

DEMOGRAPHIC DESTINIES

Interviews with Presidents of the Population Association of America

Interview with Everett S. Lee PAA President in 1969-70



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)

EVERETT S. LEE

PAA President in 1969-70 (No. 33). Interview with Abbott Ferriss at the home of Everett and Anne Lee in Athens, Georgia, June 29, 1979.

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS: Everett Lee was born in South Carolina in 1917 and grew up in North Carolina. He did undergraduate work at Armstrong Junior College in Savannah, Georgia (from which he obtained an A.A. degree), Emory University in Atlanta, and simultaneously with his graduate work at the University of Pennsylvania, from which he obtained the Ph.D. in sociology in 1952. His career as a faculty member and researcher has been spent at the University of Pennsylvania (1954-66), the University of Massachusetts at Amherst (1966-70), and Professor of Sociology at the University of Georgia at Athens (from 1970 until 2005, including his emeritus time spent at the university gerontology center). He has served as consultant to the Census Bureau, a member of the U.S. National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics, and on several committees of the National Academy of Sciences. His publications, focused particularly on population distribution and migration within the U.S., include the seminal article, "A Theory of Migration" (Demography, 1966), and the monographs (with others), Population Redistribution and Economic Growth, United States, 1870-1950 (1957), The Development of the United States Census (1975), Net Migration of the Population, 1960-70, by Age, Sex, and Color, Parts 1-7 (1975-77), and Population Estimates: Methods for Small Area Analysis (1982). Dr. Lee died in Atlanta, Georgia, in 2007.

FERRISS: Everett, we'd like for you to tell us some of your early experiences in demography. When did you first become interested in demography?

LEE: I first became interested in demography at the University of Pennsylvania [as a graduate student in sociology, beginning about 1947]. I took one course in demography in sociology. Then when Dorothy Thomas came to the University of Pennsylvania the next year, in 1948, I took a course in demography with her and after that I knew that demography was what I wanted to work in.

FERRISS: What first struck you about it, interested you?

LEE: I had come out of biology and had not really found sociology particularly interesting. When I came across demography, I found that indeed there was a subject [in sociology] in which you could get data which could be used to arrive at some sort of conclusion. I also found that demographers wrote clearly and well, so I decided that within the social sciences, this was the field that was the most interesting.

FERRISS: You were an undergraduate then?

LEE: I was a strange combination. I was an undergraduate and graduate student at the same time at Pennsylvania. I had left Emory University without taking a degree there, but I'd come to Pennsylvania and had entered the graduate school and was completing my undergraduate work at the same time. Up until that time, I'd had practically no work in the social sciences.

FERRISS: Who else was on the faculty at Pennsylvania then?

LEE: Particularly Thorsten Sellin, the criminologist. Most of the work I took was with Thorsten Sellin or Dorothy Thomas.

FERRISS: When did you first become associated with PAA?

LEE: In 1950 I went to my first meeting of the Population Association at Princeton. I gave a paper there on migration differentials ["Some Recent Contributions to the Study of Selective Migration," presented in a session on "Internal Migration," chaired by Warren Thompson]. It was, in effect, the beginning of my dissertation on migration differentials.

FERRISS: What were some other things that happened at that meeting at Princeton?

LEE: The thing I remember most was practicing my paper for the next day, along with Mike Lalli, and the people in the room next to us hammering on the wall to get us to shut up so they could go to sleep.

FERRISS: Did they have many people at that meeting?

LEE: No. The interesting thing about the meetings in those days was that they ran about 50 to 75 people, I would guess, and everybody was able to go to the Princeton Inn and have drinks together; everybody stayed at the Princeton Inn. I also recall that at midnight, we would all move down to the end of the one big room in the Inn so we could continue drinking. The township line ran through the Inn and you could drink in one township after midnight but not in the other. So we all ostentatiously moved to one end of the room.

FERRISS: This was the social hour; there weren't meetings going on at that time?

LEE: In the old days of the Population Association, it was very hard to distinguish completely between social hours and the meeting. They all went on simultaneously--not just simultaneously, but the one melded into the other. At the social hours, the topics were population, just as they were in the formal sessions. I also remember in those days, the chairman of the session would look around and say, "We'll have to wait a moment or two," and hold up the session until he could make sure everybody was there.

FERRISS: Do you remember anything else that happened at those meetings?

LEE: Either at that meeting [1950] or one soon thereafter, I remember Kingsley Davis and Frank Lorimer were arguing with each other over the proper approach to fertility.

FERRISS: This was the result of Lorimer's cultural studies?

LEE: Yes. It was the result of Kingsley having written a paper, which he gave at the Population Association, and then Lorimer commented that Kingsley should have read his book [Culture and Human Fertility, 1954]. Whereupon Kingsley said he had read Lorimer's book and that's why he gave the paper.

FERRISS: When did you become an officer of the Association?

LEE: I frankly don't remember. I recall running for director [on the Board] several times before I finally got elected [for the term 1965-68]. Once I was elected a director, then I became, I believe, second vice-president [1966-67], then first vice-president [1967-68], and then president [president-

elect 1968-69; president 1969-70] in succeeding years.

FERRISS: Do you recall some of the issues that were discussed at the early directors' [Board] meetings that you attended?

LEE: There were many issues. One was whether or not to admit people freely or whether we should be very careful whom we admitted. In these earlier days, there was great fear that the birth control people, whom we did not necessarily regard as scientists, might take over the Association. We were very careful to be sure that the members of the Association, or certainly those who were running for a directorship or for higher office, were pure demographers.

FERRISS: Not family planning people.

LEE: There was no objection to family planning people per se; it was simply that many of the family planning people were considered to be people who had an axe to grind and were not necessarily interested in pursuing science. There was a great feeling of maintaining the Population Association for scientists.

FERRISS: Had demography become very well established in the universities by that time? This was about 1948 or 1949?

LEE: No, this was about 1952, 1953. [Lee was first elected to the Board for the term 1965-68. The controversy about qualifications for PAA membership mentioned above presumably refers to the heated discussion on this issue about 1966-67, described in, e.g., Paul Glick's and Ansley Coale's interviews, and Paul Glick's PAA history vignette, "PAA Committee on Organizational Management: 1966-67, PAA Affairs, Summer 1982.] No, demography had not become well established as a discipline in most places. It was true that in most sociology departments, demographers dominated the departments if there were demographers. But there were not many departments with demographers.

FERRISS: Was there any concern about increasing the credibility of demography as a profession at that time?

LEE: No, I think the demographers felt that demography was doing very well for itself. It was the rest of the social sciences that had to be geared to demography.

FERRISS: Were there any other issues that you can think of, back in those days?

LEE: Not really important ones: Whether or not we should make awards; whether or not we should raise the dues; how we could get out of the red. That sort of thing; nothing of earth-shaking importance.

FERRISS: Do you remember any other incidents that happened at some of the early meetings of the PAA?

LEE: I remember many fine papers, from time to time. I also remember the general feeling as the Association grew larger, that the good old days were gone when everybody went to every session and heard every paper. It was something of a shock when we began to have two sessions going at one time. It was also difficult to leave Princeton, because in early May, when we always met, everything was in bloom at Princeton, the place was beautiful, the Inn was very hospitable, and everybody knew

everybody.

FERRISS: Did you always meet at Princeton?

LEE: Yes. I'm not sure when we stopped meeting at Princeton. It was a matter of growth; Princeton became too small for the Association. [Last meeting at Princeton was 1955; first was fall 1936. Between those years, there were also annual meetings in Washington, 1939; Chapel Hill NC, 1940 and 1951; Atlantic City, 1942; Philadelphia, 1948; Cincinnati and Oxford OH, 1953; and Charlottesville VA, 1954.]

FERRISS: What are some of the other ways in which PAA has changed over the years, besides the growing numbers?

LEE: PAA has gotten much larger, of course. It has members from many disciplines. The discipline itself has broadened and has established relations with all the social sciences and increasingly with biology. It's a different field. It's not quite so in-bred; it's not quite so narrow in its focus. Increasingly, we do not attempt to define demography as the formal aspects of population study, leaving out other aspects of population study, other fields. I think there has been an improvement both in the quality of the research being done and it's certainly true that the field has broadened enormously over the time in which I've been involved.

FERRISS: What was the best meeting that you recall attending, the one that you enjoyed the most?

LEE: I can't think of a PAA meeting that I haven't enjoyed. I think the meetings always offer something of interest. You always see people that you want to talk with. You always learn something-
-at least I always do.

FERRISS: For the record, although this was an IUSSP meeting, could you relate the incident that occurred at the London School of Economics, I believe it was? [IUSSP meeting in London at the LSE, September 1969.]

LEE: I think I did a great deal for the Population Association at the London School of Economics. There we had a meeting of the finance committee [of PAA] and when I rushed out of the meeting [IUSSP session] a little late to go to the meeting of the finance committee, I went into the hallway, found the elevator door open as somebody was coming out, and got in. When I got to the first floor, I couldn't get out; the door was locked. I could make the elevator move back and forth, but I couldn't get it to open anywhere. Finally, the elevator started moving on its own after about an hour and it stopped at some floor, I knew not where. The door opened, somebody got in, and I got out.

At that point, I found myself within the stacks of the library at the London School of Economics, with my briefcase, trying to come out from the stacks, and I was stopped by a very suspicious gentleman who told me that nobody could have gotten on that elevator and what was I doing in the stacks. It seems that that elevator was never unlocked except for library personnel who went up and down the floors of the London School of Economics. Anyway, I had managed to do it and gotten myself locked in.

It seems that the finance committee, however, without my bothering them, had been able to work a way of coming out of the great financial difficulty which the Association had gotten itself into during this particular year [1969].

FERRISS: Let's go back to the University of Pennsylvania in your days as a graduate student. You were doing research at that time, weren't you?

LEE: Oh, yes. At the University of Pennsylvania in those days, the university was regarded not as a place to be taught but as a place to learn. We had a faculty which steered you in the right direction and then left you alone. They let you take whatever courses seemed most appropriate. What I did was to take demography with Dorothy Thomas, a course with Ed Hutchinson, criminology with Sellin, and I went over to anthropology and studied with Pete Hallowell. I also took psychology with Morris Viteles. In fact, I wandered around there and elsewhere to suit myself. Then, finally, they gave me an examination and passed me and I was prepared to go ahead and write a thesis.

FERRISS: Were some of the problems in doing research different in those days than what you have now?

LEE: No, the problems weren't different. The fact is that no matter how much you taught, you were expected to do research. You did it as a student, even as an undergraduate student, and you did it as a graduate student, and you did it as a faculty member, regardless of whatever duties you had. Life was very simple in that regard.

FERRISS: And you had a calculator with which you ground things out?

LEE: I had one of the mechanical calculators where you turn the crank--the Friden. I thought it was one of the marvels of its day. Anything that would multiply any six-figure number by another, no matter how many twists of the crank--quite a marvel. It cost me \$75.

FERRISS: Is that what you worked with for your migration study?

LEE: Yes, until I bought an electric one for \$500, one of the first electric ones. Even that one you had to move the carriage by hitting a button; it didn't move automatically on multiplication. You would learn, for example, that to multiply by 98, you multiply by 100 and subtract 2 and that's 98.

FERRISS: What were some of the other research problems that you had?

LEE: Oh, many. We dealt with the range of migration problems, fertility, population policy, in addition to migration and population distribution. There was no problem in population that we were particularly reluctant to tackle.

FERRISS: Let's talk about your tenure as president of PAA [1969-70]. What were some of the issues that you faced as you went into office? Tell us something about that.

LEE: The first one was the great shock of finding out that the Association was essentially broke--that is, had expenses, as I remember, of about \$50 per member and an income of less than \$25 per member. At that time, the Association looked as if it might indeed be on the rocks. So, you [Abbott Ferriss, secretary-treasurer 1968-71] and Anders Lunde [secretary-treasurer 1965-68] and I formed ourselves into a committee on finance. For the first time, we prepared estimates of the expenses of the Population Association for five years and tried to establish committees which each year would prepare a five-year estimate, bringing up to date the older estimate.

The outlook was very glum, so we went from foundation to foundation, looking for money for the Association. I don't recall how much money we collected during that particular year [1969-70], but

it was enough to finance Demography for a long period of time, to enable the Association to give more of a subsidy to Population Index, and to get ourselves out of the red in general. In fact, my memory is that you [Abbott] had to go out and buy bonds with some of the money we had at that time in order to establish reasonable financing for the Association. My memory is that we were very successful in raising money but, at the moment, I have no idea how much we raised. [There was a Population Council grant of \$75,460]. I do remember visiting almost all the foundations in New York and several of the government agencies and foundations in Washington. My memory is that we did very well. Among other things, we opened a floodgate for membership in the Association and greatly increased its membership. [Membership numbers were: 1,495 in 1968; 1,552 in 1969; 1,862 in 1970; 2,075 in 1971; 2,262 in 1972.]

FERRISS: Even running the risk of some of them being family planning people?

LEE: Well, by that time I had decided that birth control was a very good thing. I even thought I might practice it myself. In that regard, I remember when we had our final meeting of the year in which I was president [Board meeting of fall 1970?], the new officers were all coming in. We had been very successful in dealing with the, at that time, apparently militant women's group, who were asking for nothing more than they deserved. We went to our final meeting in a self-congratulatory mood, at which time I announced that one of the new directors had four children and that the zero population growth people had protested against his being a director because of that. I then announced that they also would have protested against my having been president, having had four children, but I had had my four children before birth control was invented. At this point, Amos Hawley [president-elect 1970-71] spoke up and said he had four children too; he had had one by each method of birth control. That I recall as the end of my tenure as president of the Population Association.

FERRISS: Where was the meeting when you read your presidential address ["Migration in Relation to Education, Intellect, and Social Structure," Population Index, October/December 1970]?

LEE: That was in Atlanta [banquet on the evening of April 17, 1970, during PAA annual meeting].

FERRISS: Do you remember anything else about that meeting?

LEE: Oh, we had a very nice party afterwards; lots of people came and we had a good time. When you're president of an association, you're just so anxious to get through this last meeting and you're so tied up with board meetings and so forth that you don't get much time to really enjoy the Association. The very nice thing is--or has been for me since then--is that you can go to a meeting of the Association and actually hear the papers you would like to hear.

FERRISS: How about the meeting where Phil Hauser arrived with his fancy suitcase that nobody could break into, but Phil couldn't open it either.

LEE: Had all his clothes, had everything, and he couldn't get it open. General Osborn--Fred Osborn--used to arrive with his pasteboard suitcases. The shabbiest luggage that ever came to the Association was Osborn's. Remember the joke about Osborn, that he had all his children for Thanksgiving dinner and announced to all of them that the first one that gave him a grandchild would inherit a million dollars and he said grace and looked up and they'd all left the table!

FERRISS: Do you remember some other stories about the early demographers?

LEE: Well, let me think. I remember Alfred Lotka [PAA president 1938-39]. He was at a meeting, I guess he was at the 1950 meeting; I remember he made some remarks. I also remember my first knowledge of the IUD. That was having cocktails with Frank Notestein [president 1947-48], who came into the cocktail party and announced the development of the IUD as one of the great instruments for holding the world's population down to reasonable levels.

FERRISS: Did he have one to show you?

LEE: No. In fact, he wasn't quite sure what it was either. I also remember Notestein at the same meeting telling us he had had a call from Margaret Meade to come by and see her very quickly--a matter of great urgency. He went by to see her and the matter of great urgency was that the population of the world was growing too rapidly and might in time get out of hand. He was indignant, having been summoned to New York, to the Museum of Natural History, I believe, to hear what he thought he had known for a long time. She had just found out.

Among the people who came [to PAA meetings], there were the scholars who came from abroad, the established people, and of course there were always in demography many foreign students. The foreign students were much more likely to go to the meetings than were the American students, in part because the United Nations and other agencies paid their way, and also in part because they were concentrated at Princeton or Pennsylvania and some at Michigan and those places, where it was easy to get to where the meetings were usually held.

One of the nicest meetings of PAA, I think, was one which Anne and I [as local arrangements committee members] arranged at the University of Pennsylvania [May 1957], in which we arranged for the banquet to be in the museum among the mummies. [Several PAA oral history interviewees have recalled that occasion!] Anne and I did not get the dinner, because we had a limited number of seats. You were supposed to have a ticket for the dinner [in advance], but it was true that we were still selling a few seats for the dinner at the meeting itself. But after the total number of seats had been assigned, we expected that the people who had come only for the cocktail party [also in the museum, before the dinner] would leave. But it turned out that some of those were very reluctant to leave and simply sat down. And when Anne and I were about ready to go in and have dinner, we found that Lady Somebody from Britain and her husband had no seats, so we gave our tickets to Lady Somebody and her husband and went out and got ourselves a hamburger while the Population Association had its dinner.

FERRISS: But it was a great meeting?

LEE: Oh yes, I think so. When I gave my presidential address to the Population Association at the banquet in 1970 in Atlanta, the thing that surprised me most, looking out, was simply how many people were there [590 registered for 1970 meeting] and thinking how large the Association had gotten over the years in which I had known it. It's much larger now than it was then.

FERRISS: We no longer have the custom of the dinner.

LEE: No, in many ways I regret that. We are not as close as we were, in part, of course, because there are so many of us as compared with the corporal guard in the beginning.

FERRISS: At that time [1970], the president's address was delivered at the dinner?

LEE: Oh, yes--in fact, always. I remember that Margaret Hagood at her presidential dinner [Princeton, 1955] had decided that she would not do it herself, for reasons I don't know, but instead

had someone else [Carl Taylor] do it, who chose to address us on the villages in India ["India: Three Hundred and Sixty Million People Plan for Their Development"]. Before that dinner meeting, I had visited some people at the Princeton Inn and elsewhere and we had had several martinis and we came into the dinner and this gentleman came in with a huge ream of paper--at least 500 sheets, I thought--and started reading from the top, taking up each of India's 300,000 villages one at a time, was my initial impression. At that point, I got very thirsty after those martinis, but there was nothing to drink whatsoever. So, I waited until Chris Tietze looked the other way and then I took his glass of water, as we were going through the 1100th village, as I recall.

The thing which impresses me about the Population Association meetings, in addition to the camaraderie which is still there despite the size of the Association, is the generally high quality of the papers that are presented. I go to the meetings of a large number of associations and I go to a large number of meetings in which presumably eminent people have been invited to make pronouncements on some topic or other. Still, I think that, on the whole, the meetings of the Population Association are the best planned and the papers are the best presented of any association that I have ever dealt with. Not all are superb papers, but, in general, the very low-quality ones are not there. And almost always at the Population Association, there will be one or several papers which affect the direction of thought in the field, or which give you some new leads for work which you yourself are doing.

FERRISS: Do you recall any topics of the past that have done this?

LEE: Yes, I recall many such instances. I have always, for example, gone to hear whatever Ansley Coale had to say. In most instances, it is something new and path-breaking. I've always found it very useful to listen to what Kingsley Davis has to say, even though I am not particularly interested in the topic which he may happen to deal with at the moment. Kingsley almost always has something which makes me think about the field or which is a statement which I find relevant to things which I am working with. And there are many other people who do that. Most of the advances in the field of population have had at least their foreshadowing in papers which were given at the Population Association. It always has been, and still remains, a first-class organization.

FERRISS: Do you recall any session on population quality, for example?

LEE: A few. Much more attention was given to what is called population quality in the early days of the Association than at present. There are many reasons for that. The psychologists can't make up their minds about it. The biologists are likely to go off in various directions on the topic.

The fact is, of course, that there is no such thing as "quality," but a person or a people have many qualities. In fact, I tried to address that topic in my own presidential address ["Migration in Relation to Education, Intellect, and Social Structure"], in which I attempted to make the point that a particular person has many abilities that we call intelligence, or intellect is a combination of many abilities, on most of which we are simply average, on a few of which we might be good, on many of which we are extraordinarily bad. The whole reason for specialization is that specialization makes it possible for us to choose some of these abilities which, at least for us, are in better quality, let's say, than some of the others, and by specializing in those things and leaving to others the things which they can best do, we get a society that can operate much better than if all of us tried to do everything for ourselves. I still think this is a topic which has not been given adequate attention, even in demography or the psychological and sociological sciences.

FERRISS: Take topics in the area of providing advice on public policy. Do you recall any notable sessions the Association has had in this area?

LEE: No. In the beginning, the demographers kept themselves almost completely away from policy questions. There were, of course, people like David Glass and Hope Eldridge who did very good work in these areas, and there were people like Dudley Kirk and Ed Hutchinson who were extremely interested in population policy. It was a long time before the demographer came into his own as a person who advised governments and businesses.

This is something which is changing, in part because demography over time has become varied enough and complicated enough so that people who need detailed demographic information and analysis by necessity turn to demographers. It's true, of course, that over time the realization of population as a major economic factor has increased as economists came to deal with underdeveloped areas and as they realized the limits of equilibrium or Keynesian analysis. Population has come back into its own and is now being seriously considered again by economists and government--and, interestingly, by business also.

FERRISS: Could you recall some incidents associated with some of the early PAA presidents?

LEE: I just looked over the list of past presidents and I have known, or at least I have met, every president up until now [1979], except the first one, Henry Pratt Fairchild [president 1951-35] and his successor Louis Dublin [1935-36] and just one other, Lowell Reed [1942-45]. I read a great deal of Lowell Reed's work and I was on the National Committee for Health Statistics at one time, which still honored Lowell Reed as the founder of that particular group. All of the other presidents of the Association I have had some acquaintance with and, actually, most of them I have known very well. It is by and large a very able and distinguished group. I also looked at the present Board of Directors and I find that I not only know everyone on it, but I happen to be married to one of them.

Incidentally, one of the nice things about the Population Association in the past has been the ability to know so many of the husband-and-wife teams which were in population. I've known a good number of these, beginning with the Taeubers, both of whom were president of the Population Association [Conrad in 1948-49; Irene in 1953-54]. As far as I know, they are the only husband and wife who have both been president of the Association [Kingsley Davis and Judith Blake were husband and wife when he was president, 1962-63, but no longer when she was president in 1981]. And I must say, they both [the Taeubers] richly deserved to be president of the Association.

The Population Association has certainly always been one in which women have played an important part. So far as I know, there was never in this association any form of discrimination against women.

FERRISS: Even in the early days?

LEE: Oh my goodness, how could you discriminate against Dorothy Thomas and Irene Taeuber and Margaret Hagood and Hope Tisdale Eldridge? Those people would have run completely over you had you had the nerve! They were extremely competent people and with people of this ilk, it was quite immaterial from the intellectual point of view what sex they were. Although I must say that they were all quite feminine and charming people as women. That had nothing to do, one way or the other, with their intellectual qualities. They were just bright--and, I must say, much brighter than the great body of men. They made their own way. Had they been male or female, they still would have done a great deal.

FERRISS: So when the Women's Caucus was first organized [1970], they had a good deal going for them already?

LEE: They certainly did, but within the Population Association, there was not the same need to fight

for recognition which I think was found in some other associations. In fact, most of the people that I mentioned earlier were by and large indignant at the idea that women had not had a fair deal, at least within the Population Association.

They did not assume that women had had a fair deal within universities; certainly, women had not. I recall at the University of Pennsylvania, Dorothy Thomas was the first woman professor and I am told that before she came, there was a saying that you could not have women professors in the Wharton School of Business at the University of Pennsylvania because the toilets there were marked "Ladies" and "Faculty" and it would be confusing to have a woman professor. Also at the University of Pennsylvania, a woman could not belong to what at one time passed as the faculty club, the so-called Lenape Club, named after the early Indians who had inhabited the area around the university. Dorothy Thomas was the first to break the stranglehold that men had had on the faculty of the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania.

FERRISS: In the early PAA meetings, did they distribute papers about the way they do now?

LEE: Yes, there was very early in the Population Association the idea that you should give something to people to take home with them. We didn't have much in the way of electronic graphics at that time, so for the most part we distributed ditto-graphed tables and that sort of thing. But tables were distributed for almost every paper which used data.

FERRISS: Did they use slides or overhead projectors, things of that sort, in the early days?

LEE: Very seldom. They were only occasionally used and then by and large by somebody who had come down from a foundation with all sorts of assistants.

FERRISS: Do you recall any of the people who really contributed to the Association in the early days?

LEE: Yes, Clyde Kiser in particular did a great deal for the Association. I've had occasion to review much of the work which Clyde Kiser has done and I have come to increasing appreciation for somebody who was a real pioneer in several fields of demography. His work on the early movement of blacks into the North, Sea Island to City [1932], I think, is one of the classics of its kind. And his early work in fertility was path-breaking. We owe a great deal to Clyde Kiser and to the Milbank Memorial Fund, with which he was associated and which supported a considerable amount of important work in population in the early days.

THE FOLLOWING IS AN INTERVIEW WITH EVERETT'S WIFE, ANNE S. LEE

Interview with Abbott Ferriss, following the interview with Everett Lee, at the Lees' home in Athens, Georgia, June 29, 1979.

Anne Lee, though never president or secretary-treasurer of PAA (the general criterion for inclusion in this series of interviews), has also had a long association with PAA and a distinguished career in demography. In addition to the following lively reminiscences of PAA "in the early days," she has contributed a PAA history vignette on "Early Women Superstars in PAA," published in PAA Affairs, Fall 1988.

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS: Anne Lee received the A.B. in sociology in 1950 from the University of

Pennsylvania (where she and Everett Lee met) and the Ph.D. in sociology from Pennsylvania in 1966. Among her activities in demography, she has done research at the Institute for Behavioral Research at the University of Georgia in Athens and as an independent consultant, and is the author or coauthor of a number of articles and monographs, particularly on internal migration in the U.S.

FERRISS: I have now with me Anne Lee, who, she says, knows some trivia about the early days of the Population Association.

LEE: I first went to the Population Association meeting in 1950. At that time, I was an undergraduate student at the University of Pennsylvania and the meeting was being held at Princeton. I went to the meeting because Dorothy Thomas announced that she expected her students to go and when Dorothy announced this sort of thing, you didn't question it--you went. So a group of us arranged a carpool and drove over to Princeton, just for part of a day's meeting, and then came back afterwards and had dinner at Ed Hutchinson's house.

Very lovely affair. I can remember that meeting well, because I think it was in the School of Architecture and it was a very, very small group in those days. There couldn't have been more than 50 people attending the meeting and everybody clearly knew everybody else. The women were extremely smartly dressed; they all had beautiful, smart suits and smart hairdos.

And I recall the business meeting that was conducted while I was there. In the old days, before they took the business meeting out of the arena, this was where a lot of the fun in the PAA went on. The thing I remember most distinctly was the figure of Fred Osborn, because he must be about 6 foot 6, and he went up to the podium at the front and proceeded to put his foot on it. This was a huge man extending out. At that time, he was on the Atomic Energy Commission and some parliamentary hassle came up which Henry Shryock could not answer. So Osborn said, "Under the rules of the Atomic Energy Commission " such and such would apply. At which point, John Durand asked, "But does the Population Association operate under the rules of the Atomic Energy Commission?"

In those days, there was not a combined secretary-treasurer's job; you had a secretary and a treasurer. Henry was the secretary, but John Durand was the treasurer. When the time came for the treasurer's report, John came up and reached out and took a paper from Henry as he went to the podium and said, "Well, according to the treasurer's report which Henry Shryock has just handed me, these are the figures." So it was much more casual in those days.

In the early days, the meetings were almost always at Princeton. They occasionally wandered afield, but mostly they were at Princeton. There were single sessions; you went and you listened to all of the papers. It was considered poor form if you went to the lobby or anything like that; you were expected to go to the meetings.

The other thing that always happened in those early days was that the International Union [for the Scientific Study of Population] was very, very exclusive. You could only become a member by being invited [as is still the case, on recommendation of two IUSSP members]. There was a great deal of discussion about this and it was a very closed organization. They [the American National Committee, comprised of U.S. members of IUSSP] always met the night before the Population Association meetings began at Princeton. All of the people who were anybody in this chosen group would go off to the International Union meeting and those of us who were not members would sort of have to mill around and decide what to do with our time until this illustrious body finished its meeting and we could retire to the bar. [Anne Lee was elected to the IUSSP in 1969; Everett Lee in 1957.]

FERRISS: You said that the ladies wore new spring outfits?

LEE: Oh, yes.

FERRISS: Were they a different color every year?

LEE: I don't remember so much about the color; I remember a lot of very smart navy blue ones. In later years, I came to know a bit more about it, because by then I was closer to Dorothy Thomas. When Everett got out of the army [in which he served during the Korean War, but stationed in Italy and at Fort Riley, Kansas, where he completed his Ph.D. dissertation], we went back to Penn in 1952. That was when I became aware of the machinations that went on in the PAA. In those days, they were friendly to outsiders but there was very much of a sort of closed control, not nearly as democratic as it is today. What the PAA did was very much decided by Irene Taeuber, who would talk to Margaret Hagood in Washington and Dorothy Thomas in Philadelphia, and Frank Lorimer, I think, would also talk to Margaret Hagood and they would all get together and decide what was going to be done. These four--there were one or two others, Notestein was involved, I think--when they decided what was to be done, then the Association would do it. They would spend time discussing the meetings long before they came about and then would decide what was to be done.

Before the meetings, I can remember Dorothy always going off to get a new suit and a permanent. There were four single rooms in the Princeton Inn. These were always reserved for Eleanor Isbell, Dorothy Thomas, Margaret Hagood, and Hope Eldridge; automatically, they would get those four rooms.

FERRISS: Would the girls get off to themselves and chat about things?

LEE: Not really. Dorothy was not one for withdrawing with the ladies, nor were the others. At the meetings, they would mingle completely with everyone else.

I can remember also when the meetings moved to Penn for the first time [1957]. In those days, the Association would only go where it had been invited, not the way it is now, where you decide what city is large enough to hold the Association. You would be invited, so the places where the meetings were held, the selection, was dependent on who invited you. The year that the University of Pennsylvania extended an invitation, Joe Spengler was president. The meetings were held in the Wharton School, because it had a new building in Dietrich Hall and it had side-by-side auditoriums. The decision was made that year to go to double sessions. Going to double sessions meant that these side-by-side auditoriums could be used. And people were furious! I was on local arrangements and everybody would come out and mutter to me about how terrible it was that the Association was doing that; the people were just running in and out and the whole flavor had been ruined. [Double sessions actually began at the 1956 meeting at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, with two simultaneous sessions on the first morning. In 1957 at Penn, there were double sessions in four time slots.]

That was the first year that we had the banquet over at the museum [of the University of Pennsylvania], which was a huge success, in part because the university funded a free cocktail beforehand. Many demographers who came to the cocktail party, planning to go on to the brighter lights of Philadelphia, instead decided to stay, so that we had a crunch on the dinner. The next time we had the meetings in Philadelphia, we again used the museum; that was the year Kingsley Davis was president [1963]. But the decision was made that you would surrender your ticket before you entered the dining room. That year, I got to eat the menu we had so carefully planned.

Another innovation in terms of the meetings was the year that Everett was first vice-president [1968; meeting in Boston]. It used to be that the second vice-president chaired COPS [Committee on Population Statistics] and the first vice-president had the responsibility for the meeting program. Everett was in charge of the program and decided that he needed a committee and, since I was his wife, I should serve on the committee, although I would not be named to it. They decided that not enough people could get on the program. That was the year they tried the innovation of having people

who wanted to give papers to submit them [multiple copies] ahead of time and to distribute the papers ahead of time to people that were to come to the sessions. You would sign up for a session and you would have eight or ten papers distributed by title only. Then the people would get together [at the session] and have a discussion. [This innovation, or a variation of it, was started by Ansley Coale, as first vice-president/program chairman for the 1965 meeting in Chicago.]

As I recall, it was a total failure. Everett had piles and piles of papers and no way to discriminate. You'd start checking on whether somebody had a paper ready and you would call and say, "I'm putting you on a session on fertility." And they'd say, "Oh, Everett, I forgot to tell you that my fertility tape never came through; the paper I'm submitting is on mortality." And that is why there were some papers on fertility put in a session on labor force. And people would mail papers to Everett and they never arrived.

FERRISS: He had all the papers?

LEE: Oh, yes--hundreds of them. We had a whole station-wagon-full to drive to Boston. People were not feeling kindly towards him about it. The other hassle I remember from the early days had to do with the kinds of membership. When I first joined the PAA, I joined as an individual member and paid my five dollars. For years, it was five dollars to be a member. Then the dues went up to ten dollars. By then, Everett and I were married, so I thought in the interest of economy, we might as well become joint members and still be paying ten dollars [together]. There were a few years there when we were joint members.

At some point, the Board of Directors, while Everett was in office, changed the dues structure again and increased the dues. In the course of the deliberations, joint membership disappeared. I'm sure that was the year that Everett was becoming president [president-elect, 1968-69], because by then we had Ed Bisgyer [handling PAA business affairs at the American Statistical Association] and I wrote Ed a note saying, "Here are Everett's dues as a regular member, but where does this leave me as a joint member?" At which point, Ed, to my fury, wrote to Everett and said: "Dear Everett, as you can recall, at the last Board of Directors meeting," and went on with a long, full-page paragraph why they had decided to abolish joint membership; that somebody needed to look into it. All I could reply was to send him my dues as an individual member and say, "As you can see, Everett and I do not discuss Board meetings. Considered confidential." I think at that time Dorothy Thomas told me firmly, when I was telling her my troubles, that, "Well, anybody who is a real demographer should be a member on their own. I don't approve of this joint membership."

FERRISS: You were going to tell us about another incident.

LEE: In the early days, Everett would get to the meetings and I would be home taking care of the children. I could get to the ones that were closer by, but I didn't always make them after we started having a family. I still stayed active and read the journals, but Everett got a whole load of friends that I knew of, talked to on the phone, but didn't know personally.

One of these was Anders Lunde and another was Ozzie Sagen. Anders had been secretary-treasurer [1965-68] and so we had long correspondence because--again in connection with my joint membership--my ballot would never arrive on time and I'd always have to write Andy and say, "Where is my ballot?" When I went to a meeting after that, both Andy and Ozzie were there. I was getting ready to leave, going off in a rush, and Oz was standing talking to somebody and I confused him with Anders Lunde. I went rushing up to him and said, "I'm Anne Lee, Everett's wife. It's so nice to meet you after all these years of correspondence." Oz sort of looked up in total amazement and I said, "I'm sorry I can't talk longer; I must meet Everett." And I went rushing off, leaving him standing there shaking his head. Of course, in later years I knew them both very well.

Demographic Transitions

Everett S. Lee died at the age 89 in Atlanta on March 16, 2007. He was born in Raines, South Carolina, on December 31, 1917. He is survived by his wife, Anne whom he married on August 4, 1950, their four children, Dorothy, Deborah, John, Sarah, and four grandchildren. Anne is also a respected demographer.

Everett received his Bachelors, Masters, and Doctoral degrees from the University of Pennsylvania. His life was devoted to teaching and research. He spent many years in the Sociology Department at the University of Georgia. After retirement, he remained at the University's Gerontology Center until 2005. He was a very prolific author but is probably best known for "The Turner Thesis Revisited."

Among Everett's numerous contributions to the scholarly word, he and Anne were instrumental in the founding of the Southern Regional Demographic Group in 1973, which later became the Southern Demographic Association (SDA). He and Anne were charter members, and both served as President of this Association. Everett remained very active in SDA until about a year ago when his health began to fail.

Everett has been my esteemed mentor in life both professionally and personally. He fostered and encouraged my career path in demography when I was a Ph.D. student at the University of Georgia. He served as my major professor when I completed my degree in 1973. He was of great help to me and supported me throughout the process. I will always be appreciative of him for all of the valuable assistance I received.

Dr. Lee will be missed not only as a good husband, father, grandfather, and friend but as a highly respected scholar who contributed much to the world of sociology and, in particular, demography.

C. Jack Tucker



Migration in Relation to Education, Intellect, and Social Structure

Author(s): Everett S. Lee

Source: *Population Index*, Oct. - Dec., 1970, Vol. 36, No. 4 (Oct. - Dec., 1970), pp. 437-444

Published by: Office of Population Research

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.com/stable/2734064>

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

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



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

JSTOR

C U R R E N T I T E M S

MIGRATION IN RELATION
TO EDUCATION, INTELLECT,
AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE

In his presidential address to this Association some years ago Rupert Vance, that wittyest of demographers, posed the question, "Is theory for demographers?"

Noting the proliferation of empirical studies and the paucity of theoretical ventures, he wondered, "If there is room in demography for the timid souls, is there also room for the bold and audacious?" /1

The response may have been slow in coming, but tonight I shall exhibit an audacity that may make even the redoubtable Dr. Vance quail. Throwing empirical considerations to the winds and moving far beyond the bounds of established knowledge, I shall attempt to delineate some theoretical connections among migration, education, the structure of intellect, and the structure of society. In doing this, I shall draw examples from the American scene partly because that is what I know best and partly because I believe that the United States, technologically the most advanced nation, has blazed a trail that must be followed by developing countries as they proceed toward a similar economic level.

To the foreign observer, two of the most striking aspects of American life are the incessant, crisscrossing migration of the population and the attempt to educate outrageously high proportions to advanced levels. I shall argue that there is a necessary relationship between the two and that without high rates of migration mass education would lose much of its value. I shall further maintain that our attitudes toward migration and education reflect an implicit view of the structure of intellect that leads to a high degree of educational and occupational specialization. And as the division of labor becomes more intricate, competition becomes fiercer, but rewarding to a larger number, to so many, in fact, that the traditional view of a broadly based but abruptly narrowing social structure can no longer be maintained.

From the earliest times to the present, there have been those who deplored the American readiness to leave the homes of their ancestors and to begin life anew in distant places. Among them were Joseph Kennedy, the Superintendent of the Census for 1850, who opined, "The roving tendency of our people is incident to the peculiar condition of their country, and each succeeding Census will prove that it is diminishing. When the fertile plains of the West shall have been filled up, and men of scanty means cannot by a mere change of location acquire a homestead, the inhabitants of each State will become comparatively stationary, and our countrymen will exhibit that attachment to the homes of their childhood, the want of which is sometimes cited as an unfavorable trait in our national character." /2

Kennedy's prediction was not fulfilled, and from his point of view our national character remains as bad as ever. From historical data we can

Editor's Note. — This is the revised text of the address delivered by Everett S. Lee, University of Massachusetts, President of the Population Association of America, at the banquet on the evening of April 17, 1970, at Atlanta, Georgia, as part of the annual meeting of the Association.

find no evidence that there has been a long-term downward movement in rates of migration. And from the Current Population Survey, which gives us annual estimates of migration over the last twenty years, we find that with surprisingly little variation, one American in five has changed his place of residence each year, one in fourteen has migrated from one county to another, and one in thirty has made the longer move from one state to another.

Kennedy was right, however, in his judgment that marked differences in regions, especially in regard to the degree of settlement, furnish powerful inducements to migration. But the end of settlement does not imply the end of spatial differentiation. The desirable or undesirable features of an area change with technology, with the shifting importance of a given resource, with the spread of transportation and communication, and with the location of industry. And it should not be forgotten that areas are differentiated in social and psychological aspects. Discrimination can be a powerful determinant of migration. Important spatial differences, therefore, remain, but it could be argued that they have diminished. A goodly proportion of the population now lives in metropolitan fringes, and much of our migration is from one suburb directly to another. Among these there is such deadly similarity that areal differentiation may well have decreased in importance as an impelling force in migration.

This brings us to one of the anomalies of American migration. As the country was settled and the distribution of population came to depend chiefly upon the location and spread of urban conglomerates, migration might have been expected to decrease. The farm population has been reduced to a point where it no longer furnishes a major reservoir of surplus population. The migration of people, and the same is true of the migration of industry, has become largely a movement within urban agglomerations or between essentially similar metropolises.

The decrease in migration that could have been expected to occur as empty areas filled and as the different regions grew in similarity, I shall now argue, has not occurred because there has been an offsetting increase in the diversity of people. A major factor in this regard is an educational system devoted to increasing certain important differences among people.

No other country has attempted to educate so high a proportion of its population beyond the elementary level, and no other country has given such enthusiastic support to education at the college and university level. At present about three-quarters of American youths complete high school, and more than half of the graduates attempt some sort of additional education. High as these proportions are, we may expect them to increase, since the education of parents is an important determinant of the educational attainment of the child. Where both parents are college graduates, all but a tiny fraction of the children complete high school and about seven out of eight go on to college.¹³ Projections of recent trends into the not too distant future indicate that we shall have a young adult population, more than a third of whom will be college graduates, while one in five will have training beyond that level. To many, these projections are horrifying and indeed have been cited by Europeans as indicating still another of the many American follies. An influential business group in West Germany, for example, has opposed their participation in such a ludicrous design by maintaining that no more than ten per cent of any age class is intellectually qualified for higher education.

Even here Cassandras have arisen to bemoan the supposed glut of Ph.D.'s, and a number of graduate schools have restricted enrollments. One is reminded of Seymour Harris' postwar predictions of an oversupply of college graduates. The American public, however, perhaps wiser in the ways of the world than university deans, still answers the question, "How many educated intelligences does a modern community need?" in much the same way as did the Scottish psychologist, Godfrey Thompson, "In short, as many as they can get." /4

In contrast to traditional European educational systems that were designed for elites, the American system has featured the education of the masses. On the whole, the European conception has been that intelligence is largely determined by some overall global factor, and higher education came to depend upon the ability to master either foreign languages, particularly the dead ones, or mathematics. By contrast, the implicit assumption underlying the American system is that inability in a particular branch of knowledge is not a necessary deterrent to all learning or to future productivity. By varying the curriculum and shaping the courses for the students, rather than the reverse, the American system proclaims the eminent usefulness of persons who, judged by narrower criteria, would have been shunted at an early age into the lower and middle ranks of the labor force.

In the American system there is a recognition, more implicit than explicit, of a structure of intellect something like that expressed by such psychologists as J. P. Guilford. Without necessarily denying the existence of some global factor that may raise or lower whole batteries of abilities, it is presumed that the interaction of several basic intellectual processes gives rise to a rather large number of abilities possessed by each person in varying degrees. For nearly all of us the majority of our abilities are about average, but there are some that we possess to a better than usual degree and some that are better not mentioned. We are all mosaics of abilities, and for each of us there should be some things that we can do well and some that we can do but poorly.

We need not be concerned here with whether manifest abilities are determined more by heredity or by environment. The fact is that the expression of basic abilities can be heightened through the arousal of interest and through training and practice. This is evident in the seemingly miraculous performances of star athletes, but is no less remarkable in the ingenious solution of mathematical problems. The arousal of interest and the sharpening of abilities can begin very early and have considerable effect. It is not simply the inheritance of certain basic abilities that causes the sons of doctors and the sons of lawyers to follow in their fathers' footsteps. It is also the arousal of interest and the creation of a milieu that emphasize the desirability of a particular vocation.

Very early the American educational system expanded to take in a wide segment of the population and persons with varying abilities. It seems that the purpose of primary education has been to make people alike in that certain basic knowledge has been imparted to all students, but beginning in high school pupils have been differentiated according to perceived abilities. Rather than demanding that all students adapt themselves to a single rigidly prescribed series of courses, there has been an attempt to adapt different types of instruction to the abilities of the students. From high school onward, the purpose of education has been to make people different by heightening selected series of abilities.

The flexibility of the schools is reinforced by the insistence of the economy upon workers with highly specialized skills. The increase in the size of enterprises, both public and private, encourages the division of labor, and the farther one proceeds up the educational or socio-economic ladder, the greater the degree of specialization. Thus we have no more "chemists" but "organic chemists" or "biochemists," and within the tiny fraternity of demographers the generalist is yielding to experts in fertility, mortality, or migration.

A particular specialization requires the possession of a particular set of abilities. This does not mean that a person with a specific set of abilities should ideally pursue only one occupation, but rather it indicates a number of possibilities from which one can be chosen. Individuals can and do change occupations while continuing to exploit the same series of abilities. Nevertheless, an increasing number of specializations have arisen that require specific training and that are engaged in by relatively few people. There is little feeling in this country for the gifted amateur, the "liberal arts" graduate, who traditionally has risen to top management in Britain to become the bane of their faltering industrial system. Nor is there the British pattern of social and economic discrimination against the technician, or the relegation of applied science and technology to institutions of lesser repute.

While specialization is most apparent among the best educated, it extends into areas that are less demanding in terms of years of school completed. Thus air traffic controllers may be counted as highly specialized as are urologists, and we have all become aware of our dependence upon the whims of such a small group. Similar considerations hold for diamond cutters and for pipefitters, for oil drillers and for ballistics experts. While it is true that the practitioners of certain specialties, say diamond cutting, may be concentrated in a few places like New York, Amsterdam, and Israel, the demand for many kinds of specialists, while small at a given place, is widespread in space. Air traffic controllers and demographers are needed in Atlanta and Seattle as well as in New York. Even psychiatrists are found outside the confines of Manhattan, a situation that may attest as much to the spread of wealth as to the incidence of need.

Whatever the genetic factors in intellect, they are not likely to operate in such fashion that persons with a given set of abilities are likely to be born in the places where they eventually pursue careers. They will be born and raised in many places, but they are likely to be brought together in a very few places for advanced training. From the educational institutions they must be dispersed throughout the country, and rarely will they return to the place of birth except in those instances where the locality, like New York City, Chicago, Los Angeles, London, or Tokyo, is practically a nation in itself.

Before proceeding further, let us establish some of the connections that were promised at the beginning of this discourse. It is well known that there is a close and positive relationship between the rate of migration and the number of years of school completed. This relationship is nearly as invariable as that between age and migration, and it holds for every country for which I have been able to find data. This is particularly true of long-distance migration. In 1955-1960, for example, more than half of the whites and a third of the nonwhites in the age group 25-29 moved from one country to another within the United States. In general the rate

of migration was twice as high for college graduates as it was for persons at the bottom of the educational scale. While there was a great deal of intracounty movement by the poorly educated, their rate of migration, relative to that for the college trained, fell sharply as the distance of migration increased.

That the postulated relationship between migration and education exists needs no further demonstration. But is it a necessary one? I argue that it is. And proceeding immediately to reductio ad absurdum, I note that the University of Illinois would soon inundate Champaign-Urbana with chemists were it not that they move away. The hopes of farmers for their children are doubtless considerable, but when they have been processed through the universities there is little need for their new skills in the open country. For the uneducated, perception is limited to the immediate vicinity or to places included in the information network of friends and relatives. For the most educated, however, the labor market is national or international. The aircraft engineer in Baltimore is well aware of happenings in Seattle, and the Boeing designer knows about the troubles at Lockheed.

While I do not deny that laborers, or others at the bottom of the economic heap, develop some measure of specialization, they usually depend upon a wide range of abilities in performing the shifting and generalized tasks to which they are usually assigned. They find a variety of demands for the manual or poorly intellectualized skills that they have to offer, and are perhaps more often driven to migration by generally poor economic conditions at origin than they are attracted by lucrative offers or climatic amenities in distant places. For the highly educated specialist, however, the demand can be urgent and locally unfillable. For this man, there are many inducements to migration, not all of them pecuniary. For the best educated, society has created an impressive series of rewards for migration. Presidencies of firms and professorships in universities come fastest to those who are willing to migrate, and many organizations have adopted a deliberate policy of moving their top employees from place to place. Key specialists can seldom be stockpiled, nor can they be replaced by persons moving upward from lesser positions. Thus the interests of the economy and of the individual are best served by the fluid movement of those who are hardest to replace. The relationship between migration and education is indeed a necessary one.

Let me summarize up to this point by noting that our immigrant experience has served us well. A nation of migrants, we have achieved a freedom from binding ties to home and locality — the counterbalance to the rootlessness deplored by Superintendent Kennedy a century ago — that permitted the rapid settlement of a continental expanse and that still facilitates the quick exploitation of economic opportunity, no matter where it arises. While we probably have the highest rates of migration in the world, particularly when we restrict consideration to long-distance movement, we find high rates of migration in other advanced countries such as Canada and Sweden. At best the data are sketchy, but it is probably safe to assert that the highest rates of migration are found in those countries having the highest per capita income or in those that are in states of rapid transition from traditional to modern economies. Sustained economic growth and development depend upon maximizing the usefulness of human resources through the development, primarily in formal educational settings, of specific abilities, and the fluid movement of highly trained per-

sons to any place where they may be needed. Neither will occur without the implicit assumption that intellect is multifaceted and that high proportions of the population possess natural abilities that can be brought to near perfection through the arousal of interest and the proper training.

Let us now consider some of the consequences in terms of competition for status and social structure. In a primitive or agrarian society, cooperation rather than competition may be stressed. Here the differences between people are minimized because everyone uses a wide range of abilities in the performance of daily tasks. Since most of the abilities possessed by an individual are average in character, achievements tend to be similar. Most people, in fact, perform the same tasks. There is some specialization, of course, but even that may be based primarily upon inheritance, as is suggested by the many names, like Smithson, which include the designation for a male child coupled with the name of an occupation. Leadership itself is inherited. Chiefs are the sons of chiefs, and the possession of land is a common attribute of status. People ordinarily die in the same status in which they were born, and social mobility occurs only under extreme conditions. A brave man may rise from peasantry to leadership in the course of battle, while epilepsy may elevate the swineherd to shaman. Everybody knows everybody else, and there is no escaping one's inheritance or the follies of one's youth. A man lives and dies in the place where he was born, rules of endogamy permitting, or if migration occurs the whole village may move together. A geographically static society is a socially static society.

Quite a different set of social relations appears in modern societies. Leadership is no longer hereditary, and no male is judged on the basis of overall abilities. Instead, opportunities are provided for developing a specific set of abilities that lead in turn to the adoption of specializations. Competition within the specialization is keen, since, except for the unfortunate and the ill advised, the requisite abilities are possessed by almost all the practitioners of the art. Nevertheless, a relatively large number of people can have the aura of high achievement. How many have the comfortable feeling of being one of a handful of leading experts on mathematical demography, or on cohort analysis in fertility, or of similar esoteric specialties? How many have been directors of respected associations? How many are fellows of learned societies, and to how many have senators and governors, even the White House, turned for advice?

The greater the degree of specialization, the greater the number of intellectual compartments into which we fit ourselves, and the greater the number who can achieve some semblance of eminence. A feeling of rare achievement comes to many, but even for those who never make the pages of leading journals and who never sit at head tables, there are compensations. Recall that specialists tend to be scattered geographically and that their services are frequently crucial. An air traffic controller may not be the best of his ilk, but when he fails to show up for work in Kansas City, we may miss him sorely. The only cardiologist in a corn-shaded county of Iowa may be no great shakes as far as his colleagues in the metropolitan hospitals are concerned, but to the general public in time of emergency and to the local medical men with whom he consults, he is a man of nearly boundless authority. The state of the entire economy can depend upon a few key specialists, as can our lives, and we tend to reward them not only in accordance with their capacities but also in accordance with our needs.

There is, of course, no precise way of evaluating one specialty against another. From time to time one rises to special attention, as did nuclear physics in the 'forties and 'fifties and molecular biology in the 'sixties. The 'seventies will doubtless see considerable expansion of demography and ecology, and there will emerge many industrial specializations not yet dreamed of but that will be just as tiny and just as crucial to the national economy as the group of air traffic controllers. Within our own specializations we may reap encomiums, but we must nevertheless pay homage to each of the others.

There are therefore many ways of achieving status, and this multiplicity of avenues to the top has created a social structure that is no longer one with a tiny group of leaders and fashion setters, lording it over a large, undifferentiated mass of lesser beings. The top of the social structure is much wider, and it continues to broaden. It consists, however, of an elite that is geographically mobile, with loose ties to place and neighbors, with broad and national rather than narrow and local concerns.

The top of the social structure is broader, but it is no longer one, like that of Malthus' England, where the intellectual and the ruling elites all know each other. Instead, relationships tend to be concentrated within a discipline or within a vocation, a tendency encouraged by the telephone and the airplane. Like professional soldiers, other specialists form relationships despite separation in space, and events occurring across the continent may be deemed more immediate in effect than local happenings. These elite may never meet their neighbors, yet maintain the liveliest of contacts with colleagues across hundreds of miles.

A disturbing view of our developing society? In many ways, yes. What sense of community can these wanderers have, and if they have little regard for local surroundings since they may soon leave, who will lead the fight on local blight? Do wives and children adjust as easily to new surroundings as do family heads, whose relationships with the place of destination were well developed even before migration? Is a large part of the upper stratum of the social order to live in a constant state of anomie?

Surely the costs of this kind of social change are great, but so are the benefits. Mass education and migration have greatly increased the possibilities of social advancement, and they have brought profound changes to the social structure. Both depend, however, upon a concept of intellect that assigns many but uneven abilities to the individual. The end result may perhaps be viewed as a broadening of democracy through the multiplication of elites.

REFERENCES

- 1/ Rupert B. Vance. Is theory for demographers? Social Forces 31(1): 9-13. Oct. 1952. P. 11.
- 2/ Joseph Kennedy. Report of the Superintendent of the Census for December 1, 1852. Washington, 1853. P. 15.

- 3/ U. S. Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 190. School enrollment: October 1968 and 1967. Washington, 1969. [i], II, 57 pp.
- 4/ Godfrey Thompson. Intelligence and civilization. In: Stephen Wiseman, Editor. Intelligence and ability. Baltimore, Penguin Books, 1967. P. 123.

ZERO POPULATION GROWTH Zero population growth, as platitude, sales slogan or urgent goal, has caught the public by storm — and included in that public are many biologists and economists, as well as a considerable number of sociologists and demographers.

From one point of view, favoring zero population growth is somewhat like favoring the laws of motion. Anyone who knows how to use a table of logarithms must be aware that in the long run the average rate of population growth will approach zero as a limit. If, for example, the world's population had grown at its present rate since the beginning of the Christian era, the water content of the human race would fill a sphere having a radius more than ten times that of the earth. Zero growth is, then, not simply a desirable goal; it is the only possibility in a finite world. One cannot object to people who favor the inevitable.

There is another group that values zero population growth because it is a powerful sales slogan. They are willing to accept, even to promote, the slogan, despite its ambiguity, because of the energy and resources it brings to the subject of population. Some of these supporters foster the popular impression that population growth could be stopped quickly by acceptable means if only the public were alerted to the dangers of the situation; and a few of them advance this line despite their private opinions to the contrary. They justify this lack of candor on the grounds that egregious overstatement is necessary to arouse public interest. They seem to feel that it takes massive advertising to sell both soap and the ecological necessity for a prompt end to population growth. With that I am inclined to agree. But it is a sad day when we see professionally expert distortions of the truth peddled to the public under the highest scientific auspices, as if truth can be fostered best by untruth. When scientists become concerned with reform, as I think duty indeed requires, they will at their peril abandon the ardent respect for truth that lies at the basis of their professions. It is hard enough to stick to the truth when one tries. Fortunately, this huckstering group is only a small part of those who see zero population growth as a slogan that arouses interest in objectives perceived to be both timely and important. To this there can be no objection. It is our obligation to stick to the truth, but we are not compelled to be dull about it.

Editor's Note. — This is the revised text of the invited paper by Frank W. Notestein presented at the annual meeting of the Population Association of America at Atlanta, April 17, 1970, together with the comments of the three discussants, Philip M. Hauser, Judith Blake, and Paul Demeny.