

Association of America. There were Thompson and [P.K.] Whelpton at Scripps, Clyde Kiser at the Milbank Memorial Fund. Whelpton was an agricultural economist and taught down at Texas A & M College, where I had gone to school. I didn't meet him while I was there.

There were interlocking relationships. In the early 1940s, I was offered a job by the commissioner on hospital care of the American Hospital Association. One of the first people they checked me out with was Warren Thompson--wanted to know if Hamilton would do any good as a demographer on their staff. Warren evidently gave me a good recommendation, so I got the job. It moved my salary from about \$4500 up to \$8000 just within one year. Is Warren living?

KISER: No, he died about nine years ago. He'd been out of his mind for a couple of years.

HAMILTON: T.J. Woofter is another man I would meet at all the meetings and enjoyed contacts with him. In fact, Woofter asked me to write a paper, do a study on rural-urban migration in the Tennessee Valley. So we did that. Conrad Taeuber [PAA president 1948-49] sort of alarmed me. Back under the old FERA [Federal Emergency Relief Administration], he wrote a series of bulletins on the rural population and collectivization. [Something about Ohio State.]

SPENGLER: I played volleyball at Ohio State with [Charles] Lively. He was an exceptionally good volleyballer. If you got first choice, you got him. The ag economists went to Ohio State. I thought the ag economists were much more realistic than the rest of them.

KISER: I went to the population conference in Paris in 1937 [IUSSP] and Lively was there and he told me that Thompson had offered him the job in Scripps before he offered it to Whelpton.

ROSENBERG: Joe, can you tell about your first association with the PAA?

SPENGLER: I was interested in this thing [population] very early, because when I lived in the country we had a very good library in my hometown. So I'd take the stuff home, particularly if it looked like the weather was going to be bad, because I wouldn't have to go to school, for which I was always grateful. I got hold of Malthus's Essay one time and you know he has a couple of formulas in there, forecasting population. I told my father that and he said that was a lot of malarkey; nobody could forecast the population. I guess he was righter than I was.

So I had this interest from then on, which was back when I was in--I must have been about freshman high school. I went to Ohio State and I wasn't aware yet of [A.B.] Wolfe's things, but I had a very good professor of ancient history and he liked me and took me to lunch and was telling me about Wolfe. So then I got in with A.B. Wolfe immediately and I think he was one of the charter members of the PAA. So my interest in this was very early. But I cannot remember the first meeting I went to. See, I was at Duke in 1932-33 and then I went back to Arizona in 1933-34. I got one trip from Arizona to Cleveland in 30-31. Times were hard and people were being paid in [warrants?] the year I was at Duke.

I clearly remember going to a meeting when we were all invited to the White House. This must have been the Washington meeting in 1935. What I remember then was there was a man named Frank--L.K. Frank--in the chair. There was some argument--I never felt that social sciences should be pushing anything or propagandizing, though I did think that all issues are subject to examination, and I felt a certain hostility to concern with birth control matters. Of course, Norman Himes was an exception to that. I think that upset Frank a little. I had the feeling that we were enraging everyone.

A lot of my work was with Kuczynski, because I was at the Brookings Institution in 1926-27--the Institute of Economics--and Kuczynski was there working on his two books on Europe. I was

studying the movement of fertility in New England, mainly, because that's where the data were best. So that's what I wrote on, and migration and so on. Then I went back to Ohio State. I think Wolfe and Brookings and all got me involved in the PAA. So as I had an opportunity to go to the meeting--maybe the Washington one was the first, or the previous one. So I got in around the beginning.

KISER: The first annual conference [organizing meeting; May 7, 1931] was in New York and the following three meetings, 1932, 1933, 1934--at the Town Hall Club. Fairchild was a sort of resident manager of the Town Hall Club; his office was there. In 1935 we came to Washington.

ROSENBERG: I'm interested in this reception that Eleanor Roosevelt gave. What was the occasion?

SPENGLER: It wasn't much of a reception. We just marched down, arrived, Fairchild stood next to Mrs. Roosevelt and introduced each of us and we shook hands. I thought the White House very stuffy. At the Brookings Institution we'd look out and see the White House and I always referred to it as "your inferiority complex."

KISER: I remember that while we were in session, Eleanor Roosevelt came over and made some remarks to the group. She sat right behind me. Fred Osborn brought her. I wanted a good look at her, so I just turned around and looked and she gave me this stern look. She sat there and knitted while Carter Goodrich was giving his paper on migration and economic opportunity.

SPENGLER: Rupert Vance was there. She was especially solicitous with Rupert; he was crippled by polio.

KISER: At this White House reception, a young guard saw us all starting up the stairs and saw Vance come along on his crutches, so he crooked his finger and took him into a little elevator.

SPENGLER: One thing that struck me early in the game was how many people were interested in population. I was just looking at something I'd forgotten about--a chap named Punke, he was down at Georgia State Women's College in Augusta. I don't remember him from Adam, but the thing that struck me was he had an interest in this. We had some correspondence. Like Horace, I had the feeling that there were a large number of people interested and you had an opportunity to get acquainted.

I bought Lotka's book [Elements of Physical Biology, 1924?; Analyse demographique, 1939?, or other?]. I thought that was the greatest book I read in the first 50 years of my life. What it showed me was the rich variety of matters that [centered on population]. This was what I got out of Wolfe's course on population; you had to study geography and this, that, and the other. As an economist, when people asked me what I was doing and I said I'm working on population. "Well, what's that?" I just let the fools suffer in silence and never paid attention. My wife said I was really rude. The thing that caught my eye and what led me to introduce a course on it just as soon as I could was that you had a tremendous range of materials; all kinds of things emerged here. As far as an economist was concerned there was nothing else.

I first took the course with Wolfe. Then when he went away once, I took it over for him, I think for a term. I went to Arizona and introduced it there even in my second semester or second year, when I had some freedom to put something in. And when I came to Duke, I immediately introduced it there. I was supposedly a labor economist. What I got from Wolfe was a wide range. Check the journals; he wrote a tremendous lot on this. I've been tempted to write a lengthy paper on his contribution. But that's how it came.

Then things just kept enlarging and you had more and more angles. And down here in the South--as long as we were poor in the South and it's hell to be considered other than poor--we were the scheduled classes, so we got a certain amount of money from the SSRC [Social Science Research Council] without being questioned.

ROSENBERG: What's that you have there?

SPENGLER: That's the proceedings of one of our meetings, "The Third Annual Southern Social Scientists Research Conference in New Orleans, 1937." We had a regional meeting every spring; Raymond Thomas was the chairman. Rupert Vance went every year and we would get a car--four or five would go. We got the money. There was nothing to splurge on, of course. This was about the South--a major theme was always the population problem in one character or another, much of it on agriculture and migration and so on. Simon Kuznets came down one time.

ROSENBERG: Was it always focused on population?

SPENGLER: No, that was a component. But you had a number of people in the South who worked in this and then you got tied in with the population. In addition--as I remarked to Horace--Rural Sociology came into being and my own feeling was that up to the time of World War II that was the best sociological journal in the United States if you were interested in demography.

So there was a general kind of syndrome of concerns. And this fed the Population Association. I think we brought a considerable impact from the South into it, because these urban characters from up in New England didn't understand anything about agriculture anyway. We were able, I think, to give a certain orientation it might not otherwise have had.

ROSENBERG: Do you think you can tell that when you look through the officers--the impact of Southerners on the Association?

SPENGLER: Well, you've had Rupert Vance [PAA president 1951-52], who's a distinguished demographer from the very start, continuing somewhat, I think, Odum's concerns with regionalism.

KISER: T.J. Woofter, Jr. [president 1940-41], too. Odum's Southern Regions was published in 1936.

SPENGLER: Yes, Woofter was particularly interested in what you call the labor force replacement ratio or something. Several people here in the sociology department. These things all touched upon the population excess here in the South. We had a particular orientation when we were working locally and we also had a good empirical orientation, because there was so much to go on.

ROSENBERG: Was a major concern at that time with labor excess in general, let's say, during the 1930s--as a population issue?

SPENGLER: Well, the high rate of fertility among the least privileged agricultural people, particularly the blacks. Whether it was white or black, you had a very heavy fertility and they therefore didn't have the opportunity to elevate their kids upward.

You had the shortage of education and the South spent their small budgets relatively more on education than a good many places, but you couldn't get any federal help on education to speak of, as I recall.

You had mobile human capital and you were here and it's all growing up in the South. That

was beginning to move North, because we'd had the previous experience of the heavy movement during World War I. I think that comes out with Kuznets and Dorothy Thomas and those studies. So that was mobile human capital. We didn't turn it into technical terms. The economists talked about the "learning effect." Well, every damn dog is subject to a learning effect. So we didn't fancy it up; we just looked at it in the country. So there was a real sense about what was going on. We had Social Forces too and then Rural Sociology and these fugitive publications. Of course, Horace knows a lot more about these than I do. But that's what made an impression on me.

You had another thing that could have been tied in; you had the National Resources Planning Board set up in Washington, about 1932 or 33. You had two books on trends in the U.S. First there was one during Hoover's time, in the 1920s [William Ogburn?--headed the staff of Hoover's Research Committee on Social Trends], and then there was one in which Whelpton and Thompson had their first projections, that was published by McGraw Hill [Population Trends in the United States, 1933]. And the sequel to that, the National Resources Planning Board report [Problems of a Changing Population, 1938]. There were all kinds of inquiries. A good deal of this stuff grew out of Southern demographers, I think. Some of the work that had been done sort of fed into that, stirred it up.

I was always interested--as I think Warren Thompson was--in city size. My point was that a big city ought to be burned out, and that's now been confirmed. I had an argument with the New York Times editor on that. I did a piece on city size and migration. It never got published because we went to war just as I was finishing up. This is by way of saying that the interest ranged fairly widely in the National Resources Planning Board.

I think in the history of empirical social science, say from 1929 on, you'd find a whole network of things that fed into each other, to which in a way the demographers contributed a great deal. Not so much in technological terms, although they did very good empirical statistics, I thought, but in the sense of pointing to empirical issues they felt affected man's material welfare. I've been trying to interest one or two graduate students over at our place [Duke] to do something like this.

ROSENBERG: That would be somewhat an intellectual history?

SPENGLER: Yes, it would. But I think it would also throw light on the strengths and weaknesses of how you organize.

This is a little aside from the Population Association, but my point is that we had a whole network of things, because we had a network of interrelated problems. I know that Horace had a lot that he was working with on this. And you, Clyde, up there where you were [Milbank Memorial Fund in New York], you were working at you might say the other side, except for the measurements.

INTERRUPTION. Talking about Rupert Vance as tape resumes.

SPENGLER: One thing that always struck me about Rupert, you never could do anything whatever to help him. We were at VPI and he went up three flights of stairs to do a radio program. The only time Rupert would accept any assistance from me was when we were in Philadelphia, maybe when I was president [1957 PAA meeting, when Spengler was president, was in Philadelphia]. It was windy as hell; just bitter on that elevation. And I sheltered him because his circulation couldn't contend with that. That's the only time it was ever possible for me to extend any assistance.

Rupert introduced me when I made my presidential address ["Aesthetics of Population," published as a Population Bulletin of the Population Reference Bureau, June 1957].

HAMILTON: He gazed out over the audience and said, "I know this audience is a typical demographic table--all broken down by age and sex." That's funny. I can't remember your speech but

I remember that. I never was much of a joke-teller but one of the great joys I always had was at these meetings and hearing Vance tell some off-color jokes.

SPENGLER: Two people that always beat anybody else. One was T. Lynn Smith. Clyde Kiser would always have three or four up his sleeve; he'd try them out on me first. T. Lynn always used to have several on blacks.

HAMILTON: Woofter was awfully good too. I thought a lot of T.J. He was very good on methodology--undercounting of blacks in the 1940 or 1930 population census. He pinned down that they'd undercounted 150,000. He was very much interested in that.

When I talked to Woofter about one problem I had, he suggested using another method and he was right, but I wanted an argument at that time. I later recognized that he knew what he was talking about.

On the Southern regions, T.J. Woofter had a special methodology for delineating regions, special kinds of regions, sort of out of character with Odum's generalized approach. But I wonder if it wasn't good to take off from some of Woofter's work, because he adapted Hotelling's method of factor analysis of central components, first components.

KISER: If I might make a serious remark, someone once defined the South as that part of the country in which if you wanted something good to eat you had to go to a Jewish delicatessen.

ROSENBERG: Clyde, could I ask you how somebody from Gaston County developed an interest in population? Do you come from a big family, for example?

KISER: No, there were five of us--three boys and two girls. And my own household is four.

Well, I came to the University of North Carolina as a freshman in 1921. I dropped out and taught in high school a year. Then I heard about Odum's work here, through Jennings Rhyne. Jennings told me he would support me in an application for a fellowship. I didn't get a fellowship, but I got a scholarship that first year when I came back to work on a master's degree. Then after I took the master's degree, I planned to go on but I got hooked up with the study of St. Helena Island, a project Woofter was running there.

SPENGLER: What was your master's?

KISER: My master's thesis was on liquor law violations in Durham and Person counties.

Frank Ross--he used to be editor of the Journal of the American Statistical Association--he and Jack Woofter were doctoral students together at Columbia and they were good friends. So they hatched up the idea of this study of St. Helena Island. I got hooked in with that. We ran into the fact down there that a lot of these Negroes had moved north, although this was not a place where Negroes were downtrodden so much. They were poor but they owned their own little plots of land. And they've had very little in the way of racial tension because there are very few whites there. But still they were moving. So they hatched up the idea that it might be well if I transferred to Columbia, if they wanted me there, and collect some data on Harlem Negroes and then come back to North Carolina for my degree.

Well, I got up there and I liked the group up there pretty well. I became good friends with Frank Ross. As a matter of fact, I gave blood to his infant daughter--I was her blood type--my first year up there; so I happened to fit in very well with him and his family. So I stayed up there for the degree. I was already initiated into demography more or less--Negro migration--and I took Chaddock's courses in vital statistics and population.

Then in the summer of 1931, Chaddock showed me a letter he had from Frank Notestein. Frank Notestein said they had a lot of 1900 and 1910 census data on children ever born that needed analyzing and they had a fellowship for a year, for which I applied. So I went to the Milbank Memorial Fund in 1931. And I learned pretty soon there about the PAA. My immediate supervisor was Frank Notestein and Sydenstricker was above him. So I learned that a young organization, the PAA, was just beginning. They had had their organizational meeting on May 7th, 1931.

I might say a word or two about the circumstances of that organization. In my PAA presidential address, "The Population Association Comes of Age" [1953, published in Eugenical News, December 1953], I mentioned predisposing causes and immediate factors responsible for the Association. Among the predisposing factors was the increasing interest in demography during the 1920s. The Scripps Foundation started in 1922. Pearl and Reed had developed their logistic curve and Pearl had written Biology of Population Growth and at Scripps, Thompson and Whelpton were starting work on their projections. At the Metropolitan [Life Insurance Company], Dublin and Lotka had come out with "On the true rate of natural increase" [1925]. And in 1928, the Milbank division of research was started to do research on population.

The immediate factor I saw was the stimulus given by the formation of the International Union [for the Scientific Investigation of Population Problems/IUSSP]. The International Union was formed in 1928 and that grew out of a World Population Conference held in Geneva in 1927. Margaret Sanger organized that. Margaret Sanger did more for getting population started than we give her credit for. She approached an anonymous source for money for that 1927 conference and she got it. She approached the Milbank Fund for money for the International Union and she got it. She approached the Fund for money for this first little organizational meeting of the PAA and she got that. Now the amounts were relatively small. For the PAA it was just \$600 to pay Thompson and Whelpton's fare and a few people coming up from Washington, things of that sort. But she got the money on behalf of Fairchild. Fairchild did the legwork in getting the organization started. The Fund supported the International Union the first three years of its existence almost in full. It gave, I believe, \$10,000 a year, or \$30,000 for the three years 1928-31, and the Rockefeller Foundation chipped in with additional support.

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.

SPENGLER: Did you know anything about C.E. McGuire. He was at Brookings; a Catholic. I had lots of arguments with him when I was at Brookings. He was a brilliant man, very sharp and all, but a profound Catholic, and, of course, I had run-ins with him periodically on this. He was the correspondent to the London Economist too. I didn't know how he happened to get in [the PAA], because he had an ideological concern, I thought, rather more than a substantive concern.

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]

SPENGLER: In recent years, there's been a great resurgence of interest in fertility and family planning, which is really birth control, and all of these new people that have come in on family planning have now joined the Population Association and almost swamped it. That's gone full cycle. But I think the group interested in the scientific approach is so large now and dominant with the journals--Population Studies in England, Population in France, and our Demography and Population Index. By the way, do you know anything about this new World Population Society?

KISER: They're people in Washington. It's sort of an alarmist group, I guess. I couldn't make much out of it.

SPENGLER: I couldn't either; I didn't join it. Funny thing, I belong to the International Union and their dues now are up to \$40. They haven't followed all my other societies, like American Sociological Association, Population Association, Southern and so on, which have reduced the rates for elderly people down to practically nothing. The members of the Union get sort of a double rake. Your dues to the International Union are supposed to include subscription to Population Index along with Population Studies and Population. But we American members are paying for Population Index twice, that is, we get it along with Demography as PAA members.

KISER: I heard that American members of the Union would get a reduced rate because of that. [IUSSP members get a reduced rate in PAA because their subscription to Population Index is covered by IUSSP dues.]

KISER: I joined the Population Association before that first annual meeting [1932] but I didn't get into the College of Fellows. I was just a young squirt. John Innes and I attended that first annual meeting together in the spring of 1932 at the Town Hall Club. I think we were about the only two there--besides the birth controllers, Mrs. Sanger maybe--who were not members of the College of Fellows. The College of Fellows was just a sifting device. It was made up of the very first charter members, the professors and the bigshots. They were to guard the scientific character and keep the birth controllers out.

HAMILTON: The fact that Frank Lorimer wrote me for the 75 copies of that bulletin--it was published in 1934 and he wrote me right after it came off the press--there must have been a relatively small number of members in 1934. [PAA records show "around 100" members in late 1934-early 1935.]

SPENGLER: What about Walter Willcox?

KISER: Willcox was never president of the Association. He attended the early meetings all right. He even attended that [IUSSP] conference in Paris in 1937. I remember he attended a meeting at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington. He must have been well over 80 then, but he walked all over Washington. I went to his 100th anniversary at the Cosmos Club.

SPENGLER: He was over 100 when he died [103]. Got into Ripley [Believe It or Not] for that. I remember going to the Columbia Club for dinner around 1950 and he was sitting there eating with two or three people. I had corresponded with him on something and I went over and shook hands. He seemed quite spry; it was amazing, he was 100 years then.

KISER: After he got to about 100, he offered to be examined periodically by any medical group that might be interested and he did go several times to be examined. Notestein said he enjoyed being thumped by the doctors who examined him.

ROSENBERG: What was the secret of his long life?

SPENGLER: Good parents. I think a combination of genetics and culture factors. Individualistic factors too. I think nutrition has a hell of a lot to do with it and he probably got started on that. Then I think that genetically, some people do not generate excessive cholesterol or something like that--other factors that kill people off.

ROSENBERG: You say that Margaret Sanger was instrumental in generating a lot of resources and enthusiasm but that she somehow was kept out of the mainstream. Did she accept that role?

KISER: I think so. She must have seen what was happening. After all those things happened, she was quite willing to cooperate with a study of her birth control patients--Regine Stix and Notestein followed up 5,000 patients of the Margaret Sanger Clinic. She would have conferences with Notestein and Stix and take issue with them when she thought they were not showing birth control up in as good a light as she thought it should be, but she did things pretty good.

SPENGLER: Do you remember the journal called The Birth Control Review? I wrote things for that. Got invited to the first conference. You had old Charlotte Perkin--all these suffragettes--most entertaining conference I ever attended in my life. There was some pretty good stuff in that review and a lot of nonsense too. But it was in some degree a medium at a time when there was no other journal rather closely oriented [to population].

HAMILTON: I remember the year before I got married, I decided I ought to know as much as I could about birth control techniques. I wrote a personal letter to Margaret Sanger and asked her to send me any information she might have. She sent me an article and wrote me a letter and gave me the brand and name and everything which I could buy. I thought it was very instructive and to the point. As a matter of fact, I sent it to my prospective bride before we married. I wanted her to be sure of what was going to happen.

SPENGLER: She married a wealthy man, Mr. Clee, who lived in Arizona. She moved to Arizona not long after I came East. She was closely associated with the university people; very highly respected in

Tucson. She was very comfortable in her older years.

I remember one time I made a speech to women on how much wealth they owned and how much more they would own and how it got concentrated when they had smaller families. The Catholics hopped on me--"this stinking, vicious. . ." The president of the University of Arizona, he was a man of parts, he never paid any attention to people who hopped on his faculty--obviously it was a scholarly argument that I presented. I was just describing how family size affected how much wealth they had. There was quite a bit of writing in those days on wealth--this was about 1933.

You remember General Francis Walker? Well, a student of mine was writing on the significance of legislation by our Congress having to do with Indians. He had grown up on a reservation himself. He told me--and I hope I'm remembering this correctly--when Walker was made superintendent of the 1870 census, he didn't have an office. So they made him head of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and that way he got an office. He had a young yellow-haired military s.o.b. named Custer and he told Custer, "Well, if you want to make a name for yourself. . . [go after Indians?]" This was an easy way to do it.

KISER: Did you know that Willcox was the Census Bureau's chief statistician for population about 1912?

SPENGLER: He didn't have much in the way of high-powered techniques; he had simple methods. But he made a big impact. I got my vital statistics from E.B. Wilson, Harvard.

KISER: I wrote a chapter for Frank Lorimer in Problems of a Changing Population with a part in it on factors underlying group differences in fertility. I gave the biological factors and then went on to show that biological factors are not so important and most differences were due to differences in contraception. Without asking me, someone cut out the contraception part and it just ended on biological factors, attributing all these fertility differences to biological differences. Who did this? Old E.B. Wilson. [This incident is described more fully in the Notestein interview, above.]

SPENGLER: He was a mean bastard. He and Pearl had some way of ascertaining whether the other planned to go to a certain meeting and if he was to be there, the other wouldn't go. You know why? Old Pearl received an appointment at Harvard once and, according to the story, E.B. Wilson blackballed him. Blackballed him so that for a day or two Pearl was out on a limb. He'd already resigned from Johns Hopkins and then his appointment at Harvard was canceled because of E.B. Wilson's objection. But they took him back at Hopkins.

HAMILTON: Raymond Pearl [roused] a good deal of controversy on the logistics curve and that method of projections.

SPENGLER: Wolfe wrote a critique of it. Whelpton, in his first set of projections, his components method, he criticized the logistics curve.

HAMILTON: I lucked out pretty well on trying to make projections--a short method of projections of population from one decennial census to another for small groups. Came out in Social Forces in 1962. I wrote more papers and did more work with a practical interest after I retired as head of department and also when I was away from the department, like I did in Chicago with the American Hospital Association.

SPENGLER: I think Ed Hutchinson married E.B. Wilson's secretary. What did Wilson say to her?--

"Keep your mouth shut." He had a first-rate mind and he was a son of a bitch.

HAMILTON: Getting back to what PAA was like in the early days of my association with it and some of the central characters, I think two people that contributed, man and wife, as much as anybody else to PAA were Conrad Taeuber and Irene Taeuber. Irene, you know, edited Population Index for years.

I remember we had a meeting in Charlottesville [1954] and there was going to be a Negro invited, George Roberts, Jamaican, and Conrad Taeuber made arrangements to have him put up at the [Jefferson] Hotel. When he came to the hotel, he just assumed that arrangements had been made, but they wouldn't register him. Conrad Taeuber went through the ceiling on that. I think he got it worked out, but it was a nasty situation.

It's too bad Irene had a premature death. She had an offer to leave Princeton and go to Georgetown as professor at a very good salary. Princeton found out so they upped her salary and kept her. But she didn't live there; she lived in Washington.

ROSENBERG: Horace, you said you had some thought on your older recollections of PAA.

HAMILTON: I was a generalist on nearly everything--rural sociology, agriculture--and for that reason, I decided at one time that I was going to quit fooling around with population. I was going to stick to rural sociological surveys. I remember telling Dan Price or Rupert Vance that I was going to let the university over here do the armchair research and I was going to do my surveys. Well, I couldn't stick with that because the guy after Truesdell in the population division in the Census Bureau advised me to read a paper at one of the PAA meetings on net migration, techniques, and so on. I did it reluctantly. But gradually--you know, a man writes a paper or series of papers on a certain area and he begins to get tabbed--"Well, Hamilton is the guy to do that paper or say something about that."

ROSENBERG: Joe, what are your recollections of some of the early issues the Association was concerned with?

SPENGLER: I can't remember the issues too well. The thing that sticks best in my mind--something that sticks best in my memory respecting other organizations with which I was associated in the early salad days--was you had a sufficiently small group so we could hear most of the things that were presented. Furthermore, we knew each other, sort of speaking acquaintances, and there were people there with whom we had deeper common interests and it was easy to make contact and carry them on. You didn't have to plan ahead, because you played these things by ear. So what I liked was the smallness of the organization, rather than the conflict. The opportunity I had to get little views on things or lines on things that I could possibly make use of in my own research and teaching. Not so deep, but something I could jot down and stick in my head and go home and it would fester in my brain, even help me to teach or scholar or both.

Now you get these damn big markets. You can't have that anymore. There it was easy since you were all members of the same bark. You could go say, "I'd like to chat with you about this for a moment," and that was just standard protocol. That's what I remember. We got rid of most social scientists of all sorts and if we could restore that situation, I would be all in favor of it--provided I could survive the process.

HAMILTON: The universities would not pay traveling expenses to a faculty member unless they were delivering a paper. I got into trouble on that at Texas. I wanted to go to Detroit one year and deliver a paper on the social effects of the mechanization of agriculture, but they wouldn't pay my

expenses. I said, "I'm reading a paper there." They said, "We don't pay people's expenses just because they've got a paper. You have to have some other reason to go." So I paid my expenses that time, several hundred dollars, and I had to take it out of my meager salary and I didn't like that at all. I published it in I think it was Rural Sociology. Had a lot of fun writing it; Lynn Smith got me in on that. Incidentally, a lot of papers I've written have not been papers that I thought of myself, but papers other people persuaded me to write.

Later on, Everett Lee was chairman of the social science section of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, which was meeting in Cleveland in about 1961 or 62. He wanted me to write a paper at first on the Negro deserts the South. I didn't like that word "deserts" so put it "The Negro Leaves the South" [published in Demography, Vol. 1, 1964]. I got more requests for reprints on that paper, and also for it to be reprinted in other books and in other connections. At the same time, I got a request from Duke University--Edward Thompson and McKinney, I believe, were publishing books on the South. I had written this paper on the Negro and found it very easy to expand the same subject matter to whites and blacks and they thought so highly of it they put it Number 3 in the book.

I got some more mileage out of that paper. I was invited to address the alumni of North Carolina State University--they come back once a year--and the dean wanted me to make an address. I told him, "I have a paper which is going to be published and if you'll let me read it, I won't have to do any extra work." I did. The chancellor was there and all the other bigwigs and little wigs. I got a lot of mileage out of that paper, because people that I had met and known through the Population Association knew that this was something down my alley.

ROSENBERG: Clyde, could you say something about your feeling about the issues the Association was involved with and how it changed? The whole question of size is something I'm somewhat sensitive to, even over the brief period I've been associated with it. It has grown so rapidly. Last year for the first time, I went to the meeting of the Southern Regional Demographic Group, which is quite a small group. They have about a hundred people at their meetings. You get to know people over the two days on a face-to-face basis and it's much more personal. Leaves you feeling much better. People really talk to you about your presentation and you see them again at dinnertime and it's a very pleasant thing. I believe the Association size has been a real factor in changing the nature of it--at least as I hear you talking about all the people you interacted with through the Association.

KISER: Well, as I said, the original membership was around 38, according to Fairchild. I did a little spot map by state of them and most of them lived either in or around Washington or New York. The first three meetings, as I said, were held in the Town Hall Club and they were pretty small rooms. But then in 1935, the attendance did jump, because of the interest of the government workers. That topic in Washington was the relation of population to some of the New Deal programs. [Conference on "Population Studies in Relation to Social Planning," May 2-4, 1935. PAA fourth annual meeting was on May 3, 1935.]

The organization was different too. It was in some respects more loosely organized in those days.

HAMILTON: They didn't have sectional meetings; just one big program.

KISER: That's right. Everyone heard the same thing; they had one session going. It wasn't a three-ring circus. Now it's about 24 varieties.

HAMILTON: Clyde, you worked in the field of fertility--the tremendous Indianapolis Fertility Survey--we migration people got to feel maybe the fertility people were running off with things.

Dudley Kirk talked a bit about that in his presidential address ["Some Reflections on American Demography in the Nineteen Sixties," published in Population Index, October 1960].

SPENGLER: Yes, I believe he said--well, Warren Thompson used to say, "You can only be born once, but you move a hell of a lot."

KISER: And in another respect it was more tightly organized than now. The members voted on the Board of Directors and the Board of Directors appointed the officers. Furthermore, the Board of Directors was self-perpetuating. They would reappoint themselves. They didn't have this rule about not serving consecutive terms. So there were lots of complaints about a tight little group running things.

HAMILTON: I remember when that fight came to a head; I don't remember what year it was.

KISER: I'll tell you. It happened--not because of anything I did--but it happened in 1953, when I was president, that they did amend the constitution to put officer election on a membership basis. It was Con Taeuber who wrote and said he was going to propose this to the members. I rather resented it, because I had enough to do anyway getting ready to leave and then I had to read up on Robert's Rules of Order. But I think the thing worked pretty well. Phil Hauser was a bit pugnacious, so I wanted him on my side. He was the one I chose to introduce the motions one by one and then we'd vote on them. After the meeting was over, Irene Taeuber said, "You practically had that memorized" [Robert's Rules]. I sure did.

HAMILTON: Phil Hauser was president in 1950-51.

SPENGLER: He was president when they met here in Chapel Hill in 1951. We had two meetings here--1940 and 1951.

KISER: At the 1940 meeting here, Truesdell gave his presidential address on the 1940 census.

SPENGLER: Let me tell you what O.D. Duncan said about Truesdell's address. You know how exciting a speaker Truesdell is. O.D. Duncan [Senior], you remember him, says to me, "Joe, I had to listen to Buckshot [Fall-in-a-trap governor]; damn sight more interesting than this."

KISER: I remember Odum got pretty fed up too. I believe he presided that night.

HAMILTON: But Truesdell was a great man. He's still living too, isn't he?

SPENGLER: He is; he's 90 years old. He's a good man, but he's a hell of a poor speaker. He was the man who introduced me to Phil Hauser. Phil was his assistant for a while [in the Population Division of the Census Bureau].

KISER: Well, it's really a lot of scope for interesting relationships and experiences. I think the trouble with all of our social science organizations--just like the AMA almost--they have a House of Delegates and they no longer attempt to have a mass meeting of everybody.

SPENGLER: There's one thing I miss now compared with the early days and this is not so much a function of change in size, it's something else. People were very knowledgeable about the facts of life

in the early days. Now you have a bunch of young men--paralyzed monks or whatever you want to call them--who don't have much real interest in the world or any sense of it at all. So as soon as you shift away from a methodological feature you're apt to be pumping in a dry well. In the early days, people had a pretty wide range of knowledge of economics [and other things]. It might not have been scientific, but at least you had a basis. Now they don't know about any of those things and therefore you get these peculiarly circumscribed notions of [concomitants of] human behavior, despite the improvement in methodological techniques.

HAMILTON: I was thinking that too, Joe. We've had the computer and all the improvement in technology, methodology. Yet I don't believe we can predict any better now than we could 25 or 30 years ago. The facts should be in the computer. What makes a difference is not the computer; it's that they speed things up. And the stuff comes out of that thing. . .you get a stack of computer output that thick. What the hell are we going to do with it? Straight into the garbage can.

ROSENBERG: I wrote to Science magazine--there was an article by Sklar and Berkov on the trends in U.S. fertility and it said something about a resurgence in U.S. fertility. I thought there were some problems with their analysis and I wrote Science at the end of last week and they told me they would accept [my article]. Basically, I challenged what they said; it was on the basis of one year's data in California.

HAMILTON: The latest month that the monthly vital statistics came out of Washington shows a tremendous drop in births, both in the state and in the nation. The childbearing women, they've had their two kids and this depression, the housing [costs], is developing and beginning to show an effect.

ROSENBERG: But I was thinking about what you said about the use of the computer and refinement of methodological techniques. And at the same time you see a great narrowing in the capabilities of understanding and specialization. It's fragmented the Association, I think. PAA is just enormously fragmented now into small groups.

HAMILTON: There's one thing they do now in most big organizations which helps the little man trying to get a start, give a paper. They have a section called contributed papers. Anybody that can't get on the regular program, the bigtime, he can always send in a contributed paper.

SPENGLER: I hear a lot of people at the Census Bureau watch that very carefully. They use that as a basis for getting to the meeting.

HAMILTON: There's a similar thing. You know this magazine of England called Nature. Very early they adopted the principle of open submission. Anybody who had an idea, no matter what [could be published]; they didn't submit it to a bunch of referees. One of our statisticians out here now at RTI [Research Triangle Institute] worked with me on a problem and he got an idea while he was working on it and wrote it up--just a short couple of pages--and sent that to Nature; got it published. And I never did get my paper published. The damn referees in the American Statistical Association, they wanted to be snooty about it.

SPENGLER: This would make an interesting study. Nature has had a profound influence over the years on scientific thinking. If one could compare the role that Nature has played in England over, say, 50 years with some comparable journal or two or three, I would think this would demonstrate Milton Friedman's point that if you've got a lot of liberty without imposing arbitrary rules, you get more

product. I've often skimmed Nature to see if anybody's written something new in there.

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

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

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

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

SPENGLER: Gini organized a meeting earlier and Sorokin invited me to give a paper there, which I gave on state and population, or something like that. Later on Gini had another one; I gave a paper to it too. [The IUSSP'S 1931 first conference was planned for Rome but transferred to London when it was learned that it would be used as a platform for the proclamation of Mussolini's theories. Gini, however, organized an international population conference in Rome, securing the "attendance of a considerable number of foreign scholars." Frank Lorimer in the article cited above, p. 89.] This brought together a good many demographers. One thing that struck me was the small knowledge Americans had of the degree of population study in Europe. There were a tremendous number of pretty good workers and fairly good statistics. The Hungarians had done pretty good work way back. But except for people like Wolfe who were well educated, there was small comprehension of the nature of the work that was done there. We were somewhat provincial, except for the connections that we had with the British.

DUDLEY KIRK

PAA President in 1959-60 (No. 23). Interview with Jean van der Tak at Dr. Kirk's home, Stanford, California, 1989.

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS: Dudley Kirk was born in Rochester, New York, but moved as a small child to California and grew up there. He received a B.A. in political science from Pomona College in 1934 and an M.A. in international relations from the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy of Tufts University in 1935. From Harvard he received an M.A. in sociology in 1938 and Ph.D. in sociology in 1946. He was with Princeton's Office of Population Research from 1939 to 1947, where he was author of the influential monograph, Europe's Population in the Interwar Years (1946), and coauthor of The Future Population of Europe and the Soviet Union (1944). He was also Assistant Professor of Sociology at Princeton in 1945-47. From 1947 to 1954, he was demographer in the Office of Intelligence Research of the U.S. State Department. He was Director of the Demographic Division of the Population Council from 1954 to 1967. He returned to California in 1967, where he has been at Stanford as Professor of Population Studies with the Food Research Institute and also with the Department of Sociology, of which he was Chairman in 1975-76. He has published widely on such issues as population trends in Europe and Latin America, migration, the demographic transition, and population growth and economic development. He has served on the U.S. Committee on Health and Vital Statistics and as a consultant to the U.S. Agency for International Development and the Ford Foundation, among other groups.

VDT: Dr. Kirk did a first interview for the PAA oral history project with Anders Lunde at the PAA meeting in Philadelphia in 1979 [April 26, 1979]. However, the tape of that interview is flawed and also he has now added ten more years to his distinguished career. So I thank you, Dudley, for agreeing to this second interview.

How did you become interested in demography? You mentioned in your 1979 interview that your demographic interest grew out of your interest in geography.

KIRK: Yes. In high school and even before, I was intrigued with numbers, had fantasies about numbers--population growth of cities and of nations, of tribes, people and so on. But that interest wasn't crystallized because in my high school, of course, there was nothing on population and no such course at Pomona College.

In college, however, I wrote a long paper, which took quite a little research, on the future of Los Angeles County. The county supervisors at that time had a big study of the future of Los Angeles County. This was fascinating, because it assumed a good deal of population growth but nothing like what has happened. There were 2 million at the time I wrote that paper in 1933 and 9 million now. The forecast was that the population growth would be accompanied by a growth in the network of public transportation, particularly what we called the "big red cars" of the Pacific Electric; people commuted from our town, about 35 miles away, into Los Angeles on these big red electric trains. They had no idea at all--nor did anybody at that time, really--that the growth of Los Angeles would be a matter of freeways and automobile transportation. There was no forecast of the freeway mentality and culture.

So I was interested in population and population problems. Then I went to the Fletcher School [of Law and Diplomacy]. At Pomona, I had been in political science and I was interested particularly in international relations. I was at Fletcher a year.

Then my father called my brother and me in and said, "I'm going to give each of you \$2,000"--

which was a lot of money at that time--"and you can do anything you want with it. You can start a candy store or continue with graduate work or take a trip or whatever." At age 21, you can imagine what I chose, and what my brother chose. We went around the world, spent a year.

We started off on a Japanese freighter across the Pacific. Spent a month in Japan and six weeks in China. Then to Malaysia on a Norwegian freighter; the captain just couldn't wait to get to Singapore, because he loved to play golf. We went to India, spent quite a little time in India, and then to London, where we spent the spring term [of 1936] at the London School of Economics. Then came back to the U.S. and I went to Harvard as a graduate student; my brother went to the University of California.

At Harvard I was a major in sociology. I took Ed Hutchinson's course in population, enjoyed it tremendously, and went on and wrote a dissertation under Hutchinson on the Nazi population policy. My conclusions were that the success of the policy in raising the birth rate--which they did, very substantially--was as much as or more the result of re-employment as of population policies. About one third of the labor force in Germany was unemployed in 1933. With rearmament, there was a tremendous revival in employment and people had children.

VDT: You got your Ph.D. in 1946 from Harvard, where you'd gotten an M.A. in 1938. Meanwhile, you'd gone to the Office of Population Research at Princeton in 1939. When was this dissertation written?

KIRK: I wrote it at Princeton, really, but through those years, I was mainly engaged in the work of the Office of Population Research.

VDT: In your 1979 interview, you said you were really hired by Irene Taeuber for the Office of Population Research, who interviewed you sitting on a loveseat in the Hay Adams Hotel in Washington when you were there attending your first PAA meeting [May 12-13, 1939].

KIRK: Yes, she was delegated to interview me. You remember Irene, how very intense she was. You could say that she hired me as much as anyone did. Of course, Frank Notestein was the director.

VDT: You said that the job paid \$2,500 a year, on which you were very comfortable.

KIRK: Yes, it really was a good salary.

VDT: At the Office of Population Research, they were doing the four books commissioned by the League of Nations. You were a coauthor on the Notestein book, The Future Population of Europe and the Soviet Union, the first one to come out [1944], the one in which Ansley Coale did the projections. What part did you do in that book?

KIRK: I wrote a couple of chapters. We were all involved; this was a team effort.

VDT: Then there was your own important book, Europe's Population in the Interwar Years [1946]. In that book, you used the expression "demographic transition." You also called it the "vital revolution." Who was the first to use the actual expression, "demographic transition"?

KIRK: I think it was probably Frank Notestein, though I'm not sure. We demographers were a very small, compact group; we had a lot of interchange with each other. So it's really quite hard to pin down something like that--who was actually the first to use the expression.

VDT: Of course, the concept was being developed just at that time. In your book, you stressed the

importance of modernization--the threshold of development that would tip off fertility decline. You wrote a lot about the modernization threshold later.

KIRK: Later I did, yes.

VDT: Do you still believe that modernization is necessary first--that there can be no fertility decline engineered by direct family planning programs without waiting for associated socioeconomic development?

KIRK: No, I don't believe that. Modernization is certainly important, but a country like Indonesia, which has an effective population policy, has reduced the birth rate substantially. And, of course, the outstanding example is China.

But I did write a couple of articles on modernization and fertility decline in Latin America, where in those days there was no antinatalist policy. I was enamored then of the threshold hypothesis; wanted to test it out. And it worked well in Latin America, that is, it predicted when the birth rate was going to go down, by the degree of modernization. There were certain critical points and when a country got beyond that point, the birth rate began to go down. Frank Oechsli of the University of California and I developed an index of modernization that included education, health--ten items, a whole series of socioeconomic variables--and it worked very well in Latin America. But, I have to admit the threshold hypothesis doesn't work elsewhere. And I don't believe it works in Latin America now, because the whole culture is now attuned to birth control, the idea of reducing the birth rate--not only the government but the people. So the birth rates are going down quite fast in most of Latin America now.

The threshold hypothesis was intriguing because with it you could, hopefully, predict how fertility was going to go. But I don't think it's worth much now.

VDT: Well, the rapid fertility decline has also slowed down in some countries.

Back to your book, Europe's Population in the Interwar Years. It was very influential and has been much praised. You pointed out to Andy Lunde in the 1979 interview that at OPR you were creating a small library of books on population, which were rare in those days, with the four League of Nations volumes and Irene Taeuber's book on The Population of Japan [1958] and Kingsley Davis's book The Population of India and Pakistan [1951]. You were prescient in your book. You foresaw that there would be no permanent increase in Western European fertility after World War II, which was true--there was a bump of a baby boom to about 1964 and since then fertility has been very low. You said that was due to growing "individualism." I was struck by that because that's the term now used to describe the motivation for Europe's low fertility. Dirk van de Kaa used it in his Population Reference Bureau Population Bulletin, "Europe's Second Demographic Transition" [March 1987], that I edited, and he built on the work of Ron Lesthaeghe, who also used that term, which you had already used, back in the 1940s. Also, you found pockets of high fertility--the Netherlands then, Central Russia, and Albania. You wrote more later on Albania.

KIRK: Yes, Albania is the last underdeveloped country in Europe. Unfortunately, they haven't taken a census in a long time and the vital statistics aren't very reliable. Fertility has now gone down, but how much, nobody knows.

VDT: How did you get your data for that book? You had a tremendous array of data. You had an appendix table with even the gross reproduction rates for 600 areas.

KIRK: Europe historically, for a long time, has had much better vital statistics than we had in this country. They are quite reliable and you could compute reproduction rates. The total fertility rate hadn't been developed as a measure. We computed reproduction rates just for fun.

VDT: You described that in the 1979 interview, all of you sitting around doing net and gross reproduction rates, inspired by Lotka. It was a tremendous collection of data in that book.

KIRK: And I think I mentioned to Andy in 1979 that when I go to Europe now, I love to look at the minor civil areas--the departements of France, counties of England--and think about how they were 40 years ago and what it is now. Of course, fertility has now gone down.

VDT: Yes. But fertility has gone up again slightly in Sweden and such countries--up to 1.9 total fertility rate in Sweden in the 1989 PRB World Population Data Sheet [and 2.0 in the 1990 Data Sheet]. Fertility is now lowest in Italy [1.3].

KIRK: Italy is curious. I think people still have an image of Italy with a lot of bambinos. It's just amazing--the lowest in Europe!

VDT: Frank Notestein, of course, was a dominant character at the Office of Population Research and you say he remained a friend of yours all his life.

KIRK: I had two major mentors in my demographic career and the first was Frank. I also had a tremendous respect for the other, Frederick Osborn. He was a very tall man, a very remarkable man--a true American aristocrat in the best sense, that is, in the sense of having responsibility to go along with prestige. He felt that he had a responsibility to go out there and help the country. And he did. And while he was never a technical demographer as such, he was in a sense our statesman. He got funds for us and you know that he essentially started the Office of Population Research at Princeton; he got support for it. He was a Princeton alumnus, of course.

VDT: I understand he first approached Harvard and they turned him down.

KIRK: That's true. He was glad, of course, to have it at Princeton. Then later when he had helped to found the Population Council, I worked for him there. Fred Osborn was a very dear, close friend.

In demography per se, the founder of the field in this country, in a way, was Frank Notestein. Yes, he and I were close for over 40 years, from 1939 till his death in 1983.

Frank was director of the Office of Population Office from its beginning. When I got there in 1939, he had a tiny office. There was Frank, me, a secretary named Martina Evans, and Ansley Coale, then a graduate student. That was OPR. Henry Shryock and John Durand had been there earlier. We were in three rooms on the second floor of a building on Nassau Street and exactly opposite my office was that of a podiatrist.

I remember a colleague in the economics department saying, "How can you find enough in the field of population to spend your time on?" That was sort of the attitude. Population was something aside, just a figure that you put in but you didn't do anything with it.

So that was the start, and, of course, it grew. Irene Taeuber worked at the Library of Congress in Washington and she sent up the abstracts for the Population Index. She would do the bibliography and she wrote most of the "country items" too.

VDT: She was writing those lead articles on the population of different countries anonymously, didn't get a credit line on them.

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

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

VDT: I want to talk about him later, because in your 1979 interview you cited him as one of the broad-gauged people working in population in the early days.

Why did you leave the OPR to go to the State Department?

KIRK: It was an opportunity, really, to advance demography. I was the first person in the federal government to have the title "demographer." Later on the Census Bureau had demographers. I was in the Office of Intelligence Research, which was the successor of OSS [Office of Strategic Service]. I was responsible for population research in the State Department, later joined by Earl Huyck and Chris Tietze. There was something called National Intelligence Surveys, which were conducted for most every country in the world. We were responsible for the opening demographic section on countries X, Y and Z. We spent a lot of our time on that.

I became head of a division of research dealing with South Asia and Africa, huge territory! When India was partitioned, I had responsibility for drawing up what would be the fairest line between India and Pakistan, that is, in terms of the population of Muslims and Hindus. This was so the U.S. would have a view. Of course, the specific geographic delineation was done by the British, and they did a pretty good job.

VDT: As far as your figures were concerned, it was about the best place the line could have been?

KIRK: About the best they could have done. It was very hard, because there were minorities on both sides.

Of course, there were other things. I was involved in political aspects too. I had a background in political science and international relations. Every day, we had a review of intelligence that was coming in and I was there supposedly as an expert on the Near East and South Asia and Africa.

When they were going to construct the Aswan dam in Egypt, the United States opposed it. Dulles was Secretary of State and he didn't think it was a good idea. We sent up a statement on how we thought it was a good idea, the dam should be built, with U.S. assistance. But Dulles's secretary, who was in charge of looking into it, said he wouldn't dream of presenting our statement to Dulles. This illustrates our frustrations when Dulles replaced Acheson as Secretary of State.

VDT: You told Andy Lunde about the rather unsophisticated methods you used to make population projections, because, well, there were no computers then.

KIRK: There were no computers. We did a lot, but they were short-range projections; not really anything fancy.

VDT: Then you went to the Population Council, which had been established in 1953, was it?

KIRK: It was contractually established in 1952, but established an office in 1953. I came in 1954. There were Frederick Osborn, Margaret Cramer, who was the accountant, Catherine Glazer, who was the secretary, and myself, and that was it.

VDT: Again you came in right on the ground floor. Frederick Osborn was the first director?

KIRK: That's right. Frank Notestein had proposed me to Fred, but it was Fred who persuaded me to join the Population Council. It was a very pleasant experience working with him. And with Frank too, as I have said. [Frank Notestein left OPR in 1959 to succeed Frederick Osborn as second director of the Population Council.]

VDT: In your interview ten years ago, you said you were there through the "real excitement period" of the Population Council, when it . . .

KIRK: Was just starting up.

VDT: It was also the time of orthodoxy. The latest Population and Development Review has a lead article by Dennis Hodgson on "Orthodoxy and Revisionism in American Demography" [PDR, December 1988]. By orthodoxy, he means the idea that rapid population growth was impeding development in less developed countries and could be brought down by direct intervention, family planning programs, without waiting for socioeconomic development. Of course, the Population Council was one of the leaders in that policy; that's what he implies. Do you agree with that? Of course, John D. Rockefeller set up the Council because he felt something had to be done and the Rockefeller Foundation was drifting away from interest in population. In the 1950s the Population Council mostly concentrated on research and you were head of the division for demographic research.

KIRK: Yes, but we expanded a great deal. We didn't really feel any great conflict between the idea that modernization promotes reduction of the birth rate or that family planning does. From the first, we were promoting the family planning idea. And almost from the first, we had a scientist at the Rockefeller Institute doing research on contraceptives, though this was modest at first.

I think my own greatest contribution to the Council was the selection and nurturing of Council Fellows.

VDT: You chose the Population Council Fellows?

KIRK: Yes, at first; later on we had a committee, but I had a lot of say in choosing them. I administered the program, which began in the mid-1950s.

VDT: These were young people brought in from less developed countries to study at American Universities and the idea was to build up demographic expertise in their countries--that they would go back to their countries?

KIRK: And to get a viable national group, large enough to grow by themselves. A few years ago, I looked at who were the leading demographers in less developed countries and over a third of them had been Population Council Fellows. Isn't that something!

VDT: Who were some of them with whom you had a hand? What about those who went to the

University of Chicago: Visid Prachuabmoh from Thailand and Mercedes Concepcion from the Philippines and Haryono Suyono from Indonesia? Were they your Population Council Fellows?

KIRK: Yes.

VDT: And Iskander from Indonesia?

KIRK: Yes. He changed his name because of prejudice against Chinese names in Indonesia. He went to Princeton.

VDT: Can you think of some others like that?

KIRK: Yes, indeed. There was Mohamed El Badry (from Egypt), Alvaro Lopez (Colombia), Gustavo Cabrera (Mexico), Carmen Miro, S.N. Agarawala, P.M. Visaria, Lee-Jay Cho, Saw Swee Hock, Etienne van de Walle, Thomas Frejka, and many others. Perhaps more familiar are the Americans who were Population Council Fellows, such as Judith Blake, Paul Demeny [originally from Hungary], Reynolds Farley, Robbert Potter, Harriet Presser, and Joe Stycos.

VDT: Did you go out to the countries to meet them; you traveled a lot?

KIRK: I did indeed, to find suitable recruits. And we had groups sent out for more general surveys.

VDT: Yes, you and Phil Hauser and Bud Harkavy went in late 1962 on a trip to Southeast Asia.

KIRK: Yes, I still have the notes we wrote. Then, of course, demography was pretty primitive in most of these LDC countries.

VDT: I would think so. How did you go about finding people who were even interested in coming to study in the U.S.?

KIRK: Once we had one person in the country who'd been here, then they would find others suitable to come, to build up a nucleus of demographers in the major countries.

VDT: The trip you made with Bud Harkavy and Phil Hauser, that was the beginning of the connections with the Philippines and Indonesia and Thailand, those three countries in particular. Did you know they gave a dinner for Bud Harkavy at this last PAA meeting [in Baltimore], that you missed?

KIRK: Yes, I was sorry to miss that.

VDT: He looks just the same as he always has, very youthful.

Those must have been exciting years in the Population Council. You felt anything was possible. The idea was to build up expertise for demographic research in these countries?

KIRK: That's right--a "critical mass." We thought it was smart to start with research and with research, as Bernard Berelson used to say, "invented here." They'd listen much more to an expert from their own country--not think of it as something that was . . .

VDT: Thrust on them by the U.S.

KIRK: Yes. We were too cautious really. We didn't realize how much latent possibility there was. We were very cautious about urging countries to have family planning programs and all that sort of thing. The culture in a lot of these countries was not so unfavorable to the idea of family planning as it was in Western culture. We were sort of reading from Western culture all the opposition--the Catholic opposition, the whole elaborate machinery of government as opposed to family planning.

VDT: In the United States, yes.

KIRK: In Europe also. We were sort of projecting from that, and we were wrong.

VDT: Except for the Philippines, which has a strong Catholic church, but that's the American influence in a sense.

KIRK: But we could have pushed faster.

VDT: You mean in Thailand, Korea, Singapore--they were all just waiting?

KIRK: Yes. Not only the governments but also the people were beginning to be concerned about population growth.

VDT: Did you have anything to do with the KAP studies, which of course were showing [a demand for contraception]?

KIRK: Oh yes, the Population Council really started that. We financed quite a number of those. Of course, later on they spread with AID and different sources of funding.

VDT: And the KAP studies led to the World Fertility Survey. You talked about getting Thais to speak to the Thais and so on. I'm always interested in Studies in Family Planning, the string of authors on each article and there'll be three or four Thais and one American, sometimes the senior author, sometimes the junior author at the end, or sometimes in the middle.

KIRK: Yes, we were very careful on that. It was hard for them at first, because they were new to demographic research. But I think the program is very successful. We always had a difficult time persuading--by that time, the Ford Foundation, or even the Rockefeller Foundation--to give a large amount of money for Fellows.

VDT: Most of the money came from Ford, through the Population Council?

KIRK: Yes. Ford and Rockefeller always referred to us as the retailers; they were the wholesalers. We had a hard time explaining to them the importance of fellowships. From their point of view, fellowships were not a good investment, because they don't show early return. The foundation likes to see an early return. And in this case, it may be five or ten years before anything shows. They were generous, of course, but they kept wanting us to justify it every year.

VDT: You brought students over for one-year, two-year courses, or . . . ?

KIRK: Some of them would get a master's degree and go back, but our objective was to have them go

for the Ph.D. and really get fully trained.

VDT: So they could go back and set up a department or center for demographic research?

KIRK: Yes.

VDT: Did the Population Council try to follow them up?

KIRK: Yes, we supported them when they went back. We gave them financial assistance for projects, or on occasion, we'd finance a position for a Population Council Fellow in the government or a university.

Then we were very interested in the regional centers, as the one in Santiago, Chile, for Latin America, CELADE, which Carmen Miro led so effectively, and the one in Chembur, near Bombay, which was later taken over by the Indian government.

VDT: When you say the Population Council was interested, does that mean some financial support came from the Population Council?

KIRK: Oh yes. We largely established them, in terms of money. Well, CELADE, of course, was under the Economic Commission for Latin America, ECLA.

I remember one horrible experience I had there; I went down quite often. There was a meeting of an advisory committee for CELADE, presided over by the head of ECLA. We met about 10 o'clock and they elected officers and I was elected vice-chair. I assumed this was sort of honorary, because the Population Council had given the money. But at 11 o'clock, the ECLA man announced that he had to catch a plane for Mexico and he left and who was put in the chair?

VDT: There you were in the chair, one hour after it began!

KIRK: Yes, and I was the only non-Spanish-speaking person there, except for Nathan Keyfitz, who had extremely heavily accented Spanish, but he could get along. There was a man from the statistical side who sat beside me, a Castillian Spaniard, spoke beautiful Spanish, and I could understand every word he said. He spoke excellent English too. The rest was all the way down to Caribbean Spanish, which has no s's, and Chilean Spanish, which is pretty bad.

At first they gave me a nice girl to translate for me. I was hearing it in Spanish in one ear and then the English in the other ear half a sentence later. I was driven up the wall, and went to Spanish alone. It was a three-day conference, and I just struggled through it, with the help of the Spaniard, the statistician. I got so I could understand what they were talking about. But I didn't know whether they were for it or against it. The Spanish was more formal than it is now and they'd say, "As my distinguished colleague has said so beautifully, in such perfect language" and so on and so on.

What I got to listen for was the little word "pero"--"on the other hand." That was followed by the real substance of what they had to say. I learned more Spanish in those three days than in all the time before, or since.

VDT: CELADE was already taking on students at that time, in the 1950s, quite early?

KIRK: Yes, it was about 1955. Now it's independent and, as I said, the Indians have taken over the Bombay center.

VDT: Did you ever go out to teach in any of these places?

KIRK: No, we got good people to go. Dorothy Thomas was one; she went to Bombay. I remember she had a pet mongoose, because there was brush around the center and snakes. Mongooses eat snakes, so she had this pet mongoose to protect her.

VDT: Don Bogue was out there early on.

KIRK: That's right. The Chembur center turned out some very good people, and still does.

VDT: The Population Council was very important at that time.

KIRK: The accomplishments we were making were rewarding, I thought. And, of course, the Council was growing.

VDT: You were head of the demographic division; Sheldon Segal was head of the biomedical division . . .

KIRK: He became head; he wasn't the first one. The third was the international division. The demographic division became the Center for Policy Planning.

VDT: Frank Notestein was head of the Population Council from 1959 to 1969, then Bernard Berelson, then George Zeidenstein came in the early 1970s. Did you have anything to do with the Parker Mauldin-Berelson research that began to look at the relative contributions of socioeconomic development and family planning, when they had to prove that family planning had a net impact on fertility decline?

KIRK: No, I'd left the Council by then. I left in 1967.

VDT: Why did you leave and go to Stanford?

KIRK: I was attracted to Stanford and I felt that the Council was getting to be too much of a family planning rather than a research organization. And that followed on more and more. Zeidenstein pushed aside Paul Demeny, who was head of the Center for Policy Planning. He displeased Zeidenstein, because he wasn't policy-oriented enough.

VDT: That just happened last year or so, but it had been coming to a head for a long time. I interviewed Paul last June in New York, just after that decision had been made. However, he has plenty to do.

But you yourself felt in the 1960s that the Population Council was becoming too program-oriented, too family-planning oriented; you were more interested in research?

KIRK: Yes.

VDT: And that entered into your decision to come to Stanford?

KIRK: Also my family. We spent a year here at Stanford at the Institute for Advanced Studies in the

Behavioral Sciences, a think tank, in 1964-65. I took a year's sabbatical from the Council. And my wife and children had liked it so much, they urged me very much to go when I was offered the opportunity. So we came back. I joined the Food Research Institute and the department of sociology. Later I had a joint appointment.

VDT: Tell me something about your work at Stanford.

KIRK: I got very interested in Mexico and Latin America. We did this threshold hypothesis idea. I was very much interested in the acceleration of fertility decline.

VDT: Which you felt was happening?

KIRK: It was happening. As you pointed out, in some countries it has slowed down. But in those days--and I think I was one of the first to point that out--if you projected these things ahead, it appeared that fertility was likely to go down faster in the less developed countries than it did in Europe. And it did.

VDT: Indeed, in such countries as Costa Rica and Mexico.

KIRK: I think more particularly in Asia.

VDT: In your 1979 interview you said that the ten countries where fertility decline had been fastest had all been islands or--there was another word you used; I think you meant peninsulas.

KIRK: Islands and peninsulas, yes: Japan, Malaysia, Singapore, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, South Korea, which might as well have been an island, in view of its political separation from North Korea and the Asian mainland. The demographic transition proceeded faster than in mainland countries; they're more exposed to cultural influence from outside. Japan, of course, is an outstanding example.

VDT: Right. Its crude birth rate dropped from 34 to 17 in one decade--due in part to abortion, which wasn't so much used in other places.

 Ten years ago you were also working on migration in Mexico.

KIRK: Within Mexico and Mexico to this country. But I got quite interested in the food problem in Mexico and went to conferences on that issue in Mexico. They had the feeling their food was being taken from them, with vegetables grown in Baja California and Sonora and cattle from other areas being exported to the U.S. And they were interested in alternative supplies.

 One of the most interesting dinners I've ever had in my life was at a conference, given in the botanical garden of the University of Mexico. We had a dinner of possible foods--snakes, insects, molluscs, exotic seafoods, wild vegetables.

VDT: You ate these things because that might be all there was left to eat?

KIRK: Well, the Mexican sponsors of this conference were exposing us to other possible things to eat, perhaps for public relations. We were on TV. They focused in on me, perhaps to see if a gringo could eat all the "delicacies."

VDT: The idea was the Mexicans felt they could not feed their growing population because their land was being exploited for food grown for the U.S.?

KIRK: Yes, whereas in fact, you go barely outside of Mexico City and you see very primitive, rainfed, agriculture. Corn and beans are the main stuff. In the north, northwest in particular, the area that sends vegetables to us, it's a highly developed agriculture, entirely irrigated. The people of European background had developed entrepreneurially; things moved ahead. But the Indian population follows the old ways; it's hard to change. I got interested in that.

VDT: At that time did you bring in the population angle?

KIRK: Oh yes.

VDT: If Mexico continued to reduce its fertility, it would have fewer people to feed?

KIRK: I wrote some articles on the future population of Mexico, predicting a rapid decline in fertility. But even so, there's a tremendous cohort of young people.

VDT: You also have worked quite a bit on migration within Mexico and to the U.S.

KIRK: Yes. Curiously enough, the Mexican border states didn't grow as much from net migration as one might expect, because a lot of migrants that went to border towns went on across to the U.S. It was sort of a staging ground for migrants from northern and central Mexico.

It's not commonly recognized in this country that these areas are selective of more European types. The more southerly areas are more Indian. At the National Museum in Mexico City, the handsome girl guides, mixed Indian and European, will tell you about the culture that has amalgamated. But you go to Oaxaco and that's primarily Indian. We went to a wedding there, which was held in what had been a convent, and from the balcony we looked over the crowd--I suppose there were 200 people there--and I saw only one person with an Indian face. The upper class minority is definitely European in appearance. I'm citing this to show that prejudice really exists. But I've wandered a bit from demography.

VDT: No, that's migration, that we're talking about. In your PAA presidential address of 1960, which we'll get to later, you wanted demographers to look more at migration. I think they are doing so now.

KIRK: Yes, I spoke of migration as the "stepchild of demography."

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

KIRK: And Frank Lorimer.

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

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

Frank Lorimer illustrated what I see as a great difference from those presently in demography. He had very broad interests, a broad background; he'd been a minister. At that first meeting of PAA I

attended in 1939, 50 years ago, there were 17 participants, who gave papers, wrote joint papers, discussed papers and so on. Only 17, and 14 of them were then in Who's Who or a subsequent edition. And I doubt very much whether the 529 participants that I counted in the 1988 meeting program--think of it, 529 as opposed to 17!--I doubt very much whether they're going to have as high a proportion in Who's Who.

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

KIRK: That was before it was very firmly located in sociology. Several disciplines would be represented in these meetings, broad-scale people. Frank Lorimer, besides the ministry, studied anthropology. He and Fred Osborn wrote this book at the Museum of Natural History in New York, Dynamics of Population [1934].

VDT: Who else was outstanding at PAA meetings?

KIRK: Phil Hauser. As you know, he had a large influence at the Census Bureau. He was at all these PAA meetings. And there was Henry Shryock, John Durand, and Lowell Reed, for whom I had a great deal of respect. Lowell Reed was a biostatistician and a very level-headed person. He was very good at chairing meetings, because he'd get to the heart of the discussion, keep it focused. He was at Johns Hopkins.

VDT: You mentioned him in your 1979 interview. You felt he was a real inspiration in demographic methodology.

KIRK: Yes. Well, as a biostatistician, he came at the field from a different point of view. And I remember we had John D. Black of Harvard, an agricultural economist, so our meetings drew from different disciplines.

Of course, demographers come from different fields today, but we're more specialized now.

VDT: It's become a field in its own right and perhaps within that field . . .

KIRK: That's right, specialized. As you point out, I'm in migration. But, of course, there's a whole range of specialties dealing with population.

VDT: And in your time, you felt that you would like to steer clear of too much emphasis on numbers rather than their meaning. You said you came from the pre-computer age; you had your students do your computer programming for you when it was necessary.

KIRK: Well, after I came here to Stanford. When I came in 1967, the computer age was just beginning.

VDT: You mentioned to me at a PAA meeting not too long ago that you felt more should be said about Warren Thompson. You noticed that he hadn't even been mentioned in the International Encyclopedia of Population [1982].

KIRK: And Whelpton, of course. The two of them were at the Scripps Foundation and they were always participants in the early meetings. Warren Thompson's book [Population Problems] was the textbook in the field for years, generations. It had five or six editions. I had a lot of respect for him.

And I liked Pat Whelpton very much. Pat originally was sort of in Thompson's shadow.

VDT: What about Kingsley Davis? I'm going to interview him two days from now. Is he among your leading influences?

KIRK: I wouldn't quite place him in that category; he isn't much older than I am. I first knew him when I was at Harvard as a graduate student. He was teaching at Smith and came over and talked. Then we were at Princeton together.

VDT: Did you perhaps have differences of opinions?

KIRK: Yes we did, sometimes.

VDT: Norman Ryder in his interview with me last year said he had been asked at the New Orleans PAA meeting just before that who really came up first with the term "demographic transition." He felt that Kingsley Davis had used it in the volume of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science on "World Population in Transition" that he edited in 1945, but that he'd borrowed that from you. You had published an article, using that expression, in 1944, the year before.

KIRK: Well I had, but I never thought of that. I never put those things together.

VDT: As you said earlier, you were all working on it together.

KIRK: But--I suppose I shouldn't say this--but Kingsley has been a prickly character.

VDT: That is exactly the expression that Norman Ryder used!

KIRK: Well, I hesitate to put it on the record. But he's an extremely able person. Of course, he was chair of sociology at Berkeley for some years.

VDT: And you were at Stanford. Well, I guess you've both now mellowed. (Laughter)

KIRK: He was offered a job at Stanford too at the time he left Columbia, but Berkeley offered him \$2,500 more, so he went to Berkeley. Our local demographic history might have been quite different, if he'd come to Stanford.

VDT: What about your students while you were here at Stanford?

KIRK: I had a real difficulty because there was no demographic setup and I was in the Food Research Institute. I had difficulty in getting students who were interested in demography on fellowships. All the graduate students now come on fellowships and the departments distribute the fellowships and I didn't get a lot of those. So I didn't get the cream of the crop.

VDT: Those interested in demography would not necessarily come to Stanford?

KIRK: That's right, and I wouldn't blame them. My students were largely converts from other fields. Some of them have stayed in demography and some have gone into other fields.

VDT: Will that change now? I understand there's a new demography center with Fred Pinkham as

assistant director, who came from the Population Crisis Committee.

KIRK: It's a center for population and resources; it's not a department. Brian Arthur really started it. He was quite good at getting money and they got money to support this center and hire some people. But then he got tired of it and dropped it and it went over to an Australian who is interested in population biology. So we have a group that meets from time to time, but we don't have really a core group of demographers.

VDT: Perhaps that center will entice more potential demographers to Stanford, although there's the competition from Berkeley nearby.

KIRK: That's true. In any event, I never really developed a demography department or a demographic center of any consequence. I did have other demographers here and we did joint research. I had big classes and graduate students, although the majority did not go into demography. Of course, population was a big thing in the late 1960s and early 1970s. And Paul Ehrlich is here. He was more of a thunderer than I was.

VDT: And still is. I heard him recently; he's still harping on the same theme.

KIRK: He outshone me. So, I couldn't say that I've been altogether happy here professionally. My family has been happy and that was important to me.

VDT: California, a special life, and Stanford is a special atmosphere.

KIRK: Yes.

VDT: You mention Paul Ehrlich, who is still preaching the urgency of reducing rapid population growth in developing countries, and perhaps he's right. Meanwhile, there's the new revisionist approach to the problem--what do you think of that?--the idea that population growth is only one factor in economic development and, of course, at the 1984 Mexico City population conference, the Americans said it was a neutral factor. The National Academy of Sciences report in 1986 [Population Growth and Economic Development: Policy Questions] came out with the idea that population growth, while still important, was not the overriding important thing in development.

KIRK: That was discussed at the PAA meeting in San Francisco [April 3-5, 1986]. Nathan Keyfitz was a visiting professor here then and he was very much upset by it and wrote impassioned letters and articles.

VDT: He felt it was downplaying rapid population growth? And what do you think of it?

KIRK: I thought it a good report. As you say, there has been a lot of revisionism. I guess I could be put in the category of revisionists. The issue is whether or not you can have economic development, at least rapid economic development, in a rapidly growing population, and there's actually no empirical basis for saying you can't. You have lots of countries with rapidly growing populations who've had economic development too.

VDT: Brazil--and also Mexico, at certain times, not always.

KIRK: Right.

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

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

VDT: The Eugenics Society?

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

In a way I hate to go on record for saying this, but I think there's a real problem in the Western civilization in that we are approaching a stationary population and the rest of the world, the less developed world, is rapidly becoming an increasing proportion of the total population. Since I have a background in political science, I see that as a power problem too. Because as these countries get developed, and particularly as China gets developed, their large populations are going to be a tremendous asset. That's a debatable question, of course, but I think so. I think that sheer size is going to have a very great effect on our position. In the past, Western civilization was a rapidly expanding civilization in numbers, in population, as well as in technology. I see us having to face a major readjustment in which power is going to go to other countries. And maybe we'd be better off if we had more people. I've spoken about this.

Yesterday, we went out to a restaurant and there was an Irish woman and she had six children, a beautiful family, and I told her I admired her family. Because--this is a difficult thing to express really--numbers are really going to count. In Western Europe they're beginning to be concerned about low fertility and I predict that we are going to be concerned about it. Maybe not in five or ten years, but by the year 2000, something like that.

VDT: You also said in your 1979 interview that you had been watching the growth of the Hispanic population in this country, which will become an increasing proportion of our population.

KIRK: Yes. California already has a majority of minorities in the schools; the non-Hispanic whites are a minority in the schools. Those children are the population of the future.

VDT: And that's something we should think about?

KIRK: We should think about it. I waver. Sometimes I think we ought to admit Hispanics, we shouldn't be as selfish as we are about our standard of living and our possessions and so on. I waver between that view and that we ought to keep them out. I guess I lean more toward letting in a moderate amount. But we'll have to have immigration if we're going to keep up the total population.

VDT: Keep up our population growth or . . .?

KIRK: Population growth and ultimately our population size--unless we have some rise in fertility.

As you point out, in Sweden and some countries the birth rate has gone up.

VDT: Slightly. In the U.S. too. In the latest Population Reference Bureau Data Sheet [1989], the U.S. TFR rounds up to 1.9; it had been rounding up to 1.8.

KIRK: The increasing minority population in the U.S. is a problem, I think, but I don't think it's an irresolvable problem.

VDT: What do you see as leading issues in demography over the years you have been involved? We have covered rapid population growth in less developed countries. In your 1960 PAA presidential address, which you had first titled "Population Shibboleths of 1960," then when it was published in Population Index it had gotten a very sober title ["Some Reflections on American Demography in the Nineteen-Sixties," Population Index, October 1960], you decried the lack of attention to migration, which you saw as an important variable at the local level, in particular, in population change. Don't you feel there's now more attention to migration in the field of demography?

KIRK: I think there is more attention, but it hasn't really grabbed a large proportion of demographers, and for a very simple reason: mathematical demography is in the ascendance. Births and deaths are such nice variables--they're unique, they happen only once, at least as far as we know--and births and deaths are variables that you can use mathematically very easily. Migration is entirely different, because you can migrate more than once, you can migrate in a thousand different directions, you can migrate for different times and periods. It's a very messy variable. And demographers have shied away from it--mathematical demographers entirely. Meredith John, who is here at Stanford, she teaches a course on demography and there is only one hour devoted to migration, because she's a mathematical demographer.

You've heard me say before that if you go below the national level in this country, the most important demographic variable is migration. If you talk about local areas, you have to be concerned primarily with migration, because birth and death rates aren't that much different. Migration is the important variable, and it's neglected because it's difficult to deal with in a mathematical framework. In that 1960 address, I referred to migration as a "stepchild of demography," which I think is the case even today. As you say, there's a lot of attention to it within demography, but it's within the context of a tremendously expanded attention to population study as a whole. It's still not a leading interest in demography.

VDT: And you feel it should be?

KIRK: I feel it should be because, you know, the true test of science is prediction and if you're going to predict population change below the national level, and sometimes at the national level, you have to make some prediction about migration. Now, the Census Bureau really dodges that issue by just assuming some arbitrary constant amount of migration.

VDT: Indeed, 600,000 net migration.

KIRK: Right, and it isn't based on anything except taking a number.

VDT: Well, it's based on legal migration and a bit thrown in there for illegal migration.

KIRK: Yes, but it's based essentially on what's happened in the past. I understand why that should be. But I do think it needs more attention and what brings about migration, in a sociological context and

economic context.

VDT: Sociological and economic causes of migration?

KIRK: And consequences too. I have this feeling about the whole field of population that we don't really deal enough with the consequences of population change. We talk about economic consequences in a broad sort of way, but the revisionists have looked at this more closely and they say the effects of population growth are different from what has been conventional wisdom among demographers.

VDT: In your 1960 presidential speech, you did say that you felt there should be more emphasis on consequences. You felt that demographers got hung up on causes because they were so stunned by their projections of the 1930s that turned out so wrong because they didn't foresee the baby boom or rapid population growth in developing countries, so they shifted back and instead of saying what was going to happen to population, it was safer just to describe trends and deal with causes, possible causes.

KIRK: That's right. Migration is not an easy field to study. As I say, I spent considerable time studying it as it happened in Mexico. The data are primitive because in the census, you only have state of birth and then their present state. So it's hard to get a current basis of migration in Mexico.

VDT: They don't have anything like the U.S. Current Population Survey with "Where did you live five years ago, or last year"?

KIRK: They're beginning to, but they haven't done it systematically to cover the whole country.

VDT: They're having a survey of that type?

KIRK: Well, they've had fertility surveys but they don't have a national population survey.

VDT: Which of your publications are your favorites, or those you feel were most important? Of course, your book, Europe's Population in the Interwar Years.

KIRK: At the time, I thought the articles I wrote on the accelerating decline of fertility in less developed areas were important. There were several articles that referred to this. Perhaps the best was "A New Demographic Transition?" in the National Academy of Sciences, Rapid Population Growth [1971].

VDT: You had a fine article in Population and Development Review in 1979 ["World Population and Birth Rates: Agreements and Disagreements"]. Was that one?

KIRK: No, that was about errors in population estimates. Another article that I particularly liked was on "Factors Affecting Moslem Natality" in Bernard Berelson [et al, eds.], Family Planning and Population Programs [1965].

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

KIRK: I suppose that the greatest satisfaction I've had is what has happened to the Population Council Fellows and what I had to do with it. I had to recruit funds to run the fellowship program. We used to meet the Fellows when they arrived by air. We paid a lot more attention to them then than later.

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

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

VDT: If you come to be a resident in the city, right. I know, because we lived some years in Geneva. Two of my children were born there and I even went to the Institut des Hautes Etudes Internationales, where Paul was briefly.

KIRK: And the gendarme said he was going to the university but he didn't have his address. I went to see Gunnar Myrdal [then director of the Economic Commission for Europe], just before he went with his wife Alva to India where she was Swedish ambassador, and his English secretary called the university for me--my French being very bad--and found out where he lived and I sent him one of those telegrams and that's how I got in touch with him.

VDT: He didn't tell me that complicated story but he talks about the impressive lunch that you had at the Beau Rivage and how you snapped him up so quickly and made certain he got to the U.S. and to Princeton. Do you have any other dramatic stories like that about choosing Population Council Fellows?

KIRK: No, I can't think of any quite so dramatic.

VDT: Now let's turn to your reminiscences of PAA. We don't have to dwell on that too long because you wrote such a fine vignette on "PAA Meetings Over the Years" for PAA Affairs in the Spring 1983 issue. I love that one. In the book in which I'll put together excerpts from these interviews, I'll also include the "vignettes of PAA history" and that's an important one.

Your first meeting was in Washington in 1939; it was at the Hay Adams Hotel. Irene Taeuber interviewed you for the job at OPR. Lotka was president then and gave a dramatic talk. I believe it was Kingsley Davis's first meeting too and he was so impressed with Lotka that he applied for a Social Science Research Council fellowship to go study demography, this wonderful field. [Davis had already received this fellowship. See his interview, below.] You wrote of the early meetings, often at Princeton, and there was such a difference from later on, because there were single sessions to which you all went, it was a small group, and so on.

KIRK: They were a small group. There were 17 participants in the 1939 program. And now there

are--I counted 529 in the 1988 program.

VDT: We've talked about several of the notables in the early years. What about Horace Hamilton, who was president the year after you?

KIRK: He was at North Carolina State University, did quite a little work in population, but I didn't know him too well.

VDT: Could you tell me about Kurt Mayer, who was secretary-treasurer [1959-62] during your time? He moved back to Switzerland.

KIRK: He invited me to go to Brown once to be a professor there, but I turned him down.

VDT: In 1960 when you were president, you switched the days of the meeting from Saturday and Sunday to Friday and Saturday. [The meeting was in Washington, D.C.]

KIRK: I think this is an important change that has occurred. Our meetings had been Saturday and Sunday and we were not subsidized, we paid our own way, and we didn't take time off from work. We came on our own funds and used up our weekends for this. I changed it to Friday and Saturday because I thought people were entitled to have a little weekend left, and the Association was agreeable to that.

VDT: Also in your year, you had a double session on the Saturday afternoon. That was one of the early years of double sessions. Anne Lee says they started at the 1957 meeting in Philadelphia. People then had to make a choice. Up to that time everyone had always attended all the sessions. [The first double session occurred the year before, 1956, on the morning of the first day of the meeting at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. At the 1957 meeting at the University of Pennsylvania, there were double sessions in four time slots.]

KIRK: That's right. It was a family affair; we all got together.

VDT: You felt that was true even at your meeting in 1960? Unfortunately, there's no record of how many attended that 25th annual meeting. Andy Lunde prepared a list of all the meetings and he had numbers at the early meetings [through 1935] but for many years no record was kept of how many actually registered. You might have had, say, a couple of hundred or so? Seven years later in Cincinnati in 1967, there were 452.

VDT: It was growing very fast.

VDT: In 1960 there were only about 500 members altogether; the half or less than that would have attended the meeting.

KIRK: I have my old programs going way back, but we've moved; they're somewhere in boxes in the garage.

VDT: But the programs don't tell you how many attended; those who paid the registration fee. I presume you had a registration fee?

KIRK: Probably a dollar. Do they have the attendance at the 1939 meeting?

VDT: No. There were 38 at the first "organizational" meeting in May 1931 and then for some reason there's some record up through 1935 [200 at the fourth annual meeting on May 3, 1935, in Washington, D.C.], and then not until 1967, 32 years later, did they again have some record of the numbers who were there. The latest meeting [Baltimore 1989] has the record so far, nearly 1,200 [1,193, later surpassed by the 1991 meeting in Washington: 1,399].

KIRK: 500 participants.

VDT: Five hundred plus, it must have been, on the program this year in Baltimore, the meeting you missed--which would have been your 47th or 48th meeting?

KIRK: I've missed four meetings.

VDT: Only four meetings in all those years since 1939!

KIRK: So somewhere I have all the programs, going way back.

VDT: In your vignette, you said you felt that the meetings had lost something by growing so.

KIRK: I think it was inevitable. But--I have a biased point of view, I guess--but I think the meetings were more pleasurable then. We knew all the people; we were all at the same sessions; we talked about the same things. It was a family affair, as I say, and we all were interested in each other's personal affairs. But, of course, this isn't the way a science grows; we had to have this expansion and specialization. But the specialization has brought some narrowing of interests. As I mentioned, there were people of broader interests in the early days; the papers tended to be broader.

VDT: Yes, it's becoming more and more specialized, even at the meetings. This year, for instance, they had specialized workshops on Wednesday afternoon and evening; they'd never had them on Wednesday evening before--before the beer party! As well as Thursday evening, which began a few years ago. There were a lot of workshops this year on China, an increasing specialty. But you still find the meetings pleasurable?

KIRK: Oh, of course.

VDT: You started the dinner meetings of the oldtimers, those over 70 who have been members at least 35 years. That continued this year; I'm sure they missed you. That's very special.

Do you think that PAA has a network of camaraderie that is perhaps missing in other professional organizations?

KIRK: Yes, more so than, say, the American Sociological Association or the American Economic Association, which are tremendous, gigantic things. But there's such a difference. Our programs in those days were two or three pages. Now they're a hundred pages [127 pages in 1989]. We'd have four or five sessions then and now there are 84. There were 84 in New Orleans [1988].

VDT: There were 84 this year, eight overlapping at a time.

KIRK: Eight overlapping! Well, the audience is not as attentive. There isn't the same level of discussion, not as it used to be, usually just a few random questions. The meetings were more significant in a sense. There weren't people moving in and out all the time, that sort of thing; there was more attention paid to it.

VDT: But you still go.

KIRK: Oh yes. I'll be there at Toronto [1990].

VDT: My hometown. My first meeting was the last meeting in Toronto, in 1972. At that time I was embarrassed that PAA was meeting in that hotel, the King Edward Hotel, which was shabby when I was growing up and it was shabby then. That was the hotel that turned the women away in the bar and the Women's Caucus rose up in wrath and said, "We will never again allow PAA to meet at any hotel that has any discrimination against women." Well, women could go in, but to a ladies bar, where you had to have a male escort; that was an old Toronto custom.

KIRK: I remember even in New York, at lunchtime, there'd be two or three floors of restaurants, and they always had one that was for women only, accompanied by men.

VDT: I guess Toronto was carrying on that custom. Next year the meeting is in the Royal York Hotel, which when I was growing up was the largest in the British Empire. It's still an old dowager of a hotel but it's been refurbished, so I hope it's a better place.

After all its growth, PAA is still rather small; it's fluctuated at about 2,600 members since the mid-1970s [2,679 at the end of 1989; 2,752, end 1990]. That's far smaller than other professional organizations, like ASA and the American Economic Association. So, it's still rather elitist, don't you think, by the standards of other professional organizations?

KIRK: It depends on what you mean by that word. If you mean in terms of specialization, it is, I think, though the huge organizations have tremendous numbers of programs on all different subjects. I don't think I'd use the word elitist. I think we felt a bit elitist in the early days, but now it's such a huge organization, that it's not so elite.

VDT: What do you see as the outlook for world population growth? Are you depressed by the fact that world population growth seems to be stuck, the rate hasn't gone down?

KIRK: Yes, I am depressed about it. I am depressed that Western civilization countries face the prospect of losing population. I think it's not healthy for a country to lose population, because then it becomes aged, lacks youth. It isn't the fact that there are fewer people so much as the effect in terms of age distribution. A gerontocracy isn't a healthy kind of society.

VDT: The other side of the coin of the rapid population growth in developing countries?

KIRK: That's right. Even the Japanese are now getting concerned about an aging population. This will be a problem. But most of the world is a long way from that. China maybe . . .

VDT: They are beginning to be a bit concerned about how distorted their age structure will be by their one-child-per-couple policy, though they're easing up on that.

KIRK: Yes, they are. And the one-child-per-family idea was never quite as effective as people like Ravenholt thought.

I see imbalance. The developed countries, if anything, need a higher fertility rate and the less developed countries, if anything, need a lower fertility rate.

You know, when they talk about the consequences of population change, it's forgotten that in 1939, the concern was a declining population in the U.S., in developed countries--Enid Charles's book, The Twilight of Parenthood, and so on. Somebody said to me a long time ago, "You're in a good field, because demography and the population problems of the world are going to be around a very long time. It's a good field to be in." And I still think that's true.

VDT: You must have enjoyed your career and felt it was important.

KIRK: Yes, that's right. I did.

VDT: May I ask you about your current interests? You and your wife are working with the California State Mental Health Association, is it?

KIRK: We have a son who is in the Napa State Hospital, in the wine country. Ruth is president of the Napa State Hospital Alliance for the Mentally Ill. There is a California Alliance for the Mentally Ill and there was a meeting of that, which I went to, that conflicted with the Baltimore PAA meeting. We think that we're making a real difference. I'm sure Ruth is making a difference. The other day we were in Sacramento talking with the state senators and the head of the Ways and Means Committee of the Assembly about budget and research problems. We spend a great deal of time on this, she particularly. Napa is about an hour and a half away from here and she goes up two or three times a week. She works tremendously hard at it, and very successfully. She gave a wonderful speech night before last for the volunteers--250 volunteers--who work at the hospital. And she does a wonderful job.

VDT: And important in this Administration--"kinder, gentler"--more voluntarism in this current era.

KIRK: "A thousand points of light."

VDT: Indeed; you're adding several. One last question. Cary Davis of the Population Reference Bureau said he once discussed beekeeping with you. Did you ever do that?

KIRK: Yes, I used to keep bees, in high school and college. Here, I had an observation hive in the bedroom. The bees were behind plexiglass and there was a little plastic tube through a hole in the wall with a little landing place outside and I could watch them inside the hive, in the bedroom!

VDT: Like in a nature center. They didn't fly around in your bedroom?

KIRK: Occasionally they did and Ruth was very disturbed about it. I once had a party for sociology and they came and looked at the bees.

You know, I'd forgotten about this. This is one of the main reasons why I got into demography; I was interested in bees and social insects. I kept ants. I'd dig up an anthill, capture the queen, these big red desert ants, and they would pick up larvae and I'd put them in a Mason jar and they'd dig down. Then I'd put a wooden collar around the top of that, put the whole thing in a field box buried in the ground, with sawdust around the jar. So when I wanted to look at them, I could push the sawdust aside and see their underground tunnels.

I was very much interested in social insects. My first ambition in life was to be an apiarist, a beekeeper. They paid \$3,000 a year for apiarists then.