

909
Page P
Population

Suggested Points for Discussion
IHD Staff - Sept. 20 1949

1. Major policy decision re IHD participation in population studies
2. Framing of objectives

- (MB) a. General. Search for knowledge and understanding of human population problems through the development of interdivisional (interdisciplinary) interests.
- b. Specific. To describe and to try to understand population density relations in man by focussing general studies on one or more specific communities.
- c. Ultimate. To obtain information that might serve as background for possible attempts to influence population density relations.

JUN 1965

(MCB) For Field Study:

a. Immediate.

(1) To evaluate the existing demographic position of the area and to define what demographic development is desirable in relation to resources, the agricultural and industrial status, and potential.

(2) To obtain knowledge and understanding of the complex factors which influence and govern fertility or gross reproduction.

b. Ultimate.

(1) To develop plans and means of changing fertility in accord with a balanced and rational population growth or change.

(2) To improve the quality and well-being of the experimental population group by an integrated and locally supported program of socio-economic development.

3. Method of operation

- a. Direct IHD operations in cooperation with local government
- b. Wholly through grants
- c. Affiliation with specific U.S. University. - Which?
- d. Interdivisional relations

4. Operation of Field Unit

- a. Program - Title - Population vs. Ecology
- b. Activities of field program
- study
 - local service program for improvement (health and/or others)
- c. Place
- d. Type of personnel - including direction

Location

IHD staff meeting, Tues., Sept. 20, 10:30 a.m.-1:30 p.m. to consider preliminary statements of MCB and MB regarding Population Study and a Field Project.

Present: GKS, AJW, HHS, GCP, MB and MCB.

JUN 22 1965

GKS referred to Scientific Directors Meeting Mon., Sept. 26, and agenda items. He recalled also that the Nov. 4 meeting of Scientific Directors would include the 1950 estimates (more limited this year) and consideration of Population in connection with the forthcoming MB-MCB report. GKS believes at least half a day should be available for the latter subject; thus a second day may be required. Unfortunately, CIB will be away from N. Y. at that time, but GKS contemplates a general RF staff meeting about Oct. 15 regarding the IHD report and its proposals. GKS reviewed IHD preparations, pointing out that MB and MCB have been on this assignment for most of the past year. Their preliminary statements have circulated to IHD staff; draft conclusions and recommendations of the Notestein Far Eastern survey were also available, unofficially.

Strong effort was made to follow an agenda covering: Major Policy; Objectives (general, and of the field study); Method of Operation; and the Field Project. This note presents the main discussion to indicate points of emphasis and such points of agreement which resulted.

General: Concerning IHD participation in ~~field~~ population studies, it is accepted that we are in the field - at least we are thinking, exploring, and planning. Major decisions rest naturally with officers, Scientific Directors, and R.F. Trustees. At first, discussion ensued on the general title or theme of the studies and/or the field project. The term, "Studies of Human

Ecology," was suggested as preferable to "Population Studies." HHS explained his views and preference for the broader title; it is more inclusive and perhaps more acceptable to those who feel that population studies have a primary connotation of birth control. He referred to the Crete project to illustrate the need of coordinated study and development which touches many aspects of human ecology. GKS, GCP, AJW and MB favor the idea of human ecology as the broad field of interest.

MCB does not object if it is found necessary to camouflage the purpose by omitting the title "Population." ^{However,} the population field is sufficiently vast and should bring in every discipline and community interest. Population defines and grapples with the main issue. Even population study needs concentration to focus on the point of fundamental importance (fertility). Ecology requires definition, and outside U.S. or Anglo-Saxon circles, we may find ourselves trying to explain the basic purpose. "Ecological studies" run the risk of diffusion, and digressions, or tangential aspects which have only remote relation to the basic problem. Ecology stresses environment; personal factors related to psychology and cultural matters can be neglected if environment is the central idea. Human ecology is broad enough to include most phases of ~~our~~ RF activity, but it lacks the primary focus on population; Why not face the issue in regard to study and amelioration of the population problem? We close on agreement to solicit opinions of other divisions.

Nature of Report to Scientific Directors This report is expected October 15, and time presses. MB will prepare another 5,000 words on the general subject with special regard to human ecology. MCB elaborated his views about the report, covering the points included in his previous outline: definitions, ~~discrepancies~~ of world population by regions, relation to

demographic trends

natural resources, industry, scientific developments, possible actions by the RF, etc. GKS and AJW propose a report having overall perspective as well as recommendations to the IHD. That is, an educational purpose vis-a-vis directors and others is comprehended. MCB opined that length of manuscript might range from minimum of 50 pages to maximum of 100; other data to be reserved for appendices, if necessary.

Objectives There was general agreement, at least, on the spirit of the objectives as given in the agenda. MB may revise his general objectives in light of the talk on ecology. If ecology is the theme, other changes in phraseology may result. Consideration of objectives pushed the discussion rapidly to talk about the field project and its location.

The Field Project There was general agreement on desirability of a field study as an IHD operation in cooperation with local authorities and with interdivisional help. GKS stresses area development under P.H. auspices. The group anticipates a study on a long-term basis; any efforts to change fertility appear far removed. Development of methods and techniques may require two to three years. MCB admits the long duration and the fact that measureable results may be decades away, but points out that fertility control is an important means of obtaining some of the desired information.

Place of Study Almost unanimous opinion in support of an area (Caribbean or U.S.) accessible to New York and U.S. universities. Arguing the prior claims of Ceylon (covered in his memo), MCB feels alone. However, if the field project is established in the Orient, the group recognizes Ceylon as a feasible prospect. Comments on other possible locations:

Puerto Rico: Population pressure exists to a marked degree, and the island is of special concern to the U.S. This area is not favored, however, because of the local obstacles (religion, inertia, and its difficult economy which has made it a relief more than a developmental problem.

Haiti: Excess population, but it is primitive. GCP gives his impression that it is the least desirable for the population study of the places mentioned.

Dominican Republic: No convincing arguments in its favor; less population pressure, language, and the form of government offer contrary arguments.

Trinidad: MB has supported this area for study. General opinion is against it because of limited size, the complex population and disadvantages of a colonial set-up.

Barbados: A new suggestion by GCP. Has excess population, but others consider it generally too small; not an independent people.

Arizona: This state (113,000 sq. mi., population 436,000) was suggested by AJW as a possible place to study and develop methods and techniques for a preliminary two to three year period. The state's density of four per square mile and the great distances involved did not encourage others to accept it even for survey. The pros and cons regarding all areas near home left us unsatisfied with all of them. Toward the end of the meeting, Ceylon and the Far East appeared more attractive in spite of the disadvantage of distance.

Type of Personnel Discussion and some consensus of opinion that these types of experience or capacities should be represented in the study group.

- A. Cultural Anthropology and/or Psychology
- B. Statistics and/or Sociology

(Note: If above specialties are combined, one individual should have a major and a strong minor interest in two fields.)

- C. Public Health
- D. Views were expressed on direction or leadership of the group, both technical, and administrative, with the conclusion that choice depends upon individual qualifications.

Method of Operation There was a strong feeling that the study should be an R.F. operational project under public health auspices; that general socio-economic development should accompany the study. No support to ideas of endowment or large grants to another agency or institution to do the job. If our intentions and purposes are justified, the R.F. and I.H.D. must maintain the connection and probably plan and guide the program, at least until some principles and practice are tested and established.

Affiliation with a U.S. University All agreed that this is

desirable, but it should be a cooperative relationship and not merely financing. The stumbling block to a decision was - which university and how to operate? Some points of discussion were:

Princeton: The Office of Population Research is a favorable setting where demography and sociology receive major attention; there are no public health or medical faculties; natural sciences are less developed here than elsewhere.

Johns Hopkins: The public health school and Institute of Geography are strong connections, but no outstanding person like Pearl or Reed around whom to build.

Yale: Natural resources, conservation and human relations with supporting staff, are features, but public health is relatively weak.

Harvard: A large, complete university with all disciplines well-developed. The Public Health School is now promoting interdivisional relations through ecology; tropical public health emphasizes zonal problems and population. If a choice were obligatory, MB would nominate Harvard, and no one disputes this choice among the above four named. But still the ideal situation and the interest and competence of existing staff, as we foresee the population and/or ecology interests, are not yet fully covered at Harvard or elsewhere.

AJW pointed out the possibility of Chicago or a West Coast university, if the Far East is accepted as the major field. On the other hand, if the field project is established in the Orient, he favors a local university (ex: in Japan, Philippines, Ceylon, or India, depending upon location of the project).

The question of university affiliation was reserved for further consideration and exploration. Finally, the idea was temporarily accepted that utilization of university assistance could be achieved best through consultants of different universities as an advisory committee comparable to NS operations in Mexico.

Interdivisional relations Discussion was limited; some views were aired:

A. Operations through interdivisional committees were not regarded hopefully.

B.

- B. Creation of a special autonomous group under the President would be essentially a new division and would remove or lessen interdivisional relations and activity.
- C. Setting up a population group or team (three to five full-time members) charged with field program, seemed to be the favored solution. Such a group would be appointed by and responsible to one divisional director. Appointments made on the recommendation and approval of other divisional directors; the individual's specialty should lead to maintaining a desired cooperative effort with the respective divisions.