

DEMOGRAPHIC DESTINIES

Interviews with Presidents of the Population Association of America

Interview with John D. Durand PAA President in 1961-62



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)

JOHN D. DURAND

PAA President in 1961-62 (No. 25). Interview with Abbott Ferriss at Dr. Durand's home in Spruce Pine, North Carolina, August 11, 1979.

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS: John Dana Durand was born in 1913 in Washington, D.C., and died in 1981 in Spruce Pine, North Carolina. He received his B.A. in economics in 1933 from Cornell, where he was research assistant to Walter Willcox, and his Ph.D. in economics in 1939 from Princeton, where he was the first Milbank Memorial Fund Fellow at the Office for Population Research in 1936-39. Before going to Princeton and again from about 1939 to 1947, he was in the Population Division of the Bureau of the Census (of which his uncle, E. Dana Durand, had been Director during the Theodore Roosevelt administration). In 1947, he joined the newly-established Population Division of the United Nations as its first Assistant Director and was its third Director (following Frank Notestein and P.K. Whelpton) from 1953 to 1965. Among other groundbreaking demographic activities at the UN, he directed the making of the landmark Determinants and Consequences of Population Trends (1953; revised edition, 1973), launched World Population Perspectives, conceived and raised initial outside funding for the UN regional centers for demographic research and training, and organized, in collaboration with the IUSSP, the first World Population Conference in Rome in 1954 and the second such conference in Belgrade in 1965. From 1965 to 1979, he was Professor of Economics and Sociology and Director of the Population Studies Center at the University of Pennsylvania. His publications, focused mainly on the labor force, included The Labor Force in the United States, 1890 to 1960 (1948) and The Labor Force in Economic Development: A Comparison of International Census Data (1975). At the time of his death, he was working on a history of world population, of which a first chapter, "Historical Estimates of World Population: An Evaluation," appeared in Population and Development Review in September 1977.

FERRISS: John, you were president of the Population Association of America in 1961-62. Can you recall any incidents during that term of office that particularly interested you?

DURAND: I think it was a very uneventful year. I can't remember any events or incidents whatsoever.

FERRISS: You were at the University of Pennsylvania at that time, weren't you?

DURAND: No, I was at the United Nations. My association with the UN began in 1947. Preparations were being made for the first session of the Population Commission, which was to be in February 1947. Frank Notestein was acting as in charge of the Population Division, the secretariat of the Population Commission. He was still at Princeton's Office of Population Research. He was really only a consultant. I was working at the Bureau of the Census and Frank was trying to draw up a little staff for this Population Division. So he came down to Washington in January 1947 and proposed to me to come up and join the staff. I had some hesitation, but I finally decided I'd be happy to do that. I'm very glad I did. We organized the first session of the Population Commission, which was at Lake Success. There were about a hundred people there. So that's how I got started at the UN and I remained there for 19 years. I left the UN in 1965 to go to the University of Pennsylvania. The year of my presidency of the Population Association occurred during that interval. As I said, it was a very uneventful year for the Association, as far as I can recall. I can only remember the annual meeting in Madison [May 4-5, 1962] and that was very nice.

FERRISS: Was it well attended?

DURAND: Yes, there were plenty of people and it was a beautiful meeting, or so it struck me. I remember very especially the hospitality of the Wisconsin group.

FERRISS: The tradition at that time was to meet at universities, was it not, rather than in a hotel?

DURAND: Well, there had been some meetings not at universities; in Washington [1935, 1939, 1960]--that wasn't particularly a university. It was more that it was the capital.

FERRISS: You became interested in demography when you were a student at what university?

DURAND: I was a student at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, in 1931, if my memory is not tricking me. I was a sophomore. And we didn't have any money; I needed a job to continue my education. I had an uncle at Cornell, professor there, who was a friend of Professor Walter Willcox. Willcox had just retired as professor and was undertaking a historical study of the vital statistics of the United States. This was published, by the way [Studies in American Demography, 1940?], but I very rarely see a copy of it. I haven't got a copy myself and I don't find copies in the libraries. It seemed to me an interesting project. He was studying historically not only the development of statistics but mainly the trends of the vital rates of the United States, going back into the 19th century.

So I got a job, through my uncle's help, assisting Professor Willcox with this study. I moved to Cornell University and I worked part-time, 20 hours a week, earning--as I recall--25 cents an hour. My job, initially, was to punch the calculating machine and write down the figures I got. That already I began to find kind of interesting. I remember I was grinding out the birth and death rates for the counties of North Carolina. At first the people were born; you just put in the figures and write down the answer, hour after hour; it could get a little soporific. But after a while, I began to think that these statistics were showing some interesting things and it made me wonder why. Up in these mountain counties the death rate was very low--way down, like 4, 5, 6--and when you got down to lower altitudes the death rate was higher. I was struck. I said, "They're supposed to be very healthy [in the mountains], but are they all that healthy?" So I asked Professor Willcox, "How come they're so low?" And he says, "Well, look," he showed me, "Under ideal conditions if the death rate were 4, the average length of life would be 250 years." So that was impossible. He led me along this way to the conclusion that the reason why the death rates were so low was obviously because they weren't counting all those deaths.

This sort of discussion that he would lead me into attracted me. He'd give me a little leading question or part of an answer to develop my interest, which he succeeded very greatly in doing. This was the famous Professor Willcox, an old, old man already at that time. So I continued for the rest of my undergraduate career at Cornell, working part-time for other professors on assignments similar to that, and that led to a growing interest in the subject matter of this study. So that's how I became interested in demography.

FERRISS: You majored in sociology or economics?

DURAND: I majored in economics, but I didn't learn any economics there at all. I learned some other things. They tried to teach me economics, but whatever I learned in that line I immediately forgot. And the same with statistics; I think a little more statistics than economics, but very little indeed.

But I got the degree--sort of a C-average kind of a deal. Then I got a job there, working for a while at the public utility, Associated Gas and Electric Company, keeping a record of some stock transfer deal that they were foisting off on their customers. I worked on that for about half a year.

Then I succeeded sufficiently in the civil service exam to get taken on at the Bureau of the Census to work under Leon Truesdell. This was in 1933. I had various jobs I was given.

There are certain people that I want to mention that I owe a lot to. They encouraged me and whatever I've amounted to as a demographer, I owe to them. I've already mentioned Walter Willcox and now I mention Leon Truesdell. I really owe a great deal to him. I was one of his young assistants for half a dozen years. Well, now, it was only three years before Frank Notestein--there's the third man I have to mention with great gratitude.

Frank Notestein came to the Bureau of the Census and I was in a little office with Henry Shryock. Frank was looking for staff because he was trying to set up at that time another new thing, the Office of Population Research at Princeton University. It didn't exist yet, but they'd gotten some funding for it and he was trying to build it up and he had to have a helper. He was interested in interviewing Henry, proposing him as a candidate for his assistant, and Henry did take that job. I was sitting there and Frank noticed me and said, "We also got money for a fellowship for a graduate student in demography" and would I be interested in applying. [John Durand was the first Milbank Memorial Fund Fellow at OPR.] If I was, they would consider my application, along with others, for this fellowship. So I said, "Sure," and I applied and I got it. He took me! Well, my gratitude to Frank Notestein begins there.

So the next three years, I was at Princeton with Henry Shryock and Frank Notestein. I was supposed to be a graduate student in demography, but actually, they had no demography program. They had no sociology program but, of course, they had their economics, so I was a candidate for a degree in economics. I got my Ph.D. in 1939 in economics.

During those three years, I was supposed to be learning demography in addition. Well, I did learn some demography, just in a kind of very haphazard way by being around Frank Notestein. Frank is very talkative and he would discuss at the drop of a hat most anything having to do with population questions. Occasionally, he would mention something and say, "Go read about that." That was the sort of instruction in demography I received at the university; whatever I learned was pretty haphazard. No doubt this accounts for a good deal of my professional deficiencies. I was given no systematic academic instruction in demography. I picked up what I could.

Another way I learned there was by working on the Population Index. Part of my job in addition to studying was to assist in the correction of this, four issues a year. There was Irene Taeuber down in Washington in the Library of Congress, getting up the bibliographic items. She would put them on these little three-by-five slips of paper--not cards, slips of paper--with titles, whatever was to be that citation, and she'd send them up. We'd be confronted with this stack of slips of paper. They had to be sorted, made ready to type, then typed, verified and all this, put together, photographed, and made into the Index. Well, I think that's one way to learn about demography and the literature. At least I got acquainted with the names of people who were writing about that field. There weren't as many as there are now. So I knew most of the names of the authors after I'd been working in that way on the Index for three years. Maybe I learned more that way than any other.

FERRISS: You classified and arranged them?

DURAND: Yes, we classified them according to subject and author, and read them to see if the citation made sense, try to get it correct, check up on things where there was a question. There was a typist there who would type it. Then we would proofread the typing and set up the physical copy for reproduction.

FERRISS: You must have had some research responsibilities too, or you couldn't have tried to write a dissertation.

DURAND: I was always doing a little project, like graduate students do. I got some coaching from Frank--and from Henry. I also add Henry Shryock to me list of men that I owe gratitude to. Let me complete that list of all the ones I want specially to mention. There's Frank, and I owe a second debt of gratitude to Frank, who brought me to the United Nations. Then at the United Nations, there's Pat Whelpton. After a couple of years, Frank found he could no longer spend the time on that and he quit his part-time attachment to the UN [in 1949] and went back full-time to Princeton; and he left me. There I was, acting director of the Population Division that I was putting up. I struggled along the best I could and was always trying to find an appropriately senior, outstanding expert in demography to take over the directorship of that outfit. Well, they got Pat Whelpton. He agreed finally to come and he stayed there for several years [till 1953].

FERRISS: What year was this?

DURAND: Pat came about 1951 or 52. I came to the UN in 1947. Frank would have left about 1949. There was an interval and after about two years or so, Pat came. Pat stayed two or three years and then he faded away and left me.

FERRISS: Does that complete your list?

DURAND: No, I will go on to the university. I left the UN in 1965. I began to feel that it was time for me to leave the UN, particularly in view of the ways in which the work of the United Nations was evolving, directions in which I didn't feel I was very able to serve. It was becoming more and more related to action rather than research, big programs of action, not just studies. I'd felt more at home when the idea was to make demographic studies. I don't think we did too badly in those that I was there. I think we put out some pretty good things. One especially that is well known is The Determinants and Consequences of Population Trends [1953]. And then I could mention the Mysore population study and a few others. I think they were substantial contributions.

But it began to change and I felt I was not really the man to try to continue along that line; I'd be better at the universities. So when the University of Pennsylvania people asked me if I'd like to come down, I decided to accept. So now I'll add two more names and then I will have finished the list of people to whom I really feel I owe great debts of gratitude: Dorothy Swaine Thomas and Richard Easterlin, at the University of Pennsylvania.

FERRISS: When did you first become associated with PAA, that is, what is your first recollection of the Association?

DURAND: In my early years at the Bureau of the Census, frankly, I don't believe I was aware of the existence of the PAA. When did the PAA start; 1933, was it?

FERRISS: Something like that.

DURAND: About the same time I was graduating from Cornell. As far as I can recall, I didn't know that such a thing as the Population Association of America existed. I think that the Association came into my consciousness when I was at Princeton, but it was very much in my consciousness there. You said that one of the questions you'd ask me was, "What were the most interesting meetings of the PAA?" Well, I'll put that back in 1937, 1938, 1939--somewhere along in there while I was at Princeton--when PAA met at Princeton. [The Princeton meeting of those years was May 6-8, 1938.] It held its meeting at the Princeton Inn, a little hotel. I was a kid, you know, I was a student. But there weren't that many kids because there weren't that many students. This was an association of

greybeards--well, Frank Notestein and a couple of others were not greybeards, actually. But there were others who were greybearded, and there were very few kids. I think their attitude was, "Oh, here's this youngster, or pair of youngsters. We need young fellows." They really enjoyed it, and it was very nice for me to be treated as a kid. I suppose now there are so many kids, young people, graduate students around that it wouldn't be the same. All the principal demographers there were at the time were there. There were, I'd say, about 30 or 40 people at this meeting. And I could be acquainted with and talk to all of them. They were willing to talk to me--most of them. This was a great thing for a youngster.

You could say I was fortunate there to be kind of in on the ground floor. Not really ground floor, because the ground floor was constituted by those founding members, such as my mentors, Walter Willcox, Leon Truesdell, Frank Notestein, and Pat Whelpton, but pretty close to the ground--on the second story at the most. And the whole thing was still small, friendly. So I enjoyed that. I look back on that meeting as the meeting nonpareil in my life, and, of course, there were a lot of other meetings.

FERRISS: Do you recall who was president at that meeting?

DURAND: Nope.

FERRISS: Alfred Lotka was president in 1938-39; Warren Thompson in 1936-38.

DURAND: It would have to be Thompson [yes], or Lotka.

FERRISS: Did you read a paper at one of those early meetings?

DURAND: No, I sat and listened.

FERRISS: Do you recall any incidents in the discussion; any arguments that ensued?

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

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

The other one has to do with--and I could almost include this man in that list I gave you of people I owe debts of gratitude to--Simon Kuznets. At one of the meetings and I can't remember which one, Simon presented early results of his study of the long waves, long cycles. He'd been studying the long cycles, economic indicators, and had observed that there were parallel long cycles, waves, variations, in international migration. He was looking at that from the demographic aspect,

these long cycles. And nobody would pay much attention to Simon on this. The argument was about whether these cycles were real and Simon was defending his conclusion. He didn't get much of a hearing. I remember that and felt at the time that their attitude was, "Look, Professor Kuznets, of course, you're an honorable economist but you're among demographers now, so you need to get a little better acquainted with demography." It was many years before Simon was accepted by demographers.

FERRISS: The methods for identifying those cycles were not too developed at that point.

DURAND: That's true. Easterlin went on to do more research on that.

FERRISS: During your term of office as PAA president, you don't recall any issues or problems?

DURAND: I'm sure there was nothing very major.

FERRISS: Horace Hamilton was president the year before you.

DURAND: Horace's presidential address was not much of a presidential address ["Some Problems of Methods in Migration Research"]. I've listened to others. Richard Easterlin's address at Atlanta [1978], I thought was an outstanding one ["What will 1984 be like?"]. There are really many contributions in that presidential address. Frankly, I feel my presidential address was not an academic speech ["Demography's Three Hundredth Anniversary"--300 years since publication of John Graunt's book, Natural and Political Observations . . . Made on the Bills of Mortality]. I think it was not too badly received as such. People were amused, but it wasn't really a weighty thing.

FERRISS: That was presented at a dinner, was it not?

DURAND: Yes.

FERRISS: Horace Hamilton was president the year before you. Did he pass on any problems or any advice to you?

DURAND: I don't remember. All I remember was Horace introducing me at the annual meeting the following year.

FERRISS: Kingsley Davis took over the year after you, 1962-63. Did you transmit any . . .

DURAND: Legacy to Kingsley? I doubt if I had any fatherly advice to pass on to Kingsley. I can't remember. I believe the job of president of PAA at that time was not so demanding as it has since become with the extension of the activities of the Association. I doubt that my particular year of presidency was all that much more uneventful than another one. I don't think there was that much to be done. There must have been some files that had to be passed on to Kingsley that I might have received from Horace. I don't remember any of that. There weren't a whole bunch of committees like there are now.

What was your part of the annual meeting? That was the after-dinner speech like I gave; that was your part of the affair. And that was the entire year. Somebody gave a little news or announcement or maybe there would be a committee reporting at the business meeting, and that would be it. Not like it is now, when there's so much business that you can't crowd it all into a business meeting and the Board of Directors is harassed by all these difficult decisions to be taken. It wasn't like that, I believe.



Demography's Three Hundredth Anniversary

Source: *Population Index*, Vol. 28, No. 4 (Oct., 1962), pp. 333-338

Published by: Office of Population Research

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2731935>

Accessed: 18-06-2020 18:45 UTC

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

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



JSTOR

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

CURRENT ITEMS

DEMOGRAPHY'S THREE
HUNDRETH ANNI-
VERSARY

I am obliged to Nathan Keyfitz and Conrad Taeuber for pointing out to me that the year 1962 marks the three hundredth anniversary of the

publication of John Graunt's Natural and Political Observations . . . upon the Bills of Mortality and suggesting that this should not be allowed to go unnoticed at the annual meeting of our Association.

At least in the Anglo-Saxon countries, Graunt is generally regarded as the father of demography and thereby the grandfather of all statistical sciences. His fame extends even to Soviet Russia; the late Mikhail Ptukha, whose obituary appears in the current Bulletin of the International Statistical Institute, presented a paper at the 1937 International Conference on Population entitled, "John Graunt, fondateur de la démographie."¹

Without belittling the honor due to Graunt, we can recognize that some of his contemporaries and predecessors also deserve a share of the credit for founding demography. As we know, the beginnings of population theory as a topic of scholarly speculation were much earlier. Aristotle, Plato, and Confucius had some ideas on that subject, and additional contributions were made in the fourteenth century by the famous Moorish historian, ibn-Khaldun, and in the sixteenth century by the Italian Jesuit, Giovanni Botero. Among the early attempts to measure demographic quantities, we should not forget the work of Graunt's contemporary, Giovanni Riccioli, another Jesuit, who was collecting material in Venice for his estimate of the world population at the same time that Graunt was poring over the lists of burials, christenings, and marriages in London. Half a century earlier, a Swiss physician, Felix Platter by name, made a statistical study of the effects of the plague in Basel during the years 1609-1611.²

But above all others, it was John Graunt, haberdasher by trade and scientific explorer by avocation, who, as Frank Lorimer says, opened demography as a field of empirical research.³ In "the maze of events recorded in the bills of mortality" he sought and found order. To quote Walter Willcox's summary of his achievements, it was Graunt who discovered "the numerical regularity of births and deaths, of the ratios of the sexes at death and birth, and of the proportions of deaths from certain causes to all deaths in successive years and in different areas; in general terms, the uniformity and predictability of many important biological phenomena taken in the mass."⁴ In trying to get the measures of these phenomena, he took an attitude of mistrust of his data which was highly becoming to the founder of demography, probing their weaknesses with every test that he could devise. What this man did seems all the more impressive when we consider that he had no formal education.

Editor's Note.—This is the text of the address delivered by John D. Durand, President of the Population Association, at the banquet on the evening of May 4, 1962, at the University of Wisconsin, as part of the annual meeting of the Association.

Apparently he taught himself, like Lincoln, in his spare time as a draper's apprentice during his youth, but his hunger for knowledge was not satisfied by what he could find in books./5

Graunt's friend and collaborator, William Petty, also deserves honorable mention as one of the founders of demography and statistics, although he was no match for Graunt as a technician and scientist. Petty's contributions were not in the findings of his studies, which were highly dubious on the whole, nor in his methods, which were downright atrocious. What he contributed was an astonishingly precocious view of applications of demographic measures and other statistics to economic problems and questions of state policy. In his essays on "Political Arithmetick," he set out to demonstrate the value for these purposes, not only of the few statistics which were available at the time but also of many others which did not yet exist. In doing so, he helped to provide orientation and motive for later advances in the collection and analysis of statistics. It is remarkable how many questions Petty tackled, with which demographers and statisticians are still wrestling today, particularly in studies of the problems of under-developed countries. Among other things, he was concerned with population projections, the economics of urbanization, population structure and the labor force, unemployment and under-employment, and the measure of national income. Ireland was the under-developed country which was the main object of Petty's statistical speculations. You may recall that he proposed to move nearly three-fourths of Ireland's population to England and to convert the remainder of Ireland's inhabitants exclusively to cattle-breeding—not so much with the aim of relieving Ireland's poverty as adding to England's wealth and increasing the King's tax revenues./6 Most of Petty's contemporaries apparently thought this idea was mad, and perhaps it was; but in retrospect I think we may agree that if something could have been done along the lines of Petty's proposal, a great deal of Ireland's later suffering might have been avoided, and it is not out of the question that England's industrial development might have been hastened.

Graunt's and Petty's works were the beginning of a movement of empirical demographic studies in England which spread to France in the late eighteenth century and later to Germany and other European countries, and eventually America. Looking back at the progress of demography during the last three hundred years, we can see that it advanced very slowly for a long time and has only recently begun to pick up any considerable speed. For an index of the long-range trend in frequency of demographic publications, I have used Frank Lorimer's chronological bibliography of works published before 1938./7 This is biased because it is a selected bibliography and Lorimer was not so liberal in his selection of the more recent works as of the earlier ones; but all the same, it shows a rather interesting picture. For the period 1662 to 1750, Lorimer listed 14 publications: an average of one or two per decade. The frequency increased to about five per decade for the period 1750 to 1850, then rose to one or two per year between 1850 and 1900, two or three per year between 1900 and 1920, and four per year between 1920 and 1930. The pace quickened during the 1930's. For the period 1930 to 1937, Lorimer cited an average of ten items per year which he considered sufficiently important to include in his bibliography. The total frequency of demographic publications was much higher by that time, of course; Population Index for 1937 listed 1,624 titles. There has been a further

increase since 1937. The last three volumes of the Index, 1959 to 1961, have contained more than 2,100 titles. The rate of production is now about half a dozen such books, articles, and census reports a day. I hope that the effect of increasing the output by one-third since 1937 has been to intensify the light being shed on the subject. If so, I think we may be well pleased with the progress of our science during the last 25 years.

The first American entry in Lorimer's list was Benjamin Franklin's tract published in 1755,⁸ but Franklin's best contributions were in other fields. Walter Willcox was the first real demographer in America. The bibliography of his prodigious works begins in 1891 with his statistical study of divorce⁹ and continues over more than half a century. I suppose I must have been about the last in the long line of students at Cornell University who had the privilege of being introduced by him into the joys and mysteries of demography. I arrived at Cornell too late to sit in Willcox's classes, but as an undergraduate there in 1931, 1932, and 1933, I punched the calculating machine to help set up tables for his Introduction to the Vital Statistics of the United States, 1900 to 1930—and that is why I am here tonight.

In addition to the increasing volume of demographic publications, other marks of the progress of demography during the last few decades include the first world conference of demographers, held in 1927, the organization of the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population in 1928 and the Population Association of America in 1932, and the launching of the professional journals: Population Index in 1935, Population in 1945, Population Studies in 1947, the Madras Population Review in 1956, and the Hungarian and Czechoslovakian demographic quarterlies in 1958 and 1959. Demography is no longer a minor department of economics, sociology, or statistics; it has become a recognized discipline in its own name, and the profession of a rapidly growing number of specialists.

At the 1953 meeting of the PAA, President Clyde Kiser, celebrating the Association's twenty-first birthday, observed that it had started its life with only 38 members. The number increased rapidly during the second half of the 1930's and at the time of Kiser's speaking, it was about 500. Now the 1962 directory lists 659 members, not all much specialized in demography, it is true. The growth of membership of the IUSSP was less mercurial in the early years. In 1949, the Union still had only 147 members. Recently, there seems to have been some liberalization of attitude with regard to qualifications for membership as well as an increase in the number of qualified candidates. As a result, the membership of the International Union has more than tripled since 1949. The Union's vital statistics for the period from April 1960 to June 1961 are particularly impressive. They show a rate of growth in the membership approximating 20 per cent per annum. There is some comfort in the thought that the number of demographers in the world is increasing faster than the population.

The founding of the Population Council in 1952 was proof of the recognition which demography had gained by that time as an important discipline of the social sciences, and the Council's work has given a powerful impetus to research and teaching in this field. Another strong impetus has come from the interest of governments, manifested notably by the establishment of the United Nations Population Commission in 1947 and

the holding of the World Population Conference under United Nations auspices in 1954.

Demography has always had a pragmatic orientation. It thrives on public and official concern with population problems and related questions of state policy. One of the reasons for its quickening development during the 1920's and 1930's was the alarming decline of the birth rate in much of the Western world at that time. New motive power for the advancement of our science is being furnished now by the so-called "population explosion" in under-developed countries and the lesser blast—could we call it the "population pop"?—in countries like the United States. Other contributing factors include the shift from laissez-faire to the philosophy of the welfare state, the increasing engagement of governments in programmes of economic and social development, particularly in under-developed countries, and the increasing appreciation of the utility of demographic studies as an aid to such efforts. These trends can be expected to continue in the future, along with rapid population growth and increasing concern with population problems in low-income, high-fertility countries.

In these circumstances, what can we foresee for the future of demography as it enters the fourth century of its career? For one thing, with all due regard for the pitfalls of projections, I think we can be confident that the demands for demographic information and services of demographers will continue to increase during the next decades. We can expect increasing demands not only in the United States and other countries where demography is relatively far advanced but also in the parts of the world where it has lagged up to now, particularly in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. But there is a question whether the increase of effective demand in these areas will be proportionate to the increasing needs for demographic information.

There have been some impressive advances in census-taking, vital statistics, and sample survey work in African, Asian, and Latin American countries since the war; but in spite of this, they are still generally far behind in statistical development and even farther behind in demographic research. So far as research is concerned, progress seems to have been made recently both in the under-developed and in the developed countries. Analysis of the geographical index of titles in Population Index suggests this. For the years 1937, 1938, and 1939, the number of items classified under Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Caribbean Islands averaged about 400 a year, or 22 per cent of the total. For 1959, 1960, and 1961, the number was nearly twice as large, about 700 a year, and the percentage of the total rose to about 33. I suppose that what these figures imply for demography is also characteristic of the rends in other fields of science: a still continuing disproportion between the have and the have-not countries in scientific as well as economic development. To overcome this handicap will require a considerable expansion of technical assistance activities and fellowship programmes for training demographers from under-developed countries in the United States and elsewhere. To close the gap eventually will require a long, patient effort to build up demographic training and research institutions within the under-developed countries.

We can also expect to see some shifting in the topical distribution as well as the geographical distribution of demographic studies. In the

future, an increasing share of the total research effort will probably be directed toward questions which relate closely to population policy and governmental action for economic and social development, especially of under-developed countries. A good deal of "donkey-work" will be needed to meet some of the demands in this connection, such as calculating population projections by routine methods for more and more areas and varieties of classification. But there will be other problems which will challenge all the ingenuity of our profession. One of the most important and most difficult problems will be to estimate the possible effects of prospective changes in economic and social conditions upon the future trends of fertility and migration from the land to the cities in various countries. This kind of study will be essential for realistic population forecasts, and equally necessary for realistic thinking about population policy measures.

Another problem which will call for no less virtuosity of research methods during the years ahead is the study of economic effects of population growth in various economic and demographic circumstances. It is not mainly the theory of this question which will need to be developed; what will be required is detailed examination of the relevant facts as they appear in particular countries. As Joseph Spengler says, it is not so much a problem of devising new analytical boxes as of finding the empirical contents to put into our boxes.¹⁰ The problems will be to make quantitative estimates of the importance of various positive and negative influences of population increase on economic development in the circumstances of particular countries, taking into account the possibilities of increasing investments, improving technology, bringing unused resources into production, raising the educational level and skill-level of the labor force, and so forth. This is the kind of analysis needed to determine within what limits population growth in each country can be considered advantageous, tolerable, or definitely disadvantageous from the economic point of view. This is what must be done to provide a firm economic basis for population policy decisions.

Contemplating the problem of research on questions like this, we can see that demography will need to be bound with other social sciences even more closely in the future than it has been up to now. No doubt there will always be some scope for the pure demographer working in isolation on such questions as the functional interrelations of factors of population growth and structure and the properties of stable, quasi-stable, and semi-stable populations. But there will be a growing demand in the future for the services of the demographer-economist, the demographer-social psychologist, the demographer-geographer, and other such hybrids, as well as research teams of demographers and experts in the related fields.

These are only a few aspects of demography's future on which it might pay to speculate for the orientation of our present teaching and research activities. Looking back to its origins, we can say that ours is one of the oldest social sciences, and yet it is one of the youngest in terms of the recency of its coming to adulthood. Looking forward, we can see a bright future for demography and an opportunity to render an important service to humanity.

REFERENCES

- 1/ Congrès international de la démographie, Paris, 1937. Vol. II, pp. 61-74.
- 2/ Cited in Wilhelm Bickel, Bevölkerungs-Geschichte und Bevölkerungs-Politik der Schweiz (Zurich, 1947), p. 82.
- 3/ "The Development of Demography," in: Philip M. Hauser and Otis Dudley Duncan, editors, The Study of Population: An Inventory and Appraisal (Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1959), p. 124.
- 4/ Willcox's introduction to the American edition of Graunt's essay, edited by Jacob B. Hollander (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1939), p. xii.
- 5/ A short biography of Graunt is included in Charles H. Hull's edition of The Economic Writings of Sir William Petty (Cambridge, 1899), Vol. I. Graunt's essay is reproduced in Vol. II.
- 6/ "A Treatise of Ireland, 1687," in Hull's edition, Vol. II, p. 555. Earlier, in "Political Arithmetick" (*ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 285 ff.), Petty suggested the still more radical idea of moving the entire population of Ireland and of the Scottish Highlands to England; and preferably, if it were not an impossible feat of engineering, sinking Ireland beneath the sea.
- 7/ This bibliography is appended to Lorimer's "The Development of Demography," cited above.
- 8/ Observations Concerning the Increase of Mankind, Peopling of Countries, &c. (Boston, 1755). Reprinted in The Magazine of History, Extra Number, No. 63 (Tarrytown, N.Y., 1918), pp. 215-224.
- 9/ The Divorce Problem: A Study in Statistics (New York, Columbia University Press, 1891).
- 10/ "The Population Problem: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow." Southern Economic Journal, Vol. XXVII, No. 3 (January 1961), pp. 194-208.

FELLOWSHIPS IN
DEMOGRAPHY:
1963-1964

The Population Council is offering about 25 fellowships for study in demography at the predoctoral or postdoctoral levels. These fellowships are available to qualified students from all countries; particular consideration is given to students from the economically underdeveloped areas. Preference is given to applicants who have completed at least one year of study beyond the college level and who have a background in the social sciences and statistics. The plan of study and choice of university are made by the applicant.

Fellowships are for training in demography, although related study in sociology, economics, biostatistics and other relevant fields may form part of a total program. Fellows need not be candidates for a degree. The basic stipend is \$2700, which may be supplemented to provide for tuition, travel, maintenance of dependents and other expenses. The deadline for receipt of completed applications for the 1963-1964 academic year is February 1, 1963. For further information and application forms,