this subject. I wrote back saying I'd love to come but the time he mentioned was right after our scheduled honeymoon and I wasn't sure I would be ready to come. He sent me this telegram: "Please come and bring the new Coale to our castle."

Later on, Frank and his second wife had a problem about living in a hippie commune. Earlier he was traveling in Africa and, typical of Frank, he was staying in African hotels, deliberately staying away from European hotels. Staying at such a hotel was a nurse who had the same ideology, determined not to be identified as a European and to share the African life. They met and fell in love. This was Petra, many years his junior. Later they were back in the United States and Frank was always a rebel, so with Petra he moved into a commune in Connecticut, with a lot of hippie types. Frank had to leave, because the commune wouldn't tolerate dissent. If you did not follow their precise hippie line, they didn't want you there. Seventy-year-old Frank couldn't stand the hippies' intolerance! Actually, he was in his sixties then. His baby was born when he was 69, I remember that. Surpassed by Kingsley Davis, whose [last] baby was born when he was 79. I think it's lovely that this man in his sixties couldn't tolerate the intolerance of young radicals.

From Jean van der Tak's interview with Norman Ryder in 1988:

RYDER: I've never lacked for good friends in the profession. Frank Lorimer would be worth at least an hour on tape all by himself.

VDT: Tell me something about him. He's a person I most regret not having been able to interview.

RYDER: Let me tell you just one little story, because I happened to be on hand and heard it from him. It was after Faith Williams had died; Faith was his wife for many, many years. She had an outstanding career in the government as an economist. Frank had lost Faith and he was, I would think, in his late sixties and we were at the Princeton Inn, which at that time was still a hostelry, it's now a residence, having breakfast on a Sunday. I found it difficult to have a conversation with a man who had just lost his wife of so many years and it was a good marriage. But I said, "What do you think you might do now?" He said, "Well, I've always wanted to go to Africa, so I think I'm going to Africa." And I thought, isn't that great for a person who as far as I was concerned was an old man, not much older than I am now, but that he should just be able to start a new chapter in his life.

Well, while he was in Africa he was in a bar in Nairobi and he picked up a nurse sitting at an adjoining table. She was a nurse from New Zealand, and he married her. It was not long thereafter that Frank came to the Population Association meeting, which was being held at Pennsylvania that year [1963], and I remember our meeting at a big cocktail party in the museum. Frank Lorimer was strutting across the floor like a turkey cock--his wife was pregnant!

I kept in close contact with Frank, as close as I could, because he was so many different people at the same time. His career included being a minister, a psychologist, a research assistant to Fred Osborn, whom he managed to convert away from the rather racist eugenics of Osborn's uncle and really reformed Fred, turned him into an entirely different person. He was also an anthropologist; he was so many different things. He was a very good friend to me, and when I was young I got into the International Population Union [IUSSP] when I was 27 years old [1951].



Frank Lorimer, 1894-1985

Author(s): Etienne van de Walle

Source: *Population Index*, Winter, 1985, Vol. 51, No. 4 (Winter, 1985), pp. 635-642

Published by: Office of Population Research

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.com/stable/2737365>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Office of Population Research is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Population Index*

JSTOR



FRANK LORIMER
1894–1985

CURRENT ITEMS

FRANK LORIMER, 1894-1985

Frank Lorimer died of a stroke on June 23, 1985, in Wakatane, New Zealand, where he had spent most of his retirement years and where, as he was fond of saying, he had gained many new family members (through his marriage to Petra Barris), even though he had also lost many of his old friends. He is also affectionately remembered by his many friends in the United States as well as by those he made in other parts of the world, particularly while in his position as Administrative Director of the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population (IUSSP) between 1948 and 1956 and later as its President. He pleaded failing health as a reason not to attend the Florence Conference of the IUSSP earlier this year, but remained active and intellectually vigorous to the end of his life. He attended the meetings of the Population Association of America (PAA) in 1981, where he delivered a paper in a session on "The PAA at age 50" on the subject "How the Demographers Saved the Association" (Lorimer, 1981). Frank Lorimer had been one of the founding members of the Association and participated in the famous organizational conference of 1931, where the Vice-Presidency was tactfully denied to Margaret Sanger as a way of signifying the scientific, rather than the activist, nature of the new professional organization. He narrated these events in his paper and concluded with his personal credo:

I was once a minister. I have ceased to be a theologian, but I am still a preacher, so I will conclude my speech with a sermon...Modern demographers tend to be concerned exclusively with detailed and, if possible, elegant explanations of specific processes. They should also be concerned about the social and psychological consequences of current trends. Science and ethics need to be clearly distinguished, but I think that scientists, as such, should be concerned with the ethical implications of their activities. In short, scientists should be philosophers and philosophers should be scientists.

Frank Lorimer was well into his thirties when the PAA was created. He had left the ministry and taken a Ph.D. in Philosophy at Columbia with a dissertation entitled The Growth of Reason: A Study of the Role of Verbal Activity in the Growth of the Structure of the Human Mind (1929), a work strongly influenced by Piaget. After a short stint in full-time academic life as a Lecturer in Social Theory in the Department of Philosophy at Wellesley College, he settled in Washington where his first wife, Faith M. Williams, was pursuing a successful career in the Administration. He taught part-time at American University where he was Professor of Sociology from 1938 to 1964, but devoted much of his time to non academic pursuits as a researcher or an administrator.

He must have come to population through his interest in eugenics, and the publication of Dynamics of Population in 1934 marked the beginning of a fruitful collaboration with Frederick Osborn. In 1934, he became Secretary-Treasurer of the PAA, and shortly afterward began publication of Population Literature with Irene Tauerber. When Frank Lorimer became Director of the Technical Staff of the Committee on Population Problems at the National Resources Committee, the journal moved to the newly founded Office of Population Research in Princeton and was renamed Population Index. Thus, Frank Lorimer was one of the founders of this journal.

On the Technical Staff of the Committee on Population Problems, Lorimer's team included Harold Dorn, Rupert B. Vance, and Robert Woodbury. The resulting report, The Problems of a Changing Population (1938), was scholarly and balanced, and helped provide a base for public policy by summarizing available scientific knowledge. According to Notestein,

the report's sane reaction to the prospects of slowing population probably helped avoid political reaction. Instead of directing primary attention to the predicted check on national growth, it emphasized the importance of fostering the welfare and opportunities of the nation's youth.

By its tone and its content, the report was a precursor of the 1972 Report of the Commission on Population and the American Future. The work established Lorimer's reputation as one of the foremost American demographers, and he was part of the committee of the Milbank Memorial Fund which recommended the Indianapolis study. He worked on the National Resources Committee Planning Board until 1942.

With the Second World War, his international interests came to the fore. He served in the Office of Strategic Services and on the Foreign Economic Administration, and eventually in Japan as chief of the Population and Employment Branch of the McArthur administration. In the meantime, the League of Nations had commissioned Princeton's Office of Population Research to produce a series of monographs destined to illuminate population problems in Europe after the war. Lorimer published The Population of the Soviet Union: History and Prospects as part of this series in 1946. He took up his functions as Administrative Director of the IUSSP in the same year, and when Unesco offered to underwrite the cost of a study by the Union of social and cultural conditions affecting fertility, the work was entrusted to him. Much of the content of Culture and Human Fertility (1954) is devoted to Africa and reflects the work of anthropologists before the dawn of the statistical era on this continent. This was the beginning of Lorimer's interest in the area, and African demography as we know it today owes much to his subsequent efforts to develop the field.

After Faith Williams's death in 1958, the Population Council sent him on a mission through Sub-Saharan Africa. He visited and eventually brought together a number of researchers working in isolation in various African colonies, and territories. This writer vividly remembers Frank Lorimer stepping off a taxi in front of his field headquarters in Bujumbura; William Brass, Pierre Cantrelle, Anatole Romaniuk, and scores of others must have equally vivid memories. In the summer of 1959, Lorimer organized a Workshop on African Demography in Paris to which he brought most of the people who had been involved in fieldwork. He later spent a period teaching demography at the University of Ghana, thereby initiating in that institution the tradition of population studies, which eventually evolved into the first Demographic Unit in Sub-Saharan Africa and later into the United Nations Regional Institute for Population Studies (RIPS). He also compiled Demographic Information on Tropical Africa (1961) and initiated an African project at the Office of Population Research, which resulted in Coale and Demeny's Model Life Tables and in the work by Brass et al., The Demography of Tropical Africa (1968). Lorimer's intellectual contribution was acknowledged by his coauthorship of the latter volume in 1968. By then he had married Petra, whom he had met in Africa, and was starting a new family. This prospect made him very happy; he eventually had two children from this marriage, Francine and Andrea. But it also raised financial problems, which led him to accept the position of Visiting Professor of Demography for two years at the University of the Philippines, after he had reached emeritus status at American University.

Frank Lorimer was a humanist rather than a technician of demography. Yet, he broke new ground in areas where knowledge was scarce, such as the Soviet Union or Tropical Africa. He made ingenious and rigorous contributions to issues of measurement, because he was interested in truth unmarred by intellectual prejudice or by statistical bias. His work was distinguished by meticulous scholarship and a concern for ethical issues. One should not be deceived by his unconventional approach to problems and his tolerance for other points of view into believing that he would tolerate sloppy work or poor

organization. He was always highly successful as an organizer, an administrator, and a mover of people. These qualities insured his election as President of the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population in 1957.

Frank Lorimer had a total belief in the power of logic and honest discussion between opponents to resolve moral issues. He had a generous mind and a free spirit, and the warmth and charm that emanated from him gained him many friends everywhere. By his human and intellectual qualities, he marked a period of American and international demography and helped shape our discipline.

Etienne van de Walle

Bibliography

- Lorimer, Frank. 1929.
The Growth of Reason: A Study of the Role of Verbal Activity in the Growth of the Structure of the Human Mind. Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University.
- Lorimer, Frank; Dublin, Louis I.; and Engle, Earl T. 1933.
Discussion of the differential fertility of social classes. Social Forces (Chapel Hill, N.C.) 12(1):39-47.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1933.
Factors influencing ratios of children to native-white women in the United States, 1900 and 1930. Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly (New York, N.Y.) 11(3). 15 pp.
- Lorimer, Frank; and Osborn, Frederick. 1934.
Dynamics of Population. Social and Biological Significance of Changing Birth Rates in the United States. New York, N.Y.: Macmillan.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1935.
Adjustment for the influence of age composition on estimates* by Burk's Method of the distribution of sizes of completed fraternities. Journal of the American Statistical Association (Washington, D.C.) 30(192): 688-90.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1935.
The conditions of most rapid population growth. Marriage Hygiene (Bombay) 2(2):154-7.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1935.
The recent rise of birth rates in Western Europe. Journal of Heredity (Washington, D.C.) 26(3):103-4.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1935.
[Selected bibliography]. In Tomorrow's Children; The Goal of Eugenics, by Ellsworth Huntington, pp. 127-31. New York, N.Y.: John Wiley and Sons; and London: Chapman and Hall.
- Dorn, Harold F.; and Lorimer, Frank. 1936.
Migration, reproduction, and population adjustment. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science (Beverly Hills, Calif.) 188:280-9.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1937.
Defects in present information on differential reproduction. Paper presented at the 99th Annual Meeting of the American Statistical Association, Atlantic City, New Jersey, December 29, 1937.

- Lorimer, Frank. 1937.
Population and economic resources in the United States. Congres International de la Population (Paris) 7:88-107.
- Wilson, Edwin B.; and Lorimer, Frank. 1937.
Population Statistics. 1. National Data. Material Prepared for a Study of Population Problems. Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Resources Committee, Committee on Population Problems.
- Wilson, Edwin B.; and Lorimer, Frank. 1937.
Population Statistics. 2. State Data. Material Prepared for a Study of Population Problems. Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Resources Committee, Committee on Population Problems.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1937.
The significance of imminent population changes in the United States. Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly (New York, N.Y.) 15(3):207-18.
- Wilson, Edwin B.; and Lorimer, Frank. 1938.
The Problems of a Changing Population. Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Resources Committee, Committee on Population Problems.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1938.
Suggested Procedure for Population Studies by State Planning Boards. Rev. ed. Washington, D.C.: National Resources Committee.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1938.
Who's who in the next generation? Birth Control Review 22(7):74-83.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1940.
Background of internal migration. In Hearings...Pursuant to HR 63 and HR 491. Resolutions to Inquire into the Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens, to Study, Survey, and Investigate the Social and Economic Needs and the Movement of Indigent Persons across State Lines, Part 1. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Printing Office.
- Lorimer, Frank; and Roback, Herbert. 1940.
Economics of the family relative to number of children. Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly (New York, N.Y.) 18(2):114-36.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1940.
The effect of children on the economic status of American families. Journal of Heredity (Washington, D.C.) 31(6):300-3.
- Lorimer, Frank; Winston, Ellen; and Kiser, Louise K. 1940.
Foundations of American Population Policy. New York, N.Y.: Harper and Bros.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1940.
The historical context of population study. In The Cultural Approach to History, edited by Caroline F. Ware, pp. 287-90. New York, N.Y.: Columbia University Press.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1940.
Statement of farm population trends. Composition, fertility. In Memoranda Presented at the Hearings before the Subcommittee on Senate Resolution 266 (74th Congress), of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, May, 1940. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1941.
Farm population trends. In Hearings ... Pursuant to S.R. 266, 74th Congress. Supplementary Hearings, Parts 1, 2, and 3, pp. 63-89. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Printing Office.

- Lorimer, Frank. 1941.
Helping young America to responsible parenthood through social and economic aids. Journal of Heredity (Washington, D.C.) 32(12):449-54.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1941.
Population factors relating to the organization of peace. In Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. Preliminary Reports and Monographs, pp. 440-53. New York, N.Y.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1941.
Population policy and social planning in a democracy. In Planning for America, edited by George B. Galloway, et al., pp. 346-61. New York, N.Y.: Holt.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1942.
The laws of demography and social policy. Social Science (Toledo, Ohio) 17(3):267-72.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1942.
Observations on the trend of Indian population in the United States. In The Changing Indian, edited by Oliver La Farge. Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Lorimer, Frank, et al. 1942.
Problems relating to migration and settlement in the postwar period. In Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. Second Report. The Transitional Period, pp. 184-94. New York, N.Y.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1943.
Growth and distribution of the population of the Soviet Union. In Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Conference, Held at the New York Academy of Medicine May 7, 1942. New York, N.Y.: Milbank Memorial Fund.
- Lorimer, Frank; and Osborn, Frederick. 1943.
Population. Problems and Trends of Our Changing Population. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Council for the Social Studies.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1944.
Changing populations and new international problems. In Institute on World Organization, 2d Conference, Washington, D.C., 1943. Regionalism and World Organization..., pp. 147-62. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Public Affairs.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1944.
Implications of demographic trends in Europe and the U.S.S.R. Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly (New York, N.Y.) 23(2):111-30.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1944.
Population movements in Imperial Russia and in the Soviet Union. In Compass of the World: A Symposium of Political Geography, edited by Hans W. Weigert and Vilhjalmur Stefansson, pp. 443-60. New York, N.Y.: Macmillan.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1944.
Recent population trends in the Soviet Union. American Sociological Review (Washington, D.C.) 9(3):219-22.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1945.
Issues of population policy. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science (Beverly Hills, Calif.) 237:193-203.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1945.
Population as a problem in quality. In Food for the World, edited by Theodore W. Schultz, pp. 58-65. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Lorimer, Frank. 1945.
Population trends in the Orient. Foreign Affairs (New York, N.Y.) 23(4):668-74.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1946.
The Population of the Soviet Union: History and Prospects. Geneva: League of Nations.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1947.
The differentiation of logical levels in social inquiry. American Sociological Review (Washington, D.C.) 12(5):507-14.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1947.
General eugenics. Eugenical News (New York, N.Y.) 32(1):1-7.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1949.
Essential standards of living. In Proceedings of the International Congress on Population and World Resources in Relation to the Family, August, 1948, Cheltenham, England, pp. 27-40. London: Family Planning Association of Great Britain.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1949.
European governmental action regarding population. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science (Beverly Hills, Calif.) 262:56-61.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1949.
Population prospects of the Soviet Union. In New Compass of the World, edited by Hans W. Weigert, et al., pp. 162-71. New York, N.Y.: Macmillan.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1951.
Dynamics of age structure in a population with initially high fertility and mortality. Population Bulletin of the United Nations (New York, N.Y.), No. 1, pp. 31-41.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1952.
Trends in capacity for intelligence. Eugenical News (New York, N.Y.) 37(2):17-24.
- Lorimer, Frank; and Jones, Dorothy S. 1953.
The demographic characteristics of the Negro population in the United States. Journal of Negro Education (Washington, D.C.) 22(3):250-4.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1953.
The nature of Soviet population and vital statistics. American Statistician (Washington, D.C.) 7(2):13-8.
- Lorimer, Frank, et al. 1954.
Culture and Human Fertility: A Study of the Relation of Cultural Conditions to Fertility in Non-Industrial and Transitional Societies. Paris: International Union for the Scientific Study of Population, Committee on Population Problems of Countries in Process of Industrialization; and Paris: Unesco.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1954.
Dynamic aspects of the relation of population to economic development. Bulletin of the International Statistical Institute (The Hague) 33(4):243-54.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1954.
Notes on human fertility in Central Africa. In The Interrelations of Demographic, Economic, and Social Problems in Selected Underdeveloped Areas, pp. 130-5. New York, N.Y.: Milbank Memorial Fund.

- Lorimer, Frank. 1955.
Present status of research on population. Theory, structure, composition, and quality. Eugenics Quarterly (New York, N.Y.) 2(3):133-9.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1955.
"To the editor." Eugenics Quarterly (New York, N.Y.) 2(1):4-5.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1957.
General survey. In The University Teaching of Social Sciences: Demography; A Survey Prepared under the Auspices of the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population on the Basis of Regional and National Reports..., Part 1. Paris: Unesco.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1957.
Human populations: historical study. In Cold Spring Harbor Symposia on Quantitative Biology, Vol. XXII, p. 17. Cold Spring Harbor, N.Y.: Biological Laboratory.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1957.
Relations among measures of fertility. Bulletin de l'Institut International de Statistique (Rio de Janeiro) 35(3):241-52.
- Lorimer, Frank, et al. 1958.
An inquiry concerning some ethical principles relating to human reproduction. Cross Currents (Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.), Winter, pp. 24-42. Reprinted from Social Kompas, No. 2, 1957.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1958.
Population policy and politics in the Communist world. In Population and World Politics, edited by Philip M. Hauser. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1959.
The development of demography. In The Study of Population: An Inventory and Appraisal, edited by Philip M. Hauser and Otis Dudley Duncan. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lorimer, Frank; and Karp, Mark, editors. 1960.
Population in Africa. Report of a Seminar Held at Boston University. Boston: Boston University Press.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1961.
Demographic Information on Tropical Africa. Boston: Boston University Press.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1962.
Analysis of African demographic data as an aid for economic and social planning. In Economic Commission for Africa Seminar on Population Problems in Africa, 29 October - 10 November 1962, Cairo, United Arab Republic. [Cairo]: U.N. Economic Commission for Africa.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1962-1963.
Family planning and modern problems: a Catholic analysis by Rev. de Lestapis. Cross Currents (Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.), Winter.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1963.
Harold F. Dorn, 1906-1963. Population Index (Princeton, N.J.) 29(3):237-42.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1964.
The new outlook in eugenics. Eugenics Quarterly (New York, N.Y.) 11(3):125-6.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1964.
The population of Africa. In Population: The Vital Revolution, edited by Ronald Freedman, pp. 206-14. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, Doubleday.

- Lorimer, Frank. 1965.
Cultural and demographic aspects of economic development. Philippine Sociological Review (Manila) 13(4):222-6.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1965.
Demographic aspects of economic social development. Philippine Review of Business and Economics (Quezon City) 2(1):1-8.
- Lorimer, Frank; van de Walle, Etienne; and Brass, William. 1965.
Demography in the African world--a survey of social research. In The African World: Survey of Social Research, edited by Robert A. Lystad, pp. 270-303. London: Pall Mall Press.
- Novak, A.; Duran, J. D.; Lorimer, F.; and Borrie, W. D. 1966.
Closing session. In Proceedings of the World Population Conference, Belgrade, 30 August - 10 September 1965, Vol. 1, pp. 317-21. New York, N.Y.: U.N. Department of Economic and Social Affairs.
- Lorimer, Frank W. 1966.
Demographic responses to changing technology. In First Conference on Population, 1965. Proceedings of the Conference Sponsored by the Population Institute of the University of the Philippines with the Support of the Population Council of New York, N.Y., pp. 70-6. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1966.
Uskladivanje institucionalnih i demografskih faktora u ekonomskom razvoju [The balance of institutional and demographic factors in economic development]. Stanovnistvo (Belgrade) 4(2):107-15.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1967.
The economics of family formation under different conditions. In Proceedings of the World Population Conference, Belgrade, 30 August - 10 September 1965, Vol. 2, pp. 92-5. New York, N.Y.: U.N. Department of Economic and Social Affairs.
- Lorimer, Frank; Brass, William; Coale, Ansley J.; Demeny, Paul G.; Heisel, Don; Romaniuk, Anatole; and van de Walle, Etienne. 1968.
The Demography of Tropical Africa. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1969.
Issues of population policy. In The Population Dilemma, 2nd ed., edited by Philip M. Hauser, pp. 168-206. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1971.
The role of the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population. Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly (New York, N.Y.) 49(4, Part 2):86-96.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1971.
Some reflections on population policy in the United States. Discussion. Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly (New York, N.Y.) 49(4, Part 2):234-5.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1977.
Social structure and family. In The Economic and Social Supports for High Fertility: Proceedings of the Conference Held in Canberra 16 - 18 November 1976, edited by Lado T. Ruzicka, pp. 157-71. Canberra: Australian National University, Department of Demography; and Canberra, Australian National University, Development Studies Center.
- Lorimer, Frank. 1981.
How the demographers saved the Association. Population Index (Princeton, N.J.) 47(3):488-90.



We do not have a copy of Frank Lorimer's presidential address, but it is summarized below in this report on the PAA annual meeting in 1947 held at Princeton University.

Population Association Meeting May 17 - 18, 1947

Author(s): Irene B. Taeuber and Felix E. Moore

Source: *Population Index*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (Jul., 1947), pp. 180-186

Published by: Office of Population Research

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2730487>

Accessed: 19-06-2020 17:20 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Office of Population Research is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Population Index*

CURRENT ITEMS

POPULATION
ASSOCIATION MEETING
MAY 17 - 18, 1947

The annual meetings of the Population Association of America have become the forum at which results of demographic research are presented, the needs for further research assessed, and plans for and the progress of specific research projects described. This year, after the long hiatus of the war years, an attempt was made to take stock of the present situation in selected fields, to emphasize neither results, plans, nor activities but problems of definition and of methodology. Four topics were selected: population projections, the genetic and social significance of differential fertility, the measurement of the relation of population to resources, and the classification of population by farm and nonfarm residence and by type of community. The technique utilized was that of the round table, with brief, prepared statements that outlined the major topics and subsequent participation of the members in the general discussion.

The basic problem underlying all these round tables was that of the development and maintenance of demography as a science, and, as a corollary, the extent to which the demographer can or should move beyond formal statistical demography. This problem, which has become increasingly apparent to demographers involved in research that impinges on public policy, was discussed by Frank Lorimer in his Presidential address, "Population perspectives at different logical levels." Lorimer distinguished four levels on which students of population problems and related subjects commonly operate. These were the levels of:

1. Science. This level involves inferences that are rigidly controlled by systems of implication and by precise observations.
2. Technical judgments. These are scientifically informed but still subjective or intuitive judgments in a field or fields in which the scientist has special competence.
3. General theories. Some of these may be technical judgments, but intuitive elements are predominant.
4. Policy designs. These are hypotheses for action.

Lorimer then developed the thesis that activities on these different levels must be differentiated, but that if they are so differentiated their contributions are complementary. Furthermore, he maintained that the relationship of one to the other was intrinsic rather than accidental, that simultaneous complementary advance on all levels was the ideal.

After Lorimer had presented this logical development of his thesis, he proceeded to offer "a few very general observations," demographic in character, and indicated the logical level at which he thought he was operating.

This Presidential address was given at a dinner meeting which followed two of the round tables, but preceded two others. Its impact on the contributions at the last two round tables was apparent in the attempts of the various participants to specify the logical level at which they were operating. The basic thesis of the address, the complementary nature of recognized activities on all logical levels oriented toward the advancement of knowledge, was perhaps best exemplified in the first round table, that on population projections.

Lowell J. Reed was chairman of the round table on population projections; P. K. Whelpton, Robert J. Myers, and Edward P. Hutchinson, the discussants. Mr. Whelpton opened the discussion by surveying the three major methods of forecasting commonly used, i.e., the arithmetic projection, curve fitting, and the use of specific birth and death rates, with or without allowances for migration. He emphasized the advantages of the last method but pointed out that it is difficult to use and that results are generally less satisfactory in countries in which the reduction of birth and death rates is so far advanced that there is no empirical experience in other areas on which projections into the future can be based. Whelpton then summarized the series of "Thompson-Whelpton" estimates, noting changes made in the assumptions and the extent to which the estimates correspond to the demographic experience of the United States which was "future" when the various estimates were made.

Mr. Myers discussed the methodological problems involved in the preparation of population estimates for the Social Security system, in which the pre-eminent need is for estimates of the future numbers of the aged. In order to indicate the potential range of future costs of old-age and survivor's insurance, the Social Security projections used a greater variety of mortality and fertility estimates than did the National Resources Board and the Bureau of the Census in their estimates prepared by or in cooperation with the Scripps Foundation.

Mr. Hutchinson discussed the problems of population projections for local areas, pointing out that there are no standardized procedures for local estimates such as those that have been evolved for national projections, that data are less ample and less exact, and that the variability of all the components is much greater. The problems of data, of techniques, and of hypothesis as to future development were outlined on the basis of experience derived from an attempt to project the population of the Philadelphia area.

T. J. Woolfer opened the discussion by raising two specific questions: (1) The possibility of projecting death rates on the basis of an analysis of the cause of death, thus determining possible progress in the principal areas of mortality susceptible to control; and (2) The possibility of projecting birth rates on the basis of an analysis of past complete generation fertility. The major discussion, however, arose when the Chairman, asked to participate as a student of projections, presented the mathematician's point of view. He suggested that since population is a function of an almost infinite number of parameters over time, many of which are unknown, and since the analysis of the inter-relationship of these parameters is only beginning, the projection of some of the parameters of the series may frequently lead to results less valid than the mathematical expansion of the series.

For short-time projections, Dr. Reed suggested the use of "book-keeping" methods of the Thompson-Whelpton type; for long-time projections, he preferred curve fitting to the computation of presumably long-time projections that required short-term periodic revision.

The round table on population projections was concerned with the measurement of the future quantity of the population. The round table on the genetic and social significance of differential fertility was concerned with the measurement of the future quality of the population. Frederick Osborn, Chairman, stressed the pre-eminent importance of the quality of human life in a world requiring ever more human direction if it is to survive. He suggested that the question of possible qualitative deterioration is crucial, especially within those countries on whom the responsibility for world leadership rests.

Harold Dorn pointed out that differential fertility and reproduction are as old as human history, that the existence of differential fertility among the component groups of the American population is an unchallenged fact, and that the problem is not the fact but the significance of the fact. Much work in this field has begun by assuming the desiderata to be proved: a differential distribution of physical and mental qualities in the population, a change in that distribution from generation to generation, and a genetic basis for both the distribution and the changes. Studies of the relative influence of nature and nurture, of the influence of environment on "intelligence," of twins and foster children, remain in the logistic curve stage of development in that no components have been isolated. Dorn suggested that, if the "I.Q." is accepted as a measure, a study should be made of the completed fertility of people who were tested as children.

Clyde Kiser stressed the wide ramifications of differential fertility on both a national and an international level, and the complexity of the changing relationships between social and economic factors and fertility. The high fertility of rural farm Negroes is an association of high fertility and poverty; the low fertility of urban Negroes, an association of low fertility with involuntary sterility, perhaps venereal infection. But the data of the 1940 census on number of children ever born indicate a levelling off of the differentials in marital fertility at the upper end of the economic scale. In such data, however, two factors are involved, the differential prevalence of contraception and the positive correlation of fertility with income and security. In the Indianapolis study, where a "number and spacing planned" group could be segregated, there was a direct association of fertility with income, as well as with education and occupation. (See front cover chart.) On the other hand, among groups with little planning of fertility there was the usual inverse relationship of fertility and social-economic status or income. Here is evidence of a two-way relationship between economic security and fertility, inverse in the lowest stages of family planning, positive in the upper stages. This raises the question as to whether or not the traditional differentials in fertility may not be a transitory phase in the diffusion of contraception, with the relationship between economic security and fertility becoming a direct one when contraception is universal.

Laurence H. Snyder, who described himself as a geneticist who had had the temerity to consider eugenics, gave to the demographers pres-

ent a concise statement of the methodological premises of population genetics as opposed to animal genetics. The principles of animal genetics have been developed through laboratory experimentation. Human matings, on the other hand, are random rather than controlled in so far as the gene pairs are concerned, and numbers of offspring are limited. Furthermore, in the human being it is usually impossible to specify the genotype, so that research must be carried out on the basis of phenotypic characteristics. Even the most carefully classified data are likely to be heterogeneous in regard to types of mating. Under these circumstances, with large populations breeding at random so far as particular genes are concerned, reliance must be placed on the proportions of the gene and its alleles in the population and the proportions of the genotypes formed by the gene and its alleles. Classical Mendelian ratios are not to be expected in random samples from randomly breeding populations, but rather population ratios expressed in terms of the proportions of the gene or genes in the population. In a large population, with the effects of migration, mutation, and selection either negligible or balancing each other, the proportion of a hereditary trait will remain constant from generation to generation. The respective proportions of the alleles of a set may be changed by migration, mutation, or selection, including under the latter differential fertility and assortative mating.

If the genetic implications of differential fertility are to be determined, it is necessary to establish four things: (1) The existence and the extent of differential fertility; (2) Differences between groups in a specific trait, and the respective proportions of the trait in the various groups; (3) The genetic determination of the trait, in whole or in part, and if such determination exists, the mode of transmission; (4) The presence or absence of assortative mating with respect to the trait, and if there is such mating, its nature and extent. Given this information, and only given this information, can the geneticist specify the genetic implications of differential fertility.

Gardner Murphy reviewed the status of research on the inheritance of mental traits in so far as it is relevant to human heredity and hence to demography. The relevance of animal research has become increasingly apparent in recent years as a result of various studies of the inheritance of ability and temperament. Among these studies have been those of R. C. Tryon at the University of California, in which rats have been bred for maze-learning ability; Calvin Hall's experiments at Western Reserve University, which have investigated the inheritance of temperament by breeding rats for timidity or boldness; and the program at Hamilton Station, Bar Harbor, on the problem of the inheritance of behavior dispositions. The studies at Hamilton Station have included identification of a great many genes with appropriate chromosome mapping in mice and other species, and indicate the possibility of noting the appearance and disappearance of temperamental attributes as certain genes pass in or out of the picture. Recent research, especially the isolation of types of mental defect, has thrown light on the inheritance of specific attributes of human intelligence. Progress in the study of temperament has indicated that it can be studied in the new born, with predictable temperamental continuities month by month. Thus the burden of proof is shifted to those who would attempt to explain temperamental continuities throughout the life span without genetics.

Data on human temperamental and intellectual attributes indicate that there is a range of adjustment, and that the upper limit varies greatly among different stocks. With limits that differ drastically and a wide range of variability in reaching limits, the effect of the equalization of opportunity would be to produce a wider variability in the population.

The significance of these studies for differential fertility is apparent, since there is today a generally inverse relationship between developed intelligence and fertility. There are evidences of genetic differences in intellectual and temperamental factors, but the problem is very complex. The study of the hypothesis that the human stock is losing certain attributes necessary for the existing culture is urgent. Its verification or refutation requires long-range animal research; a higher level of research in parent-child resemblance with more quantification, especially in research on temperament; and the active acquaintance and cooperation of demographers studying population trends with the groups studying the genetic basis of human intelligence and temperament.

The measurement of the relation of population to resources was the subject of a round table under the chairmanship of Frederick F. Stephan. Wilbert Moore's comments, read by Mr. Stephan, emphasized the difficulties inherent in the concept of the optimum population, and indicated that the major service of the various attempts to construct operational definitions had been to reveal the necessary complexity of an adequate methodology. Comparative analysis, either historical in a given experience or contemporary through the matching of situations, was suggested as the only valid basis for developing meaningful measures of the relationship of given economic or technological changes to total population and carrying capacity.

Carter Goodrich noted various attempts to measure the relation of population to resources, emphasizing the fact that a battery of measures was needed, some for the economy as a whole, others for the performance of particular industries. He also pointed out the integral relationship between measurement and the use to be made of the data. For instance, in an area of low economic performance per capita, an area of "population pressure," it is necessary to distinguish between those per capita resources that are more from those that are less alterable. If several measures are utilized and each is distinguished as to degree of alterability, decisions can then be made concerning what must be done to improve the resources position and/or to improve the population position itself through migration, birth control, or both. The discussion that followed was concerned primarily with the concept of the population optimum, and all agreed on the imperative need for developing techniques to measure the relation of population to resources.

Conrad Taeuber was chairman of the last of the round tables, which was concerned with the classification of population by farm and nonfarm residence and by type of community. This session dealt with a small and very specific segment of the broader problem of measuring the relation of population to resources--the definition of the farm-nonfarm, and the rural-urban population. Dr. Truesdell reviewed briefly the historical and international background of the urban-rural classifi-

cation, describing its evolution in the United States from its first use in a table that appeared in a Statistical Atlas, prepared under the supervision of Francis A. Walker and published in 1874. Problems with the definition now current were noted, but it was recommended that no change be made until official population figures are available for the thickly populated areas just outside the boundaries of cities.

The history of the farm-nonfarm classification was then traced from its hesitant introduction in the 1920 census to the present, with emphasis on the problems resulting from changing definitions and changing biases in reporting. Since the farm population as defined in the censuses of 1930 and 1940 included all households living on farms, without reference to occupation, Dr. Truesdell suggested the discussion of the use of a new definition in 1950, in which farm population would be related either to a specific farm or to agriculture in general.

Dr. Margaret J. Hagood's remarks were focused mainly on problems of definition as they arise in sample surveys. She suggested that the next area of advance in population research would be in the direction of analyzing the inter-relationships of demographic with social, economic, and political phenomena, and that, therefore, any proposed definitions must be considered from the point of view of their feasibility both in complete enumerations and in sample surveys. Furthermore, the problem of definition of the farm population must go beyond definition per se, for the data secured on a specific definition differ according to the nature of the coverage, that is, whether it is a farm census or population census approach. Four recent cooperative studies of the Bureau of the Census and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics indicate the nature of the difference in coverage of the two approaches. Identical definitions and instructions to enumerators concerning a "farm" and a household considered as "living on" a farm were used in two surveys taken in January, 1947. Both surveys were enumerative sample surveys designed to provide unbiased estimates. And in both surveys additional questions, as nearly similar as possible within the framework of the two approaches, were asked to get information on the households included, especially the connection with agriculture of households in the farm population other than those of resident farm operators.

Preliminary results indicate the following findings:

1. The farm census approach and the population census approach gave quite similar numbers of households in the farm population, but each included a substantial group not covered by the other.
2. The farm census approach included in the farm population the households of many resident farm operators whose farming operations were so marginal that they were not recognized as such in the population census approach.
3. The population census approach included in the farm population many non-operator households that reported themselves as living on a farm, but that would not have been reported as such by the operator of the farm if the farm census approach had been used.

Later tabulations will be made to reveal the age, sex, occupational, and other characteristics of the population in the households included in (3).. Advice would be appreciated as to the criteria to be used in judging whether or not various subgroups should be regarded as in or out of the farm population.

The problem of how to treat group (2) leads immediately to the problem of defining a farm, which, as Dr. Truesdell had indicated earlier, was implicit in this round table but was not part of the discussion. The matter is important, for although in 1945 and 1947 groups (2) and (3) tended to cancel each other in the net effect on the total households in the farm population, they may change at different rates in the future and thus there may be even more confusion in estimates of the size of the farm population.

The Chairman proposed that suggestions on the problems of classification raised by Dr. Truesdell, Dr. Hagood, and the other participants be made directly in writing either to the Bureau of the Census or to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Irene B. Taeuber

Felix E. Moore

MEETINGS OF INTEREST
TO DEMOGRAPHERS

The Population Commission of the United Nations will hold its second session between August 11 and 22 at Lake Success. The agenda are not yet available, but topics under consideration will include: plans for a demographic year book; plans for improving comparability of censuses taken around 1950; and a consideration of means by which the United Nations can assist Member States in studying the most favorable rate of population change from the social-economic point of view, and in studying the interplay of economic, social, and geographic factors that hinder the attainment of an adequate standard of living and cultural development. The Commission is an agency of the Economic and Social Council and is composed of the representatives of Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, France, the Netherlands, Peru, the Soviet Union, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Yugoslavia. Dr. Philip M. Hauser represents the United States. The Statistical Commission, which also considers demographic materials, begins its session at Lake Success on August 18.

The World Statistical Congress, as well as the meetings associated with it, will take place in Washington, D.C., from September 6 to September 18 and promises to be one of the most notable gatherings of statisticians ever assembled. In addition to the World Statistical Congress, which is sponsored by the United Nations, the first postwar meetings of the International Statistical Institute and the first session of the Inter American Institute will be held at the same