

DEMOGRAPHIC DESTINIES

Interviews with Presidents of the Population Association of America

Interview with Philip M. Hauser PAA President in 1950-51



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)

PHILIP M. HAUSER

PAA Secretary in 1942-46 (No. 5) and President in 1950-51 (No. 14). Interview with Jean van der Tak at Dr. Hauser's home, Chicago, November 12, 1988.

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS: Philip Hauser was born in 1909 in Chicago. He received all his degrees in sociology and all from the University of Chicago: the Ph.B. in 1929, the M.A. in 1933, and the Ph.D. in 1938. He was at the Census Bureau in Washington from 1938 to 1947, as Assistant Chief Statistician in the Population Division until 1942, Assistant Director of the Bureau to 1946, and Deputy Director in 1946-47. He returned to the University of Chicago as Professor of Sociology in 1947. However, when the Director of the Census Bureau died in 1949, he was asked to serve as Acting Director to complete the planning of the 1950 census, which he did on a part-time basis in 1949-50, commuting from Chicago.

On his return to the University of Chicago in 1947, Dr. Hauser also became the first Director of the Chicago Community Inventory, later called the Population Research and Training Center and then the Population Research Center. He remained Director of the Center until his retirement in 1979.

Among many other posts, he was the first U.S. Representative to the United Nations Population Commission, from its establishment in 1947 to 1951. He has been a consultant for the UN and other organizations in many countries of the Third World, including Thailand, Singapore, the Philippines, Burma, Malaysia, Indonesia, South Korea and other countries in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East.

He was chairman of a committee at the East-West Center in Honolulu which developed the terms of reference leading to the creation of the Population Institute at the Center. Besides the Population Association of America, he has been president of the American Statistical Association (1962), the American Sociological Association (1967-68), the Sociological Research Association (1961), and the National Conference on Social Welfare (1973-74). His publications include 32 books, chapters in 50-60 other books, and over 500 articles. [He died in Chicago in 1994.]

VDT: What led to your interest in demography?

HAUSER: In 1929-30, after I had my bachelor's degree from the University, I accepted a teaching assignment at what was then the Central YMCA College of Arts and Sciences, now Roosevelt University. The course I was asked to teach included one on population. I had never had a course in population. I taught the course relying largely on Warren Thompson's textbook [Population Problems]. He was the dean of demographers in the U.S. at the time. I managed to get along reasonably well by spending enough time to stay at least two or three weeks ahead of my students. A year or two later, I had my first course in population, taught by Professor William Fielding Ogburn--a graduate course at the University of Chicago.

After his course, I became very much interested in the field and in its various related areas, including economic demography, social demography, methodological demography and so on. However, I had no intention at the time of becoming specialized in demography. I should point out that in 1932, when I began teaching at the University of Chicago, I was assigned to teach in the College as well as the Department of Sociology. Included in the college curriculum was a section on demography, which I was very happy to teach. In 1934, having spent the summer in charge of an office receiving and editing schedules for a survey being done by what was then the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA), which later became the Works Progress Administration (WPA), I was invited to join the research division of FERA in Washington, on leave of absence from the University. I went to Washington intending to spend only a year there. Actually I stayed until 1936. I came back to the University of Chicago in 1937 and 1938 as a faculty member, during which

period I finished my work for a Ph.D.

While in Washington, I served as assistant chief statistician of a survey ordered by the Congress on employment, unemployment, and partial employment. Other people working on that survey included some from the Bureau of the Census.

Through an interesting happenstance, after returning to the university in 1937 I got into a conflict with the President, Robert M. Hutchins. President Hutchins abolished the rank of assistant professor, to which I had been promoted with an increase in salary. As a result, I accepted an offer to come to the Bureau of the Census as Assistant Chief Statistician of the Population Division. My first assignment was to help plan the 1940 population census.

VDT: You must have been the leader of the "class of 1940" that I've heard so much about--the group of demographers who arrived about that time.

HAUSER: Right. As a matter of fact, as Assistant Chief Statistician, I had a hand in employing many of them. Now, finally, a direct answer to your question. I regret it took so long to tell you.

VDT: Exactly what I want!

HAUSER: The answer is that I then spent about ten years in the Bureau of the Census, with responsibilities spreading beyond the population census. With a staff, I helped develop many of the innovations in the 1940 census. But the point is, after working about ten years in the population field in the Bureau of the Census, that became my specialization. I had assumed I would teach somewhere and I was prepared to go into research in social psychology, in criminology, two or three other sub-fields of sociology; I had not made up my mind. But the job in the Bureau of the Census determined my field of specialization--demography.

VDT: It must have indeed. Frank Notestein, in his last article published just before his death, in Population and Development Review in December 1982 ("Demography in the United States: A Partial Account of the Development of the Field"), wrote that he was writing about the part of the development of demography that he knew about. He said that if Hauser or Con Taeuber or Art Campbell were writing it, they would write it differently because they would know more about the contribution of government agencies to the development of demography in the United States.

Tell me a bit of the importance of the Census Bureau in the development of U.S. demography. For instance, you said there were some innovations in the 1940 census. I know the 1940 census wasn't used as much as it should have been because it came out during the war. What were those innovations--some you were responsible for?

HAUSER: Well, I was among those who made the decisions and I would say it was a shared responsibility. My boss, Dr. Leon Truesdell, was in a position to approve everything. Being of the old school, not trained as a demographer or statistician, Dr. Truesdell, nevertheless, was open-minded and accepted most of the innovations that I and the staff proposed. Staff members included Henry Shryock and John Durand, for example, and a large number of others; we worked as a team. The innovations we introduced and for which I guess I could take major professional responsibility included such things as the substitution of a question on internal migration for questions related to birth abroad and international immigration.

VDT: The question "Where did you live five years ago?"

HAUSER: Yes, that was one of the innovations. Then there was the use of sampling of subjects

which could be covered by the census, because by having a relatively small sampling of the population who were asked additional questions, it became feasible within the limit of our appropriations to tabulate the additional data.

VDT: The long form?

HAUSER: Right.

VDT: What was the sample size that year, one in what?

HAUSER: You're straining me; that's now over 40 years ago. I guess it was about one in 20. It was the first time that was done.

Another innovation was a substitution of a question that made it possible to get better quantitative data on education--years of school completed instead of the old question on literacy; whether the respondent was literate or not. Incidentally, you may be interested to know that on my desk there were two letters signed by the Commissioner of Education, one of which said in effect, by all means adopt this new question on years of school completed, even at the expense of getting rid of literacy. The other letter took the position that we should not stop asking the literacy question, even if we could not ask the years-of-school-completed question. Two different divisions in the Office of Education had written these letters and the Commissioner had signed both of them.

VDT: You decided which made better sense and chose it?

HAUSER: Yes, the conflict enabled us to make up our own minds.

Other innovations. We introduced the "class-of-worker" for us to identify whether the person at work was an employee, own-account worker, government worker, or an unpaid family worker.

Among the most important innovations was the adoption of something we had experimented with in that survey of 1937 that I mentioned earlier. We adopted what has become known as the labor-force approach to the study of the working population, which made it possible to study employment and, for the first time, unemployment in a way that could provide usable data. The Bureau of the Census had experimented with trying to get unemployment figures on previous occasions but without success; they weren't worth publishing.

VDT: You used the question "Were you looking for work last week, or last month?"

HAUSER: Well, there were a series of questions and the order of the questions indicated what classification we could then adopt for determining employment and unemployment or, for that matter, at that time we had to make provision also for persons doing WPA work. The first question, yes, was "Were you at work or doing something else last week?" In that approach we did what had never been done before--set a specific time referent, the week prior to the census, as a basis for determining just what the person did during that time period. Prior to that, in the 1930 census for example, one was asked his occupation. A reply such as "railroad engineer" became defined as someone who was a gainful worker. But the man who was a railroad engineer might have been retired for 15 years. This had no relevance to the labor market situation in a specified time period. The new approach primarily gave us a fixed time period based so far as possible on what was actually being done. It led to a complete redefinition of a workforce of persons who were either employed or seeking employment during a specified time period. It was approximating, as best we could, the actual labor market situation.

VDT: Was that on the sample long form?

HAUSER: No, that was on the 100 percent form.

VDT: Of course, that was during the Depression and there must have been the urge to get unemployment figures.

HAUSER: Exactly. And also we wanted it because this was the anchor around which we got occupational and industrial information as well as class of worker--which, incidentally, the United Nations calls industrial status, that is, worker employee, private account or whatever.

VDT: You must have had nothing but encouragement from Congress in 1940. There was no opposition to what questions were being asked in the census?

HAUSER: Right. Well, there was one other innovation which created a bit of a stir and that was we asked money income. That was the first time the income question was asked, although there were questions relating to such matters in earlier censuses. Abraham Lincoln, for example, had to report the value of his property. Back in the 1860 census they began to get information about wealth and economic information. But there was quite a stir. A Congressman named Tobey created real controversy and advised people not to give the answer on their income because he thought it was a violation of privacy. In fact, because of him we had to publish separate materials so that a person who did not want to reveal his income to the enumerator was able to report it directly to Washington.

VDT: And very few were used; I read that somewhere.

HAUSER: About a hundred thousand. We printed hundreds of thousands of the forms and only a small fraction of them were used.

VDT: Turned out that people didn't mind telling it.

HAUSER: That's right.

VDT: Did you have something to do with the Current Population Survey, which, of course, became the vehicle for collecting labor force information?

HAUSER: Very definitely. I was party to the development of the Current Population Survey. I was still then Assistant Chief Statistician in the Population Division. But we worked closely with a research division in the Bureau led at the time by Morris Hansen. He was partly responsible for the actual sampling technique, including the area sampling approach.

VDT: That had started already--the monthly survey?

HAUSER: Well, what happened was this. John Webb, who was a statistician with the FERA/WPA at the time I was--we had overlapped--had done a survey trying also to get a count of the unemployed. The thinking that he put into it was useful to those of us who decided to use the 1937 Census of Employment, Unemployment, and Partial Employment with a new approach to measurement of the workforce, abandoning the gainful worker approach. Instead of asking the occupation question without time reference, the question we asked in that 1937 enterprise was "Were you at work last week?" or "Were you seeking work?" Now, there were some changes of one kind or another but that

approach used in the 1937 survey was adapted for use in the 1940 census.

Webb had also done a current sampling survey and after the 1940 census those of us who were doing the planning began to think of a monthly current population survey, the major purpose of which was to get the monthly count of the employed and unemployed. In addition, we had in mind a rotation of questions, so in effect we could update census information--the decennial census information--all during the decade.

VDT: What a tremendous contribution that was because that is the source of demographic information between censuses. But, of course, when Janet Norwood announces the unemployment figures every month, the whole U.S. hangs on her words.

HAUSER: Yes. The Bureau of the Census used to announce it. The Bureau not only collected the data but used to announce the results. It was switched to the Department of Labor--the Census was given some things, the Bureau of Labor Statistics was given others, including the privilege of announcing unemployment figures. But the survey is still done by the Bureau of the Census.

VDT: It must have been exciting in those days.

HAUSER: It was.

VDT: Tell me about it. You would go back and forth to each other's offices with these great ideas?

HAUSER: Oh yes, we'd have staff conferences. We introduced another kind of thing; we not only developed new methods and new questionnaires but we tested them, in advance of the census.

VDT: The pretests?

HAUSER: Yes, we brought that in before the 1940 census; first time that was done, to my knowledge. We had two kinds of pretests. One was just going down a corridor or on a street corner without any respect to sampling, asking the questions, largely to determine whether or not people could understand what you wanted and whether the response was of the type you intended to get. We called that the "hot-house approach." The other was a pretest based on a scientific sample.

VDT: A city or a rural area?

HAUSER: Right, we did both.

VDT: In those days, of course, there were enumerators who came to your house and asked questions.

HAUSER: That's right; not mail-back. Mail-back came in as one of the innovations with the 1950 census, when I was Acting Director, after the Director, J.C. Capt, died.

VDT: You stayed just about a year at that time?

HAUSER: It was more like a half year, through the period of getting the schedule frozen and the procedures worked out, after which a political man was brought in to be the Director, appointed by the President.

VDT: Peel.

HAUSER: Incidentally, after Peel resigned, I was asked whether I wanted to become the Director. But after ten years in Washington, I had decided I much preferred my professorship; wanted to get back to the university.

VDT: I understand that one reason you were asked to be Acting Director at the Census was that you were considered a "wunderkind" in the late 1930s.

HAUSER: Yes.

VDT: That's the word Norman Ryder used when I interviewed him. And you were a protege of Henry A. Wallace, who was the Secretary of Commerce.

HAUSER: I was not his protege. On the contrary, when I was Deputy Director of the Census, for reasons I've never learned, I got a call from Henry Wallace one day to come up and converse with him. He insisted that I become Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce for Policy. I was still Deputy Director of the Census and had both titles, but I had already become Deputy without any Wallace connection. I might conceivably have stayed at the Bureau indefinitely, but having gotten into the political climate with Wallace, there came a time when I definitely wanted to get out of Washington.

VDT: You did take that position, as Assistant for Policy to Wallace?

HAUSER: I had no choice; he was my boss. I had the two positions simultaneously. But that's another story.

VDT: But you admit that you were called a "wunderkind"?

HAUSER: Well, no one ever called me that to my face. But let me tell you something that is relevant. Dorothy Thomas was a consultant to the President's Committee on Economic Security, of which Professor Witte of the University was Chairman. When I joined the FERA IN 1934, as my first assignment I was detailed to become a staff member of that committee and got to know Dorothy Thomas. I was somewhat taken aback by a letter she wrote to the Secretary of Commerce after I had accepted the position of Assistant Chief Statistician of Population in the Bureau of the Census in 1938. In accordance with bureaucratic routine, the letter landed on my desk for response over the signature of the Secretary of Commerce. What the letter said, in effect, was it was a great pity that such a terrible mistake had been made in appointing to this position a young person still wet behind the ears instead of a qualified professional. So you see, Dorothy did not regard me as a "wunderkind."

VDT: Great! You were pretty young, still in your twenties. Who had that tremendous faith in you; just knew you'd be good?

HAUSER: Well, I was interviewed by Truesdell and he decided I could do it. My record was good.

VDT: You dazzled him with your knowledge of statistics?

HAUSER: No. I'll tell you another story; I'm not sure you want to print this. I had lunch with Truesdell in the official dining room at the Department of Commerce for my first interview. He was a taciturn New Englander; he rarely said much more than "yep" or "no." The first question he asked was, "Do you have any children?" He knew from the form I filled out that I was married. And my

answer was, "I don't know." He looked at me strangely and said, "How can you say that?" And I said, "I came in for this interview leaving my wife in labor. At this point I do not know, literally."

Well, he actually grimaced; it was almost a smile. Then he asked a few other formal questions and we sat there looking at each other. The silence became difficult for me--I'm a little prolix, I'm afraid. Finally, I broke the silence by asking him whether he had ever heard of such-and-such and he said no and I told him what was, by any criterion, a filthy story--the kind men told to each other before you women got emancipated; now we tell them to you too. He heard the story--presumably a good story; I can't remember what it was, but it would be obscene. And he sat there with an unchanged, glum expression; the silence seemed to last forever. I was thinking to myself, "Well, I guess I've blown it; this is the end." He finally turned and said, "Dr. Hauser, do you know more stories?" And I spent the next half hour or so telling him one filthy story after another. Before it was over he was laughing, which, I'm told, wasn't easy for him.

VDT: Wonderful! (Much laughter)

HAUSER: After that we got into the specifics of the job. When I first started to work with Truesdell, I would dash off memoranda on plans for the census. I would get back the memoranda with blue-pencil marks correcting my grammar. He would correct my memos even after he had decided not to accept the proposals. Needless to say, I was not happy about the blue penciling. Having had a couple of years of Latin in high school, I was very grammar conscious. I confess that to brush up on my grammar, I consulted an English grammar textbook--I forget which one. In due course, I received a memorandum from Dr. Truesdell which contained some grammatical mistakes. I could not resist the temptation to blue-pencil his memorandum, which I returned to him. After that, I never again got a memo of mine blue-penciled.

VDT: You were a brat wunderkind!

You mentioned William Ogburn, who was your professor at Chicago. He was one of the few people working in the population field at that time.

HAUSER: Yes, from whom I got my first course in population, as well as two or three courses in statistics. Will became a colleague later and a good friend when I was on the faculty. In 1932 when Will took a term off on leave of absence, Sam Stouffer taught a course in statistics and Sam was interested in some of the demographic methodology; he also became a good friend of mine. When I came in to begin my graduate work in 1929, Sam was finishing up as a Ph.D. and we became good friends as well as classmates. Sam went into demographic methodology more thoroughly than Will had, so I got a little more out of that.

VDT: I know that Ogburn was more a broad-based sociologist.

HAUSER: Right--a pretty good statistician, but he didn't go into the details of construction of life tables or stable population theory, etc. I picked that up partly with Stouffer and partly with the reading I did after that.

VDT: Self-taught!

HAUSER: Well, yes. If you get a good foundation it's easy to build on it.

VDT: Now, when you came back to the university . . .

HAUSER: I came back in 1947 and then went out again for six months to be Acting Director of the Census Bureau and never had a leave of absence from the university. I was teaching my courses on Saturday, flying back and forth for six months, which demonstrates how stupid people can be.

VDT: You decided you really wanted to come back to academic life, that you'd had enough of political life in Washington.

HAUSER: Right. Henry Wallace got fired for giving a speech I helped to write.

VDT: You're pointing up to your pictures of all the distinguished people. [The photos included Henry Wallace, Averill Harriman and Harry Truman.] Was Harry Truman a friend?

HAUSER: No, but I testified before his Senate committee a number of times and got to know him. And I worked some with his assistant Clark Clifford, now a very distinguished lawyer in Washington. That leads to a lot of other stories, but irrelevant for your purposes.

VDT: Right, now back to Chicago. You said the Population Center already existed at that time.

HAUSER: What happened was that I'd been interviewed in 1946 by Professors Ernest Burgess and Louis Wirth. They had received a 60 or 70 thousand dollar grant from the Wieboldt Foundation. They used to have a big department store, but they're out of business now; they had their own foundation. The grant was to do studies of the Chicago area. The title they gave to this enterprise was the Chicago Community Inventory. They recruited me to come back as a professor with the understanding that I would become the director of this enterprise. They indicated that they would not do much until I arrived in 1947. So when I came back in 1947, this organization and money were waiting for me.

Then in due course my own interests were wider than just studying the Chicago metropolitan area--I'd kept up doing demographic studies about the United States and then increasingly the world. We still did the Chicago thing but changed our name after some years to the Population Research and Training Center and finally to the Population Research Center. By then I was getting money from various sources, the most important of which was the Ford Foundation--we'd get government grants too--that enabled me to provide fellowships to students from abroad.

VDT: Why did you turn abroad?

HAUSER: I was interested in national demography, world demography, and what was clear was that the most severe population problems were in the Third World. But in the Third World there was practically nobody who could be called a demographer, who could begin to provide the basic data for policy, which they badly needed. So I began to give fellowships to a number of Asian, Latin American, and eventually African students, whom we trained to be demographers to study the situation in their own countries.

Along the way, the Ford Foundation created a committee of which I was chairman to explore the situation in Asia and to make recommendations in regard to the possible funding of demographic and family planning projects. Other members of the committee were Oscar Harkavy and Dudley Kirk. The committee, together with Oscar Harkavy's wife and my wife, traveled through Southeast Asia, Indonesia, Ceylon, and India [in 1963]. The purpose of the trip was to explore the prospects for setting up programs for demographic research and family planning and to make recommendations to the Ford Foundation on where and how monies might be dispersed. Once we had produced a Ph.D. with demographic specialty, they would fund a population center in that person's home country.

VDT: There's a reference to this in the book by Jack and Pat Caldwell, Limiting Population Growth and the Ford Foundation Contribution (1986, p. 74). When did you manage to accomplish that?

HAUSER: The first Ph.D. student that led to a center being created was Dr. Mercedes Concepcion; a center was set up at the University of the Philippines in Manila in 1964. She was the Director and with subsequent reorganization, she became Dean of a separate unit of the university--Dean and Director of the Population Institute of the Philippines.

The second one that I had a hand in founding was the Population Institute at Chulalongkorn University in Bangkok, Thailand. This was funded by the Population Council and the Ph.D. who took his degree here was Visid Prachuabmoh. Interesting footnote: His daughter has just passed her prelims and taken an M.A. at the University of Chicago and is working on her Ph.D. dissertation. She'll go back to this institute as one of the staff, eventually maybe director there. Lovely girl.

VDT: Is he still the director, her father?

HAUSER: Unfortunately, he died from leukemia in his forties.

VDT: Sad. How nice that the daughter carries on the tradition.

HAUSER: Then a similar combination of things led to the creation of the population center at the University of Indonesia. The first director was Dr. Iskander, who was not trained at the University of Chicago but at Princeton. The population center in Indonesia was one of the products of the committee's work.

VDT: You obviously went to visit or be an adviser at all these different institutes that began. Did you go several times to the population institutes at the University of the Philippines and Chulalongkorn, Indonesia--and also India and Pakistan?

HAUSER: Many times, to all of them. And for that matter, I also visited population institutes in advanced countries. For example, a number of times I visited the population institute in the Ministry of Health in Tokyo.

VDT: Your first trip to Asia, with the committee for the Ford Foundation, was about 1963?

HAUSER: Right. Harkavy was already working for the Ford Foundation. He became the key person in the disbursement of monies for population purposes.

VDT: The first population centers you mentioned are spinoffs from your original population center?

HAUSER: Right. Then there are many others in which I didn't have quite as direct a relationship as those.

VDT: Did you go for a month or two at a time in these different places?

HAUSER: Most of the time, with one exception. In Burma I spent a year, in 1951-52. That was for the UN. I was there as a statistical adviser to the government of Burma and also the government of Thailand. I was resident in Burma but Thailand was less than an hour away by airplane. I did many things there, some definitely relating to demography, but just as much relating to the development of statistics and census activity as well.

I've been to over 70 countries and in most of them I either was a consultant for population matters or census and general statistical matters, survey matters, or gave lectures at the universities, or in some cases, did all three of them, in the same country. I did so over 35 years.

VDT: Well, you obviously were operating many strings. I'd like to read you a quote from my interview with Norman Ryder (Princeton, May 11, 1988) about you and Frank Notestein.

HAUSER: I'd be glad to hear it; Norman is a good friend.

VDT: He said: "Philip Hauser, along with Frank Notestein, was an extraordinary example of the importance of what you might call a research entrepreneur. These people seem to me to have been of extraordinary importance, extraordinary as organization creators, extraordinary as the people who managed to inspire research funds to come in our direction, and people who played a major role in shaping the field" and he said not just by your own industry and creativity but also by your choice of individuals, your students and fellow faculty members--giving these very able people room and opportunity to do what they do best.

He was speaking in particular at one point about your bringing in Otis Dudley Duncan. Could you talk a bit about your colleagues at Chicago like Duncan and Nathan Keyfitz, as well as some of your leading students.

HAUSER: Dudley Duncan was just finishing his Ph.D. when I returned in 1947; I was on his dissertation committee. He developed into, and I think still is--although he's retired now--the best scientist in sociology, including demography. I say that with conviction. He is an absolutely superb researcher and methodologist, and much of it through dint of his own effort and concentration and personal development, more so than through formal training, though he had enough formal training on which to build. I think his chief professor was Ogburn and he's written some fine things about Ogburn, including a book on Ogburn in the University of Chicago monograph series.

Dudley and I were collaborators--with the first large monies we had for research from the Air Force. After the war, I had occasion a number of times to visit Maxwell Field in Montgomery, Alabama, where the Human Resources Institute was located. The head of the institute was Ray Bowers. I was consultant to that institute. In connection with the questions they had raised, they provided funds with which we did research. Duncan and I wrote a paper summarizing our Air Force activities. Dudley did much of the methodological work on that series of studies and helped develop segregation concentration and other indexes. What the Air Force was interested in was how they could get better quantitative statements of population concentrations for both defense and bombing purposes. Defense was for the U.S.; the bombings were for other countries. We worked on the U.S. part and did a number of studies for them.

Dudley got married to Beverly Davis, who became one of my students and took her Ph.D. She died just this past year. Beverly was a superb student and a superb researcher. We did one book together called Housing a Metropolis: Chicago (1960). She and Dudley were one of the best research teams that ever existed in the U.S. or, for that matter, elsewhere. They did beautiful work. They published a book, The Negro Population in Chicago (1957), which was a trailblazer in many ways. It indicated that Chicago was probably the most segregated large city in the northern United States. And it stimulated other students to do the same--Karl Taeuber, for example. He took his degree at Harvard but he spent two or three years at the Population Research Center doing his dissertation. And he got married to Alma Ficks, who was also one of our students; she took her Ph.D. here. And they're both doing yeoman work at the University of Wisconsin.

VDT: Tell me about Nathan Keyfitz.

HAUSER: Nathan Keyfitz was a unique character. I can say he was one of my students but I have to qualify that by pointing out that he had an international reputation as a top statistician in the Bureau of Statistics in Canada before he came to Chicago to do his Ph.D. He had made significant contributions, statistical and demographic, to the census operations of Canada. And late in his life--I guess you'll have to check it out; he was then in his forties, fifties--I think it was in the 1950s that he came here.

VDT: He got his Ph.D. here in 1952. He's offered to do an interview tape on his own in Indonesia, where he's just returned; I'm frustrated I can't be there [see Keyfitz interview of December 31, 1988]. He continues to divide his time between Indonesia and the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis in Vienna.

HAUSER: I've been in correspondence with him in Indonesia. We had in common a man who became very powerful in Indonesia, adviser to the President, with whom Nathan still works (Widyoyo). When Nathan came, he was already an international statistical and demographic authority, but he didn't have a Ph.D.; I was on his thesis committee. [Keyfitz did his Ph.D. course and residence requirements at the University of Chicago in the early 1940s and returned in 1952 to defend his dissertation.] I want to tell you that the word from the graduate students here was that they wondered whether any of his faculty members were able to understand his dissertation. He used advanced statistical techniques, analysis of variance, in doing his dissertation and it was a first-rate piece of work. Nathan could always do first-rate work. So when I say he was one of my students, you've got to take that with qualification. He had already arrived and the Ph.D. was just frosting on the cake.

VDT: How about others of your leading students that you're proud of?

HAUSER: Let me deal with the American ones first and then the foreign ones.

VDT: You already have a list, under your wonderful reading machine. This one is: "Outstanding Students--American."

List prepared by Philip Hauser, November 12, 1988:

DUNCAN, Beverly	1957	WINSBOROUGH, Halliman	1961
FARLEY, Reynolds	1964	EPTING, Gladys	1982
GALLE, Omer	1968	LI, Angelina	1980
GRONBJERG, Kirsten	1974	KITAGAWA, Evelyn	1951
HENDERSHOT, Gerry	1970	MASON, William	
COSTELLO, Michael	1977	TSUI, Amy Ong	1977
LIEBERSON, Stanley	1960	HODGE, Robert W.	1967
MERTENS, Walter	1966	CLOGG, Clifford	1977
MUGGE, Robert	1957	SULLIVAN, Teresa	1975
SHELDON, Eleanor	1949	MATRAS, Judah	1962
XENOS, Peter	1970	KEYFITZ, Nathan	1952
(a.k.a. Smith)			

HAUSER: I've done no ranking.

VDT: No. Oh my, look at them. Beverly Duncan at the top; we've already talked about her. There are Reynolds Farley, Omer Galle, Kirsten Gronbjerg, Gerry Hendershot, and so the list goes on and on.

HAUSER: Well, these were among the best ones.

VDT: Nathan Keyfitz is at the bottom.

HAUSER: He was an afterthought. I can claim him technically as a student, but I've already qualified that. I would say one of the best was the name down the list and that's Evelyn Kitagawa.

VDT: Tell me about her. I understand that you are the godfather of her daughter.

HAUSER: Yes. My goddaughter, by the way, having received offers of scholarships for tuition plus \$7500 living expenses from Harvard, Yale, Chicago, and Princeton, is now at Princeton studying art history, with special reference to Japanese. She refused all those scholarships because she received a Mellon fellowship which she could use for three years of graduate work at any institution she selected, with tuition plus a \$10,000 per year stipend. Imagine that!

VDT: Wow! Did she do her undergraduate work at Chicago?

HAUSER: No. She was a student here at high school, the Laboratory School, and grade school, but she did her bachelor's degree at Oberlin.

VDT: In art history?

HAUSER: Yes, she had a double major. She's brilliant and beautiful; amazing woman.

VDT: Is she an only child?

HAUSER: Yes. She was born to Evelyn when Evelyn was in her forties. Evelyn was one of my students; she finished in 1951. She came with her husband, Joseph, who is also an amazing person. He's an Episcopalian priest. Born in Japan, but he came over here to do some studying and was entrapped after Pearl Harbor and put in a concentration camp. That's where Evelyn met him; she was working for the agency that was running the concentration camps. Romantic.

She came to Chicago. She had been a math major at Berkeley, California; bright as a whip. Became interested in demography and I was able to give her a fellowship. She went through everything that we had to teach her, absorbed it all, and was among the top half dozen, I think, that I had occasion to train. Top half dozen, among other things, in methodology, utilizing her math background. She is an excellent methodologist. She became Associate Director of the Center and in due course, I was even able to persuade the Department of Sociology that it was not undesirable or immoral for a female to become a member of the faculty.

VDT: Was she first female on your faculty?

HAUSER: No, I don't think she was the first, but it was very rare. I developed a technique that made it work pretty well. She was Assistant Director of the Population Research Center under each of the titles that we had and listed in the faculty as a Research Associate of the faculty and, I think, with some professorial rank. Eventually, we were able to put her on the faculty as full professor. She became my successor as Director of the Center. She's done superb work. We did one monograph together.

VDT: The groundbreaking book on Differential Mortality in the United States: A Study in Socioeconomic Epidemiology (1973).

HAUSER: Right. Great methodology there. We both were creative but I think she did the dirty work to get it through. It's one thing to be creative; it's another thing to implement it. She did the implementation, and that's why she got the senior authorship on it. It was a very good study.

VDT: Charlie Nam told me that he and Lillian Guralnik developed the census record-matching system that you used, in a pretest for the 1960 census.

HAUSER: Right, that we worked on. I had a grant of \$1,017,000 from the National Institutes of Health. It was a lot of money at that time, but I'll tell you something interesting. This was a study that the National Center for Health Statistics wanted to do and the Congress would not appropriate the money for the study. And so the grant we got, we gave most of the money back to the Bureau of the Census and the National Center for Health Statistics for working up the confidential census data for us.

VDT: Private enterprise really helping the government! The money came from the government and it got laundered through you.

HAUSER: It got laundered through us back to the government. And Evelyn is, of course, professor at one of the best universities, one of the best research centers.

VDT: What about Reynolds Farley, who is just finishing up his tenure as PAA President?

HAUSER: He was one of our students; did a lot of his work with the PRC in demography. For a while, was he not head of the Michigan Population Studies Center? Another student of mine, William Mason, is now head of that center, of which Ron Freedman was first director. I used to half claim Ron Freedman as a student too. He was finishing up when I came back in 1947 and listened to some of my lectures.

Beverly Duncan and Omer Galle became academic professors of the highest quality in first-rate institutions. Eleanor Sheldon became president of the Social Science Research Council. She was well trained by us at the University of Chicago.

VDT: Great. And Amy Ong Tsui, now down at Chapel Hill; she worked a long time with Don Bogue.

HAUSER: Right, and Don Bogue can probably claim her as a student. Actually, it's a funny thing, all of them were students not of my center or his center but of the Department of Sociology and most of them had courses with both of us. The centers didn't do any teaching; the centers . . .

VDT: I want to ask you about the logistics of those two centers. And the last American I'll ask you about is Teresa Sullivan, now at Texas.

HAUSER: A superb student with a flair--she's got one of the best abilities to write of any student I ever had. And since she's been at Texas, they've also made her head of a women's study program and she's also current editor of the Sociological Monograph series, the Rose monograph series.

VDT: Now, let's look at your outstanding foreign students.

List of Outstanding Students--Foreign, prepared by Philip Hauser, November 12, 1988

ADEWUYI, Alfred 1977 Nigeria

ANDERSON, Patricia	1977	Jamaica
FLIEGER, Wilhelm	1967	Philippines
CHO, Lee-Jay	1965	Republic of Korea
CONCEPCION, Mercedes	1963	Philippines
JILLANI, M.S.	1962	Pakistan
MISRA, B.D.	1965	India
MISRA, J.K.	1969	India
CHANG, Chen-Tung	1973	Singapore
PRACHUABMOH, Visid	1966	Thailand
SUJONO, Harjono	1972	Indonesia
HASHMI, Sultan	1970	Pakistan
BAGCHI, Sourendra	1972	India
GARCIA, Maria del Pilar	1978	Venezuela
SIRIPAK, Wiwit	(M.A. 1965)	Thailand
KONO	(short-term)	Japan
COSTELLO, Marylou		Philippines
PIAMPITI, Souvaluck	(M.A.)	Thailand

HAUSER: Lee-Jay Cho would be the first one I'd pick, perhaps the one who has become the most prominent. He is now Vice-President of the East-West Center and Director of the East-West Center Population Institute.

VDT: And Mercedes Concepcion, you've mentioned her.

HAUSER: Yes, she became, as I say, the Director and then Dean of the Population Institute in the Philippines. A very brilliant person and a profoundly good speaker and good thinker. She's had a lot of impact in the international scene, not only in Manila but through a couple of different organizations, some of which we jointly organized. We had something called the Organization of Demographic Associates (ODA), that included people who were heads of institutes in Asia; it's dead now. She's had terrific influence. She's also represented the Philippines on the UN Population Commission.

VDT: And been President of IUSSP.

HAUSER: Right. She and Lee-Jay Cho have probably had the most distinguished careers.

VDT: There's Haryono Sujono of Indonesia. I didn't know he'd studied in the U.S.

HAUSER: Oh, yes. He's now head of the family planning organization in Indonesia [BKKBN]. He did most of his work with Don Bogue, but he had courses in demography with me as well.

Don, may I say--you'll be talking with him--has a mission. We've had something less than completely congenial relationships over the years. He's had a tendency to feel that any student that worked with him in his center was that center's student, period. And the fact is that's not true. The students were students in the Department of Sociology; that's where they got their degrees. And they took courses with anybody in the department, including not only Don but me and other members of the department. So that in a sense, anyone with whom they took courses could claim them as students. There are probably over a hundred students of the Department of Sociology who had training in demography now distributed throughout the world.

VDT: Now that we're on to Don Bogue, let me just ask you why he split off. I suspect that he decided

that family planning research was a separate branch. I re-read or read for the first time, on the plane coming here, your rather critical review of his article in the Berelson book (Bernard Berelson et al., eds., Family Planning and Population Programs, 1965, reviewed by Philip Hauser in "A Book Review Article," Demography, Vol. 4, No. 1, 1967, pp. 397-414). You were quite critical of Don Bogue's approach to family planning at that time, or at least the idea that family planning research was a separate . . .

HAUSER: Well, let me put it this way. I brought Don to the department on the basis of his published research. When he first came in, I made him Associate Director of the Population Research Center. But when the opportunity came to get a center of his own, he immediately took that over--the Community and Family Study Center. The man who had started that left for other. . .

VDT: I did not realize that Bogue did not start it; that it existed already.

HAUSER: It had previously existed. But he changed its character completely and used part of the name--the "family"--but went increasingly into the family planning thing. Now, as I saw Don, in due course he was paying 100 percent attention to that, doing nothing in relation to the Population Center.

As I see Don--a very able, very competent person, and probably the most prodigious worker that I have run into; day and night.

VDT: Next to you.

HAUSER: Well, I don't think I ever matched Don in that respect.

He became what I regard as a crusader and his crusade often led him into what I regarded as irresponsible situations. One of the things he published, for example, was an article called "The End of the Population Explosion" (1967). Have you read that?

VDT: Well, "Declining World Fertility" (Population Reference Bureau, October 1978) came out of that and I was the editor of that Population Bulletin. And we got into trouble, even though I spent hours on the phone trying to persuade Don Bogue to tone it down.

HAUSER: That's right. I think that he projected in 1967 that the population of the world in 2000 would be four billion something [4.527 billion--revised upward to 5.8 billion in the 1978 Population Bulletin]. He was ignoring everybody else's projections.

VDT: It was way off.

HAUSER: Right. It [current projections for 2000] still is the 6 point something billion that it was at the time he was saying it would be four plus billion.

I've never felt anything but friendly toward him; I've got no animosity. And I was just as happy to see him go his own way, because I could not go along with what I regarded as extreme crusading efforts that had, as a matter of fact, no place in a department of sociology at the university. What he was doing should have been part of a separate family planning agency. That's not a function of the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago. And the administration saw it the same way.

VDT: You did point out in that review article that when he got around to evaluating projects, it was not a good idea for the program director to do the evaluation. In that case, you talked about the impact of the Chicago experiment regarding black--Negro--fertility. You pointed out that the results were quite incorrect.

HAUSER: Right. But I think he's made a tremendous contribution. He's just now become emeritus, you know.

VDT: Yes, but he's hardly retired. He's got his own Social Development Center.

HAUSER: In any case, the new Ogburn-Stouffer Center, which includes the Population Research Center, contains the scientific research part of what was his center [Community and Family Study Center] and is now being overseen by Marta Tienda.

VDT: They've just done that in the newly opened quarters? [New center for population, etc., officially opened on the University of Chicago campus, November 11, 1988.]

HAUSER: Right

VDT: And you've given some of your books to them?

HAUSER: Two or three days ago, I gave them a copy of each of my 32 books and "over 500 articles." They have not only the books I've written or edited but also another 50 to 60 books in which I have a chapter. They're all in a special case at the center. These were in addition to approximately 6,000 books which I made available to the University.

VDT: Wonderful! There are few institutions that can point so definitely to one man who started it all. How about the United Nations? Could you say a bit about your time there, as the first U.S. Representative to the Population Commission (1947-51).

HAUSER: I summarized my experience there in an article in a special issue of the UN Population Bulletin [Philip M. Hauser, "The Early Years of the Population Commission, Population Bulletin of the United Nations, Nos. 19/20, 1986, A Special Issue in Commemoration of the 40th Anniversary of the Population Commission, pp. 2-5].

VDT: Tell me something that you might not have said in the article. I've heard from Ansley Coale, who followed you as U.S. Representative, that it was very divisive in those days. You could not bring up the subject of family planning, it was so sensitive. Was that your experience?

HAUSER: It was sensitive, but I would not agree that it could not be brought up. In fact, I think I have some reference to that in that article. Thinking back, it seems to me we raised questions about population control during the first five years of the Commission. I think it became a more sensitive matter later on, with changes in the Administration and an increased voice of the right in the United States.

VDT: Certainly that's true now. You think it was wider open then--not even the Catholics objected? The Catholics were vocal opponents of family planning then [late 1940s; early 1950s].

HAUSER: They were, but they were split; some were not.

VDT: Eisenhower was President then?

HAUSER: Yes.

VDT: Well, he was very much opposed. He said it was the most inappropriate thing the President could get involved in. It wasn't until 1965 that Johnson came out and put the U.S. firmly in the camp of population aid.

HAUSER: Right. And now this Administration with the radical right point of view is going in the other direction.

VDT: It is discouraging. You said an important part of the Population Commission's work was to advise the Population Division and Statistical Division on their research agenda. Did you have something to do with encouraging the Demographic Yearbook?

HAUSER: Oh yes. I recall that we also, during those five years, requested the Secretariat to do the study which came out in two editions, The Determinants and Consequences of Population Trends (1953 and 1972). In my article there's a listing of the things we did and that is among them.

VDT: One time during those years you brought Sauvy and some other Commissioners to a PAA meeting. [May 22-23, 1948, meeting at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. Guests at the dinner were: Alberto Arca Parro (Peru), Alfred Sauvy (France), Germano Jardim (Brazil), as well as Philip Hauser. Frank Notestein, then PAA President, substituted an "informal discussion" among these guests for the usual presidential address. From Population Index.] Most of you on the Commission then were demographers?

HAUSER: Yes.

VDT: Unlike those who came somewhat later.

HAUSER: That's right, including General William Draper, who was never a demographer, but he was a wise and well-intentioned man.

VDT: Well, he raised a lot of money for the field. Now I have a big question: What do you see as important issues in demography over the years you've been involved? We've touched on it already, because we've spoken of your concern over the population explosion. At the time you put out The Study of Population (1959), the great bible of the trade, you stressed then in what was supposed to be a brief for the National Science Foundation on demography as a science, the division between demographic analysis, which deals with demographic variables, and population studies, which deal with non-demographic variables. However, you then and always have encouraged a meshing of the two.

HAUSER: Right.

VDT: Another quote from the Norman Ryder interview. He said: Phil Hauser "also played a very important role as an ambassador to the outside world. He, unlike most demographers, is able to be at home and talk convincingly to the outside world, with the world of business and industry and commerce, and policymakers, and talk on major issues with some technical facility in a way that doesn't bore them silly. People like that are very important to our profession. Most of us find the role very uncomfortable and don't do it well. Yet somehow or other the health of the profession depends on interchange between the different worlds."

HAUSER: I won't disagree with that. And as a matter of fact, because of that I'm able to spend my retirement in this place.

VDT: He's living in a very lovely building on the tenth floor, with a view over Lake Michigan. You have done a lot of consultant work for business?

HAUSER: That's right.

VDT: You obviously were one of the first demographers to write and talk about the population explosion to the outside world. For instance, you published in 1960 the book The Population Explosion: World, National, Metropolitan. Then there was "The Population Explosion--U.S.A.," which ended up as a Population Bulletin (Population Reference Bureau, August 1960), which you'd given as a speech at a conference in Dallas (National Conference on "A New Look at the Population," cosponsored by the Dallas Council on World Affairs and Newsweek magazine, Dallas, May 19, 1960). You then published the book, The Population Dilemma (Philip M. Hauser, ed., 1963; second edition, 1969). All of this was before Paul Ehrlich and The Population Bomb (1968), when the world seemed to become conscious of the population explosion. You were talking about the population explosion both in the developing countries and in the U.S.--one of the first.

HAUSER: That's right. Incidentally, I introduced some language that I did not take very far. I talked not only about the population explosion, but also "implosion" and "displlosion." By population implosion, I was referring to the increasing concentration of people in relatively small amounts of space--metropolitanization--and the way in which this would, and has, completely altered much of our institutions and way of life. The "displlosion"--an interesting point, the word was first suggested to me in this use by Norman Ryder. I was looking for a piece of language that would rhyme, referring to the increased heterogeneity of population, which definitely also created many kinds of problems, including all these forms of racial, religious, and nationalistic conflicts. That's the "displlosion." It's a word I took out of the dictionary and Norman suggested it. All three are very fundamental, problematic areas in which the demographer, in my judgment, should be well versed and able to contribute to in a research way.

VDT: Well, you certainly have bent many demographers in that direction.

We haven't solved the problem of the population explosion. Are you discouraged that some of your earlier prognostications, which were tempered, I won't say really pessimistic, but you were not optimistic. You tried to tone down Don Bogue. You pointed out in the early 1960s that if world population growth continued as it was, the total would be 7.5 billion in the year 2000. Everyone knew it wouldn't be that. But the UN medium variant projection at that time was 6.1 billion; it's still 6.1 billion.

HAUSER: I think I deal with that problem of projections in those articles I did. The only projections I quoted were those of the UN, which, as you know, were presented as "low," "medium" and "high." The medium projections which I favored as the most reasonable of course assumed more declines in fertility than the high projections.

VDT: Yes, you were always very careful to point out that assumptions are important.

But now, this past year, the Population Reference Bureau's World Population Data Sheet (1988) shows that population in 2000 is likely to be closer to the UN's high variant. [That Data Sheet projected 6.178 billion for 2000. UN 1988 assessments, published after this interview, revised the medium variant projection for 2000 up from 6.122 billion, 1984 assessment, to 6.251 billion.] The

world population growth rate has been stuck at 1.7 or 1.8 percent for years. Do you find that discouraging?

HAUSER: In some ways. Not so much discouraging--I don't think that's the right word. My reaction to it is it's too bad, because the world pays a very high price for it. And, yes, it's discouraging, but it shouldn't be discouraging in the sense that we stop studying it or trying to find ways to deal with it. I don't like to use the word "discouraging" in the sense that you turn away from it. And, I would add, that despite the problems and the fact that the world population explosion has not come to an end, as some hoped it might, we have made progress. There are definite signs of progress in the decrease of fertility in some of the Third World areas.

VDT: Did you know that Thailand is down to a total fertility rate of 2.5, according to the latest Demographic and Health Survey?

HAUSER: Right, and the NICs--newly industrializing countries--have done great things in reducing their fertility--South Korea, Singapore, Taiwan, Hong Kong. All the ones that are making progress on the economic front are also making progress on the fertility front.

But certainly it is disheartening--I would rather say that than discouraging--to see what little progress has been made in, say, Pakistan.

VDT: That was one country where you thought--I'm not sure in which article--there was a possibility that it would reduce fertility, and it hasn't. And India?--not so much.

HAUSER: Not so much. Pakistan not; Bangladesh certainly not. Of course, China has been successful, though I think by some means that are perhaps abhorrent. I don't cotton much to a situation in which the husband beats the hell out of the wife for having a daughter.

VDT: Have you been to China?

HASUER: Oh yes, I was there on a UN mission. We had a week in which we had a roundtable. I was representing North America; Concepcion was representing Asia; someone else was representing the Arabic countries. There was a division of labor, about five or six of us there, and each of us for our own areas discussed with some 20 representatives of universities, mostly, and other institutions interested in population in China. Very interesting experience. My wife accompanied me; she's been dead now for five years, next month. The Chinese government gave us a guide, who stayed with us throughout our journey, and in each locality we'd pick up local guides. We really had a very good insight into China.

VDT: It's an important country for any demographer to have been exposed to.

HAUSER: Certainly.

VDT: A bit more on projections. Charlie Nam pointed out that one of the things that was so much fun at early PAA meetings were the continuing debates that went on. One he recalled in particular was between you and Joseph Davis of Stanford on projections. Joseph Davis said that because all the demographers' projections were going screwy--which was true; those done before the baby boom did indeed go screwy--that demographers were charlatans. Now, I think you were defending them.

HAUSER: I remember that, although I don't remember the details.

VDT: I guess you'd still say--with a grain of salt--that projections are simply projections; you crank in the assumptions and people have to be careful what the assumptions are.

HAUSER: I've always said, and I've always taught my students, that projections are not to be confused with predictions.

VDT: Right. But they're still worth something--that's what you were telling Joseph Davis.

HAUSER: Much superior to ignorance.

VDT: Another theme of yours that I think was important was the importance of getting good data.

HAUSER: Right.

VDT: You pointed out in your 1967 Demography review of the Berelson book that, for instance, the KAP studies did not measure response error.

HAUSER: That's right.

VDT: And also, apparently already back in 1954, you recommended sample vital registration collection in countries like India, and later India did that. Were you the one that suggested that to India?

HAUSER: Yes. I published an article on sampling of vital registration areas; I think it appeared in the Journal of the American Statistical Association. The Indians, who followed our literature, eventually adopted that thing which I recommended. I would regard that as one of my more important suggestions from the standpoint of potential, but too many countries have not adopted it. The sample vital registration system would give you accurate vital statistics way before you could complete a vital registration system on a 100 percent basis.

VDT: In your book Social Statistics in Use (1975), you dealt with the social statistics that are used in the United States, starting with the Census Bureau and so on. What do you think of the current defunding of federal statistics-gathering?

HAUSER: That is one of the indexes of the complete stupidity of the present Administration. The one way to make sure that you cover up your stupid actions is to make sure that you reduce the knowledge about it, which is what happens if you reduce statistics.

VDT: What do you think of the current plethora of mathematical demographers? You said you trained yourself a lot in the mathematics of demography; obviously you were competent but you were not a Nathan Keyfitz, for instance.

HAUSER: No, I never went into mathematical demography very much. I went into it enough to be able to read and understand what was involved, without necessarily tracing through every item and every equation. I think that mathematical demography is one of the fields which definitely must be cultivated--has been cultivated, and has made a great contribution. There should continue to be such contributions. But I think that we need more than has yet occurred in integrating the significant findings of the mathematical demographers with social and economic and political consequences. I

think there's not been enough, partly because the social and economic demographers have sometimes not been able to read the mathematical demographers. And partly because the mathematical demographers have become so intrigued with methodology that they have not followed out to deal with what the implications are of what they're discovering.

Now, I think there are two exceptions to that, whom I think have done pretty well in their efforts to integrate--Nathan Keyfitz and Ansley Coale. They have traced through and considered and analyzed implications of their findings on the social and economic scene.

VDT: You talked in The Study of Population about attempts to build up demographic theory. When I was trained in demography at Georgetown in the late 1960s and started reading your books, I was almost taught that the demographic transition was the only theory that existed in demography.

HAUSER: Yes.

VDT: In The Study of Population, you sort of dismissed optimum population and even Lotka, but that was more in the mathematical part, and certainly the efforts to get a psychosocial theory, which was tried with the Indianapolis Survey and also with the Princeton Fertility Survey and found wanting.

HAUSER: Yes.

VDT: What about the demographic transition? It's been pretty much destroyed, I think, by the European Fertility Study done at Princeton, which showed so many exceptions.

HAUSER: Right. But then the demographic transition theory served a very useful function, which all theory is supposed to do. The point to developing a theory is--and I think I state this explicitly in that book with Duncan [The Study of Population]-theory is a generalization drawn from reality in a way that has implications for further research, heuristic implications. The purpose of a theory is not to prove but to do research to see the way in which it misses the important thing, the way in which it is lacking, the way in which there are variations from the generalization. And the most important function a theory performs is to stimulate empirical research which destroys it. After it has stimulated empirical research it's done its best job. That's the way I look at it.

VDT: Great way to put it. Which do you consider your major publications and why were they important? Your favorites, among your 32 books, your chapters in 50-60 books, and more than 500 articles.

HAUSER: It's a hard question to answer. I would start with the empirical ones. The three most important empirical studies I've made, I would include Differential Mortality with Evelyn, Housing a Metropolis with Beverly Duncan--these are real empirical researches--and I would include my own two-volume publication, published by the federal government, called Workers on Relief in the United States, in 1935.

VDT: I didn't know about that. Your name was on it?

HAUSER: Sure. The first volume is about two inches thick and was done by me only, with my name on it. And the second volume, about an inch thick, I did with one of my good friends, Bruce Jenkinson, who did the methanical things involved.

VDT: Where did you collect your data?

HAUSER: Let me take you back to 1935. I was in the division of research of FERA, then WPA. FERA was going in transition from FERA--Federal Emergency Relief Administration--to Works Progress Administration. What they needed for policy was who are the people who are unemployed, so they could plan what kinds of activities could provide them with useful employment. There were three thousand some counties in the United States. Every county had a FERA office. The office contained the names of all the persons who were getting relief. I was put in charge of the project; I sometimes call this my 12 million dollar postgraduate fellowship. What I did was design a plan to go to every relief office, every county in the country, and have them, with instructions I provided, select a sample of the names and characteristics of what was on the relief rolls in that county. That sample was then sent into headquarters in Washington, where under my supervision it was compiled into data. If you'd come two days ago, I could have shown you the volumes; they are now over at the new center. Some of my books, incidentally, are included among a few books of previous presidents of the American Sociological Association now on display at their headquarters.

The first volume had the age, sex, and education, as I recall, of the workers on the relief rolls, some six point something million. The second volume was their occupations and industries from which they'd come, as well as age, sex, and general characteristics. Those data provided a basis for planning work projects, which was the function of WPA. Those were my first two big publications and what was involved in both of those volumes was a lot of demographic statistics. And I used sampling to get it. In fact, it may be one of the first things that ever came out in a federal government publication using sampling. At the end of the volume I had a table of sampling errors, so that you could read potential sampling error in any statistics the volume contained.

VDT: And you were just in your mid-twenties at that time! You say those were the three empirical publications you're proudest of. What are some others?

HAUSER: The one I wrote called Population Perspectives (1960), based on a series of lectures I gave at the College of the Pacific in the state of Washington. I feel that work was important because it was an effort to present what I regarded as the different aspects of the work I'd been doing for the public at large. Population Perspectives had a pretty good circulation. The Population Dilemma, which I edited, had some of the best demographers do chapters--there are a couple of different editions with variations in contributors--was done under the aegis of the American Assembly. That's the outfit created by Columbia University. Up until a few years ago--I haven't been receiving the American Assembly lists since--it was their most successful publication; it had gone through over 150,000 copies. I regarded that as important because it was distributing knowledge to the general public.

VDT: Speaking to the outside world, as Ryder pointed out.

HAUSER: Right. Then on the technical side--you see these are different categories--I would say The Study of Population and then, almost my most recent book, World Population and Development: Challenges and Prospects (1979), which I did for the UNFPA to celebrate their tenth anniversary.

VDT: Excellent. You ended up that by saying, "We can choose between Doomsday and Dawnsday"--I liked that.

You write so well and edit--obviously you're an excellent editor.

HAUSER: This is just part of having good training. The University of Chicago is a good place to get trained.

VDT: You must have had some good training before that; you mentioned Latin in high school.

HAUSER: Yes, and I've got to admit that I was a good student. My undergraduate work was straight A's. And pretty much the same in my high school work, although it suffered from time to time because for a good part of my high school I spent eight hours a day delivering Western Union messages, from four to midnight. And not only doing the regular high school but I was doubling up; I did my four years of high school in three years.

VDT: And you were a Western Union messenger! On a bicycle?

HAUSER: No--Ford automobile.

VDT: How old were you? Were you allowed to drive before you were 16?

HAUSER: At that time you didn't need a driver's license, but you were not supposed to drive before you were 16, I think. I first began doing that when I was about 14.

VDT: Actually driving for a living--oh boy!

HAUSER: Well, it was the only way I could manage to get to school. My father was an immigrant.

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

HAUSER: I think that would be the accomplishment represented by sending a batch of superb students to many parts of the world--Asia, Latin America, and Africa. I don't think anything can beat the satisfaction one gets from seeing an untrained brilliant mind become a trained professional, to go out and do a professional job.

The other thing that I guess would match it was the opportunities I've had to conduct research on my own and to create research with somebody that helped others do research. I think those things would be. . . I've had honorific offices and so on, but those are momentary and don't particularly count. As I've told you, I've been president of five organizations.

VDT: Which were they?

HAUSER: The three major ones--and I don't think there's anyone else who has ever done this--I was president of the Population Association, the American Sociological Association, and the American Statistical Association. Then a fourth one was the Sociological Research Association, kind of a select group, and then the National Conference on Social Welfare, an organization concerned with welfare and social work.

VDT: You were never president of IUSSP, but you were one of only 29 Americans of the 147 persons who were invited to become individual members when IUSSP was reorganized after the war.

HAUSER: That's right.

VDT: We're talking about all your beautiful furnishings, Oriental artwork and so on, from your travels. You went to the East-West Center in Honolulu regularly for a while?

HAUSER: Yes, for about 14 years in a row, I spent my winter quarters in Hawaii as a research fellow.

Those were not opportunities to be a beach boy, but as represented by my publications, were the most productive parts of my year. I had an office; I had access to secretaries, to computers, to the library. Most people didn't know it was cheap to phone me from the United States, so I wasn't run daffy by phone calls. And students would see me occasionally but not that often. I was really able to get productivity that was higher than any other time in my life.

VDT: Great. Well, we were talking about the IUSSP; the fact that you were one of just 29 Americans among 147 members invited when the IUSSP was re-formed after World War II on an individual basis.

HAUSER: Right. And I felt that having been an office-holder in a way that was probably much too much in this country, and having experienced the decreases in productivity that office-holding meant, I very definitely avoided and discouraged any efforts to hold office in IUSSP. I figured I had done my share of office-holding.

VDT: Now finally to your recollections of PAA. Can you remember the first meeting you attended? You are listed as giving a paper in 1940, at Chapel Hill, in the Howard Odum session, and your paper was called "Economic Differentials in Neonatal and Infant Mortality." Was that your first meeting?

HAUSER: I think I'd been at PAA meetings before that. What was the first year that PAA met?

VDT: What was called the "first annual meeting" was 1932, in New York. Then 1933 and 1934 in New York. Washington in 1935. Were you at that famous meeting--the one where Eleanor Roosevelt came and knitted during the sessions?

HAUSER: Yes, that was among the ones that I attended. Although what I really remember was the series of meetings I went to at Princeton. When did they start?

VDT: Princeton began in 1936 and then it was on and off at Princeton until 1955.

HAUSER: I went to practically every meeting there, and practically every meeting after the 1935 one in Washington.

VDT: You can remember that 1935 meeting. Were you in the select group that was invited to Mrs. Roosevelt's private quarters?

HAUSER: No.

VDT: You were a "wunderkind," but. . . [The occasion of the "select group" of demographers being invited to Mrs. Roosevelt's private quarters was in January 1943. See Clyde Kiser interview, April 1973, above.] Do you remember her being at the regular session [in the 1935 meeting]?

HAUSER: Oh yes. I remember her because--remember she was chairman of the Human Rights Commission at the UN and I was on the Population Commission and I got to know her at the UN; our paths crossed from time to time. I never knew her very well, but enough to say hello. Prior to that I had no dealings with her.

VDT: You were at the 1942 meeting in Atlantic City, the last one before PAA closed shop for the war, because that was the one where you were elected Secretary. In those days, secretaries were elected; now they're appointed. And you remained Secretary until 1946.

HAUSER: When you mentioned this earlier today, I'd forgotten it completely.

VDT: So you can't tell me what you did as Secretary, because you don't even remember being it.

HAUSER: That's right.

VDT: In 1942 and again in 1951--that was the year you were president and the meeting was at Chapel Hill--Con Taeuber keeps telling me these stories, and others too, about the blacks. Blacks were rare at the early PAA meetings. The few times they did come in the early days caused problems: Atlantic City and again at Chapel Hill. Do you recall those incidents?

HAUSER: Yes, and regretted them very much. There was also one session in which I had quite a brawl with Kingsley Davis. Father Gibbons, a Roman Catholic priest who had a favorable attitude toward family planning--and the point is the Population Association, having appointed a committee, invited him to come to a session--I've forgotten what city this was--and present the Catholic view on birth control. He gave a paper and I thought it was a great paper, with the most detail I had ever heard about the theological position of the Church with respect to family planning. He explained in terms of Catholic dogma and general procedures the attitude of the Church. It was the best explanation I'd ever heard, although I'd done reading on it. After which, Kingsley Davis got up and excoriated the man, practically ripped him into shreds, for the Catholic position against family planning. He used virtually every adjective that was pejorative that you can imagine.

Well, there was a deadly silence after Kingsley sat down. And I just couldn't stand it. I got up and said I thought it most inappropriate and rude for anyone to attack Father Gibbons.

VDT: It was at the meeting of 1949 at Princeton. A book was published of the proceedings of that PAA meeting--the only time that was ever done--in order to advertise the view of the Catholic Church. Anne Lee sent me a copy not long ago. [Studies in Population, edited by George F. Mair, Princeton University Press, 1949. Father Gibbons's paper was called, "The Catholic Value System in Relation to Human Fertility," followed by Kingsley Davis, "Values, Population, and the Supernatural: A Critique."]

HAUSER: I ripped into Kingsley, saying it was most rude and uncalled for to criticize the way he did a guest of the Population Association who was good enough to explain to us the position of his church. "Now, that didn't mean we agree with it, but why did you have to tear this man apart? He performed a service for us." And Kingsley and I were enemies temporarily.

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 gather there were lots of fun debates at those early meetings; you all knew each other well.

HAUSER: Oh yes. I'll tell you one thing about a meeting at Princeton that I think deserves recording.

Again, I'm sure you'll use judgment about what you publish. After an evening session, we repaired to somebody's room at the Princeton Inn. There were a half dozen of us and our wives. As was usually the case then, the men sort of split off at one end of the room and the women at the other. It turned out I was at the edge where I could hear conversations in both places; participate in the men's conversation but hear the women's conversation. The women were mostly talking about the problems they faced with their teenaged daughters and what do you do about this necking and petting. How do you deal with this whole problem of the adolescent girl.

Among the people there were Gunnar and Alva Myrdal, who were good friends of mine. And one of the women turned to Alva and said, "What do you do about this problem in Sweden?" Alva's response was one that made the American women practically fall off their chairs. She said, "We do not have such problems in Sweden--petting and necking. Our children have wholesome sexual intercourse." The American women practically collapsed!

VDT: Wonderful! You were a member of the old boys' network--and old girls' too, because it included Irene Taeuber, Dorothy Thomas, and Margaret Hagood--who ran everything. There was the College of Fellows, which PAA had from the beginning [until the 1950s], who elected 12 members of the Board [six more were elected by general members], and the Board elected the officers from the College of Fellows. There was not direct election of the officers.

HAUSER: That was at the very beginning, before my time. As I recall it, from the time I began attending the meetings, I think there were elections. I was not party to that cabal.

VDT: Okay. However, there was a smallish group that ran things. Of course, you knew each other well.

HAUSER: Oh, we knew each other well but I don't remember participating in discussions of who would be nominated for what. Maybe Con Taeuber could tell you. You know he's a bit older than I am.

VDT: He's in pretty good shape, I see him often in Washington.

HAUSER: I talked to him on the phone just last week and he wrote me a note. He says, though, his Parkinson's is getting worse.

VDT: Yes it is, but he comes to meetings and is determined to keep on.

Let's talk about the year you were president of PAA [1950-51]. The meeting was at Chapel Hill [May 12-13, 1951].

HAUSER: I'll tell you one thing I remember that I did. . .

VDT: You spoke on the UN Population Commission [at the dinner], but your main speaker was William Ogburn, on "Population and Social Change."

HAUSER: That's right. I chose Will to give the presidential address for me for the very good reason that he was the man from whom I had my first course in population, who had made, I think, very significant contributions, but who had never been recognized in any formal way by the Population Association. So I deliberately asked him to please give a paper instead of my giving a presidential address.

As I remember, I introduced him with some poetry, I think it was from Auden. It was a most

appropriate reference to knowledge and statistics and so on. I'm not sure either of the author or the poem. I'm handicapped with my eyes; I can't go back to my files. My eyesight is bad, but I'm in good physical condition.

VDT: That poetry doesn't appear in the Population Index that reprinted William Ogburn's speech. But it's nice to know about that and your reason for choosing William Ogburn, who spoke on "Population and Social Change," urging demographers' attention to other social variables not directly associated with births, deaths, and migration, but important also in effecting social change. What you have said--not keeping a divide between demographic analysis and population studies.

The year you were president, Jay Siegel gave an analysis of the membership at the meeting [in a paper on "The Teaching of Demography"]. There were just 382 members and 161 of them were at universities. He said then that a great many more people were giving population courses at universities than belonged to PAA. What do you think about the growth of the membership? It really hasn't grown too much; it has fluctuated at about 2,600 since the mid-1970s [2,655 at the end of 1988; 2,752, end 1990].

HAUSER: As I remember, back then--Jay Siegel may have brought this out--a disproportionate number of the members was from the Bureau of the Census. The growth of the PAA had the salutary effect of increasing the range of discussion topics, thus diminishing the proportion of census procedures and data which were discussed. At the beginning, attention was focused mostly on research. As the membership increased, the proportion of persons interested in family planning increased and there was some tension, as a result, between the researchers and the family planners. Now, I'm not opposed to social engineering, but at the time I thought that the Population Association should be essentially a scientific research organization and not be concerned with social policy and have a family planning mission. Well, as I look back on it, I would agree that it was probably better to get the family planning emphasis into it than not to have family planning emphasis at all. But I think I might have preferred--certainly at that time--a differentiation between the research function and the engineering function.

VDT: That's been a bone of contention in PAA from the beginning. Margaret Sanger, who helped call the first meeting, was asked not to run for vice president, because that would dilute the scientific purity of the organization.

HAUSER: Yes. You know what gave me one of the greatest thrills I ever had. I was invited to come down to Princeton for a meeting. I think it was the time that General Draper was beginning to raise funds; it was a fund-raising enterprise and I was invited to give a talk about population. As I remember, I dealt with various aspects of population problems, including problems in the Third World, and the implications for the economy and living standards. After that talk--it was a group of probably not more than 40 or 50 people--Margaret Sanger came up to me and said, "As you know, I've been working on family planning and population control for many years. I never understood as well how important it was until I heard your talk tonight." Needless to say, I was thrilled.

VDT: Great. So you have the appreciation, the accolade, from the lay people, the activists, as well as your professional colleagues.

HAUSER: I would hope so and I appreciate it very much. After all, no one gets put out by having people say you're doing okay.

VDT: Seeing these lovely family pictures here reminds me I forgot to ask an important question--

about Robert Hauser, your nephew, who was obviously influenced by you. How did that come about-- that a family member went into demography after you?

HAUSER: Bob was living in Chicago and for a while lived with me and my wife while he took his bachelor's degree here, in economics.

VDT: He's the son of your brother?

HAUSER: Yes. He had two sons. In the edition of Who's Who in the U.S. preceding the one that just came out, on one page there are four Hausers. I'm one of them; my son is one of them; and my two nephews are the others.

VDT: I don't know about your son.

HAUSER: He teaches Japanese history at Rochester University and he's been chairman of the department of history there for a couple of terms. He's pretty fluent in the Japanese language and literature.

VDT: He must have had his world widened by your travels.

HAUSER: Very definitely. And I had him with me in Japan when he was eight years old.

VDT: There are photos on the wall of the four of you: you and your wife and a son and a daughter. You could always go around saying, "I have two children," but you were lucky you had a son and a daughter.

HAUSER: Being a demographer, I knew how! I tell you what's hard for me to believe is that boy will be 50 years old next year and my daughter was 47 last month. She is in Ann Arbor. She spent some years teaching and working with emotionally disturbed children, through the Department of Psychiatry at the University of Michigan. She's raising one of my grandsons, now nine years old, and her husband is a professor of literature at Wayne State, but he'll be at the University of Michigan this coming year. He's had great success as a novelist and short-story writer: Charles Baxter.

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.

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.

The other thing I remember. Fred was six feet, seven inches tall; his wife, I think, was six foot

two; and all of his six children were over six feet. When they walked down Fifth Avenue of New York, traffic practically stopped! He was a great guy. I really got to know him and enjoy him very much as a friend.

VDT: And Rupert Vance, who came after you as PAA president. He was an extraordinary person too, I gather.

HAUSER: He was, in spite of his physical handicap. I never knew Vance very well. But from reading his works and what meetings I had with him and hearing him talk and give papers, I regarded Vance as one of the true emancipated intellectuals in the South. He was far advanced over many of his Southern colleagues. He perceived the world with breadth. Alongside of him, many other Southern faculty people were just parochials.

VDT: We have dealt with the outlook for world population growth; one isn't going to give up hope, you say, even though it's not as encouraging as it might have been. What about the outlook for demography in the future? In some of these interviews I've asked this: Do you think the big questions in demography have been answered, so that young demographers, in order to make a mark, have to sort of chip away at the corners, because, for example, the demographic transition theory has done its thing, as you said? What lies ahead for demographers in the U.S.?

HAUSER: I think what lies ahead for demographers may be evidenced by this new Ogburn-Stouffer Center I saw dedicated yesterday at the University of Chicago--the infrastructure provided for close collaboration between sociologists, economists, and other social scientists. If you think of demography as essentially concerned with fertility and fertility control and population explosion, there's no future there, that's been pretty well finished; we don't need more information about that. But if you're thinking of population studies, in the sense in which I defined it in that book with Dudley Duncan [The Study of Population], that's scarcely been touched. It has a tremendous future, I think. In relating population variables to economic variables, social variables, historical variables, genetic variables, biological variables, there's a tremendous field of opportunity that has scarcely been touched. Moreover, there's room for much more work in what I've called the population implosion and a heck of a lot more work in the population dislosion--implosion being metropolitanization and dislosion being the increasing heterogeneity of population sharing the same living space.

By the way, after having used this language, it occurred to me one day, because I had a general broad training in sociology, including our historical figures, that in one sense I've just invented new names, or used names, that Durkheim had presented in the 19th century. He talked about size and density and heterogeneity of population without following through in the demographic detail with which I and other demographers are concerned. He was talking as a sociologist, but he perceived that the size of a population, its density--where I use the word implosion--and its heterogeneity had tremendous implications for social institutions and human behavior. And in a sense, with much more emphasis on the demographic things, I quite unconsciously bowed to Durkheim.

VDT: Sociology was engrained in you.

HAUSER: Right. And then Louis Wirth, of course, had written a splendid classic article in which he used size and density--"Urbanism as a Way of Life." He was a good friend of mine as well as a former teacher; he died prematurely at age 52.

VDT: You've had splendid traditions behind you but you certainly set up a splendid tradition for those who come after you. And thank goodness for your longevity and your productivity. Just a little bit of

this has been captured this afternoon, but I thank you very much. It's been a wonderful interview.

ADDENDUM

VDT: Phil has thought of one more thing relevant to PAA.

HAUSER: A couple of years ago, I received a letter from the Hoover Institution. They wanted my materials to create an archive of what I had published as part of what they're trying to do in the history--apparently trying to trace the development of demography in the United States. I wrote back and told them--and this is what I thought I'd note for you--that all my papers and books are at the Regenstein Library of the University of Chicago. The archivist has about 26 linear feet of some of my materials. And you see those four boxes there and there are all the drawers in this desk--these are materials I'm going to offer to the archivist in addition if he wants them, because I haven't added anything since I retired in 1979 and I've been active for ten more years and have articles, books, papers to add to those archives.

VDT: The Hoover Institution wrote to Andy Lunde, asking for copies of the tapes of the interviews he had done in the 1970s; I think Dudley Kirk had told them about the interviews starting. But PAA decided that, no, they belonged to us. Unfortunately, some of those early interview tapes are mechanically defective. So I'm redoing those I can and carrying on.



Philip M. Hauser (27 September 1909–13 December 1994)

Author(s): Evelyn M. Kitagawa

Source: *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Jun., 1996, Vol. 140, No. 2 (Jun., 1996), pp. 240-244

Published by: American Philosophical Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.com/stable/987329>

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>



JSTOR

American Philosophical Society and *American Philosophical Association* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*

PHILIP M. HAUSER
(27 September 1909-13 December 1994)

Philip M. Hauser, Lucy Flower Professor Emeritus of Urban Sociology at the University of Chicago, died in a retirement home in Chicago on 13 December 1994. He was internationally known as a pioneer in the fields of demography and urban studies.

Phil was born in Chicago in 1909 and was a resident of the city for all but eleven years of his life. His brilliance, drive, and enormous capacity for work were evident throughout his school years. He completed eight years of elementary school in six years, and four years of high school in three years. During high school he was a member of the Honor Society, the track team, the debating team, and the dramatics club, and also worked an eight-hour shift delivering Western Union messages from 4:00 P.M. to midnight. He then completed two years of college at Central YMCA College by taking double the normal load of night classes and working full time during the day. In 1927 he transferred to the University of Chicago, where he received a bachelor's degree in 1929, and his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in sociology in 1933 and 1938, with a straight A record in all of his courses.

In 1932 he accepted a position as instructor in sociology at the University of Chicago, took a leave of absence from 1934 to 1937 to work at the Federal Emergency Relief Agency in Washington, returned to the university for one year, but left again in 1938 to accept a position in the Bureau of the Census, where he was promoted to deputy director in 1944.

Phil made his final return to the University of Chicago in 1947, this time as professor of sociology and founding director of the newly-established Population Research Center, positions he held until his retirement in 1979. I entered the Department of Sociology as a graduate student in 1947 and was in his first cohort of students to work for a Ph.D. with a major in demography. After I completed my degree in 1951, we were colleagues in the Department of Sociology



Philip M. Hauser-----NONE

and the Population Research Center for twenty-eight years.

In a typical year, Phil's schedule included—in addition to his regular work at the university—innumerable trips within and outside the country to give lectures, attend professional meetings, engage in research activities, provide consulting and advisory services in developing countries, and make countless public speeches to diverse types of organizations. For example:

1. In 1947, Phil was appointed by President Truman to serve as the first United States representative to the Population Commission of the United Nations. He served in this capacity until 1951, when he accepted an invitation from the Burmese delegate to the United Nations to go to Burma as a U.N. statistical advisor to the government. He and his family spent a year in Burma, while he worked on the design of a census for the country and assisted in the development of plans for its economic development. During the course of the year, he also spent some time in Thailand as a statistical advisor to the government.

2. In 1949, the sudden death of the director of the U. S. Census Bureau, just as plans were being finalized for the 1950 Census, created somewhat of a crisis for the bureau, and Phil was asked to come to Washington as acting director to oversee the completion of the census. He agreed to do this, but, not wanting to leave his demography majors at the university without any demography courses to take or faculty guidance of their Ph.D. research, he took on two full-time jobs: running the census operation in Washington on weekdays, and teaching classes and advising students in Chicago on weekends.

3. During the 1960s, Phil played an active role in the creation of two Population Institutes in Asia—one at the University of the Philippines, and the second at Chulalongkorn University in Bangkok. With financial support from the Ford Foundation he also organized a Group of Demographic Associates with representatives from about eight Asian countries, who met annually to plan research projects to be carried out in their countries.

Throughout his career Phil made significant contributions to the literature on a broad range of population issues, including the complex relationships between various population characteristics and economic development, the analysis of factors influencing the levels of birth and death rates, the study of urbanization, the study of the labor force, and the scientific development of census-taking.

A selective bibliography of his scholarly publications included 35 books and monographs, 51 articles published in professional journals,

and 108 chapters in books. Several of his important books were the result of commissioned projects. *The Study of Population: An Inventory and Appraisal* (co-edited by Hauser and Dudley Duncan in 1959) is an 850-page evaluation of the field of demography. It was commissioned and supported by The National Science Foundation, which was interested in such an appraisal to serve as a basis for the development of its own policy and funding programs for population studies.

A second book, *Differential Mortality in the United States: A Study in Socioeconomic Epidemiology* (co-authored by Kitagawa and Hauser), was the result of a research project the Population Research Center was encouraged to undertake, and was supported by a grant of more than one million dollars from the National Institutes of Health. The study involved the matching of 160,000 death certificates against the 1960 census records to obtain the first measures of the impact of various social and economic factors on mortality rates.

A third book, *World Population and Development: Challenges and Prospects*, coordinated and edited by Hauser at the invitation of the United Nations, reviews and evaluates what is known about the interrelationships between the various aspects of population and social and economic development.

Hauser's preeminence in several academic disciplines is perhaps best illustrated by his election to the presidency of five professional associations: the American Sociological Association, the Population Association of America, the American Statistical Association, the Sociological Research Association, and the National Conference on Social Welfare. He also was elected to four honorary organizations: the National Academy of Sciences, the U. S. Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Philosophical Society, and the International Statistical Institute.

Finally, Phil was an outstanding teacher, who attracted many students to the study of demography. During the thirty years he served as director of the Population Research Center, he was heavily involved in the training of more than a hundred students who earned their Ph.D. degrees in sociology with a concentration in demography, and many others who earned specialized master's degrees in demography. About half of these students were from foreign countries, and they are now scattered throughout the world teaching in colleges, working in research organizations, or employed by government or international agencies. Despite his hectic schedule, Hauser kept in touch with his

large "family of former students," and always responded to requests for advice, letters of recommendation, or help in finding a new job. He also arranged reunions with them whenever he could. I recall one of these reunions at the meetings of the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population in London in 1969, when he invited more than twenty of our foreign graduates to join us for a luncheon party.

One thing that always amazed me about Phil was how he managed to finish so much work in so little time. I never saw him use a typewriter or computer to prepare drafts of his lectures or publications, but he did make extensive use of tape recorders and secretaries. He had a remarkable capacity to dictate well-organized and near-final drafts of reports, lectures, and even research papers, which he recorded on tapes and gave to secretaries to type and return to him for editing. He always carried several tapes with him when he traveled, and he used a lot of airplane and hotel hours to good advantage. After working with him for many years, I finally decided that his brain must have a built-in personal computer with enough storage space for everything he knew, as well as the software needed to manipulate the stored information to address any topic he wished.

He also used his internal computer to give extemporaneous talks on almost any subject. My favorite example is the keynote address he gave at the annual meeting of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America the day he returned to Chicago from Burma. Because his plane was arriving only a few hours before he was to speak, I met him at the airport and took him directly to the meeting. In the taxi I asked if he had his speech with him. He said no, he hadn't written it yet, but that was all right because he still had the rest of the taxi ride to think about what he would say. A couple of hours later, he gave a fine talk. He truly was a remarkable man! And we will miss him very much.

ELECTED 1965

EVELYN M. KITAGAWA
Professor Emeritus of Sociology
University of Chicago

This memoir is a slightly revised version of remarks made by Professor Kitagawa at a memorial service held at the University of Chicago on 18 February 1995.

**Summary of Philip Hauser's Presidential Address in 1951
From Population Index July, 1951, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 165-175**

The 1951 annual meeting of the Population Association of America was held on May 12th and 13th at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill, North Carolina. According to the usual custom, the meeting consisted of four sessions of papers and discussion, a business meeting, and an evening meeting.

The Presidential Session was highlighted by the remarks of the President, Philip M. Hauser, about the change in emphasis of the Population Commission of the United Nations from the compilation of statistics to the study of the relationship between demographic data and the problems of underdeveloped areas. He pointed out that the reports of the Population Commission indicate the increased concern of that body in marshalling demographic data so that they may be used by the under-developed countries that have requested technical assistance. This program brings sharply into focus what the demographer has to offer. The address of this session was delivered by William F. Ogburn, whose topic was "Population and Social Change."

Facing the Implications of an Aging Population

Author(s): Philip M. Hauser

Source: *Social Service Review*, Jun., 1953, Vol. 27, No. 2 (Jun., 1953), pp. 162-176

Published by: The University of Chicago Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.com/stable/30019064>

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>

We do not have a copy of the full set of Philip Hauser's remarks that served as his presidential address. However, this paper was published shortly after his term as PAA President and thus reflects his thinking at the time.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Social Service Review*

JSTOR

FACING THE IMPLICATIONS OF AN AGING POPULATION¹

PHILIP M. HAUSER

IN APRIL, 1950, the Seventeenth Decennial Census of the United States reported that the average person in this country was over thirty years of age. When the First Decennial Census of the United States was taken in 1790, the average person in this country was about sixteen years of age. In a dramatic way these figures summarize the aging of the population in the United States, a process which has been under way for at least as long as we have had census records.

The proportion of older persons in a population can be used to differentiate the more "advanced" and industrialized regions of the world from the relatively "backward" ones. Approximately 7 per cent of the world population was sixty years old or over in 1947. In the industrialized areas of the world, including the United States, Canada, northwest and central Europe, southern Europe, and Oceania, between 10 and 14 per cent of the total population was sixty years of age or over. In areas under the initial impact of industrialization—eastern Europe, Japan, and the Near East—persons sixty years old and over constituted 6–8 per cent of the total population. In those areas which are still largely preindustrial—south-central Asia, Africa, and the Far East, excluding Japan—the proportion of the population sixty years of age and over was only 4–5 per cent.

The increase in the number and proportion of older persons in the United

States may then be considered but one manifestation of the world-wide demographic revolution which has accompanied the industrial revolution. The growing number of aged is but one of a series of related population changes.

Individual attainment of old age is not a recent phenomenon. Survival to relative old age by large proportions of the human population, however, is a modern invention. It is as modern and as much an innovation in the history of man as the electric light. The "problems of aging" and discussions such as this are therefore relatively new also. They are but one facet of the many complex problems of our industrial, urban society.

The chronological definition of the aged is of course a cultural variable. Among people where expectation of life at birth is thirty years—that is, where half the population will die before reaching age thirty—the senior citizen is not likely to match the age of Bernard Baruch or even Herbert Hoover. In such a society the man of forty or fifty is regarded as aged. And even the number and proportion of persons of this age will be relatively small.

The role, as well as the number and proportion of our elders, has been greatly altered in the emergence and development of an industrial society. The literature is replete with illustrations of the relative prestige and authority of oldsters in preindustrial orders. The classic example of the revered and powerful position of the aged is to be found in the large-family system of China.

To some extent, perhaps, the role of

¹ Based on addresses delivered at Northwestern University Centennial Conference, "Problems of an Aging Population," June, 1951, and before the Fifty-seventh Annual Conference of the Illinois Welfare Association, November, 1952.

the aged in a preindustrial society was partly a function of their scarcity value. It seems clear, however, that in such a society, characterized by traditionalism, illiteracy or semiliteracy, and the absence of formal education, training, and libraries, the older person through sheer survival became an important storehouse of information, knowledge, and wisdom. Moreover, as the head of a large family group, his role as "senior citizen" both existed in, and was reinforced by, his position of social and economic superordination.

The problems of aging and the social implications of an aging population derive then from the basic changes in the role and in the number and proportion of the older population—changes that have accompanied the transition of society from an agricultural, preliterate, preindustrial order to contemporary Western civilization.

FACTORS AFFECTING PROBLEMS OF AGING

A number of specific factors have affected the problems of aging. Among the more important of these are the following: (1) the transition from a rural to an urban society, (2) the changes in the family, (3) the tempo of social change, (4) the changes in our economic organization, and (5) the changing functions of government.

Transition from rural to urban society.—Urbanization carries with it a changed physical environment and radically altered forms of economic organization but also, inevitably and irresistibly, profound changes in social organization and in man's conduct and thought. Contemporary problems of aging and their social implications can be grasped only against a background of the fundamental differences between "urban" and "rural" ways of life.

There is no "problem of aging" in a rural society in the sense that the roles and the lives of older persons are integrated into the total social structure and determined by commonly accepted cultural expectations and by the nature of personal and primary contacts and interrelationships. Problems of aging in contemporary life are becoming increasingly pressing, largely because of the competitive, impersonal, and utilitarian character of urban social interaction. The city does not provide the homogeneous setting of the farm and rural community. It is made up of a diversity of social worlds, of conglomerate racial and ethnic groups, languages, institutions, religious traditions, economic levels, and patterns of conduct and thought. It is in such a heterogeneous and impersonal social order that the older person, especially the older person who is unable to hold his own in the intense social and economic competitive process, experiences or becomes a problem.

Furthermore, the emphasis in urban life on rational rather than on traditional behavior, and on science and training rather than on experience and the cake of custom, tends to undermine the importance of the role of the senior citizen as a carrier of tradition, experience, and wisdom.

The urban way of life, through its effects on fertility and mortality, on the one hand, has operated rapidly to increase the number and proportion of older persons in the population and, on the other hand, has broken down the traditional, personal, and sentimental patterns of life which in the past have provided clearly defined roles and positions of respect, prestige, and often power to the aged.

Changes in the family.—The modern American family is not what it used to

be. Compared with the Colonial rural family, the modern urban family is smaller; it is more often childless and has fewer children if fertile; it is much more mobile, collectively and individually; it is not rooted to the soil or even to a home in the manner of its rural counterpart; it possesses comparatively little economic or social unity and is much more frequently broken by separation or divorce.

Perhaps the outstanding changes in the family that have affected the position of the older person have been the shift from the large-family to the small-family system, the altered patterns of interpersonal relationships, and the attenuation of the protective functions of the family.

The shift in patterns of living from the large-family to the small-family system has its physical manifestations in the size of the contemporary dwelling unit or the average automobile. Our standard facilities for family use are adapted to the parent-child type of organization, the two-generation unit, rather than to the historic three- or even four-generation unit. In lieu of the traditional living arrangements in which older persons spent their declining years with relatives—usually their children—increasing proportions live apart from their family or relatives—over one-fifth in 1949. The older person in our contemporary society, as his children mature and form their own families, is increasingly faced with the necessity of living by himself, with the surviving spouse, or with nonrelatives.

The relationships of family members as a group of interacting personalities have been greatly altered in the urban setting. Both husband-wife and parent-child relations have tended to become segmental contacts in competition in depth, range, influence, and satisfaction with extra-family relationships. There is more

meaning than may appear on the surface to the expression "God gave us our relatives, but thank God we can choose our friends." In the changed pattern of urban living greater emphasis is placed on the individuality of the family member than was the case in the rural setting, and the historic bonds of solidarity, sentiment, and affection are subjected to considerable strain. Greater emphasis on individual values often creates situations in which children definitely prefer not to live with parents, let alone in-laws, whose patterns of thought and behavior are in conflict with their own in a rapidly changing social order. In such a setting, the gulf between parents and their married children may be one not only of physical distance and separate living arrangements but also of social distance, with its attendant emotional and sentimental strains, particularly on the part of the older person.

New dangers and new forms of insecurity have created problems of protection with which the family cannot deal. These changing forms of hazard and insecurity coupled with decreasing size of family vitally affect the position of older persons. Smaller family size tends to increase the financial burden on each child in providing support for the dependent aged, whether dependency results from defective health, decreased earning power, unemployment, or accident. So attenuated have the protective functions of the contemporary urban family become that it often cannot—even when it wishes to do so—provide security to its aging dependent members.

Tempo of social change.—Although rapid social change creates problems of adjustment for persons of all ages, it is to be expected that adjustment will be more difficult for older persons because they have been more exposed to rapid

and even drastic changes. The person of seventy has certainly lived through profound technological and cultural changes and has witnessed fundamental modifications in personal modes of conduct and thought. In fact, there is scarcely an aspect of living which has not been greatly altered during his lifetime. Moreover, it has been virtually impossible for older persons to adapt themselves to many of the significant changes in society. For example, the older person who, in keeping with the practice of his youth, has not attained more than a grammar-school education may find it difficult to keep up with his younger contemporaries who have enjoyed the benefits of high-school or college education. Or, to turn to another vital area, technological innovations have frequently resulted in the obsolescence of occupational skills that provided prestige, good psychological adjustment, and economic security for older persons. In general, rapid social change has tended to create a chasm between the oncoming and the older generations, manifested in culture conflict, emotional and affectional strains, and serious barriers to communication.

Changes in economic organization.—Among the more profound changes accompanying the development of urban industrial civilization has been the segmentation from the various activities of life of that activity known as “work.” The sharp delimitation of activities devoted to the production of goods or services for remuneration to a specified time and usually in a specified place away from other members of the family has drastically altered our way of life. The emergence of the wage and salary worker dependent upon a job to “make a living” has created new problems of adjustment for all persons of working age and especially for older persons. The employer in

a competitive economy who must deal with the worker as an element in production necessarily has a different attitude and approach in dealing with him from the employer who regards the same worker as a father, a brother, a friend, or a neighbor. In a competitive economy all workers, including older workers, must necessarily be evaluated in terms of their productivity, in terms of the cost of their contribution to the productive process.

This framework, though sketchy, helps to account for many of the problems of the older worker—problems of high unemployment, long duration of unemployment, disemployment, discriminatory hiring practices, occupational downgrading, and compulsory and involuntary retirement. Although problems of aging are by no means restricted to the economic sphere, there can be little doubt that the maintenance of income is perhaps the basic and critical problem of old age. This can be achieved either through the maintenance of a job connection or through adequate provision for retirement at an appropriate time.

Recurrent and increasingly violent swings of the business cycle have in various ways adversely affected the income maintenance of our older population. Widespread depression has characteristically resulted in a larger incidence of unemployment among older workers than among all but their very youngest colleagues and in a longer duration of unemployment. Such periods vividly exemplified by the 1930's have dissipated the savings of many older workers. Alternatively, periods of business boom accompanied by inflation have also greatly depreciated the value of various forms of savings, including insurance and pensions, with serious repercussions on the financial independence of the aged. Economic provision for old age necessarily

takes the form of claims upon the production of the future, claims that will continue to be tenuous and uncertain under present provisions as long as the economy is subject to great swings of the business cycle.

Changes in economic organization have by no means been entirely adverse to the aged. On the contrary, it could undoubtedly be demonstrated that older persons, along with the entire population, have on the whole achieved a higher standard of living in the United States than ever previously achieved in human history. More specifically, it must be recognized that continuous increases in productivity and in the utilization of resources have contributed directly and importantly to the welfare of our older citizens. Declines in the length of the work week, for example, have probably had a special significance for older workers in improving their competitive position in the labor market. Technological changes have also contributed materially to the lightening of manual tasks and the lowering of physical requirements for the performance of many kinds of work. The large increase in service occupations, as distinguished from extractive and industrial occupations, has also probably been advantageous in providing types of employment better suited to old age. Higher rates of pay and substantially increased real wages have increased the opportunity for, and the volume of, savings permitting voluntary retirement from the labor force for many. The development of strong labor unions has operated to protect the older worker and to provide various forms of security in his later years.

Much remains to be learned about the interaction of the forces in our economy which tend, on the one hand, toward the maintenance and, on the other hand, toward the disruption of the flow of income

of older persons. In any case, about 40 per cent of all our people fifty-five years of age and over today require assistance from various public and private sources to provide them with minimum income adequate for decent living. There is increasing evidence that this percentage is likely to increase rather than to decrease in the years that lie ahead.

Changing functions of government.—The Constitution of the United States, which established the framework of our federal government, and, in the main, the constitutions of the individual states, which created our forms of local government, were drawn in a preindustrial, rural setting. The technological, economic, and social changes introduced by the industrialization and urbanization of this country have posed many problems of political organization and policy. Included among these problems is a sharp divergence of opinion about the proper role of government itself. Political answers to this basic policy question have greatly affected the role and the services of government with respect to the aged.

At the risk of great oversimplification it may be said that foremost in the concept of the role of government in political heritage is emphasis on the tenet that "that government is best which governs least." This doctrine, coupled with the liberal tradition in economic thinking that each man acting in his own interest acts in the interest of the larger society, constitutes in a fundamental way the traditional framework of principles in the bitter contemporary debate over the proper functions of our federal government. The fact is that, no matter what may be the merits of the contending principles, the functions of American government on all levels—federal, state, and local—have tremendously expanded and multiplied in the course of our his-

tory. The record shows that the expansion has been continuous without regard to the complexion of the political party in power. The major explanation for the rapidly expanding functions of our government is to be found in the increasing interdependence of the various elements of our changing social and economic order, in the breakdown of traditional social controls, in the inability of our inherited social institutions to cope with the new situations and new problems of urban life.

This is the setting in which one can understand the expanding services of the government directed at meeting the needs and dealing with the problems of old age. The various services of government in the form of provisions for the aged may be regarded as social inventions designed to deal with the problems of aging no longer being adequately met by our inherited culture and social institutions. Government provisions for the aged have dealt mainly with the maintenance of income. To a lesser extent, provisions have been made for custodial and medical care. More recently, beginnings have been made, as for example in the 1950 Conference on Aging sponsored by the Federal Security Agency, to approach the problems of old age in their entirety and to consider the noneconomic as well as the economic problems of older people.

The two major federal programs designed to maintain the incomes of older persons are the programs of Old Age and Survivors Insurance and Old Age Assistance. In June, 1952, almost three and one-half million persons sixty-five years and over received benefits under the Old Age and Survivors Insurance system, including retired workers and their wives, or widows, or parents. Younger survivors

of deceased beneficiaries totaled more than a million beneficiaries. The total payments under Old Age and Survivors Insurance exceeded \$150 million monthly during 1952. In June, 1952, more than 2,600,000 persons were receiving old age assistance benefits aggregating \$120 million for the month. Old Age Assistance payments under this federal-state program averaged \$45 per month in June, 1952, ranging from slightly less than \$22 in Alabama to slightly more than \$70 in Colorado.

Other government programs not expressly designed for dealing with problems of old age contribute to the income maintenance of older, as well as other, workers. These include such programs as workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, disability compensation, and general assistance or relief programs. Military pensions are also an important source of income to many of the aged. These provisions for maintaining income are supplemented by other governmental programs, including homes and hospitals for the aged and increasing efforts to deal with special needs of the aged with respect to health, housing, education, personal adjustment, and recreation.

Although major stress has been placed on government programs for the aged, it should be mentioned that there are also many important private programs contributing to the needs of older persons. These include the services of many private welfare agencies; private homes for the aged, on both a profit and a nonprofit basis; and, most important of all, especially in recent years, industry pension plans. In general, however, the preponderant proportion of programs for the aged, especially programs designed for income maintenance, are governmental in character.

PROBLEMS OF ADJUSTMENT

Professor Burgess in his use of the concept of "adjustment" has pointed to a central idea in the light of which the problems and social implications of aging can be better comprehended, whether approached from an etiological, descriptive, analytical, or planning and administrative point of view. Burgess has called attention to two aspects of adjustment in old age, "personal" and "social." Personal adjustment represents to Burgess "the changes which a person makes in his attitudes and behavior when confronted with a new situation. Successful personal adjustment means that the individual satisfied his own needs and aspiration and at the same time the expectations and the demands of society." Social adjustment "is the adaptation of society or one of its component institutions or groups to social change. It means revision of policies, programs, and procedures in the interest both of the general welfare and of the happiness of its individual members."

Personal adjustment.—In our society, provision for the maintenance of income of older persons is unquestionably the major factor in personal adjustment in later years, but it is by no means the only one. Personal adjustment in later maturity involves not only subsistence but also living. This theme was highlighted in the Conference on Aging sponsored by the Federal Security Agency, to which reference was made above, in the reiteration of the importance of activities "to add life to years, not just years to life." The economic aspect of adjustment to old age, although by no means solved, has received and is receiving major attention by both private and government agencies. But we are just beginning to realize the importance of, to do research in, and to discuss and plan programs for,

the noneconomic phases of the adjustment of the aged.

Many of the problems of personal adjustment in old age are indicated by the factual materials, including census data. The low sex ratio among persons sixty-five and over; the higher percentage of widows and widowers; the changes in living arrangements, particularly those involving living in dependent family relationships or living with unrelated persons; the lower average years of schooling; changing occupations; and similar readily measurable and measured phenomena among the older population indicate both the range and severity of the adjustments that confront older persons. Recent studies, which do not have the advantage of the census type of coverage but which are much more intensive than the census can possibly be, have pointed to additional significant areas of personal adjustment for older people. Additional adjustments are required, for example, to the decrease in the amount of close companionship arising not only from the death of a spouse but also from the loss of intimate friends, physical impairments requiring partial or complete confinement, change of residence, and similar factors. Adjustment is also required to the decrease in participation in various forms of activities as revealed by decreased attendance at meetings, offices held, hobbies, business contacts, and planning for the future. Difficult adjustments are required by the increase in physical handicaps through disease, chronic illnesses, nervousness, or various physical impairments. Furthermore, adjustments are required in attitudes and feelings of happiness, usefulness, zest, and interest in life itself. These are among the items listed by Burgess in describing the more important as well as the more measurable "social and personal

changes and crises which accompany aging.”

The general implications of these various types of personal adjustment are clear enough. It is necessary first of all to obtain a better understanding of the problems involved. On the basis of such an understanding it is then possible to plan and administer action programs designed to minimize the frictions and problems of personal adjustment in old age and to help provide older persons with a satisfactory and even zestful way of life in their declining years. Both these tasks are already under way—but neither in an adequate manner.

A better understanding of the range, the character, and the intensity of the problems of personal adjustment in old age must depend on adequate and competent research. Studies of this character have been made, and programs for continued research are under way and in prospect. On the whole, however, resources being devoted to such research are pitifully small in relation to the human problems and values which are involved. That the products of continued research could be excitingly rewarding is indicated by the few pioneer studies which have already been conducted.

The findings of available studies indicate the principal factors that seem to be associated with good adjustment in old age and suggest the types of activities required of the person, the community, and the government if the problems of aging are to be mitigated. The major factors associated with good adjustment in old age include a feeling of permanent economic security, no lowered social status, good health, the maintenance of marital and family relations and of friendships, leisure time and participation in activities, plans for the future, at-

tendance at church, and belief in an afterlife.

In summary, the wide range and the complexity of the problems of personal adjustment in old age in contemporary life, the changing role and uncertain economic position of the older person in our urban industrial society, together with the rapidly increasing number and proportion of older persons in our population, seem definitely to call for concerted action of individuals and of private and public agencies to deal with the problems of old age and to facilitate personal adjustment.

Social adjustment.—Some of the problems of adjustment in old age depend for their solution almost entirely on the attitudes and conduct of individual older persons. Many of these problems, however, especially those arising from mortality, physical invalidism or impairment, rapid social change, and economic insecurity, are not subject to the control of the individual. The problems of old age have, therefore, albeit neither in a systematic nor in a comprehensive manner, required social adjustments—that is, the adaptation of society to the problems of aging. Some of these adaptations have already been reviewed in the materials above. Let us focus here on some of the more important types of social adjustment which are still to come and which are currently under discussion.

Let us turn first to a consideration of the noneconomic forms of social adjustment. The nature of some of the adjustments required has been pointed up by Dr. R. S. Cavan on the basis of her study of conditions of life for the aging in Rockford, Illinois. In this not atypical community in the United States

(1) many older persons find it difficult or impossible to make satisfactory adjustment to old age without assistance. (2) There is no special or

central agency to provide information, counseling or guidance to older people. The minister, the police, and the county welfare bureau are among the agencies to which the older person turns. (3) There is no community provision for assisting older persons to find employment. (4) There is no community provision for providing recreation for older persons. (5) Many older persons, by reason of the disabilities of advancing age are confined to their homes or immediate neighborhoods without access to their friends for long periods of time. (6) Little provision exists in any form for older couples who cannot maintain their own residence to live together. Institutions either do not accept old couples or require them to live in separate wards for men and women. (7) No comprehensive provisions exist for the care of old chronic invalids.

This rather unpleasant listing strongly points to the need, as one basic form of social adjustment, for "the establishment of a central coordinating service with a view to community wide and comprehensive service to aging persons," and for the organization of services to provide "personal counseling where the needs of older persons are considered individually rather than in the mass." Fortunately the provision of such services has already begun in some cities, and the trend seems to be in that direction.

Other types of noneconomic social adjustment which merit special attention include provisions for the education of the aging population for meeting the problems of old age, the adaptation of church and religious programs, provision of creative and recreational activities, and the development of professional personnel equipped to deal with, and to assist, oldsters in dealing with the problems of old age.

Economic adjustments.—Although various forms of economic adjustment to problems of old age have received widespread attention in private industry by both employers and employees (especially through organized labor) and by gov-

ernment on national, state, and local levels, the problem of providing economic security for the older population is still far from solution. How effectively, efficiently, and adequately to maintain the income of older persons is a complex and highly technical question, but we may briefly examine some of the major considerations which are involved.

As has already been stated, the major economic problem of old age is that of income maintenance. It was practically the unanimous conclusion of the approximately nine hundred persons who attended the Conference on Aging that the provision of employment opportunities for older persons was the master key to the maintenance of income in old age. Improvement of employment opportunities for older persons, however, requires drastic institutional and attitudinal changes.

To begin with, a re-examination and reconsideration of present compulsory retirement plans is required. Compulsory retirement at an arbitrarily fixed age without regard to the productive capacity, personal desires, and the psychological and social needs of the person is undoubtedly a major factor contributing to the difficulties of both personal and social adjustments to old age. Furthermore, it is becoming increasingly clear that this practice represents a huge and tragic waste of manpower and national production at all times, and especially in times of national emergency.

Stated baldly, the present systems of compulsory retirement at arbitrarily fixed ages represent, in effect, decisions on the part of society to force older persons, many of whom are capable and desirous of self-support, to be supported by the productivity of the young. It is difficult to conceive of an institutional practice better designed to force a waste of

manpower and a loss of production as well as to create and augment a large number of adjustment problems.

In the framework of this discussion, the type of economic adjustment required seems clear enough. It would be patently absurd to abolish retirement systems or even compulsory retirement systems. But compulsory retirement could depend on criteria other than chronological age. This determination, from a personal, social, and economic standpoint, would be more sensibly based on the capacity and willingness of the person to be productive. The measurement of continued capacity to produce at older ages is admittedly difficult. It is a problem for intensive and expanded research if equitable and efficient determinations are to be made. It is not an insoluble problem.

Even if compulsory retirement at arbitrarily fixed ages were abolished, however, other problems relating to the employment of older workers would remain. Economic invalidism is not a function of chronological age alone. Younger as well as older persons may have their productivity impaired. Younger as well as older persons may be unable to meet the competitive rigors of a full workday or a full work week. Rigidities of the wage structure and of hours of work undoubtedly contribute to the disemployment of the economic invalid and especially of the older economic invalid. Although this is admittedly touchy ground, from the standpoint of both management and organized labor, it would seem that consideration should be given to the development of more flexible hours of work and a more flexible wage structure which would permit older workers who so desire, or for that matter other workers who cannot meet the standards of productivity that may be set, to contribute toward their

own self-support and toward national production in accordance with their productive capacities. Needless to say, such provisions should not be used in a manner to impair the efficiency of production or to undermine the hard-won position of organized labor. This is also admittedly a difficult problem but certainly not an insoluble one.

Providing adequate employment for older workers who desire it will also require significant changes in a number of the attitudes and practices of management in hiring and firing. That discriminatory practices against the older worker exist is clearly shown by the facts. That justification for such practices exists, in terms of the productivity of the older worker, his skill, or his dependability, is not so clear. Such evidence as is available suggests, on the contrary, that the older worker who is not afflicted with definite physical impairments or chronic disorders which handicap him, more than holds his own with younger workers in many types of occupations and industry. Many of the discriminatory hiring and firing practices with respect to older workers appear to stem from superstitions rather than from economic and factual considerations. Here, again, there is a great need for effective research to provide a factual basis for the evaluation of the productivity and the economic contribution of the older worker and to point up the specific occupations and industries in which he can be most effectively utilized.

It cannot be overemphasized that employment opportunities for older people vary significantly with the phases of the business cycle. Depression means disproportionate unemployment in both volume and duration of unemployment for older workers; full employment carries with it tremendously expanded em-

ployment opportunities for the aged. It is ironical that in recent years Hitler and Stalin may have contributed more to the solution of the employment problem of older workers in the United States than we have managed to do on our own. Needless to say, we can hardly as a matter of public policy depend on war or the specter of communism to solve the economic problems of our older people. Effective contracyclical measures—whether they be privately or governmentally induced—which would mitigate the swings of the business cycle and which would maintain a high level of general employment and national production, would undoubtedly be the most important contributions to the economic problems of old age.

At least passing mention should be made of the industrial pension system as a factor in the economic problems of old age. At the present time, the number of persons receiving industrial pensions is relatively small because many of these systems have been in operation for only a short time. Recipients of such pensions will undoubtedly increase greatly in the coming years. Professor Edwin Witte, of the University of Wisconsin, who has intensively studied the economic problems of old age, does not view the industrial pension system with much optimism. He says:

It seems certain that the great majority of workers who are employed by companies having industrial pension plans have but small prospects of ever receiving benefits, unless these plans are radically changed. Nearly all of the existing plans require long years of service. Practically none of the new plans provides for the vesting of employee credits, so that they are lost on termination of employment prior to retirement age. Many of the plans are inadequately financed and will cost the employers a great deal more in the years that lie ahead than they are now putting into them.

This is not the place for an extended discussion of industrial pension systems, but it seems clear that this is an economic adjustment that is headed in the wrong direction from the standpoint of contributing to a comprehensive, efficient, and adequate solution of the economics of old age.

In general there can be little doubt that we have the capacity to deal with the economic problems of old age. Our unprecedented productivity and national product and our continuously expanding economy can unquestionably meet the demands represented by the requirements of older persons as well as those of other claimant groups. Our problem is not one of determining whether we can afford the maintenance of an older population, a large proportion of which can, in fact, maintain itself if given the opportunity to do so. Our problem is rather one of determining most effectively how to utilize our human, as well as other, resources to assure not only subsistence but the good life for all our people.

Government adjustments.—The intervention of the federal government into the problems of old age has already been discussed in the context of generally expanding functions of government in our interdependent and rapidly changing urban society. It has been noted that government interventionism on behalf of the aged has up to now been primarily concerned with income maintenance. Government financial provisions for old age can be traced to two major influences. The first is the survival of the traditions and institutions imported by the early colonists from England in the form of “poor relief,” including relief assistance to the aged. The second is the development of provisions for the aged incorporated into the social security enactments of the New Deal, in response to the tragic

consequences of the great depression of the thirties. In general, it is clear that governmental provisions for income maintenance for the aged are not based on a comprehensive study of the contemporary economic problems of old age in their entirety but represent, rather, a combination of musty inherited social institutions and patchwork improvisation under pressures of severe depression and great political unrest.

This is not the place to deal comprehensively with the needed rationalization of governmental forms of income maintenance, including consideration of needed improvements in the programs of Old Age Assistance and Old Age Insurance. These are, in fact, technical and highly complex problems. Suffice it to say that from a practical standpoint it is probably desirable to improve the programs we already have—to work on them as a point of departure rather than to start in new directions, however sound, *de novo*. The obvious next steps will be concerned with broadening coverage, ironing out existing inequities in the systems, improving benefits to make them more consonant with the requirements of decent living for the aged and their dependents, and financing the systems more realistically.

Without question the federal government, as well as state and local governments, can make a major contribution to the solution of the economic problems of old age, and probably at smaller ultimate cost to taxpayers, by activities designed to enable older workers who desire to do so to continue in employment. Four major types of programs are indicated in this respect.

First, under an obligation already assumed in the Employment Act of 1946, the federal government should adhere to its pledge to utilize its resources, within the framework of the free-enterprise sys-

tem, at least to mitigate swings in the business cycle—that is, to do all that it can through its manifold powers and resources to maintain a high level of employment and national production at relatively stable price levels. The maintenance of such an economic climate would contribute significantly toward the employment of older workers, as our recent war, and present national emergency, experiences testify.

Second, there is growing awareness that the government can make a major contribution toward reducing physical and economic invalidism and thus maximize the extent to which older workers who so desire can support themselves. Resources of a magnitude which only the government can provide are required both for the basic research and for the administration of programs designed to reduce the disabling effects of chronic illnesses and degenerative diseases and to contribute to the maintenance of good health without physical impairment of the older, as well as other, groups of our population. Such programs would not only be relatively efficient from an economic point of view but would also contribute materially to the enrichment of life itself for our older people.

Third, the government can, with the co-operation of other agencies, contribute materially to programs designed to rehabilitate that part of our older population which requires it. Such programs could be aimed at occupational, psychological, and social, as well as physical, rehabilitation. Moreover, efforts directed toward educating our older people both to make up for the gaps in their earlier formal training and to prepare them for the adjustments of old age would undoubtedly be most rewarding.

Fourth, the government can and should assist in developing programs de-

signed to assist older workers in finding and retaining employment. The state employment services should, of course, be utilized in this connection. Effective achievement in this area would undoubtedly be dependent upon sound and adequate research to dispel the ignorance we now have about the relative capacities and productivity of older workers and about the occupations and industries best suited for older workers.

A fourfold program of this type tied to a comprehensive approach to problems of aging in their entirety is among the important forms of governmental adjustment which is called for and which may be anticipated. The government should deal more systematically and comprehensively with the economic problems of aging with which it is already concerned. Government income maintenance programs must have dual objectives: first, the provision of equitable and adequate income for that part of our older population and their dependents which cannot maintain itself or which, as properly determined, has earned the right it may choose to exercise to live in retirement and leisure in later years and; second, the provision of services designed to maximize the extent to which that part of our older population that desires to do so can continue in productive employment and contribute both to their own maintenance and to the total national product.

There are many signs on the horizon that the government is becoming concerned with provisions for old age other than income maintenance. Certainly it is true that man does not live by bread alone, and this should be doubly true for older man. Some of our governmental provisions for old age, not directly concerned with income maintenance—and this is particularly true on a state and local level—are by any standards little

short of scandalous. I refer particularly to the inadequate public provisions for providing custodial care and maintenance for the indigent and physically disabled aged. It is a disgraceful fact that in many of our communities the allocation of such aged persons to institutions for the mentally ill or to the survivals of the traditional poorhouse or poor farm is determined largely by the availability of space rather than the requirements of the person. Or, what is more likely to be the case, both types of institutions are badly overcrowded and inadequately equipped to provide a decent existence.

Approximately two hundred thousand older persons are now receiving custodial care in institutions, both public and private. Very few new private homes for the aged, however, have been established in the past several decades, as this function seems to be becoming primarily a public responsibility. There is certainly room for considerable adjustment, particularly on the part of state and local governments, in the direction of providing better facilities for the helpless and indigent aged. Continuation of the present situation would mean the continuation of what is, indeed, a national disgrace.

Of special importance is the growing need of special and adequate housing arrangements for older persons who are able to avoid institutionalization. It may be expected that there will be increasing attention paid to this problem as an important aspect of government responsibility in the public housing field.

Finally, there is increasing recognition, on the part of the government on all levels, of the educational, psychological, and recreational needs of older people and of the importance of provisions for counseling and for various special services for them. A comprehensive approach to the problems of old age in their entire-

ty, it may be expected, will inevitably lead to the development of various types of programs, both public and private, to meet these needs.

One encouraging development in state responsibility for our older citizens is seen in the creation of state committees or commissions on aging. The first of these was established by legislative action in New York State in 1947. The second was appointed by Governor Stevenson in Illinois in 1950. Since that time a number of other programs of this type have come into being, and additional ones are being considered.

What purpose does a state committee serve? In Illinois the Committee on Aging has two major functions. First, it seeks to co-ordinate and strengthen the work of all state departments and institutions related to an aging population. For example, it cuts across the programs of the departments of labor, health, and welfare, the Public Aid Commission, and the University of Illinois. Second, it works with the local communities in developing their own local services to meet the needs of more and more older people. Through encouraging preventive, rehabilitative, and maintenance programs in welfare and in industry, it hopes eventually to decrease the potentially enormous incidence of dependency in old age. Other committees in other states have similar objectives.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

In this discussion of the social implications of an aging population I have studiously avoided what has become almost a conventional discussion of the effects of aging on various aspects of our society. I have made no reference to the effects of aging on national politics, on the production and distribution of consumer goods, on savings, on opportunities for the ad-

vancement of the young, or on national defense. This is not because these subjects are unimportant but rather because our ignorance of them is great and it is not possible to do more than speculate about them. I mention them at this point primarily to direct attention to the importance of concerted research attacks upon these problems so that we may gain a better comprehension of them and their implications for social and economic life.

I should like to close on the basic theme with which I started and to point to the all-embracing social implication of our aging population.

The present large, and prospectively increasing, number and proportion of older persons in our population is a recent product of modern civilization. The great changes we have experienced in the transition from a rural to an urban society and from an agricultural to an industrial economy have precipitated many new and unanticipated problems of aging. The profound changes in our culture and economy have, on the one hand, greatly increased the number and proportion of oldsters and, on the other, tended to undermine their traditional role and status and to leave them in a relatively insecure, dependent, and troubled position.

There is a great need for dealing more rationally and more effectively with the problems of old age that confront us today; and for anticipating and making provision for dealing with the augmented problems which lie ahead. The problems of aging require a comprehensive and concerted approach, public and private co-operation, and national and local attention. Significant changes in our basic approaches to the problems of aging are called for—both in thought and action. The constructive efforts which we as a nation have made and are making, with

respect to the conservation of our national resources, should now be paralleled by similar constructive attacks aimed at the conservation of our human resources, of which the aged are a significant element. We have in a major way succeeded in

adding years to life; we are only beginning to turn to the task of adding life to years.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Received December 9, 1952

SELECTED GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Age Is Opportunity*. London: National Council of Social Service, March, 1949.
- Breckinridge, Elizabeth. *Community Services for Older People*. Chicago: Wilcox & Follette Co., 1952.
- Cavan, R. S.; Burgess, E. W.; Havighurst, R. J.; and Goldhamer, H. *Personal Adjustment in Old Age*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1949.
- Donahue, Wilma, and Tibbitts, Clark (eds.). *Planning the Older Years*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1950.
- Federal Security Agency. *Man and His Years*. Raleigh, N.C.: Health Publications Institute, 1951.
- Industrial Relations Research Association. *The Aged and Society*. Champaign, Ill.: Industrial Relations Research Association, 1950.
- Lansing, A. I. (ed.). *Cowdry's Problems of Ageing*. Baltimore, Md.: Williams & Wilkins Co., 1952.
- Lawton, George (ed.). *New Goals for Old Age*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943.
- Martin, Lillian J. *A Handbook for Old Age Counsellors*. San Francisco: Geertz Printing Co., 1944.
- New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Problems of the Aging, *Age Is No Barrier* (Legislative Doc. 35, 1952), *Youth at Any Age* (Legislative Doc. 12, 1952), *Birthdays Don't Count* (Legislative Doc. 61, 1948).
- Pollak, Otto (ed.). *Social Adjustment in Old Age*. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1948.
- Tibbitts, Clark (ed.). *Living through the Older Years*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1949.