

## THE ROLE OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF POPULATION

FRANK LORIMER

The long name of this organization is loaded with history. In re-considering the name at the time of its reorganization one word was eliminated by substituting "population" in place of "population problems" in defining its interest. The adjective "scientific," though originally referring to the specific conditions of its origin, was retained as still conveying an important emphasis. The term "union," in place of association or society, though no longer pertinent, was retained for the sake of continuity.

The Union grew out of an assembly known as the "First International Population Conference," which met in Geneva in 1927. This had been sponsored by Margaret Sanger, whose name appears as Editor of its Proceedings. As we all know, she was a pioneer in her recognition of the fact that the rational regulation of fertility is essential to the progress of mankind, and in her promotion of this idea. She was not severely constrained in her thinking by scrupulous respect for the findings of scientific inquiry. But she correctly sensed that science implicitly supports the thesis to which her life was dedicated, and she was eager to make this implication explicit. She thought that this could be achieved by bringing together scientists with relevant knowledge, eliciting an authoritative affirmation of this thesis and forming an international organization for its promotion. She obtained the funds needed for the travel and entertainment in Geneva of a company of scientists from various countries to take part in an academic colloquium, and for the publication of its proceedings. This plan elicited a generally positive response. Raymond Pearl played an active role in organizing

the conference. His Johns Hopkins colleague, William Welch, became its Vice-President, with Sir Bernard Mallet of the United Kingdom as President. Sir Bernard, in opening the conference, proposed the appointment of a subcommittee to consider the advisability of some sort of continuing international organization. The proceedings were indeed highly academic. The most controversial topic concerned the validity of the "logistic law of population growth" developed by Pearl and Reed (independently of its earlier formulation by Verhulst.)

The conference generated a strong consensus on the importance of furthering the investigation of population and related problems but on the condition that its activities as an organization be divorced from the promotion of any social policy. Actually, the scientists could not arrive at a consensus on the subject of birth control. Louis Dublin then opposed the birth control movement on moral grounds; his early position on this subject was analogous to that of many reasonable people today with respect to abortion. Pearl, along with Gini, then assumed that population growth is determined by biologic and physical conditions that are quite independent of variations in individual behavior. Some participants feared that declining fertility would lead to the extinction of mankind, or at least would diminish the relative political power of European nations in world affairs. And some believed that the authority of the Papacy is supreme on any social issue that involves ethical aspects. So the participants were generally embarrassed by the situation in which they found themselves. The circumstances seemed inappropriate for any definitive action in the formation of an international organization. Nevertheless, the subcommittee, appointed in the opening session, recommended at the final session that this matter be referred to a "provisional committee," with power to plan and initiate an organization for the promotion of research and the exchange of ideas in this field. The original committee was reconstituted for this purpose, with Pearl as its chairman.

Pearl brought this need and opportunity to the attention of the officers of the Milbank Memorial Fund. His presentation was strongly supported by Welch, who was then Chairman of the Fund's Advisory Council. The officers of the Fund recognized the importance of promoting the scientific investigation of population questions throughout the world, and the possible value of an international organization in this field. It made provision for a meeting of the provisional committee in Paris the following year, and it became the major source of financial sustenance for the infant organization in its first perilous years of life.

Thus, the International Union for the Scientific Investigation of Population Problems was launched in 1928, with the assistance of the Milbank Memorial Fund. The Fund was the first foundation in this country, or in the world, to promote the advancement of demography on a broad scale—except for the earlier individual action of E. W. Scripps in establishing an institute in this field at Miami University. The pioneering initiative of the Fund in this matter, as in other important matters, should perhaps be credited to the wisdom of its founders in establishing a high-level advisory council. The Fund has continued to play an important role during the past four decades in the advancement of population studies in various ways, especially through the activities of its highly competent professional staff in this field. Today population study is a subject of serious interest throughout the world, and attracts large official and unofficial support.

The international organization was originally a “union” of autonomous, self-perpetuating national committees. The American National Committee, with Dublin as Chairman, at first had only about 15 members. One of these was Henry Pratt Fairchild, who shortly thereafter initiated and became the first President of the Population Association of America. The Committee retained its separate identity for several years, but merged with the Association on becoming convinced of the latter’s scientific character. The occasion of this action was a proposal by the secretary of the Association to initiate a periodical survey of publications in this field as its first major activity. Shortly thereafter the new Office of Population Research under Notestein at Princeton University accepted primary responsibility for this periodical, which then became known as *Population Index*, with Irene Taeuber as its first editor. Louise Kiser and Daphne Notestein also made significant contributions to its early development.

Demography had long remained an ill-defined field since its origin in John Graunt’s imaginative and truly scientific study, in the second half of the seventeenth century. The word itself, as first used by Guillard in 1855, referred to an amorphous set of social studies. Nevertheless, though sporadic, the mathematical relations among demographic functions had been developing gradually. This was stimulated by interest in the actuarial basis of insurance systems and by growing concern about hygienic conditions, and it was associated with general progress in statistical theory. Advances in official census-taking and vital statistics provided more extensive and reliable demographic data. Up to the middle of the nineteenth century, progress along these lines by

governments and individual scholars was largely uncoordinated except through dispersed publications and personal correspondence. A series of eight intergovernmental statistical conferences was initiated by Quetelet in 1853. This was superseded after 1885 by the nongovernmental biennial conferences, released from political interference, sponsored by the International Statistical Institute. These always included a special section on demographic statistics. Another series of 14 international conferences, specifically devoted to hygiene and demography, ran from 1876 to 1912. These were superseded by the activities of the Health Organization of the League of Nations. However, prior to the 1927 conference in Geneva and the formation of the International Union, no organized exchange of ideas took place on the substantive aspects of population trends, in spite of convergent lines of interest in this broad field. Lively interest in the economic implications of population growth had been generated through the Malthusian controversy. Darwin's discovery of the origin of species stimulated interest in eugenics as defined by Darwin's cousin, Francis Galton. Advances in social theory and social science included a wide range of studies on various aspects of population changes including international migration, urbanization and internal migration. The International Union for the Scientific Investigation of Population Problems was the first international, or national, organization concerned with the coordination of work in this broad field.

The history of the Union falls into two phases, divided by the radical change in its structure in 1947. The old Union, during the first two decades of its existence, was hampered by its nationalistic structure and the political vicissitudes of the interwar period. The old Union planned to hold its first conference in Rome in 1931. The rise of Mussolini to power before the conference was convened and the discovery that the conference would be used as a platform for the proclamation of his theories, led the officers of the Union to cancel this arrangement. In its place they hastily convened a meeting in London. Gini proceeded, nevertheless, to organize an international conference in Rome with resources placed at his disposal by the Italian government. He secured the attendance of a considerable number of foreign scholars and many Italian participants, and he contributed numerous papers himself. This resulted in a quantitatively impressive publication of proceedings in ten volumes. The conference in London was more restricted in resources and more limited in number, but it was a creditable affair. Its proceedings were published in one rather small volume, edited by

G.H.L.F. Pitt-Rivers, the erratic scion of a wealthy and intellectually distinguished English family, who had acted as a host for the conference and was elected Secretary of the Union.

It was then planned to hold the next conference in Berlin, where freedom of expression would be assured by the enlightened government of the Weimar Republic. Before this conference was convened in 1935, Hitler had come to power in Germany. In spite of serious misgivings, the officers of the Union decided not to boycott this affair, but the American National Committee refused to participate.

The last conference of the interwar period was held in Paris in 1937, and was a happy and illustrious affair. It was organized by Adolphe Landry, an eminent historian, economist and demographer, who was the permanent member from Corsica in the French Senate. His thesis of an intermediate demographic regime, brought about by the postponement of marriage in early modern Europe, is in my opinion an important contribution to demographic theory. He was later the author of an excellent text: *TRAITÉ DE DÉMOGRAPHIE*. He was assisted by an active operator, Georges Mauco, who had made a study of immigrants in France. They obtained quite generous support from various French agencies for the conference, though they had to seek American support for the publication of its proceedings. The enrollment of a large contingent of pseudoscientific proponents of Nazi racial doctrines posed a delicate problem. This was resolved by assigning all their papers to one section, along with an excellent scientific paper by Franz Boas, and by arranging for an American with the qualities of statesmanship, Frederick Osborn, to chair the meeting. Osborn concluded the session by quoting Voltaire: "I disagree with everything you say, but I would give my life for your right to say it." The conference in Paris in 1937 exhibited the essential character of the Union in its true light, and generated *elan*.

This *elan* was dissipated, and the structure of the Union was disrupted, by World War II. After the German occupation of Paris, Nazi officials applied all possible pressure on Landry as its President and Mr. Mauco as its Secretary to transfer responsibility for the future development of the Union to German demographers. Mauco was arrested and jailed, though only for a day. This pressure was firmly resisted. A meeting of the International Statistical Institute in Washington in 1947 brought together a dozen or more of the Union's members from various countries. They undertook the task of reorganizing the Union on a new basis. It was transformed from a union of autonomous national

committees into an association of individual members, with ultimate authority resting in the total membership. Operating decisions are made in periodic General Assemblies, usually concurrent with international conferences. Some matters, including the election of new members, are reserved for action through mail ballot by the total membership. This organizational structure was strongly influenced by that of the International Statistical Institute, but differs in one important respect. The elitist character of the Institute is maintained by a fixed limit on the number of members eligible for election from any one country, so that in nations with many statisticians the selection is highly competitive. The statutes of the Union do not include any such nationality quotas. The combination of features adopted from the ISI model with this radical departure has resulted in some anomalies. These have become increasingly apparent with the Union's growth in size and in the range of its interests. The right of every member to present a paper at any conference under the auspices of the Union has complicated the effective organization of sessions and the publication of proceedings. Election by ballot from a long list of candidates, most of whom are unknown to most members, has become an awkward, as well as an expensive, process. However, these are merely procedural complications. They have not seriously affected the character of the Union and can, in any case, be resolved. The affairs of the Union, subject to decisions by the membership in a General Assembly or by mail ballot, are now directed by a Bureau composed of the President, President-Elect, eight Vice Presidents from different countries and a Secretary-General, with the assistance of a paid Executive Director. All are subject to limited terms except the Secretary-General and the Executive Director.

On returning to Paris from Washington in 1947, Mauco as Secretary wrote to Lotka, the American Vice-President, that in Landry's judgment, with which he concurred, the Union could be most effectively advanced if its administrative office were transferred from France to the United States. He asked Lotka to nominate an Executive Director. Lotka invited me to accept this nomination. Before doing so, I conferred with Notestein, who was then organizing the staff of the United Nations Population Division, concerning a question that was uppermost in my mind—namely, the role of an unofficial international association in this field in relation to the new official center of demographic interest and activity under the auspices of the United Nations. He said that in his judgment, these two modes of activity were clearly distinct and mutually complementary. This was, I think, an eminently sound judg-

ment. Moreover, the possibility of close informal liaison between the Union and the United Nations Population Division, made possible by frequent meetings between officers of both organizations during the first postwar decade, proved extremely valuable. During a later period while Henry was Secretary, Croze was Executive Director, and I was President (as a reward for my previous work) we were also able to maintain a surprisingly close rapport through rapid correspondence between Paris and Washington. The administrative structure of the Union is now somewhat more complex, but it remains harmonious and effective. Grebenik's continuing and devoted service as Secretary and Treasurer has been an important factor in its stability and efficacy.

One of the major functions of the Union is simply to keep demographers around the world in touch with new developments in this field. One of its first decisions after its reorganization was to substitute an arrangement for the distribution of three established periodicals, *Population* (Paris), *Population Index* (Princeton) and *Population Studies* (London) to all members instead of continuing the independent journal previously published under the auspices of the old Union. This is made possible through the generous cooperation of the agencies responsible for these periodicals. The effort is complemented by the courtesy of other organizations in distributing demographic materials to the Union's members—including reprints of all articles on demography in the *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*. It is also supplemented by an occasional publication on activities of special interest to the members.

The personal exchange of ideas and experience is fostered through international population conferences, each with a schedule of scientific meetings and with opportunity for informal conversation and social activities. Nine international population conferences have been held solely under the auspices of the Union or in cooperation with ISI or the United Nations during the last 23 years in Geneva, New Delhi, Rome (twice), Stockholm, Vienna, New York, Belgrade, Ottawa and London. The organization of an international conference under the auspices of the Union places a heavy burden on its administrative staff and on the local sponsors—as Kiser, who was Chairman of the Local Arrangements Committee for the Conference in New York in 1961, must know all too well. It also involves large expense, especially in view of the emphasis placed on facilitating the attendance of scientists from the less-developed countries.

In view of the increasing number and widened distribution of persons engaged in population studies, and the complications as well as ad-

vantages of ecumenical assemblies, a new emphasis is now placed on the organization of regional conferences. The only conference under Union auspices between the Belgrade Conference in 1965 and the London Conference in 1969 was held in Sydney in 1967, without a General Assembly. Attention there was focused on topics of special interest to Asian and Oceanic countries, and 70 per cent of the participants were drawn from the ECAFE region. There have also been regional population conferences under non-Union auspices, including an African conference in 1966 initiated and supported by the Population Council, and conferences in the Scandinavian region, the Soviet Union, Hungary and Israel. During 1970 and 1971 there have been or will be regional population conferences sponsored jointly by the Union and by agencies of the United Nations, in cooperation with local organizations, in Mexico City, Manila, Accra and perhaps Dakar. The Union is also cooperating in a European Population Conference (including Eastern and Western countries) at Strassburg this fall. The next General Assembly and conference of the Union will be held in Liege in 1973, again after a four-year interval.

A significant expansion of scientific projects has occurred under the Union's auspices (especially in the coordination of ideas and information) carried out by committees consisting of scientists from different world regions. This important line of activity was previously severely restricted by paucity of resources. The Union's annual budget, though still small in comparison with many present-day operations, now begins to approach \$100,000, of which about half is designated for use in special scientific undertakings. The improved financial situation is primarily the result of contributions by the Population Council, the UN World Population Fund and UNESCO. The free contribution of time and energy by members of the Union to these undertakings raises the total value of the output to a much higher figure. However, it must be noted that the increase of the Union's membership aggravates, rather than relieves, the problem of obtaining support for its regular operations—because of the cost of its services to members, including the supply of periodicals, correspondence and so forth. It is hoped that enlarged support can be drawn from diverse governmental and private sources in different countries.

The three projects in which the Union is now making the largest investment deal with the Teaching of Demography, Comparative Studies of Fertility and Family Planning, and the Interrelations of Economics and Demography. Other projects on which committees are



now or have been recently engaged, include: Mathematical Demography, Interrelations between Education and Population, Internal Migration, Urbanization and Population Distribution, Use of Defective and Indirect Data in Population Estimates, Historical Demography, Legislation Affecting Fertility, and Nuptiality and the Family. Consideration is being given to a project for the standardization of demographic terms as a complement to the series of interlingual demographic dictionaries initiated at the request of and partially supported by the United Nations.

The Union is officially affiliated with the United Nations and with its specialized agencies concerned with population questions, as well as with the International Statistical Institute and the International Social Science Council. Also, in the organization of conferences it cooperates with, or accepts the cooperation of, organizations with which it is not officially affiliated, including the Council of Europe and the International Planned Parenthood Federation. An invitation to cooperate in the organization of a population conference in the Union of South Africa was rejected.

The Union is concerned wholly with the advancement and dissemination of knowledge and the exchange of ideas and experience on population matters, to the exclusion of any involvement in political activity or the affirmation as an institution of opinions on matters of social policy. In so doing it contributes significantly, though indirectly, to the development of humanistic social policies. It has, for example, been highly effective, merely through progress in knowledge and rational theory, in advancing the movement throughout the world toward a consensus on the importance of reducing the rate of population increase in mankind as a whole, and especially in regions now bound in poverty.

The opportunity to cooperate officially with the United Nations in organizing its First World Population Conference gave rise to some anxiety. In fact, Hersch, who was then the Union's President, opposed this move in fear that it would lead to involvement by the Union in political affairs. When overruled by a majority of the members of the Bureau, he graciously acquiesced in its decision and he was later entirely happy about the conference. Fortunately, the General Assembly of the United Nations had ruled that members of the conference be invited to participate solely in their capacity as individual scholars, and that the conference be limited to the exchange of ideas and experience. The organizing committee, composed mostly of active members of the

Union, ruled that no proposals for resolutions should be entertained. It was assumed that the development of information and ideas is in itself a positive force, even without any attempt to clothe particular ideas with a mantle of authority.

A third World Population Conference under United Nations auspices will be an intergovernmental affair, concerned with official policies and action in this field. At the last General Assembly of the Union in London, in the discussion of the Union's relation to this Conference, I expressed gratification with this action by the United Nations but doubt about the propriety of any participation by the Union, as an organization, in this undertaking. On further reflection, I have concluded that my position was erroneous. Actually, the Union's participation is limited to the appointment of representatives on the organizing committee, the preparation of one advance technical paper, and the appointment of an observer at the Conference.

The relation of academic organizations to social action involves a broad theoretical issue. All value judgments, except in immediate personal or esthetic responses, involve the cognitive appraisal of existential conditions, relations and trends, as well as intuitive and affective aspects. Therefore, scientists *qua* scientists, have a distinct and important role in policy deliberations—especially in interpreting the conditions and limitations of scientific findings (the neglect of which is a major source of error in the application of science to practical affairs) and in calling attention to information that might otherwise be neglected. A scientific organization, or university, may serve society by facilitating the participation of its members in the formulation of social policies, though it tends to undermine its essential function by engaging as an institution in policy declarations and the promotion of controversial action.

The Union's essential function remains, and we all hope that it always will remain, the advancement of knowledge along a broad front and the facilitation of critical dialogue on current theories in this field. Even in considering the economic aspects of population trends, there needs to be more concern about mounting unemployment and demoralization in swollen urban populations resulting from trends in agricultural economy and the accession to the labor force of large cohorts of children already born. There is also need for greater attention to the interrelations of social structure, culture and population trends, as suggested by the apparent difference between reproductive trends in India and Brazil in comparison with those in Japan or in China.

Attention to the design of residential community patterns conducive to the release rather than the corruption of creative human potentialities becomes increasingly important in an era of rapid population redistribution. Concern about the possible erosion of the human genetic pool and about the social implications of differential reproduction is no less imperative than concern about the erosion of the environment. There is still need for significant advances in the measurement of population changes. We must continually emphasize the diversity of demography as a many-sided discipline. It includes many issues that have not yet received the attention they merit, and some that are not yet even clearly recognized. The vigorous promotion of action along well-defined lines and the perpetual pursuit of enlarged knowledge and wisdom are, of course, not contradictory. They are complementary approaches to the creation of "the good society."

•

## DISCUSSION

*Carmen Miró*: Frank Lorimer, with his interesting account of how the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population came to being, has unveiled important historical facts. To many of us, it is indeed a surprise to learn that more than 40 years ago the preoccupation with the rational regulation of human reproduction would have been instrumental in promoting the creation of the Union. To some extent, history continues to repeat itself: a great deal of the support now being given for the development of true scientific research comes from circles that are not—as Dr. Lorimer puts it—“severely constrained by scrupulous respect for the results of scientific inquiries.” It is to be hoped that as the Union has been able to preserve its role in the objective “advancement and the dissemination of knowledge and the exchange of ideas and experience on population matters,” other institutions in the world with similar objectives will be as successful as the Union in safeguarding its scientific integrity.

The history of the Union in Latin America is of course more recent. A very small group of Latin Americans participated in the early meetings, but it was the Conference of 1955 in Brazil that created for the first time a greater interest in the activities of the Union. That meeting was attended by 30 professionals from Latin American countries other than Brazil. Ten documents were submitted by Latin Americans to the joint sessions of the Union and the International Statistical Institute (ISI).

Gradually, the number of members from the region grew. In 1959, four years after the Brazil Conference, members from ten Latin American countries numbered 41. Eleven years later, in 1970, these had grown to 80 from 14 countries of the region.

Attendance to meetings and submission of papers to them give evidence of the increased preoccupation for the study of demographic topics.

The establishment by the United Nations, at the end of 1957, of the Latin American Demographic Centre (CELADE) gave further impetus to the rising interest for the study of population.

Since then, more than 200 Latin Americans have participated in CELADE's regular training program; the general level of knowledge regarding demographic phenomena has increased considerably and there is a widespread interest in introducing the study of demographic variables in university curricula at the undergraduate as well as at the

graduate levels. The reciprocal influence of the activities of both institutions, the Union and CELADE, is clear when one realizes that half the present Latin American membership of the former is composed of professionals either working at CELADE or those who have undergone training there.

The event that confirms that population studies have come of age in Latin America is the Regional Conference held in Mexico in August 1970. Although an organizing committee was given responsibility for the Conference, most of the burden for actually making it a success rested on El Colegio de Mexico, where a Center for Economic and Demographic Studies functions. A detailed account of the Conference is really not called for on this occasion, but it should be pointed out that seven sessions were organized, covering the basic topics of mortality, fertility, migration, urbanization and regional distribution, population and economic development, future population trends in Latin America, population policies and research and training in demography. Most of the authors of papers, as well as organizers and rapporteurs of the sessions were Latin Americans.

Even though the papers submitted, as is to be expected, were of varying scientific quality, they helped to establish what was for Latin America the general level of knowledge of the basic demographic variables. The main gaps that persisted pertained to some of the methodologic approaches being taken for the measurement of levels and trends, and to the explanation of interrelations of fertility with nondemographic variables. The subject of population policy received special attention in a session to which more than 30 papers were submitted.

How has this development been possible? An exhaustive list runs the risk of omissions, but one considered somewhat complete is nevertheless attempted here.

The International Union for the Scientific Study of Population, by facilitating the participation of Latin American professionals in its scientific meetings—thus allowing them to keep abreast of developments in the population fields—by encouraging them to submit papers, by inviting them as members of the scientific committees, by putting them into contact with the outstanding population reviews being published and, above all, by promoting among them the sense of belonging to a respected field of scientific endeavor, deserves to be mentioned in first place.

The United Nations has also contributed notably to this outcome by

having established CELADE, where, as pointed out before, a large number of Latin Americans have received training in demography and where a vigorous program of research has contributed—as was recognized in the Mexico Conference—to the elucidation of many of the unknowns prevailing until very recently. An evaluation of CELADE's contribution is not called for in these comments. A mission sent in June 1970 by the United Nations, precisely with this purpose, was of the opinion that “there is reason for giving CELADE a sizable share in the credit for the growing understanding and appreciation of the importance of demographic aspects of the problems of economic and social development in Latin American countries during recent years.” Briefly the activities that support the preceding assertion can be summarized as follows:

1. In the training field:

- a) The development at the Santiago Headquarters of a sound and well-integrated training program that distinguished scholars from outside the region have considered of high quality and comparable to those given at the postgraduate level in well-known American and European universities.
- b) The organization at the subcenter of an intensive course of four months' duration, especially adapted to the Central American and Caribbean countries, which will be replaced in 1972 by a basic course, similar to that being offered in Santiago.
- c) Facilities for in-service training of researchers in the population field.
- d) The organization and development of national courses in the countries. These have been of two kinds: (1) courses of three to four months' duration addressed at creating the necessary stimulus for the permanent introduction of demography as a subject of study in the regular curricula of university departments (Cordoba, 1968 and 1970, and Zulia, 1969, already completed and Rio de Janeiro and Havana in 1971); (2) courses of shorter duration as a means of promoting interest in the study of population phenomena.
- e) Collaboration in the training programs addressed to professionals of disciplines where the study of population factors is indispensable. These programs have covered the areas of medicine and public health, social sciences, education, city planning, housing and so forth. Through this channel CELADE has entered into contact

with more than 700 professionals who in varying degrees of detail have become familiar with the Latin American demographic situation and its relation to their particular areas of professional interest and have undertaken some elements of demographic analysis.

2. In the area of research CELADE's activities have expanded gradually to cover a wide range of topics, namely:
  - a) Current estimates and future projections of population and labor force, as essential parts of the statistical requirements for socioeconomic development planning.
  - b) Investigation of interrelationships of demographic, economic and social conditions and changes to strengthen the basis for demographic and other projections, for decisions on questions of national policy and for taking account of demographic repercussions in planning of economic and social developments.
  - c) Study of biologic, behavioral and cultural factors in human fertility and evaluation of effectiveness of family planning programs to provide guidelines for national policy and action programs relevant to fertility control.
  - d) Compilation, evaluation and standardization of demographic data as materials for research in the fields outlined above.
3. Technical Assistance Program: CELADE's technical assistance activities have been the last component of its present overall program to take momentum. It can now be described as varied, flexible and highly opportune. It encompasses assistance and advice along the following general lines.

At the national level:

  - a) Demography in planning work. The support given to several national planning institutions in the execution of a program of population studies needed for development planning.
  - b) Demographic research. The guidance given to certain research institutions in the area in the execution of their demographic research activities.
  - c) Demographic variables in technical studies. The collaboration rendered for the preparation of technical documents embodying demographic variables in the study of the situation in a country as it relates to a particular field of governmental action, such as social security, education or housing.

d) The gathering of basic demographic data. As is reflected by the activities related to experimental censuses and sample surveys.

At the international level, the collaboration and assistance rendered to ILPES, CIAP, IASI, PAHO, UNESCO and subregional schemes, such as the Andean Pact.

The publication of the biannual *Demographic Bulletin* can also be listed as a form of technical assistance both to countries as well as to international organizations.

All this, of course, is in addition to the services rendered to the countries in the organization of demographic teaching at the national level and the support given to the local institutions participating as counterparts in the comparative studies on fertility, abortion and migration.

4. Publication and Information. Although CELADE's publication programme is rather vast (374 titles have been published by the end of 1970), it was not until very recently that they have taken the more conventional form of printed books and that arrangements have been made with a well-known publishing house for continental distribution. This is expected to increase the demand for the publications as well as to stimulate their introduction to a larger group of professionals of disciplines other than demography and to the public generally.

Another aspect worth mentioning is the important contribution to the enrichment of the demographic bibliography in Spanish, which has been made through the publication of text-books prepared by CELADE staff and which have undoubtedly exercised a positive influence in extending and improving the study of demography within Latin American universities.

The field of information addressed to the general public has not been neglected. Two of the activities conducted in the past three years appear to have produced valuable returns, namely: the periodic diffusion, through the Population Reference Bureau Service (5,000 circulation) of brief articles in Spanish addressed to the general public, summarizing important findings of research conducted and publications made by CELADE. Twenty of these articles have been prepared in two years.

The other apparently successful undertaking was the mounting of a movable exhibit portraying the most important demographic facts of the Latin American situation. This exhibit was presented



in three cities of Chile (Santiago, Viña del Mar and Concepción) and in four other capital cities (Bogota, Caracas, Lima and Quito). It was estimated that 80,000 persons visited the exhibit.

Press releases are sent to different countries when an event (organization of a meeting, issuance of a publication) offers an opportunity for publicizing any national contribution to it and its relation to CELADE's work.

5. **Organization and Participation in Technical Meetings.** Since 1959, when the United Nations gave CELADE the responsibility for the "Latin American Seminar on the Utilization of Population Censuses Data," the institution has participated actively, either directly or on a collaborative basis, in the organization of many technical meetings. The most recent example is the Latin American Regional Population Conference. It has now been given the responsibility for the organization of the forthcoming "Seminar on the Utilization of Demographic Data for Planning Purposes," which is being sponsored by ILPES, ECLA, BID and OAS.

Credit for the development of demography to its present status in Latin America should also go to other non-United Nations institutions that have given support to CELADE's program, namely, the USAID, the Ford Foundation, the Population Council and the Inter American Development Bank.

The Milbank Memorial Fund has also played a very important role in contributing to the development of population studies in Latin America by convening several round tables in which various general and specific topics related to Latin American Populations have been examined, by the long-standing publication of its *Quarterly*, which recently was complemented by issues in Spanish, including that valuable reader "Estudios de Demografia" and by its program of fellowships, which in several cases has contributed to the study of population topics.

The development of this work by the Fund, has been made possible among others, by the outstanding contribution of the man we honor in this occasion. It was because of the untiring efforts and enthusiasm of Dr. Clyde Kiser that we at CELADE became related to the Milbank Memorial Fund. Because of this and because we in CELADE admire and respect his dedication and devotion to the field to which he has given the best of himself, we wanted very earnestly to participate in this round table. Let this be the propitious opportunity to convey our appre-

ciation to Dr. Burney for the invitation, which has allowed us to pay this tribute to Dr. Kiser.

### *Outlook for future fertility research in Latin America*

I have been asked also to take advantage of the opportunity to give my views on the outlook for future research in Latin America in the field of fertility.

As Dr. Walter Mertens, Organizer of the Fertility Session at the Mexico Regional Conference, rightly put it, the past decade has allowed Latin America to move from the "fairy tale stage" to the more documented study of fertility. As he pointed out, we know much more now of levels, differentials and related factors.

In spite of this, our lack of knowledge about fertility is probably as great as our knowledge. CELADE's program of comparative fertility surveys sheds light on the level and on some of the determinants of fertility in the early 1960's in the large metropolitan areas. But change of these variables takes place rapidly and though in terms of levels of rates we know the direction of these changes, we know little about the groups affected, about the relative importance of the factors influencing them, about the pace with which changes are taking place and above all, about what can really be expected in the future in terms of reproductive behavior of the Latin American Population.

The situation regarding the study of fertility in small urban and rural areas is still less developed. CELADE organized a comparative program of surveys to deal with these areas. Only four countries of the region (Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico and Peru) joined the program. The data are being processed at present and it is hoped that the analyses to which they will be submitted will enhance, among other things, our knowledge of differentials. It should be pointed out, though, that these surveys refer to a reduced portion of the population of Latin America. No doubt many findings would be applicable generally, but there are good reasons to believe that differentials between rural areas, of say, Argentina and Mexico, would probably be as great as those found when their metropolitan areas were compared. In summary, while the analyses of the available data indicate possible future areas of inquiry, new and additional data must be collected so that a better understanding of the differences between social groups can be gained. Let us try to study the transition of fertility when it is occurring, so that we will not complain fifty years hence for our lack of knowledge of the phenomena, being forced then to embark in historical studies.

It should be borne in mind that by understanding the present we have only a limited picture of how it came to be so.

In mentioning history, let us be reminded that we need to dig into the past to have a picture as complete as possible to guide us into the future. Of course, I am aware that only in very few countries—Argentina, Chile, and possibly Mexico and Brazil—studies in historical demography can be attempted. They should help us in understanding past fertility behavior.

Our knowledge of fertility in the region will continue to be incomplete unless the Latin American sociologists recognize the importance of studying the complex interaction between family formation patterns and reproductive behavior. More concern for the sociologic study of the Latin American family is a prerequisite for a deeper insight into the determinants of fertility.

The fact that several Latin American countries have decided to include the rendering of advice and services in family planning as functions of the national health services has brought to the forefront the need to develop methods that will allow the measurement of changes in fertility levels within short periods. Considerable analyses will have to be conducted in Latin America in the search of the appropriate tools to be applied in solving the problem posed.

While pointing out some of the needed research, I forgot that what I have been asked to discuss is the outlook of fertility research in Latin America. I could answer with a very short sentence: it is promising! You will of course want me to justify my assertion. Here are some of the reasons for it:

1. Several groups within Latin American countries (government, academics, general public) have become aware of the importance of understanding fertility behaviour;

2. The data basic to the study of fertility phenomena is continuously being increased. Several of the 1970 decade population censuses will add to the data already available or being compiled;

3. More international aid, both technical as well as financial, appears to be available from sources such as UNFPA and country programs such as USAID, Canada's International Development Research Center, Sweden's SIDA and so forth.

4. The international Population Union is promoting, through its committee on fertility research, activities in this field;

5. CELADE continues to pay preferential attention to research in this area.

6. A core of Latin American professionals trained in demography and sociology have selected fertility as their preferred field of research.

Allow me to finish my remarks by adding to the outlook the hope we have that the Milbank Memorial Fund will also continue to be interested in promoting research in fertility in Latin America.

*Wilson H. Grabill*: Professor Miró made the point that much remains to be learned about the whys of levels and differentials in fertility. She had Chile and similar places in mind, but that point has equal validity for people in areas where fertility is largely planned. Why do some people drop out of clinical programs when they claim they do not want more children? Why has the illegitimacy rate increased so much in the United States despite sex courses in high school, the wider knowledge of the existence of newer methods of contraception and so forth? Why do young wives today want an average of about three children rather than two? Do couples voluntarily cut back only under extreme conditions such as the U.S. depression of the 1930's? In developing countries, to what extent do improved health conditions enhance the fecundity of the people and thus bolster the birth rate in the absence of much desire to curtail family size? And so it goes.

*Vasilios G. Valaoras*: I wanted to say that the Milbank Memorial Fund was the first to bring into focus the biologic (besides the socio-economic) factors affecting population dynamics and that for a long time, the *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly* was the only American journal dealing with population matters. This situation continued to exist for some years after Europeans had at least two such journals (*Population and Population Studies*).