

# **DEMOGRAPHIC DESTINIES**

## **Interviews with Presidents of the Population Association of America**

### **Interviews Referencing Louis Dublin PAA President in 1935-36**



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)

## LOUIS ISRAEL DUBLIN

We do not have an interview with Louis Dublin, who was the second PAA President (1935-36). However, as Andy Lunde and Jean van der Tak (VDT) were interviewing other past presidents, they regularly asked questions about those early presidents whom they had been unable to interview. Below are the excerpted comments about Louis Dublin.

### CAREER HIGHLIGHTS

Louis Dublin was born in Lithuania in 1882 and at age four was brought to New York City with his immigrant parents. He grew up in the Lower East Side and did so well in school that he entered City College of New York (now part of the City University of New York system) at age 14, receiving his bachelor's degree there in 1901. He then went to Columbia University, where he earned his Ph.D. in biology in 1904, just shortly before his 22nd birthday. For the next few years he taught algebra and geometry at City College of New York until he married Augusta Salik in 1908. In 1909 he joined the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company as the company was launching its health and welfare program. Two years later, he organized the Statistical Bureau and served as its chief (and a vice president of the company) until retirement in 1952. Note that prior to becoming PAA President in 1935-36, he had already served as President of the American Statistical Association and as President of the American Public Health Association. In 1961 he was elected to the Insurance Hall of Fame. He died in 1969 in a retirement community in Winter Park, Florida.

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

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

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

It's interesting, nowadays, I hear the youngsters worrying about the purity of science versus the need for action. Sometime ago, people were suggesting we ought to set up qualifications for demographers; no one should be entitled to membership in this superior group who was not fully qualified. Well, believe it or not, in the early days we took ourselves even more seriously. You wouldn't believe the distance we went in order to keep all power in the hands of the purest of the pure.

You may remember that the International Population Union [now the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population, IUSSP], which was started before the PAA, was not a membership organization but a union of societies and there wasn't any population society here. Gini and Raymond Pearl had gotten it together but there had to be some American institution. So, Louis Dublin of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company organized an American National Committee for the International Union. Then, in order to keep power where it should be in this nascent association [PAA], we had a College of Fellows, the Elect of the Elect. Then we had the plebeian organization of

members of the Association. I happened to be on all of the groups.

I was quite a youngster then; 30 years old. I was kind of the youngster of the party. Probably I got there only because I was working for the Milbank Memorial Fund and they put up some of the money. My boss was Ed Sydenstricker. He knew that if they sent a youngster like me I would not be used as a moneybags. I got to watch the elder statesmen.

We used to meet in Dublin's office at the Metropolitan as the American National Committee and draw up a memorandum for the PAA. Then the same group would quickly journey uptown to the Town Hall Club and assemble as the College of Fellows of the Population Association. We would very seriously receive the memorandum of the committee of the Union which we had just passed, deliberate it with all due seriousness, and pass on the wisdom of our remarks to the Association. Having done so, we would quickly adjourn and reassemble downstairs as members of the Population Association and receive the superior wisdom of the College of Fellows.

It all seems so ridiculous. It took us a long time to realize that the action elements of the Association were probably less anxious to capture us than we were to avoid capture. Things are turned around now and I think it's pretty healthy. I take a dim view of societies that decide they're going to be exclusive. As far as I'm concerned, interest enough to join is perhaps sufficient qualification. I don't like this self-selected concept; collects people into a mutual admiration society.

But the Population Association of America quickly came to abolish the College of Fellows and to open itself up. I think it was fortunate that we didn't initially start as an action group. I think it did a great deal of good for demography around the world to have a body of people becoming demographers--there was hardly such a trade then--whose primary dedication was to study. Now that studies are pretty well advanced and the fund of knowledge is much greater, I think the dangers of getting into action are less than they were.

Other reminiscences? It was a friendly association. For many years it met as the guest of Princeton University [nearly] every year; it was terribly pleasant for us at Princeton. It was a small association. It had the virtues of having economists, sociologists and, in the early days, biologists--people with quite a diversity of interests--but a small enough association. Every time I see Gunnar Myrdal--he used to be there in the old days--he remembers the pleasure of those meetings in the forties, when everyone knew everyone else, though we were each cultivating slightly different patches. Fairchild interested Eleanor Roosevelt somewhat and she invited us to the White House. But much more interesting, she brought her knitting and came to the session on differential fertility [at PAA's meeting in Washington in May 1935]. So, it was a rather small and gemutlich group of people.

It had perhaps very little influence on the course of events at the time, but a good deal of influence on the standing areas of demography. There really weren't demographers; there were statisticians. I remember in 1927 when I'd just finished my degree and was taking my new bride for a year's fellowship in Europe [studying occupational mortality on a Social Science Research Council fellowship], I started off by seeing [Dupont?], who was head of vital statistics in New York. When I told him what I was going to do, he said, "I've got the only job [of that kind] in the United States." The number of professional openings [in demography] was really very small.

### **From Andy Lunde's interview with Conrad Teuber in 1973 :**

**LUNDE:** What do you recall of the major figures in PAA during the early years?

**TAEUBER:** Louis Dublin [President, 1935-36] was a fascinating figure. I read his autobiography a few years ago. He arrived in New York penniless. From the ship, his father brought the family to a boarding house where he had rented space and they walked there from the ship, carrying the luggage. Louis took full advantage of the educational opportunities that were available to immigrant groups in New York City. Louis was a short person, very earnest, very friendly, very human. He was deeply

devoted to the work he was doing and very competent. He was devoted to the improvement of public health and improvement of living conditions, especially of the poor. He worked very closely with Alfred J. Lotka.

Lotka [PAA President, 1938-39] was also a short person. He seemed very much more reserved. He worked closely with P.K. Whelpton [President, 1941-42] in the development of methods of measuring deaths and births and the "true" rate of natural increase, recognizing that current birth and death rates were not necessarily good measures of the long-run trends.

During the planning phase of the 1970 census, we conducted a series of meetings in various parts of the country to learn what users felt they needed from that census. One meeting was in Florida. When we found that the meeting was to be held not far from the retirement community where Dublin was living we invited him to join us and he did. He spoke to the group, with special attention to his services on advisory committees for earlier censuses and placed the whole development of census content and techniques into historical perspective, which was a very useful contribution to the meeting. It was another illustration of his devotion to the cause of federal statistics.

Another person who played a major role in the early days was Halbert Dunn, who was the first chief of what was then known as the Office of Vital Statistics, now the National Center for Health Statistics. Harold Dorn [PAA President, 1957-58] of the National Institutes of Health was very active in the Association, a very effective member. There was O.E. Baker of the Department of Agriculture.

There were a number of people who were in and out. Howard Tolley, who was Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics for a number of years, was concerned at one time. A person who was quite active was Margaret Hagood [President, 1954-55], who was at the University of North Carolina and later in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Henry Shryock [President, 1955-56] and Paul Glick [President, 1966-67], who were at the Bureau of the Census, have been active members for a long time. There was Regine Stix of the Milbank Memorial Fund. Frank Boudreau, who was head of the Milbank Fund for many years, provided very active support, not only to the demographic work at the Milbank Fund but later to the work at the Office of Population Research.

Other names from PAA's past include Leon Truesdell [President, 1939-40]. He was Chief of the Population Division at the Bureau of the Census for many years. Frederick Osborn (President, 1949-50) was a phenomenon, physically a giant, mentally a giant, with wide-ranging interests and an innovative mind. W.F. Ogburn was again a very outgoing person, worked closely with his students [at the University of Chicago and Columbia University] and took an interest in many things. He served at the Bureau of the Census on an advisory committee. I guess the fact that we had a series of census monographs goes back primarily to the push that W.F. Ogburn gave for many years.

Then there were Raymond Pearl and Lowell Reed. Lowell Reed [President, 1942-45] came to us through a concern with public health. He had worked with Pearl in formulating the logistic curve, which at the time was believed to provide a model for human population development. There were Reed and his assistant Margaret Merrell, a very quiet person who somehow was always in the background. Reed was also a very outgoing, friendly, delightful person; very much concerned with his students, pushing his students. He served for many years as chairman of a roundtable which the Milbank Fund ran every year on a variety of issues, some of them demographic, in the health field. Reed was always the charming chairman of those meetings.

Raymond Pearl was a somewhat more forbidding presence--tall. He was one of a group that frequently met with H.L. Mencken in Baltimore; he and Mencken were close personal friends. Pearl was very fond of good food, good drink, good conversation. He was a mental giant, of course, and active in the Association.

### **From Andy Lunde's interview with Clyde Kiser in 1973:**

**LUNDE:** What about Louis I. Dublin? He was president in 1935-36.

**KISER:** He was the second president of PAA. Louis I. Dublin began writing articles for the New York Times. He'd have articles in the Sunday issue, on the aging of the population, so he was becoming pretty well known in the middle 1920s. Dublin was rather a curious fellow. He became second vice president of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company. I suppose he was a very good administrator and he certainly put together--and sold to the Metropolitan Life--the work in population. And we should always give him credit for bringing Alfred Lotka to the Metropolitan. But they were a rather incongruous team. Dublin was the man who could sway audiences; he was not a technician. Lotka on the other hand was a technician and he was a little timid about talking in public. But they got along well together, and Lotka himself would always defend Dublin. If you asked Lotka why Dublin's name came first on an article--one of their famous articles was "On the True Rate of Natural Increase" which came out in 1925 in the Journal of the American Statistical Association--if you asked Lotka why Dublin's name came first when you knew very well that Lotka had done most of the calculations, he would defend Dublin and say "We're coauthors."

The PAA had its organizational meeting May 7th, 1931. In that article I mentioned the first meeting of the American National Committee. The International Union was organized not on the basis of individual members but of national committees, so we had to have a national committee. The first meeting of that American National Committee was held February 4th, 1931. Lotka was the secretary. He gave me the minutes of that meeting and I quoted from that in that article. The first paragraph read something like this: "Louis I. Dublin opened the meeting by stating that he had been asked by the president of the International Union for the Scientific Investigation of Population Problems to become chairman of the American National Committee, in accordance with the organization of its executive committee. Dr. Dublin had accepted and in conjunction with Professor Fairchild and a group that had met at the latter's invitation, he had invited a small group to constitute the American National Committee. Those attending were: Louis I. Dublin, elected chairman; Alfred J. Lotka, elected secretary; and then H.P. Fairchild, C.E. McGuire, Lowell J. Reed, Clarence C. Little, and P.K. Whelpton."

Now last night I was digging through some old files and one of the things I read was a letter from Lotka to Edgar Sydenstricker, March 3, 1931, just about two weeks after that February meeting of the American National Committee. He wrote:

"Dear Mr. Sydenstricker, In accordance with a motion carried at a meeting of the American National Committee, held in New York on February 4th, 1931, the chairman has prepared a draft of statutes, of which a copy is enclosed. The several members of the committee are hereby requested to communicate to the chairman any comment or suggestion that they may have to make regarding this draft in order that he may be able to send the statutes in final form to Dr. Carr-Saunders for publication."

Raymond Pearl was the first president of the International Union. Lotka gave the list of the original members of that American National Committee: Louis I. Dublin, C.E. McGuire, vice-chairman, and Alfred J. Lotka, secretary-treasurer. And members: O.E. Baker, Department of Agriculture; H.P. McGuire; James W. Glover, the life table man; George W. Kosnak, editor of the American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology; Dr. Clarence C. Little of Harvard Club--he was a biostatistician and he once was the president of the University of Michigan--and Dr. Raymond Pearl and Lowell J. Reed, both from Johns Hopkins, and Mr. Edgar Sydenstricker of the Milbank Fund, Warren Thompson and P.K. Whelpton.

Now, I might just say a bit more about that first meeting of the organization [May 7, 1931]. According to Fairchild, there were about 38 there. Notestein in one of his articles recently spoke of the overlapping membership of the American National Committee and the Population Association. Fairchild was the first president of the Population Association; Dublin was the first chairman of the

American National Committee. I wonder if there was some jockeying between those two for a position as the arm of the International Union. But the American National Committee was the first on the scene. It stimulated the formation, I think, of the Population Association.

**KISER:** Frank Lorimer said that Margaret Sanger wasn't concerned too much by science but she stressed the importance of having the backing of science in her movement and she didn't get very far with the International Union. She set up the Union, but it was not going to be an activist organization. She couldn't get very far with Dublin. Dublin opposed birth control on moral grounds. So probably for that reason, I thought there might have been some jockeying for position. Or maybe Margaret Sanger thought she'd take a second chance on the PAA and on Fairchild, because she hadn't been able to get very far with the International Union. But she didn't get very far there either. Notestein says here--he spoke of the fact that she had managed to get some money from the Fund to help set up the PAA. And he said--this is from his article in my book ["Reminiscences: The Role of Foundations, the Population Association of America, Princeton University and the United Nations in Fostering American Interest in Population Problems," in Clyde V. Kiser, ed., Forty Years of Research in Human Fertility, Milbank Memorial Fund, 1971, pp. 67-84]:

"It was expected that she, Mrs. Sanger, would be elected first vice-president. Largely because of Frederick Osborn's influence, her name was withdrawn. Osborn, a great admirer of Mrs. Sanger, persuaded the meeting, and I think Mrs. Sanger, that the fortunes of the field would be advanced if the new Association were to guard its scientific character and keep free from attachment to the birth control movement." [page 70]

Now, from the very beginning, they adopted a scheme to guard the scientific character. They formed what they called a College of Fellows. These were the purest of the pure. Notestein describes it:

"We went to organizational lengths beyond all lengths to keep out all but the purest of the academically pure. I still remember when about a dozen of us would meet in Dublin's office at the Metropolitan as members of the American National Committee of the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population Problems and draw up a memorandum to the new Population Association of America. We would then adjourn our meeting and quickly travel to the Town Hall Club, where the same group would assemble as the College of Fellows of the new Population Association of which were the creme de la creme. As such we received the memorandum from the American National Committee, pondered its merit, and passed on the results of our superior wisdom together with notice of action taken to the body of the Association. The College then hastily adjourned to reconstitute itself as the Association and receive with gratitude the result of the College's mature wisdom. It really took us an incredible time to realize that the birth controllers and other action groups were probably less eager to capture the academics than the academics were to avoid capture" [pp. 70-71].



---

Louis I. Dublin, 1882-1969

Author(s): H. L. Dunn

Source: *Revue de l'Institut International de Statistique / Review of the International Statistical Institute*, Vol. 37, No. 3 (1969), pp. 344-347

Published by: International Statistical Institute (ISI)

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1402138>

Accessed: 01-07-2020 23:32 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](mailto: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

*International Statistical Institute (ISI)* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Revue de l'Institut International de Statistique / Review of the International Statistical Institute*

samples. Bill devoted a great deal of attention to making such studies, and to building up a background of knowledge in order to identify problems and to guide future related sample survey designs. He was ingenious in generalizing how to apply and interpret the results under various circumstances. He also recognized early that minimizing sampling errors was not enough, and that measurement errors and other nonsampling errors needed study and strong explicit design efforts and allocation of resources for their control. Bill and his colleagues recognized that progress in achieving improved sample survey designs called for the development of response error models and theory, and he in cooperation with others, did a great deal to develop such models and to design and conduct experimental studies as parts of ongoing census and surveys, as well as to conduct experiments in their own right, in order to provide estimates of the parameters for those models. These studies along with the research in sampling methods resulted in many basic changes in census and survey methodology.

Much of the work that Bill did, including many contributions I have not mentioned, culminated in the two volume work "Sample Survey Methods and Theory" of which he was a joint author. Many have come to know him from his authorship of these books and of numerous papers published in various journals. Also, he taught and conducted seminars and did statistical consulting not only in the United States, but throughout the world.

Among his awards are the two highest honors of the Department of Commerce, including the exceptional service award in 1954 for his part in the development and application of sample survey theory and methods. He was elected a fellow of the American Statistical Association, and a fellow of the Institute of Mathematical Statistics. He became a member of the International Statistical Institute in 1960.

Those of us that had the privilege of working closely with Bill not only owe a great debt for the opportunity of learning from him, and being inspired by him, but found in Bill a friend who gave personal comfort and inspiration, advice, and help, as few people are able to do. No matter how busy, or how much load he was carrying, he would always find it possible to spend time on someone's problem – statistical or personal – and he had great insight and ability in helping in both.

M. H. Hansen

### LOUIS I. DUBLIN

1882—1969

When requested to write a note on the life of Dr. Dublin for the Review of the International Statistical Institute my first impulse was to consult with my long time friend and colleague Dr. Stuart A. Rice, Honorary President of the International Statistical Institute. It seemed to me much more suitable for him to undertake this responsible task than I, since my own relations with Dr. Dublin dated back to a period 20 to 35 years previously when I had just taken over in 1935 the direction of the Division of Vital Statistics in the Bureau of the Census (later to become the National Office of Vital Statistics in the Public Health Service). Dr. Rice, on the other hand, had recurrent and varied working relationships with Dr. Dublin on a more recent basis and could more competently cover the wide range of interests spanned by Dublin's life work. However, I found Dr. Rice in hospital and unable to undertake the assignment, but, as ever, able to give a clear and lucid account of things he remembered.

It seems to me, therefore, entirely appropriate and desirable to introduce this state-

ment with two revealing incidents on Dublin which Rice mentioned from the earlier years, that made a lasting impression on him. Quoting Rice:

“I shall base what I have to say about Dr. Dublin upon two incidents which left a lasting imprint upon my own conceptions, first the trust that may be placed upon statistical data, and second the integrity to be expected from a man of conscience and honor.

The first incident occurred during my graduate student days at Columbia University. I was asked by a religious organization interested in prohibition to look into the deleterious effects upon society of the consumption of alcohol, and became interested in data indicating the prevalence of cirrhosis of the liver, usually associated with the excessive use of intoxicants. On this question I went to see Louis Dublin, Chief Statistician of the huge Metropolitan Life Insurance Company (later its vice-president in charge of statistics) and already an acknowledged authority on medical statistics. His discourse with me was mind-opening, one of the most illuminating expositions of human limitations upon the acquisition of knowledge to which I have ever listened. Medical diagnosis, he pointed out to me, like appraisals of other human characteristics, are subject to fad and fashion. When public attention is directed to a particular factor of human adversity instances are noted where they were previously overlooked or identified with factors of some other character. The medical profession is as subject to the creation of biased data as are other members of society. Thus if the available data on mortality or morbidity from a particular cause shows sudden increases of rates, this may be the result of development of interest in that cause. If cirrhosis of the liver, for instance, appears to be involved, the sponsors of a study might have shared responsibility by reason of the direction of attention to the phenomenon that the study itself may have brought about.”

Rice confessed that the perspectives of the fledgling statistician were widened by this suggestion with the abruptness of a mutation.

“The second incident was years later, when I had entered the stream of official life in Washington. It brought from Dublin the most handsome apology and retraction to which I have ever listened. I had supported the candidacy of “X” to an important technical position in the new Roosevelt administration. Learning of this, Dublin exploded. ““The man is completely unqualified for the post””, he expostulated. Nevertheless, despite Dublin’s formidable opposition, “X” was appointed. About a year later Dublin and I were seated on opposite sides of a large round table at the annual dinner of the American Statistical Association, assembled to hear the presidential address. Others at the table conspicuously included several leaders of the organization. At a lull in the conversation Dublin addressed himself to me while all of our tablemates listened. ““Rice””, he said, ““about a year ago I expressed the opinion to you that “X” was unqualified for the position for which you were supporting him! I was wrong – completely wrong – and I wish before our associates here to apologize for the critical things I said about him and to retract that statement. He was the best man who could have been appointed and is doing a magnificent job – a splendid and magnificent job!””

Numerous sketches have been published in various periodicals dealing with the facts of Dr. Dublin’s long and distinguished career. Consequently only the salient items of interest to his statistical colleagues are given here.

Louis I. Dublin who was one of the great pioneers in the application of vital and public health statistics and who served as President of the American Statistical Association in 1924, died on March 7, 1969, at the age of 86. At the time of his death, he had been retired for more than 16 years after a long and distinguished career as

vice-president and statistician of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company and as a forceful thinker with deep commitments to life insurance and public health.

Louis Dublin was born in Lithuania in 1882 and was brought to New York at an early age. He grew up in the Lower East Side and after completing elementary and high school in rapid sequence he entered the College of the City of New York at the age of 14. Later he earned a Ph. D. in biology at Columbia University. Trained as a biologist and a statistician, he joined the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company in 1909 when the Company was launching its health and welfare program. Two years later, he organized the Statistical Bureau and served as its chief until retirement.

During his 44 years with the Company, Dr. Dublin participated actively in the major campaigns to advance the health of the American people. He had an especially keen and continuing interest in reducing the toll of death and disability from tuberculosis, the heart diseases, cancer, and accidents. Time and again he focussed attention on the social and economic losses suffered by the country as a result of preventible sickness and premature death. A rare combination of scholar and practical administrator, he gave inspiration and direction to those who sought to close the gap between available knowledge and its broad application to human needs.

Dr. Dublin's professional stature and broad interests were recognized by his designation as President of the American Public Health Association 1931–1932, and President of the Population Association of America 1935–1936. He was also very active in the Councils of many voluntary health associations and as consultant to the government. He served as Director of the American Cancer Society, the National Tuberculosis Association, and the National Health Council, and was advisor to the Bureau of the Census, the Public Health Service, the National Research Council, and the Veterans Administration.

In the early years of my own tenure as Chief Statistician of the Division of Vital Statistics of the Bureau of the Census, starting in 1935, there was occasion to consult with Dr. Dublin on technical matters many times. I found particular satisfaction in the degree of reinforcement of our mutual concepts on the significance of the medical diagnosis and the meaning of cause of death. To me as a physician and statistician a diagnosis had never seemed an absolute, but rather a probability. For instance, no one could possibly be sure that he had discovered a new disease from seeing a single case. Syndromes become recognized as specific diseases through the frequency of their occurrence. Likewise, concepts of "underlying cause of death" and how one might most logically select the primary cause of death as reported on the medical certification so as to "charge" the death properly, were matters of great interest to both Dublin and myself.

I can recall only one technical matter in which we were unable to reconcile our viewpoints. The size of the pool of vital statistics data with which Dr. Dublin worked and made his predictions rivalled that available in the official vital statistics files of the nation. Since tabulations from these private data were available much sooner than official data could possibly be, it was my feeling that we should explore ways in which these private data could be used for the purposes of *official* predictions. However this could only be brought about if some sort of up-to-date current index could be formulated to relate the population base of the Metropolitan Life Insurance data to the age-sex distribution of the United States. We were never able to resolve the problems of using the private data to build such an interpretative bridge between the two populations involved.

On matters dealing with the International Statistical Classification of the Causes of Death, Dr. Dublin's Bureau collaborated with the Federal Government in the

work of developing a practical structure for a unified morbidity-mortality classification which the official U.S. Delegation proposed at the decennial conference in 1949 for revising this classification.

Dr. Dublin was the author of numerous books and some 700 papers. His books include: *Health and Wealth* (1928), *Twenty Five Years of Health Progress* (1937), *A Forty Year Campaign Against Tuberculosis* (1942), *A Family of Thirty Million: The Story of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company* (1943), *The Money Value of a Man* (1946), and *Length of Life* (1949), (both with Alfred J. Lotka and Mortimer Spiegelman), *Suicide: A Sociological and Statistical Study* (1963), *Fact Book on Man from Birth to Death* (1967), and an autobiography, *After 80 years* (1966) which I have not been able to review before writing this note but which I am told is a fascinating account.

In 1959, Dr. Dublin received the Sedgwick Memorial Award of the American Public Health Association, a signal mark of recognition in the public health field. In 1961, he was elected to the Insurance Hall of Fame, one of the highest honors in the life insurance field. His life was an impressive personal achievement; demonstrating what great talent can accomplish through linking the objectives of life insurance with those of public health.

H. L. Dunn

#### VINAYAK GOVIND PANSE

1906—1969

Born in India on 11 January 1906, Dr. Panse graduated from the University of Bombay and started his professional career at the Institute of Plant Industry at Indore in 1927, working with Prof. Hutchinson, the noted plant breeder. In 1940 he went to England to work with Sir Ronald Fisher and extended the study of quantitative techniques in plant breeding by introducing appropriate genetic models which helped to bring out the effects of the number of segregating genes, the magnitude of their action and the modification due to dominance on progress due to selection. This work earned Dr. Panse his PhD from the University of London. War interrupted his subsequent studies and he returned to India to take up the post of Statistician at the Institute of Plant Industry at Indore, where he eventually succeeded Prof. Hutchinson as Director of the Institute.

In 1951 Panse became the Statistical Adviser to the Indian Council of Agricultural Research. He soon developed its statistical unit into a fullfledged Institute of Agricultural Research Statistics. It was at this Institute that the use of appropriate sampling techniques for estimating the area and yield of crops were developed, which under his able guidance were soon widely adopted all over the country. Although this work brought Dr. Panse into conflict with the views of some other eminent statisticians in the country, it is to this controversy that can be traced many of the developments in agricultural research statistics.

Panse also made significant contributions to the programme and progress of the World Decennial Census of Agriculture sponsored by FAO. He was FAO's Regional Advisor for the agricultural census in Asia and the Far East for two years and in this capacity wrote for FAO a manual on agricultural census taking. He extended the use of sampling techniques to numerous other fields, such as estimating fish catch, production of milk, cost of agricultural production, etc. He was invited by several coun-

**We do not have a presidential address for Louis Dublin, but here is his introduction to a special issue on population of *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* published at the time of his PAA presidency.**

American Academy of Political and Social Science

---

Introduction

Author(s): Louis I. Dublin

Source: *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 188, The American People: Studies in Population (Nov., 1936), pp. ix-xii

Published by: Sage Publications, Inc. in association with the American Academy of Political and Social Science

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1020354>

Accessed: 23-07-2020 22:15 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](mailto: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 Academy of Political and Social Science, Sage Publications, Inc. are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science**

## Introduction

IT IS now more than ten years since the volume entitled *Population Problems*<sup>1</sup> appeared. At that time, the editor of the present collection of essays, as President of the American Statistical Association, endeavored to bring together a group of scholars qualified to write authoritatively upon various phases of this subject. His aim then, as now, was to arouse interest and to coördinate the investigations of American demographers working in a rapidly developing field. Since that date, even more radical changes have occurred. The number of students who recognize the prime importance of the subject has greatly increased, and among them they have produced a valuable body of scientific literature. Careful studies are now available on many separate phases of quantitative and qualitative demography, such as the true rate of natural increase, the various factors of differential fertility, the extent and direction of internal and international migration, and many other aspects of the structure and movement of the world's population.

### RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS FORMED

Interest in this subject has, of course, not been limited to the United States. Indeed, one of the consequences of the World War was to focus attention on the supreme importance of the population problem and its relation to world peace. This has led to many studies in the United States, England, Germany, Italy, and a num-

<sup>1</sup> *Population Problems in the United States and Canada*, Publication No. 5 of the Pollak Foundation for Economic Research, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1926.

ber of other countries, each naturally having regard mainly to its own special interests. This general movement, in which each nation is interested in its own way, crystallized in the organization of the International Union for the Scientific Investigation of Population Problems. This body was formed in 1928 in Paris, following a world population congress that had been held in Geneva the preceding July. The objectives were primarily to lay down systematic plans of research and to coördinate the studies conducted by the individual members of the Union thus established. It was hoped at the time to make of the Union a clearing house for information about population, and to facilitate the establishment of common standards for the collection, tabulation, and analysis of scientific data bearing on the population problem. The activities of the Union were projected entirely apart from any political, moral, or religious implications, and were to be concerned fundamentally with fact-finding.

The American Committee affiliated with the International Union was from the very beginning one of its most active units. A little later the Population Association of America was organized, and the American National Committee of the Union was absorbed by this Association as its Research Committee. The function of the Committee thus incorporated in the Association was conceived to be the encouragement and direction of investigation in the field of population. As a basis for the systematic conduct of this function, the Committee has felt that one of its first tasks was to

make a survey of existing knowledge as a starting point from which to plan and launch further investigations.

When the opportunity to edit a volume of *THE ANNALS* devoted to the population question presented itself, it was felt that this was an excellent opportunity for the program of work of the Population Association to be brought before the reading public as an indication of the line of thought which is occupying the minds of workers in this field.

#### MENACE OF POPULATION PRESSURE

Whatever may be its merits, this volume surely comes at a most opportune time, in view of the critical situation existing in the world today. Twenty years after a war to end wars, the world finds itself again distraught by civil upheavals, mounting armaments, and threats of war between nations and coalitions of nations. This is the political aspect of the situation, which reflects certain biological and physical underlying causes. On the one hand, population pressure and rapid growth in numbers produce strains which seek relief, only too often by force. One cannot shut one's eyes to the war spirit rampant in certain parts of the world today. At the same time it is easy to turn the concept of population pressure from an objective fact into a bogey, clouding the judgment with fears and obstructing the view that should give us a rational outlook upon international affairs. Population pressure is not in itself necessarily a cause of war, although it has at times been offered as an excuse for it.

On the other hand, perhaps in part as a reaction to population pressure and as a sort of overcompensation for it, though undoubtedly much more as the result of insistence on higher

standards of living, the reproductive process in most of the leading civilized nations has become repressed to a point that threatens population decline and ultimate extinction of certain stocks if the current trend is not arrested. To one who is pessimistically inclined, there is every appearance that before long some fundamental readjustment must be made, which may well lead to a material alteration of the entire international setup. At first perhaps somewhat indistinctly, but, as the years have passed, more and more clearly, the menace of this situation has been recognized; there can be no doubt that the more or less conscious realization of the critical population situation in which the world finds itself has been one of the motives for the formation of bodies making it their task to study population phenomena and population problems.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF CONSISTENT VIEWPOINT

In addition to exhibiting the present status of population studies in this country, one further objective was aimed at when planning this volume. It was hoped that from such a summary an intelligent and consistent point of view could be developed. Previously there has been no attempt to harmonize conflicting attitudes concerning population. Thanks to recent developments in research, knowledge has been widely extended; methodology has been greatly improved; and certain misleading ideas concerning factors in the movement of population have been corrected. As a result, we are now better informed regarding the general trends and tendencies of population in America and many European countries. But from this mass of material there has not yet emerged any comprehensive philoso-

phy of population or any clear-cut understanding of the way in which population can best be related to resources and to standards of living. When this has been formulated, the demographer and student of population will become one of the most useful aids to the government and to civilization.

One thing is certain; the problem is not so simple as it appeared to the pioneers in population theory. Malthus described a world very much more circumscribed and isolated than ours is; and the forces which governed it were very much more simple than those operative today. In the first place, all parts of the globe are now so closely bound together that communication between them is a matter of days and hours, whereas in former times it took months and even the better part of a year for one corner of the earth to communicate with another. Furthermore, the forces which Malthus counted upon to control population increase are no longer effective. In the modern mechanized world, population growth certainly does not outstrip the expanding means of subsistence. Productivity has increased at a far greater rate than has population; this destroys the fundamental thesis upon which the whole Malthusian theory rests. At the same time, it must be admitted that there are still areas like India and China to which that theory does in a measure apply. In Europe and America, on the other hand, standards of living have continuously risen, and the question confronting these countries is not that of finding the easiest way of keeping population down. Far more important is the discovery of some method to distribute more equitably the goods that are being produced in such mass volume. We have at our disposal the use of tools which have

immensely increased man's power over nature; it is for us to utilize them to better advantage. Thus in the world today we confront all kinds of new conditions; the management of all these forms a part of the modern population problem.

In one respect the population theory that Malthus set forth had great merit, whatever criticism can now be leveled against his viewpoint as a whole; namely, that it was able to unify the thought of his day. But to us such simple unifications seem impossible. So complex are the issues, so far-reaching are their ramifications, and so involved in every aspect of human affairs are their implications, that not for a moment do we think that any simple formula can express the relations between the variables involved. No longer can any one man hope to solve the problem single-handed. Its attack is rather the function of a group of men working together, pooling their experience and coöperating to shape the direction of future studies and policies. Therein lies the logical value of the International Union for the Scientific Investigation of Population Problems and of the American Population Association. It is hoped that the present contribution will testify to the need of an organization such as ours and will contribute to its growth and influence.

#### APPRAISAL OF THE WORK

Not that the editor or his group of collaborators can expect to have produced in this their first joint effort a work of perfection. The very manner in which this book was prepared, the short notice at which it was necessary, on account of publisher's exigencies, to bring the authors together, and the time limits set upon the completion of their contributions, have made it im-

possible for this collection of papers to cover the entire field or to do each subject justice. The editor feels definitely that the task is incomplete; he is aware that many aspects of the subject have barely been touched upon and some have not even been mentioned. It would take at least another volume to fill in the blank spaces, and more than that to develop all the parallel fields of research relating to population. Many issues which logically belong within the realm of population discussion, moreover, bristle with controversy. Violent antagonisms adhere to such subjects as birth control and sterilization. These have necessarily had to be omitted from this volume for the reason that, although they arouse intense emotion, the various conflicting theories set forth by their proponents are not backed up by adequate knowledge. These and many other topics require further investigation and cannot be intelligently discussed until new data are brought together. And so this volume leaves

much to be desired on the score of completeness.

Nevertheless, the editor has been especially fortunate in his choice of collaborators. Not only have they proved competent to give a well-rounded presentation of their respective subjects, but they have been most coöperative in completing their assignments at very short notice, many of them at the cost of their personal convenience during the hot summer months of 1936. The editor does not, of course, take responsibility for the opinions of his associates. The greatest freedom of expression has been allowed; the authority of each writer is the best proof of the reliability of the material presented. The main purpose of the volume was to bring together original contributions in the field of population study in order to stimulate research and to place before the public the main results of our knowledge to date. We trust that we have achieved our purpose.

LOUIS I. DUBLIN